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Leipzig 1943
Spuler, Iran = B. Spuler, Iran in früh-islamischer
Zeit, Wiesbaden 1952
Spuler, Mongolen = B. Spuler, Die Mongolen in
Iran, 2nd ed., Berlin 1955
Storey = C. A. Storey, Persian Literature: a bio-
bibliographical survey, London 1927-
Survey of Persian Art = ed. by A. U. Pope, Oxford
1938
Suter = H. Suter, Die Mathematiker und Astronomen
der Araber und ihre Werke, Leipzig 1900
Suyūṭī, Bughya = Bughyat al-Wu'dā, Cairo 1326
TA = Muhammad Murtaḍā b. Muhammad al-Zabīdī,
Tāḍī al-'Arūs
Ṭabarī = Ta'rikh al-Rusul wa 'l-Mulūk, ed. M. J. De
Goeje and others, Leiden 1879-1901
Taeschner, Wegenets = Franz Taeschner, Die Verkehrs-
lage und das Wegenetz Anatoliens im Wandel der
Zeiten, Gotha 1926
Ta'rikh Baghdād = al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Ta'rikh
Baghdād, 14 vols., Cairo 1349/1931.
Ta'rikh Dimashq = Ibn 'Ajā'īb, Ta'rikh Dimashq,
7 vols., Damascus 1339-51/1911-31
Ta'rikh-i Guṣūda = Hamd Allāh Mustawfī al-Ḳaz-
wīnī, Ta'rikh-i Guṣūda, ed. in facsimile by E. G.
Browne, Leiden-London 1910
Tha'ālibī, Yāsima = Yāsima al-Dahr fi Maḥāsīn
Ah al-'Arūs, Damascus 1904
Tomaschek = W. Tomaschek, Zur historischen Topo-
graphie von Kleinasien im Mittelalter, Vienna
1891.
Weil, Chalifen = G. Weil, Geschichte der Chalifen,
Mannheim-Stuttgart 1846-82
Wensinck, Handbook = A. J. Wensinck, A Hand-
book of Early Muhammadan Tradition, Leiden
1927
Yaḥyābī = Ta'rikh, ed. M. Th. Houtsma, Leiden 1883
Yaḥyābī, Buldān = ed. M. J. De Goeje, Leiden 1892
(BGA VII)
Yaḥyābī-Wiet = Yaḥyābī. Les Pays, trad. par Gaston
Wiet, Cairo 1937
Yahūd = Mu'ājam al-Buldān, ed. F. Wüstenfeld,
Leipzig 1866-73 (anastatic reprint 1934)
Yahūd, I斯塔 = Ṭahā da al-Ārāb ilā Ma'rijat al-
Adīb, ed. D. S. Margoliouth, Leiden 1907-31
(GMS VI)
Zambaur = E. de Zambaur, Manuel de généalogie
et de chronologie pour l'histoire de l'Islam,
Hanover 1927 (anastatic reprint Bad Pyrmont
1955)
Zinkeisen = J. Zinkeisen, Geschichte des osmanischen
Reiches in Europa, Gotha 1840-83
ABBREVIATIONS FOR PERIODICALS ETC.

Abh. K. M. = Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes.
AIEO Alger = Annales de l'Institut d'Etudes Orientales de l'Université d'Alger.
AIUON = Annali dell' Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli.
AO = Acta Orientalia.
ARq = Archives Orientales.
ARW = Archiv für Religionswissenschaft.
ASI = Archaeological Survey of India.
ASI, NIS = ditto, New Imperial Series.
ASA, AR = ditto, Annual Reports.
AUDITCD = Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi.
BAH = Bibliotheca Arabico-Hispanica.
BASOR = Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research.
Belleten = Belleten (of Türk Tarih Kurumu).
BFac. Ar. = Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts of the Egyptian University.
BÉI. Or. = Bulletin d'Études Orientales de l'Institut Français de Damas.
BGA = Bibliotheca geographorum arabicum.
BIE = Bulletin de l'Institut d'Égypte.
BIFO = Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire.
BRAH = Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia de España.
BSE = Bol'shaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya (Large Soviet Encyclopaedia) 1st ed.
BSE* = the same, 2nd ed.
BTLV = Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde [van Nederland-Indië].
BZ = Byzantinistische Zeitschrift.
COC = Cahiers de l'Orient contemporain.
CT = Cahiers de Tunisie.
EI = Encyclopaedia of Islam, 1st edition.
EIM = Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica.
ERE = Encyclopaedia of Religions and Ethics.
GGA = Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen.
GMS = Gubb Memorial Series.
Gr. I. Ph. = Grundriss der Iranischen Philologie.
IA = Islam Ansiklopedisi.
IBLA = Revue de l'Institut des Belles Lettres Arabes, Tunis.
IC = Islamic Culture.
IFD = Itihāyi Fâhilâtû Dergisti.
IHQ = Indian Historical Quarterly.
IQ = The Islamic Quarterly.
J. = Der Islam.
JBBRAS = Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
JE = Jewish Encyclopedia.
JESHO = Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient.
JPHS = Journal of the Punjab Historical Society.
JQR = Jewish Quarterly Review.
JRAS = Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
JRGeoG = Journal of the Royal Geographical Society.
JSFO = Journal de la Société Finno-ougrienne.
JSS = Journal of Semitic Studies.
KAC = Körösi Csoma Archivum.
KL = Keleti Szemle (Oriental Review).
KSIE = Kratkie Soobshteniya Instituta Entnografiy (Short communications of the Institute of Ethnography).
LE = Literaturnaya Entsiklopediya (Literary Encyclopaedia).
MDOG = Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft.
MDPV = Mitteilungen und Nachrichten des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.
MEA = Middle Eastern Affairs.
MEJ = Middle East Journal.
MFOS = Mélanges de la Faculté Orientale de l'Université St. Joseph de Beyrouth.
MGMN = Mitteilungen zur Geschichte der Medizin und Naturwissenschaften.
MGWO = Monatschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums.
MIDE = Mélanges de l'Institut Dominicain d'Études Orientales du Caire.
MIE = Mémoires de l'Institut d'Égypte.
MIFAO = Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire.
MMAF = Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique Française au Caire.
MMMI = Majallat al-Majma'a al-'Imti al-'Arabi, Damascus.
MO = Le Monde oriental.
MOG = Mitteilungen zur osmanischen Geschichte.
MSE = Malayaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya (Small Soviet Encyclopaedia).
MSFO = Mémoires de la Société Finno-ougrienne.
MSLO = Mémoires de la Société Linguistique de Paris.
MSOSAs = Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen, Westasiatische Studien.
MTM = Miill Téebbbili'el Mejjim'as.
MW = The Muslim World.
NC = Numismatic Chronicle.
OC = Oriens Christianus.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OLZ</td>
<td>Orientalistische Literaturzeitung.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM</td>
<td>Oriente Moderno.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEFQS</td>
<td>Palestine Exploration Fund. Quarterly Statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QDAP</td>
<td>Quarterly Statement of the Department of Antiquities of Palestine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECA</td>
<td>Répertoire chronologique d’Épigraphie arabe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCEA</td>
<td>Revue des Études Juives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REI</td>
<td>Revue des Études Islamiques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIMA</td>
<td>Revue de l’Institut des Manuscrits Arabes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMM</td>
<td>Revue du Monde Musulman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Rocznik Orientalistyczny.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROC</td>
<td>Revue de l’Orient Chrétien.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROL</td>
<td>Revue de l’Orient Latin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSO</td>
<td>Rivista degli studi orientali.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Revue Tunisienne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBAh. Heid.</td>
<td>Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBAh. Wien</td>
<td>Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBBayr. Ak. W.</td>
<td>Sitzungsberichte der Bayrischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBBPr. Ak. W.</td>
<td>Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Sozoskaya Étnografija (Soviet Ethnography).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>Sovetskoe Vostokovedenie (Soviet Orientalism).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.Ya.</td>
<td>Sovetskoe Yazykозnaniye (Soviet Linguistics).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBG</td>
<td>Tijdschrift van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>Tarih Dergisi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIE</td>
<td>Trudy instituta Étnografii (Works of the Institute of Ethnography).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM</td>
<td>Türkiyat Mecmuası.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEM</td>
<td>Ta’irih-i ‘Othmânî (Türk Ta’irihî) En衦jümeni med/jmu^asl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Voprosi Istoriy (Historical Problems).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Die Welt des Islams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIns.s.</td>
<td>ibid., etc., ser. ser.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WZKM</td>
<td>Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZATW</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZDMG</td>
<td>Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZDPV</td>
<td>Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästinavereins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Semitistik.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TRANSLITERATIONS

SYSTEM OF TRANSLITERATION OF ARABIC CHARACTERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants</th>
<th>Long Vowels</th>
<th>Diphthongs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t, (except when initial)</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>th</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dh</td>
<td>g (sometimes h in Turkish)</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{a; at (construct state)}\]
\[\text{all (article), al- and All- (even before the antero-palatals)}\]

PERSIAN, TURKISH AND URDU ADDITIONS TO THE ARABIC ALPHABET:

\[\text{P, z, zh} \]
\[\text{3, or 3 g} \]

Additional vowels:

a) Turkish: e, i, o, 3, a. Diacritical signs proper to Arabic are, in principle, not used in words of Turkish etymology.

b) Urdu: e, 3.

For modern Turkish, the official orthography adopted by the Turkish Republic in 1928 is used. The following letters may be noted:

\[c = \text{dj} \]
\[g = \text{sh} \]
\[j = \text{sh} \]
\[k = k and k \]
\[t = t and t \]
\[v = c \]
\[h = b, b, and kh \]
\[s = s, s, and sh \]
\[z = z, z, 3, d and dh \]

SYSTEM OF TRANSLITERATION OF CYRILLIC CHARACTERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>sh</th>
<th>y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ж</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>л</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>я</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>ç</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ç</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>г</td>
<td>г</td>
<td>и</td>
<td>н</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>й</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA

P. 1h, ʿAḥbāb, l. 6 read limit.
P. 2h, read Aḥbāb.
P. 7b, l. 4 from below, for šah-i seven read šah-i seven.
P. 13b, l. 18, for ʿAḥbās Ḥilmi I read ʿAḥbās I.
P. 21b, l. 56, read A. H. 467 al-Muqtadī.
P. 41b, l. 29, for 68/686-8 read 68/687-8.
P. 45b, l. 26, for by al-Zubayr read by ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr.
P. 57b, l. 66, for Abu Hamara read Abū Ḥimāra.
P. 57b, add: ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī ʿĀmir [see ʿĀmirids].
add: ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Abī Dulāf [see Dulāfids].
P. 58b, l. 59, for 30 March read 30 May.
P. 59b, l. 59, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Dīlāwī, read Ṣāḥēb.
P. 60, add ʿAbd al-Djalīl Abu ʿl-Maḥāsīn [see ʿAlīhīnīnt].
add ʿAbd al-Ghaffār b. ʿAbd al-Karīm [see al-Ṣawānīn].
add ʿAbd al-Ghaffār al-ʿĀkhrās [see al-ʿĀkhrās].
P. 61b, l. 46, after born Feb. 1852 add at Istanbul.
P. 61b, l. 30, for in 1937 read on 12 April 1937 at Istanbul.
P. 61b, l. 42, for Yādīgār-i Ḥarb read Yādīgār-i Ḥarb.
P. 63b, l. 7, for Waṣfī read Waṣīf.
P. 63b, ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd, II, l. 2, for 5th of 30 read 8th of 40.
P. 63b, l. 10 from below, for former read later.
P. 64b, l. 42, for ʿAmīdījī read ʿĀmīdījī.
P. 64b, l. 42, for 1894 read 1895.
P. 65, Bibliography, last line, for 1343 read 1443.
P. 71, add ʿAbd al-Karīm b. ʿAbdarrād [see ibn ʿAbdarrād].
P. 72b, l. 30, for Pārinda read Pārinda.
P. 73b, l. 15, after son of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz [i.e.] add born 30 May 1868.
P. 76, add ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ḥīṣām [see ibn Ḥīṣām].
P. 78, add ʿAbd al-Malik b. Zuhr [see ibn Zuhr].
P. 80, add ʿAbd al-Raḥīm b. All [see al-Kādī al-Fāḍī].
P. 91, add ʿAbd al-Salām b. Ahmad [see ibn Qāsim].
P. 91b, in Bibliography, for Kumūshkhānāwī read Gūmūsh-ḵānawī.
P. 97b, ʿAḥrī Esfendī, I, 4, for 1764 read 1774.
P. 102b, l. 24, art. Abraha, for 640-650 A.D. read 540-550 A.D.
P. 103b, l. 20, after idem, le Musdon, 1953, 339-42, add idem, La persécution des chrétiens himyarites au sixième siècle, Istanbul 1956.
P. 105b, l. 42, for al-Ḥābīr al-Miṣrī read al-Ḥābīr al-Miṣrī.
P. 109b, l. 8 from below, for 1136/1273 read 1136/1274.
P. 109b, l. 4, for below, for 1133/1272 read 1004/1596.
P. 109b, l. 3, from below, for ʿUṯmān III read ʿUṯmān II.
P. 111h, l. 66, for Nahāḥ [see nahāḫ].
P. 117h, l. 27, for al-Khaṭṭānī read al-Khaṭṭānī.
P. 117b, l. 15, read Akbar nāma, iii.
P. 118b, l. 30, after Nadjaf 1353, add and Cairo 1368/1949.
P. 119b, l. 63, for Ḥamāh read Ḥamāh.
P. 119b, l. 40, for Taḵḵwīm read Taḵḵwīm.
ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA XV

P. 123. ABU HANIFA. F. Rosenthal points out that the name of the grandfather (Zwt or Zwtā) corresponds to the Aramaic word for “small”; Abu Hanifa was therefore probably of local, Aramaean descent.

P. 125. ABU HATIM YUSUF B. MUHAMMAD. [See Rustomids].

P. 126. l. 36, for al-Makdisi read al-Mu‘addas.

P. 141. l. 72, for (“the man with green spectacles”) read (“the man with blue spectacles”).


P. 143. l. 9, ABU NUWĀS, for (d. 198/873) read (d. 198/813).

P. 143. l. 35, for al-Kaṭīb ṣad al-Khaṣīb. 


P. 146. l. 1, for bā rād bā.


P. 182. l. 10, for zaman read zamān.

P. 183. l. 9, for Broquiere read Breoncourt.


P. 187. l. 48 read 1748, fasc. III, 91 f.


P. 190. l. 5, for 1725 read 1729-30.

P. 194. ḌAḤAB. Bibliography: Przeglad Orientalistyczny 1956/1 (17), 86 ff.

P. 199. ADIYAMAN. Bibliography: add Hüsss-nūnsur read Hissinmansūr.

P. 201. l. 41, for 355/972 read 355/976.

P. 207. AL-KAḤBAQ. l. 5, for 97/115 read 97/116.

P. 209. l. 68, add The seat of an administrative tribunal is therefore often called dār al-ṣā‘di.

P. 211. l. 5, for 338/944 read 338/949.

P. 214. l. 48, add On the Musta‘īn of Ibn Bilkārīsh, see Renaud, in Hesp., 1930, 135 ff.


P. 215. l. 15 for Bahā‘ read Bahrā‘.

P. 215. l. 65 for SHANANSHĀH read SHĀNANSHĀH.


P. 228. l. 7, from below, for Ghana read Kābūl.

P. 228. l. 9, from below, for 1003/1621 read 1003/1595.

P. 234. AFAK. At end, change full stop to comma and add by Tahsin Yanci, 2 vols., 1953-5.

P. 244. l. 34, for Persians read Aqīkoyunlus.

P. 244. APYUN KARA HISĀR. add after line 50: Kara Hisār formerly owed some of its importance to being a junction of the caravan routes between Izmir and the commercial centres in the interior (Ankara, Kayseri, Tolot, etc.) on the one hand, and between Constantinople, or rather Scutari (Usküdar), and Syria on the other: see F. Taeschner, Das anatolische Wegenetz nach osmanischen Quellen, i, Leipzig 1924, esp. 127; more recently it has become an important railway junction on the Izmir-Kasaba and Anatolian systems.

P. 249. l. 49, read Djiabriyya.


P. 305. l. 30, read 148/765.

P. 257. l. 29, read of the brother of ʿĀd.

P. 267. ḌAḤAB I. l. 4, for 22 January read 22 December.

P. 268. ḌAḤAB II. l. 4, for Rashīd read Raqīd.

P. 268. ḌAḤAB Bibliography, l. 1, for Rashīd read Raqīd.

P. 268. ḌAḤAB III. l. 4, for 21 August read 23 August.

P. 268. l. 35, for Köprülū read Köprülū-zade.

P. 277. ḌAḤAB B. ḌAḤAB. add to bibliography: H. Lautus, Les premières professions de foi hambalites, in Mélanges Masségnon, iii/1957, 7-36.

P. 279. l. 29, for as a magistrate in the Native Courts read as a kādī in the Shari‘a Courts.

P. 287. l. 32, read in 1891, and his memoirs appeared under the title.

P. 300. l. 32 and 33 from below, read the early Middle Ages.

P. 311. heading, for Ak Kirmān read Ak Kirmān-Ak Köyunlu.

P. 312. heading, for Ak Kirmān read Ak Köyunlu.

P. 312. Bibliography, for İnanc read Yinanç.

P. 312. AK KÖYUNLU, add to bibliography: J. Aubin, Notes sur quelques documents Aq Qoyyunlu, in Mélanges Masségnon, i/1956, 123-47.

P. 313. AK ŞEHIR, add to Bibliography: İbrahim Hakki Konyali, Akşehir, Istanbul; Rifki Melül Meric, Akşehir Turbe ve Kitâbeleri, TM, v, Istanbul.
P. 317\textsuperscript{a}, l. 8, after M. Roychoudhuri, *The Din-i-Ilahi*, Calcutta 1941, *add* 2nd edition, Calcutta 1952 (with different pagination and additional appendix "C" to Chapter V).

P. 321\textsuperscript{a}, l. 50, *add* tr. and annotated by Camara Lamine, Conakry 1950.

P. 321\textsuperscript{a}, l. 5, *Akund-Zaoda*, *delete* the words in his early days.

P. 332\textsuperscript{b}, l. 11 f., *read* in *AIOUN, N.S.*, 1 (Scritti in onore di Luigi Bonelli).

P. 332\textsuperscript{b}, l. 17 f., *read* The Hijri, 1958.


P. 337\textsuperscript{a}, l. 18, *add* [see DURÖ].

P. 355\textsuperscript{a}, *add* 'ALAWI, [see [RA 'ALAWI].

P. 358\textsuperscript{b}, *add* ALBANIA [see ARNAWUT].

P. 367\textsuperscript{a}, l. 55, *read* vanished, the future.

P. 368\textsuperscript{b}, 'ALI B. ABI TALIB, *Bibliography, add* Abd al-Maksud, *ALI B. ABI TALIB*, Abd al-Fattah

P. 374\textsuperscript{b}, l. 9-10, *read* spoken in the heart of the Oran region.

P. 375\textsuperscript{b}, l. 40, *read* biliteral.

P. 376\textsuperscript{b}, l. 16-17, *read* Only Old Tênês.

P. 377\textsuperscript{b}, l. 21, *read* vowels in open syllables.

P. 378\textsuperscript{a}, l. 50, *read* of the Oued Souf.


P. 380\textsuperscript{a}, l. 60, *read* Ghilan.

P. 381\textsuperscript{a}, l. 12, *read* Djiddjilians (elsewhere džg, džh).

P. 388\textsuperscript{b}, l. 8, from below, *read* 869-83.

P. 392\textsuperscript{a}, *add* 'ALI AL-ḤĀDI [see AL-'ASKARI, ABU 'L-ḤASAN].


P. 404, ALJAMIA. Circumstances beyond the control of the Editorial Committee have made it necessary for the text and the bibliography to appear as independent contributions by two different authors.

P. 425\textsuperscript{b}, l. 14, from below, *for* 1836-39 *read* 1836-99.

P. 426, ALWĀR, *read* ALWAR.


P. 433\textsuperscript{b}, l. 50, *add* For a confirmation of the term mōnhad in an inscription at Leptis Magna, see G. Levi Della Vida, in *Africa Italiana*, vi, 1933, 4-6; J. Friedrich, *Phonitisch-punische Grammatik*, 93 § 211.

P. 437\textsuperscript{a}, l. 16, AMĀN, *for economic* *read* economic.

P. 446\textsuperscript{a}, *add* AL-'ĀMIRI [see MUḤAMMAD B. YŪSUF, AL-'ĀMIRI].


P. 506\textsuperscript{a}, ANDJUMAN (India and Pakistan), *Bibliography, add* Sayyid Hāshim Ta’īrīkh-i Pāndjāb Sīlā-e-Andijūman-i Ta’īrīkh-i Urdu, Karachi 1953.

P. 519\textsuperscript{a}, l. 8-9 from the bottom, *delete* in October.

P. 519\textsuperscript{a}, l. 10 from the bottom, *for* June 1919 *read* September 1919.

P. 511\textsuperscript{a}, *add* AL-ANKUBARA, also al-Ankubura, name of Lombardy in Arabic geographical works. (Ed.)

P. 539\textsuperscript{a}, l. 43, DIAZIRRAT AL-'ĀRAB, *for* The boundary . . . . . . . . . . . general way, *read* The boundary between Saudi Arabia and Kuwait and the boundaries of their neutral zone were agreed upon between Britain and the then Sultan of Najd (later King of Saudi Arabia) in the convention of al-'Ukayr of 1922 but were not demarcated on the ground.

P. 548\textsuperscript{a}, l. 49, *add* Recently discovered inscriptions indicate that the hypothesis set forth in this article with respect to the starting point of the "Sabaean era" is untenable, and that certain changes should be made in the chronology for Southern Arabia; see G. Ryckmans in *Museon*, lxvi (1953); J. Ryckmans in *Museon*, lxvi (1953); idem, *La persécution des chrétiens himyarites au sixième siècle*, Istanbul 1956.

P. 554\textsuperscript{a}, l. 28, DIAZIRRAT AL-'ĀRAB, *for* In the latter part . . . . . . . . . . . two years of rule. *read* In the latter part of his reign he devoted most of his attention to his East African possessions, but their independence under a younger line of his descendants was recognised in 1277/1861 by an arbitration award of Lord Canning, Viceroy of India. The only Ibāḍī Imam elected during the century, 'Azzān
b. Kays, failed to win recognition by the British and was killed in battle in 1287/1871 after two years of rule.

P. 558. i. 15, ɒizραt ɒl-阿拉伯, for but in . . . . . . . . . . . sides, read though the Sultan did not relinquish his claim to sovereign rights over the whole of ʻUmān. Thus in 1955, when the Imam, ʻAbd b. ʻAll, sought independent membership of the Arab League, the Sultan held this to be an infringement of the terms of the Treaty of al-Sib and advanced into the interior of ʻUmān.


P. 558. i. 15, read A. C. Woolner.

P. 557. i. 8, read 3rd ed., Cairo 1950.

P. 557. i. 12, read 1202/1787.

P. 557. i. 25, read Ray.

P. 557. i. 26, read: add 1202/1787.

P. 557. i. 25, read ʻAbiiyya, add to Bibliography: G. V. Creteloi, Arabische dialetiik Sredney Asia, Vol. i, Bucharskiy Arabskiy dialetiik, Tiflis 1956.


P. 557. i. 1, for Sudan Arabic, English-Arabic Vocabulary, read Sudan Arabic Texts.


P. 560. ii. 1-3 from below: delete the passage in brackets and what follows.


P. 626, l. 36, Arslənl, for [see Qurūq] read [see Sikkā].


P. 668, i. 2, for Ibn Kaysān read Ibn Kaysān.

P. 668. i. 4, for al-Talkānt read al-Talkānt.

P. 668. i. 13, for al-Daḥhān read Ibn al-Daḥhān.

P. 668. i. 15, for al-Sakkāt read Ibn al-Sakkāt.

P. 668. i. 29, for al-Kalawisi read al-Kalawisi.

P. 668. i. 19, for the symbol | o for the 'quiescent', read the symbol | for the 'quiescent'.

P. 680, for ʻArzū Kān, read ʻArzū, Kān.

P. 681, ʻAshābiyya, add to bibliography: H. Ritter, Irrational Solidarity groups, in Orientis litt. (1948), 1-44.

P. 688, for ʻAsfār b. Shīrāzīyān, read ʻAsfār b. Shīrāzīyān.

P. 688. i. 40, delete.

P. 688. i. 13, read of the son of his maternal uncle.

P. 690, i. 34, ʻArzū al-Ukhūdi, for (of Hinnom) read (Vale of Hinnom).

P. 705, ʻAsqūrbul, Bibliography, add G. Vajda, JēĀŠNE musulman et jēĀŠNE juif, in Hebrew Union College Annual, 12-13, 1938, 367-85.

P. 710, ii. 13-15, āsiyā, for caused her . . . . . . stone, read caused a big rock to be cast upon her; but as God took her soul to himself, the rock fell on a lifeless body.

P. 711, i. 21 and 22 from below, read Itil (Atīl [q.v.]).

P. 712, i. 8, read Russians.

P. 732, Atabak (Atārāb), add at the end of the art.: The atābāk al-ʻasārīk under the Ayyūbidids and the first Manūkids had restricted functions; he was the commander of the army during the minority of the prince, but in contrast with the atābāk under the Saldjidīkids he was not the tutor of the young prince; a relative or a special freedman was appointed as tutor.

P. 735, ii. 13, āvāmir, after no claim to be a range of their own, insert Ibn Rakkād's position as paramount shaykh of the nomadic elements of the central group has been disputed since 1947 by Sālim Ibn Hamm, also of Āl Badr.

P. 735, i. 59, Ātbara, for 8 June 1958, read 8 April 1898 (see Sir G. Arthur, Life of Lord Kitchener, London 1920, i, 226; Cromer, Modern Egypt, London 1908, ii, 102).

P. 736, i. 8, read al-Šabkā.

P. 754, i. 56, read: Ḥaddīlī Khalfīa.

P. 755, add Auspicious and Inauspicious [see Saʿid].

P. 756, i. 34, read Khīṭat.

P. 756, i. 15, for i, 387, read i, 408.

P. 756, i. 1, insert and at least specialised applications to before the history of science.

P. 757, i. 41, for the famous, widely read De inventioribus rerum.

P. 759, i. 44, ʻAwāmir, after no claim to be a range of their own, insert Ibn Rakkād's position as paramount shaykh of the nomadic elements of the central group has been disputed since 1947 by Sālim Ibn Hamm, also of Āl Badr.

P. 779, i. 34, for 1310/1903 read 1310/1901-2.

P. 779, i. 34, for 1938 read 1896-7.

P. 781, i. 11, read 748-760/1348-1360.

P. 786, add Ayyūbid Art [see Supplement].

P. 813, i. 12, read 1202/1787.

P. 826, i. 25, read ʻAṣzī [see KARAÇELEBI-ZADE].
P. 827b, l. 34, read Tushdād.
P. 828a, l. 11, read Khāṭir.
P. 829b, l. 43, for son-in-law read son.
P. 830b, Bād-i Ḥawā, l. 4, after income delete full stop and add (cf. the Ṭuḥṣāri mentioned by Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, BSOAS, x, 1940, 761, 774).
P. 831b, l. 7, from the bottom, read Chāḍjiḏā.
P. 832a, l. 42, read Fawdād al-Fuḍdā.
P. 833b, l. 44, read Bākāyīd.
P. 834b, l. 57, read Bākūlān.
P. 835b, l. 4, read Tadāvīlā.
P. 836b, l. 6, read Šādīmān (in Ethe District).
P. 837b, l. 17, for Djalāl al-Dīn, read Djalāl Ḵān.
P. 838b, l. 23, read Akbarī.
P. 839b, l. 47, for son-in-law read son.
P. 840b, l. 6, for Full stop in the Tāriḵ, read Tāriḵ.
P. 841a, l. 43, for son-in-law read son.
P. 842a, 908a, BAD-i HAWA, l. 4, after income delete full stop and add (cf. the Tayyādat mentioned by Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, BSOAS, x, 1940, 761, 774).
P. 843a, l. 2, for income Full stop and add (cf. the Tayyādat mentioned by Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, BSOAS, x, 1940, 761, 774).
P. 844a, l. 10, read Maḍḥir-i.
P. 845b, l. 23, read Akbarī.
P. 846b, l. 15, for income Full stop and add 77, 78).
P. 847b, l. 6, for income Full stop and add (cf. the Tayyādat mentioned by Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, BSOAS, x, 1940, 761, 774).
P. 848b, l. 10, read Maḍḥir-i.
P. 849b, l. 33, for Full stop and add (cf. the Tayyādat mentioned by Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, BSOAS, x, 1940, 761, 774).
P. 850b, l. 14, read, Abān.
P. 851b, l. 17, for Djalāl al-Dīn, read Djalāl Ḵān.
P. 852b, l. 23, read Akbarī.
P. 853b, l. 42, read Miḥdāt-i.
P. 854b, l. 13, for income Full stop and add (cf. the Tayyādat mentioned by Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, BSOAS, x, 1940, 761, 774).
P. 855b, l. 10, read Māḥthir-i.
P. 856b, l. 6, read Shukōh.
P. 857b, l. 13, for income Full stop and add (cf. the Tayyādat mentioned by Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, BSOAS, x, 1940, 761, 774).
P. 858b, l. 14, read al-Hukumat.
P. 859b, l. 66, for 3 Prophet, read Prophet.
P. 860b, l. 10, Muḥammad (Ahmuṭ) should not be in italics.
P. 861b, l. 7, read Shukōh.
P. 862b, l. 23, for income Full stop and add (cf. the Tayyādat mentioned by Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, BSOAS, x, 1940, 761, 774).
P. 863b, l. 39, read al-Hudjra min.
P. 864a, l. 39, read al-Hudjra min.
P. 865b, l. 5, read Saḫūdā.
P. 866b, l. 13, for Rājā, read Rādājā.
P. 867b, l. 14, read diwān; and read Nāḥib.
P. 868a, l. 16, for income Full stop and add (cf. the Tayyādat mentioned by Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, BSOAS, x, 1940, 761, 774).
P. 869b, l. 26, read Ṣafīdān; and read Naʿīb.
P. 870b, l. 1, for income Full stop and add (cf. the Tayyādat mentioned by Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, BSOAS, x, 1940, 761, 774).
P. 871b, l. 69, for income Full stop and add (cf. the Tayyādat mentioned by Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, BSOAS, x, 1940, 761, 774).
P. 872b, l. 15, for Full stop and add (cf. the Tayyādat mentioned by Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, BSOAS, x, 1940, 761, 774).
P. 873b, l. 7, for Farsānāb-i, read Farsānāb-i. P. 874b, l. 10, for Bombay read Mysore.
P. 875b, l. 45, for Slīvādī read Šīvādī.
P. 876b, l. 71, for Marāṭḥās, read Marāṭḥās.
P. 877b, l. 23, l. 35, l. 42, for All read 'All.
P. 878b, l. 19, for Andā read Andā.
P. 879b, for income Full stop and add (cf. the Tayyādat mentioned by Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, BSOAS, x, 1940, 761, 774).
P. 1234b, Birezik, add to Bibliography: J.-B. Chabot, Un épisode inédit de l’histoire des Croisades (Le siège de Birta, 1145), in Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, Comptes Rendus 1917, Paris 1917, 77-84.

P. 1238b, l. 58, Al-Birzalī, for al-Munadjdījima read al-Munadjdīdī.


P. 1243a, l. 59, Bishr b. Ghiyyāth al-Mārisī, for Makhālat read Maḥālat.

P. 1248a, l. 31, Bistām b. Kayūs, for Rabīb read Ḥabīb.

l. 32, Bistām b. Kayūs, for Sabā‘īk read Sabā‘īk.

l. 34, Bistām b. Kayūs, for Mu‘tālif read Mu‘tālif.

l. 40, Bistām b. Kayūs, for 1-000 read 1-100.

l. 44, Bistām b. Kayūs, for al-Hayawān read al-Hayawān.

P. 1257b, after title Bonneval insert title Bookkeeping [see muḥāsaba].
AARON [see HÄRÖN]
AB [see TÄMÄK]
‘ABÅÅ [see KISA’]

‘ABÅÅBA (sg. ‘ABBÂÅl), an Arabic-speaking tribe of Bedja [q.v.] origin in Upper Egypt with branches in the northern Sudan. The northern limits of their territory in Egypt is the desert road leading from Ken to Kusayr, and their nomad sections roam the desert to the east of Luxor and Aswān. The original ‘Ababda stock is most truly represented by the nomads but there are also sedentary sections who have intermarried with the faštâkin and adopted much of their way of life. On the Red Sea coast there is a small clan of fisher-folk, the Kirayjâb, who by some are not recognized as true ‘Ababda.

Like the rest of the Bedja the ‘Ababda claim Arab descent, and the genealogical table of ‘Abbad, their eponymous ancestor, begins with Zubayr b. al-‘Awrân, a famous companion of the Prophet. Some of the tribesmen living in the Sudan believe that they are descended from Salmân, an Arab of the Banû Hilâl. Though doubtlessly fictitious in respect of the tribe as a whole this claim to Arab descent yet embodies a genuine memory of the process by which Ḍūhayyana and Rabî’â Arabs acquired an ascendancy in the Sudan through marriages with the daughters of Bedja chiefs, amongst whom descent was originally reckoned in the female line. This process which according to Ibn Khaldûn led to the passing of the Nubian kingdom into the hands of the Ḍūhayyna must also have taken place in the case of the Bedja.

The Ababda have been affected by Arab influence more strongly than those Bedja who still retain their Hamitic tongue, so much so that in the Sudan they are not easily distinguished from the Sudan Arabs of the Ḍjâhiyyân group. They may in fact be held to occupy an intermediate position between the Bedja proper and the fully arabized elements who have become integrated in the Sudan Arabs. In their physical characteristics, nevertheless, the ‘Ababda together with the Tigré-speaking Banî ‘Amir bear a closer resemblance to the proto-Egyptian inhabitants of the Nile valley than the other Bedja. The Arabic spoken by the ‘Ababda is quite distinct from that of the faštâkin, and the word lists collected by H. A. Winckler contain an appreciable number of Bedja words.

In their material culture and their customs the ‘Ababda agree more closely with the Bedja proper than with the Arabs. Certain wide-spread customs which they share with the Sudan Arabs, such as the infibulation of girls and the ceremonial respect of in-law-relations, are of Hamitic origin. The ‘Ababda use the typically Bedja style of hairdressing (dirasa) which has given rise to the nickname Fuzzy-wuzzy, though this custom now tends to die out. Their tents of palm-matting are quite unlike the Arab “houses of hair”. Their marriages, like those of the Bedja proper, are matrilocal but their women do not enjoy the freedom which is allowed to their sisters of the Bishâriyyân. The ‘Ababda moreover share with the Bedja, but not the Arabs, certain taboos connected with milk: only men may do the milking, for which only gourds and wicker vessels may be used, and no man may drink of the milk he has drawn until someone else has drunk.

The influence of Islam, which nominally is the religion of all the ‘Ababda, has made a marked impression only on the more sophisticated elements; in the life of the majority religion, as distinct from traditional beliefs and superstitions, plays no important part. They venerate shaykh Abu ‘l-Hasan al-Shâdhîlî as their patron saint, and his tomb in the Atbai desert is a place of pilgrimage at which sacrifices are offered. It is also common to dedicate the milk of a beast to al-Shâdhîlî, and the milk of such animals is always milked into separate wicker vessels. When slaying an animal a piece of the victim’s right ear is reserved for al-Shâdhîlî or some other well-known saint and hung on the tent-pole. The celebration of the ‘Id al-kabir at the tomb of al-Shâdhîlî is the most important religious event of the year. Sacrifices are also offered at the tomb of the eponymous ancestor ‘Abbad near Edfû, and there is a cult of a female saint (jaḥira) who lived some fifty years ago and was famous for gifts of divination. The ‘Ababda like the Bishâriyyân believe that an animal sacrificed at the tomb of a ṣâli turns into a gazelle or ibex, and that such animals are protected by the wâlî. They also observe certain taboos about birds and will not eat the flesh of the sandgrouse or the desert-partridge, and both ‘Ababda and Bishâriyyân are particularly afraid of killing the bearded vulture (Gypaetus barbatus).

The most important section of the Egyptian ‘Ababda, of whom there are some 14,000, are the Ashshâbâh, who are divided into a number of clans. Their paramount shaykhs are descended from one Diabrân who flourished towards the end of the 18th century, and beyond whom there is no reliable historical tradition. The largest and best known sections in the Sudan are the Fuṣâra and the MiIlaykâb who, according to tradition, were brought to their present habitat by the Fundj kings of Sennâr in order to protect the caravan routes between Egypt and the Sudan. A small contingent of ‘Ababda, characterized by Cailliaud as the worst
soldiers in the army, were employed as irregulars by Ismacil Pasha during the invasion of the Sudan. During the 19th century the 'Abābda are often mentioned by travellers as guides and camel men between Korosko and Abū Hamad, and their chiefs of the Khalifa family held posts of distinction under the Egyptian government. Husayn Khalifa was mu'dir of Berber at the time of the Mahdist rebellion, and 'Abābda irregulars shared in the fighting against the Darwishes. Apart from traditions about wars with neighbouring tribes there are no data for their early history.


'Abād originally means time in an absolute sense and is synonymous with dāh (q.s.; see also Zāmān). When under the influence of Greek philosophy the problem of the eternity of the world (see Kīdām) was discussed in Islam, abad (or abadiyya) became a technical term corresponding to the Greek term ἄπαθετος, incorruptible, eternal a parte post, in opposition to asal (or asaliyya) corresponding to the Greek term ἀρχαιος, ungenerated, eternal a parte ante. (Ibn Rushd—cf. ed. Bouyges, index—uses asaliyya for "incorruptible"). [For asal see KIDAM]. As to the problem concerned, viz. if the world is incorruptible, the philosophers of Islam subscribed to the Aristotelian maxim that asal and abad imply each other, that what has a beginning must have an end and what has no beginning cannot have an end. According to this theory time, movement and the world in general are eternal in both senses. Among the theologians who all believe in the temporal creation of the world, only Abu 'l-Huṣayn, one of the earlier Mu'tazilites, admitted the Aristotelian maxim mentioned. (He applied the theory "that what has a first term must have a last one" even to God's knowledge and power, saying that God having arrived at the final term of His power, would not be able any more to create even an atom, to mould even a dead mosquito. See al-Khayyāt, al-Intisār, ed. Nyberg, 8 ff.; Ibn Hazm, iv, 192-3). The theologians opposed the Aristotelian dictum by the argument that if the world were without a beginning, at the present moment an infinite past would have been traversed, which is impossible [cf. KIDAM]; in the future, however, there is no such impossibility, since in the future no infinite will ever be traversed. Besides, the series of integers needs a first term but no final one, and a man may have eternal remorse, although his remorse must have a beginning (al-Badawi wa-l-Ta'rikh, ed. Huart, i, 125, cf. ii, 133). They concluded therefore that there is no rational proof either for the incorruptibility of the world or its opposite. According to the Kūrān, xxi, 67, on the Day of Judgment "the whole earth shall be His handful and the heavens will be rolled up in His right hand". It became the orthodox view that the annihilation of the whole world (including the destruction of heaven and hell, which, however, will not happen, as is known by revelation) is possible, dāh being considered as something in God's power (al-Baghdādi, Fark, 390). This world and (dāh) will be destroyed, but not heaven and hell.

**Bibliography:** The problem is treated in extenso by al-Ghazzālī in ch. ii of his Tahāfu' al-Falāsīfa, ed. Bouyges, 80 ff.; cf. Ibn Rushd, Ta-
much to his activity as an official in the service of the Umayyads as to his wonderful knowledge of Islamic traditions. The Kubd al-Maghdat, sometimes ascribed to him, is, however, according to Yskit (Irgad, i, 36) and al-Tust (Fihrist, 7) of Aban b. Ughman b. Yahya (see J. Horovitz, in OLZ, 1914, 183).

Aban was struck with apoplexy and died a year later at Madina in 105/723-4 according to report, at any rate during the reign of Yazid b. Abi al-Malik.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Sa'd, v, 112 ff.; Nawawi, 125 ff. (K. V. Zettnerstien)

**ABANOS (variants: Abinos, Abunos, Abnus and Abnos),** ebony. The word is derived from the Greek ebenos, which passed to the Aramean (ambusas) and from there to Arabic, Persian, Turkish etc. Although ebony had been already known in the old days in the East, where it was imported from India and Ethiopia, it was very little used at the early times of Islam, on account of its rarity and the scanty demand for artistic goods. Absolute faith must not be given to the story according to which, when the Mosque of the Rock was being built at Jerusalem under the Umayyad caliph Abd al-Malik, the venerable rock was enclosed with a palisade of ebony. It is certain that this wood had been already used under the caliphs together with ivory in the manufacture of chess-men [see Shtrandj] and dice, in mosaics of the sort very often used later with great skill on furniture, doors, lattice work and wainscots [see Kushab].

As a medicine, ebony was known to the Muslims as early as the ninth century from the translations of Dioscorides and Galen. It was considered to be a useful astringent for phylactenous inflammation and chronic catarrh of the eyes; it was also taken internally in the form of a powder for the bowels and stomach, and was dusted over burns. According to Dioscorides, Abyssinian ebony was generally considered to be more efficacious than Indian. To the former were ascribed the properties which at the present time are only found in the wood of the Diospyros and the Maba kinds of the East Indies, of Indonesia, of Madagascar, and of Mauritius, i.e. an intense black colour and a fineness of grain that almost makes it impossible to distinguish the fibre. The African species of ebony which the Arabs prefer are nowadays rightly held in little estimation. In the 8th/14th century Abarkuh is frequently mentioned in the history of the Muzzafarids. The oldest of the numerous ruins of Abarkuh is the mausoleum built in 443/1051 by Firuzan, a descendant of the well-known condottiere of the 4th/10th century, Firuzan of Agkawar (in Gilan). The so-called mausoleum of Tabas or Harem was built (or rebuilt) in 718/1318 by a descendant (in the fifth generation) of a Madj al-Dunya wa-l-Din Tadj al-Ma'ali Abi Bakr Muhammad (a Muzzafardi).

**Bibliography:** Le Strange, 284, 294, 297; P. Schwarz, Iran, i, 17; A. Godard, in Ahkari-Iran, 1935, 47-72; Mahmod Kubi, History of the Muzzafarids, in GMS, xiv, see Index in xiv/2; Kasm Ghani, Ta'vих-й-Apri-Hafiz, i, 1321/1942, index.

**ABARSHAHR.** the more ancient name of Nishapur [q.v.], was the capital of one of the four quarters of the province of Khorasan. Its name in Persian, according to the Muslim geographers, is said to mean "Cloud-city", but Marquart's etymology (Eranshahr, 74), the "district of the Aparvot" (comparing Armenian Apar ayard) is more reliable. It was sometimes given the honorific title of Iran-Shahr "City of Iran". Its mint-signature on Sassanian coins is Apr, Apris or Apris, forms which continue to appear on the dirhams of Arab-Sassanian type struck by the Muslim conquerors (from 5/673-4 to 6/668-9). Under the Umayyads its Arabic name appears on the Post-Reform dirhams from 91799-10 to 977155. The names of the Umayyad governors Ziyad b. Abi Sufyan and his sons Ubayd Allah and Salm as well as Abi Allah b. Kaham all figure on the coins of Abarshahr. The later mint activities of the place continued under the name of Nishabur.


**ABASKUN (or Aberskon),** a harbour in the south-eastern corner of the Caspian. It is described as a dependency of Djurgan/Gurgan (Yskit, i, 55: 3 days' distance from Djurgan; i, 91: 24 farsakhs). It might be located near the estuary of the Gurgan river (at Khodja-Nefes?). Al-Istakhri, 214 (Ibn Hawkal, 273) calls Abaskun the greatest of the (Caspian) harbours. The Caspian itself was sometimes called Bah Abaskun.

Abaskun possibly corresponds to Tolemy's Sanoavz in Hyrcania (Gurgan). Several times Abas-
kün was raided by Rūs pirates (some time between 250/764-84, and in 257/969, see Ibn Isfandiyār, Taʾrīkh-i Tabaristān, ed. A. Eghbal, 266 [E. G. Browne’s transl., 199], cf. also Mas’ūdī, ii. 18; circa 300/912). In 617/1220 the Khwarzm-Shāh ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn, tracked by the Mongols, sought refuge on “one of the islands of Abaskun”, (see al-Duwaynī, ii, 115), and died there. According to Ibn al-ʿĀǧīhī, xii, 242, he possessed in Ab-suḵūn (sic) a castle surrounded by water. The islands of Abaskun apparently correspond to the Agur-ad group of islands and spits of land, divided from the Gurgan estuary by a strait.

Bibliography: B. Dorn, Caspia, Über die Einfälle der alten Russen in Tabaristan, 1875, see index; Barthold, Istoriya orosheniya Turkestana, 1914, 33.

ʿĀBAZA, Turkish name for the Abazes (see ʿABAZA), given as a surname to many persons in Ottoman history who descended from those people.

1) ʿĀBAZA PASHA, taken prisoner at the defeat of the rebel ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn, whose treasurer he was, was brought before Murād Pasha and had his life spared only through the intercession of Khaṭṭ, ağa of the Janissaries, who, having become ḥafūdūn-pasha, gave him the command of a galley, and conferred upon him the government of Maḥrāf when he was promoted to the dignity of grand vizier. Later he became governor of Erzurūm and planned to destroy the Janissaries; those in his province lodged a complaint against him; he was deposed, but refused to obey the orders of the Porte (1032/1623); he levied taxes and raised troops on the pretext of avenging the death of the sultan ʿAlī Murād II, marched upon Anḵara and Siwās, and took Brus, but did not succeed in securing the citadel. In 1033/1624, the grand vizier Ḥāfiz Pasha defeated him in a battle near Kaysariyya, at the bridge across the Kārā-ṣā, owing to the defection of Ṭayyār Pasha and the Turkomans. ʿĀbaṇa took refuge at Erzurūm, of which he succeeded in having himself made governor on condition that he should admit a guard of Janissaries into the fortress. In 1036/1727, suspecting that the expedition against Aḥḵiṣa was in reality directed against himself, he massacred a great number of the Janissaries belonging to the army. His old master Khall seized Erzurūm in vain and was obliged to retreat because of the snow (1037/1627). In the following year, the Bosnian Khan, the last of whom had been made grand vizier, again besieged him and forced him to capitulate after a fortnight’s siege; the rebel was granted his pardon and the government of Bosnia. There he again persecuted his enemies, the Janissaries, was deposed and went to Belgrade, where on a hill to the south of the town he erected ʿAbaza Kūshkī. Then he was sent to Wiḍdīn and commanded the troops who invaded Poland (1633). Being honored with the confidence of Murād IV, he accompanied him to Adrianople when preparations were made for a new campaign against Poland; but his success excited envy; reports against him cleverly disseminated, estranged the sultan, who had him executed (29 Ṣaʿfar 1044/24 August 1634).

Bibliography: Hammer-Purgstall, iv, 569, 582; v, 26, 83, 173 ff., 189 ff.; Muṣṭafa Efendi, Nafaṭh al-Wubūd, ii, 48, 82; Ewliya Efendi, Travels, i, 119 ff.

2) ʿĀBAZA ḤASAN had been given the command of the Turkomans of Asia Minor as a recompense for his capture of the rebel Ḥaydar-eggīlū. Having been dismissed for no reason, he revolted in his turn, held the country between Gerende and Bolu, defeated the old bandit Kāṭirdji-eggīlū who had been sent to fight against him, and submitted on condition that he should have the title of voivode of the Turkomans; later as the result of complaints lodged against him, he was imprisoned in the Seven Towers and was only released by the elevation of Behāyī to the position of Shāyḵ al-Īlmām (1062/1652); his friend conferred on him the sandjak of Okhri. When ʿIḍpr Pasha, who was also one of the Abaza nation, was made grand vizier by Muḥammad IV, he sent for him. At his execution he remained faithful to him, returned to Asia Minor with the remainder of his troops and regained the office of voivode of the Turkomans (1065/1655). He settled at Aleppo and committed such ravages in Syria that the Diwān wanted to have him banished from the empire; the grand vizier, Sulaymān Pasha, however, confirmed him in his position of governor and entrusted the defenses of the Dardanelles to him. In 1066/1656 he was sent to diyār Bakr as governor. Two years later he rebelled, put himself at the head of a considerable army under the pretext of demanding the dismissal of Muḥammad Kūprūlī, at that time grand vizier, and threatened Brus. In the neighborhood of Hāmid he completely defeated Murtaḍā Pasha, who had been sent against him (15 Rabīʿ I 1069/11 Dec. 1658); but he fell into a trap which had been set for him, left ʿAynṭāb for Aleppo to make terms for his submission and was treacherously assassinated there.

Bibliography: Hammer-Purgstall, v, 481, 560 ff., 563, 575, 634; vi, 35 ff., 51 ff.

3) ʿĀBAZA MUḤAMMAD PASHA, had been given the beylerbey of Maḥrāf when, during the campaign against the Russians (1183/1769), he was ordered to act in concert with the khan of the Crimea. He commanded the fortress of Bender and received the third tāḥ in recompense for the part he had taken in raising the siege of Choczim. Having been entrusted with the defense of this place and having himself abandoned by the Ottoman troops, he fled and was commissioned to defend Moldavia, which he failed to accomplish. At the battle of Kaghul (1 Aug. 1770), he commanded the right wing; after the defeat of the Turks he fled to Ismāʿīl. Having been made governor of Silistria, he was dismissed after he had squandered the money given to him for the purpose of raising troops, and was exiled to Kustendil. At the time of the conquest of the Crimea and the flight of Selim-Girāy he refused to land the few troops he was bringing up and returned to Sinope; he was decapitated (1185/1771).


(Č. Huart) 'ABBĀD B. MUḤAMMAD [see 'ABBĀDIDS] 'ABBĀD B. SULAYMĀN AL-ŠAYMĀRĪ (or AL-DAYMARI), one of the Muṭāzila of Baṣra, died c. 250/864. He was a pupil of Ḥighām b. Ṭarīq al-Fuwaṭi (I. 210/825), like his father criticizing the main tendency of the school of Basra (that of Abu 'l-Hudhayl), and being in his turn criticized by Abu 'l-Hudhayl's successors, al-Diubā'll and Abū Ḥāṣim. Our knowledge of his distinctive views comes mainly from al-Ashtar’s Makālidī.
He eternally is must be independent of transient mundane things. Thus God is not eternally “hearing” and “seeing”, since that involves objects heard and seen (ib. 173, 493); He is not “before all things” (ib. 196, 519); no accident (such as an apparently supernatural event) can afford a proof of God, in view of its transient character (ib. 225). In this way he came to distinguish between God’s “active attributes” (sifāt al-fa‘il) and His eternal attributes (ib. 179, 186, 495-500), being perhaps the first to work out this distinction which was later adopted by orthodox theologians.

He went to extremes in insisting that God does nothing that is evil in any respect, even denying that God made unbelievers vile (kabīb; ib. 227-8, 557-9), and maintaining that His punishment of the wicked in Hell is not evil. His political views (ib. 454, 458-9, 467) seem to aim at a reconciliation of various contemporary political groups, but the point has not been adequately studied.


ABBAD B. ZIYAD u. ABU ṢU‘AYYAB, UMAYYAD GENERAL. Mu‘awiya appointed him governor of Sīdījātān, where he stayed seven years; in the course of his expeditions to the East, he conquered Kandahār. In 61/680-1 he was dismissed by Yazīd b. Mu‘awiya who appointed in his place his brother Salm b. Ziyād to be governor of Sīdījātān. (J. Schacht)

ABBAD, often called al- Ḥarām al-Murtada, was Arabian ruler, as ambitious as he was cruel, and with few scruples in the choice of means to achieve his ends. Immediately after his accession he continued his predecessors’ policy of Persianizing Arabic names, changed ‘Abbādān into Ābādān.


Al-ABBADĪ, ABU ʿĀSIM MUḤ. B. ʿABDALLAH B. MUḤ. B. ʿABBĀD, often called al-Kādī al-Harawi, a well-known Shafi‘ite juristconsult. He was born in 375/985 in Harat, studied there and in Nisābūr, and undertook extensive journeys on which he met numerous scholars. He finally became bāb of Harat and died there in 458/1066. He was notorious for his dark and difficult style of expression. Of his works, which al-Subkī enumerates, there have survived the Tabābāt al-Shafi‘īyyīn (used by al-Asnawī) in several manuscripts, and the Adab al-Kādā in the commentary which his disciple Abū Sa‘īd (or Sa‘īd) b. Abī ʿAbdāb b. ʿAbī Yūnuf al-Harawi (d. about 500) wrote under the title al-Adab al-Ṣafawī ‘alā al-Insānāt (Subkī, iv, 31). His son Abu l-Hasan is the author of a K. al-Rakm.

Bibliography: Subkī, Tabābāt, iii, 42 (with extracts from his works and a discussion of his style); Ibn Khallikān, no. 558; F. Wüstenfeld, Schafi‘iten, no. 408; Brockelmann, i, 484; I, 669. (J. Schacht)

ABBADIDS (BANU ʿABBĀD), DYNASTY OF ARAB RACE WHICH REigned FOR MOST OF THE 9TH/10TH CENTURY OVER THE S.-W. OF AL-ANDALUS, WITH ITS CAPITAL AT SEVILLE (cf. 19/4001).

It was at the moment of the disintegration of the Caliphate of Cordova and of the political dismemberment of the country by the petty kings known as the taifas (muluk al-taifahīn) that the bāb of Seville, Abu l-Kāsīm Muḥammad b. ʿAbbād, succeeded in being proclaimed ruler in 414/1023. The son of a celebrated Spanish-Muslim jurist of Lakhmid origin, Imsāfīl b. ʿAbbād, he began, on first seizing power, by recognizing the suzerainty of the Hammūdīd king Yahyā b. ʿAll, but soon threw off this wholly nominal mark of subordination. There is relatively little information on the details of his reign, which was mostly occupied in settling by force of arms his disputes with the Dīlahwārs [q.v.] of Cordova and the lesser baronies in southern Andalusia. He died in 433/1042.

His son, Abū ʿAmr Abū b. ʿAbbād b. Muḥammad succeeded, in a reign of nearly thirty years (433-460/1042-69), in enlarging the territory of the principality of Seville to a considerable size by posing the Caliphate of Cordova and of the political dismemberment of the country by the petty kings known as the taifas (muluk al-taifahīn) that the bāb of Seville, Abu l-Kāsīm Muḥammad b. ʿAbbād, succeeded in being proclaimed ruler in 414/1023. The son of a celebrated Spanish-Muslim jurist of Lakhmid origin, Imsāfīl b. ʿAbbād, he began, on first seizing power, by recognizing the suzerainty of the Hammūdīd king Yahyā b. ʿAll, but soon threw off this wholly nominal mark of subordination. There is relatively little information on the details of his reign, which was mostly occupied in settling by force of arms his disputes with the Dīlahwārs [q.v.] of Cordova and the lesser baronies in southern Andalusia. He died in 433/1042.

His son, Abū ʿAmr Abū b. ʿAbbād b. Muḥammad succeeded, in a reign of nearly thirty years (433-460/1042-69), in enlarging the territory of the principality of Seville to a considerable size by posing as the champion of the Andalusian Arabs against the Spanish Berbers, whose numbers, already large in the Iberian peninsula in the 10th century, had greatly increased since the period of the ʿAmirid dictators.

On succeeding his father, the new king of Seville, then 26 years of age, took the princely title of bābīb, following the custom of the time, but a little later adopted the honorific ʿibāb of al-Muṣṭārid bīʿllāh, by which he is generally known. Gifted with real political qualities, it was not long before he showed his true character, that of an authoritarian ruler, as ambitious as he was cruel, and with few scruples in the choice of means to achieve his ends. Immediately after his accession he conti-
nued the struggle opened by his father against the minor Berber dynasty of Carmona [cf. KIARMUNA], Muh. b. 'Abd Allāh al-Birrāl and the chiefs. At the same time al-Mu'tadid was preoccupied in extending his kingdom to the west, between Seville and the Atlantic Ocean. With this end in view he attacked and defeated successively Ibn Tayfūr, lord (ṣāhib) of Mertola, and Muh. b. Yaḥyā al-Yaḥṣūb, lord of Niebla [cf. LABLA], who, notwithstanding his Arab descent, had unblushingly allied himself with the Berber kings. In face of the success of the king of Seville, the other mulāk al-țamā'il, distrustful of him, formed against him a kind of league, which was joined by the princes of Badajoz [cf. KIARMUNA], Algeciras [cf. AL-DAQI'IRA AL-KHADRA'], Granada [cf. GHARNAṬA] and Malaga [cf. MĀLABA]. War broke out soon afterwards between the 'Abbadids of Seville and the Aftasid [q.v.] al-Mušafar of Badajoz; it was prolonged over many years, in spite of the efforts at mediation of the Djahwarid prince of Cordova, which bore fruit only in 443/1051. In the interval, while continuing to harass the frontiers of the kingdom of Badajoz, al-Mu'tadid did not remain inactive; he defeated, one after the other, Muh. b. Ayyūb al-Bakrī, lord of Huelva [cf. WELBA] and of Saltes [cf. SALTAṬA] (whose son was the celebrated erwās father), the Banū Muḥṣīn, lords of Silves [cf. SULBA], and Muh. b. Sa'īd b. Ḥārūn, lord of Santa María de Algarve [cf. SHILB] and annexed their principalities. In order to justify these annexations al-Mu'tadid employed a somewhat clumsy stratagem: he claimed to have found the caliph Hīḍhām II, who had died in obscurity some years earlier, and to be devoting himself tirelessly to restoring to him his former emirate, entirely submissive and pacified. In order to protect themselves against the assaults of the king of Seville, the majority of the minor Berber chiefs in the mountains in the south of Andalusia acquiesced in this theatrical pretence, and paid homage both to the 'Abbadids and to the Commander of the Faithful; miraculously restored to light to serve the interests of al-Mu'tadid but at the same time carefully kept in seclusion by him. But their efforts were in vain. One day the 'Abbadids invited all these minor Berber princes and their attendants together to his palace at Seville and suffocated them to death in a bath-house whose openings he had walled up; by this means he appropriated Arcos [cf. ARKUSH], seat of the principality of the Banū Ḥabūr, Moron [cf. MAWROD], ruled by the Banū Dammar, and Ronda [cf. RUNDA], capital of the Banū Ifrān (445/1053).

This action was enough to unloose the fury of the most powerful Berber prince in Spain, Bādīs b. Ḥabūr al-Zīrīd [q.v.] at Granada, who alone seemed capable of standing up to al-Mu'tadid. When the war began, however, the latter found his fortune still smiling on him and soon afterwards seized Algeciras from the Ḥamīdūd prince al-Kāsim b. Ḥamīdū. He then tried to capture Cordova, and for this purpose despatched an expedition under the command of his son Ismā'īll; but Ismā'īll sought to profit from the occasion to rebel and to create a kingdom of his own, with Algeciras as his capital. This venture the project cost him his life. It also opened the political career of al-Mu'tadid's other son, Muhammad al-Mutamid, who was to succeed him on his death. On his father's orders, Muhammad set out with an army to give support to the Arabs of Malaga, who had revolted against the tyrannical rule of the Berber despot of Granada, Bādīs. But Bādīs routed the army of Seville, and the prince, in sad plight, threw himself into Ronda, whence he solicited and obtained his father's pardon. Al-Mu'tadid had long since discarded the fable of the pseudo-Hīḍhām, which he no longer needed; he was by far the most redoubtable and most feared of the Christian neighbours of the north. In other places, he might have been given the title of Berberoktonos.

When the powerful sovereign of Seville died in 461/1069, his son, Muh. b. Shams ad dīn b. 'Abbād, better known by his honorific lakab of al-Muṭamid [q.v.], took possession of his greatly enlarged kingdom, which now embraced most of the S.W. part of the Iberian peninsula.

Already in the second year of his reign, al-Muṭamid was able, despite the ambitions of the king of Toledo, al-Muḥammad [q.v.], to annex to his kingdom the principality of Cordova, formerly ruled by the Djahwarid princes. The young prince 'Abbād was appointed governor of the former capital of the Umayyads. But on the instigation of the king of Toledo, an adventurer, named Ibn Ukkāshā, succeeded in seizing Cordova by surprise in 468/1075, and put the young 'Abbād prince and his general Muh. b. Martin to death. Al-Muḥammad took possession of the city, where he died six months later. Al-Muṭamid, wounded both in his paternal affections and his royal pride, endeavoured for three years in vain to reconquer Cordova. He gained his object only in 471/1078; Ibn Ukkāshā was put to death, and all that part of the kingdom of Toledo lying between the Guadalquivir and the Guadiana was conquered by the armies of Seville. Yet at the same time it needed all the skill of the vizier Ibn 'Ammār [q.v.] to bring an expedition of Alfonso VI of Castille against Seville to a peaceful conclusion, in return for the payment of a double tribute.

This was, in fact, the moment when, thanks to the tenacious vigour of the Christian princes in seeking to profit from the sanguinary conflicts waged against one another by the Muslim princes of al-Andalus, the reconquista—which had been arrested for a time and had even receded under the last Umayyads and the first 'Amīrid dictators—resumed its advance towards the south of the peninsula. Notwithstanding their successes, blazoned by the Muslim chroniclers, it must not be forgotten that from the middle of the eleventh century many Spanish Muslim dynasties were reduced to trying to gain, by means of heavy tributes, the temporary neutrality of their Christian neighbours. Shortly before the resounding capture of Toledo by Alfonso VI, in 478/1083, al-Muṭamid began to find himself enmeshed in serious difficulties. On the imprudent advice of Ibn 'Ammār, he attempted, after the annexation of Cordova, to annex further the principality of Murcia [cf. MURSIYA], then governed by a ruler of Arab origin, Muh. b. Aḥmad Ibn Tāhir. In 471/1080, Ibn 'Ammār paid a visit to the count of Barcelona, Ramon Berenguer II, and asked for his assistance in conquering Murcia in return for the sum of 10,000 dinars, as surety for the payment of which a son of al-Muṭamid, al-Rṣādīl, was to serve as hostage. After a series of agitated comings and goings, which ended in the payment to the count of Barcelona of a sum thrice as large, Ibn 'Ammār resumed his project of conquering Murcia, and soon realised it, thanks to the assistance of the lord of the castle of Bibi (now Vilches), Ibn Rashāk. It was not long,
however, before Ibn 'Ammār in Murcia made himself intolerable to his sovereign. Betrayed by Ibn Rashīk, he was forced to flee from Murcia, and sought refuge successively at Leon, Saragossa and Lerida. On returning to Saragossa he endeavoured to assist his prince, al-Mu'tamīn b. Hūd (cf. HŪDĪDS), in his expedition against Segura (cf. ṢHĀKHĀR), but was captured and handed over to al-Mu'tamid, who, notwithstanding the ties of friendship which had for so long bound them together, killed him with his own hand. In the meantime Alfonso VI began to disclose openly his designs on Toledo, which he had begun to invest since 473/1080. Two years later, having sent a deputation to collect the annual tribute which al-Mu'tamid was paying to him, he learned that its members had been molested and that the Jewish treasurer Ibn Shālib, who had accompanied it, had been put to death because of his refusal to accept money of low standard. Thereupon he made an incursion into the kingdom of Seville, raided the flourishing townships of the Aljarafe (cf. AL-SHARAF), struck across the district of Sidona (cf. SHADUNA) as far as Tarifa (cf. TARĪF, DJAZIRAT), where he pronounced a celebrated phrase in which he boasted of having trodden the furthest bounds of Spain. The capture of Toledo by Alfonso VI was a heavy blow to Islam in Spain. The king of Castile, having once demanded of al-Mu'tamid the return of his possessions which had formerly been part of the kingdom, of the Dhu 'l-Nūnids, i.e. part of the present provinces of Ciudad Real and Cuenca. Throughout Muslim Spain its ever-increasing demands caused a particularly difficult situation. In spite of their unwillingness, the princes of Spain, with al-Mu'tamid at their head, were compelled to pay direct from the royal treasury. With their aid, and by a successful conversion from Christianity a cavalry corps of the Ottoman army, he reaffirmed his allegiance to Muhammad Khudabanda.

The importance of the ghuldms gradually increased. al-Mu'tamīd, Fath al-Mu'amīn (killed), Carmona, and finally Seville, which was taken in spite of a heroic sortie by al-Mu'tamid. The vanquished prince, made prisoner by the Almoravid, was at first sent with his wives and children to Tangier, then to Melknes, and after several months to Aghmāt, not far from Marrākūsh. He passed a miserable existence there for some years, and died there in 487/1095, aged fifty-five years. With him, in these lamentable circumstances, ended the dynasty of the 'Abbāḍīd, which may be regarded, notwithstanding the excesses and cruelty of its princes, as the most brilliant of the dynasties of the taifa and indubitably that under which the arts and letters shone most brightly in Muslim Spain of the eleventh century.


'ABBĀS I, styled the Great, king of Persia of the Šafawī dynasty, second son and successor of Muhammad Khudabanda, was born on 1 Ramadān 978/27 January 1571, and died in Māzandarān on 24 Dūmād 1038/19 January 1629, after a reign of 42 solar (43 lunar) years. In 980/1572-3 he remained at Harāt when his father moved to Shahrūz. In 984/1576-7 ISMĀ'IL II put to death the lāla (tutor) of 'Abbās, and appointed 'All Khān Shāmlū governor of Harāt with orders to execute 'Abbās himself. 'All Kūlī procrastinated, and, when the death of ISMĀ'IL II (985/1577-8) rendered the order null and void, was made himself lāla to 'Abbās by Muhammad Khudabanda. Three years later 'All Kūlī read the Muḥāfa at Harāt in the name of 'Abbās, but, when threatened by the royal army, he re-affirmed his allegiance to Muhammad Khudabanda. Three years later 'All Kūlī read the Muḥāfa at Harāt in the name of 'Abbās, but, when threatened by the royal army, he re-affirmed his allegiance to Muhammad Khudabanda at Ghūrtyān. Shortly afterwards his protegé 'Abbās fell into the hands of his rival Mursīdīl Kūlī Khān Ustādīlī, governor of Turbat, and in 992/1587 the latter marched on Kazvin. Muhammad Khudabanda was deposed, and 'Abbās became Shāh at the age of 16, with Mursīdīl Kūlī as his wakīl-i dīwan-i tālī.

'Abbās, faced with the twofold task of enforcing his authority over the Kīfīlābī amirs, and of checking the encroachment on Persian territory of the Ottomans in the West and the Uzbegs in the East, at once created from the ranks of Georgian prisoners converted from Christianity a cavalry corps of the wulmān-i bhīṣa-yi gartīa, paid direct from the royal treasury. With their aid, and by a successful appeal to the loyalty of the šāhī-i-temen (q.v.), he crushed a revolt of amirs, and followed this by riding himself of the now too-powerful Mursīdīl Kūlī. The importance of the ḡulams gradually increased.
The appointment of Allahwardi Khan to be governor of Fars elevated a ghulam to equality of status with the Kizilbash amirs, and eventually ghulams filled some 20% of the high administrative posts. Abbas systematically pacified the provinces of 'Irāk-i 'Adjam, Fārs, Kirmān and Lurīstan. The local rulers of Gilān and Māzandarān were subjugated. In order to avoid fighting on two fronts, Abbas signed in Constantinople in 996/1589-90 a peace treaty most unfavourable to Persia. The regions of Āḏābarbāyjān, Karābāgh, Gandja, Karadāgh, with Georgia and parts of Lurīstan and Kurdistān, were to remain in Ottoman hands, and a interdict was placed on the Shi'ite objurgation of the early Caliphs.

Abbas entrusted to Allahwardi Khan the reorganisation of the army on the lines suggested by Robert Sherley, an English adventurer then at the Persian Court. A new corps of 12,000 musketeers (tuṭangī), for the most part mounted, was recruited locally from the peasantry; the strength of the ghulams was raised to 10,000 by further recruitment from the Georgian converts; 3000 more were selected as mulzmīn or personal bodyguard to the Shah; and a corps of artillery, comprising 12,000 men and 500 guns, was also recruited from the ghulams, cannon being supplied by Sherley. Abbas thus had a standing army of some 37,000 men.

After the death of the Shāybanids 'Abbās Allāh b. Iskandar [q.v.] and 'Abbās al-Mu'min, dynastic rivalries distracted the Uzbegs, and Abbas was able to inflict on them a severe defeat at Harāt (1007/1598-9), and to recover Maḥhād and Harāt after ten years of Uzbeg occupation. In a attempt to stabilise the North-East frontier, 'Abbās installed at Balkh, Marw and Astarābād Uzbeg chiefs subordinate to himself. But Bākī Muḥammad, the new khān of Transoxania, re-occupied Balkh (1009/1600-1), and though 'Abbās led a force of 50,000 men against him, he was outmanoeuvred and forced to retreat (1011/1602-3), losing large numbers of men through sickness, and abandoning most of his new artillery. At this point hostilities in the East were suspended, but in the West 'Abbās invaded Āḏābarbāyjān in 1012/1603-4, and occupied Nakhchivan and Erivan. The Ottomans under Cīghālāzāda suffered a signal defeat at Sīs near Tabrīz (214/1605-6), with the loss of 20,000 men. Gandja and Tiflis were taken by the Safawids. Internal disorders in Turkey contributed to the haphazard conduct of the war against Persia. Successful Turkish invasions of Āḏābarbāyjān were hampered by the Persian policy of devasting the regions of Cūkhur Sa'd and Nakhchivan and evacuating the inhabitants. Peace was eventually concluded at Sarāb in 1027/1617-8, but was broken by 'Abbās in 1032/1623-4, when he took Baghdād and Diyar Ḳurʿān from the Ottomans.

In other directions too 'Abbās expanded Šafawīd territory. Bahrān was annexed in 1010/1601-2, Shīrwān was reconquered in 1016/1607-8. With British aid, the island of Hūrnuz was taken from the Portuguese in 1020/1610-1, but a long series of bitter wars in Georgia failed to result in permanent annexation, and 'Abbās was finally forced to recognize the Georgian prince Tāynurāz. Military necessity was often the pretext for the transference of large bodies of people to other regions. Some 20,000 Armenians from the Erzerum region were enrolled in the ghulams: a further 3000 families were moved from Dīlūj to Iṣfahān; the Kāramānli tribe of Karābāgh was moved to Fārs in 1023/1614-5; and the influx of Georgians from Kakhētī—130,000 prisoners were taken in the expedition of 1025/1616-7 alone—was a major factor in achieving that admixture of races and creeds by which 'Abbās planned to offset the power of the Kızl ābāsh.

Diplomatic contacts with European countries and with India were numerous during 'Abbās's reign, but all his efforts to create a European alliance against the Ottomans failed. Though careful to keep on good terms with the Mogul Emperors Akbār and Dājāngir, he always regarded Kandahār, seized by Akbār in 999/1599-1, as Persian territory, and in 1031/1621-2 he re-occupied the city. 'Abbās maintained friendly relations with the princes of Muscovy and the Tatar khāns of the Crimea. Foreign monastic orders, like the Carmelites, the Augustinians and the Capuchins, friars, were accorded permission to operate without hindrance. In 1007/1598-9 Sir Anthony Sherley, brother of Robert, was dispatched to Europe accompanied by a Persian envoy, Husayn 'All Beg Bayāt, and visited Prague, Venice, Rome, Valladolid and Lisbon. Return embassies were sent by the Spaniards, the Portuguese and the English. The latter's envoy, Sir Dodmore Cotton, was the first accredited English ambassador to the Persian Court. 'Abbās improved communications by the construction of roads (notably the coast road through Mázandarān), bridges and caravanserais. He enriched Iṣfahān, which became his new capital in 1006/1597-8, with mosques, palaces and gardens: but he also built palaces at Kazzvin, and at Ashraf and Faraḥbād on the Caspian, where he spent an increasing amount of time in his later years. He explored the possibility of diverting some of the headwaters of the Kārūn into the basin of the Zāyanda-Rūd. Although endowed with great qualities, 'Abbās could be ruthless, and his family fell victims to his desire for security. His father, Muḥammad Khudābānda, and two brothers, Abū Tālib and Ṭāḥmās, were blinded and incarcerated at Alāmūt; a son, Muḥammad Bākīr Mīrzā, was executed on a charge of treason in 1022/1613, and another, Imām Kull, was made heir-apparent in 1030/1620 during an illness of 'Abbās, but was made heir-apparent in 1030/1620 on the latter's recovery. Throughout his reign, 'Abbās attached great importance to maintaining the pir u-murğāh relationship with his subjects: hence he made frequent visits to the Shi'ite shrines at Ardabīl, Maḥhād, Maqāzīsh, where he repaired the damage caused by the Uzbegs, and after their capture from the Ottomans, to those at Kārbālā and Nādījāf.


(R. M. Savory)
Djanab of al-Namir. The Abbasid dynasty took its name from him, being descended from his son 'Abd Allah. Consequently there was a tendency for historians under the Abbasids to glorify him, and in his case it is particularly difficult to distinguish fact from fiction. He was a merchant and financier, more prosperous than his half-brother Abū Tālib, who, in return for the extinction of a debt, surrendered to him the office of provisioning pilgrims to Mecca with water (ṣīḥāda) and permission also with food (rifāda). Though he owned a garden in al-Tā'if, he was not so wealthy as the leading men of the clans of 'Abd Shams and Makārim. There is no clear evidence of any rapportement between him and Muhammad until 762/7 (al-Khatīb al-Baghdadi, 133). Al-

...
'Abbas was born about 133/750. He grew up in Baghdad (this must be the meaning of the words of al-Sūfī quoted by al-Khalīfī, 128, or of those of al-Ashbaghī repeated in Aḥmān i, viii, 353). We do not know anything about his adolescence or his studies. He must have started writing poetry very early, as Bāshār b. Burd (d. 167/783) speaks of his beginnings and calls him fātā, or ẓulām (Aḥmān i, v, 210 and al-Khalīfī, 130). The only details we know about his career show him as a favourite of the caliph Hārūn al-Rašīd, who employed him, however, not as a panegyrist, but rather as one to amuse him in his hours of leisure (see e.g. Aḥmān i, vii, 355 ft., and al-Khalīfī, 131). It seems certain that the poet accompanied the caliph in his campaigns in Khūrāsān and Armenia, but, overcome by nostalgia, received his permission to return to Baghdad (Aḥmān ii, viii, 372). Al-'Abbās was also connected with the high officials of the Barmakīd family, especially with Yāḥyah b. Da'far (Aḥmān ii, v, 168, 241). One can assume that his verses were highly enjoyed by certain ladies of the caliph's harem, e.g. by Umm Da'far, who made him presents (Aḥmān ii, viii, 369). The favour shown to al-'Abbās by the men in power seems to have given him an influential position: a nephew of his, Ibrāhīm al-Suli (d. 243/857), himself a poet, was 'secretary' of the Chan- tacy (see on him al-Mas'ūdī, Murūdī, vii, 237-45 and al-Khalīfī, 129; it is to be noted that through al-Abbās was the great-uncle of the famous Abū Bakr al-Suli [q.v.]). Almost nothing has come down to us about the literary contacts of al-'Abbās. He seems to have been on bad terms with Muslim b. al-Walīd (al-Khalīfī, 128) and the Mu'tazilite Abu 'l-Hughayl al-Affāl (Aḥmān, v, 254). Various dates are given for his death: 188/803 according to Aḥmān, v, 254, repeated by al-Khalīfī, 133; or 192/807, idem 133 and Ṣākiyyū, IV, 283; or after 193/808, according to one of his friends who is said to have met him in Baghdad after the death of al-Rašīd, which occurred in that year (al-Khalīfī, 133 and Ibn Khalilikān). Al-'Abbās would have been at that time about 60 years old. He is said to have died while on pilgrimage and to have been buried in Baṣra (al-Khalīfī, 132-3 and al-Mas'ūdī, vii, 247).

The work of al-'Abbās was collected after his death by Zubūr, and subsequently, in the form of extracts, by Abū Bakr al-Suli (Fihrīst, 163, 151); al-Suli wrote also a biography of the poet (d. 151), which was extensively used by Abū 'I-Farādī al-Īṣahānī in the article in the Aḥmān. We have no information about the versions that circulated in Khūrāsān during the lifetime of 'Ubayd Allāh b. Tāhir (d. 300/912; cf. Aḥmān, viii, 353). One cannot exclude the hypothesis that verses by unknown authors were wrongly included in these versions; cf. the detail quoted by al-Marzūbānī, 252. At any rate Yākūt, iv, 284 points out that the manuscripts of his time were divergent. The work of al-'Abbās is preserved only in two manuscripts of the selection made by al-Suli; on a third one, now lost (?), was based the unsatisfactory edition, Istanbul 1298/1880 (reproduced in Cairo-Baghdad 1367/1947; cf. A. Khusrāji, Diwan d'al-'Abbās b. al-'Abbās, thesis submitted to the Faculty of Letters, Paris, in 1953). The existing collection consists of pieces that are generally short and some of which are perhaps only fragments of longer poems.

Al-'Abbās, as all his Muslim biographers have noted, cultivated only one genre, the ghānat [q.v.], i.e. erotic-elegiac poetry (cf. e.g. Ibn Kutayba, 525; Fihrīst, 132; Aḥmān ii, viii, 352). In their present state, the pieces that are available confirm this fact: Al-'Abbās appears in them as a follower of the poets of the Hīdājī, namely ʿUmar b. ʿAbd Rabbī and especially Djamīl, al-Ahwās and al-Ardā, in whose work the tendencies of the school began to take a fixed form. In his poems there reappears not only the psychological scheme of the submissive lover, but also the fictitious personalities of the rabbī and ʿawāṣī. The woman whom he extols is presented in a stylised manner, so that we are unable to say if the poet is merely combining clichés or starting from a real experience. On the whole, however, there are expressions of ideal love; we find (Diwan, Istanbul, 148-50), the description of an orgy with singing girls. On the whole, however, the poetry of al-'Abbās stands in contrast to that of Abū Nuwas [q.v.], which is permeated with the carnal cult of the beloved. The art of al-'Abbās is highly conventional and his inspiration is monotonous. On the other hand, his style avoids the use of gīrmanic rhetoric and his language, simple and fluent without being vulgar, is akin to that of Abū Nuwas.

The vogue enjoyed by the poetry of al-'Abbās from the very first cannot be explained solely by some helénnic influence or by respect for an old Arab tradition. The society in which the poet lived must also be taken into consideration. Chiming with the diletantism of al-Rašīd and the taste of the women of the court, the poems of al-'Abbās were ready-made material for composers and singers, like Ibrāhīm al-Mawṣīl (cf. Aḥmān ii, vi, 182, viii, 365, 354-6). Nevertheless the favour shown to them by men of letters like al-Dajīlī, Ibn Kutayba or al-Maṣūdī, by a music-lover like the caliph al-Wāthīq, by a bel esprit like Abū Bakr al-Suli, or finally by a rigorist like Saḥmā b. 'Āṣīm (cf. Ibn Kutayba, al-Shīr, 525 ff., and especially Aḥmān ii, viii, 354 ff.), shows that these poetical productions could be enjoyed by a public of greatly varying tastes.

It is difficult to define the importance of al-'Abbās b. al-'Abbās in the history of Arabic poetry. If Muslim Spain really appreciated this oriental poet (cf. Ibn Hazm, Taʾwīl al-Hamāmā (Bercher), 285; Péres, La poésie andalouse en arabe classique au Xe siècle, 54, 411), one might see in him one of the poets who influenced the erotic-elegiac poetry so highly valued in that country. In this case, his role in the development of the genre would be of the greatest importance. Recently, oriental critics like F. Rifaʿī and Bahbūṭī have tried to discover what in the work of al-'Abbās retains a lasting value. In two penetrating studies, Hei and Torrey placed the poet in his milieu and noted his influence in Arabic literature.


(R. Blachère)
AL-'ABBĀS b. 'AMR AL-GHANAWĪ — AL-'ABBĀS b. AL-MA'MŪN

AL-'ABBĀS b. 'AMR AL-GHANAWĪ, famous general and governor of the 'Abbasid caliphs at the end of the third century/900. In 286/899 he fought against the Arab tribes in 'Irāk. In 287/900 he was appointed by the caliph al-Mu'tadīd governor of Ya'māma and Bahrayn, with orders to fight against the Karmātian chief of Bahrayn, Abū Sa'id al-Djānnābī. He left Başra with an army of regular soldiers, volunteers from Başra and beduin auxiliaries, was left in the lurch in the first battle by the beduins and he volunteers and next day, after a bloody battle, he was taken prisoner together with about 700 men (end of Radjāb 287/July 900). The prisoners were executed, but al-'Abbās was spared by the Karmātian, who charged him with a message to the caliph, in which he set forth the dangers and the uselessness of a new campaign against him. One can find in M. J. de Goeje’s Mémoire sur les Caramathes de Basra, 37-41, an account of the battle and its consequences, after al-Tabarī, as well as the anecdote, told among others by al-Tanukhī (al-Farājī ba'd al-Shidda, Cairo 1903, i, 110-1), concerning the libelation of al-'Abbās, a matter of astonishment to contemporaries as well as his the historians. Al-'Abbās was one of the generals who in 289/901-2 abandoned the commander-in-chief, Badr, at the instigation of the new caliph al-Muktafi. According to Ibn al-Athir he was governor of Kumm and Kāshān in 296/908-9. He accompanied the army of Mu'nis ibn Ḥakam of Diyar Mudar, residing in al-Rakka, where he died in 296/908-9.

He was even a distant precursor of aviation, al-halak). In appeasing its discontent. Then the caliph, in order owing the machinations of Ibn Bakiyya, and the intrigues of Ibn Fasandjas who hoped to extract money from al-'Abbās, he was deposed in 359/969-70 and put into the hands of his rival. The latter, however, was not more successful in his office and al-'Abbās managed to recover his freedom in 360/971, to be re-appointed as vizier and to eliminate definitively Ibn Fasandjas. His extortion of money, to pay the troops, made him again the butt of hatred, especially that of Bakhṭiyār’s omnipotent majordomo, Ibn Bakjiyya. In 362/973 he was arrested owing the machinations of Ibn Bakjiyya, and the latter was appointed vizier. Al-'Abbās was confined in the house of an 'Alīd in Kūfah and died soon afterwards, probably from poison.

AL-'ABBĀS possessed a palace in Baghdad, called Khākān, which was burned down by order of Bakhṭiyār. On this palace, the festivals held in it, and the other buildings of al-'Abbās, see al-'Iṣnārī, Dhayl Zahr al-'Adab, Cairo 1353, 275 ff.

AL-'ABBĀS b. AL-MA'AMŪN, pretender to the throne under al-Mu'taṣim. His father, the caliph al-Ma'mūn, appointed him in 215/828-9 a governor of al-Ḍjazā’ra and the neighbouring frontier district, and he then showed great bravery in fighting the Byzantines. On the death of al-Ma’mūn in 216/833, his brother, Abū Ḥishāk Muḥammad al-Mu’taṣim bi-'Ilāh, by choice of the deceased, ascended the throne of the 'Abbasids (The fully manifest, thanks to the newly found volume of Ibn Hayyān’s al-Muqtābīs concerning the Andalusi amirate, where a long passage is devoted to him and a great number of his verses are quoted. Al-'Abbās b. Lais, who managed, thanks to his panegyrics, to keep his position at the court of Cordova during three successive reigns, is chiefly represented as a man of curious and inventive mind. He is said to have made a journey to 'Irāk and to have brought back to Spain the Sinadhīn. He was the only one in Cordova to be able to explain the contents of al-'Iṣlāh b. Ahmad’s treatise on metrics. To him is attributed the invention of the fabrication of crystal. He constructed, and offered to his masters, a clock (mabhānā) and an armillary sphere (dhāl al-halāh). He was even a distant precursor of aviation, thinking out a sheath furnished with feathers and mobile wings; had the courage to put it on, to jump from the top of a precipice and to hover in the air for a few seconds before falling—escaping death by a miracle. He was occasionally accused of sandaka, but without success.

AL-'ABBĀS b. AL-HUSAYN b. Shadrāzī, Abū 'l-Fadl, vizier. At the death of al-Muḥallabī in 355/963, al-'Abbās, head of the Dīwan of Expenses, was charged by the Būyid Muṣīr al-Dawla with the functions of a vizier, together with another secretary, Ibn Fasandjas, but without succeeding to the title. After the death of Muṣīr al-Dawla in 356/967, he was appointed vizier by the son and successor of Muṣīr al-Dawla, Baṭḥiyār. He succeeded in suppressing the rebellion of another son of Muṣīr al-Dawla. Owing to the enmity of the chamberlain Subuktākhī, the financial difficulties, and the intrigues of Ibn Fasandjas who hoped to extract money from al-'Abbās, he was deposed in 359/969-70 and put into the hands of his rival. The latter, however, was not more successful in his office and al-'Abbās managed to recover his freedom in 360/971, to be re-appointed as vizier and to eliminate definitively Ibn Fasandjas. His extortion of money, to pay the troops, made him again the butt of hatred, especially that of Baṭḥiyār’s omnipotent majordomo, Ibn Bakjiyya. In 362/973 he was arrested owing the machinations of Ibn Bakjiyya, and the latter was appointed vizier. Al-'Abbās was confined in the house of an 'Alīd in Kūfah and died soon afterwards, probably from poison.

AL-'ABBĀS possessed a palace in Baghdad, called Khākān, which was burned down by order of Baṭḥiyār. On this palace, the festivals held in it, and the other buildings of al-'Abbās, see al-'Iṣnārī, Dhayl Zahr al-'Adab, Cairo 1353, 275 ff.

AL-'ABBĀS b. AL-MA'AMŪN, pretender to the throne under al-Mu'taṣīm. His father, the caliph al-'Abbās, appointed him in 215/828-9 a governor of al-Ḍjazā’ra and the neighbouring frontier district, and he then showed great bravery in fighting the Byzantines. On the death of al-Ma’mūn in 216/833, his brother, Abū Ḥishāk Muḥammad al-Mu’taṣīm bi-'Ilāh, by choice of the deceased, ascended the throne of the 'Abbasids. But their strength was not so strong against the Greeks, however, proclaimed al-'Abbās caliph, although he himself was not in the least disposed to comply with the wishes of his troops and took the oath of fealty to his uncle. After that, he went back to his army and succeeded in appeasing its discontent. Then the caliph, in order to strengthen his position, took many measures of precaution; he had the fortress of Ṭuwānā (Tyana) razed, stopped the war against the Byzantines and disbanded the army. Later, having organized some Turkish regiments as his guard, he loaded them with honors to an extent which disaffected the Arab troops, who had shown themselves sufficiently ill-disposed ever since the death of al-Ma’mūn. "Udjay
b. 'Anbas, an Arab general in the service of al-Mu'tazim utilized this discontent for the purpose of organizing a conspiracy, the object of which was to assassinate the caliph and to put al-'Abbās on the throne. The latter allowed himself to be persuaded; but the plot was discovered, and the conspirators paid for their attempt with their lives. Al-'Abbās died in prison at Manbiḍ in 223/838.


(K. V. Zetterstēen)

al-'Abbās b. Mirdās b. ʿAbī ʿAmr b. Ḥaritha b. ʿAbd Kays, of Sulaym, Arabīan poet of the muḥḥadāramīn. A sayyid in his tribe by noble descent on both sides, he won renown as a warrior as well as a poet; although he did not come up to the fame of his stepmother, the celebrated al-Khansā', his poetical achievements surpassed those of his brothers and his sister all of whom displayed literary gifts and two of whom lived to compose elegies on his death. Impelled, so the story goes, by two dream experiences or epiphanies in which his family idol, Dimār (not Dimad, cf. iii, 353) announced its own downfall and the rise of true prophet, al-'Abbās went to Medina to embrace Islam. Muḥammad, who was at the time preparing for the conquest of Mecca, arranged for al-'Abbās to meet him with his tribesmen at al-Kudayd. Al-'Abbās returned to the Banū Sulaym and burned his idol while his wife, Ḥabība, returned to people in indignation over her husband's conversion. Al-'Abbās kept his word and joined in the fāth Makka (8/630) with some 900 fully armed warriors. He was among the muwāllaṭa al-ḥabībūn, those influential men whose loyalty Muḥammad endeavored to secure by lavish gifts, but demurred when on the distribution of the booty taken from the Ḥawāzīn at the battle of Ḥunayn (630) his present turned out substantially smaller than that of other leaders. As a result of a ḥastāda of protest Muḥammad satisfied al-'Abbās by increasing his share. After the fāth he withdrew to the territory of the Sulaym. He lived into the reign of ʿUmar before whom he is reported to have appeared in a quarrel with another poet. Ibn Saʿd reports that he settled near Baṣra, often coming into town where the Baṣrians would take traditions from him. His son Ǧūḥuma, too, appears as a transmitter of ḥadīth from the Prophet. His offspring settled in and near Baṣra.

Al-'Abbās's poetical fame would seem to be due as much to his colourful personality as to the actual merits of his verse. His muḥḥadīṯ with his fellow-tribesman Khufaf b. Nadha, his poem upon his burning Dimār and accepting Islam, his protest against the Prophet's inadequate donotions, and finally a ḥastāda (Aṣma'iyāyyīl, XXXVIII; cf. introduction, 12) originating in connection with a successful raid into the Yaman are perhaps the best-known of his poems, which it seems were never collected into a dīwān. The available material gives evidence of a certain forcefulness but does not betray unusual talents. Some of his lines are interesting because of dialectical peculiarities, others because of the manner in which they reflect his experience of Islam.

Bibliography: Aghānī, ii, iii, 64-72; Ibn Kutayba, Shīr, 467-70; Ibn Saʿd, iv, 15-17; Hamāsa of Abū Tamмān, pp. 61-63 (ascription doubtful), 214-6, 512-3; Ibn Ḥīṣām, Sīra, index; Khiṣāna, index; Ṭabarī, index; C. Rabin, Ancient West Arabian, London 1951, index.

(E. Lévi-Provençal)

al-'Abbās b. Muḥammad b. ʿAli b. ʿAbd Allah, brother of the caliphs Abu l-ʿAbbās al-Saffār and Abū Ḫājīfār al-Muṣāfīr. Al-'Abbās helped to retake Malṭaya in 139/756, and three years later was appointed by al-Muṣāfīr as governor of al-Djazīra and the neighbouring frontier district. He was dismissed in 155/772, but his name continues to figure frequently in the history of the following years, however little important his political part may have been. He especially and often distinguished himself in the wars against the Byzantines. In 159/775-6 he was put at the head of the troops which the caliph al-Mahdīi mustered for an expedition against Asia Minor, and it was with great success that he acquiesced himself of the charge committed to him. He died in 186/802.

Bibliography: Tabarī, iii, 121; Balkāhīrī, Futḥ, 184; Ya'qūbī, ii, 406 ff.; Ibn al-ʿĀthīr, v, 372 ff.; Mas'ūdī, Murūǧī, vi, 266; ix, 64 ff.; Fraqm. Hist. Arab. (de Goeje and de Jong), 225, 227, 265, 275, 284; Abu l-Muḥāsīn (Juyboll and Matthes), i, see index; al-Aghānī, Tables; S. Moscati, in Orientalia, 1945, 309-10. (K. V. Zetterstēen)

al-'Abbās' nāṣīḥ al-Jārāfī,Andalusī poet of the 9th/10th century. He stayed for a long time in Egypt, Ḥijāz and Ṭrāk, and the rise of the true prophet. A confidant of the amīr al-Ḥakam, who appointed him as kāfī of his native Algeciras, he soon made a name for himself both as a philologist and a jurist. The Muḥtabis of Ibn Ḥayyān has preserved numerous specimens of his poetry. He died at the end of the reign of ʿAbd al-Rahmān II, and is recorded as 235/852.

Bibliography: Ibn Ḥayyān, al-Muḥtabīs, i (in press), fol. 129 f.; Ibn al-Faraḥī, Tāwīlī, no. 879; Makkāfī, Naṣīḥ, index.
warned, together with the other Marwanids, not to let loose by their revolts the juma, which would prove fatal to the dynasty. But at the end he had to give in to violence and join the coup d'état of 136/744. Later he was thrown into prison by the last Umayyad caliph, Marwan II. He died in prison in Harran, in an epidemic, in 132/750.


(K. V. Zetterstean-F. Gabrieli)

'ABBĀS EFENDI [see Bahāʿīs]

'ABBĀS HILMI I, viceroy of Egypt, born in 1813, son of Ahmad Tūsun (1793-1816) and grandson of Muhammad ʿAll [q.v.]. He succeeded to his uncle Ibrāhīm, who died in Nov. 1848. From his very accession he showed great hostility to foreigners. The reforms undertaken during the preceding period he chose to consider as dangerous and blameworthy innovations that were best abandoned. Most of the schools opened by Muhammad ʿAll were closed, as well as the factories, workshops and sanitary institutions; he even gave orders to destroy the works of the Delta dam. Many foreign, especially French, officials were dismissed. The result was, from the beginning of his reign, the decline of French influence; on the other hand, he drew nearer to Great Britain. Great Britain offered him its support in the conflict with the Ottoman government about the application in Egypt of the tanzimat [q.v.]. In exchange for this support, Great Britain obtained on 18 July 1851 the authorisation to construct the railway between Alexandria and Cairo. The opening of this line, which was planned to be extended to Suez, was meant to counteract the French project to cut the isthmus of Suez.

Distrustful, brutal, hard, and sometimes cruel, by nature, ʿAbbās quickly became unpopular. It must be noted, however, that at least in the first years of his reign, his aversion to the reforms inspired by the West, helped, by a considerable decrease of the expenses, to relieve the poorest classes of the population. They were granted some remission of taxes and had less to suffer from corvee and conscription. Moreover, certain western and Egyptian historians have tried to explain the reactionary xenophobe policy of ʿAbbās by an ardent patriotism, which, allegedly, induced him to limit by all means the foreign influence of the consequences of which he was afraid; Sammarco, however, has refuted this assertion.

ʿAbbās, impelled by his mistrustful character to live in isolation, retired to his palace in Benha. He was strangled there by two of his servants, on 13 July 1854, in circumstances which were never wholly cleared up. He was succeeded by his uncle Muh. Saʿid [q.v.].


'ABBĀS MĪRZA, son of Fath Ṭāhir ʿAll Shah, born in Dhu l-Ḥijjah 1203/Sept. 1789, in the small town of Nawā, died on 10 Dūmād I 1249/25 Oct. 1833. Although not the eldest son, he was heir to the throne because his mother also belonged to the Kāḍārī family. Europeans who knew him were unanimous in their praise of his bravery, generosity and other excellent qualities. R. G. Watson (History of Persia, 128-9) describes him as being "the noblest of the Kajar race". He was passionately devoted to the military art, and, with the aid of, successively, Russian, French and British officers and men, introduced European tactics and discipline amongst his troops in Adharbaydjan, of which province he was Governor-General for many years. Despite his military reforms, he failed in his campaigns against the Russians, but he was successful in the war against Turkey in 1821-3.
He died at Mashhad during his father's lifetime; on Fath 'Ali Shah's death in the following year (1834), 'Abbâs Mîrzâ's son Muḥammad succeeded to the throne.


'Abbâsâ, daughter of the caliph al-Mahdî, sister of the caliphs Hârûn al-Rashîd and al-Ḥâdî; it is to her that the locality Suwaykat al-Abbâsâ owes its name. She had three husbands in succession, all who predeceased her; this inspired Abû Nuwâs to write some satirical verses, in which he recommended the caliph, should he have to train a traitor killed, to marry him to 'Abbâsâ. Her name is connected with the fall of the Barmakids through the amorous intrigue with Dja'far b. Yâbyâ al-Barmakî, with which she is credited. According to al-Tabârî, Hârûn could not deprive himself of the society of either his sister or Dja'far, so that, in order to have them both with him at the same time, he made them contract a purely formal marriage. They, however, were not contented with the form alone; and when Hârûn learned that they had children, and was convinced that the reports in circulation about them were true, he caused Dja'far to be executed.—Some earlier historians than al-Tabârî do not mention this fact; especially it must be noticed that al-Tabârî, like the others, does not give the names of Dja'far's husbands without mentioning that of Dja'far. Further, al-Tabârî, like the other chroniclers who repeat this story, only mentions it as one of the events which were reported to have caused Dja'far's execution. Later chroniclers amplify the love-story of Dja'far and 'Abbâsâ more and more, until Ibn Khaldûn calls it truth in question, even if on the grounds, which are not very conclusive for us. If one detail, found in the Persian Tabârî, must be believed, 'Abbâsâ was already forty years old when her relations with Dja'far began. It is quite certain that her second husband died eleven years before Dja'far, and these figures put all ideas of a youthful romance out of the question. We may then reasonably look upon this anecdote as the product of popular imagination, to give a poetic aura to the fall of this favorite minister.

This is the more likely in that pagan Arab stories contain a remarkably similar episode of the marriage of the minister of a king with the latter's sister (see *Darâhimâ al-Abrašî*); it was very easy to transfer to Dja'far the motif of this story. What the greater number of authorities report on the subject of 'Abbâsâ is reported by some about two other fictitious sisters of Hârûn, Maymûnâ and Fâkhîshâ! The older authorities say nothing about what happened to 'Abbâsâ after the death of Dja'far; it is only the later writers who have woven mysterious horrors about her end. The love of 'Abbâsâ and Dja'far has frequently appealed to the imagination of European as well as Arabian authors: in 1753 a French romance appeared, and again more recently, in 1904 ( Aimé Giron and Albert Tozza, *Les nuits de Bagdad*).
ABBASABAD — ABBASIDS

[Text continues from the previous page]
as emblems of religious revolt by earlier rebels against the Umayyads. Their use by Abu Muslim was thus an appeal to messianic expectations. His activities aroused some opposition among the more moderate Arab Shi'a, led by Sulaymān b. Kāthir, but a tactical withdrawal of Abu Muslim from Khurāsān was sufficient to demonstrate that no effective movement was possible without him and his policies, and led to his return as undisputed leader of the mission. By Ramaḍān 129/May–June 747 he was ready to show his hand. The time and the place were auspicious. The moderate Shi'a and the Khawāridj, the two most important opposition movements against the Umayyads, had both shot their bolt — the former in the risings of 122/740 and 126/744, the latter in the rebellion of 127/745. These served the double purpose of weakening the Umayyad regime and, by their failure, eliminating possible rivals to the Hāghāni succession. 'Irāk, the main centre of previous anti-Umayyad movements, was exhausted, and was moreover subject to special Umayyad surveillance. In concentrating their attention on Khurāsān, the 'Abbāsids were breaking new grounds. Their choice was good. An active and warlike Persian population, imbued with the religious and military traditions of the frontier, was deeply resentful of the inequalities imposed by Umayyad rule. The Arab army and settlers, half Persianized by long residence, were sharply divided among themselves, and even during the triumphal progress of Abu Muslim diverted their own energies and those of the Umayyad governor, Ṣafir b. Sayyār [q.v.], to Arab inter-tribal strife. Soon Abu Muslim was able to take Marw, and then, ably seconded by his general Kāḥtaba [q.v.], an Arab of the tribe of Tā'yin, seized all Khurāsān from the crumbling Umayyad power. From Khurāsān the ‘Abbāsids forces advanced to Rayy and then, after defeating a relieving Umayyad army from Kirmān, captured Niḥawānd. The way was now open to ‘Irāk. In 132/749 the ‘Abbāsids army crossed the Euphrates some 30 or 40 miles north of Kūfa, and engaged and defeated another Umayyad army led by Ibn Hubayra [q.v.]. Kāḥtaba fell on the field of battle, w. h. his son, al-Ḥasan b. Kāḥtaba, took command, and following up the victory, took possession of the city of Kūfa. ‘Ībrāhīm al-‘Imām had fallen into the hands of the Caliph Marwān in 130/748, and died shortly after. It was therefore his brother, Abu ‘l-‘Abbās [q.v.] who was hailed as Caliph by the Hāghāni troops in Kūfa in 132/749, with the title al-Saffāh. The accession of the first ‘Abbāsids Caliph was accompanied by the first breach with the revolutionaries, when the missionary Abu Salama [q.v.], who was put to death in obscure circumstances, allegedly for attempting to bring about the replacement of the ‘Abbāsids by the ‘Alids. Abu Muslim undertook his removal, perhaps in return for ‘Abbāsids acquiescence in the death of Sulaymān b. Kāthir. Meanwhile another ‘Abbāsids army, led by Abu ‘Awn, advanced from Nihāwānd towards Mesopotamia. In 131/749, in the neighbourhood of Shahraẓūz, east of the Lesser Zāb river, he inflicted a crushing defeat on an Umayyad army led by ‘Abd Allāh, the son of the caliph Marwān. Marwān now himself took the field, and marched across the Tigris towards the Greater Zāb river, to engage the army of his opponent. The latter had meanwhile handed over his command to ‘Abd Allāh, the uncle of al-Saffāh, who had arrived from Kūfa with considerable reinforcements. The battle of the Greater Zāb, in 132/750, sealed the fate of the Umayyad Caliphate. The defeated Marwān fled to Syria, where he tried in vain to organize further resistance. The victorious ‘Abbāsids troops advanced through Harrān, the residence of Marwān, into Syria, occupied Damascus, and then pursued Marwān into Egypt, where he was killed and his head sent to al-Saffāh in Kūfa. The authority of the new ‘Abbāsids caliph was now established all over the Middle East.

Much has been written about the historical significance of the ‘Abbāsids revolution, which historians have rightly seen to be something more than a mere change of dynasty. Many nineteenth century orientalists, unduly influenced by the racial theories of Gobineau and others, saw in the struggle a conflict between the Aryanism of Iran and the Semitism of Arabia, ending in a victory for the Persians over the Arabs, the destruction of what Wellhausen called the “Arab Kingdom” of the Umayyads, and the establishment of a new Iranian Empire under a cloak of Persianized Islam. There is at first sight much to support this view: the undoubted role of the Persians in the revolution itself, the prominent place of Persian ministers and courtiers in the new regime, the strong Persian elements in ‘Abbāsids government and culture. It is not surprising to find some statements to the same effect in the Arabic sources ( Cf. al-Masʿudi, Muridī, viii, 292; al-Ibrāhīmī, al-Dānī, al-Tā’yīnī, i, 181 and 2026; etc.). More recent writers have however made important modifications in the theories both of Persian victory and of Arab defeat. Shi’ism, for long regarded as an expression of the “Iranian national consciousness”, was of Arab origin, and had its main centre among the mixed Arab, Aramaean and Persian population of southern ‘Irāk. It was taken to Persia by Arabs, and remained strongest in areas of Arab settlement like Kumm. The revolt of Abu Muslim was directed against Umayyad and Syrian rather than Arab rule as such, and won the support of many Arabs, especially among the Yemenites. There were many Arabs even among its leaders, including the redoubtable general Kāḥtaba. Though racial antagonisms no doubt played their part in the movement, and though Persians were prominent among the victors, they nevertheless served an Arab dynasty, and, as the fate of Abu Muslim, Abu Salama and the Barmaids shows, received short shrift if they fell foul of their masters. Many high offices under the state were at first reserved to Arabs, Arabic was still the sole official language, Arabian land remained fiscally privileged, and the doctrine of Arab superiority remained strong enough, on the one hand, to induce Persians to provide themselves with fabricated Arab pedigrees, on the other to provoke the nationalist reaction of the Shī‘a ‘ibiyya [q.v.]. What the Arabs had lost was the exclusive right to the fruits of power. Persians as well as Arabs came to the ‘Abbāsids court, and the favour of the ruler, often expressed in the form of “adoption” into the Royal household, rather than pure Arab descent, came to be the passport to power and prestige. If a term must be set to the Arab Kingdom, it must be sought in the gradual cessation of the allowances and pensions formerly paid as of right to the Arab warriors and their families, and in the rise to power of the Turkish guards from the time of al-Mu’taṣim. The real significance of the ‘Abbāsids victory must be sought in the facts of the change that followed it, rather than in dubiously documented hypotheses on the movement that produced it. The first and most obvious change was the transfer of the centre of gravity from Syria to ‘Irāk, the traditional centre
of the great cosmopolitan Empires of the ancient Middle East, and of the civilisation to which Toynbee has given the name "Syriac". The first ʿAbbasid caliph, al-Saffāh, set up his capital in the small town of Ḥāshimiyya, which he built on the east bank of the Euphrates near Kūfa. Later he transferred the capital to al-Anbār. It was his brother and successor, al-ʾAnsārī, in many ways the real founder of the ʿAbbasid Caliphate, who established the permanent capital of the Empire in a new city on the west bank of the Tigris, near the ruins of Ctesiphon and at the intersection of several trade-routes. Its official name was Madīnat al-Salām, but it is usually known by the name of the small town that previously occupied the site—Baghdād.

From this city or its neighbourhood the ʿAbbasid dynasty first ruled, and later reigned, as heads of the greater part of the Islamic world for five centuries. The period of their sovereignty, covering the great epoch of classical Islamic civilisation, may be conveniently considered in two parts. The first, from 132/750 to 334/945, saw the gradual decline of the authority of the caliphs and the rise of military leaders ruling through their troops. During the second, from ca. 334/945 to 636/1238, the caliphs, with one exception, retained a purely nominal suzerainty, while real power, even in Baghdād itself, was exercised by dynasties or families. The main events of these two periods will be treated under the names of the various caliphs, dynasties, places, etc. Here only the broad outline of events will be given, and an attempt made to describe the main characteristics of each period.

1. 132/750—334/945

The ʿAbbasid Caliphate in the days following its establishment must have seemed very insecure to contemporary eyes. Rebels rose against it on every side and for a long time every new caliph had to face risings in and around even the metropolitan province of Ṭirāk. In Syria, Arab supporters of the deposed Umayyads gave trouble, and found encouragement in the growing legend of the Sufyānī, a messianic figure of the house of Umayya who competed with the Ālīd pretenders for the support of the discontented. The Ālīds themselves, temporarily disorganised by the frustration of their hopes, and kept under close surveillance, were for a time in eclipse, but soon reappeared as the most dangerous and determined opponents of ʿAbbasid rule. Even the Khwārījīgī remained an active, if minor, opposition force. Nor were the ostensible supporters of the dynasty wholly reliable. In the prevailing atmosphere of mistrust, only members of the Ābāsid family were appointed to the highest positions—but when Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Mansūr descended from Caliph with the title al-Mansūr, they set up, in the name of the Arab aristocratic monopoly of high office, and the firm establishment in power of the Barmakids, Persian influences became stronger and stronger. Sasanid Persian models were followed in the court and the government, and Persians began to play an increasingly important part in both political and cultural life. This process of Persianisation continued during the reigns of al-Mahādi and al-Ḥādī; the prejudice against the employment of mawdūdī in high places gradually disappeared. To replace the weakening bond of Arab nationality the caliphs laid increased stress on Islamic orthodoxy and conformity, trying to weld their cosmopolitan Empire into a unity based on a common faith and a common way of life. Al-Mansūr's renunciation of the heterodox origins of the ʿAbbasid movement was followed under his successors by a deliberate policy of wooing the orthodox theologians and makers of opinion, and laying a greater stress on the religious element in the nature of the authority exercised by the caliphs. This policy, when contrasted with the disolute lives led by many of the caliphs and their courtiers, often led to charges of hypocrisy, but was in the main successful in achieving its object. Mecca and Medina were rebuilt, the pilgrimage from ʿIrāq organised on a regular basis, and orthodoxy reinforced by an inquisitorial persecution of the various heretical movements and of Manichaeism, which at this time became prominent, under the name of Zandaka, as a revolutionising movement of the poorer classes (see ZINDA). For a time an attempt was made to impose the Muʿtazili doctrine, which, if H. S. Nyberg's attractive hypothesis is correct (see EI 1 ʿAbū ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Mūʿtazīla), was an official ʿAbbasid attempt at a compromise with the Shiʿa. From the
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time of al-Mutawakkil this attempt was abandoned, and thereafter the 'Abbāsids adhered, formally at least, to the most rigid orthodoxy.

The reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd is generally regarded as the apogee of 'Abbāsīd power, but it is at this time that the first portents of decline are seen. In Persia, the series of religious revolts that had followed, the martyrdom of Abū Muslim became ever more threatening, and challenged 'Abbāsīd authority in the Caspian provinces as well as in Khurāsān. In the west, 'Abbāsīd authority disappeared almost completely in Spain, while the Saffarids in Persia and the Tulunids in Egypt and Syria had rejected the 'Abbāsīds and become independent under an Umayyad prince as far back as 138/756. After the death of Yazīd b. Hātim, the last effective 'Abbāsīd governor of North Africa, in 170/787, independent dynasties arose, first in Morocco and then in Tunisia, and the authority of Baghdād was never again asserted west of Egypt. The Aghlabids of Tunisia, exercising hereditary and independent rule under the nominal suzerainty of the caliph, set the pattern for a whole series of subsequent local hereditary governorships, whose encroachments eventually reduced the effective sovereignty of the Caliphate to central and southern Irāq. Another danger-sign showed the weakness of the defences of the Empire. By 'Abbāsīd times the frontiers of Islam were more or less fixed, and the only foreign armies of any importance were with the Byzantines, and even these seem to have been of more show than effect. The inconclusive campaigns of Hārūn were the last major offensives launched against Byzantium by the Caliphate. Thereafter Islam was on the defensive. Byzantine armies sought out weak points in Syria and Mesopotamia, while Kūtar invaders entered Islamic territory in the name of the Shiʿa. Perhaps the most serious factor of weakness was the obscure internal convulsion that culminated in the fragmentation of the Beyazidids and the assumption by Hārūn of the reins of power in his own not too competent hands. This step seems to have shaken the alliance with the Persian aristocratic wing of the movement that had brought them to power, which in the early 'Abbāsīd period gave up the more extremist elements. After Hārūn's death, smouldering conflicts burst into civil war between his sons al-ʿAzmīn and al-Mumān. Al-ʿAzmīn's strength lay mainly in the capital and in Irāq, al-Mumān's in Persia, and the civil war has been interpreted as a national conflict between Arabs and Persians, ending in a victory for the latter. The same objections can be raised to this explanation as to the corresponding theory concerning the 'Abbāsīd revolution itself. The civil war was more probably a continuation of the social struggles of the immediately preceding period, complicated by a regional rather than national conflict between Persia and Irāq. Al-Mumān, relying on eastern support, for a while projected the transfer of the capital from Baghdād to Marw, but some time after his victory wisely decided to return to the Imperial city. Thereafter Persian aristocratic and regional aspirations found an outlet in local dynasties. In 205/820 ʿṬhir, the Persian general of al-Mumān, made himself virtually independent in Khurāsān, and founded a dynasty. His example was followed by others, who, while for the most part still recognizing the suzerainty of the caliphs, deprived them of all effective authority in most of Persia. While the power of the caliphs in the provinces was gradually being reduced to the granting of diplomas of investiture to the de facto rulers, their authority even in Irāq itself was dwindling. A spendthrift court and an inflated bureaucracy produced chronic financial disorder, aggravated by the loss of provincial revenues and, subsequently, by the exhaustion or loss to invaders of gold and silver mines. The caliphs found a remedy in the farming out of state revenues, eventually with the local governors as tax-farmers. These farmer-governors soon became the real rulers of the Empire, the more so when tax-farms and governorships were held by army commanders, who alone had the force to impose obedience. From the time of al-Muʿtasim and al-Wāḥīdī, the caliphs became the puppets of their own generals, who were often able to appoint and depose them at will. Al-Muʿtasim is usually credited with the introduction of the practice of using Turks from Central Asia as soldiers and officers, and from this time the dominant military caste became mainly Turkish. In 220/836 he built a new residence at Sāmarrā, some 60 miles north of Baghdād. Sāmarrā remained the Imperial residence until 279/892, when al-Muʿtamid returned to Baghdād. Its foundation illustrates the growing gulf between the caliph and his praetorians on the one hand and the people of Baghdād on the other. Its art and architecture illustrate the emergence of a new ruling caste with different tastes and traditions. Under al-Wāḥīdī the power of the Turks continued to grow. A serious attempt to reassert the supremacy of the Caliphate was made by his successor al-Muʿtamid, who tried to break the power of the Turkish guards and to rally support against them among the theologians and the civil population, whose orthodox fanaticism he sought to placate by renouncing and suppressing the Muʿtaṣīf doctrines of his predecessors and enforcing the regulations against the Christians and Jews. The attempt ended in failure. The murder of al-Muʿtamid in 247/861 was followed by a period of anarchy. During an interval of nine years four caliphs succeeded one another, but all were helpless in the hands of the Turkish guards, whose control of the court and the capital grew firmer, while the provinces relapsed into anarchy or, at best, autonomy. In Southern Irāq a revolt broke out among the negro slaves, known as Zandj (q.v.), who worked on the salt marshes near Basra. This rapidly developed into a major threat to the Empire. The Zanj leader, who displayed brilliant generalship, defeated several imperial armies, and was able to establish effective control over much of Southern Irāq and South West Persia. The lines of communication linking Baghdad with Basra, and therefore with the Persian Gulf and the trade route to the East, were cut, and by 264/877 Zanj parties were raiding within 17 miles of Baghdad itself. But meanwhile a period of greater stability had begun in the capital. The caliph al-Muʿtamid, who succeeded in 256/870, was not a very effective ruler, but his brother al-Muwallaʾ soon became the real master of the capital, and during the twenty years of his rule did much to restore the failing strength of the house of ʿAbbās. His first task was to restore order and stability in Baghdād itself, then to tackle the problems presented by the Zanj and by the encroachments of provincial leaders, especially the ʿṢaffārīds in Persia and the ʿṬūlūnīs in Egypt and Syria. By 269/882 he had expelled the Zanj from all their conquests, and in 270/883 finally crushed them. Though failing to destroy the ʿṢaffārīds and ʿṬūlūnīs, he did succeed in checking their ambitions, and facilitated the task of his successors. On the
death of al-Muwaffak in 278/891, he was succeeded as real ruler by his son al-Muktafi, who became caliph on the death of al-Mutanabbi in the following year. Al-Muktadid and his successor al-Muktafi were both able and energetic rulers. In Persia and Egypt the authority of the Caliphate was for a time reasserted, leaving the government free to deal with the menace of Shi‘ism, now active again in a militant and extreme form. After the rise of the ‘Abbāsids and the consequent disappearance of the ‘Umayyads, it was the Fāṭimid line of ‘Alī that commanded the support of most of the Shi‘is.

After the death of Dā’ūr al-Sādiq in 148/765, these split into two groups, one of which, known as Ismā‘īlī, inherited many of the functions, doctrines and followers of the vanished ‘Abbasids. The transformation of the Caliphate in the 8th and 9th centuries from an agrarian, military state to a cosmopolitan Empire with an intensive commercial and industrial life, the growth of large cities and the concentration of capital and labour, subjected the loose social structure of the Empire to grave strain, and engendered widespread discontent. The rapid growth of the intellectual life of Islam, and the clash of cultures and ideas resulting from outside influence and internal development, again helped to prepare the way for the spread of heretical movements which, in a theocratic society, were the only possible expression of moral or material dissent from the existing order. The endemic disorders and upheavals of the late 9th and early 10th centuries brought these strains to breaking point, and the caliphs were called upon to deal with a series of challenges ranging in form from the revolutionary violence of the Karmatians (q.v.) in Bahrayn, Syria, Mesopotamia and Southern Arabia, to the more subtle and ultimately more effective criticism of peaceful moralists and mystics in Baghdad itself. Al-Mu‘taṣid died after a defeat at the hand of the Karmatians, but his successor al-Muktasim managed to crush the Karmatian revolt in Syria and Mesopotamia, and, at the time of his death in 295/908, was leading a successful counter-attack against the Byzantines, who had sought to exploit the anarchy of the Muslim Empire. The Shi‘a danger was however far from ended. After a brief struggle for power, al-Muktasim was succeeded by his brother al-Mu‘taṣid, still a boy of 13. During his minority, and the long and ineffective reign that followed it, the destructive tendencies halted by the regent al-Muwaffak and his two successors reappeared. The Karmatians resumed their activities, and from their bases in Bahrayn threatened the life-lines of the Caliphate, while in the west another wing of the Ismā‘īl movement established a Fāṭimid anti-Caliphate in Tunisia. In North Syria the beduin Hamdānids dynasty established itself, while in Persia another Shi‘ite family, the Buyids, began to build a new dynasty that soon threatened even ʻIrāq. In the capital, growing disorder and confusion culminated in the death of the caliph, while fighting his general Mu‘nis. Under his successors al-Kāḥir and al-Rādī, the decay of the authority of the Caliphate was completed. The event that is usually taken to symbolise this process was the grant to the governor of ʻIrāq, Ibn Rādīq, of the title amir al-umāra—Commander of Commanders. This title, apparently intended to assert the primacy of the military commander of Baghdad over his colleagues elsewhere, served at the same time to give formal recognition to the existence of a supreme temporal authority, exercising effective political and military power, and leaving the caliph only as formal head of the state and the faith and representative of the religious unity of Islam. In 344/954 came the ultimate degradation, when the Buyid Amir Mu‘izz al-Dawla entered Baghdad, and the title of amir al-umara, and with it the effective control of the city of the caliphs, passed into the hands of a Shi‘ite dynasty. Almost two centuries had passed between the enthronement of al-Saffār and the arrival of Mu‘izz al-Dawla. Though most of the period still awaits adequate investigation, certain broad lines of development can be discerned. In government, the early ‘Abbāsids caliphs continued along the lines of the late Umayyads, with far less break in continuity than was at one time believed. Certain changes, begun under the preceding dynasty, continued at an accelerated pace. From an Arab super-shaykh governing by the intermittent consent of the Arab aristocracy, the caliph became an autocrat, claiming a divine origin for his authority, resting it on his armed forces, and exercising it through a vast and growing bureaucratic organisation. Stronger in this respect than the Umayyads, the ʻAbbāsids were nevertheless weaker than the old oriental despot, in that they lacked the support of an established feudal caste and a priestly hierarchy and were themselves theoretically subject to the Holy Law, of the authority of which their office was the supreme embodiment. With the transfer of the capital to the East and the entry of increasing numbers of Persians into the service of the caliphs, Persian influences grew in the court and the administration, which was organised in a series of diwāns (q.v.) or ministries, under the supreme control of the wazir (q.v.). The provincial government was carried on jointly by the amir (q.v.) (Governor) and ‘āmil (q.v.) (financial administrator), under the general surveillance of the capital, exercised through the agents of the saḥib al-barid (Director of Posts and Intelligence) (see barid). In the army the Arab element gradually lost its importance, and the pensions formerly paid to Arabs were discontinued except for serving soldiers. The core of the early ‘Abbāsids army consisted of the Kūrāsānīs, a term that is to be understood in a regional rather than national sense, and covering both Arabs and Persians from Kūrāsān. In time these gave way to the Turkish slave troops, who from the time of al-Mu‘taṣim onwards became the main element in the army and, in consequence, the main source of political authority for the various amirs and commanders whose power replaced that of the caliphs.

The ʻAbbāsids came to power through a religious movement, and sought in religion the basis of unity and authority in the Empire they ruled. While broadly successful in this purpose, they had throughout to contend with a series of religious opposition movements and sects, and with the mistrust or reserve of the more conscientious elements among the Sunnite religious leaders.

The political breakdown of the 9th and 10th centuries, resulting in the fragmentation of power in the Empire as a whole and the decline and eventual collapse of authority in the capital, had no immediate ill-effects on the economic and cultural life of the Caliphate. The ʻAbbāsid accession had been followed by a great economic revival, based on the exploitation of the resources of the Empire through industry and trade, and the development of a vast network of trade relations both within the Empire and with the world outside. These changes brought
important social consequences. The Arab warrior caste was deposed, and replaced by a ruling class of landowners and bureaucrats, professional soldiers and literati, merchants and men of learning. The Islamic town was transformed from a garrison city to a market and exchange, and in time to the centre of a flourishing and diversified urban culture. The literature, art, theology, philosophy and science of the period is examined elsewhere (in individual articles). Here it need only be remarked that this was the classic age of Islam, when a new, rich and original civilisation, born of the confluence of many races and traditions, came to maturity.

2. 334/945—656/1258

During the long period from the Buyid occupation of Baghdād to the conquest of the city by the Mongols, the Caliphate became a purely titular institution, representing the headship of Sunni Islam, and acting as legitimating authority for the numerous secular rulers who exercised effective sovereignty, both in the provinces and in the capital. The caliphs themselves, except for a brief revival towards the end, were at the mercy of the secular rulers, who appointed and deposed them at will, and only one of them, al-‘Nāṣir, has left any mark on history.

The appointment of Ibn Rāqīṣ as amīr al-umara² was the first of a long series, and marked the formal recognition of the office of secular sovereign. The main history of the period will be found in the articles on the various dynasties that held it.

In the second quarter of the 10th century a number of princes of the Shī‘ite Persian house of Būya (or Buwayh), originating in the highlands of Daylam, extended their power over most of western Persia, and forced the caliphs to grant them legal recognition. In 334/945 the Buyid prince Mu‘izz al-Dawla entered Baghdād, and wrung from the caliph al-Mu‘tasim the title of amīr al-umara². For over a century the caliphs were compelled to submit to the final humiliation of accepting these Shī‘ite mayors of the palace as absolute masters. Despite their Shī‘ism, the Buyids made no attempt to install an ‘A‘lid caliph—the twelfth Imām of the Iḥānā‘-aṣghar Shī‘a had disappeared some 70 years earlier—but gave outward homage to the ‘Abbāsid masters, retaining them as an orthodox cover for their own power and an instrument of their policy in the Sunni world.

With the exception of the extraordinariness of the Sale in the name of the Fatimid caliph. This brief episode was the high water mark of Fatimid power. In 447/1055 the Seljuk Tughrīl-beg entered Baghdād, and had himself proclaimed as Sultan. This title is often attributed by the chroniclers to earlier rulers who exercised a sovereignty not greatly different from that of the Seljūks. The Seljūk sultans of Baghdād appear however to be the first to have used the title officially and inscribed it on their coins. In effect the Seljuk Great Sultanate, which lasted about a century, was the logical development of the office of amīr al-umara², and the title has remained in use ever since for the holder of supreme secular power.

The Seljūks brought several important changes. Unlike their predecessors they were Turks and Sunnis, and with their advent the power of the Turks, that had been growing intermittently since the time of al-Mu‘tasim, was finally established; by now the Turks in the Middle East were no longer all slave or freed soldiers, imported from Central Asia; whole clans of free, nomadic Turks began to migrate westwards, playing an increasingly important role and in time changing the ethnic configuration of the Middle East. The replacement of a Shī‘i by a Sunni ruler increased the prestige though not the power of the caliphs, as did also the extension of the sphere of influence of the central government, and therefore of the nominal sovereignty of the caliphs, over many hitherto independent lands. The period of the Seljūks, and of the Seljukid and Atabeg dynasties that followed the break-up of the Great Sultanate, brought two major changes. One was the regularisation of the economic and social changes that had been taking place in the preceding period, and the elaboration of a new social and fiscal order of quasi-feudal character; the other was the campaign against the Shī‘ite menace, both on the political and military level through the suppression of Shī‘ite dynasties and movements, and on the intellectual level through the creation of a network of madrasas [q.v.] to serve as centres for the formulation and defence of Sunni orthodoxy against the Shī‘ite propagandists. Both changes encountered a vigorous reaction in the form of the Assassins (see nizāris), an active and energetic revolutionary movement that rose from the ruins of the Fatimid da‘wah and offered a bitter and sustained challenge to Seljuk rule and Sunni orthodoxy. The Assassins ultimately failed, and thereafter Shī‘ism was never again the major political factor until the rise of the Şafawīs.

After the break-up of the Great Sultanate, ʿIrāq fell under the domination of a local dynasty of Seljūk princes, the last of whom was Tughrīl II (573-590/1177-1194). The collapse of his power and the absence of any alternative enabled the ʿAbbāsid caliph al-‘Nāṣir to make a final attempt to restore the lost authority of the Caliphate. The moment was favourable—of the two major dynasties of the Middle East, the Ayyūbīd in Egypt and Syria were preoccupied with the struggle against the Crusaders, the Khūrizm-shāh in the East with his wars against other Turkish dynasties and then against the Mongols. In this power vacuum, al-‘Nāṣir attempted
to create a kind of State of the Church for the Caliphate in Baghhd and l'Irk, and to buttress his authority by seeking popular support through the futuwwa [q.v.] organisations and making adroit use of pro-'Alid sentiment. It was however only the diversion of their energies to meet the Mongol threat in the East that saved him from destruction by the Khwrizm-shahs. Al-Nasir's successors were weak and incompetent, and when the Mongol general Hüllük, having already conquered Persia, appeared before Baghhd in 656/1258, the last caliph al-Mustansir was unable to offer any serious resistance.

The Mongol conquest of Baghhd and the destruction of the Caliphate are usually described as a major catastrophe in the history of Islam. Certainly they mark the end of an epoch—not only in the outward forms of government and sovereignty, but in Islamic civilisation itself, which after the transformation wrought by the great wave of Tatar invasion flows in new channels, different from those of the preceding centuries. But the immediate moral effects of the destruction of the Caliphate have been overrated. The Caliphate had long ceased to exist as an effective institution, and the Mongols did little more than lay the ghost of something that was already dead. To the real organs of temporal power the Mongol invasions made little difference, the only change being that the Sultanate now began to acquire de jure recognition, and sultans began to arrogate to themselves titles and prerogatives formerly reserved to the caliphs.

The 'Abbásid Caliphs of Egypt

The establishment by Baybars of an 'Abbásid shadow-Caliphate in Cairo in 659/1261 has been explained by R. Hartmann as follows: the disappearance of the Caliphate in Baghhd created a political vacuum, affecting not so much the theologians as the secular rulers, who still felt the need for a legitimating authority. Abu Numayy, the Shārīf of Mecca, gave formal recognition to the Ḥāsid ruler of Tunisia Abu Abd Allah, who had assumed the title of caliph, with the regnal name of al-Mustansir, in 659/1261. This assumption, made before the fall of Baghhd, was not in the Sunni juristic sense of the word caliph, but in that of North Africa, conditioned by Almohad claims and practices. It acquired a new value from Abu Numayy's recognition, confirmed by Mamluk action in sending a report on the victory of ʿAyn Djlšt to Abu ʿAbd Allāh and addressing him as amir al-muʿminin—Commander of the Faithful. Baybars, stronger than his predecessor, preferred not to give this recognition to a powerful and possibly dangerous neighbour, and instead solved the problems of legitimacy and continuity by installing an 'Abbásid refugee as caliph in Cairo, with the same regnal name of al-Mustansir.

For the next two and a half centuries a line of 'Abbásids succeeded one another as nominal caliphs under the rule of the Mamluk Sultans in Cairo. Except for a brief interval in 815/1412, when the caliph al-Mustaʿīn became a stop-gap ruler for six months in the course of a feud between rival claimants to the Sultanate, the caliphs in Cairo were completely helpless and powerless, being in effect little more than minor court pensioners with purely ceremonial duties to perform on the accession of a new sultan. Attempts by the Mamluk sultans to use their 'Abbásid protegés as a means of gaining recognition in other Muslim countries met with some limited success, notably in India and in the Ottoman Empire where Bayezid I applied to the Cairo caliph in 1394 for a diploma granting him the title of sultan. But the Ottoman view of the Cairo Caliphate is perhaps best expressed by the 15th-century historian Yazlık-oghluʿAlli, who in describing the role of the patriarch at the Byzantine court calls him "the caliph of the Christians"—a comparison that is far nearer the truth than the more common one between the caliph and the Pope (cf. P. Wittek, in BSOS, 1953, 649 f.).

In 1517 the last caliph al-Mutawakkil was deposed by Selim I, the Ottoman conqueror of Syria and Egypt, and the 'Abbásid shadow-Caliphate abolished. A story that al-Mutawakkil transferred his title to Selim, and through him, to the Ottoman house, was first published by Mordagea d’Ohsson in 1788 (Tableau général de l’Empire Ottoman, i, 269-70), and thereafter won wide acceptance. Barthold however showed this story to be completely without foundation, and it is now generally rejected by scholars [see Khalipa].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.H.</th>
<th>A.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Abu ʿI-ʿAbbās al-Saffāh 750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>al-Mansūr 754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>al-Mahdī 775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>al-Hādī 785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Hārūn al-Rashīd 786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>al-ʿĀmin 809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>al-Mamūn 813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>al-Muṭʿasim 833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>al-Wāṣīhīk 842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>al-Mutawakkil 847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>al-Muntasir 861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>al-Mustaʿīn 862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>al-Muṭʿazz 866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>al-Muḥtadī 869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>al-Muʿṭamid 870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>al-Muṭʿadīd 892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>al-ʿUkṭāfī 902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>al-Muḥṭadīr 908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>al-Kāhir 932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>al-Rāḍī 934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>al-Mustakīl 940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>al-Mustakīf 944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>al-Muṭṭīf 946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>al-Tāḥfīf 974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>al-Kādir 991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>al-Kāẓīm 1031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>457</td>
<td>al-Mulkāfī 1075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td>al-Mustazīr 1094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>al-Mustarshīd 1118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>al-Rāṣīd 1135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>al-Mulkāfī 1136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>al-Mustandjīd 1160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>566</td>
<td>al-Mustafī 1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575</td>
<td>al-Nāṣir 1180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622</td>
<td>al-Zāḥir 1225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>al-Mustansīr 1226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640-656</td>
<td>al-Mustaʿīn 1242-1258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Genealogical Table of the Abbasid Caliphs of Baghdad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caliph</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Grandfather</th>
<th>Great Grandfather</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim</td>
<td>al-Mutasim</td>
<td>al-Mutamid</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Isma'il b. Abd al-Muttalib</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Genealogical Table of the Abbasid Caliphs in Egypt (after Khalil Edhem, Düwel-i İslâmîye, p. 21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caliph</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Grandfather</th>
<th>Great Grandfather</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-Mustansir</td>
<td>al-Mustansir</td>
<td>al-Mutawakkil</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Isma'il b. Abd al-Muttalib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mustansir</td>
<td>al-Mustansir</td>
<td>al-Mutawakkil</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Isma'il b. Abd al-Muttalib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mustansir</td>
<td>al-Mustansir</td>
<td>al-Mutawakkil</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Isma'il b. Abd al-Muttalib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mustansir</td>
<td>al-Mustansir</td>
<td>al-Mutawakkil</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Isma'il b. Abd al-Muttalib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mustansir</td>
<td>al-Mustansir</td>
<td>al-Mutawakkil</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Isma'il b. Abd al-Muttalib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mustansir</td>
<td>al-Mustansir</td>
<td>al-Mutawakkil</td>
<td>Muhammad b. Isma'il b. Abd al-Muttalib</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to others, the second Caliph, al-Hakim I, was descended directly from al-Rashid in the following manner: al-Hakim b. 'Ali b. Abi Bakr b. al-Husayn b. al-Rashid.
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#### 'ABBASID CALIPHS IN EGYPT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Caliph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>659-661</td>
<td>al-Mustansir billah Abu 'l-Kasim Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>661-662</td>
<td>al-Mustakfi billah Abu 'l-Rabi' Sulaymān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>662-663</td>
<td>al-Hākim bi-Amr Allāh Abū 'l-'Abbās Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>663-665</td>
<td>al-Mustādzīd billah Abū 'l-Fāth Abū Bakr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>665-667</td>
<td>al-Mutawakkil 'alā 'l-lāh Abū 'l-Sabr Yaḥyā 'Abbās Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>667-669</td>
<td>al-Mustansir billah Abu 'l-Abbas Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>669-670</td>
<td>al-Mustansir billah Abu 'l-Mu'tadid Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670-671</td>
<td>al-Mutawakkil 'alā 'l-lāh Abū 'l-Mu'tadid Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>671-672</td>
<td>al-Mustansir billah Abu 'l-Mu'tadid Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>672-673</td>
<td>al-Mustansir billah Abu 'l-Mu'tadid Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>673-674</td>
<td>al-Mutawakkil 'alā 'l-lāh Abū 'l-Mu'tadid Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>674-675</td>
<td>al-Mustansir billah Abu 'l-Mu'tadid Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>675-676</td>
<td>al-Mutawakkil 'alā 'l-lāh Abū 'l-Mu'tadid Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>676-677</td>
<td>al-Mustansir billah Abu 'l-Mu'tadid Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>677-678</td>
<td>al-Mutawakkil 'alā 'l-lāh Abū 'l-Mu'tadid Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>678-679</td>
<td>al-Mustansir billah Abu 'l-Mu'tadid Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>679-680</td>
<td>al-Mutawakkil 'alā 'l-lāh Abū 'l-Mu'tadid Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680-681</td>
<td>al-Mustansir billah Abu 'l-Mu'tadid Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>681-682</td>
<td>al-Mutawakkil 'alā 'l-lāh Abū 'l-Mu'tadid Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>682-683</td>
<td>al-Mutawakkil 'alā 'l-lāh Abū 'l-Mu'tadid Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>683-684</td>
<td>al-Mustansir billah Abu 'l-Mu'tadid Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>684-685</td>
<td>al-Mutawakkil 'alā 'l-lāh Abū 'l-Mu'tadid Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>685-686</td>
<td>al-Mustansir billah Abu 'l-Mu'tadid Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>686-687</td>
<td>al-Mutawakkil 'alā 'l-lāh Abū 'l-Mu'tadid Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>687-688</td>
<td>al-Mustansir billah Abu 'l-Mu'tadid Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>688-689</td>
<td>al-Mutawakkil 'alā 'l-lāh Abū 'l-Mu'tadid Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>689-690</td>
<td>al-Mustansir billah Abu 'l-Mu'tadid Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>690-691</td>
<td>al-Mutawakkil 'alā 'l-lāh Abū 'l-Mu'tadid Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>691-692</td>
<td>al-Mustansir billah Abu 'l-Mu'tadid Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>692-693</td>
<td>al-Mustansir billah Abu 'l-Mu'tadid Aḥmad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sources for the history of the 'Abbāsid Caliphate are too numerous for anything more than a general statement to be possible. A fuller discussion of the literature will be found in J. Sauvaget, Introduction a l’histoire du monde musulman, Paris 1943, 126 ff., and of the historians in D. S. Marquand, Lectures on Arabic Historians, Calcutta 1930 (cf. al-Ma‘bari). The first group to be considered are the chronicles. While a large proportion of these have been published especially for the earlier period, surprisingly little use has been made of them, and most of the 'Abbāsid period still awaits its monographers. Still less attention has been paid to the adab literature, perhaps the best expression of the outlook and attitude of the secular literate classes who administered the Empire, and a fruitful source of historical information. Travel and geography, poetry, theology and law all have an important contribution to make to historical knowledge, and except for the first two, have been little used. To the vast Muslim literature may be added the smaller but still valuable literatures of the Christians and Jews, in Arabic, Syriac, Hebrew, and some other languages. Finally, there remains archeology.

A useful summary and bibliography of archeological work will be found in the above-mentioned book of Sauvaget.

No general history of the 'Abbāсидs has been produced for many years, and the reader must still have recourse to early and out-of-date works like G. Weil, Geschichte der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Phil.-hist. Kl. 1928, 2 vols., Stuttgart 1918 (abridged English translation by S. Khuda Bukhsh and D. S. Margoliouth, London 1938), and 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Muhammad, Studies on the economic life of Mesopotamia in the 10th century, in Arabic, Baghdad 1948. Reference may also be made to A. J. Toynbee, A study of history, London 1934 ff.

Only the accession and the first few reigns have been monographed in any detail. On the 'Abbāsid revolution Van Vloten and Wellhausen are mentioned in the article. Th. Noldeke's Orientalsche Skizzen Berlin 1892 (English translation by J. S. Black, London 1892), includes studies on al-Manṣūr, the Zanj rising, and the Ṣaffārids. The most valuable work to date on the early 'Abbāsid period will be found in the studies of F. Gabrieli (al-'Amin, al-Mu'tamid) and S. Moscati (Abū 'l-Mahdī, al-Hādī), which, with other monographs, will be found listed under the appropriate articles. For two studies by S. Moscati on particular problems connected with the 'Abbāsid victory see Il "Tradimento" di Wdsit, Mission 1951, 177-86, and Le massacre des Umayyades, ArO 1951, 85-115. Reference may also be made to N. H. Abbott, Two queens of Bagdad, Chicago 1937, dealing with the mother and wife of Hārūn al-Raṣīl and giving a description of some aspects of court life, and A. F. Rifà', Asr al-Ma‘mūn, Cairo 1927. The period from 892 to 946 has been studied in great detail by H. Bowen, The life and times of 'Abbās ibn 'Abd al-Muṭṭab, Cambridge 1928. This must now be supplemented by an important additional source—the Akhbār al-Raṣīl wa-l-Muṭṭabkī of al-Ṣūf (ed. J. H. Dunne, Cairo 1935; annotated French translation by M. Canard, 2 vols. Algiers 1940-50). Two important works of a more general character deal with the middle period: A. Mez, Die Renaissance des Islam, Heidelberg 1922 (English translation by S. Khuda Bukhsh and D. S. Margoliouth, London 1938), and 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Dūrī, Studies on the economic life of Mesopotamia in the 10th century, in Arabic, Baghdad 1948. Reference may also be made to general works in Arabic by Aḥmād Aḥmād, A. 'A. Dūrī, Ḥasan Imāmī Ḥasan and others.


'BABBASID ART [see SAMSARA]
AL-ABBASIYYA, old town of Ifrīkīya (Tunisia), three miles to the S.E. of al-Kayrawān. It was also known by the name of Ḥārāb b. al-Aḍḥalī and al-Ḵṣār al-Kadīm. It was built by Ibrāhīm b. al- Ağlabī, the founder of the Aḥlabī dynasty, in 184/800, the same year in which he was appointed amīr of Ifrīkīya, after the revolt of some leaders of the Arab ḏūnā. He gave his foundation the name al-ʿAbbāsīyya in honour of the ʿAbbāsīs, his masters. The town contained baths, inns, sākhs and a Friday-mosque with a minaret of cylindrical form, built of bricks and adorned by small columns arranged in seven storeys. After the example of the great mosque of Kayrawān, a maksūra of carved wood, adjoining the miskřābīb, was reserved to the amīr and high dignitaries. The town had several gates, the following being the most important: Bāb al-Rahma (of Mercy), Bāb al-Ḥadīd (of Iron), Bāb Ghabilīn (attributed to al- Ağlabī b. ʿAbbāl Allāh b. al- Ağlabī, relative and minister of Ziyādat Allāh I) and Bāb al-Rīh (of Wind)—all these in the east; and Bāb al-Saʿāda (of Happiness), to the west. In the middle of the town there was a large square called al-Maydān (Hippodrome), where the parades and reviews (ʿard) of the troops took place. Not far away was the palace of al-Rusāfā (of Wind), recalling by its name those of Damas-cus and Baghdad. It was in this palace that Ibrāhīm ibn Ḥamdīn received the ambassador of Charlemagne who came to ask for the relics of St. Cyprian and delivered the gifts destined for the caliph Harun al-Rashīd. It was also there that the truce (ḥudna) of ten years and the exchange of prisoners was arranged with the gifts destined for the caliph Harun al-Rashīd. From its foundation, al-ʿAbbāsīyya had a mint (dar al-darb) where gold dirhams, silver dinārs and silver dirhams, bearing the town's name, were coined. An official factory of textiles (firās) produced the robes of honour (khīla) and the standards. Under the successors of Ibrāhīm I, al-ʿAbbāsīyya was provided with monuments of public and private utility. Abū Ibrāhīm Ahmad built a large reservoir (sakrīq or ḥāshiyya) of which important remains have been preserved. The basin had an abundant supply of water, which was carried to Kayrawān in the summer, when the cisterns of the capital were exhausted.—The town of Raḵḵāda, founded in 264/877 by Ibrāhīm II, some miles further to the south, replaced al-ʿAbbāsīyya as residence. Al-ʿAbbāsīyya sank to the level of a township, inhabited by mawsūlīs and tradesmen, but continued to exist in a modest way until the Hilālīan invasion (middle of the 5th/11th century) when it disappeared for good. A cursory excavation, in 1923, of the hill (teill) where al-ʿAbbāsīyya was situated, brought to light many potsherds belonging to the Aḥlabī period. This white pottery with large black, green and blue decoration was not doubt inspired by oriental models coming from Irāk (Sānnārā, Raḵḵā) and Egypt (Fustāt). It is worth mentioning that al-ʿAbbāsīyya was the birth-place of several scholars, notably of Abu ʿI⁻Arab [q.v.] Muḥ. b. Abmad b. Tamīm, first historian of al-Kayrawān (d. 333/945).

tice. We have the example of the Kalbite Zayd b. Haritha, who became the adopted son of Muhammad: a valuable example, even if it has been touched up in the manner of Tradition (see the decision attributed to 'Umar, infra, as plausible evidence pointing the same way). We have, however, nothing conclusive on the existence of enslavement for debt or the sale of children by their families: the late and rare accounts of such occurrences (Abūnāh, i, iii, 97; xii, 4) show them to be abnormal.

It would moreover be unwise to stretch the scanty information we have on the condition of slaves in the Hijāz before Islam, to fit every locality and every social division. Nomads and sedentaries, in particular, may have shown evidence of quite a different attitude, even in those days: we shall come to the modern period later. The abiding scorn of slave ancestry, even if only on the mother’s side, the satire aimed at the man who marries a captive girl (G. Jacob, Alawah. Beduinenleben, Berlin 1897, pp. 137-8, 213; Bichr Fares, L'honneur chez les Arabes avant l'Islam, Paris 1932, p. 71) are perhaps characteristic of beduin mentality, rather than indicative of the general outlook of town-dwellers. The biography in literary form of the renowned warrior-poet 'Antara, son of a beduin and an Ethiopian slave-girl, who has to perform dazzling feats of arms before his father, will consent to legitimize him, is a roman à thèse (Lammens, Le berceau de l'Islam, Rome 1914, p. 299) against disinheritig the children of such unions, indeed against keeping them in slavery: proof that the question had some immediacy and demanded a liberal answer, at any rate in some quarters.

It is probable that the usual practice of the pre-Islamic Arabs was influenced by an ancient Semitic distinction between two classes of slave, never perhaps reduced to a strict legal principle (I. Mendelsohn, Slavery in the Ancient Near East, New York, 1949, pp. 57-8) and never ratified by Muslim law, but which has left traces here and there in the code of behaviour of Islamicized lands: in contrast with the purchased slave (‘abd al-mamlakah), the slave born in his master’s house (‘abd usu) is entitled to full and complete rights of ownership (xxiv, 33)—in accepting it as fact that in pre-Islamic times female slaves were prostituted for the benefit of their masters, again in accordance with a Near Eastern custom of great antiquity (Mendelsohn, op. cit., p. 54).

2. The Kūrān. The Religious Ethic

a.—Islam, like its two parent monotheisms, Judaism and Christianity, has never preached the abolition of slavery as a doctrine, but it has followed a valuable example, though in a very different fashion in endeavouring to moderate the institution and mitigate its legal and moral aspects (for the part played in this by Christianity, see M. Bloch, in Arnulfs, 1947, and Imbert, in Mélanges F. de Visscher, Brussels, 1949, vol. i). Spiritually, the slave has the same value as the free man, and the same eternity is in store for his soul; in this earthly life, falling emancipation, there remains the fact of his inferior status, to which he must piously resign himself.

The Kūrān regards this discrimination between human beings as in accordance with the divinely-established order of things (xvi, 71, 75; xxx, 28). But over and over again, from beginning to end of the Preaching, it makes the emancipation of slaves a meritorious act: a work of charity (ii, 177; xc, 13), to which the legal alms may be devoted (ix, 60), or a deed of expiation for certain felonies (unintentional homicide: iv, 92, where a "believing slave" is specified; perjury: v, 89; xviii, 3); consent must be readily given to contractual emancipation (xxiv, 33). The emancipated slave is mentioned among those who should be treated "kindly" (bāsāmīn, iv, 36). Furthermore, his dignity as a human being is shown in certain ordinances relating to the sexual side of social relationships. We have already mentioned the ban on the prostitution of female slaves (xxiv, 33); nobody may lawfully enjoy them except their master (xxiii, 6; xxxiii, 59, 18x, 30) or their husband, for legal marriage is open to slaves, male and female. Masters have the moral duty to marry off their "virtuous" slaves of both sexes (xxiv, 32); if need be it is even permissible for Muslim slaves to marry free Muslims (ii, 221; iv, 25). The slave-woman who, obtaining her master’s consent, which is essential, marries a free man, is entitled to "a reasonable dowry" from her husband. She is obliged to remain faithful to him; but if she commits adultery her slave status re-emerges in the curious provision that she is liable to only one-half of the punishment reserved for the free married woman (iv, 25). Finally, the Kūrān protects the slave’s life, to some extent, by the law of retaliation, but the formula "the free for the free, the slave for the slave" (ii, 178) shows clearly how in penal matters the principle of inequality is maintained.


b.—The more or less official Muslim ethic, expressed in the hadīths, follows the line of Kūrānic teaching; it even lays perceptible stress on the humanitarian tendencies of the latter in the question with which we are dealing. Al-Ghazālī, in the Ihyā‘, ed. 1946 A.H., ii, 195-7 (jāhād al-mamlakah) (transl. G.-H. Bousquet, AIEO 1952, 423-7) had only to string together a number of well-known hadīths to produce what amounts to a lecture on ethics for slave-owners, illustrated by examples.

Tradition delights in asserting that the slave’s lot was among the latest preoccupations of the Prophet. It has quite a large store of sayings and anecdotes, attributed to the Prophet or to his Companions, enjoining real kindness towards this inferior social class. ‘‘Do not forget that they are your brothers’’; at any rate when they are Muslims, as some texts specify.—‘‘God has given you the right of ownership over them; He could have given them the right of ownership over you’’; ‘‘God has more power over you than you have over them’’. Thus the master is recommended not to show contempt for his slave; not to say ‘‘my slave’’ but ‘‘my boy, my servant’’ (u. supra), to share his food with him, to provide him with clothing similar to his own, to set him no more than moderate work, not to punish him excessively if he does wrong, to forgive him ‘‘seventy times a day’’, and finally to sell him to another master if they cannot get on well together.

Manumission is commended as a happy solution in many cases and is suggested as a way for the master to make amends for excessive chastisement of his slave. It is recommended, in the same category
as alms-giving, at the time of an eclipse, and is included among the various possible ways of expiating a voluntary breaking of the fast of Ramadan: the Qur'an prescribes no more than "the feeding of a poor man": ii, 184). A twofold reward in heaven is promised to the man who educates his slavegirl, frees her and marries her. A famous hadith affirms: "The man who frees a Muslim (v.l. 'a believer') slave, God will free from hell, limb for limb".

It is the duty of the slave, for his part, to give loyal service. He is "the shepherd of his master's wealth" and will be asked for an account of it in the next world. His reward in paradise will be twofold if, in addition to performing the usual religious obligations, he has the especial merit of having given good advice to his master.

If the Qur'an and Tradition show a certain favouritism towards such slaves as are Muslims, another direction is shown in hadiths forbidding the keeping of male Arabs in slavery; they invoke a decision to this effect said to have been given by the caliph 'Umar, in favour of disposing of instances of slavery against the payment of a ransom, where these were the result of "pre-Islamic practices" (see especially Ibn Sallām, K. al-Am'ādi, pp. 133-4).

Bibliography: Wensinck, Handbook, s.v. slaves.

3. Fīkh

Under the heading of fīkh properly so-called, we shall have recourse to the main provisions agreed on by the great Sunni schools. Thereafter we shall note very briefly some typical solutions adopted by Imām al-Shī'ism.

a.-Apart from the occasionally operative distinction between Muslim and non-Muslim slaves, Muslim law recognizes only one category of slaves, regardless of their ethnic origin or the source of their condition. The institution is kept going by only two lawful means: birth in slavery or capture in war, and even of these the latter is not applicable to Muslims, since they may remain enslaved they cannot be reduced to slavery. Legally therefore, the only Muslim slaves are those born into both categories or who were already slaves at the time of their conversion to Islam. Their number tends to diminish both through emancipation, particularly recommended in such cases, and through the following provision: whereas the usual principle of Muslim law is that the child assumes at birth his mother's status, free or slave, an exception, of all the more importance in view of its wide application, is made in favour of the child born of a free man and a female slave belonging to him; such a child is regarded as free-born (otherwise he would be his father's slave). What this amounts to is that slavery could scarcely continue to exist in Islam without the constantly renewed contribution of peripheral or external elements, either directly captured in war or imported commercially, under the fiction of the Holy War, from foreign territory (dār al-'arb).

It is pleasing to see that in the eyes of Muslim jurists slavery is an exceptional condition: "The basic principle is liberty" (al-āqīl huwa l-ḥārijyā). Consequently, for the majority of them, the presumption in favour of freedom; on the whole they have come down on the side of regarding as free the foundling (lākīh) whose origin remains unknown. But it may fairly be stated that, despite the strictness professed by certain doctors of the law, the fīkh has never evolved an adequately clear system of sanctions to suppress the kidnapping or sale of free persons, Muslim or non-Muslim. Still less do we see any positive denunciation of the practice of castrating young slaves, although it was condemned in principle.

b.—On the juridico-religious level, the slave has a kind of composite quality, partaking of the nature both of thing and of person. Considered as a thing, he is subject to the right of ownership—indeed it is in this that the strict definition of slavery lies—exercised by a man or woman, and he may be the object of all the legal operations proceeding from this position: sale, gift, hire, inheritance and so on. In this respect he is "a mere commodity" (ṣīrā min al-sīrā). In the various classes of property distinguished by the fīkh, he generally ranks with the animals and his lot is like theirs: the new-born slave, for instance, is the "fruit" (ghallā) of his mother, like the young of cattle, and belongs to her master; in the theoretical treatises on public law, the mudābisīb is given the duty of ensuring that masters treat their slaves and their animals properly. The slave may (as among the Romans and in Christian Europe) belong to two or more owners at the same time: he is then said to be "held in common" (muğālarak); such joint ownership gives rise to some extremely complex legal positions, which provide abundant material for the casuistry of the doctors. Again, it should be noted that the law lays down the amount of the reward which may be claimed by the one who restores a runaway slave (ībāk) to his master.

Yet the slave, even from the point of view of the right of ownership, of which he is the object, is not always treated exactly like other property. Mālikī law, for example, allows, in towns where it is the customary usage, an automatic guarantee of three days, at the expense of the seller of the slave, against any "faults" (wārūd) in the latter (one year in the case of madness or leprosy). The fact that a master may legally have sexual relations with his female slaves gives rise to a system of regulating these relations, which has repercussions elsewhere on the exercise of the right of ownership: thus a distinction is sometimes drawn between costly female slaves, intended for cohabitation, and ordinary female slaves (e.g. Muwaddiwana, vi, 192 seq., concerning a clause of non-guarantee in sale), between female slaves within and outside the prohibited degrees of relationship to the interested party (e.g. in the matter of the loan of consummation, ḥārd, except among the Ḥanafīs, who forbid it with all living things). Further, the regard for kinship has an even more striking effect. It is forbidden to separate a slave mother and her young child, up to about the age of seven, by their becoming the property of different different masters (a hadith runs: "Whoever separates a mother from her child, God will separate her from his dear ones on the Day of Resurrection"). Under pain of nullity of the legal transaction; the Ḥanafīs, more reluctant to impose legal sanctions, brand as "objectionable" the separating of a slave, not yet arrived at puberty, from any close blood-relative within the prohibited degrees, whether the latter is of age or not. Emancipation follows automatically, except in the Zāhiri school, when a slave becomes the property of a very close relative: according to the Shī'īs, only in the ascending and descending lines: the Mālikīs add brothers and sisters too, while the Ḥanafīs extend the rule to all relatives within the prohibited degrees. Religious affiliation is also taken into account, inasmuch as non-Muslims cannot
keep Muslim slaves; they must either free them or
dispose of them to Muslim masters.

If the master fails to meet his moral obligation of
providing for the physical maintenance (nafaka)
of his slave, the law requires in the last resort that
the latter be sold, a solution also enjoined, except by
the Ḥanafīs, in the case of animals. The Mālikīs
hold that emancipation is compulsory (cf. Exodus,
xxi, 26-7) when the master carries his ill-treatment
of his slave to the point of mutilation or disfigure-
ment. Later, when we come to deal with personal
rights, we shall meet with other instances of curtail-
ment of the absolute right of ownership, as of other
features of penal law.

c.—On the personal rights of the slave, that is, on
his juridico-religious competence, it is interesting to
see whether the classical jurists have ever attempted
a general theory that would bring out the principles
underlying the solutions scattered under the various
headings of fiqh. One such attempt is to be found
in the works of the Ḥanafi al-Pazdawi (d. 482/1089),
commented on and imitated in the later treatises on
waṣīl al-fiqh; the basic ideas, Ḥanafi of course, are as
follows (waṣīl, ed. Istanbul 1307 A.H., pp. 1401-1426):
slave-status is incompatible with "patrimonial
ownership" (madākiyyat al-mdl), whence it follows
for example, that the slave cannot take a concubine,
but is compatible with "non-patrimonial ownership"
(madākiyyat ghayr al-mdl), whence it follows, for
example, that the slave may marry. His status does
not debar the slave from administering property
and laying claim to the "possession" (yad) of it,
but is incompatible with the full exercise of the
higher legal faculties of the human being: his ghimmah
(abstract financial responsibility) and his bi'li (free-
dom of action in sexual matters) are reduced, and
all waṣīlāyyāt (public or private offices of authority)
are forbidden to him. More recent works, of the type
of the Ashbāk wa-Nazdīr by the Shāffiite Suyūṭī
and the Ḥanafite Ibn Ṭuḥayyīn, merely give dry
and rather disjointed lists of the manifold rules
about what slaves may and may not do.
d.—On the male slave's claim to full personal
rights, it is a question of differentiating between a
religious status (ibtidādi) theoretically identical with
that of his free coreligionists (the contrary opinion is exceptional; e.g.
in one solitary Mālikī, cf. Ibn Ṭuḥayyīn, Dibāḏī,
1329 268), but some derogations were more or
less inevitable on certain points. Most authori-
ties hold that his dependence on a master absolves
him from the strict necessity of performing such
pious acts as involve freedom of movement: the Fri-
day prayer, pilgrimage, the Holy War. Another
consequence of this dependence is that the master
is responsible for the annual payment of his "alms
at the breaking of the fast" (ṣahād al-fitr). The Muslim
slave-woman is not under such strict an obligation to
"hide her nakedness" (saṣr al-suṣura) at the ritual
prayer as the free woman is. The slave is not forbidden
to act as leader (iṣmād) of congregational prayer,
although the Ḥanafīs disapprove of the practice,
and some other authorities do not permit him to
become a salaried iṣmād, or at any rate they prefer
a free man to hold the office, if one is available of
the required competence. The question of his acting
as iṣmād at the midday prayer on Fridays and
the two canonical festivals is more debatable,
especially if this office is regarded as an emanation
from the public authority; even within the various
schools there is disagreement about whether or not
it is allowable. On the whole, however, the affirm-
ative answer seems to have prevailed, except among
the Ḥanbalīs. The slave is no more qualified to
hold a position of religious magistrature (judgeship,
ṭiba) than an official position of secular authority;
he is nevertheless acceptable as a subordinate officer
in the revenue department.

e.—In matters of law in the strict sense (muʿāmalāt),
the slave's incompetence to act (baqir) is assumed
in principle, but is not absolute. If he is a Muslim, the
fiqh confirms and expressly states his competence to
contract a marriage, as clearly laid down in the Kurʾān
(v. supra); but the master's consent is required both
for male and female slaves (according to the Mā-
likīs, the male slave of full age may marry of his
own accord, but the master then has the right either
to ratify the marriage or to terminate it by repu-
diation) and it is the master who acts as "guardian
for matrimonial purposes" (waṣīl) of his female slaves.
The master can even marry off by "compulsion",
(ghabr) a male slave, not yet of age, or a female slave
(the father of a family has a similar right over his
children); the schools of Abu Ḥanīfah and Mālik
concede him the same power over a male slave of
full age. The Ḥanbalīs alone, on the other hand, hold
that the slave may insist on his master's marrying
him off. Notwithstanding reservations and restrictions
based on the words of the Kurʾān, and in spite of
the customary requirement of "compatibility" (ḥafidż)
between the parties, the jurists admit and
lay down rules for marriage between Muslims of
whom one is a slave and the other free. We have
convincing evidence that, in the course of the cen-
turies, such unequal marriages occurred (to the
advantage to the slave, male or female, concerned)
more often than one might think. A slave wife, on
being emancipated, has the right to opt for divorce
if her husband is a slave and, according to the
Ḥanafīs, even if he is free.

A Muslim cannot be the husband or wife of his
or her slave (nor even, some would add, of the slave
belonging to his or her son); there is an absolute in-
compatibility, for the same persons, between connu-
bism and ownership. In contradiction to the other
rites, the Ḥanafīs permit a Muslim, even a free Muslim,
to marry a Jewish or Christian slave-girl. The slave
is entitled to a maximum of two wives, except in
the Mālikī view, which grants him four, just like
a free man. The Mālikīs are also alone in conceding
that a slave-wife has the right to share in her hus-
band's nights on equal terms with a free co-wife;
the other jurists allow her only one night in three.

The obligation, which is generally recognized as
incumbent on a slave-husband, to maintain his wife,
gives rise to various solutions if he is not legitimately
possessed of adequate means.

Although the majority of authorities deny that
the male slave of full age can contract a valid marri-
age of his own free will, yet all agree that he has
the husband's usual right of repudiation (halāk) as
he thinks fit. But in accordance with the general
tendency to reduce by one-half, in the case of
the slave, all figures prescribed for free men, he may only
take back his wife after one single formula of repu-
diation, instead of the two which the Koran (ii,
229) lays down as a maximum. Consequently a
twofold repudiation on his part has the same decisive
result as a threefold repudiation by a free man;
the Ḥanafīs alone, who in the matter of repudiation
have more consideration for the woman than for
the man, apply this reduction if it is the wife who is
a slave, whether or not her husband is a free man.
The Ḥanafīs also set themselves apart from the other
schools in not permitting the married male slave to
use the device of "cursing" (ḥādūn), instituted by the
Kur'an (xxiv, 6-9) to the advantage of the husband who may accuse his wife of adultery with no legal proof. The "legal period of withdrawal" ('idda) which must be observed by widows or repudiated woman (Kur'an, ii, 228, 734; lv, 4) is also halved when the woman in question is a slave: 1) two months and five days for a widow, instead of four months and ten days; 2) two menstrual or intermenstrual periods (depending on the school) instead of three (one could hardly say one-and-a-half) for the repudiated woman who is usually regular, except that the Zahirists keep the figure at three; 3) one month and a half for the repudiated woman who is not usually regular, except according to the Mālikīs, who oddly enough, as Averroes remarks (Bidaya, ed. 1935, ii, 92; tr. Laimèche, 233-4), here hold to the figure of three.

Far more important in practice, on account of its wide application and great bearing on social life, is the system of legal concubinage in fiqh as in the Kur'an, extramarital cohabitation is permissible only between a man and his own female slave; he is forbidden to cohabit with a slave belonging to his wife, even with the latter's consent (contrary to the Biblical custom), but indulgence is shown if he has relations with a slave belonging to his son. Co-owners of a female slave may not cohabit with her, nor may a sole owner cohabit with a married female slave. When the concubine (surriyya) has a child by her master, she enjoys the title of umm walad [q.v.] and an improved status in that she cannot be sold and becomes free on her master's death (compare the Code of Hammurabi, para. 170; but for the fluctuations in old Islamic practice see J. Schacht, in E. I. s.v., and The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence, Oxford, 1950, 264-6); that child and any other she may subsequently have born are free. There is no limit to the number of concubines as there is to the number of wives, but almost all the authorities teach that there are the same bars to cohabitation as to marriage: natural or acquired kinship, two sisters together, the woman's professing a heathen religion.

With the especial aim of avoiding confusion over parentage, in the absence of any initial ceremony or 'idda, the jurists have prescribed a temporary ban on sexual relations, in the case of a slave-woman, for "verification of non-pregnancy" or istibrid', when for any reason she becomes the property of a new master or changes her status (emancipation, marriage). If she is pregnant, this ban lasts till her confinement, as with the 'idda; if not, its duration is one menstrual period. If she is not yet regular in her periods or has ceased to be regular, the authorities differ: one month or three months is the usual rule. Mālikis and Hanbalis make the seller of the slave-woman share in the responsibility of the istibrid'; the former entrust her (muwadda') to the supervision of a third person. There is considerable difference of opinion on points of detail in the numerous cases where the istibrid' would appear to be no longer obligatory, as serving no purpose; to avoid it, recourse is had to certain devices of procedure, particularly by the Ḥanafī devotees of "circumventions of the law" (hiyā'il) (well-known anecdote of Hārūn al-Rashīd and the ḫādi' Abū Yūsuf, which has found its way into the Arabian Nights).

The children born of legal concubinage are legitimate and, in the matter of succession to their father's estate, are on the same footing as children born in wedlock. But it is harder to establish legally the paternity of a master, with all its legal and social consequences, than that of a husband; besides, the old Ḥārābī jurists were loth to declare it officially if there was no expression of willingness on the part of the master concerned. The Ḥanafīs too stand apart from the other schools in not fathering a child on the master unless the latter acknowledges it, and in permitting him to disown it if there is a legal presumption in favour of his paternity inasmuch as the concubine is already umm walad. In the other schools, the master of an unmarried female slave is legally regarded as the father of her child, not only if he acknowledges it as his own but also if he makes an implicit admission of having had relations with her, as is obviously the case if she is already umm walad. It is open to him to deny paternity only if cohabitation was manifestly impossible within the—very wide—officially recognized limits of the term of pregnancy, or if he takes an oath that he put his concubine in istibrid' at least six months before the date of the birth, and that he has not cohabited with her since. The ascription of paternity becomes complicated in such abnormal situations as when two co-owners of a slave cohabit with her during the same intermenstrual period, or when two entitled parties in succession have had relations with her without istibrid'; recourse is then had to the ruling of the "physiognomists" (khuf'pl. kāfa), an ancient Arabian expedient difficult of application at certain times. Failing this, the child is left to choose for himself at puberty. Here again the Ḥanafīs stand alone in refusing to ratify this archaic institution; they prefer, if the decision proves to be rationally impossible, to set up a kind of two-fold paternity.

Most authorities deny the slave-woman the right of custody (ḥadāsā) over her children to which the free woman is entitled, nor do they permit the male slave to be a "guardian for matrimonial purposes" (walī). The Shāfī and Ḥanafī schools (who have not ratified the partial tolerance of Abū Ḥanīfa) refuse to allow the slave to act as executor of a will (waṣf). The testimony (shahida) of a slave is not admissible in court, except among the Hanbalis, and even they do not accept it in connection with the most serious punishable offences. His affirmation (ifṣār) is generally accepted in matters affecting his person (apart from restrictions imposed by certain authorities) but not in matters of property.

All the schools agree that the master can do as he likes with property in the possession of his slave and is at liberty to take it away from him. In the eyes of third parties, the ordinary slave has no patrimony of his own; his business activities, which are severely restricted, are on behalf of his master, who alone is financially competent to act. Nevertheless the Mālikīs take up the remarkable position (for an interesting justification see ʻAbd al-Wahhāb, ʻIṣbūl, i, 270) of recognizing the slave's "ownership" (milh) of his peculium, whose source is mainly from gifts or bequests which it is permissible for him to accept on his own account, although the ownership here is precarious and may not be disposed of without consent. Two important consequences of this doctrine are that, according to the Mālikīs, the slave may lawfully have concubines without giving rise to any theoretical difficulties, and that on gaining his freedom he may keep his peculium, unless his master has formally announced his wish to retain it.

Finally, apropos of patrimony, there is quite a common practice, known from remote Semitic anti-
quity and from the Classical world, which provides the slave with a real, though not unrestricted, legal competency: it consists in the master's putting his slave in charge of a business or of certain specified business dealings, entrusting him with a capital sum where necessary. The slave is then said to be "authorized" (ma'dhun or ma'dhun lah). The effects of this "authorization" (i'tibl), which may nevertheless be revoked, are conceived in more or less generous terms by different jurists. The recipient always in fact becomes relatively independent, so as to be able to deal quite freely with third parties. The authorities are well-nigh unanimous in not making the master responsible for the debts of his "authorized" slave; the Hanafis, followed with some hesitation by the Hanbalis, allow them to be recovered on the "physical person" (nakaba) of the slave debtor, if the capital at his disposal is inadequate; in other words he may be sold to pay them. On the other hand, the Malikis and Shafiis recognize his "abstract responsibility" (zdimmah); the "obligation to pay" (dasy) they leave standing to the account of those creditors whom the assets are insufficient to satisfy, while deferring the "execution of payment" (mudilaba, "Haftung") till such time as the slave is compensated.

1.—It is in connection with punishments (u'khdb) that the hybrid and indeterminate character of the legal nature of the slave, who is simultaneously a thing and a person of inferior status, breaks through the complicated web of solutions presented by the fiib. Here is a curious example, of an unusual kind but mentioned as clearly showing this ambivalence: the "legal compensation" (diya) for the foetus aborted by a free woman is a young slave of either sex, technically known as chura, whereas the compensation for victims duly born is reckoned in camels or money.

To what extent is the law of retaliation (bi'dzg) applied to slaves, on the basis of Kur'an, ii, 178 (u. supra)? In a case of intentional homicide it works against the slave, whether the victim be bond or free (if he is free, it is no doubt not precisely the idea of retaliation which underlies the punishment); but the schools object to putting a free man to death for killing a slave, with the noteworthy exception of the Hanafis (and also of that illustrious, albeit somewhat dissident, Hanbali, Ibn Taymiyya; cf. Laoust, Etats, 418, 438), and even they exempt the man who kills his own slave or one belonging to his son. The Malikis are almost alone in conferring on the victim's next-of-kin the ownership of the guilty slave (again with a great many reservations), to do with him as he pleases: he may put him to death, keep him in slavery or set him free. This may be a survival of an archaic solution, elsewhere replaced by the simple choice, as in the case of free men, between retaliation and compensation according to the tariff. In cases of deliberate wounding the Shafiis apply retaliation between the same persons as in cases of homicide; Malikis and Hanbalis insist on equality of status, slave or free, between the guilty party and his victim; the Hanafis forego retaliation altogether.

What of the monetary compensation, according as the slave is guilty of or is the victim of bloodshed?

1) Slave victim: The compensation goes to the master. The diya is the responsibility of the guilty person alone, except that the Shafiis are undecided whether or not to bring in the "group jointly responsible for the bloodwit" (zdhab), which is the Hanafi rule in cases of homicide only. This diya is not fixed, as for the free man, but is calculated in the event of death, on the market value (bimaa) of the victim; the Hanafis alone set an upper limit to it, namely the diya of a free man less a token reduction of ten dirhams. If there is only wounding, of a type specified in the tariff laid down by the Law for a free man, the majority of authorities hold that the market value of the injured slave should be reduced by the amount of the difference between the figure shown in the legal scale for an identical wound and the maximum compensation for a free man. The Malikis and some Hanbalis teach, though with certain reservations, that the sum paid should exactly equal the depreciation in the market value of the slave.

2) Slave guilty: The majority of authorities give the master the choice between surrendering the culprit (dath, noxalis deditio) and paying the appropriate diya. But the Shafiis, followed by several Hanbalis, regard the diya as incumbent on the "physical person" (nakaba) of the slave in question, whom his master will therefore sell, and hand over the price received in exchange for him, up to the amount of the diya, unless he prefers to pay the sum due without selling him.

The slave guilty of theft and the Muslim slave guilty of apostasy are punished in the same way as free men: by cutting off the hand in the former case, by death in the latter, when the necessary conditions for these punishments are fulfilled.

Fornication (sind) committed by a slave of either sex does not legally involve the death penalty, in consequence of the Kur'anic ordinance (u. supra) and because neither male nor female slaves are held capable of acquiring the particular legal condition of a muhsan(a) spouse, which the fiib restricts to free persons who have consummated marriage and which it regards as necessary before a death-sentence can be imposed for a sexual offence. As laid down in the Kur'an, the punishment is half of that decreed (xxiv, 2) for the free person who is not muhsan(a); viz. fifty lashes instead of one hundred, to which some authorities would add the further penalty of banishment. It should be noted that Hanafis and Hanbalis refuse to regard as muhsan the spouse of anybody who is not muhsan: so, according to them, the husband or wife of a slave cannot be executed for adultery. As part of the general tendency to mitigate the punishment for sexual offences involving slaves, certain cases of unlawful cohabitation with a female slave (e.g. by a co-owner or the master's father) are not looked upon as sind.

Finally, the slave who is guilty of a "false charge of fornication" (hadi) against a free person is liable, here again, to half the penalty decreed by the Kur'an (xxiv, 4) against the slanderer who is free; viz. forty lashes instead of eighty. But the slave who is the victim of such a slander has no right at all to any such satisfaction, since the Law, which to a certain extent protects the person of the slave, does not go so far as to regard him or her as a man or woman of honour.

The vast field of the "arbitrary punishments" (a'dairin), left to the judge's discretion, almost completely defies investigation through the study of written sources. We are conscious of our inability to make a sufficiently close study of how, in matters of punishment, the slave's position really compares, throughout history, with that of the free man, in the eyes of the judicial authorities of Islam.

j.—The emancipation (uzh, 'uzaa, 'tibd) of the slave is a work of piety; it is a unilateral act on the part of the master, consisting in an explicit or implicit declaration; in the former case it is not necessary
to show intention. In principle, emancipation cannot be revoked, nor may the beneficiary refuse it. If, however, instead of being immediate, it is to take effect at some fixed future date or subject to certain conditions, all authorities but the Mālikīs permit the slave to be sold in the meantime. This destroys the effect of the emancipation (except, some say, if the slave is then re-acquired by his former owner). The children of a female slave, born or unborn, as a rule become free on her emancipation. The partial enfranchisement of a slave by his sole master is equivalent to his total enfranchisement (Abū Ḥanīfa formulates a reservation, but is not followed by his disciples). The question is more involved when the slave is held in joint ownership and one of the owners enfranchises him insofar as his own share is concerned; if this owner is well-to-do, the enfranchisement is total and he will compensate his fellow-owners for the value of their shares. If the emancipator is not wealthy enough for this, the slave remains “partial” (mukādhab), except according to the Ḥanafīs, who free him and allow the other owners to recover their share out of the income from his work (ṣū‘aṣa). There is another point on which the Ḥanafīs reject the solution readily accepted by the other schools: they do not permit recourse to the drawing of lots (kur’ā) to determine which of several slaves is to be enfranchised when circumstances make it necessary to choose; their rejection of this procedure dictates certain of their rulings.

A grant of enfranchisement with effect from the master’s death, a desirable practice for the Faithful and one for which they have often shown partiality, is known as tadbir, from the expression ‘an ḍurrā‘ min ‘aftar’ (this is the Mālikīs, who base it on a formula containing a word from the root ḍur). The Shāfīʿīs also apply the term to an enfranchisement to take effect from a date after the master’s death, which for the other schools would count as no more than a revocable testamentary disposition. Ṭadbir itself is in principle irrevocable, in the eyes of all the authorities, but here too the Shāfīʿīs and Ḥanbalis allow it to be made void by the sale of the mudabbar slave. The Ḥanafīs permit this only if the ṭadbir is limited (mubayyad) by a condition connected with the emancipator’s death. It is permissible for a master to cohabit with his mudabbar slave; and her children, except in the dominant Shāfīʿī view, follow the condition of their mother. On the master’s death, the mudabbar, being regarded as part of his estate, is subject to the rule of the disposable third and on this rule depends the manner of his effective liberation, which is different for each school. Except according to the Ḥanafīs, he remains in slavery if the debts of the deceased cannot be settled without selling him. Contractual enfranchisement is of great doctrinal and practical importance. It is recommended by the Kur’ān (xxv, 33: the interpretation of the text as implying a strict obligation has not generally prevailed). It consists in the master’s granting the slave his freedom in return for the payment of sums of money agreed between them. Some call this conditional enfranchisement, according to others it is ransom by the slave of his own person: a divergence which entails solutions differing in detail. The transaction is known in the Kur’ān as ḥabd, the verbal noun of the third form. In the classical language, no doubt to distinguish this from ḥabd = “letter, book”, it has been replaced by its morphological equivalent mukādhaba or by ḥabdā. Although the payments are usually spaced out (munadhabism) and the majority of jurists regard settlement by instalments as essential to the contract, the Ḥanafīs accept one single and immediate payment; the Mālikīs are satisfied with one instal- ment, while Shāfīʿīs and Ḥanbalis insist on a mini- mum of two. The sums to be paid are of course de-ducted from the peculium of the slave, who is ipso facto “authorized” to engage in business; the granting of ḥabdā to a female slave who has no honest source of income is frowned upon. The mukādhab is set free only when his payments are completed (on some archaic divergences, see Schacht, Origins, 275–80). But the master is forbidden to sell him in the meantime, except by the Ḥanbalis, who nevertheless hold the purchaser to the terms of the contract of enfranchisement. The Mālikīs give the master a limited right to dispose in advance of the total of the sums which the mukādhab undertakes to pay (they are known as ḥabdā, like the contracts itself). Con- cubinage with a “contractually emancipated female slave” is unlawful. A grant of mukādhaba may be superimposed on one of ṭadbir, to the same person’s advantage. When the mukādhab reaches the end of his payments, a “rebate” (ṭāḍ) is usually accorded to him, in compliance with the Kur’ānic text: fixed or discretionary, obligatory or merely recommended, according to the different authorities.

k.—Once he has gained his liberty, the freedman (‘atīk, muʿṣāb) immediately enjoys the same full legal capacity as the freeborn. But both he and his male descendants in perpetuity remain attached to the emancipator (muʿtīk), and to his or her family, by a bond of “clientship” or wālād, a term equally denoting the converse side of the relationship: “pa- tronage”. “Patron” and “client” are both referred to as mawla (pl. mansūl), in relation to each other: if necessary they are differentiated by means of epithets: “higher” (al-ʿalā) for the former and “low- er” (al-ʿasfāl) for the latter. The Ḥanafīs alone main- tain, besides this wālād which originates in slavery, a legal institution known as wālād al-mawṣūla between free men, which is outside the scope of the present discussion.

A saying, applied with slight variations in the different schools, runs: “Patronage belongs to the emancipator” (al-wālād li-man aṣṭak); it cannot be made over to a third party by any negotiation or shift at the moment of emancipation. The fiṭḥ, moreover, which insists on assimilating patronage to natural kinship (fiṭḥ: al-wālād lubma ka-lubmat al-nasab), has succeeded in making it inalienable and untransferable, whereas cases of sale were not unknown before and even under Islam (cf. Ahmad Amlī, Faḍīr al-Islām, i, 110; Schacht, Origins, 173). Nevertheless, on the strength of the peculiar concept of “attraction of patronage” (dījr al-walad), this right may be transferred in certain cases; for example, from the immediate emancipator to the one who emancipated him, or from the emancipator of the mother to the subsequent emancipator of the father, subject to certain conditions. Mālikīs and Ḥanbalis sanction, not without much wavering, and under very different final forms, an ancient type of enfranchisement without patronage, known as fiṭḥ al-salība in reference to the pre-Islamic custom, condemned indeed in the Kur’ān (v, 103), which consisted in turning loose in complete freedom one particular she-camel of the herd, protected by taboos.

The patron and his “agnates” (ṭāṣaba), or those of the patrines, stand in the position of agnates, except according to the Zāhīrites, to the emancipated slave who has no natural agnates, particularly in
connection with tutelage for purposes of matrimony and with joint responsibility in penal matters. In return, the property of the emancipated slave or of his or her descendants in the male line who die leaving neither priority heirs nor agnates, revert to the patron or patrons or to their agnatic heirs, in accordance with a system of devolution (by successive generations among the kin; maxim: al-walad li-l-kubr) more archaic than in usual cases of succession (see R. Brunschvig, in Revue Historique de Droit, 1950). A woman is absolutely excluded from this "inheritance of patronage" (mirith al-walad?): she can be patron only of her own freedmen or the freedmen of the latter; her sons inherit the patronage, while they are not counted among her agnates for purposes of joint responsibility in penal matters, a particularly conservative institution. One ancient isolated opinion notwithstanding, the jurists have not granted the freedman the right to inherit the property of the patron who dies without heirs.

Bibliography: Apart from references in the text, all the collections of hadith and treatises on fiqīh, not forgetting the works on ikhtilāf. Studies in European languages: Weckwarth, Der Sklave im Muham. Recht, Berlin 1909, mentioned for the sake of completeness; Abd Elwahed, Contributions à une théorie sociologique de l'esclavage, Paris 1931, is more important, but biased. For the three main Sunni schools only, see first of all: D. Santillana, Istitutioni, i 1, 141-160; Juynboll, Handleiding 4, 232-40, Bergsträsser-Schacht, Grundzüge, 38-42; and, for penal law, L. Bercher, Les débts et les pénés de droit commun prévus par le Coran, Tunis 1926, passim. On the Mālikī view of legality in legal concubinage, Lapanne-Joinville, in Revue Marocaine de Droit, 1952.

I.—The strictly juridical statute of slavery among the Imāmī Shi'ites, for which one may refer to the classic work of al-Hilli, Šarḥ al-Islām (tr. Querry, 2 vols., Paris 1871-2) is indicative of attitudes sometimes considerably removed from the great Sunni principles. Among the solutions it offers we shall confine ourselves to the following, as being particularly revealing of some interesting legal or social viewpoints.

The child born in wedlock does not follow the status of his mother, bond or free, but failing any stipulation to the contrary, is born free if either of his parents is free. If both are slaves but not of the same master, he belongs jointly to the masters of both parents. The master of a female slave may grant a third party the "use" of her, for purposes of work or sexual relations. There is a great deal of controversy about the possibility of manumitting a non-Muslim slave; on the other hand it is recommended that the Muslim slave should be freed after seven years' service (compare with Exodus, xxi, 2; Deut., xv, 12). Manumission is of right, according to most authorities, when the slave is mutilated by the master, as the Mālikīs hold, or if he is smitten with blindness, leprosy or paralysis in the course of his slavery. The concubine who has borne a child is not automatically freed on her master's death unless her child is still alive; her value is then deducted from this child's share of the inheritance. Enfranchisement with effect from a master's death may be revoked, just like a legacy; it does not prevent sale of the slave, which is tantamount to a revocation. Contractual enfranchisement is of two kinds: "conditional", which leaves in total slavery the slave who defaults in his debts, as among the Sunnis; "unconditional", which gives the slave his freedom in proportion to the amount he pays.

In penal law, there is no retaliation on the freeman for the murder of a slave. The maḥr of a freeman killed by a slave can, as in Mālikī law, claim the possession of the guilty slave. The diyya of the slave may not exceed (whereas the Ḥanafis say: amount to) that of a free person of the same sex.

Some of these provisions show an independent development of doctrine, while others clearly echo ancient solutions which the Sunnis as a whole have not retained (see two examples in J. Schacht, Origins, 265, 279).

The Practice of Slavery

A) In the Middle Ages

Throughout the whole of Islamic history, down to the 19th century, slavery has always been an institution tenacious of life and deeply rooted in custom. The Turks, who were to come to the relief of the Arabs in the victorious struggle against Christianity, seem to have practised it but little in their primitive nomadic state (Uçok, in Revue Historique de Droit français, 1952, 423): after providing for so long their unwilling quota, through kidnapping or purchase, to the slave class of the Muslim world, they became themselves supporters of the institution in an ever-increasing degree, as they adopted Islam and the sedentary way of life.

The wars of conquest, which, after the fulgurous expansion of Islam in the first century of the hijrīa, continued throughout the Middle Ages to further its spread in one direction or another despite setbacks elsewhere, provided the conquerors with an almost ceaseless stream of prisoners of both sexes, many of whom remained in slavery. Even in those places where the frontier of the dār al-Islām were, for the time being, established, armed raids into enemy country, organized by the central power or individual groups, continued to put into practice the principle of the "Holy War", when no official truce or momentary alliance happened to be in force; and these raids brought back captives. Piracy in the Mediterranean, coupled with the privateering war from which it was often barely distinguishable, both augmented by grim razzias against the Christian seaboard, contributed to the supply of slaves to the adjacent Muslim lands, to an extent which varied at different periods but was always considerable.

Mediterranean Christendom, from Spain to Byzantium, paid this aggressive Islam in its own coin, by land and by sea. A curious chapter in the economic and social history of these Christian countries is afforded by the periodic influxes to their territory of "Moors" or "Saracens", reduced to slavery, then closely watched, employed as labourers, sometimes escaping or being ransomed but usually blending. Little by little, into the local population, after their slow conversion to Christianity (see Ch. Verlinden's detailed study, in L'Esclavage dans le monde ibérique médiéval, Amuario Historia Derecho Espanol, 1934; idem, on Catalonia, in Annales du Midi, 1950, and his useful bibliography, for various countries, in Studi...G. Luzzatto, Milan, 1949, while awaiting his book on L'Esclavage dans l'Europe Médiévale; due to appear in 1954; interesting documentation on one particular society is to be found in A. González Palencia, Los Mostrabres de Toledo en los siglos XII y XIII, Madrid 1930, prel., vol. ii, 244-6; on the quasi-ritual invitation of Muslim captives to the Emperor of Constantinople's banquet, in the 10th century, see M. Canard, in Vasiliev, Byzance et les Arabes, vol. ii, part 2, Brussels 1950, 387-8).
It sometimes happened, admittedly on a restricted scale, that Muslims made slaves of other Muslims. This was the case, for example, when members of fanatical sects regarded the rest of mankind as beyond the pale of Islam and consequently did not scruple to attack them and, if they spared their lives, to keep them in captivity. There was an exceptional instance in 1077, when thousands of women of a revolted Berber tribe were publicly sold in Cairo. What happened more frequently, on the borders of Muslim states, was that official or private razzias against populations still largely pagan carried off indiscriminately human beings, particularly children, who might belong to Islam. With the spread of Islam in negro Africa and the intensification of Moroccan pressure in this direction, beginning in the last centuries of the Middle Ages, the question of the legality of subsequent sales had to be put to some great jurists; they answered circumspectly, giving the dealers the benefit of the doubt as to the origin of individuals offered for sale (in 15th century, al-Wansharisli, Miṣyār, vol. ix, 171-2, tr. Archives Marocaines, xiii, 426-8; towards 1600, Ahmad Bābā of Timbuktu, quoted in P. Zeyu, Exclavage et guerre sainte, Paris 1900).

The import of slaves by peaceful means tended, from an early date, to compete with the forcible method. Slaves were included in the well-known babī [q.v.] (Latin pactum?) or annual Nubian tribute, unquestionably a continuation of an ancient tradition, which was furnished to Egypt well-nigh regularly for many hundreds of years. But, in the ordinary course of events, it was trade that brought a plentiful flow of slaves from outside into the markets of the ḍār al-Islām. The slavers' caravans went into the heart of Africa or of Asia to acquire their human merchandise, bought or stolen; on the Dark Continent, the slaving propensities and internal struggles of the natives facilitated the business of the dealers. Not only negroes and Ethiopians, Berbers and Turks were the objects of this international trade; there were in addition, chiefly in the early Middle Ages, various European elements, above all, the "slaves" whose name has given rise to our term "slave" and has also been extended in Arabic (Ṣakālība) to cover other ethnic groups of central or eastern Europe, their geographical neighbours. The traffic was carried on by sea as well as by land; the Red Sea has never ceased to provide a way from Africa to Arabia; the Mediterranean, with its appendage the Black Sea, offers a route, that has always been frequented, from Christian or pagan Europe to the Muslim world. Certain ports seem to have had a bigger share than others, at various times, in the reception of this merchandise: Almeria in Muslim Spain, Farama and later Alexandria in Egypt, Darband (Bāb al-Abwāb), on the shores of the Caspian, warf from quite an early date a very busy frontier market for slaves, as were Bulhārā and Samarkand in the interior.

From the middle of the 8th century, the Venetians, to the great indignation of the Papacy, began their career as purveyors of slaves—sometimes Christian—to the Islamic lands. In the 9th and 10th centuries, Jewish merchants played an important part in the trade of "slaves" across central and western Europe (including a celebrated eunuch-"factory" at Verdun) and their distribution throughout Islam (the famous passage from Ibn Khurraḍāḍhīb on the Radhāniyya is reproduced and translated by Hadj-Sadok, in Bibliothèque arabe-francaise, vi, Algiers 1949, 20-3). At a later date, the Mamluks of Egypt, with the consent of the Byzantine emperor, imported new slaves, to serve or to replace them, from the Genoese or Venetian trading-posts of the Crimea or the Sea of Azov.

Even within the Muslim world, there were considerable movements of slaves, of every racial origin, in the Middle Ages; tribute sent to the caliphs by provincial governors and vassal amirs, or commercial traffic. We do not know all the details of the organization of this traffic, but we are acquainted with certain aspects of it. Every big town had its public slavemarket, which in some countries was called the "place of display" (maṭṣīra). The one at Sāmarrā, in the 9th century, is described as being a vast quadrilateral, with internal alleys and onestorey houses, containing rooms and shops (al-Yaḥṣūbī, Buldān, 260 = tr. Wiet, Cairo 1937, 52). The slave-merchant, who was known as "importer" (diḍālīb) or "cattle-dealer" (nabḥūb), inspired at the same time contempt for his occupation and envy for his wealth: he used in fact to draw huge profits, often through clever faking of his merchandise, if he did not actually hoodwink the unsophisticated customer in a quite outrageous fashion. Some remarkable details in this connection are to be found from the pen of the eastern Christian doctor Ibn Butlān, towards the middle of the 12th century (see Mez, Renaissance, 156-7) and in the writings of the conscientious Muslim al-Sākāf of Malaga, towards 1100 (Manuel de Hība, ed. Colin and Lévi-Provençal, Paris 1934, 47-58).

I do not consider that it would serve any useful purpose here to quote selling-prices, particularly if the prices in question are exceptional. Such figures have no real meaning unless subjected to criticism and compared with the commercial value of other commodities—a study which has yet to be made and the materials for which, it seems, could be assembled with no great difficulty. But it is already clear and well-known that there were differences in the same market as between the various categories of slave, according to their place of origin, their sex, age, physical condition and abilities; these differences seem vast in the case of choice items, particularly females: young, handsome, talented. As a rule, whites were worth more than blacks; the ascending order of value among them, in 11th-century Spain, was: Berbers, Catalans, Galicians. At Alexandria, in the 15th century, Tartars and Circassians were prized above Greeks, Serbs and Albanians. An elementary and traditional kind of comparative psycho-physiology decides the typical qualities and defects assigned, in popular lore, to representatives of the various races and, in consequence, the functions for which they are considered best suited. Berber women, for instance, are esteemed for housework, sexual relations and childbearing; negroes are thought to be docile ("one would say they born for slavery"), robust and excellent wet-nurses; Greek women may be trusted to look after precious things; Armenian and Indian women do not take kindly to slavery and are difficult to manage.

Almost all female slaves are destined for domestic occupations, to which may be added, when they are physically attractive, the gratification of the master's pleasures. Herein indeed lies the commonest motive—lawful in Muslim eyes—for their purchase. Those of them who show an aptitude for study may be given a thorough musical or even literary education, by the slave-dealer or a rich master, and beguile by their attainments the leisure hours of high society (the slave-girl musician is called bayna).
Some again are found here and there given over to prostitution, despite the Kur'anic prohibition. Male slaves have a wider range of duties, from the beginning of their captivity. A great number form the personal bodyguards or the enormous slave-militias, black or white, frequently in rivalry, which speedily reinforce or replace the Arab, Berber and Iranian fighting-men. This military function was the chief reason for the Egyptian and North African recruitment of slaves in the land of the negroes and for the introduction into 'Irāk, by the caliphs of Bāghdād, of Turkish slaves, employed in the same way by the Šāmānids of Bukhārā (details on their formation and career in Niţām al-Mulk, Siyāsēt-nāma, ed. tr. Schefer, Paris 1891-3. 95/139 f.).

But certainly the most remarkable regime in this respect, remarkable both for the extent of the phenomenon and for the great ethnic variety of white warrior-slaves involved in it, must have been that of the Mamluks [q.v.].

Other male slaves have domestic duties—sometimes of a questionable nature—in the homes of people of moderate means, as well as in those of the great. Among them were the eunuchs who, chiefly on the model of Byzantium, filled the palaces of the caliphs, the amirs and all the nobles, at first as guardians of the kāritim. They are rarely referred to by their specific appellation of "castrate" (khiṣī) or "eunuch" (tauḏshī); they are more usually designated by a neutral term: "servant" (khādīm), or, as a mark of high honour, "master" in the sense of "teacher" (ustādī; see Canard, Histoire d'ar-Rādī, Algiers 1946, 210), which also indicates the function performed by some of them. In the early Middle Ages, the proportion of "Slaves" among the eunuchs imported and then re-exported by Muslim Spain was so high that sīkhlī (var. sīkhlī) was often used there in the sense of "eunuch" (Dozy, Suppl., i, 663).

In the 9th century, the illustrious writer al-Dāhibī states that the majority of white eunuchs in 'Irāk were 'Slaves', and in the course of the remarkable essay which he devotes to the effects of castration on men, he asserts that in these "Slaves", as opposed to the blacks, the operation encourages the development of all the natural aptitudes (al-Hayvanīn, Cairo 1938, i, 106 seqq., tr. Asin Palacios in Isis, 1930, 42-54). For the following century, interesting details are to be found in the work of the geographer Mākdisī, on the categories of eunuchs and the processes of castration (re-ed. Pellat, Algiers 1950, 56-9; see also Ibn Hawākī, i, 110). Whereas the blacks were usually submitted to a complete and barbarous amputation, "level with the abdomen", as the later expression ran, the whites, who were operated on with a little more care, retained the ability to perform coitus (this distinction is also vouched for in modern times); some of them took concubines or even wives, as the Hanafi school allowed.

Outside the house, many slaves served as assistants in business, or carried on business themselves, in accordance with their legal position, with a considerable measure of independence. Others cultivated their masters' fields. Examples are found of monumental building-works carried out by slave-labour, especially by prisoners-of-war in government service. But it must be emphasized that mediaeval Islam seems scarcely to have known the system of large-scale rural exploitation based on an immense and anonymous slave labour-force. One big attempt along these lines, carried out by the 'Abbāsīds in order to revivify the lands of 'Irāk, the centre of their empire, ended, during the second half of the 9th century, in the prolonged and terrible revolt of the Tār̄ūsī [q.v.] slaves, who had been imported from the eastern coast of Africa to bring the swamps of Lower Mesopotamia under cultivation.

The vast majority of slaves therefore escaped the system of collective forced labour, which condemns a man to one of the most distressful of all existences. This does not mean that they were one and all contented with their lot; the number of runaways, which seems very high at certain periods, would indicate the reverse. But setting aside the suffering caused by the slave traffic (all the more if castration was performed), and taking into account the general harshness of the times, the condition of the majority of slaves with their Muslim masters was tolerable and not too much at variance with the quite liberal regulations which the official morality and law had striven to establish. Despite the obvious points of inferiority, it was even known for them to attain happy and enviable positions, in material prosperity and influence, especially in rich and highly-placed families and, even more, in the immediate entourage of the sovereign. They had, in addition, the prospect of liberation, which it was not always over-bold to hope for.

This liberation, in the case of prisoners-of-war or victims of razzias by land or sea, might result from negotiations between the powers concerned: an exchange of captives or restoration in return for a ransom. History is full of such negotiations, sometimes futile, sometimes crowned with success, between Christian and Muslim states. Many were the captives ransomed, in both directions, thanks to collections of an official nature, but also more and more by ordinary individuals. In the latter case, Jews often played a useful part as go-betweens; in Spain they were sometimes referred to as "al-faqeques" (Ar. jākkāh, "liberator"). Further, great Catholic religious Orders, organized for the most part since the end of the 12th century and the beginning of the 13th, devoted themselves to succouring and ransoming their co-religionists who were captives in Muslim countries: in discharging this duty, Trinitarians and Mercedarians were to have a long and fruitful career, which their eulogists, ancient and modern, have regrettably deemed it necessary to embellish still further by means of exaggerated figures.

Also worthy of consideration, for their number and for their effects on Muslim society, were the compulsory manumissions, under the conditions imposed by the Law, of concubines who had borne children, as well as the voluntary manumissions of slaves of both sexes, especially Muslims, by their Muslim masters. Thus apostasy was rendered attractive for Christians; though not, as a rule, imposed on them, it was insistently suggested. We have already said that enfranchisement is an act of piety, widely practised; it is frequently the result of a vow or oath (conditional oath, expiration for a violated oath). The beneficiary ranks unreservedly as a free man or woman; the bond of clientship which continues to exist, and whose existence is felt, presents not so much a slight moral derogation as an inestimable advantage in the reality of a highly compact social structure. From Abbasid times onward, more than one freedman rose very high indeed in the military and political hierarchy, even to the most exalted ranks to which a free Muslim might attain. Their very names, which they continued to bear, betraying to the world their former servitude and even their irremediable condition as eunuchs (some of them commanded armies), were...
no obstacle to such a rise. In the 4th/10th century, such men as Mu‘nis in Baghdad and the negro Kaf ur in Egypt afford a remarkable illustration of the system. A number of Muslim dynasties, in Spain as well as in Egypt and the heart of Asia, have an avowedly servile origin. A Turkish “slave” dynasty reigned at Dihlī in the 13th century [see Dihlī Sultanate]. The “mamlāk” sultans of Cairo actually made such an origin a condition of coming to power, through a recognised cursus honorum [see C. Wiet, in Hanotaux, Histoire de la Nation Égyptienne, vol. iv, 1937, 395-5], still perceptible in our own days. Christendom never-by European Christendom; having almost entirely disappeared slavery on its own ground, it must have undergone no radical changes during the modern period, down to the last century. The main sources and the mediaeval rules of the slave-trade were modified only to a limited extent by the disappearance of Islam from Spain and on the foreign and domestic policies of many mediae-


B) In the Modern Period

The practice of slavery among the Muslims seems to have undergone no radical changes during the modern period, down to the last century. The main sources and the mediaeval rules of the slave-trade were modified only to a limited extent by the disappearance of Islam from Spain and on the other hand its expansion or consolidation in the Balkans, India and Indonesia. Far more considerable must have been the effect of the position adopted by European Christendom; having almost entirely suppressed slavery on its own ground, it must have ceased to contribute to the commercial supply of white human merchandise long before it adopted the worldwide policy of abolitionism, whose effects are still perceptible in our own days. Christendom nevertheless busied itself with supplying its American colonies with African negroes, thrown into cruel bondage. Among these unfortunate, Muslims seem to have been particularly numerous in Brazil, where from 1807 to 1835 they fomented the great slave revolts, rigorously quelled, which shook Bahia (on their cultural influence and their disappearance, see R. Ricard and R. Bastide, in Hesperis for 1950 and 1952 respectively). In the Mediterranean, where the corsairs and “Barbary” pirates continued such their ravages, perhaps to an even greater extent, after the establishment of Ottoman supremacy [see O. Eck, See-rauberei im Mittelmeer, Munich-Berlin 1940], the bordering Christian powers retaliated almost down to the end of the 18th century, as they had done previously, by numerous captures. In this work the Knights of Malta took an active part: during the first half of the century, they sold to the French navy the men it needed as rowers on the galleys. More than ten thousand Muslim slaves attempted a revolt on the island in 1749; Bonaparte liberated the two thousand Barbary slaves whom he found there in 1798 (see Godeschot and Emerit, in Revue Historique, 1952, 105-13).

On the lot of Christian captives or slaves in the hands of the Barbary corsairs, there is abundant European documentation; perhaps even too abundant, in view of its not being always of good quality. If Cervantes’ captivity at Tunis is a matter of pure probability and had a felicitous result on his work, that of St. Vincent de Paul at Tunis is scarcely plausible. The information provided in what might be termed the classic accounts of the subject, such as those of Friar Haedo or Father Dan (17th century, the heyday of the corsairs), must be carefully checked against other data, preferably derived, where possible, from consular archives (for all aspects of slavery at Algiers, see the solid study by H. D. de Gramont, in Revue Historique, 1884-5, to be supplemented by Venture de Paradis, ed. Fagnan, Algiers 1898, and Lespès, Alger, Paris 1930, ii, chaps. 3-5; for Tunisia, we have a judicious statement of the facts by J. Pignon in R.T., 1930; see also, as a more recent publication, García Navarro, Redenciones de cautivos en África, ed. Vasques Pajaro, Madrid 1946). It is important to distinguish particularly between slaves held to ransom, who were rich and well-treated, and the slave workers, whose widely-varying destinies might hold in store for them a bitter life in the galleys, or wretched toil in the countryside, or an often much easier life in or just outside the city. Barbary at that time abounded in “matamores” (Ar. mamlûr: “slave”) and “bagnios” (Ital. bagno: “bath”) in which the slaves were penned. The Atlantic itself was scoured by the Moroccan corsairs, from their base at Rabat-Salé (see Penz, Les captifs français du Maroc au XVIIe siècle, Rabat 1944). As in the Middle Ages, the liberationist religious Orders and the Jews took an active part in procuring releases by ransom. Renegades attained high positions in the fleet or in the army. But at the beginning of the 19th century, after a slow decline that was hastened by increased pressure on the part of the European powers, the number of Christian captives was considerably diminished. At the time of the French conquest in 1830, Algiers had no more than 2,072 slaves held to ransom, who were rich and well-treated, and the slave workers, whose widely-varying destinies might hold in store for them a bitter life in the galleys, or wretched toil in the countryside, or an often much easier life in or just outside the city. Barbary at that time abounded in “matamores” (Ar. mamlûr: “slave”) and “bagnios” (Ital. bagno: “bath”) in which the slaves were penned. The Atlantic itself was scoured by the Moroccan corsairs, from their base at Rabat-Salé (see Penz, Les captifs français du Maroc au XVIIe siècle, Rabat 1944). As in the Middle Ages, the liberationist religious Orders and the Jews took an active part in procuring releases by ransom. Renegades attained high positions in the fleet or in the army. But at the beginning of the 19th century, after a slow decline that was hastened by increased pressure on the part of the European powers, the number of Christian captives was considerably diminished. At the time of the French conquest in 1830, Algiers had no more than 2,072 as against several thousands two centuries earlier.

North Africa remained an outlet for the traffic in negroes, on the other hand, right down to the French occupation. In this traffic Morocco played a preponderant part, especially at that period in the second half of the 17th century, when the sultan Mūlib Ismā‘īl raised a veritable army of negroes and half-breeds (“abd al-Bukhrī, in consequence
of the oath they took on this collection of "authentic" traditions; see H. Terrasse, Histoire du Maroc, ii, Casablanca 1950, 256-7. Black slaves of both sexes continued to be imported into Morocco until well into the 20th century, with some pretence at secrecy since the open traffic from Timbuktu and public sale (the fairs of Sidi Ahmad u-Misik on the southern borders; at Fez and Rabat the special market was called birka, as in Tunisia) had become impossible. It should be pointed out how much their presence colours the family and social life of the cities (see R. Le Tourneau, Fes avant le Protectorat, Casablanca 1949, 200-3, with references; and, under the Protectorate, J. and J. Tharaud, Fes ou les bourgeois de l'Islam, Paris 1930, 17-43).

Towards 1810, a competent observer, Dr Louis Frank, made a special study of the importation of slaves at Tunis (L'Univers Historique, Tunis, 195 seqq.) as he had done in Egypt ten years previously under Bonaparte (his Mémoire sur le commerce des nègres au Kaire, Paris 1802). The general organization of the traffic, the focus of which was public sales, recorded in writing, was much the same in both places, with the difference that whereas Cairo was supplied solely by big caravans (two annual, one from Sennar and one from Dárfor—see also J. S. Tringham, Islam in the Sudan, Paris 1949, passim—, and one biannual, from Bornu or Fezzan), Tunis used to receive some isolated consignments, apart from one big caravan every year from Fezzan or beyond (see also J. Despois, Géographie humaine du Fezzan, Paris 1946, 357, with references): an annual total of some three thousand for Cairo and one thousand for Tunis. In the latter city the male black slaves came under the authority of the agha or chief eunuch of the bey, while the negroes had "a forewoman to rule and protect them." In Egypt, the mortality of these negroes was high; in Tunis, according to Dr. Frank, their infants survived only if they were of mixed blood (on the blacks in present-day Tunisia, see Zawadowski, in En terre d'Islam, 1942). In the time of Mohammad 'Ali, towards 1835, the Egyptian army used to make up its strength by yearly razzias from bases in Dárfor and Kordofán; it would enrol the sturdiest of the captives and hand the rest over to the inhabitants of those provinces and to the dealers, some of whom were themselves black converts to Islam (see T. F. Buxton, De la traite des esclaves en Afrique, French tr., Paris 1840, 705).

The moral and social condition of slaves in an urban environment, in the 19th century, seems to have been fairly uniform in such diverse cities as Tunis, Cairo and Mecca (a great centre for the traffic on the occasion of the annual pilgrimage). White slaves had become rare since the beginning of the century: they were expensive and in little demand except by exalted personages or rich Turks; white female slaves were preferably Caucasians, famed for their beauty. Arabia could muster a small number of Indonesians. The bulk of the slaves were black, but in the east a distinction was drawn between Ethiopians, who were paler and more highly prized, and negroes in the strict sense. Eunuchs were imported already castrated; in Mecca, the majority of them were in the service of the mosques. All the European writers lay stress on the good treatment these blacks customarily received at the hands of their town-dwelling masters, in contrast to the dreadful conditions of their capture and subsequent transportation under the lash of the Arab or Arabized slaves. They readily adopted Islam and became deeply attached to it (some even thanked God for having led them to the true Faith through their captivity: Doughty, Arabia Deserta, i, 554-5), though their new faith did not prevent them from performing their traditional songs and dances, or even their African rites of exorcism (the săr [g.v.]; see Tringham, op. cit., 174-7; similar facts in Barbary). They formed, one may say, part of the family and, especially as concubines, the slave-girls came to be of one blood with it. Enfranchisements were usual, but it was not unknown for a concubine who had borne a child to seek from her master a denial of paternity, since there were more advantages for her in remaining a slave than in marrying and running the risk of repudiation (see especially Lane, Manners and Customs, London 1835, 147, 168, 194-7; Burckhardt, Voyages en Arabie, French tr., Paris 1835, i, 251-2; Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, ii (The Hague 1889), 11-24, 132-6). It is therefore not surprising that, round about 1860, the Swiss Henry Dunant, founder of the Red Cross, who knew Tunisian society, laid great stress on the customary mildness of urban servitude among the Muslims, as compared with the methods of American slave-holders.

At the end of the 18th century, Mouradgea d'Ohsoum, to whom we owe so much of our information on the structure of the Ottoman empire, declared: "There is perhaps no nation where the captives, the slaves, the very toilers in the galleys are better provided for or treated with more kindness than among the Mohammedans" (Tableau général de l'empire ottoman, iv/1, 381).

Under the sultans of Constantinople, slavery perpetuated the mediaeval traditions of the Islamic peoples: it furnished domestics, concubines, officials and soldiers. For the use of private persons, for example, the slave-dealers (esirciler), who were under the supervision of a kâhya, had at their disposal a public building in the capital, not far from which lived the expert matrons who acted as go-betweens if the purchasers so desired. Every slave, after passing the frontier, had a document of civic status bearing his name, which remained as a title-deed in the hands of his successive owners. People of quality, who imitated the court on a reduced scale, had harims of close on a hundred slave-women. The sultan's harim numbered several hundred, classified in a strict hierarchy of five ranks, only the two highest of which (those of kadın, "lady" and, below them, of gedilik, "privileged"), were attached to the person of the sovereign. Some of the women of the highest rank were former slaves whom the sultan had freed and subsequently married informally. Although for many years none of the sultan's wives had been freeborn, these former slaves had no difficulty in wielding very great influence at court. Besides this female element, there lived at the seraglio numerous eunuchs, conventionally known as "aghas" (Turkish also uses in this sense the Arabic ḥāḏīm > hadīm). The black eunuchs, under the "agha of the girls" (ktešar ağaṣ), vied with the white eunuchs, under the "agha of the gate" (hākp ağaṣ) for precedence and power; in the upshot it was the former who carried the day. Finally we must note the importance in all public services, civil and military, of slaves of various origins, "slaves of the gate" (hākpukullar), who, often converted to Islam of their own accord and enfranchised, attained the most desirable posts. From the 15th century, when the number of white slaves brought in by war and purchase had dwindled, almost down to the middle of the 17th century, there functioned the system,
contrary to the Sacred Law, of devsirme [see Dew-
sharim], or forced enrolment of young Christians of
the empire, mainly from the Balkans, as slaves of the
government. These involuntary yet devoted servants
of the Porte used to receive a training suited to their
abilities; the most gifted would enter the palace or
the higher administration; the rest were turned over
to the navy or various military corps, including the
Janissaries, whose brilliant reputation was due to them
(see M. d'Ohsinon, op. cit., vi and vii, and
H. A. R. Gibb and H. Bowen's sold and well-
documented Islamic Society and the West, i/1, Oxford
1950, 42-4, 56-60, 73-82, 329-33).

Further east, in modern Persia, it is essentially
in the domestic form that slavery has been practised.
There one meets with the general characteristics
already noted: usually good treatment, integration
in the family, ease of enfranchisement, with some
modifications belonging to Imam Shīfī's law
(v. sufra). Seventeenth-century European travellers
were struck by the high number of eunuchs and the
power they had, both at the Şafawi court and in
the houses of the great; according to Chardin (Voy-
ages en Persé, Amsterdam 1711, ii, 283-5) there
were some 3,000 of them in the service of the sove-
reign, while the nobles and even rich private citizens
had staffs of eunuchs. The term schlīdīn (šahīn,
equivalent to fostash which we have met above). Their purchase price
was extremely high; the majority were white and
came mostly from the Malabar coast of India. In
the first half of the 19th century, under the Kadjārs,
white slaves became few and soon disappeared al-
together, except for the pretty Caucasian girls who
continued to enter the šafars; but, contrary to the
most widespread Muslim practice, their children
could not succeed to the throne, which was reserved
for sons whose mothers were of royal blood. The
numbers of the black slaves had increased; they
were either Ethiopians who had crossed Arabia, or
Zanj of east Africa, who came by way of Zanzibar,
Mascat and Bushire (on this traffic, in Arab hands,
see R. Coupland, The Exploration of East Africa,
London 1959, 136-46, with references), to draw custom
to the market of Shirās. The high mortality
which overtook these coloured men in Persia prevent-
ted their forming an important element in the popu-
lation (see Polak, Persien, Leipzig 1865, 1, 246-61,
661; E. Aubin, Le Perse d'aujourd'hui, Paris 1908, 148).

The Persians, in the course of their armed con-
flicts with the Sunni inhabitants of Turkestān, were
sometimes reduced to slavery, as being heretics.
In the middle of the 19th century, it was still possible
for so many thousands of them, prisoners of war,
to be sold at once in the market at Buḥḵarā that
prices slumped. Some of them in this same town,
having won their masters' regard and being en-
franchised, rose to every official position of honour.
Others, however, less well endowed, went from there
to swell the number of the slaves on whose shoulders
fell the greater portion of the agricultural work
in the khanate of Khīwa (see A. Vambéry, Travels
in Central Asia, London 1864, 192-3, 331, 371).

Among the relatively rare examples of an essential
agricultural task performed by a compact slave
labour-force, we may cite that of the region of Zan-
zebar itself, where, in the 19th century, there was
kept a body of blacks gathered from almost as far
as the great lakes and destined in the mass for ex-
port. The harsh life of toil in the sugar- or clove-
plantations, run by Arab or Indian planters, all
along the coast, was quite devoid of the amenities
of urban servitude. The lot of thousands of slaves
employed in pearl-fishing in the Persian Gulf also
seems to have been a very harsh one over a long
period.

Much less burdensome, certainly, but wildly dis-
criminatory, is the slavery which still obtains today
in the desert: in the Sahara on the one hand, in Arabia
on the other, for the benefit of the nomad tribes.
Tuareg society, divided into three rigid castes, used
to keep on the lowest level, beneath the nobles and
their vassals, the slave-groups (akli, pi. ikli), en-
franchised or not, almost all of them black, who were
utilized by the dominant clans either as tillers of the
soil or as servants to men and beasts. Among
the beduin of the Arabian peninsula and its fringes (see
especially A. Jausen, Coutumes des Arabes au pays
de Mosab, Paris 1908, 26, 60-1, 125-6; A. Musil, The
Manners and Customs of the Rwala Bedouns,
New York 1928, 276-8), black slaves may intermarry
and acquire property, but however intimate they
may be with the master and his family, however
great the advantages custom permits them to enjoy,
they are never regarded as equals, even after en-
franchisement: they are 'abīd, and 'abdī they remain;
and marriage with the sons or daughters of them is
considered a come-down, by the lowest of whites.

Abolition

Although Islam, in teaching and in actuality, has
favoured the emancipation of slaves, it was only
under an overwhelming foreign influence that it
began, about a hundred years ago, an evolutionary
in doctrine and in practice towards the total suppression
of slavery, its abolition in law and custom. This
evolution, which has continued, is in some regions
still incomplete. Here we have one of the most typical
examples of the transformation that the Muslim
world has undergone, through European pressure
or example, from the mid-19th century down to
our own day.

The European powers concerned were themselves,
to some extent, novices in this field: they had long
favoured the traffic and maintained slavery in their
colonies. One of them, Russia, had maintained serf-
dom on her own soil. The French "philosophers"
of the 18th century, beginning with Montesquieu,
had condemned the very principle of slavery; its
short-lived suppression under the First Republic
was unfortunately a check. But, from 1806 onward,
Britain took the lead in the movement for the
suppression of the slave-trade and then of slavery
itself. She may be accused of having more than once
let her maritime and colonial interests dictate her
interventionary zeal or, on other occasions, the mild-
ness of her actions. Yet, when all is said, she stands
out as a great pioneer of abolition over the whole
surface of the earth, including the lands of Islam.

The diplomatic history of the 19th century, since
1814-15, is dotted with treaties and other inter-
national agreements aimed at banning the traffic
in negroes, by sea and across the continent of Africa,
in increasingly precise terms. The suppression
of slavery as such is mentioned only towards the end
of the century, and then timidly. But measures in
this direction had already been adopted in several
portions of the Muslim world, particularly those
under the authority of European states. Britain,
having emancipated the slaves in her colonies by
the famous Bill of 28 Aug. 1833, made in 1843 the first general decision to abolish slavery in India (completed by a series of other Acts down to 1862). France completely abolished slavery in all her overseas territories, including Algeria, by a decree of the Second Republic on 27 April 1848; the Netherlands did the same for their Indonesian possessions by the laws of 1854-59, with effect from 1 Jan. 1860 (3 years before their colonies in the West Indies); and Russia for her Central Asian dependencies on 3 June (O.S.) 1873, before even having completed the conquest of Turkestan.

Parallel with this direct and radical action by the Powers, the Muslim states which, while remaining independent, were most subject to Western pressure and had most contacts with European civilization, were slowly and cautiously embarking on restrictive measures. As early as 1830, the Ottoman sultan had enfranchised en bloc those white slaves of Christian origin who remained true to their religion, while expressly keeping the Muslims in slavery (G. Young, Corps de droit ottoman, ii, Oxford 1905, 171-2). To Tunisia belongs the honour of having been the first to promulgate a general edict of emancipation for black slaves (ipso facto, of Muslim slaves: there were practically no white slaves in the Regency). By a decree of 23 Jan. 1846, the bey Ahmad ordered that letters of enfranchisement should be granted to every slave who so wished, and that every instance of slavery of which the religious magistrates might be apprised should be referred to him. The preamble to this decision, which was approved by the two highest dignitaries of the Hanafi and Mālikī rites in the country, is worth dwelling on: in it, slavery is declared to be lawful in principle but regrettable in its consequences. Of the three considerations particularized, two are of a religious nature, the third political (maslaha siyāsīyya): the initial enslaving of the people concerned comes under suspicion of illegality by reason of the present-day expression of Islam in their countries; masters no longer comply with the rules of good treatment which regulate their rights and shelter them from wrong-doing. It is therefore befitting to avoid the risk of seeing unhappy slaves seeking the protection of foreign authorities (M. Bompard, Législation de la Tunisie, 398; Arabic text in Sanbū, Mādīmādī al-Kawānin al-Tamāyyyya, fasc. 1, p. 4).

Thirty years later, in the treaty concluded with England on 19 July 1875, the bey Muḥammad al-Ṣādirāk undertook not only to see that the decree of 1846 was given full effect, but also to do everything in his power to suppress slavery and punish any infraction. Under the French protectorate, various Tunisian ministerial circulars (1887-91) and the bey's decree of 28 May 1890 completed the formal prohibition of slavery in the Regency and the organization of the freeing of black slaves on the judicial and administrative plains (M. Bompard, op. cit., 472; P. Zéys, Code annoté de la Tunisie, i, 384-6).

At Istanbul, the first imperial firmāns against the slave-trade date from the period of the Tanẓimāt, under ʿAbd al-Majīd, and especially from the years of close understanding with France and Great Britain: Oct. 1854 for the whites, Feb. 1857 for the blacks (a religiously-inspired reservation exempted the Ḥidżār from the reform). How little effect these documents had at first in preventing the import of blacks, is apparent from the multiplicity of decisions of the same sort, the circulars and instructions which continued to repeat one another,
East Africa and its Invaders, Oxford 1938; idem, The Exploitation of East Africa, London 1939); if this did not stop it immediately, it was at any rate a considerable embarrassment for the trade. Next, under the British protectorate, a decree of the sultan in 1897 granted their freedom to any slaves who should ask for it, and forbade the courts to concede the claims of slave-owners. On 6 July 1909, a final decree abolished the status of slave in its entirety. The same thing had happened two years before in British East Africa (now the Tanzanian Ujamaa), against an indemnity to be paid to the owners (the matter was settled in 1916).

It is safe to say that, towards the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th, the export of negroes was at a very low ebb. We may add that Persia, one of the receiving countries, had also publicly renounced this trade in her 1882 treaty with England, and her newly-created National Assembly adopted in Oct. 1909 a "fundamental law" in favour of individual freedom (E. Aubin, La Perse d'aujourd'hui, Paris 1908, 210); if slavery was not suppressed by these measures, it did suffer a severe blow. In Africa itself, the greater part of the vast zone where in the Muslim slaver held sway, extending from the Atlantic to Wadai, east of Lake Chad, was conquered piecemeal and occupied by France; this has been followed by the almost complete disappearance of the slave-trade from this immense area and slavery has been abolished almost everywhere within it.

Italy, the latest comer of the colonial powers, conducted an identical policy in the territories she administered in the east (Somaliland, Eritrea) and north (Tripolitania, Cyrenaica) of the continent. But the last independent Fattah, of the holy land, was one which was conquered and governed by a Christian dynasty, remained (despite the negus's edicts against the traffic) a notable stronghold of the slaves, facing the Sudan and exporting whenever possible; in the provinces, islamization and the intensification of the slave trade often went hand in hand (Tringham, Islam in Ethiopia, Oxford 1952, 203-4 and passim). During the 1914-18 war, the relinquishment of Fezzan by the Italians, who had just taken it from the Turks, and its occupation by the Sanûsî, allowed the traffic to resume much of its activity: a slavemarket was held every week at Murzûk (Petragnani, in L'Afrique française, Feb. 1921, tr. in L'Afrique française, April 1922).

At the end of the first world war, when the victors had visions of organizing the peace and of securing, in accordance with their Convention of St. Germain of 10 Sept. 1919, "the complete suppression of slavery in all its forms", long experience gave them advance information on the problems that were bound to be raised by a task of this nature; on the successes that might be hoped for and the resistance that might be expected in Muslim lands. The suppression of the traffic, which had become for the most part clandestine, was a troublesome affair, demanding the use of powerful forces and involving, by sea, the risk of provoking legal conflict between nations (France and Great Britain, 1905, in the Indian Ocean). Yet making an end of the trade does not mean putting a stop to slavery or to the transfer of slaves from one owner to another. As for official abolition, it is not always easy to secure under a protectorate; nor is it always equivalent in practice to positive and immediate suppression.

The fact is that, if slavery is such a firmly-rooted institution in certain Islamic countries, it is due far more to social conservatism than to a collective economic need. We established above that the part played by slave-labour in those lands is rarely essential for productive work. This explains why an abolitionist policy, so long as it is not applied too high-handedly, provokes no serious disturbance there, nor any violent reaction. The prevailing wish in the minds of slave-owners is to enjoy the comfort afforded by having a large domestic staff, kept under strict control; from which, moreover, lawful concubines may be recruited. They have on their side not only the tacit consent of the majority of their slaves but also an extensive public opinion and the religious tradition of Islam. The domestic slave is in his master's power through fear and respect, through self-interest, through affection. We must bear in mind that he is generally well-treated; we may reflect that he lives in a family atmosphere, without thought for the morrow. To the slave-woman, concubinage offers, besides various advantages for herself and her children, the chance of an ascent in the social scale, of which an untimely emancipation would rob her. Even when freed, the slave is often likely to remain close to his master. If he has procured his freedom against the latter's wishes, or if he has been snatched from the claws of the slave, he is woefully without resources in a hostile environment, unless his benefits by the special measures which governments ought to take—and which they have occasionally taken—with a view to his social readjustment.

The fact, brought out in the Kur'ân, that slavery is in principle lawful, satisfies religious scruples. Total abolition might even seem a reprehensible innovation, contrary to the letter of the holy Book and the exemplary practice of the Prophet. Nevertheless, contact with the realities of the modern world and its ideology began to bring about a discernible evolution in the thought of many educated Muslims before the end of the 19th century. They may be fond of emphasizing that Islam has, on the whole, bestowed an exceptionally favourable lot on the victims of slavery. Yet they are ready to see that this institution, which is linked to one particular economic and social stage, has had its day. The reformer Sayyid Ahmad Khán in India, goes so far as to maintain, in a special work, Ibâlí-i Qulâmi, which appeared in 1893, translated into Arabic in 1895, that the Kur'ân (xili, 4) forbade the making of new slaves (Baljon, The Reforms . . . of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khán, Leiden 1949, 28-29). Without going so far, his illustrious compatriot Ameer Ali (The Spirit of Islam, London, 1st ed. 1893; ed. 1935, 262) includes slavery among the preislamic practices which Islam only tolerated through temporary necessity, while virtually abolishing them: man-made laws were later to complete the abrogation of it, which could not have been done formerly by a sudden and total emancipation (cf. the Egyptian Chafik, on much the same lines: L'esclavage au point de vue musulman, Cairo 1891, 2nd ed. 1938). This thesis gradually found its way, to a varying extent, into the circle of the wulâm (for the school of Muhammad 'Abduh, see Tafsîr al-Mandar, xi, 288 ff.), already open to the older arguments of the Tunisian muftis, which were more restrained and more legalistic. But obviously it could not gain the support of the Wahhâbs of Arabia, those uncompromising restorers of the sunna of the Prophet; up to the present day they have vigorously maintained their downright antagonism towards abolition.

The League of Nations, from the very outset of its work, displayed an active interest in all problems
relating to slavery. This interest was notably expressed in the adoption of the international Geneva Convention of 23 Sept. 1926, in which the legal definition of slavery is formulated ("status or condition of a person over whom any or all of the powers attaching to the right of ownership are exercised"), which squares with the concepts of Muslim law and the signatories pledge themselves "to bring about, progressively and as soon as possible, the complete abolition of slavery". One by one, almost all the States concerned adhered to this Convention, but not Saudi Arabia or the Yaman. From then on, a consultative committee of experts worked indefatigably, gathering official returns (some of which, furnished mainly by the British and Italian governments, are highly instructive) and publishing copious reports. Legal measures multiplied, independently of this international organization as well as under its aegis. Abolition came as a matter of course in the new Turkish Republic, which repudiated every trace of Muslim law, as in the Levant territories severed from the old Ottoman empire and directly administered by France or Great Britain. In Egypt, the 1923 Constitution confirmed the guarantee of individual liberty. One after another, Afghanistan (1923, 1931), 'Irāk (1924), Kalāt (1926), Persia [Iran] and Transjordan (1929) suppressed the legal status of slave. Bahrayn followed suit in 1937.

In Africa, an order of 1922, coupled with penal sanctions in 1930, abolished slavery in Tanganyika (the former German East Africa) under British mandate; the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan took steps, as far-sighted as they were vigorous, to put an end by degrees to the vestiges of the traffic and to assist freed slaves. In Northern Nigeria, under British administration, abolition, which began in 1907 and suffered a momentary check towards 1933 from a new offensive on the part of the trade, was accomplished by an order of 1936. In Morocco, a circular from the French Protectorate administration in 1922 suppressed public slave-dealing and granted their liberty (v. H. Ingrams, *Arabia and the Isles*, London 1942, 349-50; and U. N. Economic and Social Council, *Official Records*, Sept. 1951, 644).

Under cover of the second World War (1939-45) there seems to have been some retrogression, with a small-scale resumption of the trade, particularly in certain Ethiopian provinces. At the time of writing, it is usually acknowledged that there is practically no transport of slaves any longer from Africa to Arabia. Nevertheless the legal status of slave persists in the peninsula. It is evidently the example of the neighbouring independent states of Saudi Arabia and the Yaman that prevents Britain from increasing her pressure on the states under her control with a view to total abolition. Other considerations, no doubt, keep France from having slavery abolished by law in Morocco, where there are in any case only mild survivals in the cities or the southern oases (see, for the bend of the Dra, Dj. Jacques-Meunie, in *Hesperis* 1947, 451-2; persistence to a final solution does not come from the class of 'ulamā' (for the present-day legal aspect, see *Gazette des Tribunaux du Maroc*, 1944, 5-7; and *Revue Marocaine de Droit*, 1952, 154-5; 183-5). In the Sahara, the French administration which as early as 1916 deprived the Tuareg of their agricultural slaves, took their house slaves away from them in 1946 (R. Capot-Rey, *Le Sahara français*, Paris 1953, 288-9). The United Kingdom of Libya (a former Italian possession), in its constitution of Oct. 1951, laid down as a principle the personal liberty of its subjects.

The United Nations Organization (U.N.O.), the moral heir of the League of Nations, has resumed the study of slavery and has condemned it, in no uncertain terms, in its "Universal Declaration of Human Rights", voted by the General Assembly on 10 Dec. 1948 (though not ratified by every State): "Art. 4. No one shall be held in slavery or servitude. Slavery and the slave trade are prohibited in all their forms". An ad hoc Committee on Slavery, under the Economic and Social Council, is proceeding with enquiries by means of questionnaires addressed to governments and recognized associations (Saudi Arabia and the Yaman, both members of U.N.O., have not replied) and is proposing concerted solutions. Its Report of 4 May 1951 (ref. E./1988) advocates making a start by abolishing the legal status of slave and demands that every State concerned should assist emancipated slaves to fashion a new life for themselves. As yet no resolution has been passed by the United Nations, who are divided on this point as on so many others and are far more preoccupied with the serious forms of servitude which continue to exist, or have come into existence in the world of today, than with the last vestiges of Muslim slavery, which are doubtless bound to disappear quietly in the reasonably near future.
"ABD ALLĀH B. AL-‘ABBĀS


‘ABD ALLĀH B. AL-‘ABBĀS (frequently Ibn ‘Abbās, without the article), Abū ‘Abbās, called al-Ḫāṭīb ‘the doctor’ or al-Bahr ‘the sea’, because of his doctrine, is considered one of the greatest scholars, if not the greatest, of the first generation of Muslims. He was the father of Kur'ānic exegesis; at a time when it was necessary to bring the Kur'ān into accord with the new demands of a society which had undergone a profound transformation, he appears to have been extremely skilful in accomplishing this task.

He was born three years before the hijra, when the Hashimite family was living shut up in ‘the Ravine’ (al-Shb‘), and, as his mother had become a Muslim before the hijra, he also was regarded as a Muslim.

From his youth he showed a strong inclination towards accurate scholarly research, in so far as such a conception was possible at that time. We know indeed that the desire to gather information concerning the Prophet by questioning his Companions. While still young, he became a master, around whom thronged people desirous to learn. Proud of his knowledge, which was not based only on memory, but also on a large collection of written notes, he gave public lectures, or rather classes, keeping to a sort of programme, on different subjects: interpretation of the Kur'ān, judicial questions, Muhammad’s expeditions, pre-Islamic history, ancient poetry. It is because of his habit of quoting lines in support of his explanations of phrases or words of the Kur'ān that ancient Arabic poetry acquired, for Muslim scholars, its acknowledged importance. His competence having been recognized, he was asked for fatwas (especially famous is his authorization of mu′a marriage, which he later had to vindicate). The Kur'ānic explanations of Ibn ‘Abbās were soon brought together in special collections, of which the isnāḏs go back to one of his immediate pupils (Fīhris, 33); his fatwas were also collected; today there exist numerous manuscripts and several editions of a taṣfīr or taṣfīrīs which are attributed to him (whether rightly or wrongly cannot be said, as no study of this material has yet been made (Goldzihner, Richtungen, 76; cf. also Brockelmann, i, 190, S i, 331).

The importance of the role played by Ibn ‘Abbās in the political and military events of his time should not be exaggerated, as his Muslim biographers have tended to do, influenced by the fact that he was the grandfather of the ‘Abbāskuds. He followed the Muslim armies in several campaigns: into Egypt (between 18 and 21 H.), into Ifriqiya (27 H.), into Dişrāǧān and Tabārisṭān (30 H.), and, much later (49 H.), he accompanied Yazīd on his expedition against Constantinople (with ‘Abd Allāh b. Umar b. al-Khaṭāb). At the battles of the Camel (36 H.) and of Sīfīn (37 H.), he commanded a wing of ‘All’s troops. For want of resounding exploits and important offices to record, Ibn ‘Abbās is presented to us later, by his biographers, as a counsellor whom the caliphs ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān valued highly, and as a counsellor too—unfortunately little heeded—of ‘All and his son al-Ḥusayn. The truth is that Ibn ‘Abbās did not enter political life until after ‘All came to power, and took an active part in it for only three or four years. A single official mission had been, in fact, entrusted to him by ‘Uthmān, that of conducting the pilgrimage to Mecca the year the caliph was besieged in his house at Medina. It was for this reason that Ibn ‘Abbās was not in the capital at the time of the assassination of ‘Uthmān. When he returned some days later, he paid homage to ‘All. From that time he was charged with important missions and, after the occupation of Baṣra (36 H.), appointed governor of that town. He was one of the signatories of the convention of Sīfīn (37 H.), which handed over to two arbitrators the task of settling the quarrel between ‘All and Mu‘āwiya, and in a discussion with the Ḥarrātīs (see Ḥarrātī) he pleaded in support of the legal validity of that arbitration. But the relations between Ibn ‘Abbās and the caliph rapidly became strained, with the result that Ibn ‘Abbās withdrew to Mecca, abandoning his seat of government, and that ‘All no longer regarded him as his representative at Baṣra. The sources assign different dates to this defection of Ibn ‘Abbās: 38, 39, 40, but there is good reason to believe that it took place in 38 H. (it is possible to follow the movements of Ibn ‘Abbās during that year, and in the succeeding years he no longer appears in the foreground). The traditions which assert that Ibn ‘Abbās was consistently faithful until the death of the caliph are not worthy of credence. What were the reasons for the defection? Some Arabic sources say that Ibn ‘Abbās took offence because ‘All reproached him for defalcations which he was alleged to have committed as governor; but the true motive of his relinquishment of office, which coincided with that of many other supporters of ‘All, has to be related to other much more important events of the period: the massacre of the Ḥarrātīs at al-Nahrawān, which Ibn ‘Abbās, ‘according to certain men’, had stigmatised, and the false position of ‘Ali, who maintained his claim to be caliph when, according to the verdict of the arbitrators, he was no longer recognized as such by the majority of Muslims.

Later, Ibn ‘Abbās took a step which one might be tempted to judge severely, were it not that the precise circumstances are completely unknown: he carried off the provincial funds of Baṣra, probably when he returned to the town some time after his defection. Was this seizure criminal? When one observes that this act did not diminish the esteem in which Ibn ‘Abbās was held by the Muslim community, one may suppose that there were some fairly valid motives to justify it. Similarly, the events in which Ibn ‘Abbās was involved immediately after the death of ‘All are far from clear. Al-Ḫasan appointed him general of his troops, but Ibn ‘Abbās established contact with Mu‘āwiya: whether on his own initiative or at the invitation of al-Ḫasan is obscure; perhaps it was he who successfully brought about the agreement between the two claimants to the Caliphate; he maintained that, as a reward for his good offices, Mu‘āwiya had recognized his right to appropriate the money which he had seized (part
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of the treasury of Basra). All these machinations of Ibn 'Abbās seemed to certain rā‘īs incompatibility with the dignity of such a personage; and so they transferred them, obviously wrongly, to his brother, ʿUbayd Allāh. During the long reign of Muʿawiyah, Ibn 'Abbās lived in the Ḥijāz; he went fairly frequently to the Damascus court, mainly, it seems, to defend the interests of the Ḥāghimites, which were also his own.

The troubled events of the years which followed the deaths of the first and second Umayyads brought Ibn 'Abbās once again, perhaps against his will, on to the political scene. Although the information which we possess is fragmentary, it can be deduced from it that ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr, having raised the standard of revolt at Mecca, became violently incensed with Ibn 'Abbās who, with the son of Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya, refused to recognise him as caliph. Both were banished from Mecca; in 64, the year of the siege of the town, they returned, but they persisted in their opposition to Ibn al-Zubayr, with unfortunate results: they were imprisoned. Al-Mukhtar, informed of their dangerous situation, sent from Kufa a large troop of horse, which delivered them by a surprise attack. It was thanks to Ibn 'Abbās that on that occasion bloodshed was avoided in the holy city. Under the protection of this troop, which Muslims of all periods have shown him. But the portrait sketched by Lammens.

Both were banished from Mecca; in 64, the year of the siege of the town, they returned, but they persisted in their opposition to Ibn al-Zubayr, with unfortunate results: they were imprisoned. Al-Mukhtar, informed of their dangerous situation, sent from Kufa a large troop of horse, which delivered them by a surprise attack. It was thanks to Ibn 'Abbās that on that occasion bloodshed was avoided in the holy city. Under the protection of this troop, which Muslims of all periods have shown him. But the portrait sketched by Lammens.

The verdicts which Caetani and Lammens have given on Ibn 'Abbās are in contrast to the respect which Muslims of all periods have shown him. But Caetani's arguments can easily be disproved by fair and careful criticism (it is especially important not to confuse accounts from Muslim biblical history with the kadīfl concerning the Prophet), and grave doubts can be cast on the resemblance to the original of the portrait sketched by Lammens.

Bibliography: Biographies by Arab authors (numerous, but often repeat the same information, and mainly concerned with Ibn 'Abbās's scholarly activity): Ibn Sa'd, ii/2, 119-23, 125; iv/2, 4; v, 74-5, 216-7, 231 and Index; Bahāḥ, Anābī, ms. Paris, 64°, 714v-731v; 448v-454v; 723; Kashshāf, Muṣafrāt Abārār Al-Ridāl, Bombay n.d. 36-42; Ibn al-ʿAṯīr, Usd, Cairo 1280-6, ii, 192-5; Sibīt, Ibn al-Dāwīzī, Mirāt al-Zamān, ms. Paris Ar. 6131, f. 187v-190v; Ḍabbālī, Muṣafrāt al-Kurrā, ms. Paris Anc. F. 742 = Cat. 2084, f. 5v-6; Ibn ḤāḍJR, Isāba, Calcutta 1946-53, ii, 502-15, no. 5149; id., Tahdīth al-Tahdīth, Hyde-}

 shortcuts in his Memoirs, in which he mentions he established himself in that town and earned his living in many different ways. He acted as an interpreter, gave lessons in Malay, wrote letters, and assisted the American missionaries North, Keasberry and others in translating mission books and school books.

In 1838 was published at Singapore under the title Bahawa in Kestah Pā-layar-an Abdullāh, ibn Abdul-kadhir, Munsfji, de P Singapura ka-Kalantan, a description of a journey to the Malay States on the east coast of the Peninsula of Malacca, giving most important information concerning them. This book inaugurated a new and free Malay prose style; its author may be considered a pioneer of the literary movement which, continued by authors of the 20th century, ultimately led to the development of Malay into the national language of Indonesia.

'Abd Allāh's principal work is the Hikayat Ab-}

dullah, his Memoirs, in which inter alia he mentions politically important personages, such as Farquhar and Raffles (whose secretary he was), and emphasizes the advantages of a European administration over an Indian one, even though he at the same time sharply criticizes the administrative measures of the English and Dutch. The work was finished in 1843 and lithographed with a few additions in 1849. Some copies of this first edition have an English dedication to Governor Butterworth, in which the work is called a "humble attempt to revive Malay literature". In his Memoirs 'Abd Allāh mentions several works written by him. Among these is a poem describing a fire in Singapore, in which the author lost all his possessions. It was entitled Shaīr Singapura dimakan api and printed in Malay as well as in Latin characters (1843). The Ms. described in the catalogues under this title do not contain this
poem, but a similar one, entitled Sha'ir Kampung Gelam terbakar, published after a fire in 1847.

The periodical Čermin Mata contains some contributions by Abd Allah. He died in 1854 during a pilgrimage to Mecca, shortly after his arrival in that city. The notes of his voyage as far as Djjidda are preserved in Čermin Mata.

Besides these original works Abd Allah translated the Tamil redaction of Panatantara (a collection of Indian fables) into Malay under the title of Hikayat Pandja Tanđaran, and edited the Malay Chronicles (Sedjarah Melayu).


(C. A. van Ophuysen—P. Voorhoeve)

'ABD ALLAH b. 'ABD AL-MALIK b. MARWÂN, son of the caliph 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwân (q.v.), was born about the year 60/680-1, perhaps somewhat earlier, as he is said to have been 27 years old in the year 85/704. He grew up in Damascus and accompanied his father in several campaigns. We first meet him as an independent general in the year 81/701-2, in one of the usual razzias against the Eastern Romans. Then in the year 82/702-1, he was sent with Muḥammad b. Marwân to help al-Ḥadijdâdi against al-Ăsh'âth and played a part in the negotiations of Dayr al-Djamādîm. Thereupon he again led expeditions against the Eastern Romans, and in the year 81/702-3 conquered al- Masâṣâ, which he converted into a military camp. After the death of his uncle 'Abd al-Ăazîz b. Marwân, he was appointed governor of Egypt in the year 85/704. On 11 Djamâdî II he made his entry into Fustât. He was to wipe out all traces of 'Abd al-Ăazîz, and therefore changed all the officials. His administration left a bad record in the tradition, because he accepted bribes and embezzled public monies. The only really important achievement of his rule was the introduction of the Arab language into the diwans of the capital. His administration gave o- fience in Damascus; in the year 88/706-7 he made there a passing visit, and in 90/708-9 he was defi- nitely recalled. He departed to Syria with many presents, but they were taken from him in the pro- vince of al-Urdunn by order of the caliph. Thereupon he disappeared from the political arena. Only al-Yaşûbi has the information that he was executed when the 'Abbâsids came to power. He is said to have been crucified by al-Salîfî in the year 132/- 749-50 in al-Hîrâ.


(C. H. Becker)

'ABD ALLAH b. 'ABD AL-MUTTA'LÎB of B. Hâshîm of Kûraysh, father of the prophet Muhammad. The earliest and most reliable sources give little information about him. His mother was Fâţima bint 'Amr of B. Mâkhzûm. Al-Kâlîb places his birth in the 24th year of the reign of Anûshîrwan (554), but he is usually said to have been twenty- five when he died (570). According to a well- known story, picturesque but probably with little factual basis, 'Abd al-Muttablîb vowed that, if he had ten sons who reached maturity, he would sac- rifice one; he attained this and selected 'Abd Allah by lot, but eventually sacrificed 100 camels instead. His marriage to Âmina bint Wâbî has been much embellished in legend. It may have marked an alliance between 'Abd al-Muttablîb and Âmina's clan, B. Zuhra, as he himself married a woman of this clan at the same time. During a trading expedition 'Abd Allah fell ill and died at Medina among the clan of his father's mother, B. Âdî b. al-Nadîdâr, being buried in Dâr al-Nâbiga. His death took place either shortly before Muhammad's birth or a few months after; the word "orphan" in K. xcvii, 6, doubtless refers to Muhammad's early loss of his parents.

Bibliography: Ibn Highâm, 97-102; Ibn Sâ'd, i,1, 53-61; Ţabari, i, 967, 979-80, 1074-51; Caetani, Annaî, i, 65-7, 118-20. (W. Montgomery-Watt)

'ABD ALLAH b. 'ABI ISHâK AL-HADRAMI, grammarian and Qur'an-reader from Bâcia, died in 1177/735-6. His "exceptional" (şâdhik) reading continued the tradition of Ibn 'Abbas and, in turn, influenced the readings of 'Isâ b. 'Umar al-Thâkafi and of Abû 'Amr al-Âlî. It seems now established that he was the earliest of the real Arab grammarians (cf. Ibrahim Mustafa, Actes du XXI Conr/es des Orient., 278-9). He is said to have extended the use of inductive reasoning (khdâb) and the detail is handed down in this case. The fact that he the title is handed down, but in that case he opted for the accusative (mâshî). Nothing else is known about him beyond the facts that, being of
non-Arabic origin himself, he felt some hostility towards the Arabs, and that he was the object of a stinging riposte by al-Farazdaq, whose mistakes must have pointed out.

Bibliography: The fundamental passage of al-Djamal, Tahdæ, ed. Heli, 6-8 is partly reproduced by Ibn Kutayba, Sähr, 25; Zubaydi, Tahdök, ed. Krenkow in RSO, 1919, 117; Sirâfî, Akbîr al-Nahwîyyin, ed. Krenkow, 25-28; Anbârî, Nûh, 22-25; Ibn al-Djazari, Kurâr, no. 1747; Suyûtî, Muṣâr, ii, 247; G. Flügel, Gramm. Schule, 29; cf. also Fihrist, 9, 30, 41, 42; Aqødî, i, xi, 106. (Ch. Pellat)

'Abd Allâh b. Ahmad [see Sunûd].

'Abd Allâh b. 'Ali, uncle of the caliphs Abu l-'Abbâs al-Saffâî and Abu Dja far al-Mansûr. 'Abd Allâh was one of the most active participants in the struggle of the 'Abbâsîds against the last Umayyad caliph Marwân II. He was commander-in-chief in the decisive battle at the Greater Zâb, where Marwân lost his crown, and when the latter took to flight, 'Abd Allâh pursued him, quickly captured Damascus and marched on to Palestine, whence he had the furtive caliph pursued to Egypt. He was even more implacable than his brother Dâ'îd b. 'Ali in waging war on the members of the Umayyad house, and shrank from no method to exterminate them root and branch. During his stay in Palestine, he had about eighty of them murdered at one time. Such cruelties naturally caused ill-will against the Muslims and was the object of such cruelties naturally caused ill-will against the Muslims and was the object of the Meccans and Asârî, he returned to Basra, leaving the government of Khurasan in the hands of deputies. In 35/656 he attempted in vain to support Uthmân, and subsequently assisted A父子, Talba and al-Zubayr in organizing the resistance to 'Ali at Basra. After their defeat in the Battle of the Camel he took refuge with the Banû Hûrkus and made his way to Damascus, where he joined Mu'awîya. In 41/661 he was one of Mu'awîya's delegates to treat with al-Hasan b. 'Ali, and at the end of the same year he was re-appointed to the governorship of Basra. In 42-43/662-4 his lieutenants reconquered Khurasan and Sicily, which had been lost to the Arabs during the civil war, and an expedition was sent into Sind. But his lenience towards the tribesmen appeared too dangerous to Mu'awîya, who replaced him in 44/664 by a more energetic governor; thereafter Ibn 'Amîr appears to have lived in retirement until his death at Mecca in 50/668, or in 57 or 58.

'Abd Allâh b. 'Amîr was celebrated not only for his military abilities, but also for his generosity and other personal and especially for his many public works. Among these were the construction of two canals at Basra and the canal of Ubulla, plantations in al-Nîhâdî and Kâratayn, and improved water supplies for the pilgrims at 'Arafah.

Bibliography: Tabari, index; Ibn Sa'd, v, 30-5; Yaḳûbî, ii, 191-5, etc.; id., Buldûn, index; Baladûrî, Futâh, 51, 315 ff.; id., Ansâb, v, index; Mub. b. Habîb, al-Muâsîd, 150; Aqødî, index; Ta'risî, Istidân, 79 ff., 90-1; Ibn al-Ahîr, Usd, iii, 197-2; Caetani, Annali, vii, Chronographia, 629-30; B. Spuler, Iran in frühislamischer Zeit, Wiesbaden 1923, 17 ff.; J. Walker, Catalogue of the Arab-Sassanian Coins (in the B.M.), London 1941, index. (H. A. R. Gibb)

'Abd Allâh b. 'Ulluggin b. Badîs b. Habîb b. Zîlî, third and last ruler of the kingdom of Granada, of the Sinâhâdî Berber family of the Banû Zîlî [see Sâhâdî of Spain]. Born in 447/1056, he was appointed at the death of his father Buluggîn Sayf al-Dawla, in 456/1064, as the presumptive heir of his grandfather Badîs b. Habîb. He succeeded him on the throne of Granada, while his brother Tamîl b. Mu'izz became independent ruler of Mallaga. His reign consisted of a long series of troubles inside his kingdom, of armed conflicts with his Muslim neighbours, and of compromises with Alfonso VI, king of Castile. At the time of the Almoravid intervention in Spain he took part in the battles of al-Zallâkâ (q.v.) and Aledo, but his negotiation with the Christian king soon cost him his throne. He was besieged in his capital in 483/1090 by Yûsuf b. Tâshûfîn, was dethroned and sent into Mediterraneo, Rome 1923, under the relevant years; S. Moscati, Le massacre des Umayyades, in Archiv Orientalî, 1950, 88-115. (K. V. Zetterstén—S. Moscati)
forced residence in Aghmat, in Southern Morocco, where he ended his days.

It was during his exile in Morocco that `Abd Allah composed his "Memoirs", the almost complete text of which was found by the author of the present article in successive fragments, at intervals of several years, in the library of the Diámi al-Karawaiyín in Fes. This autobiography, called al-Tibydn 'an al-kádháka al-há'íma bi-biídálit Bani Zirí ji jírmána, is the most considerable and the least deformed document on the history of Spain in the second half of the 6th century. In spite of menacing his kingdom, these "Memoirs" give a very detailed chronicle of all the events that led in 478/1085 to the taking of Toledo by Alfonso VI, and, in the next year, to the arrival of the Almoravids in the Peninsula. At the same time it is a psychological document of the first order, that mirrors, much better than the chronicles of the Andalusi fašeji, the state of social and political decomposition in which Muslim Spain was found at the end of the 11th century, and the progress made by that time by the efforts of the Reconquesta. The account of the events prior to the reign of the author is also new and important. The "Memoirs" of `Abd Allah must be considered as the guiding thread that allows us to find our bearings through the maze of the history of Muslim Spain at the moment it was about to fall into the power of the North African dynasties.

Several fragments of the Tibydn were published, with an annotated translation by the author of this article, in And., 1935, 233-344; 1936, 29-145; 1941, 231-93. The whole of the Arabic text, now recovered, will be published soon. A Spanish translation, made by E. Lévi-Provençal and E. García Gómez (Las "Memorias" de `Abd Allah, último rey ziri de Granada) is due to be published in 1953.

Bibliography: The biographical articles about `Abd Allah by Ibn Idrísh and Ibn al-Khathib have been reproduced in And., 1936, 124-7; see also Ibn al-Khathib, A'mál al-A'Tám (Lévi-Provençal), 268-70; Nasb al-Qdásí (Lévi-Provençal), 93-4; R. Menéndez Pidal, La España del Cid 4, Madrid 1947, indices; idem, Leyendo las "Memorias" del rey ziri `Abd Allah, And. 1944, 1-8; E. Lévi-Provençal, Esp. Mús., iv (E. Lévi-Provençal).

`ABD ALLAH B. DJARÁF b. ABI TALIN, nephew of the caliph 'All. `Abd Allah's father had gone over to Islam very early, and took part in the emigration of the first believers to Abyssinia, where, according to the common belief, `Abd Allah was born. On his mother's side he was a brother of Muhammad b. Abi Bakr; the mother's name was Asmá' bint 'Umayys al-Khath'amáyya. After some years the father returned to Medina taking his son with him. `Abd Allah became known chiefly on account of his great generosity, and received the honorific surname of Bahr al-Djád, the Ocean of Generosity'. He appears to have played no very important part in politics, although his name crops up from time to time in history during `All's time and that following. When Mu'áwiya tried to throw suspicion on Kays b. Sa'd, the valiant governor of Egypt, to damage him in `All's eyes, `Abd Allah advised the removal of Kays; `All allowed himself to be persuaded and took the fateful step of replacing him by Mu'ámmad b. Abi Bakr, who in a very short time brought the whole of Egypt into the greatest confusion. This took place in the year 60/656-7. When in the year 60/656-8, after Yazid's accession, the Shi'ites of Kufa summoned Husayn b. `Abd Allah to proceed to that city to take to himself proclaimed caliph, `Abd Allah amongst others endeavoured to dissuade him from this dangerous enterprise, but without success. The date of `Abd Allah's death is generally given as 80 or 85, but 87 and 90 are also recorded.

Bibliography: Ţabarí, i, 3243 ff.; ii, 3 ff.; iii, 2339 ff.; Ibn al-Afhrí, iii, 224 ff.; Nawawi, 337 ff.; Yaḵbúlî, ii, 67, 200, 331; Mas'údî, Murúdij, iv, 181, 271 ff., 373, 329, 434; v, 19, 148, 383 ff.; Lammens, Études sur le règne de Calife omayyade Mo'áwia 1er, in MFBO, index. (K. V. Zettersténk)

`ABD ALLAH B. DJUDÁN, of Banú Asad b. Khuzyamay, a confederate (halál) of Banú Umayyà of Kuraysh. His mother was Umayma bint `Abd al-Muţallîb, Muhammad's aunt. An early Muslim along with his brothers, Ubayd Allah and `Abd Allah, he took part in the former in the migration to Abyssinia. Ubayd Allah became a Christian and died there, but `Abd Allah returned to Mecca and was the most prominent of a group of confederates, including his sister Zaynab (q.v.), who all migrated to Medina. He led the much-criticized raid to Nāghla where Muslims first shed Meccan blood, and fought at Badr. At his death at Ulûd he was between 40 and 50.

Bibliography: Ibn Sa'd, iii, 62-4; Ibn al-Ąfhrí, Usd, iii, 131; Ibn Ħadjar, Isbá, s.v.

(W. Montgomery Watt)

`ABD ALLAH b. DJUDÁN, Kurayshite no table of the clan of Taym b. Murad, at the end of the 6th c. A.D. He acquired such wealth from the caravan and slave trade that he possessed one of the largest fortunes in Morocco, Fas, Táhribih, Makhdum (van Vloten), 165; Ibn Rusta, 215; Mas'údî, Murúdij, vi, 153 ff.; Lammens, La Mecque à la veille de l'Hégire, index. He surrounded himself with unusual luxury (being nick-named bási 'I'lláhab, because he used to drink from a golden cup), and was the owner of the two singing-girls called "Locusts of 'A'd" (Djarradat 'A'd) whom he offered to Umayya b. Abi N-Salt. In giving magnificent banquets, he showed a generosity that became proverbial (Agfání, viii, 4; Thāqlíbî, Thimár, 487, in connection with the expression: fījân Ibn Díjadīn). Thus he won the favour of the poets, but also drew on himself some invective (al-Djabît, Hayawwán i, 364; ii, 93). His prestige enabled him to play a certain role in politics (Agfání, xix, 76), and he seems to have been the promoter of the Meccan confederacy known as hif al-fada'il (Ibn Ḥighám, 85; Yaḵbúlî, ii, 12; Lammens, op. cit., 54 ff.).

Already before the 3rd/9th c., his unusual wealth, and the wish of the Meccans to explain it otherwise than by the slave trade, gave rise to his identification with the hero of a Yamanite legend, discoverer of the tomb of Shádâd b. 'Amr (q.v.) (Wab b. Munabbîb, Tijdiyn, 65 ff.). Thus he is represented as a şuţád banished by his clan, wandering in the desert and enriched by a treasure of precious stones and gold which he finds in an old tomb (al-Hamdán, Ḩišil, viii, 183 sqq.; al-Damhîrî, s.v. Thavaban; al-Djabît, Baydân, ed. Sandúbî i, 31). According to an isolated and no doubt apocryphal tradition, he is buried in a place in Yaman called Birk al-Ghumad (Yakut, i, 589).
al-‘Abd Allah b. ‘Abd al-Malik, 88; Yāqūt, iv, 621; Mas‘ūdī, al-Tanbīḥ, 210-1, 291 (trans. Carra de Vaux, 282-4, 381); Sibt, al-Mu‘arrad, Cairo 1940, i, 124; Caussin de Perceval, Essai, i, 300-51, passim; Barbir de Meynard, Surnoms et sobriquets (= JA, 1907), 66; O. Rescher, Qalqīb’s Naṣīḥa, Stuttgart 1920, no. 101.

(Ch. Pellat)

‘Abd Allāh b. Ǧamāl ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Mu‘āwīya, ibn al-Ǧaḥib, 88; Yakut, iv, 621; Mas‘ūdī, al-Ǧaḥib, 210-1, 291; al-Kūfī, al-Mu‘āwīya, Cairo 1940, i, 125; Caussin de Perceval, Essai, i, 300-51, passim; Barbir de Meynard, Surnoms et sobriquets (= JA, 1907), 66; O. Rescher, Qalqīb’s Naṣīḥa, Stuttgart 1920, no. 101.

(Ch. Pellat)

‘Abd Allāh b. Ḥammām al-Sulīl, ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥammām al-Sulīl, Arab poet of the 3rd/7th century (he is said to have died after 66/715), who played a political role under the Umayyads. He was attached from 66/720 to the Syrians. His head was cut off and brought to al-‘Abbās al-Ṣaffāh. In 66/720 he took part in the delegation sent to Medina by the Umayyads. He was attached from 66/720 to the Syrians. His head was cut off and brought to al-‘Abbās al-Ṣaffāh.

(Yakut, iv, 621; Mas‘ūdī, al-Ǧaḥib, 210-1, 291; al-Kūfī, al-Mu‘āwīya, Cairo 1940, i, 125; Caussin de Perceval, Essai, i, 300-51, passim; Barbir de Meynard, Surnoms et sobriquets (= JA, 1907), 66; O. Rescher, Qalqīb’s Naṣīḥa, Stuttgart 1920, no. 101.
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‘Abd Allāh b. Ḥammām al-Sulīl, ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥammām al-Sulīl, Arab poet of the 3rd/7th century (he is said to have died after 66/715), who played a political role under the Umayyads. He was attached from 66/720 to the Syrians. His head was cut off and brought to al-‘Abbās al-Ṣaffāh. In 66/720 he took part in the delegation sent to Medina by the Umayyads. He was attached from 66/720 to the Syrians. His head was cut off and brought to al-‘Abbās al-Ṣaffāh.

(Yakut, iv, 621; Mas‘ūdī, al-Ǧaḥib, 210-1, 291; al-Kūfī, al-Mu‘āwīya, Cairo 1940, i, 125; Caussin de Perceval, Essai, i, 300-51, passim; Barbir de Meynard, Surnoms et sobriquets (= JA, 1907), 66; O. Rescher, Qalqīb’s Naṣīḥa, Stuttgart 1920, no. 101.
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April 1914 he had interviews in Egypt with Lord
Kitchener and Ronald Storrs and thus took part in
the negotiations that led to the proclamation of
"Arab Revolt" announced by his father in Mecca, 9 Sha'bân 1334/10 June 1916. During the hostilities
he played only a minor role. On 8 March 1920 an
"Irâkî Congress", which met in Damascus, pro-
claimed him "constitutional king of Irâk". But he
never took possession of the throne, which
was given by the English, in June 1921, to his brother
Faysal, who had been expelled from Damascus by the French
troops of General Gouraud (24-27 July
1920). In March 1921 'Abd Allâh met in Jerusalem
W. Churchill, then colonial secretary. It was during
that interview that it was orally agreed to create in
Transjordan, separated from the rest of Palestine
placed under British mandate, a "national Arab
government" headed by 'Abd Allâh (28 March).
On 28 August 1923 this government was recognized by the
High Commissioner for Palestine. Its relations
with Great Britain were fixed by a treaty signed
in Jerusalem 20 February 1928 (modified by the
agreements of 2 June 1934 and 9 July 1941).
In 1946 Great Britain recognized Transjordan "as a
completely independent state" (treaty of 22 March
1946, modified by the treaty of 15 March 1948).
'Abd Allâh was crowned as king in 'Am'mân, 25
May 1946, and Transjordan, constituted a kingdom,
took the name of "Hashimite Kingdom of Jordan". After the war in Palestine (15 May 1948-3 April
1949), 'Abd Allâh annexed the territories occupied by the Arab Legion to the west of the Jordan (April
May 1950). He was assassinated in Jerusalem on 20
July 1951.

In the last years of his life, he visited successively
Turkey (Jan. 1947), Iran (July-August 1949) and
Spain (Sept. 1949). His journeys were followed by
the signature of treaties of friendship with these
countries (Turkey, 11 Jan. 1947; Iran, 16 Nov. 1949;
Spain, 7 Oct. 1950). On the other hand he tried to
overcome the hostility of the Arab League to his
projects of territorial expansion. He died, however,
without accomplishing the great ideal of his reign:
marshalling round his throne the Arab lands of Syria
(project of Greater Syria).

He was the author of memoirs, only the first
part of which has been published.

See also T. E. Lawrence, Seven pillars of wisdom,
London 1935; idem, Revolt in the desert, London
1927; C. S. Jarvis, Arab command, London 1943; R.
Storrs, Orientations, London 1943; J. Bagot Glubb,
The story of the Arab Legion, London 1948; Et-
tore Rossi, Documenti sull'origine e gli sviluppi
della questione araba (1875-1904), Rome 1944. On
the project of Greater Syria, see Transjordan
White Book, 'Am'mân 1947, and Là voîld la
Grande Syrie, published by the review al-Dunyâ,
Damascul 1947. (M. COLOMBE)
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Iskandar, in the same way Abd al-Mu'min wanted to occupy the same position in relation to his now aging father, 4 Abd Allah would, however, not hear of any diminution of his power, and only the mediation of the clergy prevented an open breach between father and son, and compelled 4 Abd al-Mu'min to yield. On hearing of the strained relations between father and son, the nomads had penetrated into the region of Taškhend and had defeated between Taškhend and Samarqand an army against them. At the beginning of a punitive expedition against this enemy 4 Abd Allah was overtaken by death in Samarqand (end of the "hen year", 1066/beginning of 1598).

4 Abd al-Mu'min was murdered only six months later by his subjects. The conquests in Khurasan and Khârizm were lost, and in the Òzbek's own country the power fell into the hands of another dynasty. Of greater permanence were the results of 4 Abd Allah's activity in internal affairs; the administration, especially the coinage system, was remodelled by him, many public works (bridges, caravanseras, wells, etc.) were completed. Even at the present day popular folklore ascribes all such monuments either to Timur or to 4 Abd Allah.

**Bibliography:** The life of this ruler up to the year 996/1587-8 is described in detail by his eulogist Hâfiz Tânish: Sârafânâ-ye Shâhistân (Persian), usually called 4 Abd Allah-nâmâ. Much information (especially about the last few years) is given by 4 Abd Allah's Persian contemporary Iskandar Munshi in Ta'rîf-i 'Alâm Arâ-ye 'Abbasî (biography of Shâh 'Abbâs I, Teheran 1897). Extracts from both works are in Welyaminow-Zenonzow, Islyedowaniya o kasmovskikh izslyedovaniya i islyedowaniya s (in the Trudy wostoc. old. imper. arkeol. obsh., t., and before that in his Moneti bukharskiya i khwaišiyâ. See also my extracts from the little known Bahir al-Asrdr by Mahmûd b. Wall. In the Zapisiki wostoc. old. imper. russ. arkeol. obsh., xv. On the Bahir al-Asrdr comp. Ethê, India Office Cat., No. 575. The information given by Vambéry, Gesch. Bochara's, and by Howorth, Hist. of the Mongols, ii. div. 2, who follows him, is to be accepted with great caution.

(W. Barthold)

**4 Abd Allah b. Ismâ'il, 4 Alâwîd [q.v.]** sultan of Morocco, whose first reign started 4 Shrâbân 1141/5 March 1729, while his last ended 4 Ziyâd 1171/10 Nov. 1757.

This sovereign was in fact deposed several times, five times according to the Arabic historians, and as often recalled to power. For the good order established in Morocco under Mawlay Ismâ'il [q.v.] was at that time but a memory. When 4 Abd Allah assumed power, two of his brothers, Ahmad al-Dârj and 'Abd al-Malik, had been fighting for it for two years, and had roused, by their mutual bids and their weakness, violent antagonism between the black army of their father, the 4 'abid al-Dârjârî, and the gish [diyâsh, q.v.] tribe of Òdâyâ and the Berbers of the Middle and Central Atlas. When it is added that the sons of Mawlay Ismâ'il were numerous and that several of them aspired to power, and that, on the other hand, 4 Abd Allah showed himself from the beginning as an ungovernable and cruel prince, then it is plain why Morocco was at this time the scene of constant disorders.

Raised to power by the 4 'abid, who had been won over by his mother, 4 Abd Allah immediately stirred up against himself the city of Fez, whose resistance was overcome only after a siege of six months. He then tried to pacify his kingdom, but in consequence of a disastrous campaign in the Central Atlas, he excited the enmity of the 4 'abid and had to flee, on 29 Sept. 1734, to the Wâdi Nûn, to his mother's tribe. Replaced by his brother 4 Ali al-A'radj, he was recalled in 1736, but was again expelled a few months later by the 4 'abid. He took refuge with the Berber Ait Idrâsân and was replaced successively by two of his brothers, Muḥ. b. al-Abhâyîs and al-Mustadî. Recalled in 1740, he fought against al-Mustadî and his ally, the pasha of Tangier, Ahmad al-Riff, when another son of Ismâ'il, Zayn al-'Abîdîn, was elevated to the throne by the 4 'abid. 4 Abd Allah found new supporters among the Berbers, with whose help he regained power in the same year. He then succeeded in defeating al-Mustadî and al-Riff and made an effort to pacify Morocco. New revolts, however, followed each other without interruption and the sultan constantly changed his allies, relying sometimes on the 4 'abid, sometimes on the Òdâyâ, sometimes on the Berbers. He was deposed yet again (1748) in favour of his son Muhammed governor of Marrâkûsh. His son, however, remained loyal and assured the reign of 4 Abd Allah until his death, but in the midst of continual disorders. 4 Abd Allah resided partly in Meknes, and partly in a country house near Fez, Dâr Dîshâbâh.


4 Abd Allah b. Khâzîm al-Sulâmî, governor of Khurâsân. On the first expedition of 4 Abd Allah b. 4 'Amîr [q.v.] into Khurâsân in 31/651-2, Ibn Khâzîm commanded the advance-guard which occupied Sarakhz. According to some accounts, he put down a rebellion led by Kârin in 33/653-4 and was rewarded with the governorship of the province, but this is probably an anticipation of the events of 42/662. During Ibn 4 'Amîr's second governorship of Bayra (41/661), Kays b. al-Haythâm al-Sulâmî was appointed to Khurâsân, and 4 Abd Allah b. Khâzîm and 4 Abd al-Râhîm b. Samura were dispatched to recover Balîk and Sîujîstân. When Kays showed himself unable to deal with an Ephthalite revolt which broke out in the following year, Ibn 4 'Amîr replaced him as governor by 4 Abd Allah b. Khâzîm, who remained in Khurâsân until recalled by Ziyâd in 45/684.

Ibn Khâzîm returned to Khurâsân with the army of Salm b. Ziyâd (61/68-2/684) and when the latter withdrew after the death of Yazîd I Ibn Khâzîm persuaded him to nominate him as governor of the province (64/684). Having gained possession of Marw after defeating its Tanmite governor, he then attacked, with the aid of Tamîm, the Bakrite governors of Marw al-Rûdh and Harât, and overcame them after a long struggle. The victory was followed by repeated risings of the Tamîm against Ibn Khâzîm, who now nominally governor on the death of Ibn Abd al-Malik. In 72/682 he received, but indignantly rejected, an offer by 4 Abd al-Malik to confirm him as governor for seven years; the offer was then made to and accepted by his deputy in Marw, the Tanmitte Bukayr b. Wishâh, who overtook and killed him (probably
'abd allâh b. khâzîm — 'abd allâh b. mu'âwiya

in 73/692-3) as he was attempting to join his son Mûsâ in the stronghold which he had previously prepared at Tîrûnâ. The career of Ibûn Khâzîm was afterwards embellished with saga-like accretions, which make it difficult to estimate many details with precision.


(1. H. A. R. Gibb)

'abd allâh b. maymûn, client of the family of al-Hârîb b. 'Abd allâh b. al-Mahmûzîn (Ibn al-Zubayri's governor in Basra, cf. al-Tabarî, index), known in the Twelver Shi'ite literature as a transmitter of traditions from Dîjarîr al-Sâdîk (al-Kullîn, Ibn Bâbûrû, al-Tûsî, passim, cf. Ivanow, Alleged Founder, 117-60; see also the Shi'ite books of rîdîqîl: al-Sâdîk, 130-136; al-Adîrûlî, 160; al-Nâjîlî, al-Rîdîqîlî, 148; al-Tûsî, Fihrist, 197; he appears also in Sunni books of rîdîqîl: al-Dhahabî, Mîzân al-Irâtî, ii, 81, who quotes the earlier Sunni authorities; Ibn Hâdjâr, Takhtût al-Tâhutîbî, vi, 149). Since Dîjarîr al-Sâdîk died in 148/765, 'Abd allâh belongs to the middle and the second half of the 2nd/8th century. His father Maymûn al-Kaddâk ("sharpeners of arrows"—so al-Madhîl), and his son 'Abd allâh as the founder of Ismâ'îlism, is mentioned in the earliest Ismâ'îlî sources (cf. Lewis, Origins, 65-7).

The anti-Ismâ'îlî writers, from the beginning of the 4th/10th century on, have a long and colourful tale to tell of 'Abd allâh as the father, and of Maymûn as the mother, of Ismâ'îlism. The source of all these accounts is that of Ibn Rizâm, anachronistically, in the middle of the 3rd/9th century. His father, Muh. b. Ismâ'îl, and his son 'Abd allâh as leaders of the extremist movement out of which grew Ismâ'îlism. The evidence is as yet not sufficient for a definite solution of this problem, and it would seem possible that the story for the story about Maymûn and 'Abd allâh is to be sought in the role that some descendants of 'Abd allâh b. Maymûn may have played in the Ismâ'îlî movement in its beginnings about 260/873, and that the story was spun out of this knowledge of the connection of some "Kaddâshids" with Ismâ'îlism. The origins of Ismâ'îlism, Cambridge 1940 (see especially 49-73), admits, on the whole, the historicity of the role of Maymûn and 'Abd allâh as leaders of the extremist movement out of which grew Ismâ'îlism. The evidence is as yet not sufficient for a definite solution of this problem, and it would seem possible that the story for the story about Maymûn and 'Abd allâh is to be sought in the role that some descendants of 'Abd allâh b. Maymûn may have played in the Ismâ'îlî movement in its beginnings about 260/873, and that the story was spun out of this knowledge of the connection of some "Kaddâshids" with Ismâ'îlism.

'S. M. Stern')

'abd allâh b. mu'âwiya, 'Aid rebel. After the death of Abû Hâshîn, a grandson of 'Ali, claims were laid to the Imamate from several quarters. Some asserted that Abû Hâshîn had formally transferred his right to the dignity of Imam to the 'Abbâsîd Muhammâd b. 'Ali. Others said that he had spoken in favor of 'Abd allâh b. 'Amr al-Khaqî b. Khâshîh and wanted to proclaim him Imam. As he, however, did not come up to the expectations of his followers, they turned from him and declared 'Abd allâh b. Mu'âwiya, a great-grandson of 'Ali's brother Dîjarîr, to be the rightful Imam. The latter asserted that both the godhead and the prophetic office were united in his person, because the spirit of God had been transferred from the one to the other and had finally come to him. In accordance with this his followers believed in metempsychosis and denied the resurrection. In Muḥarram 127/Oct. 744, 'Abd allâh revolted in Kûfâ where he was joined by many followers, especially from amongst the Zaydîtes (q.v.). The latter captured the citadel and expelled the
prefect. In a short time, however, Abd Allah b. Umar, who was governor of Itrāk, put an end to his manoeuvres. When it came to fighting, the ever unreliable Kufans deserted; only the Zaydites fought bravely and continued the battle till Abd Allah was granted an unimpeded retreat. From Kufa he proceeded at first to Madā'in and then to al-Dībāl. His power was in no way broken. From Kufa and from other places numbers of people flocked to him and he soon succeeded in winning over several important strongholds in Persia. After residing for some time in Isfahān, he went to Īṣṭābhr. Owing to the temporary weakness of the government in Persia, as a result of the disorders in Itrāk and Khurāsān, he had no difficulty in extending his rule over a great part of al-Dībāl, Aḥwāz, Fārs and Kūrma. The Khāridjītes, who had fought against Marwān II on the Tigris, withdrew into 'Abd Allah's domain and other opponents of the caliph also joined him, including some 'Abbāsidās. In the end, however, he was unable to maintain his power. 'Āmir b. Dubārā, one of Marwān's generals, who had been entrusted with the pursuit of the Khāridjītes, led an army into 'Abd Allah's domains and brought his rule to a sudden end. In the year 229/746-7, 'Abd Allah was defeated at Marw al-Shāhān and forced to flee to Khurāsān, where Abd al-Muslim, the celebrated general of the 'Abbāsidās, had him executed. After his death, some of his followers, called al-Dīnāhīyya [q.v.], maintained that he was still alive and would return; on the other hand, others, the so-called Hāridjītes, believed that his spirit was reincarnated in Isbāk b. Zayd b. Īlāhirī al-Ansārī.


'Abd Allah b. Muhammād, Sharīf of Mecca

[see Makkā]

'Abd Allah b. Muhammād b. 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Marwānī, seventh 'Umayyad Amīr of Cordova. He succeeded his brother al-Mundhir on the latter's death before Bobastro, centre of 'Umar b. Hafซ's rebellion, on 15 Safar 275/29 June 888. The circumstances of al-Mundhir's death arouse the suspicion that the new sovereign was not quite innocent of it. At his accession, 'Abd Allah, born in 229/844, was forty-four years old. His reign, which lasted for a quarter of a century, until his death on 1 Rabi' I 300/26 October 912, was described in detail by the chronicler Ibn Ḥāyyān, in that part of his Muṣḥābis which has been preserved in an Oxford manuscript, long since known and utilized, and published in a somewhat faulty edition by M. M. An inscription, Paris 1937.

His biographers present a flattering portrait of the Amīr 'Abd Allah and omit to mention his cruelty and his lack of scruples. They extol his sobriety, his piety and his Islamic culture. It may be granted to him as an undoubted merit that he maintained, in a difficult period, the Hispanic-Umayyad dynasty and contrived to counter a multitude of internal dangers, notably the Andalusian revolt fomented by the muwallads and the particularist tendencies of the Arab gentry of Seville and Elvira. For further details see 'Umayyads of Spain.

Encyclopedia of Islam

Bibliography: Lévi-Provençal, Esp. mus., i, 329 (list of Arabic sources, note 1)-396; Dossy, Hist. Mus. Esp., ii, 21-93. (E. Lévi-Provençal)

'Abd Allah b. Muhammād al-Tā'ishī (his name is invariably pronounced as 'Abdullāh), the successor of Muḥammad Aḥmad [q.v.], the Suda- nese Mahdī. He belonged to the Awlād Umm Surra, a clan of the Dībarāt section of the Ta'ishī tribe of cattle-breeding Arabs (Bakkāra) in Darfur. His great-grandfather is said to have been a Tunisian šarīf who married a woman of the tribe. His father Muḥammad b. 'All Kārār bore the nickname of Tūr Shāyīn (Ugly Bull). Religious pretensions were hereditary in the family, and both father and son were ḫākis of repute. Zubayr Raḥma, the famous merchant-adventurer and conquerer of Darfur, relates that 'Abdullāhī narrowly escaped execution at his hands, when taken prisoner during the Dāfūr fighting in 1873, and that even then he was in search of the Expected Mahdī. Tūr Shāyīn died among the Bakkāras in Darfur, whom he brought to the Central Sudan where his governor of the eastern province, the redoutable 'Abdullāhī, assumed control of the new Mahdist state. A convinced believer in the Mahdī's mission and himself claiming supernatural gifts, he rigorously upheld the religious ordinances of the Mahdiyya, without neglecting the temporal aim of establishing his personal and absolute rule. With this end in view he deprived the Mahdī's blood-relations (the Agārāf) of all influence and successfully crushed the opposition of powerful tribal chiefs and of rival religious pretenders. Not himself a military leader, 'Abdullāhī was served by a number of capable amīrs who, in the first year of his reign, captured the last posts still held by the Egyptian garrisons. His governor of the eastern province, the redoutable 'Uṯmān Dīnā (q.v.) fought numerous actions with varying success against the Anglo-Egyptian forces based on Sukin. Between 1887 and 1889 there was intermittent warfare with the Abyssinians (sack of Gondar by the Mahdīs in 1887; battle of Kallabât 9 March 1889 when an Abyssinian victory was turned into rout by the death in battle of King John). In the execution of his policy 'Abdullāhī relied largely on the Bakkāra tribesmen of Kordofān and Darfur, whom he brought to the Central Sudan where they incurred much unpopularity as a privileged and predatory class. 'Abdullāhī's most trusted associate was his brother Yaḥūkī and he seems to have intended his eldest son 'Uṯmān Shāykh al-Dīn to be his successor.

The first serious reverse of his reign was the defeat at Toskhi (3 Aug. 1889) of the Mahdīs under 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Nājdūm who attempted the invasion of Egypt with quite inadequate forces. The country over which 'Abdullāhī still ruled with absolute power was now devastated by incessant warfare and by the terrible famine of 1889. The end came when the British government, then in virtual control of Egypt, decided on the re-conquest of the
Sudan. The occupation of Dongola (1896) by Anglo-
Egyptian forces was followed by their advance to
Omdurman and the decisive defeat of the Mahdist
army (2 Sept. 1898). Abdullāh fled to Kordofān
where he maintained himself with a considerable
body of followers for another year. In the final
battle of Umm Dubaykārat (24 Nov. 1899) he met
death with courage and dignity.

The Mahdī and his successor professed to re-live
the life of the Prophet and of early Islam, and 'Abd-
Dhulāh's epistles, in which he exhorted the Sultan
of Turkey, the Khedive of Egypt, and Queen Vic-
toria to embrace the Mahdist faith, vividly display
the anachronistic spirit of the Mahdiyya. Ruthless
towards external enemies and suspected rivals, and
governing without regard for the material welfare
of his country, 'Abdullāh yet remained true to his
fanatical faith and to the primitive code of a Bāṣākārī
Arab. In contrast to European writers who stress
the cruel and barbaric character of his reign, Su-
danese tradition credits him with the virtues of
simplicity in his private life, generosity as a host,
and sword in the Sudan

proposed to leave Medina, but 'Abd Allāh b. 'Umar
(q.v.) advised him to remain, and he gave in to Ibn
'Umar's arguments. When the inhabitants of Medina
rebelled against the new caliph, he became the leader
of the Kurāyshī element in the city and took
part in the battle of the Harra in Dhū 'l-Hijjah
63/August 683. Escaping from the general rout, he
took refuge in Mecca with the anti-caliph 'Abd
Allāh b. Zubayr, who appointed him in Rama-
dān 65/April 683 governor of Kūf. Shortly after-
wards he was attacked by the Shī'ite adventurer
al-Mukhtar b. Abī 'Ubayd [q.v.]. Abandoned, he
siegèd in his palace and probably betrayed by his
own general Ibrāhim b. al-Aṣhtar, he relinquished
his post, withdrew to Baṣra, and then joined Ibn
al-Zubayr in Mecca. There he joined Ibn al-Zubayr's
forces and was killed together with him in 73/692.

Bibliography: Balādhurī, Ansāb, v, index;
Ibn Sa'd, Tabāhā, v, 48, 106 ff.; Tabālī, ii, 232
ff.; Ibn al-Aṣhir, iv, 14 ff.; G. Weil, Gesch. d.
Chal., index: H. Lamment, Le califat de Yazid
Ier, 214 ff. (= NFOB, v, 212 ff.); Caetani-Gabrielli.
Onomasticon, ii, 922.

(K. V. Zetterstén—Ch. Pellat)

'ABD ALLĀH b. RAWĀḤA, a Kharrājīte, be-
longing to the most esteemed clan of the Banu
l-Ḫārij. At the second 'Akhāba assembly in March
622, 'Abd Allāh was one of the 72 trustworthy
whom the already converted Medinians, conform-
ably to the Prophet's wish, had chosen. When
Muhammad had emigrated to Medina, 'Abd Allāh
proved himself to be one of the most energetic and
upright champions of his cause. Muhammad appears
to have thought a great deal of him, and often en-
trusted him with honorable missions. After the battle
of Badr, in the year 2/623, in which the Medinians
were victorious, 'Abd Allāh together with Zayd b.
Ḫārijah hastened to Medina to bring the tidings
of victory. During the so-called "second campaign
of Badr", in Dhūl-Ḫājdār 4/Apr. 626, 'Abd
Allāh remained behind in Medina as lieutenant-
governor. When in 5/627, at the commencement of
the siege of Medina, the fidelity of the Banu Kurayzah,
his allies, was suspected, the Prophet sent 'Abd
Allāh together with three other influential Medinians
to find out the real sentiments of his allies. After
Khaybar had been conquered in the year 7/628 and
its territory divided, Muhammad appointed 'Abd
Allāh as appraiser of its yield. On sending out the
Mu'ta expedition in the year 8/629, 'Abd Allāh was
appointed by the Prophet as second in succession
to the commander of the army, and when both his
superiors had fallen, he sought and met his death
as they had done fighting for the Faith.

Besides his military talents 'Abd Allāh possessed
other qualities which made him valuable to his
master; he was one of the few pre-Islamic men who
could write, and was for that reason, together
with other faithful followers, chosen as secretary
by the Prophet. Muhammad appears to have esteemed
him very highly, more especially on account of his
poetical gifts. In the Aḥbānī it is expressly stated
that the Prophet considered his poems equal to
those of his "court" poets Ḥāsān b. Thābit and Ka'b
b. Mālik. It is characteristic of 'Abd Allāh’s "literary
tendency" that he attacked the Kurayshī more espe-
cially for their unbelief, whilst the two other poets
always reproached them with their impious deeds.
Only about 50 verses of his have been preserved and
they are for the most part to be found in Ibn Ḥāşim.

Bibliography: Ibn Sa'd, iii/2, 79 ff.; Ibn
Ḥāşim, i, 457, 675; Tabālī, i, 1460, 1610 ff.; al-

'ABD ALLĀH b. MUḤAMMAD AL-TAṢĪḤI — 'ABD ALLĀH b. RAWĀḤA
Aghânlâ, xi, 80; xv, 29; G. Weil, Gesch. Mohammed der Prophet, 350; Rahatullah Khan, Von Einfluss des Qur'ân auf der arabischen Dichtung, eine Untersuchung...Abdalla b. Rawaha, Leipzig 1938.

(A. Schaade)

‘ABD ALLAH B. SABA’, reputed founder of the Shi‘a. Also called Ibn al-Sawādā, Ibn Ḥarb, Ibn Wahb. “Saba” appears also as Sab’; the name of the associated sect appears as Saba‘yya, Sab‘yya, or, corrupted, as Sab​āya, Sab​āya.

In the Sunnī account he was a Yamanite Jew converted to Islam, who about the time of ‘All first introduced the ideas ascribed to the more extreme wing of the Shi‘a (aghūd, q.v.). Especially attributed to himself is the exaltation of ‘All himself: that ‘All stood to Muhammad as divinely appointed heir, as Joshua did to Moses (the wiṣāya doctrine); that ‘All was not dead, but would return to bring righteousness upon earth (the raq‘a); that ‘All was divine, exalted to the clouds, and the thunder was his voice.

To Ibn Saba’s conspiratorial cunning was ascribed the Shī‘a’s special rights; that ‘All was divine, that ‘All was a purely political supporter of ‘Uthman (cf. al-Makdīsī, 107, 227; Al-Dhahabi, ed. Ritter, vi, 6); and Surer sources seem to confirm it being true. Ibn Saba and the muqaddas ascribed to Ibn Saba and the muqaddas are now ascribed to Ibn Saba and the muqaddas ascribed to Ibn Saba and the muqaddas (cf. Khushaysh al-Nasa’i, ed. Ritter, 1910, 1-46; L. Caetani, Annali, viii, 42 ff. and passim.

(M. G. S. Hodson)

‘ABDALLAH B. SAD’, Muslim statesman and general. Abū Yahya ‘Abd Allah b. Sad b. Abī Sarḥ al-Ṣamīrī belonged to the clan of Ḥār. Luḥayy of Kuraysh and was as foster brother of the subsequent caliph ‘Uthmān a chief partisan of the Umayyads. He was less a soldier than a financier. The judgements of historians on his character vary greatly. His name is connected in many ways with the beginnings of Islam. First he is mentioned as one of Muhammad’s scribes: he is supposed to have arbitrarily altered the revelation, or at least he boasted of doing so after his apostasy from Islam, and thereby incurred the hatred of the Prophet. For this reason the latter desired to have him executed after the capture of Mecca, but ‘Uthmān obtained, though with difficulty, the Prophet’s pardon. This story afterwards became very famous. ‘Abd Allah later on showed himself grateful to ‘Uthmān for his rescue by agitating for the latter’s election as caliph.

He was one of the Hidrā-companions who took part in the conquest of Egypt under ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣī [q.v.] and appears to have governed Upper Egypt independently under ‘Umar, after the latter’s quarrel with ‘Amr. It is impossible exactly to fix the date when he was appointed governor of the whole of Egypt; according to Ibn Taghribirdī, as early as the year 25/645-6, and therefore before the visit of Alexandria under Manuel. As he was not able to suppress this rising, ‘Amr was recalled, who, immediately after his victory had to restore the government to ‘Abd Allah. ‘Uthmān desired to confirm ‘Abd Allah as financial prefect and to appoint ‘Amr as military governor, but the latter declined. ‘Abd Allah now succeeded in considerably increasing the state revenues of Egypt, much to the satisfaction of the caliph. Although his principal aim was the administration of the finances, he also became renowned as a general. ‘Abd Allah regulated the relations between the Muslims and the Nubians and supported Mu‘awiyah’s expedition against Cyprus. He himself undertook several expeditions against Roman Africa, the first probably in the year 25/645-6, the most important and most successful certainly in the year 27/647-8. He subjected the territory of Carthage to Islam. His most important military performance, however, was the naval battle of Dḥāt al-Ṣawārī, comparable in significance to the battle of the Yarmūk [q.v.], in which the Roman fleet was completely destroyed. This battle took place in the year 34/655, although different dates are given in some sources. Soon afterwards the agitation against ‘Uthmān began in many parts of the empire. ‘Abd Allah appears as the principal champion of the regime represented by the caliph. He endeavoured to warn the caliph and even left Egypt in order to support him. His lieutenant al-Sādib b. Hishām was expelled by the Egyptian revolutionary party under Muhammad b. Ḥishām, and ‘Abd Allah himself was prevented from returning to Egypt. On the frontier ‘Abd Allah learned of the murder of the caliph, and fled to Mu‘awiyah. Shortly before the latter’s march to Siffin, he died in Askalon or Ramla (in 36 or 37/656-8). His supposed participation
in the battle of Siffin and his late death in the year 57/676-7 belong to the numberless myths connected with the battle of Siffin.


'Abd Allâh b. Salâm, a Jew of Medina, belonging to the Banû Kaynûkû and originally called al-Hasayn (on the name Salâm, see Ibn Khâtîb al-Dhghî, Thwâfî, ed. Mann, 69). Muhammad gave him the name of 'Abd Allâh when he embraced Islam. This conversion is said to have taken place immediately after Muhammad's arrival at Medina, or, according to others, when Muhammad was still in Mecca. Another account which makes him accept Islam in the year 56/675-6 is worthy of more credence—though Muslim critics think it badly accredited—for his name is sought in vain in the battles which Muhammad had to wage in Medina. The few unimportant mentions in the Maghazi may well have been inserted in order to remove the glaring contradiction with the generally accepted tradition. He was with 'Umar in Dhîbiya and Jerusalem, and under 'Uthmân took the latter's side against the rebels, whom he in vain endeavored to dissuade from murdering the caliph. After 'Uthmân's death he did not do homage to 'Alî and imploded him not to march to Irân against `Abd Allâh b. al-Khâja; legend brings him into relation with Mu'awiyâ also. He died in 43/663-4.

In Muslim tradition he has become the typical representative of that group of Jewish scribes who honored the truth, admitting that Muhammad was the Prophet predicted in the Torah, and protecting him from the intrigues of their co-religionists. The questions which 'Abd Allâh is made to ask Muhammad and which only a prophet could answer, the contents of the haddîth which the works on tradition ascribe to him, and the story of Bulûkîyâ which Thâlîbi puts into his mouth, mostly have their origin in Jewish sources; if they do not really come from 'Abd Allâh himself, they certainly come from Jewish renegade circles. While his contemporaries often reproached him with his Jewish origin, later on traditions were circulated, in which Mu'awiyâ assumes him of entry into Paradise, or in which the Prophet and celebrated Companions give him high praise. Certain verses of the Qurân are also said to refer to him. The "questions" which he put to Muhammad were subsequently enlarged to whole books, and in the same manner several other works were foisted on him, which are partly based on what is related by him in Hadîth. As well as his sons Muhammad and Yûsuf, Abû Hurayra and Anas b. Mâlik also handed down his traditions. Tabarî took more especially Biblical narratives from him into his Chronicle.


'Abd Allâh b. Tâhir, born 182/798, died 230/844, was a poet, general, statesman, confidant of caliphs and, as governor of Khurâsân, almost an independent sovereign. His father, Tâhir b. al-Hasayn, had founded the powerful Tahirîd dynasty which ruled over a territory extending from al-Rayy to the Indian frontier, with its capital at Naysâbûr. In 206/821-2 the caliph al-Ma'mûn appointed 'Abd Allâh b. Tâhir governor of the region between al-Râkîa and Egypt and at the same time he was placed in command of the caliph's troops in the campaign against Nasr b. Shâbâh, a former partisan of al-`Amin, who was endeavoring to gain control of Mesopotamia. After subduing Nasr 'Abd Allâh went in 211/826-7 to Egypt, where for ten years refugees from Spain had been further weakening an already weak state, and he swiftly captured the leaders and restored order.

While he was at Dinawar, in al-Djibal, busy raising troops to quell a revolt of Bâbak the Khorramite, his brother, Tâlîka, died and in 214/829-30 he was appointed by al-Ma'mûn to succeed him as governor of Khurâsân. He proved to be an exceedingly wise ruler, establishing a stable government in his domains, protecting the poor against abuses by the upper classes and bringing education to the masses; no boy, however poor, was denied the means to acquire knowledge. As a result of litigations in Naysâbûr he ordered an investigation into the use of water for irrigation, and the book of Canals, which was the outcome of this, established legal rules for water utilization which served as a guide for several centuries (cf. A. Schmidt, Islamica, 1930, 128).

During the caliphate of al-Mu'âtasîm, 'Abd Allâh subdued the revolt of the 'Alîd pretender, Muhammâd b. al-Kâsim, in 219/834-5; and in 224/838-9 in Tâharîstân, which was under his jurisdiction as governor of Khurâsân, he quelled the far more alarming revolt of its ibhakhâd, al-Mâzîlyâr [q.v.], incited to rebel by al-Afshîn.

Gardîzî relates that al-Mu'âtasîm so hated 'Abd Allâh b. Tâhir for a personal criticism that when he became caliph he attempted to poison 'Abd Allâh by sending him a slave girl with a gift of poisoned cloth, but the attempt failed because the slave girl fell in love with 'Abd Allâh and revealed the plot. However that may be, 'Abd Allâh seems to have enjoyed the caliph's esteem. His most implacable enemy, al-Afshîn, during his own heresy trial, testified bitterly to the high regard the caliph had for him, and al-Mu'âtasîm himself referred to 'Abd Allâh as one of the four great men (curiously enough, all of them Tahirîds) of his brother's reign and regretted that he had not been able to foster any men of the same noble calibre.

Like all Tâhirîd rulers, 'Abd Allâh was enormously wealthy; his magnificent palace in Baghdad enjoyed
the royal right of sanctuary and served as a residence for the governor of the city, which remained under Byzantine domination for a long time (Le Strange, Baghdad, 139).

He was a man of wide culture with a deep love and respect for learning; in the controversy regarding the relative merits of Arabic vs. Persian culture, which engaged the keenest minds of that day, 'Abd Allāh strongly supported all things Arabic. In his own right he was an accomplished musician and a poet of note, as well as a sympathetic patron of the poet Ābū Tammām, the compiler of the ʿUṣūlāt, who sang his praises in many poems.

At the age of 48 'Abd Allāh b. Thāhir died as a result of a quinsy after an illness of three days, on Mon. 11 Raḥmān I, 230/Nov. 26, 844, according to most Arab historians (but Nov. 26 was Wed.) and, in true dynastic fashion, he was succeeded by his son, Thāhir. At the time of his death the taxes from the provinces under his control amounted to 48 million dirhams.


'ABD ALLĀH b. TĀHİR [see ABU FUDAYK].

'ABD ALLĀH b. UBAYY b. SA'Lū. (Salūt being Ubayy's mother), chief of Baʿl-Hublā (also known as Sālim), a section of the clan of ʿAwf of the Khazraǰīs, and one of the leading men of Medina. Parricide to the high priest he had led some of the Khazraǰīs in the first day of the Fījar at Medina, but did not take part in the second day of the Fījar or the battle of Buʿāth since he had quarreled with another leader, ʿAmr b. al-Nuʿmān of Bayāda, over the latter's unjust killing of Jewish hostages, perhaps because he realized the need for justice within a community and feared ʿAmr's ambition. But for the coming of Muḥammad he might have been the director of Medina, as the sources suggest. When all but a small minority of the Medina Fatimids accepted Islam, Ibn Ubayy followed the majority, but he was never a whole-hearted Muslim. In 2/624 when Muḥammad attacked Banū Kaʿyukūk, Ibn Ubayy pleaded for them since they had been in league with him in pre-Islamic times; he probably urged their importance as a fighting unit in view of the expected Meccan onslaught. In the consultations before Uḥd (3/625) he supported the policy originally favoured by Muḥammad of remaining in the strongholds. When Muḥammad decided to go to meet the enemy, Ibn Ubayy disapproved, and eventually with 300 followers retired to the strongholds. This move may have stopped the Meccans from attacking Medina itself after the battle, but it showed cowardice and lack of belief in God and the Prophet (cf. Qurʾān, iii, 166-8 [160-2]). Up to this point Ibn Ubayy had done little but criticize Muḥammad verbally, but for the next two years he also intrigued against him. He tried to persuade Banū al-Nādīr not to evacuate their homes at Muḥammad's command, even promising military support. On the expedition to Muṣayrāt he used the occasion of a quarrel between Emigrants and Ṭanṣūr to try to undermine Muḥammad's position and make men think of expelling him; and immediately afterwards he was active in spreading scandal about Ḥāsha. Muḥammad called a meeting and asked to be allowed to punish him (without incurring a feud). There was high feeling between the Aws and the Khazraǰīs, but it was clear that Ibn Ubayy had little backing. His reputation of being leader of the Hypocrites (mudālīkūn) or Muslim opponents of Muḥammad was based on these incidents. After this year there is no record of his actively opposing Muḥammad or intriguing against him. He took part in the expedition of Ḥudaybiya, but stayed away from that to Tabūk, doubtless because of ill health, since he died shortly afterwards (9/631). He was probably not involved in the intrigues connected with the "mosque of dissension" (masjīd al-qirār), since Muḥammad himself conducted his funeral. Throughout his dealings with Ibn Ubayy Muḥammad showed great restraint.

Ibn Ubayy had a son 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd Allāh and several daughters who became good Muslims.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Hīšam, 411-3, 546-558, 591, 653, 726, 734, 927; Tabari, index; Wellhausen, Muḥammad in Medina, Berlin 1882, index; idem., Sissten und Vorarbeiten, Berlin 1889, iv. 50-62; Ibn Saʿd, iii/2, 90, viii, 279; F. Buhl, Das Leben Muḥammad's, 207, 253, etc.; Caetani, Annali, i, 418, 548, 602, etc.; Samhūdī, Wāfāʾ al-Wafāʾ, Cairo 1908, i, 142; Ibn al-Athīr, i, 506 ff.

Well, Montgomery WATT.

'ABD ALLĀH b. ʿUMAR b. 'ABD AL-ʿAZĪZ, son of the caliph ʿUmar II. In the year 126/744 'Abd Allāh was appointed governor of Ṣirāk by Yazīd III, but in a short time aroused the discontent of the Syrian chiefs in that place, who felt that they were unfavorably treated by the new governor compared with the inhabitants of Ṣirāk. After the accession of Marwān II, 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥtiyya b. Djaʾfar, a descendant of ʿAlī's brother Djaʾfar, rebelled in Kūfa in Muḥarram 127/Oct. 744, but was expelled by 'Abd Allāh b. ʿUmar, whereupon he transferred his propaganda to other parts. When Marwān transferred to al-Nāḍr b. Saʿd ibn-Ḥarāshi the governorship of Ṣirāk, 'Abd Allāh energetically refused to leave his post. Al-Nāḍr appeared at Kūfa, whilst 'Abd Allāh remained in Ḥira and hostilities broke out between them. Soon after, his enemy appeared in the person of the Khāridjite chief al-Dāḥḥāk b. Kayš, and then the two adversaries had to come to terms and even to join forces. In Radjab 127/April-May 745 they were defeated by al-Dāḥḥāk and 'Abd Allāh withdrew to Wāṣīf, whilst the victor captured Kūfa. Then the old enmity between the two governors again broke out, but for a second time al-Dāḥḥāk put an end to their quarrels. After a siege lasting several months 'Abd Allāh was obliged to make peace with al-Dāḥḥāk. Subsequently Marwān had 'Abd Allāh arrested. According to the usual account, he died of plague in the prison of Ḥarrān in the year 132/749-50.

**Bibliography:** Tabari, ii, 854 ff.; Ibn al-Athīr, v, 228 ff.; G. Well, Gesch. der Chalifen, ii, 548, 602, etc.; Samhūdī, Wāfāʾ al-Wafāʾ, 253 ff.; Caetani and Gabrieli, Onomasticon, ii, 982. (K. V. ZETTERSTÉN)

'ABD ALLĀH b. ʿUMAR b. AL-KHATTĀB, one of the most prominent personalities of the first generation of Muslims, and of the authorities most frequently quoted for Traditions. He derived his reputation not only from being a son of the Caliph, but also because his high moral qualities compelled the admiration of his contemporaries. At a time when the Muslims were being carried by their passions into civil war, Ibn ʿUmar was able to maintain himself aloof from the conflict; furthermore, he followed the precepts of Islam with such scrupulous
obedience that he became a pattern for future generations, to such a degree that information was collected as to how he dressed, how he cut and dyed his beard, etc. The biographies of him are full of anecdotes and charming touches which serve to illustrate his native wit, his deep piety, his gentleness, propriety and continence, his determination to detach himself from all that he loved most. Some of these stories may have been invented, but his nobility of soul is incontestable. As a transmitter of Tradition, he has been regarded as the most scrupulous in neither adding to nor omitting anything from the hadiths as Lamans has suggested, it is undeniable that Ibn Umar was lacking in energy, and his own father recognized this defect in him.

The following are the events recorded on the life of Umar. Before the hijra, at an unspecified date, he embraced Islam with his father, and emigrated to Medina some time before him. The Prophet sent him back on account of his age when he presented himself to fight at Badr and at Uhud, but he was about fifteen when he took part in the decisive battle of the Moat, when the Muslims were victorious. This service, together with his bravery and piety, earned for him the surname 'dhu 'l-thafindt, leader, a title of the Badjia tribe, noted for its bravery and piety and surnamed 'Abd Allah b. 'Abd Allah b. Sa'd b. Abl Sarh in 26-7/647 against the Byzantines in Ifrikiya and is said to have killed the exarch Gregory with his own hand. On returning from his native land, his dresses, how he cut and dyed his beard, etc. The biographies of him are full of anecdotes and charming touches which serve to illustrate his native wit, his deep piety, his gentleness, propriety and continence, his determination to detach himself from all that he loved most. Some of these stories may have been invented, but his nobility of soul is incontestable. As a transmitter of Tradition, he has been regarded as the most scrupulous in neither adding to nor omitting anything from the hadiths.

Ibn Umar returned to Medina some time before Umar died of septicaemia in 73/693, well before the hijra, at an unspecified date, he embraced Islam with his father, and emigrated to Medina some time before him. The Prophet sent him back on account of his age when he presented himself to fight at Badr and at Uhud, but he was about fifteen when he took part in the decisive battle of the Moat, when the Muslims were victorious. This service, together with his bravery and piety, earned for him the surname 'dhu 'l-thafindt, leader, a title of the Badjia tribe, noted for its bravery and piety and surnamed 'Abd Allah b. 'Abd Allah b. Sa'd b. Abl Sarh in 26-7/647 against the Byzantines in Ifrikiya and is said to have killed the exarch Gregory with his own hand. On returning from his native land, his dresses, how he cut and dyed his beard, etc. The biographies of him are full of anecdotes and charming touches which serve to illustrate his native wit, his deep piety, his gentleness, propriety and continence, his determination to detach himself from all that he loved most. Some of these stories may have been invented, but his nobility of soul is incontestable. As a transmitter of Tradition, he has been regarded as the most scrupulous in neither adding to nor omitting anything from the hadiths.

Ibn Umar returned to Medina some time before Umar died of septicaemia in 73/693, well before the hijra, at an unspecified date, he embraced Islam with his father, and emigrated to Medina some time before him. The Prophet sent him back on account of his age when he presented himself to fight at Badr and at Uhud, but he was about fifteen when he took part in the decisive battle of the Moat, when the Muslims were victorious. This service, together with his bravery and piety, earned for him the surname 'dhu 'l-thafindt, leader, a title of the Badjia tribe, noted for its bravery and piety and surnamed 'Abd Allah b. 'Abd Allah b. Sa'd b. Abl Sarh in 26-7/647 against the Byzantines in Ifrikiya and is said to have killed the exarch Gregory with his own hand. On returning from his native land, his dresses, how he cut and dyed his beard, etc. The biographies of him are full of anecdotes and charming touches which serve to illustrate his native wit, his deep piety, his gentleness, propriety and continence, his determination to detach himself from all that he loved most. Some of these stories may have been invented, but his nobility of soul is incontestable. As a transmitter of Tradition, he has been regarded as the most scrupulous in neither adding to nor omitting anything from the hadiths.

Ibn Umar returned to Medina some time before Umar died of septicaemia in 73/693, well before the hijra, at an unspecified date, he embraced Islam with his father, and emigrated to Medina some time before him. The Prophet sent him back on account of his age when he presented himself to fight at Badr and at Uhud, but he was about fifteen when he took part in the decisive battle of the Moat, when the Muslims were victorious. This service, together with his bravery and piety, earned for him the surname 'dhu 'l-thafindt, leader, a title of the Badjia tribe, noted for its bravery and piety and surnamed 'Abd Allah b. 'Abd Allah b. Sa'd b. Abl Sarh in 26-7/647 against the Byzantines in Ifrikiya and is said to have killed the exarch Gregory with his own hand. On returning from his native land, his dresses, how he cut and dyed his beard, etc. The biographies of him are full of anecdotes and charming touches which serve to illustrate his native wit, his deep piety, his gentleness, propriety and continence, his determination to detach himself from all that he loved most. Some of these stories may have been invented, but his nobility of soul is incontestable. As a transmitter of Tradition, he has been regarded as the most scrupulous in neither adding to nor omitting anything from the hadiths.
to Medina to announce the news of the victory, he was credited with an eloquent description of this exploit (Aghdni, vi, 39, on which most of the later narratives depend). He accompanied Sa'ad b. al-As in his campaigns in northern Persia (29/30/650), and was subsequently nominated by 'Uthman to be one of the commission charged with the official recension of the Qur'ān (Gesch. des Qorans, ii, 47-53). After the assassination of 'Uthman he accompanied his father and 'Aāqiq to Bayṣra and commanded the infantry in the battle of the Camel (to ii, 36/4 Dec. 656); after the battle he returned with 'Aīṣa to Medina, and took no further part in the civil war, except to attend the Arbitration at Dāmāt al-Djiandal (or rather Adhruh), where he is said to have advised 'Abd Allāh b. 'Umar to bribe 'Amr b. al-As (Naṣr b. Muzāḥim, Waqṣūt Siṣān, Cairo 1356, 62).

During the reign of Mu'āwiyah I, 'Abd Allāh, who had inherited a considerable fortune from his father, remained in the background, biding his time, but refused to take the oath to Yazid as heir-presumptive. On Mu'āwiyah's death (60/680), he, together with Ḥusayn b. 'Ali [q.v.], again refused to swear allegiance to Yazid, and to escape the threats of Marwān they fled to Mecca, where they remained unmolested. When, however, after the expedition of Ḥusayn and his death at Karbāba, Ibn al-Zubayr began secretly to enrol adherents, a small force was sent from Medina under the command of his brother 'Amr to arrest him. 'Amr was defeated and taken prisoner, beaten and incarcerated in a cell until he died, and his body was exposed on a gibbet (61/681). 'Abd Allāh now publicly declared Yazid deposed, and his example was followed by the Anṣār at Medina, who elected 'Abd Allāh b. Ḥazāzla [q.v.], known as Ibn al-Ghāsīl (lbn Sa'd, v, 46-9) as their chief. Yazid, realizing that he had temporized too long, despatched a Syrian army under Muslim b. ʿUkbā, which defeated the Medinians in the battle of the Harra (27 Dhu 'l-Hijjah 63/27 Aug., 683) and proceeded (notwithstanding Muslim's death) to besiege 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr in Mecca (26 Muh. 64/24 Sept. 683). Sixty-four days later, on receiving the news of Yazid's death, the Syrian forces desisted, and the commander, Ḥusayn b. Numayr, tried to persuade Ibn al-Zubayr to accompany them back to Syria, but he determined to stay in Mecca.

The ensuing confusion in Syria and the outbreak of civil war gave Ibn al-Zubayr his chance. He proclaimed himself amir al-mumāminin, and the opponents of the Umayyads in Syria, Egypt, southern Arabia and Kūfa recognized him as Caliph. But his authority remained almost wholly nominal. The victory of Marwān I [q.v.] at Mardī Rāḥīt (end of 64/July 684) and the revolt of Muḥkār [q.v.] at Kūfa fifteen months later, placed his supporters in Syria, Egypt and Ṭirāk on the defensive; and although al-Muhāllab's support of Mus'ab b. al-Zubayr at Basra and subsequent victory over Muḥkār (67/682) restored a Zubayrid government in Ṭirāk, Mus'ab was to all intents an independent ruler. At the same time, the Bakīrite Khaḍirījītes, who had separated from Ibn al-Zubayr after the death of Yazid and had established themselves in eastern Najd under the command of Nadjīd, occupied the province of Bahrāyin (i.e. al-Ḥaṣa), and in 68/687-8 seized al-Yaman and Hadramawt, followed next year by the occupation of Ta'if, thus completely isolating him in the Hijāz. At the Pilgrimage of 68/688 no fewer than four different leaders presided over their separate groups of partisans: Ibn al-Zubayr, a Khaḍirījī, an Umayyad, and Muḥammad b. al-Hanafīyya. Finally, after the Umayyad reoccupation of Irāk, 72/692, 'Abd al-Malik despatched al-Ḥadījādī to deal with Mecca. The siege began on 1 Dhu 'l-Ka'da 72/25 March, 692, and lasted for more than six months, during which the city and the Ka'ba were under bombardment. When at length his supporters gave way, and even his own sons surrendered to al-Ḥadījādī, 'Abd Allāh, urged on by his mother, returned to the field of battle and was slain. His body was placed on a gibbet on the spot where his brother 'Amr had been exposed, and some time later was given back by orders of 'Abd al-Malik to his mother, who buried it in the house of Ṣafiyya at Medina.

'Abd Allāh is the principal representative in history of the second generation of the noble Muslim families of Mecca, who resented the capture of the Caliphate by the Umayyad house and the gulf of power which this had created between the clan of 'Abd Shams and the other Meccan clans. This resentment is still clearly visible as a groundtheme in the numerous anecdotes on his relations with Mu'āwiyah (see Bibl. under Balādhuri), in spite of their later elaboration and of Muslim idealization of this challenger of Umayyad rule, which has transformed a brave, but fundamentally self-seeking and self-indulgent man into a model of piety (see especially Ḥiya al-Awliyā', i, 329-337). On the other hand, many sources portray him as avaricious, jealous, and ill-natured, and reproach him particularly for his harsh conduct towards his brother, Muhammad b. al-Hanafīyya, and 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abbās.

with Antoine de Bourbon, king of Navarre, and was prepared to cede to him al-Kasr al-Šâghir in exchange for 500 soldiers, and entered into commercial relations with England. He tried to conquer the fortress of Mazagan, which was in the hands of the Portuguese, dispatching against it a numerous army under the command of his son Muḥammad, his heir. The siege lasted from 4 March to 30 April 1562 and ended with the failure of the Sa'did troops, who suffered heavy losses.

In internal affairs he consolidated the work of his father, without meeting any serious opposition. He seemed to have feared especially the members of his family; he had his brother al-Ma'mūn assassinated in Tlemcen and put to death his nephew Muḥ. b. ʿAbd al-Kādir, whose popularity roused his ill-will (975/1567-8). He also seems to have suspected some of the religious leaders: he imprisoned, or put to death, several members of the Yūsufiyya order and had crucified in Marrākūsh the faqīḥ Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥ. al-Andalusī, accused of heresy (15 Dhu'l-Hijjād 980/19 April 1573). He constructed several important buildings in Marrākūsh, such as the Ibn Yūsuf madrasa. Diego de Torres also attributes to him the establishment of the malālkūt of Marrākūsh in its present location. He also built a fortress to protect the harbour of Agadir.


Abd Allāh Pasha Muḥsin-Zāde Čelebi, Ottoman statesman and general, son of Muḥsin Čelebi, descended from a family of merchants at Aleppo. He started his career in 1115/1703 in the financial administration with the post of supervisor (emīs) of the Mīn (darb-khānâ), the defterdar of which was his brother, Muḥmed Efendī. He became son-in-law ( damsâr) of the Grand-Vizier Corlulu ʿAlī Pasha (1707-10) and enjoyed the favour of the grand vizier Kaytaş Beg, who was sent to Egypt in 1126/1714, succeeded in subduing the rebel and sent his head to the Porte. Between 1715 and 1737 he filled several administrative and military posts: defterdar in Morea, governor (muhâfîz) of Lepanto (Aynabakhti), chief of the kapudânlâs with the rank of a Pasha, head of the imperial chancery (nâshīdâlâs), agâh of the Janissaries, Beylerbey of Vidin, of Rumeli and of Bosnia. He was commander (ser-vâshîr) at Bender, in Bessarabia, when Russia invaded the Crimea (1736) and Austria threatened to intervene on the Danube. Negotiations at Niemirov (Poland) led to no results.

Appointed by Sultan Mahmud I (1730-54) as Grand-Vizier (6 Rabi` II, 1150/August 3rd, 1737), Abd Allâh Pasha directed the war operations, without achieving the results hoped for by the court. Re-called to Istanbul after four months, he had to hand over the seal of office to the new Grand-Vizier Yegen Pasha (Dec. 19th, 1737). He continued to fill posts as commander of fortresses and governor of provinces and died in Rahb (`i, 1162/spring 1749 in Trikala, Thessaly, at the age of 90 years. His son Mehmed Pasha Muḥsin-Zāde signed the peace of Küçük Kaynarja (1774).

Bibliography: Hammer-Purgstall, iv, 330, 340; Sīdījî-i ʿOthmānî, iii, 379; N. Jorda, Gesch. des osm. Reiches, iii, 430, 434. (E. Rossi)

Abd Allâh Sari [see Sari Abd Allâh Efendi].

Abd al-ʿAzîz (Abdulaziz), the thirty-second Ottoman sultan. Born on 9 Feb. 1830, the third son of Sultan Mahmûd II [q.v.], he succeeded his brother Abd al-Madjîd [q.v.], 20 June 1861. His reign was marked by revolts and insurrections in the Balkan provinces (Montenegro, Serbia, Bosnia, Herzegovina and Bulgaria) and in Crete, which brought about the intervention of the great powers. From 1870 onwards, the influence of Russia, supplanting that of France and England, preponderated in Istanbul, and General Ignatieff, the Russian ambassador, often imposed his views on the grand vizier Mahmûd Nadîm Pasha. Russia also made efforts to stir up the discontent of the subjects of the Porte: Slavs, Albanians, and even Arabs and Egyptians.

In spite of internal crises, the policy of reforms, called tanzîmât [q.v.], was not abandoned. The administration of the provinces was reorganized (law of wîldâyets modeled on French law, 1867) and some attempts were made to reform the institution of the waḥf (1867). On French advice, a council of justice ( shârâ-i dawâšt), composed of Muslims and Christians, and a council of justice (imâdan-i ahkâm-ı ʿadîyyet) were set up (1868). Public education was reorganized after the French model and a lycée was opened in Galata-saray. It was open to all Ottoman subjects and instruction was given in French by French teachers (1868). A university (dâr ul-fûnûn) was established. At the same time, the army, and especially the navy, were reorganized. Foreigners acquired the right to possess immovable property (1867). Other attempts at economic reforms remained fruitless: in 1877, the deficit of the budget reached 112 millions. The government, judging itself unable to face its obligations, followed the advice of the Russian ambassador, reduced by half the payment of interest on the debt and had to declare itself bankrupt. The deplorable state of the national economy, the financial crisis, the revolts and insurrections in the Balkan provinces, made it particularly difficult to apply the reforms, with which the great powers were dissatisfied, while the Old Turks considered them incompatible with religion and the Young Turks insufficient. This resulted in general discontent against the sultan, who was deposed on 30 March 1876 and committed suicide a few days later.

Bibliography: Mahmûd Djeladdîn, Mîrâ-i Ḥâkîmî, Istanbul 1326; Ibnûlînîm Muḥâtîn Köçak, Osmanlı devrinde son sadralazamalar, i, Istanbul 1940; idem, Hatta-i Âti, TOEM, xv, 40; idem, Sultan Abdûlazîz dair, TOEM, xv, 177; Abdurrahman Şerif, Sultan Abdülazîz in veşfa vişnîk mi hakîl mi, TOEM, xiv, 341; Ismail Hakîki Uznâr, Sultan Abdülazîz vak'asına dair vak'a nüvüs Lütfî Efendinin bir risalesi, Bell. viii, 349; Ahmed Şâh, Wâba-yi Sultân ʿAbd ul-ʿAzîz, Cairo 1326; Milliger (Osman Seyfi Bey), La Turquie sous le règne d'Abd ul-Azîz, Paris 1868;

(E. Z. Karal)

‘ABD AL-AZİZ B. AL-ḤADDĪJ IBRĀHĪM AL-ǦİAMIĬI AL-ISGĀNĪ, celebrated Ibâdi scholar, b. c. 1130/1717-8, probably at Wardjlân (Ouargla), d. Raḍjâb 1223/August 1618, at Banû Isgân (Beni Isqen) in the Mzab, where, at the age of about forty, he had begun his studies under the shaykh Abû Zakariyyâ Yahyâ b. Sâlih, of Djarr. ‘Abd al-‘Azîz is held by the Ibâdis to-day to be one of the greatest scholars who ever lived in the Mzab, where he has left the reputation of a man of fervent piety, remarkable sagacity, great imperturbability, perfect self-control, and astonishing assiduity.

He devoted himself to the composition of a dozen works on theology and jurisprudence. His most important work is K. al-Na’l-a-Shî’a al-‘Ālî, autographed at Cairo 1305/1887-8. This treatise, conceived on the plan of the Mukhâsasâr of Khâlit, but less concise in style, is a complete exposition of Ibâdi legislation, put together from the most authoritative works of Ibâdi scholarship in ‘Uman, Djâbal Nafusa, Djarr and the Mzab, all of which can be identified without difficulty. It was on this work that E. Zeys drew for his studies on this subject. The other works of ‘Abd al-‘Azîz are the following: Takmilat al-Nâ, published at Tunis some 25 years ago; al-Ward al-bâsîm fi Riway’al-Akhâm, a précis of jurisprudence devoted chiefly to questions of judgment; Ma’âlim al-Din, a reasoned exposition of the Ibâdi creed, along with refutation of the arguments put forward by the defenders of the other sects (unpublished); Mukhâsasâr al-Musâhîb min K. Abî Maṣ‘ûla wa’l-Awlâh, on questions of inheritance; ‘Ikâd al-Dīwânîh, a summary of Kanâ’ir al-Khayrât al-Dîayâtî, on worship and religion in general (unpublished); Mukhâsasâr Ḥubûk al-Awdâdî, on the rights and duties of husband and wife (unpublished); ‘Ulama min Durar al-Minbâdî al-Ma’âmî, abridgment of a voluminous ‘Umixî work of jurisprudence (unpublished); Ta‘âṣum al-Mawqijâr (or Dhûl-Nârânî) al-Ṣa’di Marqîl-Baḥrâyn (unpublished); al-Asrâr al-Nârânîyya, on prayer and the accompanying rites (autographed in Egypt 1306/1888-9); al-Nûr, on the principal dogmas of the Faith (autographed in Egypt 1306/1888-9); Mukhâsasâr al-Mawqijâr al-Târîhî, résumé of several Ibâdi works on Ḥadîth.


(De Motylinスキ一T. Lewicki)

‘ABD AL-‘AZÎZ B. AL-ḤADDĪJ IBRÂHĪM B. ‘ABD AL-MALIK, Umayyad general. He was a faithful partisan of his cousin Yazid III and one of his most eminent assistants. Already in al-Wâlî II’s reign he helped Yazid, who headed the mawkûtins, to enlist troops against the caliph. When they had succeeded in getting together an army in Damascus, ‘Abd al-‘Azîz received the supreme command and marched against al-Wâlî. Yazid’s brother ‘Abbâs, who was about to go to the caliph’s assistance, was attacked and forced to pay homage to Yazid.

Shortly afterwards ‘Abd al-‘Azîz stormed the castle of Bâlghrân, whither al-Wâlî had withdrawn, and put the caliph to death. This was in the year 126/744. Yazid was now proclaimed caliph; the inhabitants of Himâ (Enesa), however, stoutly refused to do homage to the usurper and marched against Damascus. Yazid sent two army divisions against them, and while the rebels were engaged with one division, ‘Abd al-‘Azîz advanced with the other and decided the combat, whereupon the rising was suppressed. In the same year Yazid died after settling the succession on his brother Ibrâhîm and after him on ‘Abd al-‘Azîz. The inhabitants of Himâ, however, again refused to do homage to the new ruler, who for that matter was hardly recognized outside the capital. On Ibrâhîm’s orders ‘Abd al-‘Azîz therefore began to lay siege to the town, but withdrew when Marwân b. Muḥ., then governor of Armenia and Adhâbarbaydjiân, advanced against him. His successor, its gates to Marwân, the followers of the late caliph were defeated in Sa’dîr 127/Nov. 744 at ‘Ayn al-Djarr, and Marwân had himself proclaimed caliph in Damascus. As soon as he had entered the town, ‘Abd al-‘Azîz b. al-Ḥaddîjîdî was murdered by clients of al-Wâlî II.


(Sc. V. Zetterstêen)

‘ABD AL-‘AZÎZ B. AL-ḤADDÎJ IBRÂHÎM, sultan of Morocco from 1894 to 1908. He was born, according to Weisgerber, on 24 Feb. 1878, according to Doutte and Saint-René Taillandier 18 Rabî’ I 1298/18 Feb. 1881, of the sultan Mawlay al-Ḥasan and Lâlâ Rukçâyî, of Circassian origin. When his father died on a campaign, 9 June 1894, ‘Abd al-‘Azîz was proclaimed sultan in Rabat, thanks to the hâdîjî Aḥmad b. Mûsâ, called Bâ Aḥmad, who had been in charge of his education and received as reward the title of Grand-Vizier. ‘Abd al-‘Azîz left the management of affairs in the hands of Aḥmad until his death on 13 May 1900. During this period Morocco continued to live more or less in its traditional way.

After the death of his mentor, ‘Abd al-‘Azîz fell under the influence of a small group of Europeans, including Sir Harry McLean, instructor of the Sherifian infantry, who encouraged the natural taste of the ruler for modernism, so that very soon the Sherifian palaces housed photographic cameras, billiards, etc. All this shocked the conservative feelings of the Moroccans and cost money. Moreover, in Sept. 1901, ‘Abd al-‘Azîz contemplated an equitable reform of taxes, tarîbî, in order to abolish the privileges and immunities of the existing system. In consequence, an agitator (râfî), called Dîlîlî b. Idrîs al-Ẓarâbînî al-Ŷûsûfî, nicknamed Bâ Ḥmi‘îra (‘Abî Ḥmâra), rose in the district of Taznîf, gave himself out as a brother of the sultan and quickly became master of the region to the east of Fez (1902), threatening the capital itself in 1903.

On the other hand, the European powers exerted a strong pressure upon the Sherifian government, to protect the Europeans established in Morocco,
repress frontier incidents (region of Figuig), and obtain a guarantee for the considerable sums lent to the sultan by various European groups. These pressures, marked by various incidents, such as the visit of the German Emperor William II to Tangier (31 March 1905), led to the conference of Algeciras. The Act of Algeciras (7 April 1906), interpreted as an admission of surrender to the demands of the European powers, made 'Abd al-'Azîz even more unpopular in Morocco. Anarchy and discontent increased equally, and the sultan was unable to bring about any improvement. One of his brothers, Mawlay 'Abd al-Hafliz, was proclaimed sultan in Marrakûsh on 16 August 1907, immediately after the disembarkation of French troops in Casablanca. 'Abd al-'Azîz tried to resist by organizing an expedition to Marrakûsh in July 1908. His army broke up and was defeated by the troops of his brother on 19 August at Bû Aqlîba on the Wadi Tassâtût. 'Abd al-'Azîz took refuge in Casablanca and there abdicated on 21 August 1908. After a short stay in France, he established himself in Tangier, where he lived, without mixing in politics, until his death, 10 June 1943.

**Bibliography**:

(Le Tourneau)

**'ABD AL-'AZIZ B. MARWÂN**, son of the caliph Marwân I and father of 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azîz. 'Abd al-'Azîz was appointed governor of Egypt by his father, and the appointment was confirmed by 'Abd al-Malik, when he ascended the throne. During his twenty years' sojourn in Egypt, 'Abd al-'Azîz proved himself a capable governor, who really had the welfare of his province at heart. When in the year 69/689, 'Abd al-Malik, after the assassination of his rebellious lieutenant 'Amr b. Sa'd, intended to have the latter's relatives executed as well, 'Abd al-'Azîz interceded for them and persuaded the incensed caliph to spare their lives. Towards the end of his life 'Abd al-'Azîz suffered from the ill will of his brother 'Abd al-Malik. Marwân had nominated him to succeed 'Abd al-Malik, but the latter wished to secure the throne for his two sons, al-Walîd and Sulaymân, and therefore cherished the project of removing his brother from his governorship and excluding him from the succession to the throne, when in the year 85/704 news suddenly reached Damascus that 'Abd al-'Azîz was dead.

**Bibliography**:

(K. V. Zettenstreën)

**'ABD AL-'AZIZ B. MUHAMMAD B. IBRAHIM AL-SINHâGÎ FIGHTAGH, Moroccan writer, b. 956/1549, d. at Marrakûsh 1031/1621-2, was head of the chancery (wazîr al-balâm al-'UD) and official historiographer (mutawalli ilâ-rîkh al-dawla) of the Sau'did sultan Ahmad al-Mansur al-Dhâhibî (q.v.). Of his literary and historical works, which were considerable, there survive only lengthy quotations, especially by the chronicler al-Îfrîînî (q.v.) in his *Nuzhat al-Hâdît*. Al-Fighthâlî, who was a contemporary and friend of al-Mâkkarî (q.v.), the author of *Nafl al-Tîb*, composed annals of the Sau'did dynasty down to his own times, under the title of *Mawâbîl al-Sa'îdî fi a'Ibâr al-Malik al-Šurâfî*. He was the author of many panegyric poems, more particularly *mawâlîdyyâd* [q.v.]. The verses used for the epigraphic decoration of the palace of al-Badî' at Marrâkûsh were of his composition.

**Bibliography**:

(E. Lévi-Provençal)

**'ABD AL-'AZIZ B. MÛSÁ B. NUŠAYR**, first governor of al-Andalus, after the departure to the East of his father Mûsâ b. Nušayr, the famous conqueror of the Iberian peninsula, in 95/714, Mûsâ, on leaving, gave his instructions to pursue the Muslim advance and to pacify the regions which had come under Muslim control. According to certain traditions, it was under his government that part of what is now Portugal, including the towns of Evora, Santarem and Coimbra, and the sub-pyreanean regions from Pamplona to Narbonne were conquered. He himself took Malaga and Elvira, and then subdued the land of Catalonia, concluding with a Gothic lord, Theodemir (who gave his name to the district, Tudmir [q.v.]) a treaty, the more or less authentic text of which has survived.

'Abd al-'Azîz married the widow of the last Visigothic king Roderic, Egîlon, who is said to have adopted Islam and taken the name of Umm 'Asîm. This princess gained so much influence over the governor that he soon became suspect to his compatriots and was accused of abusing his position. He was assassinated in Seville, where he had fixed his residence, by a certain Ziyâd b. Udhra al-Balawî, at the beginning of Radjab 97/March 718, and was succeeded by his maternal cousin, Ayyûb b. Habîl al-Laghmî.

**Bibliography**:

(E. Lévi-Provençal)

**'ABD AL-'AZIZ AL SA'OD** [see SA'ODDS]

**'ABD AL-'AZIZ B. AL-WALÎD**, son of the caliph al-Walîd I. In 91/709, he took part in the campaign against the Byzantines, under the orders of his uncle, Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik, and during the following years, he also participated in the battles against the same enemies. In 96/714-5, al-Walîd, whose designated successor was Sulaymân b. 'Abd al-Malik, tried to exclude Sulaymân from the succession in favour of his son 'Abd al-'Azîz, but his attempt failed. After the death of Sulaymân at Dâbîk, 99/717, 'Abd al-'Azîz wanted to claim the crown, but learning that 'Umar II b. 'Abd al-'Azîz had been proclaimed as caliph, he betook himself to him and paid him homage. He died in 110/728-9.

**Bibliography**:

(K. V. Zettenstreën)
ABD AL-'AZIZ EFENDI Kara Celebizade [see KARA CELEBIZADE]

SHAH 'ABD AL-'AZIZ AL-DIHLAWI, the eldest son of Shah Wali Allah al-Dihlawi (g.v.), a noted Indian theologian and author of several religious works in Arabic and Persian, was born at Delhi in 1159/1746 (hence his chronogrammatic name Ghulam Haliin) and died there in 1239/1824. He studied mainly with his father, after whose death in 1176/1762 he soon began to teach as the head of the Madrasa Rahimiya, founded by his grandfather. As a teacher, preacher and writer, he exercised a considerable influence on the religious thought of his time. His chief works are as follows. In Arabic: (1) Sira al-Shahadatayn (Delhi 1261), in which he sets forth the ingenious view that the Prophet vicariously acquired the merit and distinction of shahda or martyrdom through the tragic death of his grandson, Husayn son of 'Ali. One of his pupils, Salamat Allah wrote a commentary on it in Persian (Lucknow 1882). (2) 'Asis al-lkthibas fi Fadail Aghyar al-Nas, a collection of traditions on the virtues of the first four Caliphs (Dilli 1322/1904, with Persian and Urdu translations). (3) Mu'in al-Ab'did, a concise statement of the Muslim creed (Dilli 1321 A. H.). In Persian: (4) Tufa' iihna 'Ashariyya (edited by Muhammad Sadik 'Ali Ridawi, Lucknow 1205 A. H.), in which he refutes the Shi'ite doctrines and thus continues the controversial work of his father, Isat al-Khata'i 'an Khulafa al-Khulafa. It has also been translated into Urdu. (5) Ugdul Nafa' (Dilli 1312, 1348 A. H.), an introduction to the science of Hadith. (6) Bihtiar al-MuHadithin (Dilli 1989), a bibliography of Hadith literature, giving descriptions of books together with brief biographies of their authors. (7) Fathawi (in 2 parts, Dilli 1341 A. H.), a collection of opinions and formal decisions on questions of law and doctrine.

There is also an Urdu translation of part 1 by M. Nawwab 'Ali and 'Abd al-Dajib (Haydarabad Deccan 1333; also Cawnpore). (8) Fath al-'Asis, commonly known as Tasir 'Asiri, a commentary in Persian on Suras i and ii, and sections 29 and 30 of the Kur'an. Sections 29 and 30 were both printed at Calcutta; the former bears the date 1248 A. H., while that of the other is not traceable. There are several other prints. Urdu translations of all the various parts have been published. (9) Mufidat Shah 'Abd al-'Asis, the obiter dicta of the author, originally collected in Persian in 1233 A. H. and later translated into Urdu by 'Azmat Ilahi in 1315/1897 and lithographed at Meerut.

Bibliography: Siddik Hasan Khan, lbii al-Nubaida', 296; Muhammad b. Yahya al-Tibrizi, al-Yani' al-Dawli fl Asamid al-Shayk 'Abd al-Ghani, lithographed on the margin of Kasfi al-Astir 'an Riga'i Ma'sani al-Athir (Deoband 1349 A. H.), 73-5; Rahim 'Ali, Tadhkira Ulama? Hind (Lucknow 1914), 122; Rahim Babhik, Hayati Wali (in Urdu), Dilli 1319 A. H., 338-42; idem., Hayati 'Asisi, Storey, Persian Literature, i, 24; Zubaid Ahmad, The contribution of Indians to Arabic literature, Jullundur 1946, Index; Bashir al-Din, Tadhkira 'Asisiyya, Meerut 1934. (SH. INAYATULLAH)

'ABD AL-BA'H [see BAH'I'S].

'ABD AL-DJABBAR B. 'ABD AL-RAHMAN AL-ADLI, governor of Khurasan. In 1307/1748 and 1337/1750-1 he was a supporter of the 'Abbasiids in their conflict with the Umayyads, and was appointed to command the shura during the caliphates of al-Saffah and al-Mansur. The latter sent him to Khorasan as governor in 1409/197-8. On arrival in the province, he began a violent persecution against the local aristocracy, whom he accused of partiality for the 'Aliids; but it seems that his measures affected also some of the partisans of the 'Abbasiids (as is stated in the Persian version of al-Tabari). This was apparently the reason why the caliph came to suspect him of rebellion. A cunning exchange of letters, which followed, only confirmed these suspicions, and eventually in 1417/1558-9 al-Mansur sent an army against him under the command of his son al-Mahdi. On the approach of the troops the population of Marw al-Rudh rose and delivered up 'Abd al-Djibbar, who was brought before al-Mansur, tortured, and put to death, probably at the beginning of 142/1775-60.

Bibliography: Ya'kub, index; Tabari, index; Chronique de Tabari (Persian), tr. H. Zietenberg, iv, 378-80; S. Moscati, La risoluzione di 'Abd al-Gabbah, in Rend. Lincei, 1947, 613-5. (S. MOSCATI)

'ABD AL-DJABBAR B. AHMAD B. 'ABD AL-DJABBAR AL-HAMADHANI AL-ASADABADI, Abu I-Hasan, Mu'tazilite theologian, in law a follower of the Shafi'i school. Born about 325, he lived in Baghdad, until called to Dilli in 367/978, by the sdbb Ibn 'Abbad, a staunch supporter of the Mu'tazila. He was subsequently appointed chief kadi of the province; hence he is usually referred to in later Mu'tazilite literature as khddi al-kudati. (For some anecdotes on his relations with Ibn 'Abbad see Yakub, Irjidad, ii, 312, 314). On the death of Ibn 'Abbad, he was deposed and arrested by the ruler, Fakhr al-Dawla, but was later released, probably through the intervention made by him about his deceased benefactor (Irjidad, i, 70-1, ii, 335). No details seem to be given, about his later life, and we do not seem to know, for instance, whether he was re-instanted in his office. He died in 415/1025.

His main dogmatic work is the enormous al-Muhgihi, of which the greater part has been preserved (in Sa'ad, see: Fihrist Kutub al-Khizna al-Mutawakkiliyya, 103-4; some volumes in Cairo, brought from Sa'ad, see: Kh. Y. Nami, Kh. Y. Nami, Tadhkira 'Aziziyya, 1946, Index; Bashir al-Dln, Tadhkira 'Aziziyya, 1929, 42) contains as important dogmatic treatise seems to be his al-Misriyya li-Taswir al-Maktyuddt al-'Arabiyya; of India to Arabic literature, an introduction al-Misriyya li-Taswir al-Maktyuddt al-'Arabiyya, Cairo 1952, 15). Another important handbook of his dogmatics, al-Mu'hib bi'l-Taklif, was compiled by his pupil Ibn Mattawayh (q.v.). Several volumes in Sa'ad, Fihrist, 102 (vol. 1149; Al-Irshad, 357; fragments in Leningrad, see: A. Borisov, Les manuscrits mu'assilltes de la Bibliotheque publique de Leningrad, Bibliografia y Vostoka, 1935, 63-95). His monograph on prophecy (Tathbis Dalai'di 'Ibluwwal Sayyidina Muhammad, Shahid 'Ali Pasha 1575, cf. H. Ritter, Isl., 1929, 42) contains also important discussions of the views of other schools, especially those of the Shi'a. Another important dogmatic treatise seems to be his Sirar al-Ural al-Khamsiyya (vat. 1928). For other writings that have come down to us, cf. Brockelmann. It is only from his own works, however, that his system can be reconstructed. All the writings of the latter Mu'tazila—including the Zaydi writers of his own school, too, have been preserved mainly by the Zaydis of Yemen—appear in reports of his opinions. He was the chief figure in the last phase of Mu'tazilism, but his teaching has not yet been studied.

Bibliography: Abu Sa'id al-Bayhaki, Sheik Qyuan al-Mas'udi, MS Leiden, Landberg 215, fol. 123-125, whence Ibn al-Murtaqi, al-Mu'tasila, Arnold), 66 ff.; al-Shaykh al-Baghdadi,
"Abd al-Djabbar b. Ahmad — Abd al-Hakik b. Sayf al-Din


— Abd al-Djabbar’s Tabakdt al-Mu‘asla was the main source of Abu Sa‘id al-Maybaj’s important historical account of the Mut‘azila in the introduction of his Sharh ‘Uyun al-Masa‘il. Al-Maybaj’s account was taken over, in a slightly abbreviated form, by Ibn al-Murtada (ed. T. W. Arnold). (S. M. Stern)

Abd al-Fattah Fumani, Persian historian, lived probably in the 16th-17th centuries. Entering into government service in Fuman, the old capital of Gilan (Ch. Schefer, Christ. pers., ii, 93) he was appointed controller of accounts by the vizier of the place, Behzad-beg, about 1018 or 1019/1609-10. After serving under several other viziers, he was taken to ‘Irak by ‘Adil Shah. He wrote in Persian Ta’rikh-i Gilan, a history of Gilan from 923/1517 to 1038/1628. This book, published by B. Dorn (with a resume in his introduction), completes the histories of Zahir al-Din [q.v.] and ‘Ali b. Sham’s Gilan [q.v.].


Abd al-Ghani b. Ismai’il al-Nabulusi, a mystic, theologian, poet, traveller, and voluminous writer on a variety of subjects, born in Damascus 5 Du‘a‘ 1-Hijjah 1050/19 March 1641, and the leading figure in the religious and literary life of Syria in his time. His family, traditionally Shafi‘i (though his father had changed to the Hanafi rite), had long been settled in Damascus and Muhhibi describes his great-grandfather as ‘ghaykh mas‘ahib al-Sham’ (Khudija, ii, 433). He early showed an interest in mysticism, joining the Kādiri and Naṣḥandi taṣkīs, and as a young man shut himself up in his house for seven years with the famous scholars there (of whom he mentions Behzad-beg, about 1018 or 1019/1609-10. After serving under several other viziers, he was taken to ‘Irak by ‘Adil Shah. He wrote in Persian Ta’rikh-i Gilan, a history of Gilan from 923/1517 to 1038/1628. This book, published by B. Dorn (with a resume in his introduction), completes the histories of Zahir al-Din [q.v.] and ‘Ali b. Sham’s Gilan [q.v.].


Abd al-Ghani, Tadhrib al-‘Abhār, i, 154-7; Mustafa al-Bakri, al-Falah al-tariyy fi ... al-shaykh ‘Abd al-Ghanî al-Masri (Ms. in the writer’s possession); Ibn al-‘Arabi, Fuqâ‘i al-hikam, ed. ‘Ali (Cairo, 1940), i, 23; A. S. Khalidi, Riwa‘i id-yid al-Sham (Jaffa, 1946); ‘Abou’dou, Rouwad al-nahda al-haditha (Haurat, 1952), 143 ff.; L. Massignon, La Passion de al-Hallaj, passim. (W. A. S. Khalidi)

Abd al-Hakik Abü Muhammad [see MarnNius].

Abd al-Hakik Abü Sayf al-Din al-Dihlawi, al-Buhgârî, Abu l-Majdî, with the taḥkallus Ḥabîb, Indian author in Arabic and Persian, born Mubarram 958/Jan. 1551, died 2 Rabî‘ II 1052/30 June 1642. He spent some time in Fat’hâbîr, studying with Sayfî and Mîrzâ Nîzâm al-Dîn Ahmad, but fell out with them (cf. Bâdûnî, iii, 113, 115 ff.; al-Mahdî wa l-Râzî, on marg. of. Akhbâr al-Abhâb, Delhi, 1352, 156; ‘Abd al-Hakîk’s book on the writers of Delhi, cf. below, p. 20; Haft Ilmîm, s. v. Diḥî). He left for the Hijâz in 996 (Akhbâ‘i-Abhâr, Urdu transl. of Ghalwî’s Gulsîr-Abhâr, Aga 1326, 559), studying for several years with the famous scholars there (of whom he gave an account in his Zad al-Muttaqîn). On his return, he taught for half a century in Delhi. He won the favour of Dînahîr (who praises him in the Târîkh-i-Dînahîr, al-‘Adhîm, 180-2, 204, and Shabdadîhîn. ‘Ubayd Allah Khâshêh, Makhbûsar Mu‘âdîy âl-Wilayy, Panjab Univ. Libr. MS. fol. 258 v., quotes a riyaḍa by ‘Abd al-Ḥakîk against the “ecstatic phrases” (ghâfisîyâd) of Ahmad Kâhûl (Mudjid‘i-al-‘Imâm, d. 1034), but ultimately

(‘Awâd al-Dîn Nûrî, Muḥmmad Uskudârî, Muhammad Birgâli. He wrote also on the orders to which he belonged, as well as on the Mawârîn, p. In his original writings he seems to be dominated by the concept of wadât al-wuqûjid; of these original works the most important is the first volume of his great diwân.

The Dhu‘a‘n al-‘adawâ’wîn, which contains the main body of his poetical output, comprises, as well as the first volume on mysticism (published Cairo 1302 etc.), three other volumes containing eulogies of the Prophet, general eulogies and correspondences, and love-poems respectively. This by no means represents the whole of his poetical output, many of his other works also being written in verse form, and his interest in poetry is reflected in his commentary on the poems of Ibn Hâni‘ al-Andalusî. During his lifetime and after he had a great reputation as a poet (see Amir Haydar, Le Liban (ed. Rustum) i, 8 ft., 22 ft., and for his use of the muwâshshâh, Hartmann, Muwâshshâh, 6).

In his narratives of his travels (see above) it was not ‘Abd al-Ǧhani’s intention to present a description of topographical or architectural detail. They are rather records of his own mystical experiences; but at the same time they throw a considerable amount of light on the religious and cultural life of the age. They are important also because they served as models for later travellers, such as the Damascene Muṣṭâfâ al-Bakîrî and the Egyptian As‘ad al-Ḻukayymi. In addition, he wrote works, some of them vast and encyclopaedic, on tafsîr, hadîth, kalâm, fikh, interpretation of dreams (a mine of information on the spiritualism and superstitions of his age), agriculture, the lawfulness of tobacco, and many other subjects.

Bibliography: Murâdî, Silh al-durar, i, 30-8; Dijâbî, ‘Adlîb i-‘Abîr, i, 154-7; Muhî ‘alî al-Bakrî, al-Falîh al-tarîî fi ... al-shaykh ‘Abd al-Ghanî al-Masri (Ms. in the writer’s possession); Ibn al-‘Aralî, Fuqâ‘i al-hikam, ed. ‘Ali (Cairo, 1940), i, 23; A. S. Khalidi, Riwa‘i id-yid al-Sham (Jaffa, 1946); ‘Abou’dou, Rouwad al-nahda al-hadîthâ (Haurat, 1952), 143 ff.; L. Massignon, La Passion de al-Hallaj, passim. (W. A. S. Khalidi)
the controversy was settled peacefully (Siddil: Hasan Khan, Tiksdr ... falar, 201; A thydr al-Aghydr, 6; W. Beale, Mstfâh al-Tawârîsh, Capnwr 1867, 246; Bashar al-Din Aymad, Wâdrî-i Hikmât-i Dildr, Agra 1919, iii, 305. According to the Taflîf-i and Abydr al-Hâmîd's descendants in Delhi were still celebrating every year his 7ers at the tomb.

In his Taflîf Kaîb al-Alî bi-Kitâbât Fîhrîst al-Tawârîsh, appended to his treatise on the writers and poets of Delhi (cf. the Urdu periodical Târîkh, Haydarabad-Deccan, vol. i, part 34), 'Abd al-Hâmîd gives a list of his forty-nine works in Arabic and Persian. The following are the most important of his works: a Dîwân (cf. Shîbûh-Guîsîân, Bhopal 1295, 741); Lamâtah al-Tankh, Arabic commentary on al-Tibrizî's Mtbkât al-Masârb; Aşîrât al-Lamaâtî, a fuller, Persian, commentary on the Mtbkât, Lucknow 1277; A thydr al-Aghydr, lives of saints, mostly Indian; Zuwdat al-Áthbdr, biography of 'Abd al-Kâdîr al-Dîjlânî; Mstfâh al-Fawîsh, Persian translation, with commentary, of al-Dîjlânî's Futûh al-Ghayb; Dîshr al-Mulâk, a sketch of Indian history from the Ghûrûds to Akbar; Dîshdr al-Kuîs, a history of Medina, based mainly on al-Sambûdî; Madâřîd al-Nubuwâ, a biography of the Prophet (Urdu transl.: Mâdarîd al-Nubuwâ, the Prophet, Lucknow 1277). His main contribution is his share of the popularization of the study of Hadith in India. His autobiography: in Aghydr al-Aghydr and another in the treatise on the writers of Delhi; Tabâkât-i Tabâkî (Engl. Transl.), Calcutta 1936, 692; 'Abd al-Hâmîd, Badâqânâmâ, i, 341; M. Şâlîb, Aşamâl-i Şâlih, ii, 384; Ilbâd al-Nubâlî, Capnwr 1289, 303; Târîkh, 112; âthdr al-Sanâdîdî, Capnwr 1904, 65; Cal. Peshawar Liber., 43, 273, 203 ff., 277; Brockelmann, ii, 549, S. 1, 779, 777, 603; Storey, 194 ff., 181, 214, 427, 441; Zubair Ahmad, The contribution of India to Arabic literature, index. (Mohammad Shafi)
literary form and while sometimes still hesitant, finally strikes a happy harmony between thought and language. His works reflect his joy in redeeming nature, to which he no doubt owes the pantheistic strain of his poetry.

Nowhere, however, can Hâmid's personality be so clearly perceived as in the poems written on his wife's death: 

Ma§ber, Olü, Hzadiye. Obsession with death, already present in Quräim, is here still more persistent and the problems of human destiny are treated with genuine anguish. The influence of a society which had lost the purity of its peaceful faith in Islam and looked with apprehension at the changing world, and the literary influence of Ziyyä pasha's two poems Terkib-i Bend and Terdi§î-i Bend which Hâmid had read in his youth with great admiration, contributed to strengthen this feeling of anguish. 

Ma§ber is doubtlessly Hâmid's masterpiece. 

Mâfta's image seems never to have been absent from his mind and it is significant that his second wife Nelly, whom he married in England, resembled greatly his dead wife. Hâmid's poems written in this second period show affinities of thought, if not of vision, with those of V. Hugo, especially with such pieces as Dieu and La Fin de Satan. In the poetry written after his appointment to London, there is less philosophical searching, but the inspiration is of a clearer perfection. For example, his poem "On passing through Hyde Park" is one of the best ever written in Turkish on the subject of nature and freedom. However, 'Abd al-Hâmid's prohibition of the publishing of his poems in the Istanbul newspapers put an end to this third period of his literary career.

In his preface to Dukhter-i Hindu Hâmid exposed his preference for the romantic and exotic drama; from then onwards, in all his plays, even in plays such as E§ber, Nesteren or Teter that seem by their very subject to be nearer to the French classical theatre, he remained faithful to this conception. A despair born of political reasons and of the realization that his plays would never see the stage, make these pieces overloaded with speculation, while the dramatic situation is either absent or lost under the weight of incident. Though a play like Finten pretends to be a picture of English life, the dialogues of Rüklar and Tatylar Gorlud are dealing with the problem of man's destiny, most of the plays are historical. They deal with ancient India, Greece (E§ber), Mesopotamia (Sardânpâlâ), Turkish history in Central Asia, history of Andalusia. E§ber, supposed to be influenced by Racine's Alexandre and by Corneille, is an apology of pacifism and patriotism, while Türk is the expression of Namik Kemal's ideology. A peculiar feature of these plays is Hâmid's endeavour to assign to woman her place in life. In Zeyneh, in Ibn-i Mü§sü, sequel of Türk and in Finten, Hâmid appears as a follower of Shakespeare.

Hâmid has deeply influenced Turkish poetry. The generations both of Therueti Fûnûn and Fengirî A§i were under the impact of Hâmid, and followed the creative and revolutionary lead which he had given in language and form. He not only employed new metres unknown in Turkish poetry up to his day, but also quantitative verse. He even tried a sort of blank verse. In his drama he came nearer to spoken language. As, however, his works written after 1885 were not published at the time, he had little share in the developments that took place afterwards. His real influence, starting in 1885, can be said to have stopped already in 1905.

Bibliography: P. Horn, Geschichte der Türkischen Moderne, 34 ff.; Gibb, Ottoman poetry, 1, 133-5, iv, p. VII; Riza Tewfik, "Abdulhakk Hâmîd ve Muâlâhâtî-i Felsefîyesi" (sonc. 1918); Türk Yurdu Medîmû'si, ii, no. 13, Istanbul 1933; Ülkü Mecmuası, ix, no. 51, Ankara 1937 (both special numbers about the poet); Sabri Esad Siyavuqgil, in IA, s.v. Abdulhak Hâmid; Mehmed Kaplan, "Garam" daki irâmî ve felsefî fikirler, Ist. Univ. Edebiyat Fak. Türk dili ve edebiyatı dergisi, 1940, 246-60; idem, Tabiat kursusunda Abdulhak Hâmid, ibid., 1949, 333-49; 1951, 167-87; Ahmed Hamdi Tanpinar, XIX. asr Türk edebiyyatı tarihii, Istanbul 1949, 276-466.

'A'B'D AL-HÂMID I (ABDÜLHAMID), Ottoman Sultan, born 5 Radjab 1137/20 March 1775, succeeded his brother Mustâfa 6 Dhu l-Ka'da 1187/21 January 1774.

'Abd al-Hamid succeeded to the throne during a war with Russia, in which financial difficulties, rebellions in various provinces, and the weariness aroused by ill success made the cessation of hostilities an absolute necessity for Turkey. At the same time Russia also had been placed by the Pugachev revolt in a position to welcome peace. The new Sultan, however, was unwilling to end the war without some kind of victory, and the Porte accordingly refused to accept the Russian proposals for peace talks; hostilities were reopened, and the Turkish army was defeated at Kozluqû. The route spread to the headquarters at Shumla of the Grand Vizier Mulsin-zade Mehmed Pâshâ, who was forced to sue for peace from the Russian commander Runjanev.

The treaty by which the war was terminated, and which was dictated by the Russians, was signed on 12 Dümâdâ I, 1188/21 July 1774 at Kuuç Kaynardje (g.v.) and is known by the name of that town. By its terms the Crimea was to become an independent state; and Russia obtained the fortresses on the coast of the Sea of Azof (Azak), the lands of Lesser and Greater Kabartay, the area between the rivers Dnieper and Bug, freedom of navigation in the Black Sea, and the right to pass merchant ships through the Straits. Its most dangerous feature for Turkey was the wording of some of the clauses in such a way as to lead Russia to claim the right to protect Turkish subjects belonging to the Orthodox church; in return, however, Russia recognized a somewhat vaguely stated claim by the Sultan, as khalîfa, to religious authority over all Muslims. After this treaty Austria too took advantage of the weakness of Turkey and annexed Bukovina, hitherto part of the principality of Moldavia (1775).

In 1774 war broke out also between Turkey and Persia, following a Persian invasion of Kurdistan. Ottoman forces were despatched to Bagdad in 1775, with the object of putting an end to the rule of the Mamlûks, but the Porte was forced to recognize their administration, and in the following year Basra fell to the Persians. In 1779 it was evacuated in consequence of internal disturbances in Persia, and reoccupied by the mamlûk Sulaymân Ağâ, who was then granted the three pashaliks of al-Irâq (1180).

The peace of Kuuç Kaynardje proved to be no more than an armistice between Turkey and Russia. Catherine II continued to aim at the annexation of the Crimea, whereas the Porte was trying to bring the principality back to its former status. For this reason the Crimea became an area of conflict and of Russian intervention under various forms; and
in addition, the clauses concerning the Straits and the Orthodox Christians in Turkey were subjects of contention between the two countries. Although it seemed at one time that war was imminent over the Crimean question, the terms relating to the Crimea in the treaty of Kucuk Kaynardje were interpreted and reaffirmed by a Convention, in which France acted as mediator, signed at Istanbul in the pavilion of Aynali-Kawak on 10 March 1779.

Nevertheless, Catherine II, after forming an alliance against Turkey with Joseph II (who had succeeded Maria Theresa of Austria), stirred up a revolt in the Crimea against the Khan Şahîn Girây, and on this pretext sent an army to the Crimea and annexed it to Russia. ’Abd al-Hamîd I, though deeply mortified by this action, could not, being aware of the weakness of his empire, envisage going to war. When, however, the Carazina began to form far-reaching schemes for the setting up of a Greek state with her grandson Constantine Pavlovîc at its head, the Porte could no longer tolerate the menacing demonstrations against Turkey provoked by her and her ally Joseph II.

In spite of the Sultan’s love of peace, war was declared against Russia and Austria by the Grand Vizier Koğja Yûsuf Paşa (1787), when a request for the return of the Crimea was rejected, and Swinemünde subsequently occupied on the side of Turkey. An attack by the Turkish fleet in the direction of Killburn was unsuccessful, and the Russians laid siege to the fortress of Očakov. The Turkish army, however, attached more importance to the Austrian campaign and after twice defeating, at Vidin and Slatin, the Austrian armies which had taken the offensive along the Danube, invaded the Banat. On the other hand, the Turkish fleet failed in its attempt to relieve Očakov, and after a long resistance the fortress fell and its population was put to the sword. ’Abd al-Hamîd, whose health was already undermined by the worries of the war, died of a stroke on reading the news, 11 Radjab 1203/2 April 1789.

Although ’Abd al-Hamîd I, who succeeded to the throne at an advanced age after spending most of his life in the seclusion of the palace, cannot be considered an energetic and successful sovereign, he is noted for his zeal, humanity, and benevolence. He gave wide powers, for that time, to his Grand Viziers and left them free in their conduct of affairs, and he endeavoured to strengthen the central government against rebel forces within the empire; e.g. he sent a punitive expedition under Dîezarîhi Hasan Paşa against Zahir al-Qumr, who had acquired great influence in Syria, and against the rebellious Mamlûk beys in Egypt. It may be observed that whereas during his reign the Porte followed a special policy towards Caucasia by trying to civilize the Circassian tribes and to attach them to Turkey and, in order to further this object, developed the education of trained officers, and the reopening of Ibrahim Muteferrîka’s [q.v.] printing house, which had been allowed to fall into disuse, are among the achievements of ’Abd al-Hamîd I. He also founded the Beylerbeyi and Mirgün mosques on the Bosporus, as well as a number of benefactions such as libraries, schools, soup-kitchens, and fountains.


’Abd al-Hamîd II (Ghâzî) (Abdûlhamîd), 36th Ottoman sultan, fifth child of thirty of ’Abd al-Majîd (Abdûlmeqîd) [q.v.], born Wednesday, 22 September 1842. He is traditionally represented as a reserved child, easily overcome by his keen intelligence, not given to study. It is said that, after a stormy youth, he led a thrifty family life, which earned him the undeserved nickname ‘Pinti Hamîd’, Hamîd the Skinflint, taken from a comedy by Kașsab. He early showed a great liking for the company of devout persons (Pertewîncî, ‘ukmînîcî) and, in order to further this object, developed the education of trained officers, and the reopening of the Vizîrînî Bahriîn University, [q.v.], founded by the enlightened Grand Vizier, who paid for his special policy towards Caucasia by trying to civilize the Circassian tribes and to attach them to Turkey. He endeavoured to strengthen the central government against rebel forces within the empire, e.g. he sent a punitive expedition under Dîezarîhi Hasan Paşa against Zahir al-Qumr, who had acquired great influence in Syria, and against the rebellious Mamlûk beys in Egypt. It may be observed that whereas during his reign the Porte followed a special policy towards Caucasia by trying to civilize the Circassian tribes and to attach them to Turkey and, in order to further this object, developed the education of trained officers, and the reopening of Ibrahim Muteferrîka’s [q.v.] printing house, which had been allowed to fall into disuse, are among the achievements of ’Abd al-Hamîd I. He also founded the Beylerbeyi and Mirgün mosques on the Bosporus, as well as a number of benefactions such as libraries, schools, soup-kitchens, and fountains.

the coup de force carried out by the reactionaries and by troops roused to fanaticism, on 13 April 1909, the 3rd army corps of Macedonia, commanded by Marshal Mahmud Sherifet, which had for that occasion become an “investing” or “marching” army (harekat ordusu), brought back the fugitive Young Turks and the Constitution to Istanbul (24 April).

Abd al-Hamid was deposed by a decision (harâr-nâmê) of the two Chambers, meeting as a National Assembly on 28 April 1909, based on a jâava of the same day, a document in which appeared in particular the strange imputation that he had “forbidden and burnt the books of the religious Law”. The brother of Abd al-Hamid, Muhammad (Mehmet) Reshid, succeeded him as Muhammad V.

Abd al-Hamid was exiled to Salonika. When the Balkan war broke out, in 1912, he was moved to the palace of Beylerbeyi (on the Bosphorus). He died there of pneumonia, on Sunday, 10 February 1918, at the age of 75, and was buried in the turbe of his grandfather, Mahmud II.

The two salient points of Abd al-Hamid’s political system were absolutism and Panislamism.

1) Absolutism (istidâd) — Although their power was unlimited, ‘Abd al-Hamid’s predecessors interfered relatively little in the affair of government. They usually left it to their plenipotentiary representative, the grand vizier (Sadir a’zam), who was regarded as their wekil-i miyâlak (a term which has sometimes been translated as ‘vicar absolute’). The government was ‘the (Sublime) Porte’ of the grand vizier. ‘Abd al-Hamid wished to create an instrument of domination carrying even closer personal control, and he gave great importance to “the Palace” or “the Court”. In Turkish, this was termed the Mabeyin, an Arabic term which means literally “that (which is) between (the private apartments and the Porte)”. It was a separate building (within the precincts of Yildiz), and contained the offices of the chamberlains (mabeyndi) and of the rapporteurs or referendaries (ameqij or amadi). Hence the power of the first secretary of the Mabeyin (of the sultan, in fact act) Taftun Pagha, for instance — or of a second secretary such as Izzet ‘Abed, a Syrian who was the object of public execution. The palace of Yildiz, usually shortened to Yildiz (q.v.), with its harem and its administrative departments, became a sort of town with several thousand residents — a town half shrouded in secrecy, which long haunted and terrified people’s imaginations, often without cause.

This system, carried on at a time when there existed a strong revolutionary ferment, was not calculated to discourage conspiracies, and it was only by miraculous good fortune that ‘Abd al-Hamid escaped an Armenian bomb in 1905. This only by miraculous good fortune that by authentic documents. The censor struck out words like watan, “fatherland”, because it was a conception that implied rivalry to dynasty and religion, and other words, such as liberty, explosion, bomb, regicide, murder, plot, etc.

2) Panislamism.— ‘Abd al-Hamid had a deep sense of the importance of his role (which was, however, debatable) of khalifa, by virtue of which he was protector of the religion of Islam (art. 3 of the Constitution of 1876). He greatly esteemed Djamal al-din al-Afghani (q.v.), who had held out to him the bright prospect of bringing the Shi’ites themselves back into the bosom of Sunnism. This sterile and even dangerous policy was largely based on the illusion that he could count on the loyalty of the Arabs, his spoilt children.

Strangely enough, the Turcologist Arminius Vambery, a Hungarian Jew who was on terms of friendship with ‘Abd al-Hamid, encouraged him in these tendencies. They had one useful result at least, in that they prompted ‘Abd al-Hamid to build the Hidjak railway to the holy places of Islam. This undertaking, which had also strategic value because of the frequent troubles in the Yemen, and of which ‘Abd al-Hamid was justly proud, was paid for by collections made exclusively among Muslims, and by the revenue from the “Hidjak stamp”. The railway was begun on 1 September 1900, on the 25th anniversary of the Sultan’s accession.

It was also the indirect cause of the Anglo-Turkish dispute over Tabia and the Gulf of Akaba, in which England appeared for the first time (1906) as the official defender of Egyptian interests. The line reached Medina in 1908.

Another manifestation of Panislamism was less successful. This was the sending to Japan of the screw training ship Erzogul, a wooden vessel that went down within sight of the Japanese coast (25 September 1890).

The European press and caricaturists accused ‘Abd al-Hamid of blind fanaticism, and branded him with the name of ‘Red Sultan’ because of the role attributed to him in the suppression of revolts or of bloody conflicts in Macedonia and Crete, and especially Armenia (risings in 1894 and 1895, raid on the Ottoman Bank in 1896). The least that can be said, indeed, is that he did little or nothing to prevent horrible massacres (just as he did nothing to prevent extortion). On the other hand, the atrocities had begun before his time, and did not stop after his disappearance. The Turkish population, fanaticized for these occasions, was not the only one to take part. There were also other Muslims: the Circassian immigrants from the Caucasus, and the Kurds.

It would be unjust to judge ‘Abd al-Hamid, who has so often been accused of obscurantism, without giving him credit for all the institutions established during his reign.

Physically, ‘Abd al-Hamid had regular features, an aquiline nose and lightcoloured eyes, but as he grew older his appearance became that of a bent old man. He had a loud, deep voice, and knew how to be agreeable. In his dress he was quiet, very simple, and distinguished. He was a man of contrasts. Very approachable, unlike most of the Ottoman sultans, he was given to sudden fits of anger, which were, however, quickly suppressed. Authoritarian to the point of despotism, very intelligent, and possessed of an excellent memory, he had an exceptional capacity for work, and liked to deal with all affairs himself — a paralyzing trait in the head of a State.

Bibliography: Works, in alphabetical order of authors, which, without being general histories
of Turkey, are devoted entirely or in part to ʿAbd al-Hamid. (No sultan has elicited in Europe so many studies, for the most part tendentious).


The twelve years' reign of ʿAbd al-Hamid in Egypt under the name of Banu 'l-Muḥājjir and in the house of his disciple Ibn al-Mukaffa, but was misfortune and is generally said to have shared it can only be conjectured (in the absence of earlier secretaries). Since the same style sequences of qualifying clauses. Since the same style—...—is to be traced to Greek influences in the Umayyad secretariat.
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The surviving compositions of ʿAbd al-Hamid, comprising six formal rasāʾil and a few chancey pieces and private letters, exhibit a remarkable divergence of styles. His most elaborate...—is to be traced to Greek influences in the Umayyad secretariat.
His most famous risālā, on the other hand, that addressed to the Secretaries (kutub),...the Makdisid al-Alhdn ("Purports of Music"), written about 834-7/1421-3, was dedicated to the Turkish Sultan Murad II, the dignitary of his office and their responsibilities, is fluent, simple and straightforward. A comparison of its contents with the writings of Ibn al-Muḳaffa and later quotations from Persian works shows clearly that it is inspired by the tradition of the Sāsānid secretariat, and largely reproduces with an Islamic gloss the maxims of the Iranian dikhrā (see A. Christensen, L'Iran sous les Sassanides, Copenhagen, 1944, 132 ff.). Also of Persian inspiration, and quite distinct from the traditional Arabic presentation of the subject, is his risālā describing the incidents of a hunt, evidently written for the entertainment of the court. A large proportion of the maxims addressed to the prince in the first risālā mentioned above are also derived from Sāsānid court ceremonial and usages, although the military instructions are more probably influenced by Greek tactics, either through literary channels or from actual experience in the Byzantine wars.

It would appear, therefore, that both views expressed by later Arabic critics in regard to 'Abd al-Ḥamīd are justified, in spite of their apparent incompatibility. On the one hand is the statement (e.g. al-'Askari, Dīwān al-Muḍżīn, ii, 89) that "'Abd al-Ḥamīd extracted from the Persian tongue the maxims of secretarial composition which he illustrated, and transposed them into the Arabic tongue". On the other hand there is the description of him (e.g. Ibn 'Abd Rabīḥ, al-'Ikbāl al-Farīd, ii, 169 (1321) = iv, 165 (1944/1363) as having been "the first to open up the buds of rhetoric, to smooth out its ways, and to loosen poetry from its bonds". He was also a master of pithy epigram, several examples of which are recorded in the adab works of students, who achieved prominence as teachers and scholars in their own turn. One of his pupils, Mawlāwī Ḥāfīz Allāh wrote his biography under the title of Kunīs al-Barakah. He died at Lucknow in 1304/1886.

Bibliography: Rahmān 'Āli, Taḥkhirat ʻUlamā Hind (in Persian, Lucknow 1894 and 1914), 114-7; Zubābid Ahmad, The Contribution of India to Arabic Literature (Jullundur 1946), 114, 186; Sarkis, Dictionnaire de bibliographie Arabe (Cairo 1928), col. 1595-7; Brockelmann, S II, 857-78 (where works nos. 18 and 19 are wrongly ascribed to the subject of this article).

'ABB AL-KĀDIR B. KHALID AL-HAMID AL-MARĀGHI, the greatest of the Persian writers on music. Born at Marāgha, about the middle of the 8th/14th century, he had become one of the minstrels of al-Ḥūsayn, the Dīlahārīd Sultan of ʻIrāk, about 781/1379. Under the next Sultan, ʻĀdham, he was appointed the chief court minstrel, a post which he held until Timūr captured Baghdaḏ in 795/1393, when he was transported to Samarqand, the capital of the conqueror. In 1395-96 he went to Tabriz in the service of Timūr's wayward son Mīrānshāh, for whose erratic conduct his "boon companions" were blamed. Timūr acted swiftly with the sword, but 'Abd al-Ḳādir, being forewarned, escaped to Sultan ʻĀdham at Baghdaḏ, although he once more fell into Timūr's hands when the latter re-entered Baghdaḏ in 803/1402. Taken back to Samarqand, he became one of the four brilliant men who shed lustre on the court of Shāhrukh. In 824/1421, having written a music treatise for the Turkish Sultan Murād II, he set out for the Ottoman court to present it in person in 826/1423. Later he returned to Samarqand, dying at Harāt in 838/March 1435.

Of the fame of 'Abd al-Ḳādir in his day, and since, there can be little doubt. Muʿīn al-Dīn-i Iṣfīzārī, the author of the Rawdat al-Dījarāt, eulogizes him for his threefold talents as musician, poet, and painter, but it was more especially for his skill in music that he was called "the glory of the past age". In addition to being a deft performer on the lute (ṭūdā) and a prolific composer (laynīfī), he excelled as a music theorist. His most important treatise on music is the Dījamāt al-Albān ("Encyclopedia of Music"), autographs of which are preserved at the Bodleian Library and the Nūrū ʿOṯmānīyya Library, Istanbul. The first of these, written in 808/1405 for his son Nūr al-Dīn 'Abd al-Ḥamīn, was revised by the author in 816/1413. The second, dated 818/1415, carries a dedication to Sultan Shāhrukh. Several abridgments of this work also exist, notably a shorter one, autographed, without title, dated 821/1421, which is at the Bodleian. It was written, evidently, for Bāysunghur. A longer version in the same library, called the Makāṣīd al-Albān ("Purports of Music"), written about 834/1421-3, was dedicated to the Turkish Sultan Murād II,
According to the Leiden copy, a third treatise on music, the Kanz al-Tuhaf ("Treasury of Music") which contained the author's notated compositions, has not survived. His last work, the Sharh al-Adwar ("Commentary on the Kitab al-Adwar" [of Saff al-Din]), is to be found in the Nuru 'Othmáníyya Library. At Leiden there is a short Kitab al-Adwar in Turkish bearing his name. These works are of great importance in the history of Persian, Arabic, and Turkish music. Although only a few of his musical compositions have survived in the Nimu'm, many have been handed down viva voce in a form known in Turkish as the 'stär.

A son, 'Abd al-Aziz, who is thought to have settled at the Ottoman court after 1435, was the author of a music treatise, the Naqdwdt al-Adwar ("The Select of the Modes"), dedicated to the Turkish Sultan Muhammad II (d. 866/1461), whilst a grandson, Mahmud, who lived under Bâyazid II (d. 918/1512), compiled a Mahásíd al-Adwar ("Portraits of the Modes"), both mss. being at the Nuru 'Othmáníyya Library.

Bibliography: Khâdámír, iii, 3, 212: Dowlâtshâh, see index; Sharâf al-Din Yazdî, Zâfar-nâma, i, 619; English version of the same History of Timur-Bes (1723), i, 439, 557-8; Munâjacât al-majmu', i, 57; Eliot, Notice sur Mar Ali-Chir Nâdir, in JA, 1861, i, 283-4; Barbier de Meynard, Chronique Persane d'Herât, J.A, 1862, ii, 275-6; Browne, iii, 191, 384; Râ'uf Yekta, La musique turque (Lavignac, Encyclopédie de la musique, pp. 2977-9); Ethé and Sachau, Catalogue of Persian ... MSS. in the Bodleian Library, pp. 5057-63; Catalogus codicum orientalium Bibl. Acad. Lugduno Batavorum, i, 1854-77, ii, 305-5; Nuru 'Othmáníyya kutubkhâna defteri, Istanbul, Nos. 3644, 3646, 3649, 3651: J. B. N. Land, Ton-schriftversuche und Melodieproben aus dem muhamedanischen Mittelalter (Vierteljahrschrift für Musikwissenschaft, i, 1886); Farmer, History of Arabian Music, 1925, 198-200. (H. G. Farmer)

'Abd al-Kâdir B. Muhyî al-Dîn al-Hâsání, the Amir 'Abd al-Kâdir, descended from a family which originated in the Rîf and settled among the Hâshîm, was born in 1223/1808 at the gate of the Wâdi al-Hammâm, some twenty kilometres west of Mascara. Studies at Arzew, then at Oran, marriage, and a pilgrimage to Mecca in 1244/1828-9 were the most outstanding events in a youth that was devoted to the reading of sacred books and to physical exercises, under the direction of his father, who, by his pieté and charity, had acquired a great influence.

The indecision shown by the French after the capture of Algiers (5 July 1830) in the organization of their conquest favoured Muhyî al-Dîn in Orania, and he took the initiative in the struggle against the Christians, but soon yielded first place to his son, who was proclaimed sultan of the Arabs on 5 Radjab 1248/22 November 1832 by the Hâshîm, the Banû 'Amir, and the Gharâbâ. In spite of the opposition of certain elements of the population and the failure of his supporters before Oran and Mostaganem (1833), 'Abd al-Kâdir's action prevented the pacification of the country. This state of affairs prompted General Desmichels to treat with his adversary (4 and 26 February 1834). Thus officially recognized the new Amir of the Faithful extended his authority to the gates of Algiers (April 1835), but his claims provoked the renewal of hostilities. First Clauzel and then Bugeaud avenged the defeat on the Macta (28 June) by burning Mascara (6 December), occupying Tiemcen (13 January 1836), and winning a great victory on the Wâdi Sîkkak (6 July); but these successes were fruitless. Three times abandoned by his troops, 'Abd al-Kâdir immediately regrouped them. The position of the French remained precarious, with their towns invested, their columns ceaselessly harassed, and their allies receiving heavy punishment. The desire to be secured against attacks in the west while an expedition against Constantine was being carried out led Louis-Philippe's government to negotiate. By the signature of the treaty of the Tafna (30 May 1837) Bugeaud repeated, in a worse form, the mistake made by Desmichels. Though the French kept Oran, Arzew, Mostaganem, Blida, and Kolea, the Amir obtained the whole province of Oran, part of that of Algiers, as well as the whole baytîkh of Titteri.

From June 1837 to November 1839 'Abd al-Kâdir used the cessation of hostilities to organize the territories that had been handed over to him. After establishing his capital at Tagdempt, he travelled about his new state, imposing chiefs, by force if necessary, on all the tribes between Morocco in the west and Kabylia in the east, and gaining recognition for his dominion as far as the Sahara.

In the course of these journeys 'Abd al-Kâdir, taking advantage of the faulty wording of the Treaty of the Tafna, had gone beyond the boundaries that had been assigned to him; Marshal Valére therefore submitted to him a draft of an additional treaty which accurately indicated, and reduced, the territories over which France recognized his rights, but he refused to ratify it. The 'Iron Gates' expedition, in the course of which the Duke of Orleans linked Constantine to Algiers, provided the Amir with a pretext for restarting the war. On 20 November 1839 his forces invaded the Mitidja, sacking farms and massacring settlers. Algiers was threatened. The occupation of Miliana, then of Medea (May-June 1840) by the French did not ease their difficulties, for the supplying of their garrisons made necessary the movement of convoys which were exposed to continual attacks.

The nomination of Bugeaud as governor-general (29 December 1840) changed the course of events; he realized that Algeria would never be pacified until the power of 'Abd al-Kâdir was crushed and until the tactics of 'active columns' took the place of 'limited occupation'. Between 1841 and 1843 he seized the towns of Tagdempt, Mascara, Boghar, Tata, Saida, Tiemcen, Sebdou and Nedroma, and sent out expeditions with instructions to capture his enemy and destroy his supporters. The capture of the smala (16 May 1843), the travelling capital of the Amir, was a serious blow to him. The tribes submitted to France. Hunted and weakened, 'Abd al-Kâdir took refuge at the end of the year on the borders of Morocco, to obtain shelter, to recruit soldiers, and to compromise French relations with that empire.

His hopes were not deceived. The occupation of Lalla Maghnia by la Moricière stirred up a conflict, but the bombardment of Tangier and Mogador (6 and 15 August 1844) and the victory of the Isly (14 August) compelled the Sultan Mâlwây 'Abd al-Râjmân to refuse his guest any support and to declare him an outlaw. 'Abd al-Kâdir appeared again in Algeria in 1846 to take the lead in the insurrections while they were breaking out on all sides. His first successes (Sidi-Brahim, 23 September) seemed to promise final triumph for his cause. No less than eighteen columns were needed to stem the revolt and to throw the Amir back into Morocco.
(July 1846), where he was now the object of the hostility of the Sultan, who feared in him a dangerous rival. Attacked by the tribes, and pursued by the Sharifian troops, 'Abd al-Kadir crossed the Algerian frontier again. Finding all lines of escape towards the south closed to him, he gave himself up to the Duc d'Aumale on 23 December 1847.

In spite of the promise to him that he would be transported to Acre or to Alexandria, 'Abd al-Kadir was, with his suite, interned successively at Toulon, at Pau, and then at Amboise. Released by the Prince-President Louis-Napoleon on 10 October 1852, the former leader of Algeria in revolt now received a pension from the France of which he had become the loyal subject, and went to live in retirement first at Brusa (1853) and then at Damascus (1855). It was in this town that he proved in a very special way the sincerity of his loyalty, by delivering the French consul and saving several thousand persons when the Druses tried to massacre the Christian population (July 1860). He died there in the night of 25 to 26 May 1883, having passed his time during his exile in meditation, the practice of his faith, and charity.


'ABD AL-KÂDIR B. MUHYI ‘L-DIN — 'ABD AL-KÂDIR DIHLAWI

His library was unique for those times, cf. Khîsîna, i, 2. In Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da 1077 he visited Istanbul, but returned to Cairo after less than four months, in 1078. In the same year, he made the acquaintance of İbrahim Pasha Katkhuda, governor of Egypt, who treated him with great respect and made him his associate and boon-companion. Some years later, when Katkhuda was deposed from the governorship and returned home through Syria (reaching Damascus in 1085), 'Abd al-Kadir accompanied him and sojourned in Adrianople. He made the acquaintance of the learned grand-vizier of Turkey, Ahmad Pasha al-Fâdîl Köprülü-xâde, and dedicated to him his masterly gloss on Ibn Hîshâm’s Sharh Bânat Swâ’d. Al-Muhibbi, son of an old friend of ‘Abd al-Kadir, who saw him in Adrianople, records that he enjoyed, in this period, the highest regard and respect of the important personages of Turkey. But after a while he was attacked by a disease, and as a cure could not be affected by the physicians, he left for Cairo in disgust, though he came back later. This time he caught a disease of the eye and almost lost his sight. He returned to Cairo and died there shortly after.

He was known by the Makâmât of al-Harîrî, many Arabic diwâns and numerous Persian and Turkish verses. He had a fine critical sense and a profound knowledge of Arabic philology, Arabic poetry, the history of the Arabs and Persians, Arabic proverbs and anecdotes.

He wrote a number of useful books. Among these are: 1) The Khîsînat al-Adab wa Lubb Lubbîh Lîsîn al-‘Arâb (Cairo, 1299/1882, 1347/1928-9 [publication stopped in 1335 after the death of the author]); a commentary on the 977 shâdhid of Ibn al-Khâlid in his Kofiyah. It was begun in Cairo in 1073/1663 and finished there in 1079/1668 (after a brief interruption due to his visit to Istanbul) and dedicated to Muhammad IV (1058-99/1648-87). It seems originally to have been divided into eight volumes (see al-Muhibbi). 2) A commentary on the shâdhid cited in al-Râdi’s Sharh al-Maṣûrah, called by al-Radî the ‘Allâhîn. To this he appended a Sharh of the same title, which he transmitted to the Sharh of al-Dîrâbî, trans. by V. Rosetty in Le spectateur militaire, 15 Febr. 1844, repub. by L. Patorni, Algiers 1890. 3) A commentary on the 968 shâdhid of Ibn al-Khâlid in his Kofiyah. To this he appended a Sharh of the Sharh of al-Dîrâbî, trans. by V. Rosetty in Le spectateur militaire, 15 Febr. 1844, repub. by L. Patorni, Algiers 1890.

'ABD AL-KÂDIR DIHLAWI, Indian theologian, the third son of Shâh Wali Allâh Dihlawî [q.v.], born at Dihlî (Dehlî) in 1160/1753-4. He is chiefly remembered for his Urdu translation of the Kûrân, accompanied by explanatory notes. Its title Mûdiq-i Kûrân ("Interpretation of the Kûrân")
is the chronogram for 1205/1790-1, the date of the completion of the work. It was published at Houghly in 1245/1829, under the conditions, Lucknow 1263/1847 and Bombay 1270/1853-4. Since then, it has been repeatedly lithographed interlinearly along with the Arabic text. It is generally regarded as more faithful than the one prepared by his brother Šãh Râfî' al-Dîn. He died in 1228/1813.

**Bibliography**

(Sh. Inayatullah)

**'ABD AL-KÂDIR AL-DJILÂNÎ (or al-Djîlî) MUBârîK AL-DîN ÂBD MUH. B. ÂBD SÀLIH DUNGÔL DÎSîR, Hanbalite theologian, preacher and Šûfî, who gave his name to the order of the Kâdirîyya [q.v.]; b. 470/1077-8, d. 561/1166.**

Apart from Abu 'l-Mahasin (al-Nudium al-Zdhirâ, *c.*) who gave his name to the order of the Kâdirîyya, their writings have, therefore, little to contribute to a historical account of his life and only a small proportion of their data can be considered reliable. Apart from Abu 'l-Maḥâsin (al-Nudjîm al-Ẓâhirî, ed. Juynbool, i, 608), who names as the birth-place of 'Abd al-Kâdir al-Djîlî, a village between Baghdad and Wâsît, all authorities are unanimous in stating that he was a Persian from Nayf (Nîf) in Djîlân, south of the Caspian Sea. The Persian name of his father not only supports this statement, but at the same time contradicts the common assertion that he was descended in the paternal line directly from al-Ḥasan, the grandson of the Prophet. Baghdâd, where he came to study at the age of eighteen, remained the scene of his activities up to his death.

'Abd al-Kâdir was active. He appears as a teacher of theology in his *al-Kâdir al-Djîlî al-Qawwâl*, a book containing 17,738 hadiths. He was averse to all forms of asceticism and lived in the society of the poor and free. His school was continued, with the help of pious endowments, by 'Abd al-Wâhûb, one of his numerous sons, and by his descendants [see Ḳâdirîyya].

'Abd al-Kâdir lived at a time when Šûfîsm was triumphant and expanding. In the century preceding him a conflict, tîtâf had existed long before, assumed an acute form and became the concern of every individual. The consciousness of the individual as well as the whole of society was torn by the breach between secularism, religiously indifferent or religious only in a conventional way, on the one hand, and an intellectualist religion, at odds over theological doctrine, on the other. Innumerable are the complaints in literary works that express despair in face of the vanity of the "world", but also the emptiness of the legalistic religion, "dead knowledge handed down by dead people" (Âbû Yâzîd al-Bistâmî). In such a situation Šûfîsm, as the embodiment of emotional religion, became in the generations preceding 'Abd al-Kâdir, a wide-spread movement. The historical process pushed one problem into the foreground: how to reconcile the ascetic and mystic elements with religious law. Ibn 'Abbâs [q.v.], 'Abd al-Kâdir's teacher, met Šûfîsm, as befitted the zealous Hanbalite convert, with a definite no. The same attitude was later taken again by the strict Hanbalites. This was not, however, the only possible way for them. Al-Ansârî al-Harawî [q.v.] (d. 481/1088), who conducted disputations in the strictest accordance with the school of Ahmad b. Hanbal (which he extolled with the motto *madhhab Ahmad ahmad madhhab*), wrote Šûfî books appealing to the emotions, and Ibn al-Djâwwîl [q.v.], who made violent attacks on the orgiastic piety of the Šûfî meetings, himself held, according to the testimony of Ibn Djuhabay, meetings that are paradigmatic for Šûfî cult practice. This is the period in which 'Abd al-Kâdir was active. He appears as a teacher of theology in his *al-Qawwâl li-Tâlibî Tarîkh al-Ḥâbî* (Cairo 1304). Starting with an exposition of the ethical and social duties of a Sunni Muslim, it sets forth in the form of a Hanbalite handbook the Šûfî teachings for the believer, including a short exposé of the seventy-three sects, and ends with an account of the particular way of Šûfîsm. Extreme Hanbalites have criticised the special duties taken upon themselves by the Šûfîs. According to Ibn Taymiyya, the particular litanies for certain days, taken over in the *al-Qawwâl* from Mâkki's *Kut al-Kâlid*, are reprehensible if they assume the character of a legal duty. Conflicts with the religious law, however, such as Ibn al-Djâwwîl, in his *Tabîls Iblis*, finds among contemporary Šûfîs, do not occur in the writings of 'Abd al-Kâdir. The unquestioning submission to the message of Muḥammad, as it is set forth in the *Kûrân* and the *sunna*, excludes on the part of the Šûfî any claim to inspired revelation. The fullfilment of works of supererogation assumes the prior fulfillment of the demands of divine law. Ecstatic practices, though not forbidden, are allowed only with certain restrictions. Ascetism is limited by the duties towards family and society. The perfect Šûfî lives in his divine Lord, has a knowledge of the mystery of God, and yet this saint, even if he reaches the highest rank, that of a Ḳâdî or a Ḥâbîb, cannot teach the grade of the prophets, not to speak of surpassing it, as some Šûfîs were teaching. In the personality of 'Abd al-Kâdir the Šûfî is not at variance with the Hanbalite.

This appears also in his sermons contained in the
collections al-Fath al-Rabbani (62 sermons; Cairo 1302) and Futūkh al-Dhā‘abib (78 sermons; on the margin of al-Shaṭṭa‘nawī). Abd al-Kādir often directs the attention of his audience to the perfect saint. Yet both the contents and the style show that the sermons were not addressed to exclusive süfī circles. The plain manner, avoiding süfī terminology, and the often very simple moral admonishment suggest that they were delivered before a large audience. Before men, who experience the power of fate as a permanent threat, he sets the ideal figure of the saint, who has overcome his accidental self and reached his essential being, conquering the fear of fate and death, because he participates in Him who orders fate and death. Sūfism as taught by the Hanbalite ‘Abd al-Kādir consists in fighting, in a dhikr greater than the holy war fought with weapons, against self-will; in thus conquering the hidden ḥīrāk, i.e. the idolatry of self and, in general, of creaturely things; in recognizing in all good and evil the will of God and living, in submission to His will, according to His law.

Al-Shaṭṭa‘nawī’s work on ‘Abd al-Kādir, Bahā‘ī jat al-‘Askār, from which several other writers derived their information, was written just over a hundred years after ‘Abd al-Kādir’s death. His account, rejected as untrustworthy already by al-Dhahābī (JRAS, 1907, 267 ff.), presents him as the supreme saint. He is not described according to the ideal of the saint conceived by ‘Abd al-Kādir himself. He is not a man who serves as a symbol for cosmic resignation, whose example can be followed by resigning this and the next world, by accepting in both of them the lot given by God. The figure of ‘Abd al-Kādir as a saint, as it is drawn by al-Shaṭṭa‘nawī, is the outcome of a piety which relinquished the hope of being able to put the ideal into practice.

According to the legend, ‘Abd al-Kādir himself, by the sentence which remained closely associated with his name: “My foot is on the neck of every saint of God”, laid claim to the highest rank and obtained the consent of all the saints of the epoch. A poem ascribed to him, al-Kawida al-Ghāthiyya, speaks, in a style that is very different from that of his authentic writings, of his mystery which has the power to extinguish fire, raise the dead, crush mountains, dry up seas, and of the exaltedness of his position. In the ‘Abd al-Kādir of legend, the inconceivable, incomprehensible majesty of God has become manifest. From his earliest childhood, when he marked the beginning of the fast that of his authentic writings, of his mystery which relinquished the hope of being able to put the ideal into practice.

Claims of religion could not be complied with, the saint was experienced as the presentability of that which was unattainable to human effort. The saint does not make demands, but bestows grace for men who worship the inconceivable. In this capacity, ‘Abd al-Kādir became one of the best known media tors in Islam. His tomb, over which sultan Sulaymān had a beautiful turba built in 941/1535, has remained to the present day one of the most frequented sanctuaries of Islam in Baghādād.


‘**ĀBD AL-KĀDIR B. ‘ALI B. YUSUF AL-FĀSĪ**, the most famous representative of the Moroccan family of the Fāsiyyūn, b. in al-Kṣār al-Kabīr 1077/1599, d. 1091/1680. He was the head of the mā‘ṣıya of the Shāhidīyya in al-Kṣār al-Kabīr. He wrote a ḥārahīs and some books on hadith, but he is best known as one of the main representatives of Moroccan sūfism at the beginning of the 17th century. His descendants form today a very numerous and important branch of the religious and scholarly aristocracy of Fz (the inhabitants of the town being called, in order to avoid a confusion with the family of the Fāsiyyūn, aḥl Fāsī).

**Bibliography**: E. Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Chorfa, 264-5 (with references). (E. Lévi-Provençal)


He is best known for his collection of alphabetically arranged brief biographies of Hanafites, al-Dhā‘abib al-Mudīyya fī Ṭaba‘dī al-Hanāfiyya (Raydarābād 1332/1913-4), a valuable reference work, generally considered to be the first to deal with its particular subject. Written in a country in which the Hanafite school was weakly represented, and in a period just preceding its renaissance, the work has little firsthand information but preserves much material, especially from Persian local histories.

In addition, ‘Abd al-Kādir wrote a biography of Abū Hamīfa (al-Būtanīyya Masālima Ṣayyida ‘Na‘mān, used in ‘Dīsam, i, p. 26 ff.) and a collection of biographies of persons who died between 665/1267 and 760/1359. His other publications (most complete list in Ibn Ḥūṭūbūgha ed. Flügel, p. 28, and Ibn Tūlūn) belong to the ordinary run of juridical textbooks, commentaries, and indexes.

CABD AL-KARIM BUKHARl, a Persian historian, wrote in 1233/1818 a short summary of the geographical relations of Central Asian countries (Afghanistan, Bukhara, Khivâ, Khokand, Tibet and Kashmir), and of historical events in those countries from 1160 (accession of Ahmad Shâh Durrânî) down to his own times. 'Abd al-Karîm had already left his native country in 1222/1807-8 and accompanied an embassy to Constantinople; he remained there till his death, which took place after 1240/1820, and wrote his book for the master of ceremonies 'Ârif Bey. The only manuscript was obtained by Ch. Scheler from 'Ârif Bey's estate and published in the PELOV (the text was printed in Bulâk, 1290/1873-4, the French translation in Paris in 1876). The Histoire de l'Asie Centrale is a most important authority for the recent history of Central Asia, especially for Bukhârâ, Khivâ and Khokand. (W. BARTHOLD)

'ABD AL-KARlM KASHMIRI. Kutb Al-Dîn R. IBRâHIM AL-DÎJlL, a Muslim mystic, descendant of the famous 'Abî Abd al-Kâdîr al-Dîjlânî, was born in 767/1365 and died about 832/1428. Little is known of his life, as the biographical works do not mention him. According to some of his own statements in al-Insân al-Kâmîl, he lived from 796/1393 until 805/1400-3 in Safîd in Khâlq, and added: The only manuscript was Al-Jâzîl, who is the best known (several editions printed in Cairo). An analysis of its contents and modified. According to his ontological doctrine exposed in his al-Insân al-Kâmîl and his Marâtîb al-Wudu'd, nothing really exists but the Divine Essence with its creative (âkhâlî) and creaturely (khakhâlî) modes of being. Absolute Being develops in a scale (mârâtîb) of individualisations or "descents" (ka-nazalûdî). The most important of these are the following: 'âmâ, the simple hidden pure Essence before its manifestation (talâqâati); adhâbîyya, the first descent from the darkness of 'âmâ to the light of the manifestation, the first manifestation of Pure Essence (âdâlî) exclusive of Divine attributes, qualities or relations; wâshîriyya, the manifestation of the Essence with the attributes and qualities and their effects under the aspect of unity. It is plurality in unity. On this scale there is no distinction between the attributes, they are identical with each other and with the One. Opposites coincide—Mercy and Vengeance are the same. 'Il-dîhiyya is higher than the above-mentioned manifestations. It comprehends both Being and Non-being in all degrees, the "places of manifestation and the manifested" (al-masdûr wa 'l-tâshîr), i.e. the Creator and the Creature (al-hâl wa 'l-khalîl). At the same time it is the principle of order for the whole series of individualisations and maintains each of them in its proper place. All opposites exhibit their relativity in the greatest possible perfection, they do not coincide any longer. Râmahîyya manifests the creative attributes (al-šîd il-khalîbiyya) exclusively, whereas 'Il-dîhiyya comprehends both the creative and the creaturely. The first Mercy (rahma) of God was His bringing the Universe into existence from Himself. God is the substance (hayûlû) of the Universe. The Universe is like ice, and God is the water of which the ice is made. Rubûbiyya comprehends those attributes that require an object and are shared by man, as knowing, hearing, seeing. The differentiation of the phenomena of the Universe is caused by their mutual relations to the respective divine attribute through which God manifests Himself. In his al-Insân al-Kâmîl al-Dîjlî deals with most of the cosmic, metaphysical, religious and psychological notions current in his time. He establishes their place in his system and explains their relations to the respective divine attribute. In doing so he has succeeded in giving many new, unexpected and highly interesting interpretations of well-known theologoumena. Thus he builds a phantasmal cosmology which differs widely from orthodox views: e.g. Adam ate the forbidden fruit because his soul manifested a certain aspect of Lordship (rubûbiyya), for it is not in the nature of Lordship to submit to a prohibition; for the people in Hell God creates a natural pleasure of which their bodies become enamoured; Hell at last will be extinguished and replaced by a tree named Dîjdîrî; IBls will return to the presence and grace of God; all infidels worship God according to the necessity of their essential natures and all will be saved, etc. Al-Dîjlî's doctrine of the Perfect Man (al-Insân al-Kâmîl), the Logos, is almost the same as that of Ibn 'Arabî (cf. K. G. NEUGEBAUER, Kleine Schriften des Ibn al-'Arabî, Leiden 1916, 104). He is Muhammad the Prophet who may, however, assume the form of any holy man. So al-Dîjlî met him in 796 in Safîd in the form of his shaykh. He is a copy of God, who becomes visible in him, and at the same time, he is a copy of the Universe, which is brought into existence from him. His whole being is sensible of a pervasive delight and contemplation, the emanation of all that exists from himself, etc. Al-Dîjlî had many auditions and visions. He talked with angels and cosmic beings. When in 800 he stayed in Safïd, he met all the prophets and saints; he wandered through Heaven and Hell, in which he met Plato. In the Marâtîb al-Wudu'd forty degrees of Being are enumerated, the first being al-dâlî 'l-Idhîyya or al-shaykh al-mudahl, the last al-Insân. The other books and treatises of al-Dîjlî have not yet been studied by European scholars. They are listed in Brockelmann, II, 264-5, S II, 283-4. (H. RITTER)

'ABD AL-KARIM KASHMIRI. 'ÂKIRAT MAHMUD B. BULÂKI B. MUKH. RIPA, Indo-Persian historian. From autobiographical references in his Bayân-i Wâbišw we learn that he was living in Dîhlî at the time of its sack by Nâdir Shâh (1151/1739), and entered the service of Nâdir as a mulâsaddî. He accompanied Nâdir on his march from Dîhlî to Kazwîn, reaching Kazwîn in 1154/1741. From there he travelled to Mecca and returned to India by sea in 1156/1743. He died in 1198/1784.

He is the author of a history of his own times obtained from Nâdir Shâh's invasion of India to 1198/1784 (the India Office copy, Ethê 666, comes down to 1190/1785), including an account of his own travels, entitled Bayân-i Wâbiš. He gives much information obtained from Nâdir's courtiers, including 'Alâwî Khan, the hakîm bâghî, or based on personal observation, and is not afraid to criticise Nâdir. The text has not been printed so far; a condensed translation was published by F. Glotz, The Memoirs of the Khoja Abdalhureem, Calcutta 1878, 1812, London 1873; abridged version of this by L. Langens, Voyages de l'Inde à la Mecque, Paris 1797. To the MSS enumerated by Storey can be added: The Panjâb Public Library Cat. (Persian), Lahore 1942, p. 51.
British public announcements in the Panjāb at the time, inscriptions on the Sikh guns etc.

(ii) Ta'rikh-i Ahmad (or Ta'rikh Ahmadshāhī), lith. Lucknow 1266/1850 (for the ms. of the work see Storey ii/2, 403). Having completed the history of Shudja al-Mulk Durrani (see ii above) who left Ludhianā and with the help of the British Government regained the throne of his ancestors in 1255/1841, the author decided to write a complete history of the Durrānīs. Till 1221/1777 (about the middle of the reign of Zaman Shāh) he based it on the Husaynshāhī or the Ta'rikh Husaynī (see Rieu, Cat. Pers. Ms. Br. Mus., iii, 904b) by Imām al-Dīn who had lived for a long time in Afghanistan. A very brief history of the subsequent period up to the fall of the dynasty he based on the information received from well-informed, trustworthy and truthful visitors of his from Kābul, Kandahār and vicinity (Ahmadshāhī, 3, 51). After stating the genealogy of the Abdāllās he gives the history of Ahmad Shāh and his successors. In the last quarter of the work is given an account of the chief amirs of Zaman Shāh, a geographical note on the Panjāb and the stages of the route Kabul-Kandahār-Harāt-Čīch (with a list of the tombs of the Čīchīl saints), and a chapter on Turkistān and its ruler Nabūtā Bāy. The last event mentioned in the text is dated Shudja al-Mulk and the recall of the British troops from Afghanistan, to which is appended a list of the 75 sons of Pā'inda Khān.

This work and the Muhārāba are among the sources of the Sirāj al-Tawārīkh (Kabul 1337), a history of Afghanistan compiled under the orders of the Amir Ḥābib Allāh Khān. An Urdu version of the Ta'rikh Ahmad by Mīr Wārīgh 'All Sayfī and entitled Wāzbāt-i Durrānī was lith. in Cawnpur. 1292/1875.


Bibliography: Storey, ii/2, 402-4, iii/3, 673; O. Mann, Quellenstudien zur Geschichte des Ahmed Sāk Durrānī, in ZDMG, 1898, 106 ff.; Fr. transl. of the chapter on Turkistān in Ch. Schefer, Histoire de l'Asie Centrale par Mīr Abdal Kerim Boukharī, Paris 1876, 280 ff.

[MOHAMMAD SHAFI]
Hadiar, with its citadel al-Mushakkar. Another fortified place was Djuwatha. The oasis district on the coast reached from Safwa (a name that does not occur before the Middle Ages) in the north to Zahran in the south, its capital being Zara near Katif.

'Abd al-Kays was divided into two groups, Shann and Lukayz. Lukayz comprised the tribes of Nukra, al-Dil, 'Ajji and Muḥārib b. 'Amr. The last three were distinguished by the denomination al-ʿUmūr from their "brothers" the Anmār. These latter consisted of the tribes of ʻĀmir b. al-Ḥārith (with the sub-tribes of Banū Murra and Banū Mālik) and Djiadhima b. 'Awf (in which the branches 'Abd Shams, Ḥiyay and 'Amr confederated, under the name Barādīm, against the stronger Ḥāriqa).

The Muḥārib lived in the villages of the oasis of al-Bahrayn. Hadiar itself was inhabited by a mixed population, not bound by tribal ties. The same was probably the case in Zara and other towns of the coastal oasis, where there existed also a considerable population of non-Arabic origin (Persians, Indians, Jews, Mandaean). Amr confederated, under the help of the other chiefs of 'Abd al-Kays, to expel the Kharidiite from the west. It cost al-Ża'labā, proclaimed a Lakhmīd as their ruler. The Muslims were besieged in Djuwatha, but held out. After the arrival of reinforcements, made available by the victory over Musaylima, they took the initiative and attacked (12/633). It was not before the autumn of 634 that the Persian garrison of Zara was forced to surrender.

With the Muslim conquest starts a new movement of emigration. Labīd (an older tribe than Shann and Lukayz) took part in an expedition across the Gulf against Fars and settled mainly in Tawwādī. The emigration was directed mainly towards Başra; in Kūfa, the 'Abd al-Kays were not so strongly represented. With the troops of Kūfa they reached Mosul, with those of Başra Kūrūsān, where their strength in 715 was four thousand men. The 'Abd al-Kays took no prominent part in the politics of the newly conquered provinces. They more often, with a few exceptions, adapted themselves to local conditions, were ʻArid in ʻAlīd Kūfa, and participated in Başra and Kūrūsān in the feuds between the tribes. In Başra, Harīm b. Ḥayyān, one of the earliest pietists of Islam and a forerunner of al-Hasan al-Baqri, belonged to this tribe.

In their native country the 'Abd al-Kays tried to withstand, but without success, the Ḥāristī movement of Najīda, centered in the Yamām (67/686-7). At the same time, the tribal distribution there begins to change. Of the tribes of 'Abd al-Kays only Djiadhima b. 'Awf and Muḥārib remained in their old sites—Muḥārib occupying also the harbour of ʿUkayr, and 'Amr b. al-Ḥārith remaining in Zahran and on one of the smaller islands of Bahrayn (Sitra?). The rest of their territory was occupied by the Saʿ—Tamīm, who is the Isābī, and of these the Saʿīd is to be most noted.

Emigration from the over-populated oases started at an early date, directed particularly towards the other coastal lands of Arabia, ʻUmān (fractions of Nukra and Dil, ʻAwaka, "brothers" of the ʻUmūr and Anmār, etc.), and partly towards the Persian coast. When 'Abd al-Kays penetrated into Eastern Arabia, they are said to have found there remnants of Isyak, who were at that time migrating towards Ḥirāk. Later, they had as their northern neighbours those of the Kays b. Ţhālabā (of Bakr-Rabil'a) who had left their dwellings in Ṭārid and were grazing along the line Thajji—Kātimma—Faldji = al-Baṭīn. The enemies of 'Abd al-Kays were the Saʿīd, a group of Tamīm, who roamed on both sides of the Dahān as far as Wādī Farūk and Wādī al-Sahba. It cost al-Ţhālabā, proclaimed a Lakhmīd as their ruler. The Muslims were besieged in Djuwatha, but held out. After the arrival of reinforcements, made available by the victory over Musaylima, they took the initiative and attacked (12/633). It was not before the autumn of 634 that the Persian garrison of Zara was forced to surrender.

With the Muslim conquest starts a new movement of emigration. Labīd (an older tribe than Shann and Lukayz) took part in an expedition across the Gulf against Fars and settled mainly in Tawwādī. The emigration was directed mainly towards Başra; in Kūfa, the 'Abd al-Kays were not so strongly represented. With the troops of Kūfa they reached Mosul, with those of Başra Kūrūsān, where their strength in 715 was four thousand men. The 'Abd al-Kays took no prominent part in the politics of the newly conquered provinces. They more often, with a few exceptions, adapted themselves to local conditions, were ʻArid in ʻAlīd Kūfa, and participated in Başra and Kūrūsān in the feuds between the tribes. In Başra, Harīm b. Ḥayyān, one of the earliest pietists of Islam and a forerunner of al-Hasan al-Baqri, belonged to this tribe.

In their native country the 'Abd al-Kays tried to withstand, but without success, the Ḥāristī movement of Najīda, centered in the Yamām (67/686-7). At the same time, the tribal distribution there begins to change. Of the tribes of 'Abd al-Kays only Djiadhima b. 'Awf and Muḥārib remained in their old sites—Muḥārib occupying also the harbour of ʿUkayr, and 'Amr b. al-Ḥārith remaining in Zahran and on one of the smaller islands of Bahrayn (Sitra?). The rest of their territory was occupied by the Saʿ—Tamīm, who is the Isābī, and of these the Saʿīd is to be most noted.

Emigration from the over-populated oases started at an early date, directed particularly towards the other coastal lands of Arabia, ʻUmān (fractions of Nukra and Dil, ʻAwaka, "brothers" of the ʻUmūr and Anmār, etc.), and partly towards the Persian coast. When 'Abd al-Kays penetrated into Eastern Arabia, they are said to have found there remnants of Isyak, who were at that time migrating towards Ḥirāk. Later, they had as their northern neighbours those of the Kays b. Ţhālabā (of Bakr-Rabil'a) who had left their dwellings in Ṭārid and were grazing along the line Thajji—Kātimma—Faldji = al-Baṭīn. The enemies of 'Abd al-Kays were the Saʿīd, a group of Tamīm, who roamed on both sides of the Dahān as far as Wādī Farūk and Wādī al-Sahba.
The attempt of the 'Uyunid 'Ali b. Muṣarrab to revive the ancient glory of the tribe by his poems miscarried, partly because the old Arabian world had long since become petrified, partly because also the oases of East Arabia were permeated by new immigrants.

Before the 'Abd al-Kays accepted Islam, the tribe seems to have been overwhelmingly Christian. Only a few names bear witness to its original pagan past, viz. al-Muthakkib and al-Mumazzak (from Babylonian ḥaṭṭušu, "priest") was taken over, as in other tribes, from the early Arabian town civilization. Tradition, ignorant of this fact, made of 'Amr al-Afkal a representative of ḥybris.

The genealogy of the 'Abd al-Kays is, compared with that of other tribes, remarkably incomplete, to judge by Ibn abu al-Kalbis Mukhtasar (Table A of judge by Ibn al-Kalbi's officer of the caliph al-Mansur is put higher than 'priest') was taken over, as in other tribes, only a few names bear witness to its original pagan past. The oases of East Arabia were permeated by new elements. The Arab philologists as an inferior one.

There was also a whole series of troubles, insurrections and massacres: in Kurdistan (1847), in the Danubian principalities (1848), in Bosnia (1850-51), and soon afterwards returned to his native Baghdad where he died.

His numerous writings covered almost the whole domain of the knowledge of those days. Of those extant, al-Ifṣāda wa-l-Ṭibbār, a short description of Egypt, was widely known in Europe and was translated into Latin, German, and French; cf. S. de Sacy, Relation de l'Egypte par Abd al-Latīf, Paris 1810; the others are on philology, tradition, medicine, mathematics and philosophy. (For his work on metaphysics cf. F. Kraus, in BIE, 1941, 277.)

The most important events of his reign were the proclamation of the khāfij-i sherif, or khatīb-i humayūn, of Gūlhāne (26 Bahar 1255/3 Nov. 1839) and the Crimean war, which began in 1853 and was ended by arbitration in the Treaty of Paris (30 March 1856). For the proclamation see TANZIMAT, GULKHANE.
in Montenegro (1852-3), in the Lebanon (1849), in Djidda, in the Lebanon and in Syria (1860), not to speak of Bulgaria and Albania.

Apart from his legislative work, Abd al-Madjid was the author of important reforms, in regard to the administration (in the eyalets or wilayets, "provinces"), the army (law of 6 Sept. 1843; see ref.), education (i'dddi, "primary military preparatory" schools, 1845; riîddiyye, "higher primary" schools for boys and girls, 1847; dar ul-madîrî, 1849; mektûb-i ʿôtûmînî, "Ecole ottomane" in Paris 1855), and the coinage (money of good alloy, carefully coined, issued from 1844). To him is due the building of hospitals and other edifices, such as the palace of Dolma Bagîche 1853), the restoration of the Aya Sofiya mosque by Fossati (20 July 1849), the first depositary for the state archives, Khatîne-ye Esmâîl (1845), the first theatre (French Theatre or "Crystal Palace"); besides the "imperial year-book" (1847).

In the summer of 396/1006, Abd al-Malik started an expedition to Bulgaria and Albania.

Khazine-yi Ewrdk Sofiya mosque by Fossati (20 July 1849), the first medîrîyye, especially the pieces called eydiets or "imperial year-book" (1847). "The provinces"), the army (law of 6 Sept. 1843; see ref.), education (i'dddi, "primary military preparatory" schools, 1845; riîddiyye, "higher primary" schools for boys and girls, 1847; dar ul-madîrî, 1849; mektûb-i ʿôtûmînî, "Ecole ottomane" in Paris 1855), and the coinage (money of good alloy, carefully coined, issued from 1844). To him is due the building of hospitals and other edifices, such as the palace of Dolma Bagîche 1853), the restoration of the Aya Sofiya mosque by Fossati (20 July 1849), the first depositary for the state archives, Khatîne-ye Esmâîl (1845), the first theatre (French Theatre or "Crystal Palace"); besides the "imperial year-book" (1847).

It was from his reign onwards that the imperial princes (şahs-şâde) bore the simple title of efendi. "Abd al-Madjid was the first sultan to speak a Western language (French). He was a subtle and attractive feature of his mild and attractive features revealed a generous soul" (Mgr. Louis Petit—(pseudonym: Kutchuk Efendi), Catholic bishop of Athens, Les Contemporains, no. 333, Maison de la Bonne Presse, 1899).

He died young, on 17 Dhu 'l-Hididja 1277/25 June 1855, in the midst of the financial crisis of the country. He was buried in a modest little mausoleum near the mosque of Sultan Selim.

For three out of the ten Grand-Viziers of his reign, see MAŞHÎRE PASHA, ŞAL PASHA, KHUSRAW PASHA.

The foreign diplomat who played during the reign of this sultan the most important role in Istanbul was Stratford Canning (Lord Stratford de Redcliffe).


'ABD AL-MALIK II (ABDULMECID), last Ottoman caliph, son of 'Abd al-'Azîz [q.v.]. He was elected caliph by the Great National Assembly, 18 Nov. 1922, and succeeded, in this quality only, his cousin Muhammad VI, who, after the abolition of the sultanate (1 Nov. 1922) took refuge on board a British warship and left Istanbul. During some months, all the opponents of the regime established in Ankara by Mustafa Kemal rallied round the caliph, who had, in reality, no power at all. Mustafa Kemal put an end to these intrigues by proclaiming the republic, 29 Oct. 1923. A little more than four months afterwards, 3 March 1924, the Great National Assembly resolved upon the abolition of the caliphate. The next day 'Abd al-Madjid left Istanbul. He died in Paris, 23 August 1944.


'ABD AL-MALIK B. MUHAMMAD B. ABD 'AMIR B. MU'ÃFIRI ABU MARWAN AL-MUZAFFAR, son and successor of the famous "major domo" (hadîj) al-Mansûr [q.v.] under the reign of the Umayyad caliph of al-Andalus Hishâm II al-Mu'ayyad bi'llah. He was the real sovereign of Muslim Spain after the death of his father in Medinael (Madinat Sâlim) in 392/1002.

'Abd al-Malik, second son of al-Mansûr, was born in 364/975; his mother, an umm malalî called al-Dhalî, survived him several years. Even before succeeding his father he gained experience as general in several campaigns, both in the North of Spain, against the Christians, and in Morocco. He was appointed by his father as a kind of viceroy of Morocco in 388/998, and took up his residence in Fez, but was recalled to Cordova the next year.

On the career of 'Abd al-Malik as sovereign we are informed in sufficient detail by the newly discovered Hispano-Arabic chronicles. One gets the impression that 'Abd al-Malik b. Aby 'Amir, without having the genius of his father, was not lacking in certain administrative and military qualities. At any rate, the seven years during which he held power are represented as the last favourable period of the history of al-Andalus before the fall of the Umayyad caliphate of the West. The "majordomo", remaining faithful to the line followed by al-Mansûr, continued his policy of harrying the Christian enemy beyond the frontier zones (thugûr). For this purpose he undertook year after year an expedition to one or the other of the marches of al-Andalus. In 393/1002 he directed his army towards the Hispanic March (bilad al-Hruhand), ravaged the surroundings of Barcelona and laid waste thirty-five fortresses of the enemy. In 394/1004, he attacked the territory of the count of Castille, Sancho García, who asked for an armistice and in the following year helped 'Abd al-Malik in his campaign against Galicia and Asturias. In the summer of 396/1006, 'Abd al-Malik started an
offensive against the Frankish county of Ribagorza. His most famous expedition, however, was that of the following year, aimed against the fortress of Clunia, which was taken and destroyed. This victory gained for the Amirīdī hādīsīb the honorific title of al-Muzaffar. In 398/1007 he had again to take up arms against Sancho García and Castille, and yet again in the following year. While he was preparing to set out against Castille, he succumbed to a disease of the chest, near Cordova, on the Guadimellato (Wadi Armilat), 16 Safar 399/20 Oct. 1008.

During the seven years of his rule, ʿAbd al-Malik al-Muzaffar preserved for the State of Cordova its strong administrative structure, by favouring the Slavonic dignitaries (tsākāliba) against the Arab aristocracy. Nevertheless, several attempts were made on his person. There are reasons to assume that his brother, ʿAbd al-Rahmān Sanchuelo, who succeeded him, was not without his share in the unexpected and premature death of the second Amirīdī.

[See also Amirīds and Umayyads of Spain.]


ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ḫaṭīb, govern- or of al-Andalus. He succeeded in this office ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Ḫaṭīb, since the latter was killed during his expedition into Gaul, 114/732. He had to surrender his office, in 116/734, to ʿUkbā b. Ḫaḍīlād b. Ṣalāḥ, but renewed it in 123/740. While he was preparing to set out against Castille, he succumbed to a disease of the chest, near Cordova, on the Guadimellato (Wadi Armilat), 16 Safar 399/20 Oct. 1008.

In face of this danger, and in view of the insufficiency of his own military resources, ʿAbd al-Malik had to appeal, whether he liked it or not, for the services of a group of Arabs belonging to various ālimāds (q.v.) of Syria, who were besieged in the North-African fortress of Cuita, and gave them permission to cross the Straits under the command of their chief Baldj (q.v.). Thanks to this reinforcement and to three successive defeats which they inflicted upon the rebellious Berbers, he succeeded in allaying the danger that menaced him. The Syrian troops, however, confident in their strength, had no difficulty in removing ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ḫaṭīb and put in his place as wali of al-Andalus their own general Baldj, at the beginning of Dhu l-ʿKhādīja 123/Sept. 741. One of the first actions of the new governor was to order the execution of his predecessor, who was then a very old man.


ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ḫaṭīb, governor of al-Andalus from 398/1007 to 404/1015. He was the son of ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ḫaṭīb, who was the brother of ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Muzaffar. When his brother was proclaimed Caliph, ʿAbd al-Malik was unable to trust him, and soon after- wards had him seized and executed him, according to the general statement, with his own hand. In the following year (70/689) the campaign against Musʿab b. Zayd, which was made a ten years’ truce with the Greek Emperor, by which, in return for an annual tribute, the latter removed the Mardaites from Syria into Greek territory. Immediately afterwards ʿAbd al-Malik set out from Damascus against Musʿab, but was obliged to return in order to deal with a revolt in the capital led by his kinsman ʿAmr b. Saʿd b. ʿAṣḥāb (q.v.). ʿAmr fortified himself in the vecinity, but on the Caliph’s arrival he capitulated on promise of life and liberty. Nevertheless, ʿAbd al-Malik was unable to trust him, and soon afterwards had him seized and executed him, according to the general statement, with his own hand. In the following year (70/689) the campaign against Musʿab was renewed, but both armies faced one another in Mesopotamia without result. In the third year, ʿAbd al-Malik opened his campaign by besieging Zufar in Kirkisīya for some months. After its capture he reoccupied Upper Mesopotamia, and reinforced by the Kays marched into Ḫarāt. At Dayr al-Ǧāḥshīlī, near Maskin, Musʿab and Ibn al-ʿAṣhtar were defeated and slain (Diwān al-ʿAṣhtar, ii, 72/Oct.-Nov., 691). Al-Muhallab with the troops of Baṣra was engaged in the struggle with the Ḫarajīlite, and most of the ʿIrākīs were weary of the conflict, which had brought them little but hardships and loss. Immediately after the Caliph’s entry into Kūfa, where he received the homage of the province, a force of 2000 Syrians was despatched under al-Ḥadidjābī to deal with Ibn al-Zubayr at Mecca. After a halt at Tāʾif, al-Ḥadidjābī laid siege
to Mecca on 1 Dhu 'l-Ka‘da 72/25 March 692; it was a little more than six months before Ibn al-Zubayr was killed on the field and the city surrendered (17 Di. 1 or II, 73/4 Oct. or 3 Nov., 692). Al-‘Adjudiadi was rewarded with the governorship of the Hijaz.

The recovery of ‘Irak involved 'Abd al-Malik in the necessity of organizing immediate measures against the Kharijites. After an initial failure, the combined forces of Kufa and Basra defeated the Najdiyya of Yamama at Mu‘ahhar in 73/692-3, but the more dangerous and fanatical Azarikha in Persia set a tougher problem. Even under the command of al-Muhallab, the war-weary *mukātita* showed little stomach for this task until in 75/694 ‘Abd al-Malik transferred al-Hadidiadi to the government of Kufa. With his ruthless and energetic backing al-Muhallab was able to hunt down the Azarikha in a three-years’ campaign. In the meantime a fresh Kharijite rising broke out among the Rabi‘a tribesmen in Mesopotamia, who, under the leadership of Shabib, swept down on the territories of Kufa and seized Madā‘in (76-7/695-6). When the *mukātita* of Kufa, recalled from Persia, proved unable to prevent Shabib from investing their city, al-Hadidiadi obtained the services of 4000 Syrian troops, who, after driving off the attackers and killing Shabib (end of 77/beg. of 697) went on to break up the Arab section of the Azarikha in Tabaristan. Following on an outbreak of disorder in Khurasan in the same year (78/697), 'Abd al-Malik added this province also to the government of al-Hadidiadi, who appointed al-Muhallab to govern it as his deputy. Al-Muhallab reopened shortly afterwards the campaigns towards Central Asia, but few positive gains are recorded before his death in 82/701-2, when he was succeeded by his son Yazid. At the same time 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Mu‘ammad b. al-Ash'ath, who had been appointed to Siǧdijān, was engaged in Afghanistan with the troops of Kufa and Basra. Enraged by the criticisms directed against him by the pious vicerey, Ibn al-Ash’ath and the asqari revolted (81/799-1) and marched back into ‘Irak. The small body of Syrian troops and their supporters were unable to withstand the united forces of the province, and for a time the situation was critical; but with the aid of reinforcements from Syria the rebels were defeated at Dayr al-Drimāduin (Di. II, 82/July 702) and again routed at Maskin on the Duṣṣa (Shabbat 83/ 703), and the remnants were pursued into Siǧdijān and Khorāsān, where they were dispersed by Yazid b. al-Muhallab (83/702). In the same year al-Hadidiadi built a new garrison city for the Syrian troops at ‘Asīr. This episode proved to be a turning-point in the history of the Umayyad Caliphate and the Arab empire. Henceforward a permanent Syrian army of occupation garrisoned ‘Irak, and the *mukātita* of Kufa and Basra were never again called out on a war footing. For twelve years more the heavy hand of al-Hadidiadi maintained order and security, and laid the foundations of future economic prosperity in ‘Irak, but at the cost of much bitter resentment amongst the tribesmen, especially in Kufa.

The war with the Byzantines was renewed in 73/692, in consequence of the Emperor’s refusal to accept the new Muslim gold currency struck by ‘Abd al-Malik. Despite some initial successes in their raids into Anatolia and Armenia, the Syrian troops, commanded by the Caliph’s brother Mu‘ammad, gained little territory, but prepared the way for the expeditions of the next reign. In North Africa, however, the *mukātita* of Egypt, under Ḥassān b. al-Nu‘mān, after regaining the southern part of Ḥirkuwah, advanced on Carthage with naval support (78/679). A reinforcing Greek fleet was defeated, Carthage occupied, and a secure base established at Rayrawwān for further conquests.

In the midst of these preoccupations with internal conflicts and external wars, ‘Abd al-Malik found time to develop the administrative efficiency of his empire. The answer to the disintegrating tendency of tribalism was centralization, and various reforms were put in hand to this end. The most important was the substitution of Arabic for Greek and Persian in the financial bureaux; this was a first step towards the reorganization and unification of the diverse tax-systems in the provinces, and also a step towards a more definitely Muslim administration. This appears even more clearly in the decision to issue an Islamic gold coinage, replacing the Byzantine *denarius* with its image of the Emperor by a Muslim *dirār* with Kur‘ānic texts. Despite the hostility which later tradition displayed towards the Umayyads and al-Hadidiadi in particular, it cannot be doubted that already the influence of Islam was strongly felt in this, the first generation of Muslim rulers who had been brought up from an early age in the Muslim faith. Another, and even more far-reaching reform was the re-edition of the Qur‘ānic text of the Kur‘ān with vowel-punctuation, a measure generally attributed to al-Hadidiadi, but which enraged the pietists of Kufa who held to the “reading” of Ibn Mas‘ūd. ‘Abd al-Malik was also the builder of the Kubbat al-Ṣaḥra [q.v.] at Jerusalem.

The last years of his reign were on the whole years of prosperity and peaceful consolidation, but for his anxiety over the succession. Marwān had appointed as successor to ‘Abd al-Malik his brother ‘Abd al-Malik b. ʿAzīz, but ‘Abd al-Malik wished to exclude him in favour of his own sons al-Walīd and Sulaymān. A split was avoided just in time, by the death of ‘Abd al-Malik b. ʿAzīz in Egypt in Di. I, 86/ May 705, only five months before the death of ‘Abd al-Malik (Shawwāl 86/Oct. 705). He was succeeded by his eldest son al-Walīd [q.v.].

**Bibliography:** General histories of Tabar, Balladhur, Ya‘kūbi, Mas‘ūdī, Ibn al-Ash‘ir, etc.; Ibn Sa‘d, v, 165-75; Aḥṣānī, index; Ibn Kutayba, *Uyūn al-Aḥṣān*, index; the general histories of the Caliphate (see also Umayyads); J. Walker, *Catalogue of the Arab-Sasanian Coins* (in the B.M.), and other catalogues of Umayyad coins; Caetani, *Chronographia*, A. H. 86, para. 31 (pp. 1040-). (H. A. R. Gibb)

‘Abd al-Malik b. Nūh [see Samānids].

‘Abd al-Malik b. ʿAlī, cousin of the caliphs Abu ʿīb ʿAbdās al-Saffār and Abu ʿAlī al-Mansūr. In the reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd ʿAbd al-Malik led several campaigns against the Byzantines, in 74/970-1, in 181/797-8, and according to some authorities also in 175/791-2, although other sources assert that in this year the forces were commanded not by ʿAbd al-Malik but by his son ʿAbd al-Rahmān. He was also for some time governor of Medina and held the same office in Egypt. At length, however, he could not escape the Caliph’s suspicion; in 187/803 he was, for no adequate reason, thrown into prison and remained there until al-Raghad’s death in 183/809. The new Caliph, al-ʿAmin, restored him to liberty and appointed him in 196/ 811-2 governor of Syria and Upper Mesopotamia.

‘Abd al-Malik set out at once for al-Rākṣa, but fell ill and died in that town shortly afterwards (the year
of his death, 196/811-2, is confirmed by al-Mas'ūdi, Tanbih 348; but the same author, Murūdī, iv, 437, gives 197, while Ibn Khallikān indicates 193 (trans. de Slane, l. 316) and even 199 (ibid., iii, 665, 667). Some years later the caliph al-Mamīn ordered his tomb to be destroyed, it is said, because ʿAbd al-Malik had sworn, during the civil war between al-ʿĀmin and al-Mamīn, never to pay homage to the latter.


ʿABD AL-MUʿMIN b. ʿAlī b. ʿAlī b. Yaʿṣar al-ʿĀmilī Abū Muḥammad, successor of the Mahdi Ibd ʿTāmart (q.v.) in the leadership of the reformist movement of taʿākhid, known as the Almohad movement (see AL-MUẒAYYID), and founder of the Muʿminīd dynasty, which in the West, in the 6th/12th century, took the place of the kingdoms of Ifriqiya and of the Almoravid dynasty of Morocco and of Spain, with its capital at Marrākush (q.v.). The history of the origins of the Almohad movement and of the reign of ʿAbd al-Muʿmin has been illuminated and in large measure reinterpreted since the present author had the good fortune to find, in a miscellaneous collection in the Escurial library, some extracts from an anonymous Kitāb al-Ansāb devoted to the principal protagonists of the religious and political system set up by Ibn ʿTāmart, and especially the extremely lively and certainly authentic 'Memoirs' of a companion of the Mahdi and of his successor, Abū Bakr b. ʿAll al-Sinḥādī, called al-Baydhaqī (E. Lêvi-Provençal, Documents inédits dʼhistoire almohade, Paris 1928). This extremely important find was followed by the discovery of a volume of the Nasīm al-Dīwān by Ibn al-ʿAtṣṭān on the beginnings of the movement (published in part by E. Lêvi-Provençal, Six fragments inédits dʼun chronique du début de lʼhistoire almohade, in M. angot, Rend. Basset, Paris 1925, ii, 335-93), and also of a collection of official letters from ʿAbd al-Muʿmin and his immediate successors (E. Lêvi-Provençal, Trente-sept lettres officielles almohades, Rabat 1941; Un recueil de lettres officielles almohades, analysis and historical commentary, Paris 1941). It has thus become possible, without having to rely only on later Arabic historians, to attempt a detailed critical account of this period which covered a large part of the 6th/12th century and coincided with an unprecedented revolution in the history of the Islamic West—an account which, however, still remains to be written.

The circumstances of the meeting of Ibn ʿTāmart and of his disciple ʿAbd al-Muʿmin might have been regarded as legendary were they not confirmed by al-Baydhaqī, who was a witness, ʿAbd al-Muʿmin, a humble student, of the Arabized Berber tribe of the Kūnyā, of the ethnic group of the Zanāta, settled in the north of what is now the province of Oran, not far from Nedroma, made no attempt to claim, as did his master, an Arab and even Prophetic ancestry until very much later. Still a young man the year of his birth has not been ascertained—he had, with his uncle Yaʿṣar, left his native village of Tāgrā to visit the East, or possibly Iṣrīkiya only, in order to complete his studies there. But this peregrination for the purpose of ṣalab al-ʿilm was to take him no further than Bougie (Bīḍāya). It was in a suburb of that town, Mālīla, that Ibn ʿTāmart, the ʿAbd al-Muʿmin of the Sus', as he was then called, who was on his way back to Morocco, encountered the man who was to be his successor. He persuaded him to join the small group of disciples who accompanied him, and taught him his "unitarian" doctrine, during the few months that he remained at Bougie. This meeting probably took place in the course of the year 511/1117.

From this time onwards and until the death of the Mahdi in 524/1130, ʿAbd al-Muʿmin plays an extremely active part at the side of his master, who attached him by adoption to his own tribe, the Hargha, and gave him a place in his "Council of Ten". He took part in all the expeditions, had a say in the deliberations of the Almohad general staff, and found a far-seeing protector in the person of the most active member of the movement, Abū Ḥafs ʿUmar al-Ḥintāfī (q.v.). It was the latter who, at the death of Ibn ʿTāmart, imposed on the Berber hillmen of Tinmallal acceptance of the choice made by the Mahdi of his own successor. Three whole years were, however, to elapse before ʿAbd al-Muʿmin was proclaimed. He then received from all his new subjects the bayʿa of allegiance, but had at the same time to face an uncertain political situation. Events were to reveal his outstanding qualities as a statesman, as a general, and as chief of a coalition which was still, in spite of appearances, heterogeneous. His first task was, leaving aside all other business, to break down the Almoravid structure, whose foundations were already undermined. Fortune favoured him to a degree beyond his highest hopes.

The career of ʿAbd al-Muʿmin as a sovereign began on the day of his proclamation, in 527/1133, and continued until his death in 558/1163. Here we shall merely summarise its principal stages.

The first stage was to secure for the Almohads the whole of Morocco. The conquest proved long and difficult. ʿAbd al-Muʿmin first of all attacked the Sūs and the Dra (Wādī Darʿa (q.v.)), then the line of Almoravid fortresses which in the North encircled the Grand Atlas, preventing access to the plains and to the capital, Marrākūsh. Then he swung towards the northeast, took the fortified towns of Dānnāt and Dāy, and step by step secured possession of the middle Atlas and of the oases of the Ţāflālāt during the years 534-35/1134-41. Then the Almohad columns debouched into northern Morocco, and, from their base in the mountain massif of the Djebla, occupied the fortresses in the region of Tāgrā. Thence, they went on to win over to the movement the sub-Mediterranean tribes of the Wādī Lāw, and of Bāḍis, Nākūr, Melīla, and the North-Oranian region; to his own village of Tāgrā, ʿAbd al-Muʿmin returned as a conqueror.

From this moment, ʿAbd al-Muʿmin, at the head of considerable forces, felt himself strong enough to abandon the guerilla operations in hilly country which had hitherto been his tactics, and to confront the Almoravids in the plain. The carrying out of this intention was made all the easier for him by the death of the Almoravid amīr, ʿAll b. Yūsus b. Tāghuīn, which took place in 537/1143, leaving a tottering throne to his son Tāghuīn, and open rivalry between the Lāmtūna and Massufa chiefs in regard to the succession to the amirate. Another untoward circumstance for the Almoravid dynasty was the tragic death of one of their most devoted and skilful generals, the Catalan Reverter (al-Ruburtayr), leader of their Christian militia, who was killed in an engagement with the Almohads, in 539/1145, in eastern Morocco.
Finally, the adhesion of the Zanāta to the taṣwīd further inclined the balance in favour of the rebel movement. The armies of ʿAbd al-Muʿmin and of Tāghūt b. ʿAll met before Tlemcen, and the Almoravid was forced to fall back on Oran, but he died as a result of a fall from his horse in the same year, 539. Now the road to Fez was open: first Oujda (Wajdja) and then Guercif (Adjarisf) were taken, and the capital of north Morocco fell after a siege of nine months in 540/1146, followed by Miknāsa (Meknes) and Saʿl. This series of victories was quickly followed up by the capture of Marrakush. The Almoravid capital made some attempt to resist the attackers, but was soon forced to capitulate, in spite of the heroic defence made by the garrison of the kaṣaba (Shawwāl 541/April 1147), and there was great slaughter of the Almoravids, among the dead being the young prince ʿIshāk b. ʿAll b. ʿYūsuf. Henceforward the Muʿminid dynasty had the capital of its choice. The Almoravid palace was selected as his personal residence by ʿAbd al-Muʿmin, who gave orders for the erection in its vicinity of the monumental Mosque of the Booksellers (Djāmīʿ al-Kutubiyyin), whose imposing minaret still towers above Marrākush today.

The final destruction of Almoravid power made it possible for ʿAbd al-Muʿmin to organise his new empire, using as a basis the political system of the Almohad community, but broadened and adapted to his purpose. He carried out a new scrutiny of his supporters, thousands of whom, judged to be of doubtful loyalty or lacking in religious fervour, were put to the sword. Then it seemed to him that the time had come to extend his conquests beyond the boundaries of the Almoravid possessions in the Maghrib, and he prepared to annex Iftirkiya.

Iftirkiya was in any case an easy prey at that moment. The Sinhadjian dynasties of Bidjaya and Kayrawān were thoroughly undermined, and the wave of beduin incursions was swamping the whole country, while the Normans, led by Roger II, king of Sicily, were gaining a foothold in the principal ports of Iftirkiya. An Almohad expedition against Iftirkiya could therefore be regarded as all the more justified, in that it could claim to be a ḍaʿīd against the infidel. ʿAbd al-Muʿmin entrusted his success at Saʿl, in 546/1151, then, in the course of an irresistible thrust towards the east, took possession once again of Algiers, Bougie and of Kalīb Bānī Hāmmād, and utterly routed near Setif the nomadic Arabs, formerly in the service of the Hāmmādīs of Bougie; after which he did not scorn to accept their services, and for the time being refrained from advancing any further towards Tunisia.

Iftirkiya properly so called was not conquered until eight years later. ʿAbd al-Muʿmin, leaving as his lieutenant in the Maghrib Abū Hafs ʿUmar al-Hintāṭī, arrived before Tunis, after a journey of six months, in Djiṅmād I 554/June 1159. Having taken the town, he went on towards al-Mahdiyya and attacked this fortified town, which was in the hands of Roger II of Sicily, with powerful forces; the town fell in Muharram 555/January 1160. In the course of this campaign he also secured possession of Sūsa, Kayrawān, Sfax, Gafsa, Gabes, and Tripoli. Then the ruler returned to Marrākush, whence he left for Spain in 556/1161.

The establishment of the Almohads in the Iberian peninsula had begun in 539/1145, immediately after the capture of Tlemcen. In the next year the Almoravid admiral Ibn Maymūn, who had gone over to ʿAbd al-Muʿmin, contributed his part by taking Cádiz. In 541/1157 an Almohad army took successfully the fortified towns of Jerez, Niebla, Silves, Béja, Badajoz, Mertola, and finally Seville. In 549/1154 Granada was surrendered to the new masters of the country by its Almoravid governor. In 552/1157 Almeria was recaptured from the Christians, who had seized it, and whose designs on al-Andalus became ever more obvious. It was in these circumstances that ʿAbd al-Muʿmin decided to cross the Straits himself, and established his head-quarters at Gibraltar (Djabal Tārīk, afterwards Djabal al-Fāṭih), whose reconstruction he had ordered in the previous year. He remained there for two months of winter, and sent out his columns towards Jaén, where the mercenaries of Ibn Mardanīgh [q.v.] had engaged in raiding.

ʿAbd al-Muʿmin returned to Morocco at the beginning of 558/1162. He proceeded to concentrate his troops in the huge enceinte built opposite Saʿl, the Rībāl al-Fāṭih, now Rabat, with a view to another expedition to the Iberian peninsula. But he had to take to his bed, and, after a long and painful illness, died in the month of Djiṅmād II 558/May 1163. (All the historians agree as to the month and the year, but not as to the actual day). His remains were taken from Saʿl to Tinmallal and buried near the tomb of the Mahdi Ibn Tūmart.

In all probability, it was at the time of the capture of Marrākush that ʿAbd al-Muʿmin allowed his entourage to confer on him the exalted title of amīr al-muʾminin, whereas the Almoravids had used only the title amīr al-munṣūṣīn, recognising the spiritual suzerainty of the ʿAbbaṣid caliphate of the East. Also, breaking with the Almoravid tradition, which itself had been inspired by the Hispano-Umeyyad organisation, he set up an administrative system which took into account the political needs of his great empire, as well as his desire not to give offence to his entourage of Berbers, “Almohads from the very beginning”. Many regulations that formed part of this system are still in existence in the organisation of the makhzen [q.v.] of modern Morocco. But he had also to turn to Andalusian experts for his chancellery, mostly to men who had formerly been secretaries at the Almoravid court. He cleverly secured his succession in the direct line, as well as his desire not to give offence to his entourage of Berbers, “Almohads from the very beginning”.

Various estimates have been given of ʿAbd al-Muʿmin, who was in no way marked out for the brilliant career that he made for himself. If, at the beginning and during the years that followed the death of Ibn Tūmart, he seems to have been somewhat timid and to have allowed himself to be led what timid and to have allowed himself to be led by his principal collaborator Abū Hafs ʿUmar ʿIntīf, it appears that he later manifested in increasing measure not only strategic but also political qualities, handling tactfully his susceptible entourage of Almohad Berbers, winning the good will of the Arabs of Iftirkiya after subjugating them, and carrying out with great intelligence and energy, and also cruelty, his role as head of a State and guardian of the doctrine of the Mahdi, to whom he owed his own fortune and that of his dynasty.

See also the arts. Abū Ḥafṣ ʿUmar al-Hintāṭī, Mūʾminīd and Mūʾūdahīdūn.

Bibliography: In addition to the basic texts cited at the beginning of this article, the career of ʿAbd al-Muʿmin is traced, though with many errors in chronology, by ʿAbd al-Wāḥīd al-Marrā-
So CABD AL-MLPMIN — MIRZA CABD AL-RAHIM KHAN

**‘ABD AL-MUT‘ALÎB B. HÂSHIM, paternal grandfather of Mu‘âmmad.** Passing through Medina on trading journeys to Syria, Hâshim b. ʿAbd Manâf married Salmâ bint ʿAmr of the clan of ʿAdî b. al-Nâdidjar of the KhazrâdJ, by whom in her house in Medina, this apparently being the practice of her family in accordance with a matrilineal kinship system. Some time after Hâshim’s death his brother al-Muṭṭalîb tried to strengthen his deteriorating position in Mecca by bringing his gifted nephew from Medina to help him. The common explanation that the youth was called ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalîb because he was mistaken for the slave of al-Muṭṭalîb is not acceptable; the name has probably a religious significance. Arabic sources give the impression that ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalîb was the leading ‘man in Mecca (sayyid Kuraysh), whereas some Western scholars have tried to show that he was insignificant. It seems more probable that he was a leader of a political group within Kuraysh which had developed out of the alliance of the Mutayyabun (B. ʿAbd Manâf, B. Asad, B. Zuhra, B. Taym, B. al-Ḥârîth b. Fîhr) by the succession of B. Nawfal b. ʿAbd Manâf and B. Shams b. ʿAbd Manâf. It is significant that ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalîb is said to have had disputes with Nawfal and with the grandson of ʿAbd Shams. Moreover it is doubtless as leader of this group that he negotiated with the leader of an Abyssinian army invading Mecca, perhaps hoping thereby to obtain some advantage over Meccan rivals. He also appears to have been in alliance with tribes from the neighbourhood of Mecca, Khuza‘a, Kinânâ and Thâtîf, and to have owned a well at al-Tâm. The basis of his prosperity was trade, especially with Syria and the Yemen, coupled with the tikāya and rīsâda (the privilege of supplying pilgrims to Mecca with water and food), which he had inherited from Hâshim. He is credited with having dug several wells, notably that of Zamzam at the Ka‘ba. Fâtima bint ʿAmr (of B. Mâghzam, Mu‘âmmad’s father) and ʿAbd al-Tâlib; he had other wives from B. Zuhra of Kuraysh, al-Nâmîr, ʿAmir b. ʿSâ‘a‘a and Khuza‘a, mothers respectively of Ḥamza, al-ʿAbbas, al-Ḥârîth and Abî Lahab. On the death of Mu‘âmmad’s mother he took the boy of six to his own house. While the stories about ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalîb have been subject to tendentious shaping, there may be more fact underlying them than sceptical Western scholars have allowed.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Hâšîm, 33-5, 71, 91-6, 107-14; Ibn Sa‘d, i, 46-58, 74-5; Tabari, i, 917-45, 980-1, 1073-83, etc.; Causson de Perceval, Essai sur l’histoire des Arabes avant l’islamisme, i, 259-90; ZDMG, vii, 30-5; Caetani, Annali, 111-20; F. Buhl, Das Leben Muhammeds, 113-6; Montgomery Watt, Muhammed al Islam, index.

**MIRZA ‘ABD AL-RAHIM KHÂN, KHÁN-I KHÁNÁN, general, statesman and scholar,** was born in Lahore, 14 Safar 964/18 Dec. 1560, the son of Akbar’s first wâkîl, Bayram Khân [q.v.]. He belonged to the Bahârî, a branch of the Kara Köyunlu Turkmen, and his mother was a daughter of Djamîl Khân Mewâtî, whose elder daughter he married. When he was four his father was murdered and he was thereafter brought up by Akbar himself, who gave him an excellent education and training, and from whom he received the title of Mirzâ Khân. In 1572 he accompanied Akbar to Gudrâr and then had assigned to him, under the tutelage of Sayyid Âlîmd of Bârâhâ, the district of Fâtan, within which his father had been murdered.

In Dhumâdār 1 I 981/Aug. 1573 he accompanied Akbar on his historic forced march to Gudrâr and he shared the command of the centre in the battle of Sarnâl which destroyed the power of the rebel Mirzâ. In 1576 he was appointed governor of Gudrâr, Wazîr Khân Harawi being entrusted with the actual administration of the province. He was deputed in the same year to the Mewâr expedition and assisted in the conquest of Gîrîm and the subjugation of Bahlâmîr in 1578. As a mark of great confidence the emperor appointed him, in 1581, mir ‘ard, an office which was previously held by seven officers jointly. He was also given the džâgîr of Ranthâmber and ordered to pacify the area. In 1582 he was appointed adâlî to Akbar’s son Salîm, then a boy of thirteen. In 1583 he was deputed to suppress the revolt of Mu‘zafar Shâh Gudrârî, which he broke by defeating Mu‘zafar against heavy odds in Mu‘harram 992/Jan. 1584, at the two battles of Sardjûdî and Nâdût. In recognition of his victories he was given the title of Khân-i Khânân and raised to what was till then the highest mansâb, of 5,000. He remained in command of Gudrâr, pursued Mu‘zafar into Kâthâwâr, and subjugated Nawânagîr. In 1585, during his temporary absence at the court, Mu‘zafar again raised the banner of revolt. He quickly returned to Gudrâr and pacified the province. In the following year, when the system of joint governors was instituted, Kulîd Khân was associated with him in the government of the province. In 1587 he was permitted to return to the court while retaining nominally the governorship. In 1589, Gudrâr was taken from him and given to Mirzâ ʿAţîz Kûkâ, the brother of his wife, Mâh Bânu.

In the same year he was appointed to the highest office at the court, that of wâkîl, and given Džawnâr as džâgîr. In that year he presented to the emperor his Persian translation of Bâbour-nâma, entitled Wâlîšdî-i Bâbour. In 1590-1 his džâgîr was transferred against his wishes from Džawnâr to Muluq and Bâkkrâr and he was appointed to command the army sent to conquer Kândâhâr and to annex Thatta, then held by Mirzâ Dîjâr Beg Târkân. ʿAbd al-Rahîm decided, according to Abu ʿI-Fâḍl, to proceed against Thatta in preference to Kândâhâr in the hope of getting more booty. Consequently the command of the Kândâhâr expedition was entrusted to Akbar’s son Dândîl. In 1590-1 the conquest of Thatta was completed. Mirzâ Dîjâr Beg married one of his daughters to ʿAbd al-Rahîm’s son, Shâh Nawâz Khân [Iridî], and came to the court along with ʿAbd al-Rahîm.

In 1593 he was appointed to assist the prince
Daniyal who was given the command of an expedition to the Deccan, but on his taking the active part in the campaign except when he defeated a largely outnumbering force under Suhayl Khan of Bidjakpur in an important battle fought in 1597. His relations with the prince remained strained and in 1598 he was recalled from the Deccan.

On the death of Murad, Daniyal was appointed to the Deccan in 1599; 'Abd al-Rahim was ordered to join him and besiege Ahmadnagar, which was being heroically defended by Când Bób. After the fall of Ahmadnagar Daniyal was appointed to its government and was married to Djâhâni Bâgum, 'Abd al-Râhîm's daughter. In 1601 'Abd al-Râhîm was ordered to repair to Ahmadnagar and pacify the territory and in the following year the command of Berá, Pathír and Telingâna was made over to him. When Salim ascended the throne Daniyal was recalled from the Deccan.

In his religious views he was professedly a Sunnî. Though religious leaders like shaykh Afrmu Sarhindî and shaykh 'Abd al-Hâcîf Dihlawî counted him among the orthodox, his religious outlook remained mystical and liberal. The belief that he was suspected of practising ta'âziyya and of secretly following Shâfîite tenets is not supported by contemporary evidence.

Bibliography: Abu 'l-Fâdîl, Ahâr-nâmâ, iij; Nîzâm al-Dîn Ahamd, Tabâkât-i Akbarî, ii, esp. 375-91; Tuzuk-i Dîhângîrî, transl. Rogers and Beveridge; Mu'tamâd Khân, 'Ilbîl-nâma-yî Dîhângîrî, esp. 287-8; 'Abd al-Bâkî Nâhâwîndî, Ma'djhir-i Rahlmî, Firiqat, Gulshan-i Ityâmi; Abu Turâb Wâli, Ta'rikh-i Gandhî, Calcutta, 1846; Muhammad Ma'sûm, Ta'rikh-i Sindî, Bombay 1938, 250-7; Inâgî-yi Abu 'l-Fâdîl, 1625, i, nos. 9, 10, (first half); Mahbûb-i imâm-i Râbhâî, Lucknow 1913, i, nos. 23, 67, 69, 191, 214, ii, nos. 8, 62, 66, 67; 'Abd al-Hâkî Dihlawî, Ma'djhir-yyî Khâbî al-Madvîlî, Delhi 1932, nos. 12, 14, 18, 19, 22; Shâh Nawâz Khân, Ma'djhir-i Ummâgî, i, 693-713; 'Ilbîl-i Akbarî, transl. Blochmann, Calcutta 1927, i, notes 354-61; Dêvâ Prafâdâ Mînîfî, Khân Khân-nâmâ (in Hindi); Mâyû Şânkâra Yâdînâka, Râhîm Râtanâvîl (in Hindi).

NURUL HASAN

'ABD AL-RAHMAN, the name of the Marwânid prince who restored the Umayyad dynasty in al-Andalus, and of four of his successors.

1. 'Abd al-Rahmân I, called al-Dâhiq, 'the Immigrant', was the son of Mu'âwiya b. Hîqâm [q.v.]. When his relatives were being hunted down by the 'Abbâsîs, 'Abd al-Rahmân, still a youth—he was born in 1137 [1312—convinced to escape secretly to Palestine, whence, accompanied by his freedman Bâdî, he made his way first to Egypt, and then to Irân. At Kayrawân, the hostile attitude of the governor, 'Abd al-Râhîm b. Hâbîb, drove him to seek refuge in the Maghrib. He stayed for some time in the region of Tâhâr; subsequently he sought hospitality first from the Berber tribe of the Mîkâsâ, and then from the Nafza tribe, on the Moroccan shore of the Mediterranean, taking ad-
vantage of his family connections—his mother having been a captive woman from that very tribe. But the Berbers did not look with favour on the political schemes of the young Syrian émigré, who with the help of his musulûd, decided to try his luck in Spain.

`Abd al-Rahmân b. Mu`tawiyya managed most cleverly, and with keen political sense, to turn to account the bitter rivalries which at that time grouped the Arab Kaysite party and Yamanite party in the Iberian peninsula in opposed camps. We succeeded similarly in enlisting the support of the numerous Umayyad clients who had come to Spain with Baldí b. Bishr [q.v.], and who formed there a local cadre of Syrian gûnds dominating a large part of the south of Andalusia. The ground having been well prepared by Badr, `Abd al-Rahmân entered the peninsula: he disembarked at Almuhecar (al-Munâkkab) on 1 Rabî` I 138/14 August 755, and at once put forward his claim to the sovereign power.

The governor of al-Andalus, Yûsûf b. `Abd al-Rahmân al-Fihri, soon had to take up arms against him. `Abd al-Rahmân, whose forces were continually increasing, made his entry into Seville in Shawwâl 138/March 756, defeated Yûsûf al-Fihri in the outskirts of Cordova on the 10 Dhu`ul-Hijjah following (15 May), and entered the capital, where he was proclaimed amîr of al-Andalus.

The founder of the Umayyad amirate of Cordova was to reign for more than thirty-three years. He spent the greater part of them in consolidating his position in the capital itself. The news of his success spread in the East, and soon a stream of dependents or supporters of the Umayyads was flowing into Spain to help with the restoration in the West of the dynasty that in the East had fallen from power.

It was not long before the amîr of Cordova was forced to confront a multitude of political problems. He had first of all to subdue finally the former wâlid Yûsûf al-Fihri, who had collected round him a certain number of malcontents and tried to retake Cordova; but he was defeated in 141/758 and in the next year was killed near Toledo. Meanwhile, just as in the time of the former governors, embers of revolt were smouldering in almost every part of the new kingdom; unrest was stirred up not only by the neo-Muslim Spaniards and by the Berbers of the mountainous regions, but also by the mutual hostility of the Arab clans. `Abd al-Rahmân I thus had to stamp out rebellion at many different points: for example, in 146/763, the rising of the Arab chief al-`Alî b. Mughîth al-Djâhîmî, and, in 152/769, that of the Berber Shâkyâ in the Santaver district (Shantabâriyya), now the province of Cuenca. Later, a certain number of the Arab chiefs on the eastern side of the Peninsula formed a coalition, and asked for help from Charlemagne. The latter himself crossed the Pyrenees at the head of a Frankish army and laid siege to Saragossa; but a sudden recall to the Rhineland compelled him to raise the siege. On the way back his army was attacked in the narrow valley of Roncesvalley by bands of Basques (Bashkunish) and was decimated (episode of Roland, Duke of Brittany). `Abd al-Rahmân in his turn laid siege to Saragossa, and gained possession of it for a time. But he was forced to give up the idea of recapturing the other towns that had fallen into the hands of the Christians. Thus it was that Gerona (Djarunda) came under Frankish control in 169/785.

Three years later, on 25 Rabî` II 172/30 September 788, `Abd al-Rahmân I died at Cordova before reaching his sixtieth year. The State of Cordova was doubtless still very insecure; but at least he had provided it with an administrative and military organisation similar, on a lesser scale, to that of the former caliphate of Damascus, and which was to last as long as the Marwânid of al-Andalus remained faithful to the `Syrian tradition'. In any case, the success of the `Immigrant' made a deep impression in the East, and the `Abbasid caliph `Abd al-`Azîz al-Mansûr gave him the name shârîr Kûraysh, `Hawk of Kûraysh', as a tribute to his courage and his spirit of enterprise.

Bibliography: E. Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. mus., I, 91-138. The essential Arabic source for the career of `Abd al-Rahmân I is the anonymous compilation entitled AKBÂR MADÎMÂ'U [q.v.], 46-120. For the other sources and the bibliography, see Hist. Esp. mus., I, 91, n. 1.

2. `Abd al-Rahmân II b. al-Hakam b. Hishâm b. `Abd al-Rahmân b. Mu`tawiyya, great-grandson of the above, succeeded his father al-Hakam I on 25 Dhu`ul-Hijjah 206/821 May 822. He was born at Toledo in 176/792 and was chosen as heir presumptive by his father. The recent discovery of that part of the Mukâlabîs of Ibn Hayyân which deals with the reigns of al-Hakam I and `Abd al-Rahmân II has made it possible for the present writer to offer a rather different picture of the latter sovereign and of the kingdom of al-Andalus during his period from that which Dozy based on the documentation available in his time. It now appears that the reign of `Abd al-Rahmân II, which covered a third of a century, was much more prosperous and brilliant than was thought hitherto; in the history of Andalusian civilisation it represented a decisive turning-point, when for the first time there penetrated to Cordova manners and a way of life directly borrowed from Baghdad and from the `Abbasid civilisation which firmly set their stamp on the aristocracy (khâdsâ) of Muslim Spain, and led to a continuous ebbing of the Syro-Umayyad tradition in the Marwânid kingdom.

At the beginning of the reign of `Abd al-Rahmân II some disturbances, which came about as a reaction against the iron rule with which al-Hakam I had governed al-Andalus, were easily put down; gradually the Levante territories (Shârk al-Andalus) were brought completely under the crown, and a new town, Murcia was founded in 216/831 to replace the former chief town, Ello. A revolt on a considerable scale broke out at Toledo; it was finally put down, and the town taken by storm in 222/837. At the same time the ruler of Cordova took up afresh the struggle against the Christians along the frontiers of al-Andalus, and nearly every year personally led or sent summer expeditions (zâ`îfâ) against the Asturio-Leonese kingdom. He also had to deal with the revolt of the Berber Mahmûd b. `Abd al-Jâhîl in the region of Merida and with the minor aggressive outbursts of the muwallad Banû Nasr family [q.v.] of Aragon, while at the same time waging war, at regular intervals, against the Basque kingdom of Pamplona and the Hispanic Marches (now Catalonia), which then formed part of the empire of the Franks (Ifrânj; q.v.).

Two important political events also took place during the reign of `Abd al-Rahmân II. The first, following upon a recrudescence of nationalist propa-
ganda, was the tenacious revolt of the Mozarab Christians [q.v.] of Toledo and Cordova, fomented by certain fanatics. Arabic historiography makes no mention of this revolt, and information about it...
can only be obtained from a few contemporary Latin sources. Not without reluctance, the government of Cordova had to deal severely with a large number of Mozarabs, priests and lay persons, men and women, who were guilty of having reviled the religion of the Prophet. At this time there was a disturbing outbreak of voluntary martyrdom, which was to continue until the end of the tenth century, see the art. UMAYYADS OF SPAIN.

Far more serious was the raid of the Norsemen, in 230/844, on Muslim Spain. The plottings of Norsemen (Urdumaniyyun), usually called Madjus [q.v.] by the Chroniclers, first made their appearance at Lisbon, then came up the Guadalquivir from its mouth and sacked Seville and all the surrounding country. The counter-stroke was not delayed, and after a bloody battle Seville was recaptured from the pirates at the end of Safar 230/November 844. To meet this unexpected menace and to forestall any new attack the navy was reinforced.

Abd al-Rahmân II instituted friendly relations with the three little independent kingdoms of western Barbary: the Rustumid kingdom of Tâhurt, the Saâhid kingdom of Nakûr, and the Midrârid kingdom of Siджîlâmâsa, but made no advances to the Aghlabids of Ifrikîya, who were partisans of the Abdâsids and had just conquered Sicily. From his reign too dates the opening of diplomatic relations between Cordova and Byzantium. An embassy from the emperor Theophilus arrived in Spain in 225/840 to demand the restitution of Crete, which had been occupied by the Andalusian adventurer Abû Hafis 'Umar al-Ballutî [q.v.]. The reply was in the negative, but a Cordovan deputation, of which the poet al-Ǧahzâl [q.v.] was a member, went to Constantinople at this time.

Abd al-Rahmân II was to become particularly renowned as an organiser and builder, and as a patron of letters and the arts. He reorganised the administration of his kingdom on the lines of the Abdâsíd system, ordered the construction at Cordova of several works of public utility, and on two occasions undertook the extension of the great mosque in his capital, in 218/833 and 234/848. His court soon became most brilliant, from the time when the musician and singer Ziryâb [q.v.], who came to Cordova in 207/822, won acceptance at Cordova for the refined usages of the Baghdad civilisation. Several poets won fame in the entourage of the amir of Cordova: for example, al-Abbas ibn Firnas [q.v.], al-Ǧahzâl, mentioned above, and Ibrâhîm ibn Sulaymân al-Ǧâfârî. During his reign the Malikite school of Cordova developed greatly, and several fâkihs acquired a reputation in juridical science, in particular the Berber Yabây [q.v.] al-Laythî, whose dictates Abd al-Rahmân II followed in his choice of kadîs. The end of the amir's life was darkened by palace intrigues, instigated by his fata Nasr and by his concubine Ta'rûb. He died at Cordova on 3 Rabî' II 231/853 September 852, after he had mustered all his resources to put an end to the revolt in southern Andalusia, and to neutralise once and for all the aggressive power of the principal instigator of this revolt, Umar b. Hafşûn [q.v.].

Abd al-Rahmân III was to become particularly renowned as an organiser and builder, and as a patron of letters and the arts. He reorganised the administration of his kingdom on the lines of the Abdâsíd system, ordered the construction at Cordova of several works of public utility, and on two occasions undertook the extension of the great mosque in his capital, in 218/833 and 234/848. His court soon became most brilliant, from the time when the musician and singer Ziryâb [q.v.], who came to Cordova in 207/822, won acceptance at Cordova for the refined usages of the Baghdad civilisation. Several poets won fame in the entourage of the amir of Cordova: for example, al-Abbas ibn Firnas [q.v.], al-Ǧahzâl, mentioned above, and Ibrâhîm ibn Sulaymân al-Ǧâfârî. During his reign the Malikite school of Cordova developed greatly, and several fâkihs acquired a reputation in juridical science, in particular the Berber Yabây [q.v.] al-Laythî, whose dictates Abd al-Rahmân II followed in his choice of kadîs. The end of the amir's life was darkened by palace intrigues, instigated by his fata Nasr and by his concubine Ta'rûb. He died at Cordova on 3 Rabî' II 231/853 September 852, after he had mustered all his resources to put an end to the revolt in southern Andalusia, and to neutralise once and for all the aggressive power of the principal instigator of this revolt, Umar b. Hafşûn [q.v.].

Under the rule of Abd al-Rahmân III the benefits of an unusual degree of continuity, and made it possible for him to subdue one after another all the centres of disaffection in al-Andalus.

The reign of Abd al-Rahmân III can be divided into two principal periods: first a period of internal pacification, the result of which was the achievement of political unity in the kingdom of Cordova, a unity which had been gravely threatened in the reign of amir Abd Allâh [q.v.]; then a longer period, mainly distinguished by activity in external policy: an offensive against Christian Spain, and a struggle with the Fâtimid empire for influence in North Africa.

As soon as he came to the throne, Abd al-Rahmân III mustered all his resources to put an end to the revolt in southern Andalusia, and to neutralise once and for all the aggressive power of the principal instigator of this revolt, Umar b. Hafşûn [q.v.]. Until 305/917 he unceasingly harassed the Andalusian rebels and attacked the Arab aristocrats of Seville, Carmona, and Elvira, who were forced to submit. After the death of Ibn Hafşûn, his sons quickly gave up the struggle. Their head-quarters at Bobastro [q.v.] were taken by storm in 315/928. Five years later the last centre of resistance, Toledo, fell in its turn.

At the same time the ruler of Cordova took care not to allow himself to be outflanked by sporadic outbursts of aggression by his Christian neighbours. He stopped the advance of the king of Asturio-Leon, Ordoño III, in 308/920, and seized a series of strongholds along the strategic line of the Duero, Osma, San Esteban de Gormaz, and Clunia, particularly after his victory at Juncaria (Valdejunqueira). Four years later the victorious operations known as the Pamplona campaign put him in a position to sack the Basque capital, the seat of Sancho Garces I, and to secure his land frontiers for several years. But he was to find a powerful opponent in the new king of Leon, Ramiro II, who, shortly after his accession, took the offensive against Islam and, after a series of encounters in which he was beaten, succeeded in inflicting on the ruler of Cordova, in 327/939, the very serious defeat at the "moat" of Simancas (sometimes wrongly called the battle of Alhandega).

Ten years had already passed since Abd al-Rahmân III, after the taking of Bobastro, and as a retort to the designs of the Fâtimids on his realm, had adopted the exalted title amir al-mu'minîn, and the honorific appellation al-Nâṣîr li-Dîn Allâh. He was now to pursue in North Africa a policy of attraction and to combat, particularly in Morocco, the influence of the new masters of Ifrikîya. In order to secure from bases of operations on African soil, he occupied certain presidios, Ceuta in particular, which was taken in 319/931. On this battle of influences, which was to continue until the end of the tenth century, see the art. UMAYYADS OF SPAIN.

After the Simancas disaster, Abd al-Rahman III quickly succeeded in restoring the situation, especially as his enemy Ramiro II died in 339/951 and his sons Ordoño III and Sancho quarreled over the succession. Al-Nāṣir took full advantage of the civil wars which at that time steeped the kingdoms of Leon and Pamplona in blood (for fuller details see the art. Umayyads).

Abd al-Rahman III died at Cordova on 22 Ramadān 350/15 October 961, at the height of his fame and power. During the latter part of his reign he had lived in the style of a veritable potentate, by obtaining from Hisham II his designation as caliph, the Umayyad Hisham II al-Mu‘ayyad bi’llah. At the end of his reign he had transferred his residence to his royal establishment of Madinat al-Zahra [q.v.], at the gates of Cordova, which he made into a town by itself. Of the kingdom of al-Andalus, which under his predecessors had ever been an object of contention shaken by civil war, the rivalries of the Arab clans, and the clash of ethnic groups in opposition to each other, he had contrived to make a pacified, prosperous, and immensely rich State. From that time Cordova was a Muslim metropolis, a rival to Kairouan and to the great cities of the East. It far surpassed the other capitals of Western Europe, and enjoyed in the Mediterranean world a reputation and a prestige comparable to that of Constantinople.


4. Abd al-Rahmān IV b. Muh. b. ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Abd al-Rahman, grandson of ‘Abd al-Rahman al-Nāṣir, Umayyad caliph of al-Andalus, who took at the beginning of his short reign the honorific title of al-Murtadā. This personage, who, at the time of the fall of Cordova, had retired to Valencia, was proclaimed at the end of 408/1017-18, after the assassination of All b. Hammūd [q.v.] by a number of supporters collected together by the lord of Almeria, the Scelvonian Zaid al-Khayrán. Al-Murtadā, before trying to retake Cordova and to instal himself there, laid siege to Granada, where the Šinhāda of Zāwī b. Zirī [q.v.] were in command, and suffered a serious defeat. Betrayed, and abandoned by his own men, he took refuge at Qū 큰 (Wādī Ash), where he was betrayed, and was long assassinated.


5. Abd al-Rahmān V b. Hīghām b. ‘Abd al-Djabbār, one of the last Umayyad caliphs of al-Andalus, was proclaimed on the 16 Ramadān 414/2 December 1023 at Cordova, and took the honorific title of al-Mustazhir bi’llah. He had barely attained his majority, and showed remarkable literary gifts. He surrounded himself with counsellors chosen from among the aristocracy of the capital, men such as the great writer All b. Ḥazm, but was able to remain in power for only forty-seven days. The Cordovan mob deposed him in the course of a riot, and replaced him by Muḥammad III al-Mustakhf, on 3 Dhū ‘l-Ka‘dā the same year/17 January 1024. The first act of his successor was to put ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Mustazhir to death.


‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Muḥammad b. ‘Aḥẓār, nicknamed Sanchuelo (Shandjulio), the "liberated" (or by his men as a grandchild of Sancho Garcés II Aba-reka, Basque king of Pamplona), son of the famous "majordomo" al-Mansūr [q.v.] b. Aḥẓār. He succeeded his elder brother ‘Abd al-Malik [q.v.] al-Muṣṭafar on his death, 16 Ṣafar 399/20 Oct. 1008, with the consent of the titular caliph, the Umayyad Hīghām II al-Mu‘ayyad bi’llāh. Indifferently gifted, vain, debauched, ‘Abd al-Rahmān Sanchuelo, from the moment that he assumed power in Cordova, made one mistake after the other and alienated public opinion. He started by obtaining from Hīghām II his designation as presumptive heir of the crown. The text of the document of investiture, dated Rabī‘ I 399/Nov. 1008, has been preserved. The designation was very badly received by the people of Cordova, who were already exasperated by the pro-Berber feelings of the Āmirīd Khādījī. While ‘Abd al-Rahmān misguidedly decided to go, in the middle of winter, on an expedition against the kingdom of Leon, an opposition party was formed in Cordova. They elevated to the throne the Umayyad Muḥammad b. Hīghām b. ‘Abd al-Djabbār, whose first care was to order the sack of the residence of the Āmirīds, al-Madinah al-Zāhirah [q.v.]. The reaction of ‘Abd al-Rahmān to this news was half-hearted. He turned back in the direction of Cordova, but during his return journey he was abandoned by his troops and arrested, not far from the capital, by emissaries of the Umayyad pretender, who put him to death, 3 Rājād 399/3 March 1009.

[See also Āmirīds and Umayyads of Spain].

The relations of Mawlay Abd al-Rahman with the European nations were marked by a series of failures that made him abandon his earlier plans of aggression and expansion. The blockade of Tangier by the English in 1828 and the bombardment of al-Araki (Larache), Arzila and Tifla by the Austrians in 1829 as reprisals for the seizure of merchant ships, made an end to an attempted reconstruction of a corsair navy, while the military successes of France in Algeria forced the sultan to renounce all intervention in the territory of the late regency. He tried in 1830-2 to extend his influence to the East of his empire by appointing khallfas in Tlemcen, Miliana and Medea, but had to recall, or disavow, them, because of their troubles and the protest of the French government. From 1832 to 1834 he lent Abd al-Kadir, leader of the holy war, his moral and material support and allowed himself to be involved in a conflict with France when his ally took refuge in Morocco in order to continue the struggle. The reverses which he suffered: battle of Islay (14 August 1844), bombardment of Tangier and Mogador (6 and 15 August), obliged Abd al-Rahman to outlaw the Amir (treaty of Tangier, 26 Oct. 1844). In 1847 he decided to expel him from the country, thus compelling him to retire himself up to the French. Several incidents due to the fanaticism of his subjects, such as the murder of the Spanish consular agent Darmon (1843), that of the Frenchman Paul Rey (1855) and pillage of the brig "Courraud Rose" (1851), embarrassed his relations with the foreign powers, but generally he gave in before threats or force (bombardment of Salé, 1851).

During his reign, Portugal (1823), England (1824, 1827), Sardinia (1825), Spain (1825), France (1825, 1844), Austria (1830), the kingdom of Naples (1834), the United States of America (1836), Sweden and Denmark (1844), renewed, or completed, their commercial treaties with Morocco.

A pious ruler and a good administrator, Mawlay Abd al-Rahman had many monuments built or restored: in Fez (Mosque of Mawlay Idris), Meknes, Salé (minaret of the Great Mosque, fortifications), Tangier (harbour), Safi, Mazagan, Marrakush (mosque of Boughzalan, Kannariyya, al-Wuslat, and the plantation of the Agdalah), etc. He died in Meknes, 29 Muharram 1276/28 August 1859.


Ph. de Cassé-Brissac

ABBAD AL-RAHMAN B. ABU HABID B. AL-WALDJ AL-MARJAWIMI, the only surviving son of the famous Arab general. At the age of eighteen he commanded a squadron at the battle of the Yarmuk. Mu'awiya subsequently appointed him governor of Himas and he commanded several of the later Syrian expeditions into Anatolia. During the civil war, after successfully opposing an 'Iraki expedition into the Jazira, he joined Mu'awiya at Siffin and was made standard-bearer. According to the received tradition, Mu'awiya, fearing that 'Abd al-Rahman might be a rival of Yazid for the succession to the Caliphate, had him poisoned in 46/666 by his Christian physician Ibn Uthāl, who was himself killed shortly afterwards by one of his victim's relatives. H. Lammens (see Bibli.) has disputed the reliability of this tradition (transmitted from 'Iraki sources) and ascribed its origin to incidents connected with an outbreak of anti-Christian violence at Himis.

Bibliography: Balâdâhurl, Ansâb, in G. Levi della Vida, II Califfo Mu'awiyâ I, Rome 1938, nos. 269, 281; Tâbarî, i, 2093, 2913; ii, 52-3; Ya'qûbî, ii, 265; Dhinawari 164, 183, 197; Naṣr ibn Muzâhid, Waḥât al-Sifîn, Cairo 1365, index; Aghâni, xv, 13; Tâbâkh Ta'rikh Ibn 'Asâkir, v, Damascus 1333, 80; H. Lammens, Études sur le règne de Mo'duwa I, Paris 1908, 3-15, 218 f. (H. A. R. Gibb)

ABBAD AL-RAHMAN B. MARWÂN B. YÔNUS, called Ibn al-Djilliîtik ("son of the Gallican"), famous chief of insurgents in the West of al-Andalus in the second half of the 3rd/9th century. He belonged to a family of neo-Muslims originating from the North of Portugal and established in Merida. Although his father had been governor of this town on behalf of the sovereigns of Cordova, Abd al-Rahman revolted against the Umayyad Amir Muhammad I in 254/868. The Amir besieged him and forced him, after the capitulation of the city, to reside in Cordova. He remained in the capital until 261/875, when he returned to the region of Merida and threw off his allegiance to the Umayyads. He fortified himself in the castle of Alange (Hish al-Hanâgh), but was again forced to surrender by the Amir Muhammad I, who assigned to him as residence Badajoz. It was not long before Ibn al-Djilliîtik again raised the standard of revolt, supported by the Muslims of Portugal (Burtukal), Sa'dun al-Surubabi, and by Alfonso III, king of Asturias and Leon. The insurgents laid an ambush for the loyalist general Hāshim b. Abd al-Azîz, in the region of the Serra de Estrella, captured him and delivered him into the hands of the Christian king, who released him only against a high ransom. Fearing, justly, a violent reaction from the government in Cordova, Ibn al-Djilliîtik took refuge with Alfonso III. After staying for eight years in Christian territory, he returned in 271/884 to Badajoz and reached a tacit agreement with Cordova. This allowed him to rule over a veritable principality extending over the valley of the Guadiana and the south of what is now Portugal. Under the reigns of the Amirs al-Mumghir and Abd Allâh, Abd al-Rahman practically had a free hand and ruled over his territory as an independent prince, until his death in 276/889. He was succeeded by his son Marwan who only survived him by two months, and after him by a grandson 'Abd Allah b. Muhammâd b. Abd al-Rahman, who died in 311/923 and was followed by a son, Abd al-Rahman. This great-grandson of Ibn al-Djilliîtik was finally compelled to submit to Abd al-Rahman III in 316/930.

'ABD AL-RAHMAN B. MUHAMMAD — 'ABD AL-RAHMAN AL-SUFİ

'ABD AL-RAHMAN B. MUHAMMAD [see Ibn AL-Â¢IBIH]

'ABD AL-RAHMAN B. RUSTUM [see RUSTUM]

'ABD AL-RAHMAN B. SAMURA B. HARDI

'ABD SHAMS B. 'ABD MANÅF B. KHÂSâVî, ARAB general. The name 'Abd al-Rahman was given him by Muhammad on his conversion in place of his former name 'Abd al-Karab. His first command was in Sidjestân in succession to al-Râbî b. Ziyâd in the latter years of the caliphate of 'Uthman, when he conquered Zarandj and Zabûr-î Dâwar and made a treaty with the ruler of Kirmân. He withdrew after the death of 'Uthman; according to Chinese sources, Pêroz, the son of Yazâdirzî, then attempted to establish himself in Sidjestân (Chavannes, Documents sur les Tou-kiue occidentaux, 275, 279). 'Abd al-Rahman b. Samura was, along with 'Abd Allah b. 'Amir, one of the envoys of Mu'âwiya to al-Hasan b. 'Ali [q.v.]. Ibn 'Amir, reappointed governor of Başra and the East, despatched 'Abd al-Rahman and 'Abd Allâb b. Khâzîm in 42/662 to restore Arab rule in eastern Khurasân and Sidjestân. In 43/663 'Abd al-Rahman reoccupied Sidjestân and captured Kâbul after a siege of several months. He then led an expedition to al-Rûkhkhadj (Azerbaijân) and Zabûl-istân (region of Ghaznâz) and again attacked and captured Kâbul, which had rebelled, probably in 45/665. Mu'âwiya subsequently made him directly subordinate to the Caliph, but shortly after the appointment of Ziyâd as governor of Başra he was replaced. He brought back with him a body of captives from Kâbul, who built a mosque for him in his kâse at Başra in the architectural style of Kâbul. He died in 50/670 in Başra, where his descendants formed a powerful and influential clan during the next century.

Bibliography: Balâdûrî, Fûtûh, 390, 394, 396, 397; Ibn Sa'd, vii, 2, 100-1; Tabari, i, 2831; ii, 3; iii, 22; Ya'qûbî, Budûn, 280, 281-2, 296 (tr. Wet, 59-91, 117); Ta'rîh-i Sîstân, Tîhrân 1314, 82-9 (legendary expansion); Caetani, Annali, vii, 276; Chronogrammata, 313-549 passim; J. Marquart, Der Beirat, Berlin 1902; 179, 255; idem. in Festschrift aduar Sackau, Berlin 1915, 267-70.

(H. A. R. Gibb)

'ABD AL-RAHMAN B. 'ABD AL-KÂDIR AL-FÂSÎ, MOROCCAN scholar, b. at Fez 1040/1631, d. in the same town 1096/1685. He was the pupil of his father, 'Abd al-Kâdir b. 'Ali [q.v.] and of numerous other masters. He became a famous polygraph, celebrated by all his biographers for the breadth and variety of his knowledge. It is said to have compiled more than 170 works on Malikite fiqû, medicine, astronomy and history. But it is especially as a lawyer that he is an authority, and his main works are his great collection on the "customs" of Fez, al-'Amal al-Fâsi, and a commentary on al-Shâbî by the famous kâfî Muhyî, entitled Miqât al-Shâbî. He is also the author of a long didactic poem in rûfûs, al-Ubnûm fi Mabûdî al-Ulûm.

Bibliography: E. Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Chorîa 266-9 (with references); Brockelmann, ii, 612, 616, 694.

(E. Lévi-Provençal)

'ABD AL-RAHMAN B. HARDI B. ABU 'UBAYDA (or 'Abba) AL-FIHRÎ, great-grandson of the famous 'Abd Allâb b. 'Ali, independent governor of Irfêkîya at the end of the Umayyad caliphate. His father, Hardi, had sent expeditions against the Sûs, Morocco and Sicily, in which 'Abd al-Rahman, still a youth, took an active part. He was one of the survivors of the bloody defeat inflicted by the Berbers upon the regular Arab troops in 123/741, in which his father and the governor, Kulhîm b. Qiyâd, lost their lives. He crossed over into Spain, but fearing for his life, returned in 127/745 to Irfêkîya, where he revolted against the actual governor, Hanâzâl b. Sa'îdân al-Kâblî, who two years later saw no other choice but to yield the power to him. 'Abd al-Rahman, on becoming master of al-Kayrawân, had to suppress several rebellions and undertook several large expeditions, notably against Sicily and Sardesînî, in 125/752. His seizure of power was the less contested as it coincided with the fall of the Umayyad caliphate of Syria. It seems that at the beginning he acknowledged the 'Abbâsid allegiance, but shortly afterwards repudiated it, on the receipt of an insulting message from the caliph al-Mansûr. No doubt at al-Mansûr's instigation, two of the brothers of 'Abd al-Rahman decided upon his ruin; he was assassinated by one of them, Yûsûb b. Habîb, who took possession of al-Kayrawân in 127/755. Habib, son of 'Abd al-Rahman, with the help of another uncle of his, 'Imrân b. Habîb, governor of Tûnis, soon afterwards attacked the usurper and, in turn, made himself master of Irfêkîya.

Another 'Abd al-Rahman b. Habîb al-Fîhrî, a contemporary of the preceding, who was called, to distinguish him from the former, was the kadi of al-Silâkî, was a propagandist of the 'Abbâsid in Spain. Pursued by the Umayyad amir 'Abd al-Rahman I, he was assassinated near Valencia in 162/778-9.


(E. Lévi-Provençal)

'ABD AL-RAHMAN B. 'ABD ALLAH AL-GHAFIRÎ, GOVERNOR OF AL-ANDALUS. He succeeded Muhammad b. 'Abd Allâb al-Ashdîja, B.) in this office at the end of 111 or at the beginning of 112/730, and retained it until his death in 114/732. 'Abd al-Rahman, who had already governed Spain provisionally for about two months in 103/721, was a lábi' reputed for his piety. He is chiefly famous for the incursion into Gaul that cost him his life. His expedition, which was carefully prepared, had for its object the basilica of St. Martin at Tours. He collected a numerous army, and from Pamplona marched through the pass of Roncesvalles on Bordeaux, which he devastated, Duke Eudes of Aquitania being powerless to oppose his advance. He then advanced towards the Loire, but was checked in his progress by the Duke of the Franks, Charles Martel, who engaged him about 20 km. to the north-east of Poitiers and inflicted on him a severe defeat. The battle is known as the "battle of Poitiers" in Frankish historiography, while the Arabs call it balâf al-ghûhâdî, "causeway of the martyrs of the faith". The Muslim survivors retreated in disorder towards Narbonne, leaving behind on the battlefield many dead, including 'Abd al-Rahman. The date of this memorable encounter can be fixed at the end of Oct. 732/Ramadân 114.


(E. Lévi-Provençal)

'ABD AL-RAHMAN B. 'UMAR AL-SUFÎ, ABU L-ḤUṢAYN, EMINENT astronomer, born at Rây
14 Muharram 291/8 Dec. 903, died -13 Muharram
376/25 May 986. In ... frontier across
which neither the Amir nor the Government of
India was to interfere in any way. Afghan intrigues

The work was illustrated by drawings,
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published by Caussin de Perceval,
The text and translation of the introduction was
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(S. M. Stern)

'Abd al-Rahman Khan — 'Abd al-Rahman Khan

The best known work is a description of the fixed stars (Suwar al-Kawdkib
al-Thabita, quoted also by different titles), which he
wrote about 355/965 and dedicated to 'Adud al-
Dawla. The book described the constellations both
according to the system of the astronomers (after
Ptolemy) and the Arabic tradition of the anwa? (cf. Naw'). The work was illustrated by drawings,
which the author, according to his own declaration,
preserved by al-Biruni (see H. Suter, Beitrage zur
Geschichte der Mathematik bei den Griechen und
Arabern, Edingen 1922, 86), traced from a celestial
globe. He also saw, however, as he says in his introduction, an illustrated work on the constellations
by Uhttps b. Muḥammad. The earliest extant MS,
the Bodleian Library, was copied and illustrated
by the author's son, in 400/1009-10. There are many
other manuscripts, illustrating the styles of the
various epochs. (See J. Upton, Metropolitan Museum
Studies, 1933, 189-99; K. Holter, Die Islamischen
Miniaturhandschriften vor 1750, Zentralbl. f. Biblio-
thekswesen, 1937, 2-5, cf. Ars Islamica, 1940, 10).

Although pro-British in so far as Russian expansion
was concerned, 'Abd al-Rahman Khan's desire to annex
the territories of the Pathan tribes of the Indian
frontier was not calculated to improve Anglo-
Afghan relations. The tension was somewhat eased
by the Durand Agreement of 1893 which delimited
a boundary on the Indo-Afghan frontier across
which neither the Amir nor the Government of
India was to interfere in any way. Afghan intrigues
on the Indian side of this frontier still continued and were partly responsible for the Indian frontier conspiracy of 1887. In fact, Afghan intrigues were the chief cause of unrest on the Indian frontier from 1890 onwards.

The greatest service rendered by 'Abd al-Rahman to his country was the suppression of internal rebellion. The powerful Gilzay tribesmen were crushed in 1886; the rebellion of Ishak, son of 'Abd al-Khaliq, was suppressed in 1888; and finally, after severe fighting, the turbulent Hazaras of central Afghanistan were forced to acknowledge his authority. In 1896 the territories of the non-Muslim tribes of Kiftiristan to the west of Cirtar were annexed and the Kafirs converted to Islam. 'Abd al-Rahman Khan died in 1901 and was succeeded by his son Habib Allah Khan.

Bibliography: Parliamentary Papers, Central Asia, 1884–5; 1887; 1888; J. A. Gray, My Residence at the Court of the Ameer, 1895; S. Wheeler, The Ameer Abdur Rahman, 1895; Sultan Mahomed Khan, Life of Abdul Rahman, 2 vols. 1900, vol. i being a translation of 'Abd al-Rahman's autobiography; C. C. Davies, The problem of the North-West Frontier, 1890–1908, 1923; W. K. Fraser-Tytler, Afghanistan, 1920; M. Longworth Davies, in EHS, c. Abd al-Rashid b. Abd al-Ghafur Al Husayni Al-Madani Al-Tattawi, Persian lexicon, born in Tatta, but a Suyyid by descent; died after 1069/1658. His principal work is a Persian dictionary, usually called Farhang-i Rashidi, or Muntakhab al-Lughat, which is a translation into Malay of a popular dictionary, usually called Badi'a, the author of the same name, the author of the...
analysis of the second part had been given by Hammer-Purgstall, in the Jahrbiicher der Literatur (lxviii, 68 ff.). This book also was used by Tholuck, and cited under the author's name (loc. cit. 7, 11, 18, 26, 73). It is of special interest because in the preface he states that it was written after his publication of the Qandaz al-Saż‘irin of al-Harawi in order to explain the Şûfi technical terms which occur in the book, and in his commentary to the Ta‘wilât al-İrâd of Ibn ʿArabî (Cairo 1309) and in his Ta‘wilât al-İrâd, according to Hadîji Khalifa (ii, 175) the Ta‘wilât of ʿAbd al-Razzîk extend to Sûrâ xlviii only, yet Berlin MS. no. 872 covers the entire Qur‘ân, but apparently in abstract. Risâla fi‘l-kadär wa‘l-kadar, treatise on predestination and free will, first translated into French, (J.A., 1873; revised edition 1875), then the text published by St. Gauydr (1879); it will be dealt with in detail below. The treatise seems to have existed attention, for Hadîji Khalifa (iii, 429) gives three answers to it by Ibn Kamâl Pâsha, Tâshkîrû-zâde and Bâlî Khalifa Şûfiyahwî. A commentary on the Ta‘ţiya poem of Ibn fârid (Cairo 1310). His works as yet unpublished are: Risâla al-Sarmandiya, on the idea of an eternal Being; Risâla al-Khadiyya, on the traditional answer by ‘All to the question of Kumayl b. Ziyâd fi‘l-kadhîba (comp. the Berlin MS. no. 3462; Hadîji Khalifa iv, 38; J.A. 14, 83); a commentary on the Mawdû‘î al-Nudjûm of Ibn Arabî and Tâshkîrat al-Sâhîbiya. Hadîji Khalifa (v, 387) adds Mi‘âbî al-Hîdâyya. For MSS. reference will suffice to Brockemann, ii, 203, 204; S ii, 280–1; the Gothacat. no. 76, 1, and Palmer’s Trinity College Cat. 116.

It will already be tolerably clear what ʿAbd al-Razzîk’s interests and positions were. He was a Şûﬁ of the school of Ibn ʿArabî, the great theologian of the Western Arabic type, though with touches of independence, and he gave much labor to defence and exposition of his master. In the three great divisions of Muslim theologians, the upholders of tradition (naﬁl), of reason (ʿaql), and of the unveiling of the mystic (kashf), he took his place with the third. It may be signiﬁcant that his name never indicates to what legal school he adhered. Like many mystics, he may have regarded such matters as beneath notice, or he may, like Ibn ʿArabî, have been a belated Zâhirî in law, as he was evidently a Bâtinî in theology. The last is evidently the case with the heart, wherein is his particular, material world. The three great conceptions, and these are further specialized, determined, limited, brought near to what we know, by being engraved on the individual reasonable souls, which are the souls of the heavenly bodies, corresponding to the angelic Intelligences, the fractions of the Universal Reason. This world, from its likeness to the human imagination, is called the Imagination of the World (khayâl al-ʿâlam) and the Nearer Heaven (al-samd al-dunyâ). From it issue all beings in order to appear in the World of Sense (ʿâlam al-dâhâk), it manifests everything, measuring out matter and assigning causes. The heavenly bodies, then, have reasonable souls just like our own, these are the imaginative faculties of the particular reasonable souls, into which the Universal Soul divides. On their changes all change in this world below depends (comp. al-ʿazhâzî’s scheme, in J.A.S. 1809, 116 ff.).

Further, this constitution of the universe corresponds to man’s body, macrocosm to microcosm. Just as the brain is the seat of man’s ruling spirit, so the Universal Spirit or Reason is seated in the throne (ʿargh) above the sphere of the fixed stars. The fourth heaven, the sphere of the sun, which vivifies all, is the seat of the Universal Soul, in man this is the heart, wherein is his particular, reasonable soul. So the fourth sphere is like the breast, and the sun like the physical heart. The individual soul of the sun corresponds to the animal spirit in the heart, which is the source of human reason.

Next, as to the place of predestination in this scheme, for that there are three words, kadăr, kadăr and inråya. Kadăr means the existence of the universal types of all things in the world of the Universal Reason. Kadăr is the arrival in the world of the Universal Soul of the types of existing things, after being individualized in order to be adapted to matter, these are joined to their
causes, produced by them, and appear at their fixed times. 'Insya is, broadly, Providence and covers both of the above, just as they contain everything that is actual. It is the divine knowledge, embracing everything as it is, universally and absolutely. It is not in any place, for God's knowledge, in His essence, is nothing else than the presence of His essence before His essence, which is essentially one and goes with all the qualities which inhere in Him. Further, while the essence (badi'a) of badi' is part of the 'Insya of God, its entelechy (hamd) is in the world of the Universal Reason. The Universal Soul is sometimes called the Preserved Tablet (la-ta'kh al-maẖfūz), for on it are preserved unalterable all the general conceptions which are on their way to the individual heavenly souls.

It is the world, then, of badar, of the Soul, which sets everything in motion. This is by the yearning of the reasonable souls of the heavenly bodies towards their spiritual source, the Universal Reason. They try to assimilate themselves to this, to universalize themselves. Step by step, they mount up, and with each advance they receive a new outpouring from that source, drawing them on further. With each movement, there flows from them an influence upon matter according as it is adapted to receive it, and serious there is a change in the material world, corresponding to those in the world of the Soul. These changes may be either absolute of creation and destruction, or, between those extremes, simply of condition. The duration of existence constitutes the Kur'ānic adjal, and all these are fixed by badar.

Finally, this exegesis of Kur'ān, ii, 1—6 will show how 'Abd al-Razzak applied Scripture. "By the Mount and by a Book Inscribed in a Parchment Outspread, and by the Frequented House, and by the Raised Roof, and by the Flowing Sea!" The Frequented House is the Spirit of the fourth sphere, that of the sun. Therefore Jesus, the Spirit of God, has been placed there, whose miracle is the raising of the dead. The Mount is the kābah, the seat of the Universal Reason. The Book Inscribed is badi', which is in that Reason: and the Parchment Outspread is the Reason itself. The Raised Roof is the nearest heaven, where are the individual celestial souls; it is mentioned immediately after the Frequented House, because from this heaven the forms descend on the earth, and from the Frequented House comes the breath of the Spirit, by the combination of which the creation of animated beings is achieved. The Flowing Sea is the sea of primary matter which spreads everywhere and is filled with forms.

How, then, is such a scheme related to pre-determination and free will? It is highly complicated, consisting of a remote first cause and an infinity of intermingling and crossing, nearer, secondary causes. It is possible to look at these last only, and so to assign absolute creative and deciding power to our own wills. Or to look only at the first cause and becomefallacists. We must preserve the balance and hold by both. The complete cause of anything into which human will can enter must have as an element in it, among so many others, free will. It sets all the others in movement. Under this conception, though never clearly stated, is evidently implied that man has in him an element of the divine deciding power. If there is freedom in the divine nature, there must be also in its emanations. For Ibn 'Arabī the oneness of the divine nature over against the creation had overcome everything. 'Abd al-Razzak lays stress on the multitudinous interweaving causes in the world, its constantly developing processes, to show that in life, purpose and will there must be multiplicity. The divine is spread down through the sub-lunar things, it does not simply rule from above. Again, amongst the many causes working in the world and upon men are the restraints and influences of religion, the promises and threatenings of the prophets. These we should permit to have their effects upon us as parts of the whole scheme, the process of training under which we are. But, again, why should training be necessary? Why are there bad and good? Here, again, is an implication, once pretty clearly expressed. Matter is of very differing nature, grosser and finer. It can receive only a corresponding soul, therefore souls also vary. Character and disposition is a combination of both, and it is for the soul to overcome its material body and itself rise. This evidently is the fundamental thought, but 'Abd al-Razzak does not give much space to it. Rather, he uses the old theological catch. This must be the best possible creation, otherwise God would have created a better. Further, if all things were equal, there could be neither order nor organization. This would also be hard on the best things thus ruled out of existence. All things should have a chance; it is for them to use it. God knows their differences and will allow for them. The most and the greatest sins are from ignorance, and God will so treat them. In the life to come the same thing is to go on. Some will attain felicity, others, because they might have done better, must undergo purification by punishment, but that will not be eternal. Here, perhaps, 'Abd al-Razzak is most unsatisfactory. He passes over into the normal Muslim conception although it is not at all clear that his system can permit individuality apart from matter. Freed souls, we should expect, would either return into the unity, or else be sent forth again to another material life. Like so many in Muslim theology and philosophy, this tractate was adapted to an audience, and was not perfectly ingenious. Yet behind its caution of statement the real system is tolerably plain. It is nearer orthodoxy than that of Ibn 'Arabī, but not as near as this eschatology would suggest.

Bibliography: St. Guyard, in Journ. As., 7th ser., i, 125 ff., which is the main source; Brockelmann, ii, 203—2 (treating him as two different persons), S ii, 280-1.

(D. B. Macdonald)
service and allowed to attend the court regularly. Two years later, he was examined by the 'silāma' at Samarkand, and given a salary and provisions (marṣum wa-'alufa) (ibid., ii, 704, 731 f.).

In Ramadān 845/Jan. 1441 'Abd al-Razzāk was sent to India as ambassador and returned in Ramadān 848/Dec. 1444. (For his mission and the result obtained see Matla', ii, 783; T. W. Arnold, The Caliphate, Oxford 1924, 113.) He was similarly sent to Gīlān in 850/1446. He was ordered to make ready for a mission to Egypt in the same year, but due to the death of Shāhrukh this was cancelled. In the period following the death of that king he served his successors. Mīrzā 'Abd al-Latīf, Mīrzā 'Abd Allāh and Mīrzā Abu'l-Kāsim Bābur, with some as sadār, with others as nāfūb and khāṣṣ; see ibid., ii, 1440. Under the last-named prince, who included him among his confidants, he enjoyed many favours (ibid., ii, 1119). In 856/1452 he was in Yazd with Mīrzā Bābur, when the Mīrza interviewed Shāraf al-Dīn Allāh Yāzdī, and in 856/1452 he was with the same prince when he besieged Samarkand, in which city 'Abd al-Razzāk had many friends and old acquaintances (Matla', ii, 1041, 1078). In 866/1462 he was sent to Aṣfūzar for fixing taxes (bunifā) soon after, under Sultan Abū Sa'īd, on 3 Dhu'l Qa'da 1 i, 867/a, Jan. 86/I (R. LE TOURNEAU).

CABD AL-RAZZAK AL-SAMARKANDI — CABD AL-SALAM B. MASHISH

(R. LE TOURNEAU)

Besides this account of his death, which seems to be reasonably probable although reported by much later authors, little more is known of the saint than his genealogy, which, through several ancestors with typically Berber names, attaches him to the house of the Prophet. He is said to have been born in the neighbourhood of the Dībash al-Ālam, in the territory of Almohad power and was attempting to pass himself off as a prophet, and who assassinated the saint because the latter's prestige was an obstacle to his ambitions. 'Abd al-Salām was buried at the top of the mountain, at the foot of an oak, and seems to have been for a long time the object of a purely local cult; Ibn Khaldūn does not mention him, nor for that matter the revolt of his murderer.

His teaching is scarcely better known, in spite of the elaborations which it acquired in Moroccan mysticism. "Perform the obligations of the Law and avoid sin", he is said to have advised a disciple who had asked him for a rule of life, "keep your heart aloof from every temporal attachment, accept what God sends you, and put above all else the love of God" (Ibn 'Ayād, K. al-Mafḍīkh, 106). It is related also that he had as a disciple Abu 'l-Ḥasan 'All al-Shāhīlī (q.v.), who came to him for his initiation into mysticism.

Only from the 15th century, it seems, at the time when the marabout movement connected with al-Shāhīlī became active in Morocco, did the fame of 'Abd al-Salām extend beyond the limits of his tribe into the whole northern part of Morocco. He was then regarded as the "pole" of the East, as 'Abd al-Kādir al-Gīlānī was regarded as the "pole" of the West. A pilgrimage was organized around his tomb in the three days following the 1426-71
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'ABD AL-SAMAD b. 'ABD ALLAH AL-PALIMBANI — 'ABD AL-WADIDS

'ABD AL-SAMAD b. 'ABD ALLAH AL-PALIMBANI, i.e. of Palembang in Sumatra, was a pupil of Muhammad al-Sammān (d. 1196/1197), the founder of the Sannāniyya order (cf. Brockelmann, S II, 535 and Nachtr.). He is known chiefly as translator of al-Ghazzālī's Luḥāb ʿIyāʾ al-ʿUlamāʾ al-Dīn into Malay, under the title of Sayr al-Sālikīn lā ʿUddāt Rabb al-ʿĀlamīn. It was begun in 1193 and finished at Tâʾīf in 1203. The translation is very free, shortened in some places, enlarged elsewhere by numerous additions, the sources of which are enumerated in book iii, bāb 10. Here we find also an interesting list of sūfī literature recommended by the author to three stages of pupils in Sufism. Most of the works in this list are in Arabic, but some in Malay. It seems that 'Abd al-Ṣamad lived mostly in Arabia. One of his earlier writings, Zahrāt al-Murūd fī Bayān Kāmilat al-Tawbīḥ, is a Malay treatise on manṭīḥ and ʿaṭā al-dīn, based on notes which he took during a lecture given at Mecca by Ahmad al-Dāmanḥūrī (Brockelmann, I, 371) in 1176. His Hīdāyat al-Sālikīn fī Sulḥāt Masāḥ al-Muttaulators is a Malay adaptation of al-Ghazzālī's Bīḍāyat al-Hīdāya, finished at Mecca, 5 Mūḥ. 1192. In Arabic he compiled a collection of aʿrādīt entitled Urwāt al-Wuthūqa wa-Silsilat al-ʿItīkād, a ṭibāb, and a treatise entitled Naqṣat al-Muʿālāmah. This last work contains fervent admonitions to holy war against infidels. It inspired the author of the Achehnese poem Hīkayat prang sabā of which various redactions were circulated in Acheh during the war against the Dutch in the last quarter of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century.

Bibliography: Ph. S. van Ronkel, VBG 57, 385, 400, 429; id., Cat. Arab. Ms. Batavia, 139, 216; R. O. Winstedt, A history of Malay literature (JMBRAS 17, III), 103; H. T. Damstè, Hīkayat prang sabā, in BTLV 84, 545 ff.; for the Sannāniyya: C. Snouck Hurgronje, BTG 85, no. The tract Anṣīs al-Muttaulators by 'Abd al-Ṣamad b. Fāṭḥ Husayn b. Fāṭḥ Muḥammad is not the work of an Indonesian author, though on the title-page of the lithographed edition the epithet al-Palimbānī is added to the author's name; its attribution to a Malay author (Brockelmann, S II, 966) is equally false. (P. VOORHOEVE)

'ABD AL-WADIDS (BAʾNŪ 'ABD AL-WĀD, OR ZAYYĀNIDS, BAʾNŪ ZAYYĀN), a Berber dynasty which, from the first half of the 7th/13th century to the middle of the 10th/16th century had its capital at Tlemcën (Tilimsān, [q.v.] and extended its power, against frequent opposition, over the central Maghrib (from the frontiers of the present Morocco to the meridian of Bougie).

According to the concepts recorded by Ibn Khaldūn, the Banū 'Abd al-Wād were Zanāṭa "of the second race." Like the Banū Marīn, B. Tāǧūn, B. Rāḡīd and B. Māzāb, they belonged to the great Zanāṭa family of the Banū Wāsān. Living as nomads, like their neighbours and relatives, the B. Marīn and B. Tāǧūn, they once occupied a more extensive territory, extending to the vicinity of the Awtās. In consequence of the Hilālāt invasion (5th/11th century) these Zanāṭa nomads, driven eastwards, were forced to abandon their territory to the Arab nomads and to emigrate to the high plateaux of what is now the province of Oran. The conquest of the country by the Almohads, at the beginning of the 6th/12th century, made the fortune of the Banū 'Abd al-Wād. They proved themselves loyal and useful allies of the caliphs of Marrākūș, especially at the time when the terrible ravages of the Almoravid Banū Ḥāniyā brought destruction upon Iṣfīkiya and the central Maqrīz (381-600/1185-1203). The assistance which they gave to the Almohad forces earned its reward. Tlemcën, successfully defended, profited by the ruin of the neighbouring centres and by the emigrations that were depopulating them. In 633/1235 the chief of the Banū 'Abd al-Wād, Yaghmūrūsān (or better: Yaghamrūsān) b. Zayyān, inherited from his brother the command over all the branches of the family. This dignity, ratified by the consent of the tribes, was confirmed by a diploma of investiture issued by the Almohad caliph al-Raḡīd. Yaghmūrūsān, the shaykh of an imposing nomad group, who used to lead his tribesmen and their flocks periodically from the desert to the plains of the province of Oran and who could speak only the Berber dialect of the Zanāṭa, became the seden-
tary sovereign of a powerful state. He had moreover the qualities of a founder of empire: energy, the ability needed to hold his associates together around him, political insight, a taste for grandeur and the generous gesture. During a reign that lasted not less than 48 years (633-81/1235-83), he already encountered the dangers that never ceased to menace the kingdom of Tlemcën. These arose on the one hand from the legacy of the clan's former life and the rivalries that set Berber against Berber, and on the other hand from the consequences of the new situation in which the Banū 'Abd al-Wād found themselves. True to his duty as a vassal, he supported the last Almohad caliphs against the Marinids, who had become the masters of Fez. The fall of the Almohads in 646/1248 left him face to face with the Marinids. Between the Marinids and the Banū 'Abd al-Wād there was a long tradition of conflict; it was singularly widened by the establishment of the two kindred kingdoms, neighbours and all the more ardently rivals.

These are the main themes which dictated the course of the external history of the Banū 'Abd al-Wād. Yaghmūrūsān foresaw their development and on his death-bed, so the story goes, he traced for his son ʿUḫmān the conduct he should adopt with regard to the other powers: a strictly defensive attitude as against Marinīd Maqrīz; attempts at expansion at the expense of the Ḥafṣīd kingdom of Tunis, as occasion should offer. In addition to this political testament, his successors could derive lessons from the activities of Yaghmūrūsān himself: his firmness in the face of the Zanāṭa, his relatives in the central Maqrīz, namely Maqrīzāwā and Banū Tāǧūn; in Spain, the triple alliance which he concluded with the sultan of Granada and the Christian king of Castile, in order to thwart the action of the Marinids, their common enemy, both in North Africa and in the Peninsula.

The struggle of Fez against Tlemcën, the attack on the Banū 'Abd al-Wād kingdom—the first objective of their expansion in North Africa—by their western neighbours, the Marinids, is the principal motif of this history and could seem to mark its stages. The first noteworthy episode was, under ʿUḫmān, the son of Yaghmūrūsān, the long siege of Tlemcën by the Marinid sultan Banū Yaʿūb al-Maḥrūṣ, who isolated it during eight years (658-706/1260-1306) by a rigorous blockade and began to build the
encampment-town of al-Manṣūra (see Abū Zayyān I). This time, Tlemcen did not fall. After expanding eastwards under Abū Ḥammūnī I [q.v.], the 'Abd al-Wādīds were again attacked by the Marinid Abū 'l-Ḥasan (see Abū Tāshufīn I), and on 30 Ramadan 737/2 May 1337 Tlemcen was taken by storm. After ten years of Moroccan domination, Tlemcen was delivered from the foreign yoke in 749/1348 by the Marinid Abu Zayyan I Muh. b. 'Utihman, and was not regained by the 'Abd al-Wādīds until 760/1359.

These two Moroccan interregnums caused a break in the history of the 'Abd al-Wādīds which was to show itself in all fields of action. Under Abū Ḥammūnī II (760-91/1359-89 [q.v.]), the kingdom regained a relative freedom of movement, but attempts at expansion in the direction of the Hafsid kingdom were frustrated (the expedition of 767/1366 against Bougie ended in disaster) and Marinid invasion remained as a periodic threat. The struggle with the Marinids had also taken on a new character, for various reasons: firstly, because of the role played by the Maʿṣil Arab of Tafilalet and the valley of the Mūlliya (Wādī Malwiyya), who supported Tlemcen against Fez; secondly, through the policy of the Marinids, whose aim was less to annex Tlemcen than to support an 'Abd al-Wādīd pretender and so to reduce the kingdom to a vassal state; thirdly, owing to the incapacity of the sultans of Tlemcen to defend their capital, and its temporary abandonment by the sovereign to seek refuge with his nomad allies.

This is, in its main lines, the history of the 'Abd al-Wādīds during the second half of the 8th/14th century. For the further hundred and fifty years during which the dynasty continued to exist they never again became masters of their own fate. It is true that they had nothing more to fear from Morocco, where the weak Wāṭṭāṣīds had succeeded to the Marinids; but the hegemony passed to Tunis. The last two great Ḥāṣids, Abū Ḍāris (827/1424) and 'Uṯmān (891/1486), harking back to the tradition of the first rulers of the dynasty, led victorious expeditions against Tlemcen and imposed in their turn vassal sovereignty of their own choice on the 'Abd al-Wādīd kingdom.

The incurable weakness of this kingdom, its internal quarrels and the cupidity of the foreigners made of the last phase of its history—i.e. the first half of the 10th/16th century—an epoch of submission and decadence. Tlemcen passed successively under the suzerainty of the Šādid sovereigns of Marrākush, from whom it was seized by the Turks in 957/1550.

There can be no doubt that, compared with the kingdom of their Marinid kinsmen, that of the 'Abd al-Wādīds appears less rich in men, fertile land and cities, and in every respect less well furnished. Thus it was unable to undertake great military enterprises in North Africa or in Spain. Its geographical position exposed it to the attacks of its covetous neighbours to the east and to the west. The place taken by the Arabs, notably by the great Hūllī tribes of the Banū Ḍāmir and Suwayd, who had invaded the plains of the district of Oran, imposed upon it a ruinous collaboration with these nomads. The Arabs, providing troops that could easily be mobilized, and acting as collectors of taxes and repaid in this service, took part in the dynastic crises and always profited by them. The Arabs, providing troops that could easily be mobilized, and acting as collectors of taxes and repaid in this service, took part in the dynastic crises and always profited by them.

In spite of these precarious conditions of existence, and in spite of their slighter resources, which did
not allow the rulers of Tlemcen to live a life as sumptuous, or to erect buildings as important, as those of the kings of Fez, the ‘Abd al-Wādīds seem to have cut a figure as sovereigns earlier than the Marinids. From the very reign of Yağmurşan, the administrative personnel appears to be more complete and their duties to be better defined than among their western neighbours. At first, the sovereign recruited his viziers among the members of his own family. Under the fourth ruler, Abū Ḥammāt I, who according to Ibn Khaldūn (Berbères, ii, 142; transl. iii, 384) transformed the kingdom from its patriarchal ways and imposed on it the etiquette of a real court, the vizierate was entrusted to Andalusians; and the same system continued under the fifth sultan. The Marinid interregnum gave rise to a new system: the vizier, sometimes a relative of the prince, becomes, as at Fez, a commander of the army and a viceroy, who is tempted to use the authority granted to him. In regard to the ḥādījīb (great chamberlain), it is noteworthy that while in Fez this dignity is often a familiar of the prince, of humble origin and an inglorious past, in Tlemcen he is chosen for his knowledge of law and his financial capacity. After the Marinid interregnum, the title of ḥādījīb vanished almost completely. No less markedly than in the military and economic fields, the Moroccan occupation of the middle of the 8th/14th century represents a collapse in the development of the ‘Abd al-Wādī state.


‘ABD AL-WĀHHĀB b. ‘ABD AL-RAMĀN b. RUSTUM [see RUSTUMIDS]

‘ABD AL-WĀḤĪD b. AL-TAMI MIN AL-MARĀKUSHI, Abū Muḥammad, Maghrībi chronicler from the beginning of the 13th century, b. Marrākush 7 Rabi‘ II 581/8 July 1185. We have no information about his life except for a few autobiographical data that allow us to some degree to piece together his career. He left, at an early age, his native town for Fez, where he made his studies, but returned several times to the Almohad capital before going to Spain. He stayed in Seville in 605/1208-9 and stopped for two years in Córdoba. After a short visit to Marrakush he established himself at Seville, whose Almohad governor took him into his service. At the end of 613/1217, he undertook a journey to the East, going to Irīkiya and then to Egypt. It seems that he remained in the East till the end of his life; according to his own testimony, he was in 617/1220 in Upper Egypt, three years later in Mecca. It was in 621/1224 that he compiled, probably in Baghdād, his Maqṣūb fi Taḥfīz Akhbar al-Maghrib, published by R. Dozy (Leiden 1847, 2nd ed. 1881) under the title The History of the Almohads (French transl. by E. Fagnan, Algiers 1893).

The Maqṣūb gives an often interesting précis of the history of the Muslim West up to the epoch of the Mu‘mīnid dynasty. The author treats this dynasty in often relying on his personal memories than on the official Almohad historiography. For the earlier period, he seems to have had at his disposition certain works of the Andalusian chronicler and traditionist al-Ḫumaydī. The value of the book of ‘Abd al-Wāḥīd is enhanced by its rich material concerning literary history, especially of the century of the mulāḥ al-tanawī in Spain.

Bibliography: Pons Boigues, Ensayo biblio- gráfico, 413; Brockelmann, i, 392, 51, 555. (E. LEVY-PROVENCAL)

‘ABD AL-WĀḤĪD AL-RASHĪD [see AL-MUWAHĪDĪN]

‘ABD AL-WĀŠĪ DŽABALĪ b. ‘ABD AL-DJAMI’, Persian poet, one of the panegyrist of the Seljūk sultan Sandjar. He came from the province of Ghārdjistan, lived for some time in Harāt, then went to Ghazna to enter the service of the sultan Bahrām Shāh, son of Mas‘ūd, of the Ghaznavīd dynasty. Four years afterwards he took the occasion of sultan Sandjar’s coming to Ghazna—to assist Bahrām Shāh, his maternal cousin—to address to him a panegyric. During the last fourteen years of his life he lived at Sandjar’s court and is said to have died in 555/1160. He excerption in Arabic and Persian poetry according to ‘Awi, who quotes, in this connection, two mulammas’. His diwan (MSS Bodleian, and Brit. Mus. Or. 3320) is mainly composed of kājidas, often very difficult. The edition, Lahore 1862, is in need of revision.

Bibliography: Dawlat Shāh, Tadhkirat al-Shar‘ād (Browne), 73-6; ‘Awi, Lubdah (Browne), ii, 104-10; Riḍā Ḥātt Khan, Majma‘ al-Faṣāḥāb i, 185-92; J. Hammer-Purgstall, Gesch. d. schönen Rede Künste Persiens, 101; H. Ethé, in Grundr. d. iran. Philol., ii, 261. (C. HUART-H. MASÉE)

‘ABDAL (A.; plur. of badal, “substitute”), one of the degrees in the šī‘ah hierarchical order of saints, who, unknown by the masses (ridāl al-ghayb [cf. ḥayb]), participate by means of their powerful influence in the preservation of the order of the universe. The different accounts in the šī‘ah literature show no agreement as to the details of this hierarchy. There is also great difference of opinion as to the number of the abdāl: 40, e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal, Musnad, i, 112, cf. v, 322; Ḥudwírī, Kashf al-Mahdīb (Zhukowsky), 259, (transl. Nicholson, 214), 300 (al-Makhlī, Kuf al-Kalūb, ii, 79); 7 (Ibn ‘Arabi, Futūhāl, ii, 9). According to the most generally accepted opinion, the abdāl take the
fifth place in the hierarchy of the saints which descends from the great 
Kūb [q.v.]. They are preceded after the Kūb by: 2) both assistants of the latter
(al-talîmān); 3) the five “stake” or “pillars”
(al-aubād [q.v.] or al-wusūd; 4) the seven “incom-
parables” (al-‘arāf). After the abdāl in the fifth
degree come: 6) the seventy “pre-eminents”
(al-nādājibāt); 7) the 300 “chiefs” (al-rukābatāb); 8) the “troops”
(al-‘asāfi‘āb), 500 in number; 9) the “wise”,
or the “isolated” (al-bukhāmāt or al-mufradāt),
of an unlimited number; 10) al-rudāgahlīyūn. Each of
these ten classes is located in a particular region
and assigned a particular sphere of action.
The vacancies which occur in each of the classes
are filled by the promotion to that class of a member
of the class immediately below it. The abdāl (also
called al-rukābatāb, “the guardians”) have their
residence in Syria. To their merit and intercession
are due the necessary rains, victory over the enemy,
and the averting of general calamities.—A single
individual of the Abdāl is called badāl; badīl,
however, which grammatically corresponds to
another plural (budāl*), is the usual form in the
singular. In Persian and in Turkish the plural
abdāl is often used as a singular.

Bibliography: G. Flügel, in ZDMG, xx,
38-9 (where the older sources are indicated);
Wiser, abdāl, xlii, xliii; Hasan Ali
(where is to be found the most frequently accepted
division of the classes); A. von Kremer, Gesch. d.
herrscht. Ideen, 172 ff.; Bargès, Vie du célèbre mara-
bout Cid Abou-Médiem, Paris 1884, Introduction;
Blochet, Études sur l'étoile de musulman, in J.A,
1902, 1, 329 ff. ii, 49 ff.; Concordance de la tradition
musulmane, s.v.: I. Masson, Passion d'Al-Hadi
(al-frukáb), 725; Reid, Essai, 112 ff. (J. Goldzieher)

In various orders of derwishes in the Ottoman
Empire the name abdāl, as well as budāl* (plur.
of budāl) was used for the derwishes, e.g. among the
Khawlātīyā (cf. for instance Yūṣuf b. Ya‘kūb,
Menābīb-i Sherif we-Tarikat-nāme-yi Pirān we-
Makkīyyāh-ī Tarikat-ī Aṭīyye-yi Khawlātīyaye, Istanbul
n.p., 1834, 377, 38, where it is expressly stated that
Shaykh Sūhū Sīnān used to address his derwishes
as abdāl). When the esteem enjoyed by the derwish
orders declined, the word abdāl, and budāl*, used
as singulars assumed in Turkish a pejorative meaning:
“fool”. The derivation of budāl* from a Turkish
word budal*, “plump body” (K. Lokotsch, Etymologisches
Wörterbuch der europäischen Wörter orientalischen Ursprungs,
Heidelberg 1927, 28) is mistaken. Budal* occurs,
in the same acceptance, also in Bulgarian,
Serbian and Rumanian.

ABDĀL, the former name of the Afghān tribe
now known as the Durrānī; they belong to the
Sabānī branch of the Afghāns. According to their
own tradition, they derived their name from Abdāl
(al-Awdāl) b. Tārīf b. Shārikān b. Kays; Abdāl
was so called because he was in the service of an
abdāl or saint named Khādīja Abū Ahmad of the
Čiğliyya order. The Abdāls for long inhabited
the province of Kandahār, but early in the reign
of Ṣāḥḥ “Abbas I, pressure from the Ghulzay tribe
crushed them and moved to the province of Harāt.
Ṣāḥḥ “Abbas made Sadū, of the Popalzay clan,
head of the tribe, with the title Mir-i Afghānī.
Though loyal to Ṣāḥḥ “Abbas, they emulated the
Ghulzay a century later and made themselves
virtually independent. Nādir Ṣāḥḥ [q.v.] later
subdued the Abdāls, but treated them with leniency
and enrolled many in his army. Amongst these

Abdāls was Ahmad Khān, the second son of Muḥam-
dād Zāmīn Khān Sadōzay. The Abdāls served
Nādir well, and he rewarded them by restoring
them to their former territory of Kandahār. On
Nādir’s assassination in 1747, Ahmad Khān had
himself crowned in Kandahār. Either as the result of
a dream or because of the influence of a jāhīr
named Šāhī Zhāḥ, Ahmad Šāh took the title of
Durrū-i Durrānī (“The Pearl of Pearls”), and the
tribe has since that time been known as the Durrānī.
The two principal clans were the Popalzay and the
Bārākzay; the present royal family of Afghānīstān
belongs to the latter. (For the history of the Durrānī
tribe see DURRĀNĪ and AFGHĀNĪSTĀN).

Bibliography: M. Elphinstone, Cawul, London
1842, ii, 95; Abd al-Karim, Ta’rīkh-i Ahmad,
Kānpūr 1292/1875, 3-4; Muḥammad Ḥayāt
Khān, Ḥayāt-i Afghānī (English trans. entitled
Afghanistan, 37); Muḥammad Mahdī Kawkābī
Astarābādī, Ta’rīkh-i Nādirī, Bombay, 4-6;
B. Dorn, Gesch. d. Afghānān, ii, 42; L. Lockhart,
Nadir Shah, London 1938, 3, 4, 16, 29, 31-4,
54-2, 113-4, 120, 201; K. Fraser-Tytler, Afghanistan
8, 62. (L. Lockhart)

ABDALĪ, plural Ḍabdilī, Ḍabdilīa and, in the
Ta’rīkh-i Aʿṣāb, Ḍabdilīyūn with i, is now most
commonly used as a collective name for the
inhabitants of Lāhūd (S. W. Arabia. Abadil Faḍl
believes this usage to date from the time
when Ṣhaykh Faḍl b. ʿAlī b. Šāh b. Šallām b.
ʿAlī b. ʿĀlī al-Sallāmī al-Abdālī, made Lāhūd independent
of the Zaydī Imām (1145/1732-3) and founded the
dynasty by which it has since been ruled (see LĀHŪD).
According to the Ta’rīkh-i Aʿṣāb (7th/13th cent.)
the original clan of the ‘Abdāl are descended from
Khwālīn b. ʿAhmar b. ʿAlī b. Khuwālīn, who
mentions them in southern Yaman (Pearl Strings,
v, 217) and Landberg concluded from local enquiries
that they still lived in their former territories.
In the time of Faḍl b. Ṣallām they belonged to the
Yafīfī confederacy; the Āl Sallām, his own
branch, were represented at Khanfar, in Yafīfī
territory, and at Mukkā. Ṣāḥḥ Faḍl states that the
majority of the inhabitants of Lāhūd were then
Aṣābīh, descended through Aṣāb b. ʿAhmar from
Himyar al-Asgār; they had been there in al-
Ham-dānī’s time; the rest belonged to various
 Kahtān tribes, ʿAdālīm, Dījāfīl, Yafīfī, ʿAṣābīh,
Ḥawāshģī and ʿĀmīra. The capital of the state, al-
Hawštā, now has a very mixed population including
representatives of many tribes of S. W. Arabia as
well as people of African descent. (There is also a
branch of the Banū Mawrān called ʿAbdālī, living
on the Safādī side of the southern border of ʿAsrār;
see Philby, Arabian Highlands).

Yūṣuf, Ta’rīkh-i Aṣāb, Damascus 1369; F. M.
Hunter and C. W. H. Sealby, An account of the
Arab tribes in the vicinity of ‘Aqab; C. Landberg,
Études sur les dialectes de l’Arabie méridionale;
Ahmad Faḍl b. ʿĀlī ʿAbdīn al-Abdālī, Ḍabdilīyūn
al-Zamīn, Cairo 1351, giving copious quotations.
(C. F. Beckingham)

`ABDĀN, according to the account of Ibn Rīznām
(see Fīhrīst, 182) and ʿAbīn Muḥīn (quoted in
Nawawī’s chapter on the Karmaṭians and in an ab-
notated form in al-Maqrīzī, Aṭṭār al-Ḥawiyya[Buny,
103 ff.], also going back, no doubt, to Ibn Rīznām, was
a brother-in-law and lieutenant of Ḥam-dān
Karmaṭ [q.v.], leader of the Karmaṭians [q.v.] of
southern ‘Irāk. When the Ismaʿīlī headquarters in
Salamiya changed their policy, ʿAbdān fell away
from their allegiance, but was killed, in 286/899, at
the instigation of Zikrawayh, the leader of... 1045 (the best MS), in the
private collection of R. Tschudi, Basle, and in
Istanbul, Millet Kiitubkhanesi, 277 (414).

Abdan are claimed to be in the possession
of Syrian Isma'ili circles; cf. also W. Ivanow, A
Guide to Ismaili Literature, 31. [See also SARMA-TIANS].

Abdan's main concern is with
the state of Muslim scholarship and instruction. He shared the custo-
manship for tijdast, and gives details of the
authorities from whom he obtained, both for himself and his son, such certificates of study: Thus his book turns into a specimen of the rich literature about teachers and books (barnamad, fahrasa), from which we gain an insight into the range of works usually studied, classical, post-classical, and contemporary. In Kur'an-reading and grammar the late works of the Andalusians are preferred, in poetry most interest is shown in the famous post-classical product of North Africa. Among the longer poetic pieces quoted are al-Kashida al-Sharafiyya, by Abu Muhammad 'Abd Allah al-Kurashi (d. 466/ 1073), in praise of the Prophet, and a takhyims of the Mufarrijda. He quotes also some of his own poems; for instance one to his son, containing moral advice, another addressed to the Sultan Salih al-Din Yusuf b. Ayyub, praying him to deliver the lands of Islam from the Christian yoke.

The influence of the Rihla MS of which was copied as late as 1883) can be traced in the geo-
historical and literary literature of the Maghrib from the 14th to the 18th cent. For instance, Ibn Ba'ttuta's description of the Pharaohs of Alexandria (i, 29-30) is derived from it; other travellers, e.g. al-Balawi, and also biographers like Ahmed Bâbâ and Ibn al-Kâdi used it extensively. Finally, its moral purpose, to lay bare the material and spiritual short-
comings of contemporary Ifrîfîya and Middle Maghrib, makes the Rihla a document of considerable interest.

Biography: Brockelmann, I, 634, S I, 883
(add MSS Algiers 1017; Fez, Karawiyyin 1937);
Ahmed Bâbâ, Nagi, marg. of Ibn Farhûn, Dîdajî,
68; TA, iii, 375; B. Vincent, in JA, 1845, 404-8;
M. Cherbonneau, in JA, 1854, 144-76; R. Dozy,
Cat. Lgd. Bâl., iii, 137; M. Reinaud, Geographie
d'Afrique du Sud, i, xxxvi; Moyalinski, in Bull. Soc.
de Geogr. d'Alger, 1900, 71-7; W. Wright, in Intro. of Ibn Djugayr, Rihla, 1907, 16-7; E. Rossi,
La Chron. de Ibn Gaîbûn, 12; W. Hoenerbach, Das
Nordafrikanische Itinerar des 'Abdari, Leipzig 1940.

(МУН. БН. ЧЕНЕБ-В. ХОЕНБЕРБАХ)

AL-'ABDARI [i.e. descendant of 'Abd al-Dâr b.
Khûsayy, of the tribe of Kuraysh], MUHAMMAD b.
MUHAMMAD b. 'âli b. 'âbd al-Abû MUHAMMAD,
author of a book of travels bearing the title of al-Rihla al-Maghribiya. He was
staying with the Haha, near Mogador, when he
started on his journey on 25 Dhu l-Hijjah 414/11 Dec.
1289. The dates of his birth and death are not
known; all biographical data are lacking, although
he was always held in esteem as the learned author
Fez, 199; Durrat al-Hijjâ, i, 124) and al-Mâqâkî,
Analecets, 786, 866) knows of him only from his work.
That he had süfî affinities is shown by his interest in
the cult of saints; he himself tells us that he received the süfî khwâra from the shaykh Abû Muhammâd
'Abd Allah al-Abû Yusuf al-Andalûsî in Tunis (MS. Algiers, fol. 154b). In politics he seems to have been a partisan of the Marinids as against the
'Abd al-Wâdîdîs. It was due, probably, to this
circumstance that he was unable, on his return,
to publish his book in Tlemcen.

On his journey he received instruction from the following: Şjârâf al-Dîn al-Dînayû'l-dîn al-Djâhch, Tañdharî, iv, 278), the famous traditionist Ibn Dâqîl al-Tîd (al-Suyûtî, Iftssan al-Muhadara, i, 143),
Zayn al-Dîn b. al-Munayyirî (Ibn Farhûn, Dîdajî,
205; Ahhad Bâbâ, Nagi, 191), 'Abd Allah b. Hârûn
al-Târi al-Kurshûfî in Tunis, Abû Zayd 'Abd al-
Rahmân b. al-Asadî in Kayrawân, Abû 2-Hasan
'âli b. Abû al-Karâfî and others. His son Muham-
mad (see IBN AL-HÂDUB) and Abûl-'Kasîm b.
Rîdwan are mentioned as his pupils. He writes
approvingly of some, such as al-Dabbâgh (author of Ma'didm al-Imân), while others are treated with
devastating criticism (e.g. Abû 'Abd Allah b. 'Abd
al-Sayyid of Tripolîs).

The importance of his book does not lie in its
geographical details. Though he thinks it proper
to criticize—within strict justifications—some state-
ments of al-Bakri, he is not a geographer and his
summary descriptions of various sights—where he
usually follows other geographers—are of no great
value. His rhetorical descriptions have no more
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Bibliography: Babinger, 217 f.; J. H. Mordtmann, in Isl., 1925, 364. (Fr. Babinger) 'Abdî Efendi, Ottoman historian. The only information about his life is that he worked under the sultans Mahûmî I and Mustaфа III, i.e. about 1730-64. His history, called either simply 'Abdî Ta'rîkh or Ta'rîkh-i Sultan Mahûmî Khân, deals mainly with the antecedents of Patrona Khâtîmân. (1730-1) and is one of the main contemporary sources for this event. MSS are to be found in Istanbul, Es'ad Efendi, 2153 and Millet Kütüphanesi 409.

'Abdî Efendi, Ottomân tarihi. ABDI EFENDI, Ottoman historian. The only information about his life is that he worked under the sultans Mahmûd I and Mustaфа III, i.e. about 1730-64. His history, called either simply 'Abdî Ta'rîkh or Ta'rîkh-i Sultan Mahmûd Khân, deals mainly with the antecedents of Patrona Khâtîmân. (1730-1) and is one of the main contemporary sources for this event. MSS are to be found in Istanbul, Es'ad Efendi, 2153 and Millet Kütüphanesi 409.

Bibliography: F. R. Unat, 1730 Patrona ihtilali hâkbenda bir eser 'Abdî ta'rihi, Ankara 1943; Osmanî Müellifleri, iii, 106; İmânı Anısklopedisî, i, 31; Ahmed Reâlî, Lâle dewrî, Istanbul 1331, 116, 125, 140; Râmis Tezghebî, MS Millet Kütüphanesi 762, 183; Seznet-ul-Rûâdan, 83 ff., 90 ff.—For the MSS cf. Istanbul Kütüphaneleri Ta'rîkh-Coğrafya Yazarlari Kataloqları, 1: Türkçe Ta'rîkh Yazarlari, 2nd fasc., Istanbul 1944, 103 f. (Fr. Babinger)

'Abdî Pasha, Ottoman historian. 'Abd-al-Rahmân 'Abdî Pasha came from Anadolu Hisarî on the Bosporus, was educated in the Seryû, and finally attained the post of imperial privy secretary (sirr êdûtibi). In Muhammî 1080/June 1669 he was appointed to the office of nîchânî with the rank of a vizier, and was later appointed hâ'im-makâm of the capital. In April 1679 he became governor of Bosnia, next year again nîchânî, in March a so-called vizier of the cupola, in August 1684 governor of Bağra (cf. Hammer-Purgstall, iv, 379). Described in 1686, he was in the next year appointed governor of Egypt. In 1688 he was governor of Rumelia, next year governor of Crete, where he died in Radjâb 1103/March 1692. 'Abdî Pasha is usually described, though whether correctly is open to some doubt, as the first officially appointed historianographer (wekâtê-nûsêtî); cf. Ismail Hakki Urunçaparî, Osmanî devletinin merkez ve bahriye indirîs, Ankara 1943, 64-8. At any rate he was the author of the history of the Ottoman empire, which starts with the beginning of the reign of Muhammîd (Mehmed) IV, 1058/1648 and ends with 3 Ramaðân 1093/5 Oct. 1682. The book, usually called Ta'rîkh-i Wekâtî (Hâtîdît Khâtîfà, ed. Flügel, no. 14253), but also Wekâtî-nûmesî 'Abdî Pasha, was dedicated to the sultan Mehmed IV. For the MSS cf. Babinger; additional MSS in Istanbul, Baghdad Kûşkû, 217, Khaled Ef., 615 (cf. Isl., 1942, 207), and Istanbul Kütüphaneleri Ta'rîkh-Coğrafya Yazarlari Kataloqları, xi: Türkçe Ta'rîkh Yazarlari, 2nd fasc., Istanbul 1944, 111 f. A partial French translation, by Étienne Roboly, is published in Paris, suppl. turc, 667 (Biochet, 1924, 781).

Bibliography: Babinger, 227 f. (with further references); İmânı Anısklopedisî, i, 30; Hammer-Purgstall, iii, 558 f. (Fr. Babinger)

Abdjad (or Abjad or Abdjâd), the first of the eight mnemonotechnical terms into which the twenty-eight consonants of the Arabic alphabet were divided. In the East, the whole series of these voces memoriales is ordered and, in general, vocalised as follows: abjad haewas huâsiy kalâman sa'aş ârasqu akbâkât abakbâk darsqu. In the West (North Africa and the Iberian peninsula) groups no. 5, 6 and 8 were differently arranged; the complete list was as follows: 'abadjîd haewas huâsiy kalâman sa'aş ârasqu akbâkât abakbâk darsqu. The first six orders of the Oriental series preserve faithfully the order of the “Phoenician” alphabet. The last two, supplementary, groups consisted of the consonants peculiar to Arabic, called, for this reason, rawâdît, “mounted on the hind-quarters”. From a practical point of view, this arrangement of the alphabet has only one point of interest, namely that the Arabs (like the Greeks) gave each letter a numerical value, according to its position. The twenty-eight characters are thus divided into three successive series of nine each: units (1 to 9), tens (10 to 90), hundreds (100 to 900), and "thousand". Naturally, the numerical value corresponding to each of the letters that belong to groups no. 5, 6 and 8 differs in the Oriental and the Occidental systems.

The use of the Arabic characters as numerals has always been limited and exceptional; the ciphers proper (cf. 1114)A have taken their place. Nevertheless, they are used in the following cases: (i) on astrolabes; (ii) in chronograms, usually versified (epigraphic or otherwise), formed according to the system called al-dûjumal (see 1113A and râ'wîf); (iii) in various divinatory procedures and in composing certain talismans (type of bâdâb = 24 6.8. see 1113A). Even in our own days the tîlîs of North Africa use the numerical value of the letters for certain magical operations, according to the system called yâbek (1.10.100.1000); a specialist in this technique is called the vernacular yâkabât. (iv) in the pagination, according to the modern convention, of prefaces and tables of contents, where we would use the Roman letters. This “abecedarian” order of the Arabic letters does not actually correspond to anything, whether from the point of view of phonetics or of graphical representation. To be sure, it is very old. For the first twenty-two letters, it appears already in a tablet discovered at Ra’s Shamra which gives the list of the cuneiform signs that constitute the alphabet of the people of Ugarit in the 14th century B.C. (Ch. Virolleaud, L'abbédaire de Ras Shamra, GLECS, 1950, 57). Its Canaanite origin, at least, is certain; but moreover, the order was kept in the Hebrew and Aramean alphabet, and was, no doubt, taken over by the Arabs together with the latter. Yet the Arabs, having no knowledge of the other Semitic languages and moreover full of prejudices arising from their strong self-consciousness and their national pride, doubtless added explanations for the mnemonotechnic words abjad etc., handed down by tradition and incomprehensible to them. All that they had to say on this head, however interesting, is but a fable. According to one version, six kings of Madyan arranged the Arabic letters after their own names; according to another tradition, the six groups are the names of six demons; a third tradition explains them as the names of the days of the week. Sylvestre de Sacy has noted that in these traditions only the first six words are used, and that, e.g., Friday is not called thakbât, but *urâba; yet it is not admissible to base on such vague traditions the conclusion that the Arabic alphabet had originally only twenty-two letters (J. A. Sylvestre de Sacy, *grammaire arabe*, ii, par. 9). In fact, even among the Arabs there were some more enlightened grammarians, such as al-Mubarrad and al-Sârîf, who, not satisfied with the legendary explanations of abjad, straightforwardly declared that these mnemonotechnic words were of foreign origin. There is, however, one noteworthy detail among
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these fabulous indications. One of the six kings of Madyan had the supremacy over the others (ra’suṣuqum); this was Kalaman, whose name is perhaps somehow connected with the Latin *elementum*.

For the other arrangement of the alphabet which exists alongside this “abecedarian” order and which is the one currently employed, see *Hüruf al-Hidjam*.

It may be added that in North Africa the adjective *budjeddi* is still alive, with the acceptance of “beg- inner, tiro, green”, literally, “one still at the abecedarian stage” (cf. the Persian-Turkish *abjad-khādān*, English *abecedarian*, German *Abzchüler*).


(G. Weil-G.S. Colin)

**ABÈCHÉ** [see *Abeche*].

**ABEL** [see *Habul*].

**ABENCERAGES** [see *Al-Sarradj Bani*].

**ABENRAGEL** [see *Al-Sarradj Bani*].

**ABESHR** [see *Ibn Abi 'L-Ridjal*].

Little is known of Abbâ’s history until Wâhâbî doctrine swept across the mountains about 1215/1800. The subsequent Turco-Egyptian campaigns brought an army including several Europeans to Manâzîr, which was occupied for about one month in 1250/1834 (Tamisier mentions a nearby village of “Apha”). Al-‘Ayîd, the shaykhly clan of Bânî Mughâyad, there after ruled from Abbâ, later receiving the blessing of the resurgent Wâhâbîs under Faysâl b. Turtî. In 1287/1871 when the Turks were engaged in reoccupying the Yaman, Muhammad b. ‘Ayîd attacked them in the lowlands but they soon overwhelmed him, occupied Abbâ, and put him to death. The town became the center of a kadâ in the Yaman wilâyet and remained Turkish until after the 1918 armistice, except for several months in 1328-9/1910-1 when the Idrîslîs [q.v.] of Shâbyā wrested it from Sulaymân Shâfîk, the Turkish governor. A relief expedition led by Şâhirî Hûsâyin of Mecca arrived in Djumâdî II 1329/June 1911 to find Abbâ once more in Sulaymân’s hands.

After the Turkish withdrawal, Al-‘Ayîd again became sole rulers, but were promptly challenged, first by Muhammad al-‘Idrîsî, then by the Sa‘ûdîs, whose two campaigns (one in 1339/1921 and another in 1340-1/1922 led by Fâysâl b. ‘Abd al-‘Azîz) broke their power. Abbâ has since been the seat of a Sa‘ûdî governor, increased in importance by the Sa‘ûdî acquisition of Idrîsî territory in 1345/1926. The force commanded by Sa‘ûdî b. ‘Abd al-‘Azîz in the Yaman War of 1355/1934 was based on Abbâ. Two years later Philby found the place still suffering from the ravages of its former insecurity, but under peaceful rule prosperity is returning.

For bibliography see *Asîr*. (H. C. Mueller)

**ABHAR** (in *Hudâd al-Alam*: Abhar), a small town owing its importance to the fact that it lies about halfway between Kazân (86 km) and Zandjân (88 km.) and that from it a road branched off southwards to Dinawar. It was conquered in 24/645 by Barâ’î b. ‘Azbî, governor of Rayy. Between 386/996 and 409/1029 it formed the fief of a Musafîrid [q.v.] prince. The stronghold of Sar-djâhân (in Râhât al-sudâr: Sar-danî), lying some 25 km. N.W. of Abbār near a pass leading into Târom [q.v.] played an important rôle under the Sa‘ûdîs.

**Bibliography:** Le Strange, 221; Schwarz, *Iran*, 726-8; Minorsky, *Studies in Caucasian history*, 1952, 165.

**AL-ABHARî, Abîr al-Dîn Mufaddal b. ‘Umar, philosophical writer, about whose life nothing is known; d. in 663/1267. He was the author of two works on scholastic philosophy, which were much in use and often commented: (i) *Hidâyat al-Bîkma* in three parts, a. Logic (al-manîhî), b. Physics (al-fabîyyâdî), c. theology (al-dâ’îyyâdî). The best known commentary is that by Mir Hûsâyin al-Maybûlî, written in 880/1475. (ii) *Isâghâtîjî*, an adaptation of the *Isagoge* of
Porphyry (cf. *FURFRIYUS*). Of the commentaries, that by Shams al-Din Ahmad al-Fanarf (d. 854/1450) has been printed in Istanbul; for other commentaries and glosses, see Brockelmann.


(C. Brockelmann)

**ABIB** [see *TA'ALIM*].

'ABID [see *'ABD and MAHSAZAN*].

'ABID b. AL-ABRAB, pre-Islamic Arab poet, of the tribe of Asad. Very little is known of his life, which must have lain in the first half of the 6th century A.D. The legendary story that his death was caused by al-Mundhir III, king of Hira, would fix as a *terminus ante quem* the date of the king's death, 554. The literary tournament with Imru' al-Kays, attested by the historicoliterary tradition and by verses in the *di'ad* of 'Abid, shows that the two poets were contemporaries; their joust would have to be placed between 530 and 550. About 530—so Lyall assumes—the Banu Asad revolted against the supremacy of the kings of Kinda and killed king Hugir, father of Imru' al-Kays; hence the enmity and the rivalry between the two poets.

The *di'ad* of 'Abid (edited and translated together with that of Ab!d b. al-Tufayl by Ch. Lyall, Leiden 1913, GMS xxii) contains thirty more or less complete *kasidas* and seventeen fragments. The very distinct archaism in the structure and the language of the *di'ad* is a strong argument for its authenticity. The dominant tone is one of melancholic and sententious austerity, as well as of a proud dignity which finds in individual and tribal fadh the expression that becomes it best.

The sentiment of love appears in a very restrained and already strongly stylized form, so that the nasib is more often devoted to the collective regret for a dispersed group than for an individual woman (e.g. *kasida* i, ix, xv, etc.). It is perhaps this melancholic conception of life's flight and of its fleetingness, so often expressed with original accents in the poetry of 'Abid, that gave rise to the legend that places him amongst the mu'ammara [q.v.]. He seems to have died, according to Grunebaum's view (*Orientalia*, 1939, 343, 345), rather young, perhaps even before his fiftieth year. The sententious mind of 'Abid is expressed not only in his nostalgia for the past, but also in his praise of himself and of his tribe (iv, vii, xxii, xxiv etc.) and in his virulent polemics against Imru' al-Kays and other, unknown, poets. The allusions to his poetical talent are especially noteworthy (x and xxiii): they show that he had a clear conscience of his inspiration and his artistic technique. The old Arab critics admired his descriptions of storms and desert tempests, but the modern reader appreciates most among all the poems of his *di'ad* his descriptions of animals, such as the famous scene of an eagle chasing a fox (i) and that of the fish in the sea (xxiii). In these poems and in other celebrated *tableaux*, 'Abid appears as one of the most powerful poets of the *djhaliyya*.


'ABID b. SHARYA [see *'UBAYD b. SHARYA*].

'ABIK [see *'ABD]*.

'ABISH [see *SALCHORDS*].
of these sites must go back to the Arsacid period (Isidore of Charax mentions for example a town of Parz/Ah.) and some are even prehistoric; cf. R. Pumpelly, *Explorations in Turkestan*, Washington 1905, excavations at Anau.


(V. MINORSKY)

**AL-ABIWARDI,** Abu 'l-Mu'azzafar Muhammed b. Ahmad, Arab poet and genealogist, a descendant of 'Abasa b. Abu Sulaym (of the Umayyad lineage of the younger Mu'awiya). He was born in Abiward (Khurásan), or more exactly in the village of Kawfan (not Fokan) near Abiward (he is therefore sometimes called al-Kawfani), and died from poison in Isfahan in 507/1113 (not 557/1161-2). His philological and historico-genealogical works, notably a history of Abiward and a book on the different and identical names of the Arab tribes, are lost; but al-Kaysaran extensively used the latter work. Of his diwan, the three most important sections: al-Nadjiyyat, al-Tabiqiyat (nearly on the caliphs al-Mu'tadil, al-Mustaphir and their viziers) and al-Wadidiyyat are preserved in several MSS. A diwan, arranged according to the alphabetical order of the rhymes, was published in the Lebanon in 1317, but many poems by al-Ghazal have been erroneously included; a choice of less important poems: *Mukhafih al-Abiwardi al-Umarawi*, published in Cairo, 1373/1361-c.


(C. BROCKELMANN-[CH. PELLAT])

**ABKAYK** (properly Buakayk), a town and oil field in al-Haš Province, Saudi Arabia. The name is taken from that of the shallow water sources (naba*) of Buakayk in the sands some 15 miles north of the present town. The name is similar to that of the Arabic root *bakka* relating to water rather than to bugs. The Bedouins know the location of the town as Aba 'l-Ki'dân, "the place of the young male camels".

Surrounded by the heavy dunes of al-`Bagdad, Abkayk (49° 40' E. Long., 25° 55' N. Lat.) is about halfway between al-Zahran and al-Hufhuf on the main road connecting inner Arabia with the Persian Gulf ports of al-Dammam and Ra's Tannûra, and is also on the Saudi Government Railroad (al-Dammam-al-Riyadh). Prior to the discovery of oil in the Abkayk field by California Arabian Standard Oil Company (now Arabian American Oil Company) in 1359/1940, no settlement existed there. In 1372/1952 the population was approximately 15,000, including 1,310 Americans.

The American geologist Max Steininke was primarily responsible for finding oil in this wilderness of dunes. The oil field is about 32 miles long, averages 5 miles in width, and for a time was the most productive field in the world. In 1370/1951 daily production reached about 600,000 barrels (90,000 tons) from only 61 wells. (W. E. MULLIGAN)

**ABKHAZ.** 1. For all practical purposes the term *Abkhaz* or *Akhâz*, in early Muslim sources covers Georgia and Georgians (properly Diwrân, q.v.). The reason (cf. below under 2.) is that a dynasty issued from Abkhâzâia ruled in Georgia at the time of the early `Abbâsids. A distinction between the Abkhâzian dynasty and the Georgian rulers on the upper Kur is made by the Mas'ûdî, ii, 65, 74. The people properly called Abkhaz is possibly referred to only in the tradition represented by Ibn Rusta, 135:

> "*Awqâf, see Marquart, *Streifsüge*, 164-76, and *Hudâd al-`Ajam*, 456. Characteristically, Ibn Rusta places this people at the end of the Khazar dominions."

2. *Abkhâz,* a smaller people of Western Caucasus on the Black Sea, which called itself *Aps-âwâd.* It occupies the area between the main range and the sea, between the river Psw (north of Gâgrî) and the mouth of the Ingur in the south. Since the 17th century (and possibly much earlier) a portion of the tribe has crossed the main ridge and settled on the southern tributaries of the Kuban.

The Abkhâz are mentioned in ancient times as Absâgoi (by Arrian) or Abâgi (by Pliny), cf. Contarini (A.D. 1475): *Avocassia,* in older Russian: *Obesi,* in Turkish: *Abasa,* According to Procopius (5th cent. A.D.) they were under the sovereignty of the Lazes (q.v.), and in those days slaves (eunuchs) were brought to Constantinople from Abkâhâziâ. Subjugated by Justinian, Abkâhâzâ was converted to Christianity. According to the Georgian Annals (Broset, *Histoire de la Géorgie*, i, 237-43), the Arab general Murwan-Kru ("Murwan the Deaf") having occupied the passes of Darial and Dârband, invaded Abkhâzâ (whither the Georgian kings, Mir and Arûtî, had fled), and ruined Tskhum (Sukhum). Dysentry and floods, combined with the attacks of the Georgians and the Abkhâzians, caused great losses to his army and made him retreat. The chronology of the Annals is very uncertain. The name Murwan-Kru seems to refer to the Umayyad Muhammed b. Marwân, or to his son Marwân b. Muhammad, i.e. to the early part of the 8th century, cf. al-Baladhurî, 205, 207-9. Towards A.D. 800 the Abkhâz won their independence with the help of the Khazars; the prince *eristâns* Leon II, of the local dynasty descended from Abkâhâzi, married to a Khazar princess, assumed the title of king, and transferred his capital to Kutai and under the governor of Tiffîn, Isbîk b. Isamâtî (c. 830-53), the Abkhâz are said to have paid tribute to the Arabs. The most prosperous period of the Abkhâz kingdom was between 850 and 950; their kings ruled over Abkhâzâ, Mingrelia (Egrisî), Meretia and Kartilia, and also interfered in Armenian affairs. Since that period Georgian has remained the language of the educated classes in Abkhâzâ. In 978 the Georgian Bagratid Bagrat III, son of the Abkhâzian princess Gurandukht, occupied the Abkhâzian throne and by 1010 united all the Georgian lands. As his first successes were based on the hereditary rights of
his mother, and as even in his later title the rank of "king of Abbâhâzâ" occupied the first place, the Muslims continued to call the Georgian kingdom Abbâhâzâian (down to the 13th century, and occasionally even later).

About the year 1325 the house of Sharvashidize (in Russian: Sharvashidze, alleged to be descended from the dynasty of the Shhrwân-ghâhs, [q.v.] was enfeoffed with Abbâhâzâ; towards the middle of the 15th century (under king Bagrat VI) the Sharvashidze were confirmed as rulers of the country. According to a letter from the emperor of Trebizond in the year 1459, the princes of Abbâhâzâ disposed of an army of 30,000 men.

After the settlement of the Ottomans on the east coast of the Black Sea, the Abbâhâz came under the influence of Turkey and Islam, although Christianity was but slowly supplanted. According to the Dominican John of Lucca, even in his time (1637) the Abbâhâz passed as Christians, although the Christian usages were no longer observed. Since the separation from Georgia the country had been under its own Catholicos (mentioned as early as the 13th century) in Pitzund. Up to the present day the ruins of eight large and about 100 small churches, including chapels, are said to exist in Abbâhâzâ. The house of Sharvashidze did not embrace Islam until the second half of the 18th century, when Prince Leon recognized Turkish sovereignty. On this account, he was given the fort of Sukhûm, which had already been besieged by the Abbâhâz about 1725-8. The country was divided politically into three parts: 1) Abbâhâzâia proper, on the coast from Gagri to the Galidzga under the said Sharvashidze; 2) the highlands of Tzebelda (without any centralized government); 3) the country of Samurzakan on the coast extending from the Galidzga to the Ingr (ruled by a branch of the house of Sharvashidze, subsequently united with Mingrelia).

After the incorporation of Georgia by Russia in 1801, the Abbâhâz had also to enter into relation with this new powerful neighbour. The first attempt was made in 1803 by Prince Kelegh-beg, but was abandoned soon after the assassination of this prince in 1808, his son Sefer-beg came into closer touch with Russia and claimed her help against his brother, the parricide Arslan-beg. In 1810 Sukhûm was taken by the Russians. Sefer-beg, who had become converted to Christianity and assumed the name of George, was installed as prince, but from that time on Sukhûm was occupied by a Russian garrison. The two sons of Sefer-beg, Demetrius (1821 and Michael (1822, after poisoning his elder brother) had to be put in power by the Russian armed force. Their rule was limited to the neighbourhood of Sukhûm, whose garrison could communicate with headquarters only by sea. By the incorporation of the whole coast-line from Anapa to Poti (Treaty of Adrianopol in 1829) Russia's position was naturally strengthened, but even in 1835 only the north-western part of the country, the district of Bzibb, is said to have been in the possession of Prince Michael. The other parts had remained under the rule of his Muslim uncles. Later on, with the help of Russia, Michael succeeded in establishing his power almost as an absolute ruler, but he too, in spite of his Christian faith, had surrounded himself with Turks.

After the final subjugation of Western Caucasus by the Russians (1864) the dominion of the House of Sharvashidze, like that of the other native princes, came to an end; in November 1864 Prince Michael had to renounce his rights and leave the country. Abbâhâzâia was incorporated into the Russian empire as a special province (okrug) of Sukhûm and divided into three districts (okrug)—Pitzund, Ose'miri and Tzebelda. In 1866 an attempt made by the new governor to collect information concerning the economic conditions of the Abbâhâz, for the purpose of taxation, led to a revolt, and, subsequently, to a considerable emigration of the Abbâhâz to Turkey. In the thirties of the 19th century the population of Abbâhâzâia was estimated at about 90,000, and the number of all Abbâhâz (i.e. including those living in the north outside Abbâhâzâia) at 128,000 souls. After 1866, the population of Abbâhâzâia was reduced to c. 65,000. The almost depopulated district of Tzebelda ceased to be a district and was placed under a special "Settlement Curator" (popoheit naseleniya). Later the whole of Abbâhâzâia under the name of district (okrug) of Sukhûm-Kale (Su-khûm-Kalâ) formed a part of the government of Kutais. The population again decreased through emigration, especially after the Abbâhâz took part in the rebellion of the mountain tribes caused by the landing of Turkish troops (1877); in 1881 the number of Abbâhâz was estimated at only 20,000. No statistics on the Abbâhâzians in Turkey are available.

Sovremennye sostëvâ. The Soviet power was proclaimed for a short time in 1918, and finally in 1921. In April 1930 Abbâhâzâia, as an autonomous republic (A.S.S.R.), became part of the Georgian republic (S.S.R.) and its special constitution was confirmed in 1937. The Abbâhâzian A.S.S.R. has a population of 303,000, but in this number the Abbâhâzians are but a minority. In 1939 the total number of the Abbâhâzians in the Soviet Union (i.e. apparently including the northern colonies in Ceresia) was 59,000. The capital (Sukhûm) has 44,000 inhabitants. The territory of the republic has acquired great importance for subtropical cultures. Its water power has been considerably exploited (in 1935, 45 electrical stations).

Since the time when an Abbâhâz alphabet was invented by the eminent specialist in Caucasian languages General Baron P. P. Uslar (1864), and when a book on Biblical history was compiled by a priest and two officers of Abbâhâz nationality, Abbâhâzian letters have had a considerable development. In 1910 the founder of the new literature, Dimitri Gulia (born in 1874), published a book of popular poems. He has been followed by writers in prose (G. D. Gulia, Papaskiri), poets (Kogonia 1903-29), L. Kvitsinia) etc. Abbâhâzian folklore has been collected and schoolbooks written (Ch'od'ua etc.).

The Abbâhâz "polysynthetic" language belongs to the same type as the Cerkèse language. It has two basic vowels as against 65 consonants in the northern (Bzibb) dialect, and 57 in the southern (Abâzû). The latter has been adopted as the literary language. It is now written in the Georgian alphabet suitably completed.

the recent works by Serdiudenko and Tobil’ on northern Abkhazian dialects (1947-9).

ABLATION (see GHUL, TAVAMMUM, WUD7).  

ABNAA', "the sons", a denomination applied to the following:

(I) The descendants of Sa'd b. Zayd Manât b. Tamîm, with the exception of his two sons Ka'b and 'Amr. This tribe inhabited the sandy desert of al-Dahna. (Cf. F. Wüstenfeld, Register zu den genera. Tabellen der arab. Stämme).

(II) The descendants born in Yaman of the Persian immigrants. For the circumstances of the Persian intervention in Yaman under Khursaw Anûghirîwân (531-79) and the reign of Sayf b. Dhî Yazân, as told by the Arabic authors, cf. SAYF b. DHÎ YAZÂN. After the withdrawal of the foreign troops Sayf was murdered and the country again subjugated by the Ethiopians, so that the Persian general Wahriz had to return. The power of the Ethiopians was this time definitely broken and Yaman turned into a vassal state of Persia. At the time of the Prophet the Persian governor Bâdhâm (Badhan) was, together with his people, converted to Islam and acknowledged the suzerainty of Muhammad. Later, however, troubles broke out in Yaman which led to complete anarchy; it was only under the reign of Abû Bakr that order was restored. (Cf. also AL-YAMAN).


(K. V. ZETTERSTEN*)

(III) Abûdâl-dawla, a term applied in the early centuries of the 'Abbâside caliphate to the members of the 'Abbâsid house, and by extension to the Khurâsânî and other mawdiî who entered its service and became adoptive members of it. They survived as a privileged and influential group until the 3rd/9th century, after which they were eclipsed by the growing power of the Turkish and other troops.


(IV) Abûdîl-Atrîk, a term sometimes used in the Mamlûk sultanate to designate the Egyptian or Syrian-born descendants of the Mamlûks, as an alternative to the more common awdâl al-nâs [g.v.].

(V) Abûdî-sîfâbiyân, a term sometimes employed in formal Ottoman usage in place of the more common sîfâbi oğlanlarî—the first of the six regiments (bölük) of cavalry of the Ottoman standing army. They were classed as "Slaves of the Gate" (kapî kułu).


(B. LEWIS)

ABRAHA, a Christian king of South Arabia in the middle of the sixth century A. D. In Islamic literature his fame is due to the tradition that he led a Yamani expedition against Mecca (referred to in the Kur'ân, cv) in the year of Muhammad's birth, c. 570 A.D. The details of Abrahah's life are vague, and the Persians to their invasion are largely under stories of folklore origin which have been attached arbitrarily to the name of a famous personage. For

authentic information we must turn to Procopius and the Himyaritic inscriptions. According to Procopius, Hellestheos king of Abyssinia (Fifth of the inscription Istanbul 7608 bis) invaded South Arabia a few years before 531 A.D., killed its king, appointed a puppet-ruler named Esimiphaios (SMYF of the inscriptions), and retired to Abyssinia; subsequently, Abyssinian deserts who had remained in South Arabia revolted against Esimiphaios and set on the throne Abrahah, originally the slave of a Byzantine merchant of Adulis; two expeditions sent by Hellestheos against the rebels were unsuccessful, and Abrahah retained the throne; Justinian's attempts to incite Abrahah to attack Persia were in vain, for he merely marched a little way northward and then retired; so long as Hellestheos was alive, Abrahah refused to pay tribute to Abyssinia, but agreed to do so to Hellestheos' successor. Our main epigraphic source is Abrahah's long inscription on the Ma'reb dam (Corpus inscr. sem., iv, 541). This records the quelling of an insurrection supported by a son of the dethroned Esimiphaios in the year 657 of the Sabaean era (between 640-650 A.D.); repairs effected to the dam later in the same year; the reception of embassies from Abyssinia, Byzantium, Persia, Hira and Harrîb b. Djabalat the phylarch of Arabia; and the completion of repairs to the dam in the following year. A further text (Ryckmans 656, see le Muson, 1953, 275-84) discovered at Murayghân, east of the upper Wadi Taghih, records a defeat inflicted by Abrahah on the North Arabian tribe Ma'add in 662 of the Sabaean era. The Ma'reb text begins, "By the power and favour and mercy of God and His Messiah and the Holy Spirit (rk qds)". It is perhaps significant of a sectarian distinction that Esimiphaios, who was no doubt a Monophysite like his Abyssinian patron, uses a different formula, "In the name of God and His Son Christ victorious and the Holy Spirit (mnfs qds)"; possibly Abrahah had Nestorian leanings. The titulature adopted by Abrahah is identical with that of his immediate predecessors, "King of Saba' and Dhî-Raydân and Hâdramawt and Yamanat and their Arabs in the plateau and lowland", but in the Ma'reb text he calls himself in addition âlî mlhn 'q'zyn. The word 'zly is not found elsewhere, and no satisfactory explanation of the phrase has yet been given. Conti-Rossini's rendering "the valiant king, of the (tribe) 'Ag'azî" is syntactically improbable; and Glaser's "vicerey of the Abyssinian king" is incompatible with the passage later in the inscription where Abrahah receives an Abyssinian embassy on the same footing as those of Byzantium and Persia. J. Ryckmans' proposed reading âlî mlhn "the king's highness" is worth consideration. From here onwards reliable sources are silent, and we have only the probably legendary story in the Islamic sources, which attributes the motive of the Meccan expedition to Abrahah's jealousy of the Meccan sanctuary and a futile attempt to substitute his church at San'a as the place of pilgrimage for all Arabia. If Abrahah really made such an expedition (the Kur'ân does not name its leader), a more likely explanation of his aims is that the rapprochement with Abyssinia under Hellestheos' successor caused Abrahah to adopt a more aggressive policy towards Persia, and the expedition was the first move of a projected attack on the Persian dominions. However, it proved a failure, and only provoked the Persians to their invasion by Wahrîb a few years later, which finally destroyed the ancient South Arabian kingdom. The Martyrium Arethae

ABKHÂZ — ABRAHA
that Abraha was placed on the throne by the Abyssinian king Elesbaas (usually identified with Procopius' Hellasbaos) immediately after the death of Pubh Nuwas. Other ecclesiastical sources, such as the Leges Hierosolymarum attributed to Gengentius bishop of Zafar, give similar accounts. This version of events, which conflicts fundamentally with both Procopius and the inscriptions, must be regarded as unhistorical and due either to a confusion of names or to a falsification for polemical reasons.


( A. F. L. Beeston)

ABRAHAM [see ibrahim al-khaliil].

"ABS [see ghatafani].

AL-ABSHIHI [see al-ibshih].

ABU 'l-ABBAS AL-SAFFAH, 'Abd Allâh b. Muhammed b. 'Ali b. 'Abd Allâh b. 'Abbas, the first 'Abbasid caliph. The surname al-Saffah means "the bloodthirsty" or "the generous". With the other members of the 'Abbasid family, he took refuge in Kufa in Safar i32/Sept.-Oct. 749, shortly after the occupation of the town by the Imam b. Kahtaba and was proclaimed as caliph in the great mosque on 12 Rabii I/28 November, on which occasion he pronounced a famous speech.

The first task of Abu 'l-Abbas was the total defeat of the Umayyads. The 'Abbasid troops, under the command of his uncle 'Abd Allâh b. 'Ali, achieved a complete victory on the Upper Zab (Djumada II 135/Jan. 750) and flung themselves into the pursuit of Marwan II through Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine. While Marwan was killed in Egypt (12h Dhu 'l-Hijja 134/August 750), the main campaign could be considered as ended. The isolated resistance of Ibn Hubayra [q.v.] in Wasit was soon overcome by treachery, while the revolts that broke out in Mesopotamia and Syria were bloodily repressed. The conquerors abandoned themselves to violent acts of revenge, of which the first in importance was the episode on Nahri Abî Futrus [q.v.]. Here 'Abd Allâh b. 'Ali, having killed eighty Umayyad chiefs, laid tables over their bodies, which he afterwards threw to the dogs to eat. Similar scenes occurred in al-Kufa, al-Bagha and in the Hijaz. Furthermore, the tombs of the Umayyad caliphs were violated. Similarly, the discontent of the 'Alids, who, after having supported the cause of the revolt, saw themselves deprived of its fruits, was suppressed in blood: in 135/750-1, the governor of Khurásan, Abû Muslim, put down a rising on behalf of the 'Alids in Bukhâra.

In this way, soon after the accession of the 'Abbasids to the caliphate, the principal sources of opposition, namely the Umayyad and the 'Alid ex-enemies, were eliminated. The 'Abbasids, however, wanted to go even further, to the elimination of their own political and military chiefs who had gained too great an authority, or who were, rightly or wrongly, suspected of insubordination. With the complicity of Abû Muslim, Abû Salama [q.v.] and Sulaymân b. Kaghîr [q.v.] were suppressed. Afterwards it was the turn of Abû Muslim; the first attempt against him, in connection with the rebellion of Ziyâd b. Šâlih in Transoxania (135/752-3) was unsuccessful; the second, immediately after the death of Abû'1-'Abbâs, was carried out successfully by his successor, al-Mansûr [q.v.].

Abû'1-'Abbâs died in al-Anbâr, to which town he had transferred his residence, in Dhu'l-Hijja 136/June 754. It is difficult to pass a judgment on his personality, as we do not exactly know what was his personal share in the events of his short caliphate. What is certain is that during his reign the 'Abbasid movement not only passed from the revolutionary to the legal phase, but also consolidated itself, and the first signs appeared of that political and economic power which were confirmed by the caliphate of al-Mansûr.


ABU 'ABBAS AL-YAKUB IBN 'ABDUR, vizier. Belonging to a philo-'Alid family, he participated, together with his brother 'Ali, in the revolt of Ibrâhîm and Muhammed b. 'Abd Allâh against the caliph al-Mansûr in 145/762-3. Imprisoned for this, he was pardoned by the next caliph al-Mahdî in 159/775-6 and succeeded in gaining his favour, it is said, by revealing the plan of escape of another partisan of the 'Alids. Having become a confidant and counsellor of the caliph, he was appointed vizier in 163/779-80 in place of Abû 'Ubâyday Allâh, and used his power in favour of his 'Alid friends. This policy was the main reason for the massacre of the Umayyads, which followed upon several unsuccessful attempts of escape of another partisan of the 'Alids; if so, he himself was at the same time the chief architect and the victim of the precarious nature of such an attempt.


'ABD ALLAH AL-SHITI, Nasir b. 'Abd Allah b. Mu'ayr b. Zakariyyâ, sometimes also called al-Muhtasib [he had allegedly been a muhtasib, market overseer, in 'Irak], the founder of Fâtimid rule in North Africa. A native of Şanabî, he joined the Ismâ'îlî movement in šIrak and was sent to Yaman, where he spent his apprenticeship with Mansûr al-Yaman (Ibn Hawshab), head of the
Ismâ‘îl mission in that country. On the pilgrimage
of 279/892 he met in Mecca some Kutâma pilgrims and
accompanied them back to their native country,
which they reached on 14 Rabî‘ I 280/6 June 893. He first
established himself in Ikdjan near Satfî. In face of the
opposition directed against him by the Aghlabid government,
(289/902 and 290/903). On the occasion of a temporary
setback, his headquarters were moved back to
Ikdjan, which remained his base for subsequent
operations. In 289/902 the imâm al-Mahdî 'Ubâydy Allâh
[q.v.] fled from Syria, attempted to join Abû 'Abd Allâh, but had to take refuge in Siǧismâsâ,
where he was imprisoned. Abû 'Abd Allâh's brother
Abû 'l-Abbas Muḥammâd, who had accompanied the
imâm, fell into the hands of the Aghlabîs. Abû
'Abd Allâh then took Satfî, Tubnâ (293/906) and
conquered Tidjis, Baghaya, defeated Abû 'Abd Allâh's brother
Abd Allâh, but had to take refuge in Sidiilmassa,
which they reached on 14 Rabî‘ II 280/3 June 893. He
and accompanied them back to their native country,
steadily strengthened his position, captivated Mila
face of the opposition directed against him by a
confederacy of Kutama clans, Abû
Abd Allâh transferred his headquarters to Tazrut, where he
fled from Syria, attempted to join Abu
[fq.v.]
Kutayba, Ma'drif, Cairo 1353/1934, 200; fabari,
i, 108-25; Abu Nueaym, ffilya, Cairo 1351-6, ii,
In the ecstasy of divine love, he gave
up observing the commandments of God and the
Prophetic Traditions, though he subjected himself
to self-mortification. He is supposed to have
been a spiritual descendant of Kūth al-Dîn Balîqîyâr
[q.v.]; however, it is doubtful if he belonged to any
organized ëélf order. Numerous legends regarding his
life, miracles and death have grown, and it is
difficult even to say whether the tomb at Fatâq or
at Karnîl is his, though the former is more famous.
The works attributed to him include letters on
divine love addressed to Iklîyâr al-Dîn (Sulayman
Col., Aligarh Univ.); Ḥikâm-nâmâ (As. Soc. Bengal, Ivanow: 1196), which is definitely apocryphal;
and two madînawîs: Kâlâm-i Kalandâr (Meerut)
and Maṭnawî Bû 'Ali Shâh Kalandâr (Lucknow 1891).
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Abrâîr (As. Soc. Bengal, Ivanow: 1210, ff. 249-259, ff.)
other and Shu'âb-i Sâdiq (A. S. Coll., Aligarh Univ., iii f. 4126);
Stîyâr al-Abhâb; Mirîdî al-Asràr (B. M. Or. 216,
f. 386a); Ma'dirdî al-Wâlîyâ (Nizami's MS.,
Aligarh Univ., 230-5); Şaraf al-Madîjîlis (Sulaymân
Col., Aligarh Univ.); Punjab Dist. Gazetteer,
Karnal 1918, 76, 210-1, 223-4; Proc. As. Soc.
Bengal, 1870, 1251-2, 1873, 97; (Nurâl Hasan)
Abû 'Ali al-Kâli [see AL-KALI].
Abû 'Ali Muḥammad b. Ilyâs [see ILYASISI].

Abû 'l-ÄÂYÎRA RûFâY b. Mihrân al-RîyâHî,
a liberated slave of the Banû Riyâh, belonging to
the first generation of tâbî‘ûn residing in Baṣra; d.
907/809-9 or 907/714. A commentary on the Kur‘ân is attributed to him (Hadîth Kâhilîf (Flügel, ii,
352), but he is mainly known as a traditionist
and a transmitter of the Kur‘ân. Having
collected in al- Başra and in Medina kadi‘î transmitted
particularly by Ĕûmar and Ĕûbayy b. Ka'b,
who was considered trustworthy (hâkî); and contributed to
the training of Kaṭâda, Dâbî b. Abû Hind, Āṣîm
al-Ahwâl and other traditionists of renown. His
name figures frequently in the "chains" of trans-
mission of kadi‘î admitted into the great collections.
In the same way, data put under his name are
admitted by al-Tabârî, Tâfisîr, passim, e.g. i, 228;
cf. al-Bayyâjî, Amwâr al-Tânsîî (Fleischer), i, 242.
He transmitted his system of "reading" (hir‘â) to
al-A‘mahî and to the readers of Baṣra Abû
'Amr b. al-Äâîrî [q.v.]; and Shu‘âbî y b. Abû al-Hâlîf b. Azdî
(d. 130/747). He played no political role and took
no part in the conflict between 'Ali and his partisans
and the Umâyâyids.

Bibliography: Ibn Sa‘d, vii, 81-5; Ibn
Kutayba, Ma‘ârîf, Cairo 1353/1934, 200; Tabârî,
i, 108-25; Abû Nu‘aym, Hîyâ, Cairo 1351-6, ii,
We refer to the fuller text that ABU ‘L-ALIYA AL-RIYAH and ABU ‘AMR B. AL-ALÀ wrote, 105
227-24; Ibn ‘Asakir, Ta’rikh, Damascus 1332, v, 323-6; Nawawi, Tahdhib al-Adama (Wüstenfeld), 759-75; Ughmûd, Ta’rikh al-Fushah, MS Paris 2093, 435; Ibn al-Athir, Usd, ii, 186-7, Ibn al-Djazari, Kurraj, no. 1272; A. Sprenger, Leben des Mohammed, iii, cvii, cxvi, (R. Blachère).}

ABU ‘AMR ZABBÀN B. AL-ALÀ, a celebrated ‘reader’ of the Kur’an, regarded as the founder of the grammatical school of Basra, died c. 134/750. This scholar seems, indeed, like a number of others. He is believed to have been born c. 70/689 of the grammatical school of Basra, died c. 154/770. In one isolated statement, links him with the Arab tribe of Mazin of the confederation of Tamim; see Ibn Khallikan and al-Anbari, 32, merely says that Abu Amr was then a little more than twenty (which gives some force to the statements which put his year of birth at 70/689); see Ibn Khallikan, i, 387. It seems permissible to assume, from the passage of Ibn al-Djazari, i, 289, that this journey gave him the opportunity of pursuing further his ‘readings’ of the Kur’an at Mecca and Medina, studies which he would appear to have continued on his return to ‘Irak. It is difficult, however, to reconcile this assertion with the statement of Ibn Khallikan, i, 387, that Abu ‘Amr and his father returned immediately to ‘Irak upon the death of al-Hâdîdî, in 95/714. However that may be, when Abu ‘Amr had settled in ‘Irak, it appears that he rarely left Basra again. If it is indeed he who is praised in a line of al-Farazdak (d. 114/732-3) (see Fihrist, 50*), he was already before that date a celebrity of some standing in his city of adoption: cf. the flattering comment on him attributed to al-Hasan al-Basri (d. 110/728) and of others (at Basra), and when this same author adds, 88, that a K. al-Nawâdîr was handed down in the version left by him, he must have been referring to writings taken down from his oral teaching by his disciples.

ABU ‘Amr belongs to the generation of scholars for whom the study of Arabic was dependent on that of the Kur’an. It is thus an arbitrary distinction if one tries to separate in him the ‘reader’ of the Koran from the grammatical and the ‘transmitter’ of poetry.

During his stay in Hidjaz, Abu ‘Amr initiated himself into the system of ‘reading’ in process of formation at Mecca and Medina, following the teaching of Abu ‘l-‘Alîya [q.v.] and Ibn Kaṭîr in particular. In ‘Irak he studied the system of Ibn Abî Ishâk al-Haḍâmî and of others (at Basra), and that of ‘Asîm (at Kûfâ). A list of his masters is given by Ibn al-Djazari, 289; cf. also al-Suyûtî, Muzhir, ii, 398, and Fihrist, 39. He built up a system of his own in which the Mecca and Medina influences predominate; a complete table of the origins of this system has been drawn up by C. Pellat, Milieu basrites, 77 f. The ‘reading’ of Abu ‘Amr, at Basra, displaced all others previously existing in the town, and especially that of al-Hasan al-Basri: see Pellat, op. cit., 76; it is said to have been recommended by the ‘reader’ of Kûfâ, Abu ‘l-‘Amr al-Kâtar al-Misrî (see al-Diāhiz, K. al-Nâddir, 88), that a number of others: see the list ibid., 289.

In the 4th/10th century, when the reforms of Ibn al-Mudjâhid were introduced, this system took its place among the canonical ‘Seven readings’. At the time of Ibn al-Djazari (d. 833/1429) it was the accepted system in Yaman, in Hidjaz, and in an important province where it had finally ousted that of Ibn ‘Amr in the 5th/11th century: see Ibn al-Djazari, 292. This system of ‘reading’ was the subject of a treatise by Ibn al-Mudjâhid, see Fihrist, 31*1. Nevertheless, writings of the same order had been composed before that period: see the list, ibid., 28. Another summary is also known, entitled al-Kafar al-Misrî fi birid’al ‘Abî ‘Amr b. al-‘Ala al-Basri, by Umar b. al-Kâtar al-Basri (d. 900/1495), which is preserved in Berlin: see Ahiroard, no. 639. We have, too, an opuscule based on the oral tradition, on the orthography of the Koran: see O. Rescher, in WZKM, 1912, 94 (this opuscule is in a miscellaneous collection, in Aya Sofia, no. 4814). The influence of Abu ‘Amr was not only that of the importance for the development of grammatical and lexicographical studies at Basra. It is less easy to follow, however, than the influence of his system of ‘reading’. Among his disciples, the following names are worthy of note: Yûnus b. Hâbb, al-Asmâ‘î (see id., ii, 323, 329; Fihrist, 42; Ibn al-Anbârî, 30), Abu ‘Ubaydâ (see Ibn Khallikan, 387), Khalîl al-Ahmar (see al-Suyûtî, ii, 278, 403), and the future founder of the School of the Kur’an, Abu al-Ru‘shâb (see id., ii, 400). It is possible that already then, under his stimulus, the method of seeking information from the Beduins, in matters concerning grammar and lexicography, was developed at Basra. (see the anecdote recorded by id., ii, 278 and 304). By his disciples, and especially by Abu ‘Ubaydah by such a scholar as al-Dajîbî, Abu ‘Amr was regarded as ‘the most learned man in things pertaining to the Arabs, and combining with the accuracy of his auricular transmission the veracity of his statements’ (see al-Dajîbî, Bayân, i, 255, 256; cf. Abu ‘l-Tayyib, who expresses a similar view in Muzhir, ii, 399). And yet this point raises a very delicate problem. This scholar seems, indeed, like a number
of his contemporaries, to have been an enthusiastic collector of archaic poetry and of accounts of the 'Days of the Arabs'; cf. Blachère, Histoire de la littérature arabe, Paris, 1952, i, 101 f. According to an account taken up from Abū 'Ubayda by al-Dīhājīz, Bayyūm, i, 256 (repeated in a somewhat changed form by Ibn al-Dījarī, 290, Ibn Khallikān, i, 386, and al-Kutubī, i, 164), 'the books which Abū 'Amr had written by taking the words down from such Arabs as were worthy to serve as informers filled a room in his dwelling. Later on, having devoted himself to reading (of the Kūrān), he burnt these books'. This piece of evidence, which we have no means of checking, does not say that Abū 'Amr destroyed the collections of poetry made by himself, as has been too often asserted. Actually, the main point to keep in mind is that after this destruction—if it took place—Abū 'Amr continued nevertheless to communicate orally the documentation which he had accumulated in his memory. There are many anecdotes which show his knowledge of ancient poetry; see for example, al-Dīhājīz, Bayyūm, i, 256, ii, 121; al-Śūrāfī, 30; Ibn al-Anbārī, 31, 34. It is known that on one occasion he did not hesitate to forge a line; see al-Śuyūtī, Muṣṭir, ii, 415. This fact, which he himself admitted, in no way detracted from his acknowledged authority as a transmitter (tādīl). His place among Arab lexicographers seems to have been very important, since he is said to have been, in this sphere, the master of al-Khāliq [q.v.]; see ibid., ii, 396, and also the numerous references to Abū 'Amr's lexicographical authority, ibid., ii, 73, 111, 291, 350. The authors of adāb and the anthologists often quote, too, his judgements on the poets; see for example, ibid., ii, 73, 111, 291, 350.

It is no exaggeration to say that the figure of Abū 'Amr b. 'Alā' dominates the intellectual activity of the centre of Basra at the period when the generation of scholars was growing up—men such as al-Khāliq, al-Asma'i, Abū 'Ubayda—who have been, in this sphere, the master of al-Khāliq [q.v.]; see ibid., ii, 396, and also the numerous references to Abū 'Amr's lexicographical authority, ibid., ii, 73, 111, 291, 350. The authors of adāb and the anthologists often quote, too, his judgements on the poets; see for example, ibid., ii, 73, 111, 291, 350.

Practically nothing is known about his life, except the names of his authorities and his students, none of them very famous personalities. He is said to have been judge or mufti of Harrān. One source (Ibn 'Asākir, (ms. 1793); Dhahabī, Nubald*, 1793); Dhahabī, Tadhkira, 329; F. Rosenthal, 322; Samʿānī, Anṣāb, fol. 161a and passim; Yāḥyā, ii, 232, and passim; Ibn al-Adīm, Baghyā (ms. Topkapısaray, Ahmet III, 2925, iv, fols. 179b-179a); Dhahabī, Nubalad* (ms. Topkapısaray, Ahmet III, 2910, ix, 545-7); idem, Tarikh al-Islam, anno 318, Ibn al-'Imām, ash-Shahristānī, ii, 279; F. Rosenthal, A history of Muslim historiography, Leiden 1952, 310, 389, 393.

ABŪ 'l-ASWAD AL-DU'ALI (or, according to West-Arabic pronunciation al-Dili, nomen relativum from al-Du'ali b. Bakr, a clan of the Banū Kināna),

Bibliography: Fihrist, Brockelman, II, 663; Fihrist, 322; Samʿānī, Anṣāb, fol. 161a and passim; Yāḥyā, ii, 232, and passim; Ibn al-Adīm, Baghyā (ms. Topkapısaray, Ahmet III, 2925, iv, fols. 179b-179a); Dhahabī, Nubalad* (ms. Topkapısaray, Ahmet III, 2910, ix, 545-7); idem, Tarikh al-Islam, anno 318, Ibn al-'Imām, ash-Shahristānī, ii, 279; F. Rosenthal, A history of Muslim historiography, Leiden 1952, 310, 389, 393.
a partisan of 'Ali. His name (Zālim b. 'Amr) and genealogy are uncertain; his mother belonged to the clan 'Abd al-Dār b. Kuṣayy of Kuraysh. He was probably born some years before the Hijra. In the caliphate of 'Umar he went to Basra. He lived first among his own tribe, then among the Banū Ḥudhayl, and for some time also among the Banū Kuṣayr, the kinsmen of his favourite wife; but his Şī'ite propensities as well as his obstinacy and avarice made him disagreeable to his neighbours. It is doubtful whether he held any office under 'Umar and 'Uthmān. In 'Ali's caliphate he rose to prominence. He is said to have taken part in the unsuccessful negotiations with 'Āqīqa and in the ensuing “Battle of the Camel,” and also fought at Shīfūn for 'Ali. He was employed at Basra either as kādi or as secretary to the governor 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abbās, and is even said to have held a military command in the wars against the Ḥanāfīs. When 'Ali's star was setting, and according to al-Madā'ini, 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abbās planned to leave Basra, taking with him the treasury, Abu ʿl-Aswad tried to stop him and reported the matter to 'Ali, who appointed him governor. This post he held, if at all, only for a short time. When 'Ali was murdered, he made a poem (no. 59 in Rescher's numbering) the Umayyads responsible for it. But his sentiments were of no consequence, as there was no large Shī'a element in Basra (Aḥkāmī, xi, 121). He did not realize that he had lost all influence. He had reason to complain about Muʿwiyya's representative 'Abd Allāh b. 'Amir, with whom he had formerly been on good terms (Poems nos. 23, 46), and also tried in vain to gain the favour of the viceroy Ziyād b. Abīh. Relations between them had been strained already in the caliphate of 'Ali, when Ziyād was in charge of the revenue-office (Aḥkāmī, xi, 170). He lamented the death of al-Husayn in 61/680 (no. 61) and cried for vengeance (no. 62). The last event mentioned in his poems is his complaint to the “Prince of the Faithful” Ibn al-Zubayr about his representative at Basra in c. 67/686 (Ibn Sa'd, v, 19). He died, according to al-Madā'ini, at Basra during the great plague in 69/688.

A collection of his poems, made by al-Sukkārī, is extant, but has been published only in part. They are poor in language and style and artistically and historically insignificant; most of them deal with petty incidents of everyday life; some of the poems are apparently forged. This applies also to the widely circulated allegation—invented most probably by some philologist of the Basra school—that is was Abu'l-Aswad who laid down for the first time the rules of Arabic grammar and invented the vocalisation of the Kurān.
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Abū ʿAtāʾ al-Sindī, Aflah (or Marzūq) b. Yāsār, Arabic poet. He owes his surname of al-Sindī to the fact that his father came from Sind; he himself was born in Kūfa and lived there as a client of the Banū Asad. He fought for the declining Umayyad dynasty with pen and sword, praising them and casting scorn on their adversaries. It is true, however, that when he obtained power, he tried to insinuate himself into the favour of the new rulers by singing their praises. But the iron character of al-Saffāh was but little sensible to such fawning, and under the reign of his successor, al-Mansūr, the poet was even obliged to keep himself hidden. Only after al-Mansūr's death in 158/774 did he again make his appearance. He died, no doubt, shortly afterwards, but the exact date is not known. Abū ʿAtāʾ was considered a good poet—his elegy on Ibn Hubayra [q.v.] being especially famous—although he pronounced Arabic badly and even stammered, so that he was obliged to have his poetry recited by others.
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Abū ʿl-ʿAtāʾī, poetical nickname (“father of craziness”) of Abū ʿImār ʿIsāmīl b. al-Kāsim b. Suwayd b. Kaysān, Arabic poet, born in Kūfa (or ʿAyn al-Tanṭū) 130/748 and died 210/825 or 211/826. His family had been mawdūl of the Anaza tribe for two or three generations, and were engaged in menial occupations; his father was a cupper, and the poet himself as a youth sold earthenware in the streets. His outlook on life was embittered by a sense of social inferiority; his later verse is devoted to his hatred of the governing class and the wealthy; and he was notorious for covetousness and meanness to the end of his life. But like Bahshār b. Burd, he had a natural gift for poetry, and hoped to find in this the door to a larger life. On account of his poverty he had not the time to attend lectures on philology and the poetry of the ancients, and to this we must attribute the roughness and unconventionality of his style. As a young man he associated with the prolific circle of poets grouped around Wāliba b. al-Ḥubāb, and gained a reputation with his ghazals and wine-songs; later critics have condemned these productions as poor and effeminate (Ibn Kūtayba, Shīr, 497), and only fragments of them have survived. Like most of the spontaneous poets, he showed a preference for simple language and metre, and he was especially famous—his elegy on Ibn Hubayra [q.v.] being especially famous—although he pronounced Arabic badly and even stammered, so that he was obliged to have his poetry recited by others.

In the caliphate of al-Mahdī he went to Basra either as kādi or as secretary to the governor Ṣaddāt b. al-Hubab. He had no intention of throwing herself, away on a penniless nobody. He held the caliph responsible for his failure to win ʿUtbā, and some indiscrete verses gained him a flogging and banishment to Kūfa. When al-Mahdī died, he took his revenge in some verses which could be read ambiguously.

Back in Baghdād his fulsome praise of al-Mādhī annoyed the latter's successor Ḥārūn al-Raṣīld, who sent him to prison along with his friend Ibrāhīm al-Mawāllī. Restored to favour, he charmed Ḥārūn with his love-lyrics, but suddenly renounced the ghazal and devoted himself to ascetic poetry (c. 178). Ḥārūn at first took umbrage at his conversion and imprisoned him, but was reconciled later at the instances of al-Faḍl b. Kābih, and in part also no doubt because of his popularity with the masses. It may be suspected that al-Faḍl's patronage was connected with his intrigue, in association with the queen Zubayda, against the ʿArqamids, and that Abū ʿl-ʿAtāʾī's new “ascetic” produce conveniently served their purposes. However that may be, Abūl-ʿAtāʾī maintained henceforward a vast
output of sermons in verse, long and short, painting the horrors of all-leveling Death, and directed especially against the rich and the powerful, not excluding the caliph himself. So profitable was it that when Abū Nuwās also began to produce suhayyiḍī, Abū'l-Atahiyya warned him not to trespass on the field to which he had established a prescriptive right (Akhbd Abī Nuwās, Cairo 1924, 70). Some later critics questioned, not without cause, the sincerity of his conversion, notably the real ascetic Abū'l-ḥālā al-Maṣʾarī, who referred to him as “that astute fellow” (Ibn Faḍl Allāh, Masūdik al-Asbār, xv, MS Brit. Mus. 575, fol. 136).

A more frequent accusation brought against Abū'l-Atahiyya is that of heresy, which was a favourite weapon at the time; and it was suggested by Goldziher that one reason for his imprisonments may be sought in the occasionally unorthodox tone of some of his poems. Having no theological education he seems to have been influenced by the modified legacy of Manichaean beliefs still current in Iraq, which accounted for the disorders of this world by the creation of Allah. In certain of his verses also, such as “If you would see the noblest of mankind look for a king in the guise of a pauper”, there may be suggestions of a concealed attachment to Muṣā al-Kāẓim and the cause of the Shīʿite imāms, still strong in Kūfa.

His astonishing success as a poet was due to the simplicity, spontaneity, and artlessness of his language, which contrasted with the labour-dense artificiality of some of his contemporaries, and expressed the feelings of the people in verse that they could understand. He was fortunate also, by his friendship with Isrāḥīm al-Mawgūlī, to have many of his poems set to music by the foremost musician of the day. He and his younger contemporary Abān b. Ḥabīb al-Hāmidī (q.v.) were the first to use muḍawādī (couplet) rhyming verse, and he was the first, according to al-Maṣʿarī (al-Fāṣal wa-l-ṣawādī, i, 131), to invent the metre muḍawīḍī. He also used a metre consisting of eight syllables. Owing to his enormous output his entire duwān was never collected. The suhayyiḍī were put together by the Spanish scholar Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr (d. 461/1071).
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Abū l-ʿĀwar al-Sulāmī, general in the service of Muṣawīya. He belonged to the powerful tribe of Sulaymān (hence “al-Sulāmī”); his mother was a Christian and his father had fought at Uhud in the ranks of the Kuraysh. The son, who does not seem to have belonged to the closest circle of the Prophet, went, probably with the army commanded by Yazīd b. Abī Sufyān, to Syria. In the battle of the Yarmūk he was in charge of a detachment, and from that time he followed faithfully the fortunes of the Umayyads. He thus exposed himself to the execration of ʿAll, especially after he had taken part in the battle of Siffin. He assisted ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣī in conquering Egypt for Muṣawīya and was in command of various military expeditions by sea. In addition, he showed also diplomatic and administrative abilities. At Siffin, he took part in the negotiations with ʿAli and prepared the preliminary draft for the conference of Ṭabrūz. He was also commissioned to count the jallākī of Palestine for a new distribution of taxes. Muṣawīya had in mind to appoint him in Egypt to the post of ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣī, who had been guilty of showing a too independent attitude; but this plan came to nothing, and he was appointed to the governorship of the province of al-Urdūn. On the ground of his services the Arabic annalists counted him among the main lieutenants of Muṣawīya, those who constituted his shī'a or bidūna. He disappeared from the political scene before the end of Muṣawīya's reign.

Bibliography: Ibn Saʿd, iii/2, 106; Ibn Rusta, 213; Tabari, index; Masʿūdī, Murūdī, iv, 351; Michael the Syrian (Chabot), ii, 442, 445, 450; Baybaki, Mahāšīn, 149; Ibn al-Aṣfar, Usd., v, 138; Ibn Ḥadjdār, Isāba, iv, 14; H. Lammens, Études sur le règne de Muṣawīya, 42 ff. (M. Lammens)

Abū ʿAwn Abūd al-Malik b. Yazīd al-Khorasānī, general in the service of the ʿAbbasīs. After the outbreak of the rebellion in Khurasan, 25 Ramadān 129/9 June 747, Abū ʿAwn several times took part in the war against the Umayyads. At Siffin he accompanied the ʿAbbasī general Kaṭaba b. Shabbīh; then he was sent by the latter to Shahhrarāz, where on 20 Dhuʾl-Hijja 131/10 August 749, in conjunction with Mālik b. ʿArif, he defeated Uṭḥmān b. Sufyān. While Abū ʿAwn remained in the vicinity of Mosul, the Umayyad caliph Marwān II marched against him. Under the supreme command of Abū Allāh ʿĀrīf, Abū ʿAwn took part in the battle by the Greater Zāb (12 Dhuʾl-Muḥarram 12/25 January 750), in the pursuit of Marwān, and in the capture of Damascus. When Abū Allāh remained behind in Palestine, he sent Ṣāḥib b. ʿĀrīf together with Abū ʿAwn and a few others to continue the pursuit to Egypt, and it was there that the caliph, after a fresh defeat, was tracked down and killed in the same year. Abū ʿAwn remained in Egypt till further orders as governor. In 159/775-6 he was appointed governor of Khūrasan by al-Mahdī, but deposed in the following year.

Bibliography: Yaʿqūb b. Ṭabarī, Masʿūdī, Murūdī, Indexes; Wellhausen, Das arabisch Reich und sein Sturz, Berlin 1902, 331 ff.; L. Caetani, Chronographia Islamica, Roma 1912, under the relevant years. (K. V. Zetterström)

Abū l-ʿAYNĀʾ Muḥammad b. al-Kāẓim b. Khalīl b. Yaḥyā b. Sulaimān al-Hāshimi, an Arabic litterateur and poet. He was born about the year 190/805 in al-Ahwāz (his family came from al-Yamāma) and grew up in Baṣra, where he received instruction from the most famous philologists, Abū ʿUbaīda, al-ʿAṣmaʾī, Abū Ẓayd al-Anṣārī and others. He was renowned amongst his contemporaries not only for his linguistic attainments, but also for his quickness at repartee. Ibn Abī Tāhir collected anecdotes concerning him in a special work entitled Abkhdr Abī l-ʿAynd, many of which are to be found in the al-Aghārī. The book itself as well as the collection of his poems have not been preserved. He became blind at the age of 40, later on he emigrated to Bagdad, but returned to Baṣra again and died there in the years 251 or 252/865.
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Abū Ayyūb Khalīl b. Ẓayd b. Kušayy b. al-ʻAšmāʾī al-Anṣārī, generally known by his kunya, companion of the Prophet. It was in the
house of Abu Ayyub that the Prophet stayed on his emigration to Medina, before his own mosque and house were built. He took part in all the Prophet's expeditions, was present at all the battles of early Islam and served under the command of 'Amr b. al-Asi during the conquest of Egypt. Later on he was appointed by 'Ali to the governorship of Medina, but was obliged to rejoin 'Ali in Irak when Busr b. Abu Jarjat approached the town with an army of 3000 men. At his disposal by 'Amr b. al-Asi. In Irak Abu Ayyub al-Ansari took part in the battles fought there by 'Ali. During the reign of Mu'awiyah, he took part in the invasion of Cyprus and the expedition against Constantinople led by Yazid b. Mu'awiyah. During the siege of the Byzantine capital Abu Ayyub died of dysentery, in the year 52/672 (the years 50, 51 and 55 are also given as the date of his death). At his own request, he was buried under the walls of Constantinople.

226 hadiths are attributed to Abu Ayyub, but only a small number of them (thirteen altogether) have been admitted as authentic by al-Bukhari and Muslim.
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E. LÉVY-PROVÉNÇAL

The tomb of Abu Ayyub is mentioned for the first time by Ibn Kutaiba, al-Ma'arif, 140 (ed. Cairo 1934, 119); according to al-Ṭabarî, iii, 324, Ibn al-Ṭahār, iii, 381, Ibn al-Dīwānī and al-Kazwīnī, 408, the Byzantines respected it and made pilgrimage to it in time of drought to pray there for rain (isiṣṭād). The probably legendary—discovery of the tomb by Ak Shams al-Dīn (d. 1273) during the siege of the city by Muhammad II can be compared to the finding of the Holy Lance by the Crusaders during the siege of Antioch. The Turkish legend is fully reproduced in Leunclavius, Historiae musulmanae, Frankfurt 1591, 38 ff. and in the careful monograph of Hāḍīṣī 'Abd Allāh, al-Ṭāhir al-Maṣḥūṣiyā fi 'Ī-Manāhith al-Kadīthiyā. See also A. M. Schneider, in Oriens, 1951, 113 ff.; P. Wittek, Ayyūnasyawī, in Annales de l'hist. de phil. et d'hist. orientales et slaves, Bruxelles 1951, 505 ff. (esp. 513 ff.).

J. H. MORDTMANN

A mosque was built on the spot by Muhammad II in 863/1458; it was enlarged by Etmeqilī-zāde Ahmad Pasha in 1000/1591; two new minarets, each with two galleries, were added in 1136/1273. It was in this mosque that the sultan Mahmūd II deposited the relics of the Prophet discovered in the treasury of the Sarāy (the imprint of the foot). The grand-vizier Sinān Pasha (d. 1133/1729), Māh Frīr Khādījā (mother of the sultan 'Uṯmān III), the grand-vizier Semzū 'Ali Pasha, Gurdīl Muhammad Pasha, Lala Muṣṭafā Pasha (the conqueror of Cyprus) and a number of other important persons are buried in the turba or in the immediate vicinity of its court-yard. The mosque is situated outside the Byzantine walls, and an important suburb (Eyyūb [see İstanbul]) grew up round it. The mosque was the object of special veneration and it was forbidden for non-Muslims to enter it. According to a rather late custom (cf. Isl., 1931, 184 ff. and Mawlāwīyya) it was in this mosque that the sultan, on his accession, was girded with the sword of his ancestors by the Celebi Etendi, the head of the Mawlawi order who came especially from Konya to carry out the ceremony.


ABŪ BAKR, the first caliph.

i. Name, family, and early life.—Abū Bakr was probably born shortly after 570 as he is said to have been three years younger than Muhammad. His father was Abū Kūfā ("Uṣmān") b. "Amir of the clan of Taym of the tribe of Kūryas, and he is therefore sometimes known as Ibn Abū Kūfā. His mother was Umm al-Ḵayr (Salmā) bint Ṣaḥīr of the same clan. The names "Abū Allāh and "Āṭīk ("freed slave") are attributed to him as well as Abū Bakr, but the relation of these names to one another and their original significance is not clear. Muhammad seems to have made a play on the name "Āṭīk and to have said that he was "freed from Hell". He was later known as al-Ṣadīk, the truthful, the upright, or the one who counts true; the last meaning is supported by the tradition that he alone immediately believed Muhammad's story of his night-journey (tird, q.v.).

In the course of his life he had four wives. (1) Kūyāya bint "Abd al-Uẓzā of the Meccan clan of "Amīr, who bore him "Abd Allāh and Asmā (who married al-Zubayr b. al-"Āwām); (2) Umm Rūmān bint "Amīr of the tribe of Kūfīn, who bore him "Abd al-Raḥmān (originally "Abd al-Kaβa or "Abd al-"Uzza") and "Āḥīya; (3) Asmā bint "Umays of the tribe of Ḥathāīm, who bore him Muḥammad b. Ḥathāūd b. al-Ḵarḍījā, of the Medinan clan of al-Ḫārīth b. al-Ḫarḍājī, who bore him Umm Kūltūmīm posthumously. The last two marriages were made late in his life and were doubtless political; Asmā bint "Umays was the widow of Dīya' b. Abī Tālib (who was killed in 6/629). The first two marriages were probably concurrent, since "Abd al-Raḥmān was the eldest son, but only Umm Rūmān accompanied Abū Bakr to Medina.

Little is known about Abū Bakr's life before his conversion. He was a merchant (tird) worth 40,000 dirhams, indicating (according to H. Lammens, La Médecine à la Veille de l'Hégire, Beirut 1924, 226-8) that his business was comparatively unimportant. He is not mentioned as having travelled to Syria or elsewhere, but he was an expert in the genealogies of the Arab tribes.

ii. From his conversion to the death of Muhammad.—Abū Bakr was possibly a friend of Muhammad before the latter's call to be a prophet and his own conversion. According to some traditions he was the first male Muslim after Muhammad (Ibn Sa'd, iii/1, 121; al-Ṭabarî, i, 1165-7); but this may simply be a reflection of his later preeminence, since the same claim is made for "Ali and Ṣayd b. Ḥārījā.
Similarly the statement that Abu Bakr was responsible for the conversion of Uthman b. Affân, al-Zubayr, 'Abd al-Rahmân b. 'Awf, Sa'd b. Abi Waqqâs and Talhah b. Ubayd Allâh is suspicious because these five and 'Ali constituted the gûrû or council to elect a successor to 'Umar. What is certain is that for some time before the Hijira, Abu Bakr was the foremost member of the Muslim community after Muhammad.

He remained in Mecca when many Muslims emigrated to Abyssinia. This is an obscure affair. It has been suggested that the emigrants objected to the policy of the group among the Muslims led by Abu Bakr. The traditional view, however, was that the emigrants went to avoid persecution; and it may be that Abu Bakr's clan of Taym, like others belonging to the group known as Hîlf al-Fujûl, did not persecute its members. It seems, however, that it also lacked the will or the power to defend them, for it allowed Abu Bakr and his fellow clansman Ta'bâ to be bound together by a man of the Meccan clan of Asad; and at a later date Abu Bakr left Mecca and only returned on receiving the protection (djiwar) of Ibn al-Dughunna, the chief of a nomadic group in alliance with Kurayh. The slaves bought and set free by Abu Bakr, notably 'Abd Allâh b. Fuhayra and Bilân, suffered bodily violence. The purchase of slaves who professed Islam, though slaves bought and set free by Abu Bakr, notably 'Abd Allâh b. Fuhayra and Bilân, suffered bodily violence. The purchase of slaves who professed Islam, though the Meccan council to elect a successor to Muhammad, however, remained in Mecca, and Abu Bakr's son 'Abd al-Rahmân actually fought against the Muslims at Badr and Uhud, but was converted to Islam before the conquest of Mecca. In Medina Abu Bakr found a house in the district of al-Sunb. His special position in the community was marked by Muhammad's marriage to his daughter 'A'isha. He was a participant in all the expeditions led by Muhammad in person, and was constantly at his side, ready to help with advice and information. In critical moments he was steady as a rock and did not lose heart. There seems to have been a remarkable degree of harmony between leader and follower. When others (including 'Umar who was inseparable from Abu Bakr) questioned Muhammad's decisions to make peace at al-Âdhabiyah and to abandon the siege of al-Tâ'if, Abu Bakr gave immediate and wholehearted support. He was the first to know the true objective of the expedition which conquered Mecca in 8/630. In other words, he was Muhammad's chief adviser. He did not have any separate military command, except of a small party detached from a larger expedition in 6/627 and of a minor expedition against the tribe of Hawâzin in 7/628. In 8/629 he served with 'Umar under the command of Abu Ubaydah, probably in order to smooth over political difficulties. By his being appointed to conduct the pilgrimage of A. H. 9 and to lead public prayers in Medina during Muhammad's last illness, and by other signs of respect, he was marked as successor.

iii. His caliphate, 11/632-13/634.—The day of Muhammad's death (12 Rabî' I, 1/8 June, 632) was a critical one for the young Islamic state. The Anṣâr set about appointing a leader from their own number, but were persuaded by 'Umar and others to accept Abu Bakr. He took the title of Khâlid rasûl Allâh, 'deputy or successor of the messenger of God', and after a short time moved to a house in the centre of Medina.

His caliphate of a little over two years was largely occupied in dealing with the ridda or 'apostasy'. This phenomenon, as the name given by Arabic historians indicates, was regarded by them as primarily a religious movement; but recent European scholars, especially J. Wellhausen (Syrian and Farabeyes, vi, Berlin, 1895, 7-37) and L. Caetani (Annales, ii, 549-83) have argued that it was essentially political. More probably it was both. Medina had become the centre of a social and political system, of which religion was an integral part; consequently it was inevitable that any reaction against this system should have a religious aspect. There were six main centres of this reaction. In four of these, the leader had a religious character and is often called a 'false prophet': al-Aswad al-Ansi in the Yemen, Musaylima among the tribes of Hanîfa in the Yamama, Tulayhâ in the tribes of Asad and Qaṭafân, and the prophetess Sadjâh in the tribe of Tamím. The form of the ridda in each centre varied according to local circumstances; it involved the refusal to send taxes to Medina and to obey the agents sent out by Medina. In the Yemen the ridda began before Muhammad's death, and when Abu Bakr came to power al-Aswad had been replaced by Kays b. Hubayra b. 'Abd Yaghûh al-Makshûh. In other places there had presumably existed for some time a movement against the rule of Medina, but it became open revolt only after Muhammad's death. During the absence of the main Muslim army in Syria under Usâma b. Zayd, some neighbouring tribes tried to surprise Medina, but were eventually defeated at Dhû 'l-Kaṣâ. After the return of the Syrian expedition, a large army commanded by Khâlid b. al-Walid was sent against the rebels. First Tulayhâ was defeated in a battle at Buzầkha, and the area restored to its allegiance to Islam. Soon afterwards, Tamîm abandoned Sadjâh and submitted to Abu Bakr. The most important battle of the ridda was the battle of the Yamama at 'Akrâbâ' (about Rabî' I, 12/May 633), known as 'the garden of death' on account of the great slaughter on both sides. Here Musaylima, the most serious opponent of the Muslims, was defeated and killed, and central Arabia brought under their control. Subordinate commanders were entrusted with subsidiary operations in al-Bahrayn and 'Umar (with Mahra), while Khâlid pacified the Yamama before moving towards Irak. The ridda in the Yemen and Haḍramawt was defeated by another commander, al-Muḥādjir b. Abu Umâyra. In dealing with captured leaders Abu Bakr showed great clemency, and many became active supporters of the cause of Islam. The traditional view was that the ridda had been quelled before the end of 11 A.H. (March 633); but Caetani has shown that the events require a much longer time, and that it may have continued into 13/634.

The size of Muhammad's expeditions along the road to Syria shows that he had realized the urgency of expansion if peace was to be maintained among the Arab tribes. Abu Bakr was aware of this strategic principle. In the first days of his caliphate, despite the threats of rebellion in Arabia, he persisted with Muhammad's plan of sending a large army under Usâma towards Syria. Again, once the danger from Musaylima in central Arabia was removed, no time
was lost in despatching Khalid towards 'Irafc. Thus was set on foot under Abu Bakr's ... Id bi'l-Nahdr, it passes for a work of Ibn Sma (cf. G. C. Anawati, Essai de Bibliographie avicennienne, no. 162).

... radically revised by European scholars' critique of 'conquest of the lands'. The traditional account out a celebrated march to Damascus and linked up of Abu Bakr's death the position would seem to ii, iii). By the time 

... as follows. Khalid, joining a force of B. Bakr b. Wa'il under al-Muhannā b. Ḥārīja, had advanced plundering into 'Irāk and threatened al-Hira, which plundering into
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In *al-Mu'tabar*, modelled in great part on the *Shifd* of Ibn Sīnā, Abu'l-Barakāt sometimes takes over theses from that book, quoting them literally, but at the same time attacks others that are among the most essential. In his opposition to Ibn Sīnā he is often at one, in the field of physics, with the tradition that bore in Islamic lands the name of Platonic, and which was that followed by Abū Bakr al-Rāzū. His psychology is, in some respects, related more than that of the *Shifd* or more manifestly so to that of the Neoplatonists.

Abu'l-Barakāt's method of philosophizing does not, however, lend itself easily to recourse to the authority of tradition. This is shown by the very title of the *Kitāb al-Mu'tabar*, which in the usage of Abu 'l-Barakāt means something like: "The book about what has been established by personal reflection". As a matter of fact, this method is distinguished in the first instance by the appeal to self-evident truths, the certainties *a priori*, which nullify the theses *a posteriori* of the ruling philosophy of the period. Abu 'l-Barakāt refuses to make a difference between the certainties of reason, admitted as valid by the Peripatetics, and those depending on the estimative faculty (*wahm*), dismissed by them.

It is mainly this method that leads Abu 'l-Barakāt to assert, against the partisans of the Aristotelian theory of space, the existence of a tridimensional space. With John Philoponus he refutes the proposition denying the possibility of movement in the void. Having demonstrated the fallacy of the peripatetic arguments to the contrary, he proves the infinity of space by the impossibility for man to conceive a limited space.

Similarly, it is the appeal to the *a priori* knowledge of the human mind that allows Abu 'l-Barakāt to clarify the problem of time—the true solution of which, according to him, depends upon metaphysics rather than upon physics. In effect, he shows that the apperception of time, of being, and of self, is anterior in the soul to any other apperception the soul might have, and that the nature of being and that of time are closely linked. According to his definition, time is the measure of being (not, as the peripatetics held, that of movement). He does not admit the diversity of the various levels of time, the gradations of *samīn*, *dahr*, *sarmad* assumed by Ibn Sīnā and other philosophers. In his opinion, time characterizes the being of the Creator as well as that of created things.

He identifies prime matter with the body considered merely from the point of view of corporeality, apart from any other characteristic; corporeality being an extension susceptible of being measured. Among the four elements, earth alone is, in his view, constituted of corpuscles, indivisible because of their solidity.

Dealing with the movement of projectiles, Abu 'l-Barakāt accepts, though with modifications, the theory of Ibn Sīnā—ultimately, as it seems, inspired by John Philoponus—according to which the cause of this movement is a 'violent inclination', that is to say a force (called later by certain Latin schoolmen *impetus*) imparted by the projecting body to the projectile. He explains the acceleration in the fall of heavy objects by the fact that the principle of natural inclination (*masyf tabīfi*), a current philosophical term, contained in them, furnishes them with successive inclinations. The text of the *Mu'labar* treating of this doctrine is the first one, as far as is known at present, where one finds implied this fundamental law of modern dynamics: a constant force gives rise to an accelerated movement.

It is especially the psychological doctrine of Abu 'l-Barakāt that shows in the most palpable way the role given in his philosophy to recourse to what is self-evident. As a matter of fact, this doctrine has as its starting point the consciousness that man has of himself, i.e. of his soul. This consciousness bears the stamp of certainty and is anterior to any other knowledge; it would be there even without the perception of the sensible things. Ibn Sīnā had already availed himself of this *a priori* datum, which he had great difficulty in integrating with his psychology—which bears the stamp of Peripaticism—while Abu 'l-Barakāt is led by it towards other psychological verities, equally guaranteed and authenticated by their self-evident character. For instance, the valid consciousness that man has of being one—the same when he sees and hears, thinks, remembers or desires, or accomplishes any other psychical act—is sufficient in the view of Abu 'l-Barakāt to refute the various theories postulating a multiplicity of the faculties of the soul. Another example: the certainty that one has of perceiving, in the act of seeing, the very object that one sees, and at the place where it really is—and not an image, that according to certain hypotheses is situated inside the brain—this certainty proves by itself the truth of the impressions that it guarantees. We have, then, a psychology that consists, partly, of a system of self-evident truths, and is dominated up to a certain point by the notion of consciousness or apperception (*shu'ūr*, a term used in a similar sense by Ibn Sīnā). It denies the distinction established by the Aristotelian doctrine between intellect and soul. In fact, according to Abu 'l-Barakāt, it is the soul which accomplishes the so-called acts of intellecution—a concept which he criticizes. Similarly, he denies the existence of the active intellect postulated by the peripatetics.

Platonic or Plotinian influences—which are, to be sure, in harmony with the personal intimations of Abu 'l-Barakāt—appear perhaps in the definition of the soul as an incorporeal substance acting in and by the body. Immateriality is taken by Abu 'l-Barakāt in a very strict sense, which was not current at all; so for instance in the theory of memory. The human souls are caused, in the view of Abu 'l-Barakāt, by the stellar ones, and return, after death, to their causes.

The knowledge of God, cause of causes, comes at the end of the knowledge of existing things and that of being perceived by an *a priori* knowledge, which divides being into necessary and contingent. On the other hand, the wisdom manifested in the order of nature proves the existence of a Creator. Last not least there are ways of direct communication between God and men. Abu 'l-Barakāt, following in this point the Avicennian tradition, does not admit the proof for the existence of God based on movement.

He holds that the essential attributes of God, such as knowledge, power and wisdom, belong to His essence in the same way as having three angles equal to two right angles belongs to the essence of a triangle.

In his view God may have manifold knowledge, also about particulars. In order to refute arguments to the contrary, he refers to his psychological doctrine, where he proves that the forms of the things perceived, stored up in the human soul, are immaterial, like the entity that has perceived them.
In this way divine knowledge appears as being up to a point analogous to human knowledge.

Rejecting the theory of emanation held by the philosophers, Abu 'l-Barakât thinks that things have been created by a succession of divine volitions, either pre-eternal or coming into being in time. The first of these volitions, an attribute of the divine essence, created the first thing in existence, viz. according to religious terminology, the highest of the angels.

The personalism of the conception of God in Abu 'l-Barakât sometimes relates it to the doctrines of the kalâm. Nevertheless, this does not necessarily justify the conclusion that the kalâm has influenced his thought.

So far as the problem of the eternity of the world is concerned, Abu 'l-Barakât, having confronted the theses of those who affirm it and those that deny it, does not explicitly state his own conclusions, but hints that one who has understood his exposé of the question will not fail to find the correct answer. It seems, in summing up the discussion, that the true solution is, in the view of Abu'1-Barakât, that which asserts the eternity of the world.

Abu 'l-Barakât whose authority was invoked by a Jewish scholar of 'Irâk, Samuel b. 'Eli, in his polemic against Maimonides, had as his partisans amongst the Muslims 'Abd Allah b. Râ'înî, Khâlid b. Sâdiq b. Sân'ânî, and the Tâbilli, the junior to the last. The influence of Abu 'l-Barakât over a personage of the first order, Fâhûr al-Dîn al-Râ'îzî, seems to have been decisive. It is manifest especially in al-Mabâthî b. al-Maghârîyya, a capital work of Fâhûr al-Dîn, and was of great historical importance. In fact, the observation of the Shi'ite Muh. b. Sulaymân al-Tanakabûnî, a Persian author of the 15th cent., who says, in substance, that the tradition of Ibn Sînâ had almost succumbed under the attacks of Abu 'l-Barakât and Fâhûr al-Dîn, before being re-established by Naṣr al-Dîn al-Ṭûsî (Kishâr al-'Ulâmîd, lih. 1304, 278), refers to a crisis in Islamic philosophical speculation, a crisis originated by Abu ‘l-Barakât, the memory of which remained alive among the Iranian students of Ibn Sînâ.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Khiyârî (Lippert), 343-6; Ibn 'Abî Ujaybî’î (Müller), i, 278-80; Bayhya’dî, Ta’limmat al-‘Ilmân al-Ishâfîy, 150-3; S. Poznanski, in Zeitschrift für hebräische Bibliographie, 1913, 33-6 (edition of some pages of the Commentary on Ecclesiastes); Schefetten, in complete Turkish translation of the Ilahiyydt of al-Mu'alla'b, with introduction, Istanbul 1932; study of Sulaymân al-Nadwî on Abu ‘l-Barakât, at the end of vol. iii of the ed. of al-Mu'alla'b, 250-52; S. Pines, Beiträge zur islamischen Atonenlehre, Berlin 1936, 82-3; idem, Etudes sur l'influence d’Abû ’l-Barakât al-Baghdâdî, in REJ, c.iii, 1938, 4-6; c. iv, 1938, 1-33; idem, Nouvelles Etudes sur Abu’l-Barakât al-Baghdâdî, will appear in REJ, 1953. (S. Pines)

ABû BAYHÂS AL-HAYMÂN B. DÄHIR, KH SHAHID, of the Banû Sa’d b. Dubay’î. In order to escape from the persecution of al-Hâdîkhârî, he fled to Medina, but was arrested by the governor, Uhmân b. Hâyyahoph, Abu ‘l-Baghdâdî executed (94/713). He gave his name to the Bayhasiya, one of the Khâhordjîte sects, which occupied an intermediate position between the strict Azrâkîs and the milder Şurîs and İbâdîs. The Bayhasîs, though admitting that Muslims of different opinion from their own were unbelievers, considered it permissible to live amongst them, to intermarry with them and to inherit from them. Their tenets again diverged, so that they branched off into various subdivisions.

Bibliography: Mubarrad, Kâmil, 604, 615; Balâdhûrî (Ahwardt, Anonyme Arab. Chronik), 83; Mas’ûdî, Murâdhî, v, 230; Aṣârî, Mahâlîdî, 113 ff., 95; Baghdâdî, Farâk, 87 f.; Ibn Ḥazm, Fisal, iv, 190; Shahrastânî, Mi’âd, 93 f.

ABû BILâL [see MIRJâD B. UDAVYA].

ABû BURDÀ [see AL-ṢAMâRâIL].

ABû DAHMÂL AL-DJUMâHÎ, WAHô B. ZAM’À, Kurayshîte poet of Mecca, who started to compose poetry before 40/660 and died after 96/715. He is included among the erotic poets of the Hijrî by his poems devoted to three women: ‘Amra, of a noble Meccan family, a Syrian woman who led him into a breach with his family, and especially ‘Aïkâ, daughter of Mu’âwiya, whom he first saw during a pilgrimage. His verses, soon becoming famous, attracted the attention of the princess, whom he followed to Damascus, but the caliph, though recognizing the chaste character of Abû Dha’bal’s relations with his daughter, took umbrage and sent the poet away.

Abû Dahr’al is not, however, an exclusively erotic poet, as an important part of his work is devoted to panegyrics on Ibn al-’Azrâk, governor of al-Djand in Yaman, appointed by ‘Abî Allâh b. al-Zubayr, and ’Ummârah b. ‘Amr, governor of Hadramawt. The incident with Mu’âwiya seems to have turned him away from the Umayyads and made him a partisan of the anti-caliph; the Aghâhî even quotes some verses alluding to the murder of al-Husayn b. ‘All.

Bibliography: Brockelmann, S, 1-80 and the references given there; to the fundamental article in the Aghâhî, vi, 154-70 should be added al-Murzubanî, al-Muwashshah, 70, 189; idem, Mu’jam 117, 342; Nâlînî, Scrisitî, vi, 55; O. Rescher, Abriss, 1, 144-5; and especially the sources quoted by F. Krenkow, JRA SI, 1910, 107-75, who has collected the verses of the poet. (Cn. PELLAT)

ABû DÂMDAM, the heir of a stock of anecdotes, cited already in the 10th century. All kinds of foolish remarks are attributed to him, and more particularly comical decisions on questions of law, similar to those later attributed to Karâkûş. This Abû Dâmam is probably identical with the devotee who, before or during the lifetime of Muḥammad, offered up his good name in place of the poor tax to the servants of God; for this express sacrifice of the respect of his fellowmen may easily be interpreted as a permission or invitation to expose the devotee as the typical figure of foolishness. To one bearer of the same name there is ascribed an extraordinary knowledge of the ancient poetry, but there is no means of deciding whether this is the same personage.

as 'Amir instead of Uwaymir, and for his father's name instead of Zayd we find variously 'Amir, 'Abd Allah, Malik or Tha'laba, while some give him the nisba al-Rahānī. He was a younger contemporary of Muhammad who is generally listed among the Companions (Sahabā) though some sources raise doubts as to the legitimacy of this. He did not become a Muslim till after the battle of Badr and it is noted that he was the last of his family to become a convert to Islam. Some list him among the people of Medina he was the "brother" chosen for Salmān al-Fārisī. A certain number of traditions are reported on his authority and are given in the Dākhā'īr al-Mawāridh, iii, 158-62. The Sūfis claimed him as one of the aḥā al-sulṭānī [q.v.], quoting a number of sayings of an ascetic or pietistic character from him, which is probably the reason why in the biographical dictionaries he is called a šāhid and one to whom 'īmām was given. These sources also say that he became known as the sage (hakim) of the early Muslim community. He is reported as having said that before Islam he was a merchant, and after his conversion found that business life interfered with strict attention to cult duties (dīwān) so he gave up business. His great reputation, however, was as an authority on the Kurān. He is listed as one of the few who collected (dāmā'a) revelations during the Prophet's lifetime, and a small number of variant readings from him is recorded in the kaidāl books. During his stay in Damascus, where he was sent to serve as a kādi, he made it a practice to gather to the mosque groups to whom he taught the Kurān, thus becoming the true father of the Damascus School later headed by Ibn 'Amīr [q.v.]. He died at Damascus in 32/652, or thereabouts, his tomb and that of his wife Umm al-Dārḍā being shown near one of the gates.

**Biography:**
Ibn Habīb, Muḥabbār, 75, 286, 397; Ibn Kutayba, Ma'ārifs, 137; Ibn Hīšām, 345; Ibn Dārayd, Ithā'āt, 268; Nawawī, Taḥḥāb, 715; Ibn al-ʿΑbīl-Uṣūl, Usūl, iv, 158; v, 185; Ibn al-Diẓāɔr, Dāhsa, No. 330; Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, Istārīj, ii, No. 2908; Ibn Ḥāḍar, Isābā, iv, 110, 111; idem, Liṭān al-Ḥāḍar, vii, 375; idem, Taḥḥāb al-Taḥḥāb, viii, 175-7; Ibn ʿImām, Shabānjīra, i, 39; Fīrīṣt, 27; al-Dākhābī, Taḥkhrīt al-Wuṣūl, l, 23, 24; al-Kharrājī, Khulāṣa, 254; 'Abd al-Ghānī al-Nābulusī, Dākhā'īr, iii, 158-62; Caetani, Annales, Index s.v. (A. JEFFERY)

**ABŪ ḌĀ'UD AL-SIDJĪŠĀNI, SULAYMĀN B. AL-AS'UṬAṬI, a traditionist;** born in 202/817. He travelled widely in pursuit of his studies and gained a high reputation for his knowledge and piety. Eventually he settled at Basra, which is no doubt why some wrongly held that the nisba Sidjīšānī comes from a village near Basra called Sidjīšān (or Sidjīšānā), and not from the province of that name. He died in 322/935/Febr. 889.

Abū Dā'ūd's principal work is his Kitāb al-Sunan, which is one of the six canonical books of Tradition accepted by Sunni. He is said to have submitted it to Ahmad b. Hanbal who gave it his approval. Ibn Dāsa says Abū Dā'ūd declared that he collected this work of 4800 traditions from a mass of 500,000, and that it contains sound traditions, those which seem to be so, and those which are nearly so. He also said, "I have made clear the traditions in this book of mine which contain great weakness, and those about which I have said nothing are good (ṣīh), some being sounder than others". This refers to the notes which he often adds to his traditions to express his opinion on the value to be attributed to them. Muslim has an introduction to his Sahih which in which he discusses some general questions of criticism; but Abū Dā'ūd is the first to give such detailed notes, paving the way for the more systematic criticism of individual traditions given by his pupil al-Tirmīdī in his collection. Abū Dā'ūd quotes men not found in the two Sahīhs, his principle being that transmitters are counted trustworthy provided there is no formal proof to discount them. His work which has the generic title of Sunan, dealing mainly with matters ordained, or allowed, or forbidden by law, received high praise. For example, Abū Sa'id b. al-Arābī said that anyone who knew nothing but the Kurān and this book would have sufficient knowledge; and Muhammad b. Maqiṣīd said that the traditionists accepted it without question just as they accepted the Kurān. But one is surprised to find that, although many men in the fourth century praised it highly, no mention of it is made in the Fīrīṣt. Indeed, Abū Dā'ūd is merely mentioned there as the father of his son. People of later times have expressed some criticisms. Al-Munṣūri, for example, who produced a summary of it, called al-Mugaddab, criticized some of the traditions not supplied with notes, and Ibn al-Diāwūzīya added further criticisms. But while faults have been found with the work, it still holds an honoured place. The Sunan was transmitted through several lines, some versions being said to contain material not found in others. Al-Luḥūlī's version is the one which has gained most favour. A number of editions of the Sunan have been printed in the East (see Brockelmann). A small collection of mursal traditions by Abū Dā'ūd, entitled Kitāb al-Mardīš, was published in Cairo in 1310/1892.

**Biography:**

(Š. ROBSON)

**ABŪ DHARR AL-SHÂṢÂRI, a Companion of Muhammad.** His name is commonly given as Djuundub b. Dujāda, but other names are also mentioned. He is said to have worshipped one God before his conversion. When news of Muhammad reached him he sent his brother to Mecca to make enquiries, and being dissatisfied with his report, he went himself. One story says he met Muhammad with Abū Bakr at the Ka'ba, another that 'All took him secretly to Muhammad. He immediately believed, and is surprisingly claimed to have been the fifth (even the fourth) believer. He was sent home, where he stayed till he went to Medina after the battle of the Ditch (5/627). Later he lived in Syria till he was recalled by 'Uṯmān because of a complaint against him by Muṣ̣āwiya. He retired, or was sent, to al-Rabadha, where he died in 32/652-3, or 31. He was noted for humility and asceticism, in which respect he is said to have resembled Jesus. He was very religious and eager for knowledge, and is said to have matched Ibn Mas'ūd in religious learning. He is credited with 281 traditions, of which al-Bukhārī and Muslim rendered 31 between them.

**Biography:**
Ibn Kutayba, Ma'ārifs (Wustenfeld), 130; Ya'kūbī, ii, 138; al-Mas'ūdī, Murādi, iv, 268-74; Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, Istārīj, Haydarābād
ABU DHUWAYB AL-HUDHALI, Khuwaylid

B. KHALID, Arabian poet, a younger contemporary
of Ibn Abi Sarh, and as such the poetical school
of Medina. Like his master
Abu Dhu'ayb was not "nadjdi" and did not follow the poetical
tradition. Moreover, al-Asmaci accuses Khalaf al-

[Text continues with detailed information about Abu Dhu'ayb's life and contributions to poetry, including his style, influence, and the poetical tradition he represents.]

Bibliography:
Ibn Hisham, Tabari—in see indexes; Ibn Sa'd, iii/1, 194, iv/2, 55, viii, 193, 220; Ya'qubi, ii, 27; Caetani, Annali, i, 345-6, 364, 378, 381, 401, etc.; Montgomery Watt, Muhammad al Mecca, by index; Azafran, Wiisten-
feld, 455, 469. (W. Montgomery Watt)

ABU DU'AD AL-YYADI, Dhuyayrya, Dhuyayryya of Haritha b. al-Huwayri b. al-Huwayriyya (or again Hanzala b. al-Shakir, which was more probably, however, the name of Abu l-Tamahān al-Kaymi, see Shīr, 229), pre-Islamic poet of the Era, contemporary of al-Mundhir b. Mā' al-Sāmā' (about 506-544 A.D.), who put him in the charge of his horses. The expression dāījāh ḥa'dā' Abū Du'ād, which appears in
line of Khayyār B. Zuhayr and has become proverbial,
gave rise to several traditions showing Abū Du'ād as
the "protégé" of a noble and generous dāījā, who is either al-Mundhir, al-Harīth b. Ḥammām or Ka' b b. Māma.

As poet, Abū Du'ād is famous for his description of horses, and in this genre some critics consider him superior to Šafyāl al-Charnawī and al-Nahgha al-Djahl. Nevertheless, the lexicographers have not collected his poems systematically, and the yid did not collect those of 'Adi b. Zayd, because his language was not "nadjdi" and he did not follow the poetical tradition. Moreover, al-Amsā' accuses Khalaf al-
Amar of having attributed to Abu Du'ad forty kasidas composed by himself (al-Marzubani, Muwaddak, 73). 

Bibliography: Brockelmann, S I, 58; Caussin de Perceval, Essai sur l’Histoire des Arabes, ii, 110-3, putting together the traditions; the fundamental article is that of the Aghānī, xv, 95-9; see also Ibn Kutayba, Shīr, 120-3; Maydānī, Amīdī, Cairo 1932, i, 49, 170 (in reference to dhūr kāḏūr A. D. and anā al-magḥīr al-‘uraydān); Marzuban, Muwaddak, 73-4, 86; idem, Muwadda, 115; Ibn Durayd, Iṣba’d, 104; Yaḥkūbī, i, 259-306; W. Ahlwardt, Sammlungen, i, 8-9; O. Rescher, Abīs, i, 80-1; Nallini, Scritti vi, 56, who classes himself among the Christian poets, although Cheikh, Naṣrānīyya, does not mention him. A number of verses are to be found in Ahlwardt, op. cit. i, 27-8, 68-70; Buhtur, Ḥamāsya, 87 (Cheikhlo); Diāhīz, Ḥayawānī, index; as well as in the works of philologists and lexicographers. Collection of fragments by G. E. von Grünbaum, Abū Du’ād al-Iyādī: Collection of fragments, WZKM, 1948, 1952.

Abū Dulaf, Misrā b. Muḥammad al-Ḳhāradjī al-Yanbu’ī, an Arab poet, traveller and mineralogist. The earliest date in his biography is his appearance in Bukhārā towards the end of the reign of Naṣr b. Ahmad (d. in 331/943). His travels in Persia hint at the years 331-341/943-952. Abū Du’ār Muḥammad b. Abīdār, whom Abū Dulaf mentions as his patron in Sīstān (read: *Abīdār b. Muḥammad), ruled 331-52/943-63. The author of Abu Dja’far Muhammad b. Afrmad, whom Abu Dulaf himself supplied the commentary on the poem of Abu Dulaf, is his appearance in Bukhara towards the end of the reign of Naṣr b. Ahmad (d. in 331/943). His travels in Persia hint at the years 331-341/943-952. 

Abū Dulaf, Misrā b. Muḥammad al-Ḳhāradjī al-Yanbu’ī, an Arab poet, traveller and mineralogist. The earliest date in his biography is his appearance in Bukhārā towards the end of the reign of Naṣr b. Ahmad (d. in 331/943). His travels in Persia hint at the years 331-341/943-952. Abū Du’ār Muḥammad b. Abīdār, whom Abū Dulaf mentions as his patron in Sīstān (read: *Abīdār b. Muḥammad), ruled 331-52/943-63. The author of Abu Dja’far Muhammad b. Afrmad, whom Abu Dulaf himself supplied the commentary on the poem of Abu Dulaf, is his appearance in Bukhara towards the end of the reign of Naṣr b. Ahmad (d. in 331/943). His travels in Persia hint at the years 331-341/943-952. 

On the contrary, the second risāla, describing Abū Dulaf’s journey in more easily controllable regions (western and northern Persia, Armenia) gives a clear itinerary and contains a number of interesting details which can be verified.

Bibliography: F. Wüstenfeld, Des Abu Dolaf Misar Bericht über die türkischen Horden, in Zeitschr. f. vergl. Erdkunde, 1842 (text according to Kazwīnī); C. Schlözer, Abu Dulaf Misaris... de itinere suo asiatico commentarius, Berlin 1845 (text according to Yāḵūṭī); V. Grigorov, Ob arab. pulesteshethoven, 1952, Al-Abul Bal, in Zurnal Min. Narod. prov., 1872, 1-45; Marquart, Streifzüge, 1903, 74-95; id., Das Reich Zulab, in Festschrift E. Sachau, 1915, 301-2; A. von Rohr-Sauer, Des Abul Bal Bericht über seine Reise nach Turkestän, China und Indien, Bonn 1939, (translates the text of the Maghādī MS. discovered by A. Z. Validi-Togan; H. von Mūk, in his review of this work, OLZ, 1942, 240-2, has pointed out the leniency of Rohr-Sauer’s conclusions); V. Mirowsky, La deuxième risāla d’Abu Dulaf, in Orients, 1952, 23-7; id., Abul Bal’s travels in Iran (being printed in Cairo, 1954)—gives the Maghādī text of the second risāla with a detailed commentary.

(Ch. Fellay)

Abū Dulāmā, Zand b. al-Djawn, a black slave, client of the Banū Asad of Kūfah. He is already mentioned in the history of the last Umayyad caliph, but appears as a “poet” only under the ‘ABBāsīs and plays the part of a court jester in the palace of al-Saffāh and especially in those of al-Manṣūr and al-Mahdī. His poem on the death of Abu Muslim (137/754-5) is said to have been the first of his works to make him a name. Examples of his poetry show him to have been a clever, witty versificator, who readily seizes upon low expressions and displays all sorts of filth with cynical joy; but he does not despise the most insidiously folsome praise when this form of mendicancy promises some reward. He laughs at the praise of the crowd and his spiteful tongue is feared by all. It is true he did not spare himself and still less his nearest relations; he would even occasionally revenge himself for the coarse jokes which the magnates played on him when one of his patrons was pleased to ridicule another through him. He also enjoyed the jester’s liberty of being above the Islamic laws and could make them the butt of his insolent mockery. He has given proverbial fame to his mule, which possessed all possible defects and to which he dedicated a witty kasīda. Abū Dulīmā embodied a popular type of crude and unrestrained comicality; hence the historicity of some of the anecdotes that are told both of him and of Abū Nuwās is somewhat doubtful.

Statements as to the date of his death vary: according to some he died in 160/776-7, according to others in 170/786-7; the first of these dates being the more likely.

Bibliography: Ibn Kutayba, Shīr, 489 ff.; Aghānī, ix, 130-40; xv, 85; Ibn Khallikān, no. 243; Harṭī, Maḥāmāt, 518 (Maḥāmāt 40); Sharḥ Maḥāmāt al-Harīrī, ii, 236 ff.; Bayakhi, Maḥāsīn, Schwally, 645; Ta’rikh Bagdād, viii, 488-93; Nuwayrī, Nihāyāt al-Abāb, iv, 37-48; Yāfī, Mir’āt, i, 341-3; R. Basset, in Revue des traditions populaires, xvi, 127; Brockelmann, i, 72; i, 111; O. Rescher, Abīs, i, 303-7; A. F. Rifa’, Taj al-Ma’mūn, ii, 300-16; Mohammed Ben Cheneb, Abū Dūlāmā, Poète bouffon de la cour des premiers califes abbassides (containing an edition and partial translation of the collected poems and fragments), Alger 1922.

(J. Horovitz)
ABU 'L-DUNYA — ABU 'L-FADL ALLAMI

ABU 'L-DUNYA, ABU 'L-HASAN ALI B. UTHMAN B. AL-KHATTAB (or 'Uthman b. al-Kh.), one of those to whom preternatural longevity has been ascribed (mu'ammarun, q.v.); he is also called al-Mu'ammarr al-Maghribi or al-Ashadjdi al-Mu'ammar. He is said to have been born about 600 A.D. and to have died in 1097/22 Aug. 1602. His head was severed and sent to Sallm, at whose instance the crime had been committed, while the body was buried at Antari (near Gwalior). The news came as a shock to the Caliph, who had made a scar on his face (al-Ashadjdi = the scarred one). After the death of the caliph, he went to Tangier. He returned at the beginning of the 4th/10th century, to fulfil the pilgrimage and to relate traditions which he claimed to have heard from the mouth of 'Ali. The information about him relates traditions which he claimed to have heard from his father, and owed his profound scholarship to his study of religious sciences, Greek thought and the second son of Shaykh 'Abd al-Mu'ammar al-Maghribi or al-Ashadjdi al-Mu'ammar. He is said to have been born about 600 A.D. and to have died in 316/928, 327/938-9.

ABU 'L-FADL, (Fazl) ALLAMI (Shaykh), author, liberal thinker, and informal secretary of the emperor Akbar, was the younger brother of the poet Fayd (q.v.); and the grandson of Shaykh 'Amr al-Mu'mmar, who was buried at Antari (near Gwalior). The news came as a shock to the Caliph, who had made a scar on his face (al-Ashadjdi = the scarred one). After the death of the caliph, he went to Tangier. He returned at the beginning of the 4th/10th century, to fulfil the pilgrimage and to relate traditions which he claimed to have heard from the mouth of 'Ali. The information about him relates traditions which he claimed to have heard from his father, and owed his profound scholarship to his study of religious sciences, Greek thought and the second son of Shaykh 'Abd al-Mu'ammar al-Maghribi or al-Ashadjdi al-Mu'ammar. He is said to have been born about 600 A.D. and to have died in 316/928, 327/938-9.

In political affairs, Abu 'l-Fadl sought to emphasise the divine character of Akbar's kingship. Royalty, he claimed, was light emanating from God (farr-i-fadl), communicated to kings without the intermediate assistance of any one. Though the existence of kings was necessary at all times, it was only after many ages that there appeared, by divine blessing, a monarch who could not only rely effectively but also guide the world spiritually. Since Akbar could ensure the material as well as the spiritual well-being of his subjects, he could be truly regarded as the "Perfect Man" (insan-i-kamil). It was the duty of all to give Akbar complete loyalty and to seek his spiritual guidance by becoming his disciples. The chosen among the disciples would be those who attained the "four degrees of devotion" (chahar martsaba-i-ikhlas), i.e. preparedness to place at Akbar's disposal their property, life, honour and faith.

Though Abu'l-Fadl's religio-political views earned him the enmity of the ulama', the policy of religious toleration which he helped Akbar in evolving, the non-denominational yet spiritual character of obedience to the Emperor which he advocated, his justification of ethical grounds of every imperial action, and his persistent efforts to inculcate, especially among the nobles, a sense of mystical loyalty to Akbar, contributed greatly to the political consolidation of the Mughal Empire. In spite of Abu'l-Fadl's immense influence over Akbar and the numerous duties which he performed at Court (especially in drafting letters to nobles and foreign potentates), his progress in the official hierarchy was slow. It was only in 1585 that he was promoted to the mansab of 1000, which was doubled in 1592. Six years later it was raised to 2500. Except when he was associated, for a short time in 1586, with Shah Kull Khan Mahram in the joint-government of Delhi, Abu'l-Fadl never held any office until 1599, when he was posted to the Deccan, at the instance of hostile elements at the Court. He distinguished himself there as an able administrator and military commander. In recognition of his services, he was promoted, in 1600, to the rank of 4000, and two years later, to that of 5000. The same year he was hastily summoned to the Court when Akbar's son Sallm (afterwards the Emperor Jahangir) rebelled. On his way back, he was waylaid and assassinated by Râdja BÌr Singh Deva, the disaffected Bundela chieftain of Orchha, on 4 RaÌy I 1011/22 Aug. 1602. His head was severed and sent to Sallm, at whose instance the crime had been committed, while the body was buried at Antari (near Gwalior). The news came as
A great shock to Akbar, who mourned the loss deeply and never forgave Salim for instigating the murder. Abu'l-Fadl was survived by his son, 'Abd al-Rahmân Afdal Khan (d. 1613), who rose to be governor of Bihâr.

Abu'l-Fadl's principal title to fame as an author rests upon his monumental work, Akbar Nâma, a history of Akbar (down to the 46th regnal year) and of his ancestors, compiled in three daftars (first two daftars published in Bibl. Ind. 3 vols.). The third daftar, Al-in-i-Akbari (Bibl. Ind., 3 vols.), dealing with Imperial regulations and containing detailed information on Indian geography, administration and social and religious life, was the first work of its kind in India. Abu'l-Fadl's compositions, characterised by an individual literary style, served as a model for many generations, though none was able to imitate him successfully. His numerous works include a Persian translation of the Bible; 1^{	ext{st}}-Dânîk (a recension of Amwâr-i-Suhaîlî); prefaces to Târikh-i-Alî (unfortunately lost), to the Persian translation of Mahâkâhârâta, and to many other works; and a Mâjudâjîd (ed. by Rizvi, Medieval India Quarterly, Aligarh, i/iii). His letters, prefaces and other compositions were compiled by his nephew under the title Inshâ-i-Abu'l-Fadl (3 vols.). Another collection of his private letters is entitled Rukâlî-i-Abu'l-Fadl.

Bibliography: Autobiographical accounts: Al-in-i-Akbari, iii (at end); Inshâ-i-Abu'l-Fadl, iii. Biographies: Ma'dâ'isr al-Umarî (Bibl. Ind.), ii, 606-22; Elliot and Dowson, vi, 1 ff.; Blochman, Introduction to his translation of Al-in-i-Akbari; Storey, ii/3, 541-51 (detailed references on 551). (Nurul Hasan)

other singers, such as MaBâf and Ibn Surayjî, and

ABU 'L-FADL 'IYÄD [see iyyâd].

ABU 'L-FARADJ [see RABBAGHA]; IBN AL-DRAWZ; IBN AL-‘IYR; IBN AL-NADIM.

ABU 'L-FARADJ AL-ISBAHANI (or AL-ISPAHANI), 1^{	ext{st}} B. I. A-BUSAYN B. MUH. B. AHMAD AL-KURAYSHI, Arab historian, litterateur and poet. He was born in 284/897 in Isfahan (whence his nishâba), in Persia, but was of pure Arab race, a descendant of Kuraysh, or, to be more exact, of the Marwânî branch of the Umayyads. In spite of this, he was a Shi‘îte. He studied in Baghdad, where he passed the greater part of his life, protected by the Bâyâdis, especially by the vizier al-Muhallabî. He found also a warm welcome in Aleppo at the court of the Hâmidî prince Sayyâf al-Dawla. He died in Baghdad on 14 Dhu'l-Hijjâda 356/20 Nov. 967. His main book, on which he worked according to his own testimony for fifty years, is the Kitâb al-Aghdên ("Book of Songs"). In it the author collected the songs that had been chosen, by order of the caliph Hârûn al-Rashîd, by the famous musicians Ibârîm al-Mawîsî, Ismâ'îl b. Dâmîn and Fulayh b. al-Awra, and later revised by Ismâ'îl b. Ibârîm al-Mawîsî; he added songs by other singers such as MaBâf and Ibn Surayjî and by caliphs and their descendants; for each song he indicated its melody. This is, however, but the least part of his work, as Abu'l-Faradj added rich information about the poets who were the authors of the songs, giving an account of their life and quoting many of their verses, as well as about the composers of the melodies.

Furthermore, he gives many details about the ancient Arab tribes, their ayyâm, their social life, the court life of the Umayyads, society at the time of the 'Abbâsid caliphs, especially of Hârûn al-Rashîd, the milieu of musicians and singers. In one word, in the Aghdên we pass in review the whole of Arabic civilization from the dijâhîyya down to the end of the 3rd/9th century. The author even does another service: following the method of the Arab writers, he quotes long passages from earlier writers, whose works have not come down to us. His book is thus a source also for the development of Arabic style.


Another work of Abu'l-Faradj that has come down to us is Makâli al-Tablîyîn wa-Itkharruh, a historical work composed in 353/967. It contains biographies of the descendants of Abû Tâlib (from Djaîf b. Abî Tâlib to the seventy who died under the reign of al-Muktadir, 295-320/908-32) who in some way lost their lives for political reasons, including those who died in prison or in hiding. This book was published in lithography, Teheran 1907 and in print, Nâdiri 1355. The Bombay edition (1311) on the margin of Fâhîr al-Dîn al-Nâdirî, Muntakhab fi 'l-Ma‘râthî wa 'l-Khutab, contains the first half only.

Among those books that are lost should be mentioned books on genealogy and a Kitâb Ayyâm al-'Arab, where 1700 "days" were mentioned. Abu'l-Faradj also edited the Awdhûn of Abu Tammâm, al-Buhturî and Abu Nuwas.

Bibliography: Ibn Khallîkân, no. 351; Yâkût, Irshâd, v. 149-68; al-Khâtib al-Baghdâdi, TaRîih Baghdadî, xi, 398-400; Brockelmann, i, 146, S i, 225-6. A good biography, quoting his poetry and containing information about the Aghdên, in Aghdên, preface, i, 15-37 (the information about the Muhallabî is to be corrected). For MSS of the Aghdên see H. Ritter, in Oriens, 1949, 276 ff.; for miniatures illustrating it, D. S. Rice, in Burlington Magazine, 1953, 128 ff. (M. Nallino)

ABU 'L-FATH [see IBN AL-‘AMID; IBN AL-FURât; AL-MUZAFFAR].

ABU 'L-FIDA, ISMÄ‘IL B. (AL-APDA), 2^{	ext{nd}} B. (AL-MUZAFFAR) MAHMûD B. (AL-MANfSM) MUHAMMAD B. TAKî AL-DîN UMAK B. SHÂHÂNSHÀH B. AYYÔB, AL-MALIK AL-MU‘AYYAD IMÂD AL-DÎN, SYRIAN prince, historian, and geographer, of the family of the Ayyûbîds [q.v.], born in Damascus, Dijm. i, 672/Nov. 1273. At the age of 12, in the company of his father and his cousin al-Muzaffar Mahmûd II, prince of Hamâh, he was present at the siege and capture of Markh (Margat) (684/1285). He took part also in the later campaigns against the Crusaders. On the suppression of the Ayyûbid principality of Hamâh in 698/1299, he remained in the service of its Mamlûk governors, at the same time ingratiating himself with the Mamlûk sultan al-Malik al-Nâsir [q.v.] Muhammad b. Kâlûn. After several vain attempts to obtain the government of Hamâh, he was finally appointed on 18 Dijm. i, 710/14 Oct. 1310, at the instance of the "king of the Arabs", Muhammân, shaikh of Al Fadl. In 712/1312 his government was converted to a life principality, but two years later he, with the other governors,
was made directly subordinate to the governor of Damascus, Tankiz, with whom his relations were for a time strained. In the following years he strengthened his position by lavish patronage and generosity, especially on the occasion of his visits to Egypt. In 719/1319-20 he accompanied sultan Muhammad on pilgrimage to Mecca, and on their return to Cairo he was publicly invested with the insignia of the sultanate and the title of al-Malik al-Mu'ayyad (17 Muh. 720/28 Feb. 1320), and given precedence over all the governors in Syria. He continued to enjoy the great reputation which he had acquired as patron and man of letters, as well as the friendship of the sultan, until his death at Hamah on 23 Muh. 732/27 Oct. 1331. With the support of Tankiz, his son al-Afdal Muhammad was nominated as his successor, and was also granted the insignia of the sultanate. (For his grave, cf. ZDMG, laxi, 657-60; lxiii, 329-33, 853 ff.; Bull. d'Estudes Orient., 1931, 149).

The Arabic biographical notices furnish several specimens of his poetical productions, which included a versification of the juristic work al-Iidwl of al-Mawardi [q.v.]. Of various other writings on religious and literary subjects almost all have perished. His reputation rests on two works, both largely compilations, but rearranged and supplemented by himself. The Mukhtasar ta'rikh al-bashar, a universal history covering the pre-Islamic period and Islamic history down to 729/1329, is in its earlier part based mainly on Ibn al-Athir. Its contemporary popularity is shown by the continuations to it written by Ibn al-Wardi [q.v.], Ibn Habib al-Dimashki, and Ibn al-Shihna al-Halabi [q.v.]. It was a major source of eighteenth-century orientalism, through the editions of J. Gagnier, De vida ... Mohammedis (Oxford 1723) and J. J. Reiske-J. G. Chr. Adler, Annales Moslemici (Leipzig 1754 and Copenhagen 1789-94). The complete text was first published in Istanbul (2 vols., 1286/1869-70).

The Tabwin al-Buladn, a descriptive geography supplemented by physical and mathematical data in tabular form (derived mainly from the Arabic translation of Ptolemy, the tenth-century K. al-masid, al-Biruni and Ibn Sa'd b. Maqrizi [q.v.]), these divergences being completed in 721/1321, largely replaced all earlier geographical works. It is extensively quoted by al-Kalakshandi [q.v.], and several later abridgements were made, including one in Turkish by Muh. b. 'Ali Sipahiзаде (d. 997/1589). Individual sections were edited and translated by European scholars from the seventeenth century (John Greaves, London 1650; J. B. Koehler, Leipzig 1766; etc.). The entire work was edited by J. T. Reinaud and MacGuckin de Slane (Paris 1840) and translated by Reinaud (Paris 1848) and Stanislas Guyard (Paris 1883), the first volume of the translation consisting of a classic survey entitled Introduction générale à la géographie des Orientaux. The judgments of scholars on Abu 'l-Fida's geography have differed widely, from "a rather poor compilation of earlier sources" (J. H. Kramers, in Legacy of Islam, Oxford 1931, 91; cf. C. E. Dubler, Abû Hâmid el Granadino, Madrid 1953, 182) to G. Sarton (see Bibli.), for whom Abu'l-Fidâ is "the greatest geographer of his age". See also the art. DURAR.

**Bibliography:** Autobiography (extracted from the History), trans. de Slane, in Reueil des Historiens des Croisades, i, 156-182 (see also Appendice 744-51); Dhahabi, Ta'rikh al-Islam, Suppl., Leiden MS. 755; Kutubî, Fawâd (Cairo 1951), i, 70; Ibn Hadjar, al-Durar al-kâmina, Hyderabad 1348, i, 371-3; Subki, Taḥâbî al-Muhfîz, vi, 84-5; Ibn Taghribirdî, Cairo, ix, 10, 23, 24, 39, 46-7, 64-5, 94, 100-101, 193, 204 (largely reproduced in Mägriß, Sudah, i, Cairo 1941, 87, 89, 90, 137, 142, 166, 196, 202, 238); idem, Les Biographies du Manhal Şâfi (G. Wiet, Cairo 1932) no. 432; F. Wüstenfeld, Geschichts- schreiber der Araber, 1881, 161-6; Brockelmann, ii, 44-6; S II 44; M. Hartmann, Das Muwaššah, Weinmar 1896, 10; Carra de Vaux, Les Penseurs de l'Islam, Paris, i, 130-46; G. Sarton, Introduction to the History of Science, iii, Baltimore 1947, 200, 308, 793-9; A. Ates in Oriens, 1952, 44.

(ABU 'FIRAS)
ABU FIRAŚ — ABU ’L-ĞHAZI BAHĀDUR KHĀN

His *dīwān* was edited with a commentary (largely from the poet himself) shortly after his death by his tutor and biographer, the grammarian Ibn Khāhawayh (d. 370/980). The manuscripts present, however, so many variations in text and arrangement that other recensions must also have been circulated, including probably that of al-Babbagha (d. 398/1008: see Tanūkhi, *Bibl.*). All the earlier defective editions (Bayrūt 1873, 1900, 1910) are superseded by the critical edition of S. Dahhan (3 vols., Bayrūt 1944), with full bibliography.


**ABŪ FUDAYK** ‘ABD ALLĀH B. THĀ’AWI, a Khāridji agitation, of the Banū Kays b. Thā’abā. Originally associated with Nāfiʾ b. al-Azraq [q.v.], he left him to join Nāḏīb b. ‘Amīr [q.v.], whom he did not hesitate to murder, because of certain differences of opinion between them.

After this murder he gained control over Bahrayn (72/691) and succeeded in withstanding the attack of an army from Basra sent against him by ‘Abd al-Malik. Shortly afterwards (73/693) a second expedition, consisting of 10,000 men from Basra and commanded by ‘Umar b. ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Ma’mar succeeded in defeating and killing him.


**ABU FUTRUS** [see NABH ABUTRUS]

**ABU ’L-FUTRūH HASAN** [see MĀKKA]

**ABU ’L-FUTRūH AL-RĀZĪ**. Persian commentator of the Kurān. He lived between 480/1087 and 525/1131, fixed by conjecture. Among his disciples are the famous Shī’ī theologians Ibn Shahrābūbūb and Ibn Bībīyya [q.v.], who describes him as a scholar, preacher, commentator of the Kurān and a pious man. According to al-Shughrārī (Maḏḏalīs al-Muʿminīn) he was a contemporary of al-Zamānī and a pious man. According to al-Shughrārī (Maḏḏalīs al-Muʿminīn) he was a contemporary of al-Zamānī and a pious man. According to al-Shughrārī (Maḏḏalīs al-Muʿminīn) he was a contemporary of al-Zamānī and a pious man. According to al-Shughrārī (Maḏḏalīs al-Muʿminīn) he was a contemporary of al-Zamānī and a pious man. According to al-Shughrārī (Maḏḏalīs al-Muʿminīn) he was a contemporary of al-Zamānī and a pious man. According to al-Shughrārī (Maḏḏalīs al-Muʿminīn) he was a contemporary of al-Zamānī and a pious man. According to al-Shughrārī (Maḏḏalīs al-Muʿminīn) he was a contemporary of al-Zamānī and a pious man. According to al-Shughrārī (Maḏḏalīs al-Muʿminīn) he was a contemporary of al-Zamānī and a pious man. He had been a companion of ‘Ābed al-Wahhāb (168-208/784-823) at Taharīt, to offer him his book *Mudawwana*, he stayed with the Ibāḍī *shaykh*. Abū Haṣīm Amrūs b. Ṭahāf, of Djabal Nāfusa, who rendered a service to Ibāḍī literature by conserving in the Maghrib a copy of the work.

The *Mudawwana* of Abū Ǧānim is the oldest Ibāḍī treatise on general jurisprudence, according to the teaching of Abū ’Ubayda Muslim al-Tanmī (d. under al-Mansūr, 136-55/754-75; cf. ‘ĪBĀDIYYA) as transmitted by his disciples. The manuscript of the *Mudawwana*, copied by ‘Amrūs b. Fath, was composed of twelve parts; the titles are given in the catalogue of Ibāḍī books compiled by Abū ’l-Kāsim al-Barrādī (6th/9th century). The work has become very rare; according to information received from S. Smogorzewski, a unique manuscript was in the possession of an Ibāḍī *shaykh* in Kaukāsa (Mzāb). Al-Barrādī’s catalogue also quotes another law book by Abū Ḥānim.


**ABU ’L-ĞHAZI BAHĀDUR KHĀN**, ruler of Khiwa and Caghātāy historian, born probably on 16 Rabīʿ 3, 1012/24 Aug., 1603, son of ‘Arab Muhammad Khān, of the Ōzbek dynasty of the Shyābānīdīs [q.v.], and of a princess of the same family. He spent his youth in Urgaṇç (at that time largely depopulated owing to the change of course of the Oxus), at the court of his father, who was khān of this place. In 1029-1619 he was appointed to be his father’s lieutenant in Kāṯ, but when his father was killed soon afterwards in a rebellion of two of his other sons, had to take refuge at Samarkand with Imam-kuli Khān. After long fighting he, together with his brother Isfandiyar, succeeded inousting the rebellious brothers, with the aid of some Turkmen tribes. In 1023-1623 he became lieutenant of his brother in Urgaṇç, but quarrelled with him, in connection with Turkmen tribal feuds, in 1036-1626 and had to flee to Tāshkent, where he lived for two years at the Kazakh court. After another attempt to seize the throne in Khiwa, he spent ten years (from 1039/1629) as an exile at the court of the Ṣalaḥwīds, mostly at Isfahān. Here he widened his knowledge of the past of his people, acquired at the Kazakh court, by the study of Persian sources. By the evidence of his translation, he knew Persian and Arabic well. After his flight from Persia he perfected his knowledge at the Kalmūk court, by collecting Mongol traditions.

It was only after the death of Isfandiyār (1052/ 1642) that Abū ’l-Ḡāzi became (in 1054/1644-5) khān of Khiwa. As khān, he maintained diplomatic relations with all his neighbours, including Russia, interrupted by repeated wars. Expeditions against the Turkmen in 1054/1644, 1056/1646, 1058/1648, 1062/1651 and 1064/1653, led finally to the submission of some of these tribes in Kara-Kum and

**Bibliography:** Storey, section 1, p. 6; H. Massé, in *Melanges W. Marçais*, Paris 1950, 243 ff. (H. Massé)
Manghīshlak. He was engaged also against the Kalmuks in 1066/1655 and 1073/1662. Occasionally he allowed Russian caravans passing through his territory to be plundered, but had, in the interests of his own trade if for no other reasons, to pay compensation. For the rest, he endeavoured to further the welfare of his country and to promote scholarship. The military turn in his life seems to have left him himself, according to less partial sources, rather modest. He died in 1074/1663, shortly after he had abdicated in favour of his son.

Of his works we possess: 1) Šajēdīr-i Terā-hīne, composed in 1070/1659, mainly derived from Rashtdāl-Dīn and the Qhuzmāna, but with additions of independent value. The Caghātāy text was published in facsimile by the Türk Dāl Kurumu, Ankara 1937; there is a Russian translation by A. Tumanski, ʿAshkābād 1892. 2) Şahjāsarat al-Aṭrāk (Şajīdēr-i Türk), which he left unfinished at his death; the part from 1054/1644 was finished by his son Abu ʿlmużaffar Anuḫa Muhammad Bahādūr in 1076/1665. This work contains the history of the Shlaybānids from the middle of the 13th century, and is the main source for the dynasties up to 1074/1663, though written mostly "from memory", without direct use of sources, and widely defective for the earlier periods as well as in its chronology. The introduction, containing traditions about Cūghiz Kān and his immediate successors, is almost wholly legendary. Nevertheless, as the work became known in Europe at an early date, it remained for some time the main authority for the history of the Mongols. Two Swedes captured in the battle of Poltava (1709), Tabbert von Strahlenberg and Schenström, became acquainted with it in Siberia and, with the help of a Russian interpretation by an imām, prepared a German translation, on which is based the French edition of v. Bentinck, Histoire généalogique des Tartars, Leiden 1726. This was soon followed by a Russian and in 1780 by an English edition. The German original of 1716-7 was published by Messerschmidt, Göttinngen 1780, as Geschichtsbuch der mungalisch-mogulischen Chanen. Finally Ch. M. v. Frähn published a Latin translation, Kazan 1825. A critical use of the text was only made possible by the publication of the Caghātāy text, with a French translation, by J. J. P. Baron Desmaisons, Histoire des Mogols et des Talars, 1874, but this work in turn requires revision in the light of more recent studies.


ABŪ ḤAFṢ UMAR B. DĪJAMI, probably a native of the Dījāl Nafāsīa, mentioned in al-Shāmmakhī's K. al-Siyār (Cairo 1301, 561-2), in a short note that gives no chronological information, but from which it may be deduced that he lived at the end of the 8th/14th or the beginning of the 9th/15th century. He translated into Arabic the old ʿAḥida of the Ibāḍī of the Maghrib, originally composed in Berber. This translation was in use, at the time of al-Shāmmakhī (d. 928/1521-2), in the island of Djarba and in the other Ibāḍī communities of the Maghrib, excepting the Dījāl Nafāsīa. It is still the catechism of the Ibāḍī of the Ma#ab and of Djarba. The ʿAḥida of Abū Ḥafs was the subject of numerous commentaries: by al-Shāmmakhī (circulating in MSS); by Abū Sulaymān Dāʿūd b. ʿĪbrāhim al-Thalāṭī of Djarba (d. 697/1599-60) (see Exiga dit Kayser, Description et histoire de l'île de Djerba, Tunis 1884, 9-10 text, 9-10 transl.); and finally those by Umar b. Ramaḍān al-Thalāṭī (12th/18th century), autographed or printed after the ʿAḥida, in the editions of Algeria (e.g. Constantine) or Cairo.

The ʿAḥida of Abū Ḥafs was published and translated, with notes taken from the Ibāḍī commentaries, by A. de Motylinski, L' ʿAqīda des Abadithes, Recueil Mém. et Textes XIV* Congrès des Orientalistes, Algiers 1905, 505-45. (A. de Motylinski-T. Lewicki)

ABŪ ḤAFṢ UMAR B. SHUʿAYB AL-BALLŪTĪ, a native of Pedrero (Bitrawdj) in the Fāṣ al-Ballūt, a district to the north of Cordova, founder of a minor dynasty which ruled over the island of Crete (Irktīfīh [q.v.]) between 212/827 and 350/961, when his descendant Abū al-ʿAzīz b. Shuʿayb was dethroned and the island recaptured by the general and future Byzantine emperor, Nicephorus Phocas.

After the celebrated revolt of the Suburb which broke out in Cordova in 212/827 and was harshly suppressed by the amīr Ḥakam I (cf. UMAYYADS OF SPAIN), a group of Andalusians, several thousand in number, who had been expelled from the capital, decided to emigrate and try their luck in the Mediterranean. They succeeded in gaining a foothold in Egypt and occupied Alexandria for a few years. Besieged by the governor, Abū ʿAllāh b. Tāhir, they had to capitulate in 212/827 and then decided to attempt a landing in Creté. Under the leadership of their chief, Abū Ḥafs al-Ballūtī, they captured the island, which thus passed under Muslim domination. There is little information about the chronology of the dynasty founded by al-Ballūtī and the history of the island during that period. All that is known, thanks to Byzantine historians, who call Abū Ḥafs Apocapsa or Apoçapsa, is that all attempts by the Byzantines to recapture Crete were in vain. It was also in vain that in 225/840 the emperor Theophilius addressed himself to Abū al-Rahmān II [q.v.] to ask for the restitution of the island. During its Muslim occupation, Crete maintained economic and cultural relations with al-Andalus, and its capital, al-Khandāk (modern Candia), was quite a brilliant intellectual centre.

Abū Ḥaṣṭ Intī—on whom the “Memoirs” of al-Bayyāḥī (q.v.) are the most detailed source, whose information is most likely to be authentic—bore, in common with all his fellow-tribemen before the activity of the Almohade Mahdī, a Berber name, which appears to have been Faskat ʿū-Mzāl. Ibn Tūmart himself, after he had persuaded him to support his cause, gave him the name of Abū Ḥaṣṭ ʿUmar, in memory of the famous companion and lieutenant of the Prophet. Their first meeting, after the Mahdī’s return to his native mountains, can be placed in the year 514/1120-21; Abū Ḥaṣṭ, at this time, was apparently about 30 years old. From that time on, he was to make a remarkable career for himself, showing an extremely developed political sense, a more and more marked ascendant over the first Almohade caliph, his own “creator”, and enjoying the respect of all those who benefited under his protector and Maecenas, Abū Hafs, at the forefront of the historical scene of the Maghrib, al-Andalus and Ifriqiya. For details of his long political and military activities, see the articles Al-Muwaḥḥidūn and Muʾminīnāt.
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Abū Hāmmū had a highly cultivated mind and 
sought the society of scholars and poets; he himself 
composed a treatise on political ethics. His secretary, 
imite friend and historian, was Yāḥyā b. Khayyām, 
who was assassinated in Ṭamaḏān 780/Dec. 1379, 
at the instigation of Abū Tāḥufīn.

_Bibliography:_ see _Abū al-Wādīds_. (A. Bel)

**ABU HAMZA** [see _al-mugheṭār b. ’awf_].

**ABU HANIFA AL-NUMĀN** b. Ṭabīṣī, the 
teacher of law and religious lawyer, the eponym of 
the school of the Ḥanafīs [g.v.]. He died in 150/767 
at the age of 70, and was therefore born about the 
year 80/699. His grandfather Zūhī is said to have 
been brought as a slave from Kabul to Kūfā, and 
set free by a member of the Arabian tribe of Taŷm-
Allāh b. Ṭḥālaba; he and his descendants became 
thus clients (mawla) of this tribe, and Abū Ḥanīfā is 
ocasionally called al-Taŷmī. Very little is known 
of his life, except that he lived in Kūfā as a manu-
facturer and merchant of a kind of silk material 
(khāṭa). It is certain that he attended the lecture 
meetings of Ḥammād b. Abī Sulaymān (d. 120) who 
taught religious law in Kūfā, and, perhaps on the 
occasion of a khāṭī, those of ‘Aṭā’ī b. Abī Rabāh 
(d. 114 or 115) in Mecca. The long lists, given by 
his later biographers, of the authorities from whom 
he is supposed to have „heard“ traditions, are to be 
treated with caution. After the death of Ḥammād, 
Abū Ḥanīfā became the foremost authority on 
questions of religious law in Kūfā and the main 
representative of the Kūfian school of law. He 
collected a great number of private disciples to 
whom he taught his doctrine, but he was never a 
kāfī. He died in prison in Baghdād, two generations 
built over his tomb in 459/1066. The quarter around the mausoleum is still called 
al-’Āṣamiyya, al-Īmām al-’Āṣīm being Abū Ḥanīfā’s 
customary epithet.

The biographical legend will have it that the 
‘Abbāsīd caliph al-Ŷmūṣīr called him to the newly 
founded capital, wanted to appoint him as a kāfī 
there, and imprisoned him because of his steady 
refusal. A variant makes already the Umayyad 
governor Yazīd b. ’Umar b. Ḥubayra, under Marwān 
II, offer him the post of kāfī in Kūfā and flog him 
in order to make him accept it, but again without 
success. These and similar stories are meant to 
explain the end of Abū Ḥanīfā in prison, and the 
fact, surprising to later generations, that the master 
should not have been a kāfī. The truth is probably 
that he compromised himself by unguarded remarks 
at the time of the rising of the ’Alīdīs al-Nafs al-
Zakīyya and his brother Ibrāhīm, in 145, was trans-
ported to Baghdād and imprisoned there (al-Kaṭīb 
al-Baghdādī, xii. 329).

Abū Ḥanīfā did not himself compose any works 
on religious law, but discussed his opinions with 
and dictated them to his disciples. Some of the works 
of these last are therefore the main sources for Abū 
Ḥanīfā’s doctrine, particularly the _Iḥtisāb_ Abū Ḥanīfā wa’dn Abī Laylā and the _al-Radd‘al-Siyār 
al-’Arāzī_ by Abū Yūṣūf, and the _al-Hudūd_ and 
the version of Mālik’s _Muwaṭṭa‘_ by al-Shaybānī. (The 
formal _ṣmād_ al-Shaybānī—Abū Yūṣūf—Abū Ḥanīfā, 
that occurs in many works of al-Shaybānī, designating 
as it does merely the general relationship of pupil 
and master, is of no value in this connection). For 
the doctrine that Abū Ḥanīfā himself had received 
from Ḥammād, the main sources are the _al-Aktār 
of Abū Yūsuf_ and the _al-Ākhar of al-Shaybānī_. The 
comparison of Abū Ḥanīfā’s successors with his 
predecessors enables us to assess his achievement in 
developing Muhammadan legal thought and doctrine. 
Abū Ḥanīfā’s legal thought is in general much 
superior to that of his contemporary Ibn Abī Laylā 
(d. 148), the _kāfī_ of Kūfā in his time. With respect 
to him and to contemporary legal reasoning in Kūfā 
in general, Abū Ḥanīfā seems to have played the 
role of a theoretical systematizer who achieved a 
considerable progress in technical legal thought. Not 
being a kāfī, he was less restricted than Ibn Abī 
Laylā by considerations of practical necessity; at the 
same time, he was less firmly guided by the administration 
of justice. Abū Ḥanīfā’s doctrine is as a rule system-
atically consistent. There is so much new, explicit 
legal thought embodied in it, that an appreciable 
part of it was found defective and was rejected by 
his disciples. His legal thought is not only more 
broadly based and more thoroughly applied than 
that of his older contemporaries, but technically 
more highly developed, more circumspect, and more 
refined. A high degree of reasoning, often somewhat 
ruthless and unbalanced, with little regard for the 
practice, is typical of Abū Ḥanīfā’s legal thought 
as a whole. Abū Ḥanīfā used his personal judgment 
(_aṣayy_) and conclusions by analogy (_ḥiṣād_) to 
the extent customary in the schools of religious law 
in his time; and as little as the representatives of the 
other schools, the Medinese for example, was 
inclined to abandon the traditional doctrine for the 
sake of „isolated“ traditions from the Prophet, 
traditions related by single individuals in any one 
generation, such as began to become current in 
Islamic religious science during the lifetime of Abū 
Ḥanīfā, in the first half of the second century A. H. 
When this last kind of tradition, two generations 
later, thanks mainly to the work of al-Shafi‘ī, had 
gained official recognition, Abū Ḥanīfā for adventi-
tious reasons was made the scapegoat for the resist-
ance to the „traditions of the Prophet“ and, parallel 
to this, for the exercise of personal judgment in the 
ancient schools of law, and many sayings shocking 
to the later taste were attributed to him. Al-Khaṭīb 
al-Baghdādī (d. 463/1071) made himself the mouth-
piece of this hostile tendency. The legal devices 
(_hiṣa_) which Abū Ḥanīfā had developed in the 
normal course of his technical legal reasoning, were 
criticized too, but they became later one of his 
special titles to fame (cf. Schacht, in _Ist._, 1926, 
221 ff.).

As a theologian, too, Abū Ḥanīfā has exercised a 
considerable influence. He is the eponym of a 
popular tradition of dogmatic theology that lays 
particular stress on the ideas of the community of 
the Muslims, of its unifying principle, the _sunna_, of 
the majority of the faithful who follow the middle 
way in matters of religious law and avoid extremes, 
and that relies on scriptural rather than on rational 
proofs. This tradition is represented by al-Rāzī, 
_Muta‘allīm_ (wrongly attributed to Abū Ḥanīfā) and 
by the _Fikh al-Aṣba‘_ which both originated in the 
circle of Abū Ḥanīfā’s disciples, and later by the 
works of Ḥanafī theologians, including the creed of 
al-Ṭahāwī (d. 321/933) and the catechism of Abū 
’l-Laylā al-Samarqandī (d. 383/993) which has always 
been very popular in Malaya and Indonesia, in 
territory which in matters of religious law is solidly 
Šafi‘ī. This dogmatic tradition arose out of the 
popular background of the theological movement of 
the _Murdhī‘a_ [g.v.], to which Abū Ḥanīfā himself 
belonged. The only authentic document by Abū 
Ḥanīfā which we possess is, in fact, his letter to 
’Uṯmān al-Battī, in which he defends his _mudjī‘_
views in an urbane way. (It was printed, together with the al-Ālim wa'l-Muḍṭalīm and the Fikh al-Abṣāt, in Cairo 1368/1949). Another title that was ascribed to Abū Ḥanīfa is the Fikh al-Ākbar. Wensinck has shown that the so-called Fikh al-Ākbar I alone is relevant. This exists only embodied in a commentary wrongly attributed to al-Māturīdī (printed as no. 1 in Madjlīs al-Shurūḥ al-Fikh al-Ākbar, Hyderabad 1931). The text itself consists of statements of Abu Hanifa as against the Muḥaddiths, and the Djahmis [see these articles]. Propositions directed against the Murji'īs as well as against the Muʿtazila [q.v.] are lacking. This means that the author was a Murdji'īte who lived before the rise of the Muḥaddiths, and the Djahmis [see these articles].

As, in effect, immediately after the death of Abū Ḥanīfa, this text appeared, the author was a Murdji'īte who lived at the time of the revolt of al-Nafs al-Zakīyya. Of a strong constitution, he seems to have been still able to distinguish and to compare the tenets of the Murdji'ī, the Rāzī, the Karamīs, the Shiʿites, and the Ḯālīmīs [see these articles]. The authenticity of the tenets of the Fikh al-Ākbar I is therefore authentic opinions of Abū Ḥanīfa, though nothing goes to show that he actually composed the short text. But the so-called Fikh al-Ākbar II and the Wasīyyat Abī Ḥanīfa are not by Abū Ḥanīfa. The authenticity of a number of other short texts attributed to Abū Ḥanīfa has not yet been investigated and is at least doubtful; the Wasīyya addressed to his disciple Yūsūf b. Khālid al-Sūnī and the Bāṣrī represents Iranian courtiers' ethics and cannot be imagined as a work of a specialist in Islamic religious law.

The later enemies of Abū Ḥanīfa, in order to discredit him, hazed him not only with extravagant opinions derived from the principles of the Murdji'īs, but also with all kinds of heretical doctrines that he could not possibly have held. For example, they ascribed to him the doctrine that hell was not eternal—a doctrine of the Ḯālīmīs, against whom Abū Ḥanīfa ranged himself explicitly in the Fikh al-Ākbar, or the opinion that it was lawful to revolt against a government—a doctrine which goes straight against Abū Ḥanīfa's own tenets as expressed in the al-Ālim wa'l-Muḍṭalīm; he even was called a Murdji'īte who believed in the sword, a contradictio in adiecto. (This is perhaps deduced from his attitude at the time of the revolt of al-Nafs al-Zakīyya).

Among his descendants, his son Ḥamad and his grandson Ismāʿīl, ǧāfī in Baṣra and in Raḵḵa (d. 212/827), distinguished themselves in religious law. Among his more important pupils were: Zafar b. al-Ḥudhayl (d. 158/775); Dāwūd al-Ṭāʾī (d. 165/781-2); Abū Yūsuf [q.v.]; Abū Muḥammad al-Balḵī (see above); Al-ǧayyānī [q.v.]; Asbād b. ʿAmr (d. 190/806); Ḥasan b. Ziyād al-Łuṭuʿ (d. 204/819-20). Among the traditionalists, ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Mubārāk (d. 181/797) esteemed him highly.

Under the growing pressure of traditions his outlook of a great prince. Numerous public buildings show his piety and his magnificence. His reign saw not only the zenith of the dynasty and its greatest territorial expansion, but also the beginning of its decline. In Spain, he took Gibraltar from the Christians (1333), but after a success at sea, he suffered a disastrous defeat at the Rio Salado, near Tārīfa, which put an end to the holy war for the Marinids (1340). In Barbary, he took up again the expansionist policy of the great Almohades; he besieged Tlemcen, rebuilt the town-camp of al-Manṣūra and, after three years, at last took the capital of the ʿAbd al-Wādīds. In conquered Tlemcen, he received the congratulations of the Mamlūk sultan of Egypt and of the king of the Sudan. In support of his ally, the Ḥāfīz of Tunis, he marched on ʿIrīkīyya; but, after a period of success, he was crushingly defeated near al-Ḵayrawān (Kairouan) by a coalition of the nomad Arabs (1348).

He left Tunis by sea, his fleet sank; he managed to disembark at Algiers and tried to recover his kingdom, which his son Abū ʿĪnān had seized. He died in 752/1352. Abū ʿĪnān had him buried at Chella (Ṣḥīla [q.v.]).


Abū Ḥāṣim Abū Allāh, Shiʿite leader, son of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīyya, whom he succeeded as head of the smaller branch of the Ḥanafīyya [see KAYSANIYYA]. The only information we have about him concerns his death and his testament in favour of the Ḥāfīzids. Old historical and heresiographical sources relate that Abū Ḥāṣim went, with a group of Shiʿites, to the court of Sulaymān b. ʿAbd al-Malik, who, afraid of his intelligence and authority, had him poisoned during his return journey. Feeling his approaching death, Abū Ḥāṣim made a detour to ʿUmayma, not far from the residence of the Ḥāfīzids, where he died after bequeathing his rights to the Imamate to Muhammad b. Ḥanif [q.v.]. This tradition has been generally taken as an invention of the philo-Ḥāfīzīs for party. Nevertheless, stripped of incongruences and superstructures, it may well contain a kernel of truth, especially as, in effect, immediately after the death of Abū
Hashim the Abhábídís came out of the shadows and the 'Iráki shí'a went into action in obedience to their orders. [Cf. also 'Abá'íns].

**Bibliography:** Ibn Sa'd, v, 240-1; Ibn Kutayba, Ma'dáris (Wüstenfeld), 111; Baládlhurt, Ansâb, MS Paris Schefer a. 247, 685-6v, 745v; Ya'kúbí, Tabári, indexes; Nabáwkbí, Firáb al-Shí'a (Ritter), 29-30; Aghá'íí, Makállá (Ritter), i, 21; Bağhdádis, Fárak, 28, 245; Shahrárání, 15, 12; S. Moscati, Il testamento di Abú Hámí, RSO, 1905, 28-46. (S. Moscati)

**Abú Ḥámísh**, sharif of Mecca [see Makká].

**Abú Ḥámísh**, Mu'tázílí theologian [see AL-DU'BÁÀ'Í].

**Abú Ḥámísh** Ya'qúb b. Labíd (or Labín or Ḥábí) al-Málázi al-Najjáší, Ibdá'í imám in the Maghrib. The orthodox Arab historians represent him as a mere leader of Berber rebels. His role, however, was more defined, as he was given by the Ibádís of Tripolitania the title of imám al-dá'í ("imám of defense"). According to the chronicle of Abú Zakariyyá bi al-Wardíání, this revolt took place in Ra'djáb 145/Sept.-Oct. 762, only one year after the death of Abú 'r-Kháthatáb. According to al-Shámmákhí, al-Súyáris, Cairo 1301, 134, Abú Hámísh's government began in 154 A.H. It is, however, possible that this is a mistake for 145.

Little is known about the first years of Abú Hámísh's imamate; he captured Tripoli, massacring many of his enemies, and made the city his capital. According to Abú Zakariyyá bi he was in contact with the future founder of the imamate of Táhárt, ʿAbd al-Ráhman b. Rustum, who was at this time entrenched in the mountain of Suúf Ádjl. In 154/762 Abú Hámísh took part in a general rising of the Berbers against the 'Abásídís government of Irfíkíya, ʿUmar b. Ḥáfs, called Ḥazááríd. With his troops he took part in the siege of Túbná, in the Záb. Another detachment of Abú Hámísh's army had been for eight months investing al-Karaywán, which was taken in the beginning of 155/771-2. Soon after the capture of al-Karaywán, an 'Abásídís army from Egypt appeared on the eastern frontier of Tripolitania. Abú Hámísh left Tripoli and defeated this army in a battle, which is said by the Ibádís chronicles, probably erroneously, to have taken place near Maqmadás (Macomas Syrtis in antiquity, Marsá Zafrán of the modern maps). Shortly after, however, another 'Abásídís army commanded by Ya'qúb b. Hámísh al-Ádzí advanced from Cairo towards Tripoli. Abú Hámísh collected the Ibádí Berber tribes of Tripolitania: Náfúsá, Hawwárá, Darísá, etc. and went out to meet the enemy. The battle took place on 27 Ra'djáb 155/March 772, to the west of a place called Di'aní (Abú Zakariyyá bi) or Díndúbá (al-Shámmákhí), to the east of Díbab Náfúsá. The Ibádí army was cut to pieces, and Abú Hámísh with 30,000 of his men are said to have been left on the battlefield.

**Bibliography:** Abú Zakariyyá, al-Síná wa-Abhábí al-Ámmá (MS of the coll. of S. Smogor-zewski), fol. 147-160; E. Masqueray, Chronique d'Abou Zabaris, Algiers 1875, 41-9; Shawhákhí, Súyáris, Cairo 1301, 138-58; Baládlhurt, Fárak, 235-3; Ibn Khaldún, Hist. des Berb., i, 211-3, 397-85; Idem, Descriptio al-Magribi (de Goeje), 82-4; F. Fournel, Les Berbéres, 370-80; R. Basset, in JA, 1899 ii, 115-20. (A. de Motylinski—T. Lewicki)

**Abú Ḥámísh al-Ráží**, Ahmad b. Ḥámdáan, early Ismá'Ílí author and missionary (dá'í) of Rayy. Born in the district of Bashahrí near Rayy and well versed in Ḥadíth and Arabic poetry, he was chosen by Ghiyásh al-Ádí of Rayy, as his lieutenant. Ghiyásh was succeeded by Abú Dja'dár, whom, however, Abú Hámísh contrived to oust, thus becoming himself the leader of the dá'íwá in Rayy. It is reported that he succeeded in converting Ahmad b. 'Áli, governor of Rayy (304-11/916-24). After the occupation of Rayy by the Súmámidí troops (311-923-4) Abú Hámísh went to Dáylam to make common cause with the 'Alísíls there. His activities seem to have been at first supported by Mardáwídí, [q.v.]. When Mardáwídí later turned against the Ismá'Ílís, Abú Hámísh fled to Mufdíb (who became governor of Adharbájyán in 319/931). There he seems to have died, according to Ibn Ḥádíjar, in 329/933-4, the date being, if not quite certain, approximately correct.

Of his works the most famous is the al-Zína, a dictionary of theological terms, which is dominated by his philological interests, while Ismá'Ílí tenets are only discreetly alluded to. (For a short description of the book see A. H. al-Hamadani, Actes XXIe Congrès des Orientalistes, 291-4). In a lost book, al-Ísák, he attacked the philosophical system of al-Nasáfí [q.v.], as expounded in al-Nasáfí's al-Múdásí. When this controversy has been better explored and Abú Hámísh's al-Nám al-Nubuwá is fully published, it is hoped that more light will be shed on his own opinions. (P. Kraus has published an important section of Al-Nám al-Nubuwá, the dialogue between Abú Hámísh and the philosopher Abú Bakr al-Ráží).

**Bibliography:** Niğám al-Mulk, Siyásat-Náma, Scheder, 186 ed. Kháthír, 136; Mírás, Utís (Bunz), 130; Fihríst, 188, 189; Bañádádis, al-Fárak, 267; Ibn Ḥádíjar, Lisán al-Miás, i, 164; W. Ivanov, A guide to Ismá'Ílí lit., 32; Idem, Studies in early Persian Ismá'Ílism, 115 ff.; P. Kraus, in Orientalia, 1936, 32 ff.; idem, Rasá'il Falsáfiyya is Abi Bakr al-Ráží, i, 291 ff. (S. M. Stern)

**Abú Ḥámísh al-Sidjáštáí, Sáhí b. Múr. al-Djusámi**, Arabic philologist of Basrá, d. Ra'djáb 255/865. His nisba is related to Sidjáštáí, a village in the district of Basrá (Yáğút, iii, 44). He was a disciple of Abú Zayd al-Ánsáris, Abu 'Ubayda Mú'már b. al-Muğğáná, al-Ásma'í, etc. Among his disciples are mentioned Ibn Durayd and al-Mubárrad. As a grammarian he was of no great importance, since his specific field was the works of the ancient poets, their vocabulary and prosody. Of his works the bibliographers mention thirty-seven titles (enumerated by A. Haffner, Drei arabische Quellenwerke über die Adádd, Beirut 1913, 160-2). The following works have come down to us: (1) al-Adádd, ed. by Haffner, op. cit. 163-209; (2) al-Nadá, ed. by L. Lagumina in Atti... Lincei, Scienze morali, Ser. 4, 1919-20, 8, 5-45; (3) al-Tadhkhir wa l-Ta'dhib, MS Taym, cf. MMIA, 1923, 340; (4) al-Masá'mírámí, ed. by I. Goldziber, Abh. z. arab. Philologie, ii, Leiden 1809.

**Bibliography:** Fihríst, 58-9; Aghári, Tahríkh al-Lugha, ed. K. V. Zetterstén in MO, 1920, 22; Zubaydî, Tadhkhir, ed. F. Krenkow in RSO, 1919-20, 127, no. 35; Añábí, Núsha, 251-4; Yáğút, al-Iájdá, iv, 258; Ibn Khallikan, no. 266; Yádírî, Mírás al-Djusamán, Haydarbájyán, 1357, ii, 156; Ibn Ḥádíjar, Tahríkh al-Tahríkh, Haydarbájyán 1336, ii, 257; Suyútî, Bugháya, 265; Brockelmann, I, 107, S I, 157. (B. Lewin)

**Abú 'l-Háwl** (Hól), "father of terror", the Arabic name for the sphinx of Dwísa (Gizeh). Some authors simply call it al-šánam, "the idol", but the name Abu 'l-Háwl is already attested for the Fatimid
period. At that time the Coptic name Belhib (Belhīb), or as al-Kuqa (quoted by al-Maqrizi) has it: Belhīb (Belhib), was also still known. The Arabic Abu 'l-Hawl is most probably a popular etymology based on the Coptic designation; the initial B probably represents the Coptic article, which has been transformed in Arabic, as often happened, into Abū. In the old tradition the name Abu 'l-Hawl was applied only to the head of the Ibonodied sphinx, as the body was covered by sand in the Middle Ages and was discovered only in 1877. Modern Arabic authors use the word for “sphinx” in general, not only for the sphinx in the vicinity of the pyramids.

The Arabs, who had no knowledge of ancient Egyptian civilization, regarded with superstitious awe the head which reached high above the sand of the desert in majestic dimensions. It was considered to be a talisman preventing the encroachment of the sand on the valley of the Nile; the same magical effect was ascribed by others to the pyramids. Another, female, colossal statue—to judge by the descriptions probably a statue of Isis with the child Horus—which lay on the other shore of the Nile in Fustāt, was considered to be the beloved of Abu 'l-Hawl. She had her back to the river, as Abu 'l-Hawl had his to the desert, and was thought to be a talisman against the flooding of Fustāt by high water. This statue was destroyed in A.D. 684. Its hunters and its stones were used in the building of a mosque. According to another tradition Abu 'l-Hawl was the effigy of the legendary Ushmum, a shaykh colour is frequently mentioned. About 780/1378 a fanatical ḥawāfi caused further damage to the statue.

Abū Ḥayyān's greatness as a grammarian was due not only to his mastery of the linguistic data and control of his predecessors' theories, but also to his willingness to illuminate an Arabic grammatical concept through quotations from other languages and by following such operational principles as "One may base rules of Arabic on frequency of occurrence" and "Analogous formations that contradict genuine data found in good speech are not to be permitted". This unusual spirit of objectivity and respect for facts have made of the Manhādī al-Salih a work of great distinction. Besides elucidating and correcting Ibn Mālik's brilliant if occasionally erroneous compression of the totality of Arabic grammar into 1000 verses of poetry, the Manhādī presents a miniature bibliography of grammatical science and a panorama of thought on some of its most difficult problems on which the opinions of hundreds of grammarians, Karāmān readers, and lexicographers are cited. It was consigned to obscurity by the more elementary works on the same subject written by his pupil Ibn 'Akkīl and Ibn Hākhān.

Bibliography: Makrīzī, Khutāb, i, 122 f.; ed. Wiet, ii, 155 ff. (with notes); Ibn Dukmāk, iv, 21 f.; Makdisī, 210; Yākūt, iv, 566; S. de Sacy, Description de l'Egypte, ii, 21 f.; 'Alī Muhārak, al-Mafrā al-Diādīsah, xxvi, 44 ff.; E. Reitmeyer, Beschreibung Ägyptens im Mittelalter, 98-102; K. Baederker, Ägypten, 124 f. (C. H. BECKER)

ABU 'L-HAYYĀN AL-TAWHĪDĪ, 'Alī b. Muḥ. b. 'Ammās (probably called al-Tawhīdī after the sort of dates called tawhīd), man of letters and philosopher of the 4th/10th century. The place of his birth is given either as Nishāpūr, Shīrāz, Wāṣīt or Baghādād; its date must be placed between 310-20/922-32. He studied in Baghādād, grammar under al-Sīrāfī and al-Rūmnānī, Shīfi'ite law under Abū Hāmid al-Mawārī and Abū Bakr al-Shāhībī; and also frequented ṣaff masters. He supported himself by acting as a professional scribe. It is said, in a somewhat doubtful passage (see al-Subkī, al-Ṣafadī, al-Dhahābī, Ibn Ḥadījar) that he was, owing to heretical opinions, persecuted by the vizier al-Muḥallābī (d. 352/963). He was in Mecca in 353/964 (al-Imām, ii, 79), Basānīr, MS Cambridge, fol. 169v) and in Rayy in 358/971 (Yākūt, Irkād, ii, 292; at the court of Abu 'l-Fadl b. al-'Ammīd?, d. 360/970). From his al-Muhābāsātī, 156, we know that in 361/971 he attended lectures of the philosopher Yahyā b. ʻAdī in Baghādād. He tried his luck with the vizier Abu 'l-Fāthī b. al-'Ammīd in Rayy (d. 366/976), to whom he addressed an elaborate epistle; to judge from his hostile sentiments towards the vizier, he did not achieve much. From 367/977 he was employed by Ibn ʻAbbād as an amanuensis. In this case, too, he was anything but a success, owing, no doubt, mainly to his own difficult character and sense of superiority (he for example refused to "waste his time" in copying the bulky collection of his master's epistles), and was finally given his dismissal. He felt himself badly treated and avenged himself by a pamphlet containing brilliant caricatures of both Abu 'l-Fāth b. al-'Ammīd and Ibn ʻAbbād (Dhamm—or Mathālīb or Aḥādab—al-Waṭirāy; considerable extracts in Yākūt, i, 281, ii, 44 ff., 282 ff., 317 ff.; v, 359 ff., 392 ff., 406 f.).
It was in the period between 350-65/961-75 that he composed his anthology of adab, entitled Ṣaḥīḥ al-Ḳudāmī, also called al-Ḳudāmī wa-l-Ḍabābīr, etc. in ten volumes (vols. i-v in Fāṭih [Istanbul], 3205-9; i-ii in Cambridge 134, in Dījār Allāh [Istanbul] and in Manchester 767; unidentified volumes in the ʾUmāniyya [Istanbul, Rāmāpur i, 330, Ambrosiana (?)]. It was probably in Rāvī that he addressed to Miskawayh the questions which the latter answered in his Ṣawādmī wa-l-Ṣāwāmdī. After his return to Bāghdād, at the end of 370/980, he was recommended by Zayd b. Rifaʿa and Abu Ṭawfīq al-Būḏjānī, the mathematician, to Ibn Saʿdān (also called, after his function as an inspector of the army, al-ʾĀṣīd—cf. al-Rūḍhawrī, Ḍayyāl Tadjībīr al-Umm, 9; hence the confusion in Ibn al-Ḫīṭṭī and in modern authors). For him he started his book on Friendship, which was finished, however, only thirty years later. He frequented regularly at this epoch (lectures attended in 371/981, al-Mukdāsī, 246, 286) the man who exercised the greatest influence on him, namely Abū Sulaymān al-Manṭiqī [q.v.], who was his main oracle, especially on philosophical matters, but also on every other conceivable subject. Ibn Saʿdān was appointed by Ṣaḥmān al-Dawla as his vizier in 373/983. Abu Ḥayyān remained an assiduous courtier of the vizier, attending his evening receptions where he had to answer on the vizier’s questions on the most varied topics of philology, literature, philosophy, court- and literary gossip. (He very often reproduces the views of Abū Sulaymān—who lived in retirement and did not attend the court—on the matter in question). At the request of Abu Ṭawfīq the mathematician, he compiled for his personal a record of thirty-seven of these sessions, under the title of al-Muḍnāsī wa-l-Muḍnāsī (ed. A. Amin and A. al-Zayn, Cairo 1939-44). In 375/985-6 Ibn Saʿdān fell and was executed, and Abū Ḥayyān apparently remained without a patron. (He wrote for Abu Ṭawfīq al-Mudlīdī, vizier in Shīrāz for Ṣaḥmān al-Dawla in 382-3/993-4, al-Mukhābātī wa-l-Munṣāhāt; quotations in Yāḥyā, i, 15, iii, 97, v, 384, 405, vi, 466). Of the latter period, when he must have been very old, we have evidently nothing left. It was in these later years that he compiled his al-Mukhābātī (Bombay 1306, Cairo 1929—both very faulty editions), a collection of 106 conversations on various philosophical subjects. The chief speaker is again Abū Sulaymān, and there appear all the other members of the Baghdad philosophical circle. Al-Mukhābātī and al-Muḍnāsī wa-l-Muḍnāsī are mines of information about contemporary intellectual life and they should prove invaluable for a reconstruction of the doctrines of the Baghdād philosophers.—Towards the end of his life Abū Ḥayyān burned his books, alleging as reason the neglect in which he had to live for twenty years. In the preface to his treatise on Friendship (al-Ṣadākā wa-l-Ṣaʿīq, printed together with a short treatise on the use of science, Istanbul 1301), which he finished in 400/1009, he makes similar complaints. A guide book to the cemetery of Shīrāz (Ṣaddāl al-Isār an-Ḥafi al-Awārād, 17) claims that the tomb of Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawhīdī (whom it calls, however, Ahmad b. ʿAbdāb) was to be seen in Shīrāz and gives as the date of his death 414/1023.

His talent is most apparent in the passages, frequent in his books, where he characterizes people. As for his beliefs, he does not seem to have had any original system. He was obviously impressed by Abū Sulaymān’s Neo-platonic system, which the latter shared with most of the other contemporary Baghdād philosophers. Like the other members of the circle, Abū Ḥayyān also showed an interest in Sūfism, but not enough to make him a regular Ṣūfī. His al-Ṭabārī al-Ṣāḥīyya (ed. A. Badawī, Cairo 1935) aconsists of prayers and homilies and contains occasional references to Ṣūfī technicalities”. “Abū Ḥayyān was coupled with Ibn al-Rāwandī and al-ʾAšʿarī as one of the sindīs of Islam (JRAS, 1905, 80) but his extant works scarcely justify this assertion” (D. S. Margoliouth, in EJ, s.v.).

**Bibliography:** Yāḥyā, Iṣāḥāk, v, 380 ff.; Ibn Khallīkān, no. 707; Subkī, iv, 2; ʿAḍāmī, Wāḥīfī, in JRAS, 1905, 80 ff.; Dabāḥī, Muṭnāsī, iii, 355; Ibn Ḥādi, Līdān, iv, 356; Suyūṭī, Buḥyūs, 348; Brockelmann, i, 283, ii, 435; Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb Kāzūnī, Sharḥ al-Ḥādiʾī Abū Sulaymān Manṭīḥī Sīdīsīṭānī, Chalon-sur-Saone, 1933, 32 ff. (also in Bist Maktāba, Tehran 1935); Abū al-Razzāk Muhīyīʾ-l-Dīn, Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawhīdī (in Arabic), Cairo 1949; I. Keilani, Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawhīdī (in French), Beyrouth 1950—Abū Ḥayyān’s little treatise on writing, ed. F. R. M. Arif, Ars Islamica, 1948, 1 ff.; three epistles (Rāsiṣalī al-ʿIsmāʾ—quoted by Ibn al-ʿArabī, Muṣāmāratī, ii, 77, Ibn Abī ʾl-Ṭāṭīnī, ʿArkh Ṣawādiʿ, 1939-40, 592 ff., etc., and containing a message purporting to be from Abū Bakr to ʿAll, but which, it has been suspected, was invented by Abū Ḥayyān himself; R. al-Ḥayātī, From a philosophical point of view; and the above mentioned treatise on writing) have been edited by I. Keilani, Thalāth Rasāʾīl, Damascus 1952. An extract from al-Żulfā, al-Rūḍhawrī, 75. (S. M. Stern)

the dualists, represented by the Zoroastrians, the Manichaens and other Gnostics; the philosophers of Greek inspiration, the 
haqriyyas, mainly represented by the champions of the natural sciences; finally against the increasingly numerous Muslims who were influenced by these foreign ideas: crypto-Manichaean poets like Ṣāliḥ b. 'Abd al-Kuḍūs, the theologians of the "modern" type who had adopted certain gnostic and philosophical doctrines, etc. It seems that it was only at a mature age that he made himself acquainted with philosophy. On the occasion of his pilgrimage (the date of which is unknown) he met in Mecca the Shī'īe theologian Ḥišām b. al-Ḥakam and disputed with him concerning his anthropomorphist doctrines, which show a gnostic influence; and it was only then that he began to study the books of the ḏahrīyya. Later observers notice certain similarities between his doctrine of the divine attributes and the philosophy of Pseudo-EmpeDocles, forged by the Neo-Platonists and natural scientists of late antiquity; in effect his philosophical sources must have been of such a kind, which are represented in general by medieval Aristotelianism. These philosophers attracted, as well as repelled, him; while combatting them, he adopted their methods and their manner of looking at problems. Naive as a thinker, and having no scholastic tradition, he approached speculative problems with a daring which did not even recoil from the absurd. Hence all the prematurity and the lack of balance which characterize his theology, but also the freshness of his attempts. He was the first to set many of the fundamental problems at which the whole of the later Mu'tazila was to labour.

The unity, the spirituality and the transcendence of God are carried in the theology of Abu '1-Hudhayl to the highest degree of abstraction. God is one; he does not resemble his creatures in any respect; he is not a body (against Ḥišām b. al-Ḥakam); has no figure (ḥay'a), form (ṣūra) or limit. God is knowing with a knowledge, is powerful with a power, alive with a life, eternal with an eternity, seeing with a faculty of sight, etc. (against the Shī'īes who asserted that God is knowledge, etc.), but this knowledge, power, etc. are identical with himself (against popular theology which regarded the divine attributes as entities added to essence); provisional formulas of compromise which did not satisfy later generations. God is omnipresent in the sense that he directs everything and his direction is exercised to the highest degree of abstraction. God is one; he does not resemble his creatures in any respect; he is not a body (against Ḥišām b. al-Ḥakam); has no figure (ḥay'a), form (ṣūra) or limit. God is knowing with a knowledge, is powerful with a power, alive with a life, eternal with an eternity, seeing with a faculty of sight, etc. (against the Shī'īes who asserted that God is knowledge, etc.), but this knowledge, power, etc. are identical with himself (against popular theology which regarded the divine attributes as entities added to essence); provisional formulas of compromise which did not satisfy later generations. God is omnipresent in the sense that he directs everything and his direction is exercised to the highest degree of abstraction. God is one; he does not resemble his creatures in any respect; he is not a body (against Ḥišām b. al-Ḥakam); has no figure (ḥay'a), form (ṣūra) or limit. God is knowing with a knowledge, is powerful with a power, alive with a life, eternal with an eternity, seeing with a faculty of sight, etc. (against the Shī'īes who asserted that God is knowledge, etc.), but this knowledge, power, etc. are identical with himself (against popular theology which regarded the divine attributes as entities added to essence); provisional formulas of compromise which did not satisfy later generations. God is omnipresent in the sense that he directs everything and his direction is exercised to the highest degree of abstraction. God is one; he does not resemble his creatures in any respect; he is not a body (against Ḥišām b. al-Ḥakam); has no figure (ḥay'a), form (ṣūra) or limit. God is knowing with a knowledge, is powerful with a power, alive with a life, eternal with an eternity, seeing with a faculty of sight, etc. (against the Shī'īes who asserted that God is knowledge, etc.), but this knowledge, power, etc. are identical with himself (against popular theology which regarded the divine attributes as entities added to essence); provisional formulas of compromise which did not satisfy later generations. God is omnipresent in the sense that he directs everything and his direction is exercised to the highest degree of abstraction. God is one; he does not resemble his creatures in any respect; he is not a body (against Ḥišām b. al-Ḥakam); has no figure (ḥay'a), form (ṣūra) or limit. God is knowing with a knowledge, is powerful with a power, alive with a life, eternal with an eternity, seeing with a faculty of sight, etc. (against the Shī'īes who asserted that God is knowledge, etc.), but this knowledge, power, etc. are identical with himself (against popular theology which regarded the divine attributes as entities added to essence); provisional formulas of compromise which did not satisfy later generations. God is omnipresent in the sense that he directs everything and his direction is exercised to the highest degree of abstraction. God is one; he does not resemble his creatures in any respect; he is not a body (against Ḥišām b. al-Ḥakam); has no figure (ḥay'a), form (ṣūra) or limit. God is knowing with a knowledge, is powerful with a power, alive with a life, eternal with an eternity, seeing with a faculty of sight, etc. (against the Shī'īes who asserted that God is knowledge, etc.), but this knowledge, power, etc. are identical with himself (against popular theology which regarded the divine attributes as entities added to essence); provisional formulas of compromise which did not satisfy later generations. God is omnipresent in the sense that he directs everything and his direction is exercised to the highest degree of abstraction. God is one; he does not resemble his creatures in any respect; he is not a body (against Ḥišām b. al-Ḥakam); has no figure (ḥay'a), form (ṣūra) or limit. God is knowing with a knowledge, is powerful with a power, alive with a life, eternal with an eternity, seeing with a faculty of sight, etc. (against the Shī'īes who asserted that God is knowledge, etc.), but this knowledge, power, etc. are identical with himself (against popular theology which regarded the divine attributes as entities added to essence); provisional formulas of compromise which did not satisfy later generations. God is omnipresent in the sense that he directs everything and his direction is exercised to the highest degree of abstraction. God is one; he does not resemble his creatures in any respect; he is not a body (against Ḥišām b. al-Ḥakam); has no figure (ḥay'a), form (ṣūra) or limit. God is knowing with a knowledge, is powerful with a power, alive with a life, eternal with an eternity, seeing with a faculty of sight, etc. (against the Shī'īes who asserted that God is knowledge, etc.), but this knowledge, power, etc. are identical with himself (against popular theology which regarded the divine attributes as entities added to essence); provisional formulas of compromise which did not satisfy later generations. God is omnipresent in the sense that he directs everything and his direction is exercised to the highest degree of abstraction. God is one; he does not resemble his creatures in any respect; he is not a body (against Ḥišām b. al-Ḥakam); has no figure (ḥay'a), form (ṣūra) or limit. God is knowing with a knowledge, is powerful with a power, alive with a life, eternal with an eternity, seeing with a faculty of sight, etc. (against the Shī'īes who asserted that God is knowledge, etc.), but this knowledge, power, etc. are identical with himself (against popular theology which regarded the divine attributes as entities added to essence); provisional formulas of compromise which did not satisfy later generations.

Divine activity is interpreted in the light of the doctrine of accidents: the whole process of the world consists in an incessant creation of accidents which descend into the bodies. Some accidents, however, are not to be found in a place or in a body; e.g. time and divine will (irāda). The latter is identical with the eternal creative word kun; it is distinct from its object (al-murād) and also from the divine order (amr), which can either obey or disobey (while the effect of the creating word Kun is absolute: kun fa-yakunu, Kunān ii, iii, etc.). Those who are not acquainted with the Kur'ānic revelation, but have nevertheless accomplished laudable acts prescribed by the Kur'ān, have obeyed God without having the intention to do so (theory of jā'la la yurḍu'lladhu bihd, otherwise attributed to the Kūrānjīes). The Kur'ān is an accident created by God; being written, recited or committed to memory, it is at the same time in various places.—In the question of the mansīla bayn al-mansīlatayn Abu '1-Hudhayl took up a position which was in conformity with the political situation of his time: he did not reject any of the combattants round 'Alī, yet preferred 'Ali to ʿUlīmān. He enjoyed the favour of al-Māyān, who often invited him to the court for theological disputes.—All the writings of Abu '1-Hudhayl are lost.

During his long life, Abu '1-Hudhayl had an enormous influence on the development of theology and he collected round him a large number of disciples of different generations. The best known amongst them is al-Nāẓrān, though he quarrelled with his master because of his destructive utterances concerning the atom; Abu '1-Hudhayl condemned him and composed several treatises against him. Among his disciples are named Yahya b. Bishr, Bighr al-Arradjānī, al-Ṣāhībānī, and others. His school continued to exist for a long time; even al-Dhubbāt still avowed his indebtedness to Abu '1-Hudhayl's
theology, in spite of the numerous points on which he differed from him. Unfortunately, the theology of Abu l-Hudhayl was exposed to the malevolence of a renegade from Mu'tazilism, the famous Ibn al-Rawandi, who, in his Tadhkira al-Mu'tasila grossly misrepresented it, by submitting it to an often too cheap criticism; this caricature has been faultily reproduced by al-Baghda'di in his Fark and often recurs in the resumes of the Mu'tazila. It is only with the help of al-Intisar, by al-Khayyati, the severest critic of Ibn al-Rawandi, that we are able to unmask the latter's procedure and gain an exact idea of the true motives of Abu l-Hudhayl's speculation. Al-As'ari, in his Makhd, reproduced his theses with admirable impartiality, after the school tradition of the Mu'tazila. Al-Shahrastani based his expose on the later Mu'tazilite tradition, especially, it seems, on al-Ka'b.


ABU 'L-HUDHAYL AL-SALLAF. — ABO INAN FARIS

Abu Hurayra, was published by M. Hasaughty, MM. 1953, 96 ff. (J. ROBSON)

ABU HUSAYN (BANU ABU HUSSAYN) Sicilian dynasty [see KALBIDS].

ABU 'INAN FARIS, eleventh sovereign of the Marinid [q.v.] dynasty of Fez, born in 729/1329, had himself proclaimed at Tlemcen in 749/1349, when his father, Abu l-Hasan 'Ali, after being defeated at Kayrawan, was returning as a fugitive to Morocco. Ibn al-Ahmar describes him as very tall, with a fair skin (his mother was a Christian slave), and says that he had a long beard. A fearless horseman, he was also widely versed in literature and the law. Like his father, he was a prince with a passion for building, and completed several of the foundations that his father had begun, in particular medersas at Fez, Meknes, and Algiers. The Bâ 'Ináníyya at Fez is the most monumental of these Maghribi colleges.

Having gained the throne by usurpation, Abu 'Inan went on to assume the caliphal title amir al-mu'minin, which his father had not borne. He made it his aim to rebuild his father's empire in Barbary and fairly quickly succeeded in doing so, but only for a few years. He seized Tlemcen from the 'Abd al-Wadid (1352) and, the same year, took possession of Bougie. In 757/1357 he occupied Constantinople and had himself proclaimed at Tunis; but, abandoned by his Arab auxiliaries, the Dawawida of the Constantine region, he was compelled to return to Fez. Not long afterwards he fell ill (757/1357) and was strangled by his vizier al-Fadlud, who had the son of his victim proclaimed, and thus inaugurated the series of palace revolutions and the long decadence of the Marinids.

ABŪ 'ĪNĀN FĀRĪS — ABU KABIR AL-HUDHALI


ABŪ 'ĪSA AL-ISFĀHĀNĪ, Jewish pretender to the title of the Messiah under the Umayyad ʿAbd al-Malik b. Marwân, or according to others under Marwân II. The most noteworthy of his doctrines was his acknowledgment of the validity—for the non-Jews—of Islam and Christianity. He was killed in a battle against the Muslims; the sect, called ʿIsawīyya, survived into the loth century A. D. (S. M. STERN).

Biography: Birûnl, al-Āḥār al-Bāḥiyya, 15; Ibn Hazm, Fīṣal, i, 114-5; Shahrastânî, 168; Makrizî, Khitaṭ, ii, 478-9 (= S. de Sacy, Chrest. arabe, i, 116); H. Grätz, Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes, v, 173 and note 17 (by A. Markavy); Encyclopædia Judaica, s.v. Abu Issa. (S. M. STERN).

ABŪ 'ĪSA MUḤAMMAD B. ḤĀRŪN AL-WARRĀK, a Muʿtazilite at first, became one of the arch-heretics in Islam: his friend and pupil, Ibn al-Rawandi, went through the same metamorphosis.

The date of Abu ʿĪsa’s death is given by al-Masʿūdī (vii, 236) as 247/861; if it is true, however, that Ibn al-Rawandi died about the end of the 3rd/9th century (see Kraus, 379), this date would seem to be too early. The issue would be decided if one could be sure that the paragraph in al-Shahrastânî, 195, where the date 271 occurs, still continues the quotation from Abû ʿĪsa.

Abû ʿĪsa was accused of Manichaean sympathies. Al-Murtaḍâ’s defence, al-Shâfî, 13, to the effect that his books al-Maghribî and al-Nawâḥ ʿalâ al-Bahḍîm were spuriously attributed to him by the Manicheans, deserves, of course, no credit. On the other hand it is not very likely that he was a formal adherent of Manicheism; most probably he was an “independent thinker” (L. Massinogn). Interesting quotations, showing his method in criticising current religious beliefs, and taken from his al-Qâhîr al-Maghribî—such is the full title also in Fīṣal, 177, and al-Tûsî, 99; a “stranger from the East” was evidently introduced as the exponent of heterodox views—are to be found in Abû Ḥâyyân al-Tawbîdî, al-Imdaḍ wa ʿl-Muḥāsasa, iii, 192.

His main work was a book on religions and sects, al-Makhâlî, which served as an important source for writers such as al-Shârî (Makhdîd al-Īṣâmiyyin, 49, 51; cf. e.g. al-Tibrizî on the Šīʿa), 33, 34—Ṣḥîḥa; cf. also index, 37), al-Masʿūdî (Mūrâdî, v, 473 ff.—Zaydiyya), al-Baghdâdî (Farkh, 49, 51), al-Birûnl (al-Āḥār al-Bāḥiyya, 277, 284—Jewish sects, Samaritans), Abu ʿl-Maʿâlî (Bayān al-Adyān (Eghbal), 10—religion of the pagan Arabs; as the editor points out, 54 ff., similar passages are to be found in Ibn Abî ʿl-Hadîd, Sharḥ Nâḥâj al-Bâlāqâša, i, 39, iv, 437; Ibn Abî ʿl-Hadîd quotes Abû ʿĪsa in other passages also), al-Shahrastânî, (141, 143—Ṣḥîḥa; 192—Mazdak; 188—Mâna). Abû ʿĪsa’s Muʿtazilite adversaries insinuated that he was too eager to reproduce in his book the arguments of the Manicheans.

Abû ʿĪsa wrote books favourable to the Šīʿa (al-Imâma; al-Sâkhīf, quoted by al-Mufîd, cf. Eghbal, Khânânâ-d-i Nawbâkhtî, 86)—hence the partiality of Šīʿite authors for him.

His critical examination of the three branches of Christianity (Orthodox, Jacobite, Nestorian) survives in the refutation by Yahyâ b. ʿAdî (cf. A. Perier, Yahya ben ʿAdî, 67, 150 ff.; L. Massinogn, Textes inédits concernant l’Histoire de la mystique, 182-5; A. Abel, Abû ʿĪsa al-Warrâq, Brusel 1949).


ABŪ ISHĀK AL-ILBĪRĪ, Ibâšmî b. Masʿūd b. Sâ’dî al-Tujâdl, Andalusian jurist and poet, native, as shown by his nisba, of Ibbira (Elvira), which in the century of the mulâk al-tawâlîl lost its position to the neighbouring Granada. Little is known of his life. Born in the last years of the 4th/10th century, he was, during the reign of the Zirid king of Granada, Bâdî b. Ḥâbuṣ, secretary of the hâdî ʿAli b. Muḥ. b. Tawbâ and at the same time was occupied in teaching. In his poems he protested against the increasing influence of the Jews in the kingdom of Granada and especially against the functions, too important in his eyes, entrusted to the famous vizier Samuel ha-Nagîd Ibn Nagrella, and to his son Joseph, who succeeded him in this office in 448/1056-7. It was no doubt at the latter’s instigation that Bâdî assigned to the fâkîh a forced residence in the râbiqa of al-ʿUkhâb, in the Sierra de Elvira. Abû Ishâk, however, did not give way, and the celebrated political poem, to which he owes most of his reputation, was, if not the determining cause, at least one of the factors which brought about the well-known pogrom in Granada, on 9 Safar 459/30 Dec. 1066, during which Joseph b. Nagrella and 3000 of his coréligionists were murdered. Abû Ishâk al-Ilbîrî died shortly afterwards, at the end of the same year of 459/1067.

In addition to his fulminating poem, to which attention was long ago drawn by Dozy, Abû Ishâk left a collection of poems, which are in the majority of ascetic inspiration and which he apparently composed at an advanced age. This dīwaʿ, of which a MS has been preserved in the Escorial (no. 404), has been published by the author of this article, with an introduction. It is very characteristic of the limited poetical faculties of an Andalusian fâkîh of medium culture, who rises to eloquence only when expressing his intolerant fanaticism.


ABŪ ISHĀK [see al-Šâbihî and al-Šīrâzī].

ABŪ KABIR AL-HUDHALI, an early Arab poet, after Abû Ḫuqu’ayb the second greatest poet of the tribe of Hudhayl. He belonged to the Banû Sa’d, or, according to some, to the Banu Dhu’ayrab. His real name was ʿAmîr (or ʿUwaymir) b. al-Hulays (also without the article), according to other statements, ʿAmîr b. Ḫámrâ, but he was always known by his hânya. According to some commentators (cf. e.g. al-Tibrîzî in the Ḥamâsa), Abû Kabir married the mother of the famous ʿAbd al-ʿAbbâs b. ʿHâri (El), as the stepson was displeased at this union Abû Kabîr is said to have been advised by the mother of Taḥabbâs b. ʿHâri to kill him at the first opportunity, but failed on account of the latter’s bravery. This
story can hardly be true but is rather an attempt to explain the well known lines of Abu Kalamun as a name for the chameleon (though, according to the "Burānī-i Ḍāḥif", the word has this meaning in Persian). The proverb: "more changeable than Abu Kalamun", or: "than Abu Barakish" (e.g. Freytag), Proverbs, i, 409; Hamadhānī, Makāmah, Beyrouth 1924, 86; Ibn Ḥazm, Tawd, 69, cf. And., 1950, 353), could refer to the chameleon or to a bird of changing colours which is also called Abu Barakish (cf. Kazwini, ed. Wüstenfeld, i, 406). Further, according to Muhammad, 240 i (ed. and tran. by Allah, 53 and no. 143), Abu Kalamun denotes a mollusc (pinna), the byssus or "beard" of which is used in the manufacture of a sheeny cloth, which is also known as ṣaf al-bahr (cf. Dozy, Suppl., s.v.). P. Kraus, Jābir ibn Ḥayyān, ii, 110 refers to the use of ẓayyālqaw as a term for the philosophers' stone in ancient alchemy (cf. Lippmann, Entstehung... Alchemie, i, 298). This usage explains why Ḍāḥif gave one of his books, in which he treats of the various colours of the seven metals (ādīsād), the title Kūbā Abū Kalamān (P. Kraus, op. cit., i, 24; cf. Ruska, in Isl., 1925, 102 n.).

**Bibliography:** In addition to the references given in the text: Ḣūṭārī, 42; G. Jacob, Studien in arab. Geogr., ii, 61; and the references given by P. Kraus, Jābir ibn Ḥayyān, ii, 109, no. 4.

**ABŪ KALB [see SIKKA].**

**ABŪ KĀLĪDJĀR ABU-MARZUBĀN B. SULTĀN AL-DAWLĀ, a prince of the Buwayhid [q.v.] dynasty, born in al-BAṣra in Shawwāl 399/May-June 1009. When in 412/1021 Muḥarrif al-Dawlā's Daylamite troops murdered his wazīr at al-Ahwāz and declared for his brother Sultan al-Dawla [q.v.], the latter, whom Muḥarrif had supplanted as ruler of al-Īrāq in the previous year, took heart and sent them his son Abū Kālīdjār, though then only a boy of twelve, to take over the city in his name. In the following year Muḥarrif and Sultan made peace, Muḥarrif retaining al-Īrāq and Sultan regaining Fārs and Khūzistān; but in Shawwāl 415/December 1023-January 1024 Sultan died, on which the control of those provinces was for the next two years disputed between Abū Kālīdjār (who was even then no more than sixteen) and another of his uncles Abū 'l-Fawāris, the ruler of Kirmān. Abū Kālīdjār emerged victorious from this struggle, but then failed in an attempt to dislodge Abū 'l-Fawāris also from Kirmān; so that when they made peace in 418/1027 he was obliged to pay Abū 'l-Fawāris a yearly tribute of 20,000 dinār.

Meanwhile these preoccupations had prevented Abū Kālīdjār from accepting the invitation of the Baghdād garrison to replace yet a third uncle, Djalāl al-Dawla [q.v.], as Amīr al-Umarā', on the latter's failure to appear in the capital after the death, in Rabī' II 416/June 1025, of Muḥarrif al-Dawla. Abū Kālīdjār was nevertheless acknowledged in the khwāṭa at Baghdād for some eighteen months (from Shawwāl 416/Dec. 1025 to Dhu al-Ḫadādhi 1488/June-July 1027); in 417/1026 he was likewise acknowledged in the khwāṭa at al-Kūfā; and in the following year he was able to send his wazīr, Ibn Bābshāhīd, to assert his authority over the Euphrates marshes, though the only result of this move was a rebellion of their inhabitants against the wazīr's extortion. In 419/1028 Abū Kālīdjār added both al-BAṣra and Kirmān to the area under his control, the former by a timely intervention in a conflict between the Daylamites and Turks of Djalāl's garrison, and the latter by the death of Abū
During his ensuing four years’ reign Abû Kâlidjar was chiefly concerned to preserve his power against Sâlûqûd enroachment. This had already caused him to begin wailing his capital, Shirâz, for the first time, and in 437/1045-6 only the outbreak of disease among his horses prevented him from challenging a Sâlûqûd advance into the south-western Dijâbl. Two years later, however, he decided instead to ally himself with the Sâlûqûd; and, Tughrûl [q.v.] proving amenable, an alliance was sealed by Tughrûl’s marriage with Abu Kâlidjar’s daughter and the marriage of Abu Kâlidjar’s second son to Tughrûl’s niece. This alliance preserved his dominions in the west from further Sâlûqûd attacks; but in 440/1048, a Sâlûqûd force again invaded Kirmân, where, instead of being opposed, it was joined by Abû Kâlidjar’s governor. He therefore set out to vindicate his authority in person, but suddenly died before reaching his destination (Dirumâd I 440/ October 1048).

Abû Kâlidjar left at least nine sons, the eldest of whom, entitled al-Malik al-Râhil [q.v.], succeeded him as Amir al-Umar, the last of the dynasty to rule in Beghûd and al-Irk, and the second of whom, Fûlûd-Sûtûn, succeeded him as ruler of Fârs until murdered by a rebel in 454/1062.

In 439, while in Shirâz, Abû Kâlidjar, in common with many of his Daylamite troops, was converted to Ismâ’îlism by the Fatimid dâdi al-Mu’âyyad fi l-Dîn [q.v.]. Some four years later, in order to maintain good relations with the ‘Abbâsâd al-Kâ’îm he was obliged to banish the dâdi from his dominions; but it would appear from the account of these events in the latter’s Sîra (ed. Kâmil Husayn, Cairo 1949, 77) that he remained personally devoted to the Fâtimid cause. A reference to Abû Kâlidjar’s dealings with al-Mu’âyyad is made also by Ibn al-Bâkîhi in his Fârîn-nâmâ.

c. 1460) who translated also Abu Kamil’s treatise on algebra (Munich 225, 3). As assumed by G. Sacerdote, Il trattato del pentagono e del decagono di Abu Kamil, in Festschrift Steinschneider, Leipzig 1896, 169-94, and proved by Suter, Die Abhandlung des Abü Kamil Shudja b. Aslam “über das Fünfzick und Zehneck”, Bibl. Math. 1909-10, 15-42, these translations were made not from Arabic or Latin, but from Spanish. According to Suter, it is probable that the Muslim MS 1927 A, no. 6, is a Latin version of al-Tarā’if. (The same MS contains Latin versions of Abū Kamil’s algebra and of his treatises on the pentagon and decagon).—Indeterminate equations with integral solutions appear in India fully developed about 1150 in Bhāskara’s Vijaganita (cf. Colebrooke, Algebra with arithmetic and mensuration, London 1817, 233-5), but the problem is referred to already by Āryabhaṭa (b. 476), who even anticipates for its solution the method of continued fractions, to which Bhāskara applies the term kuṭaka “dispersion” (cf. M. Cantor, Gesch. d. Math., 1, 588 ff.) Abu Kāmil’s procedure is less systematic and therefore inferior to the Indian. He finds his solutions mainly by way of trial, yet shows considerable skill in overcoming the difficulties involved. It is hard to decide whether or not he knew the kuṭaka method. However that may be, it is certain that the anonymous author of a commentary on al-Tarā’if, of which the Leiden MS contains a fragment (fol. 101-2), was familiar with it, because he clearly refers to the proof of a method of finding integral solutions that can hardly have been different from the kuṭaka method.

The connection between Abu Kāmil and the Indians is shown by a curious detail: they resort to the same, or at least similar, varieties of birds as examples in their problems. In Europe, we meet with indeterminate equations in Leonard of Pisa’s Liber abaci (1202; Scritti, ed. Boncompagni, Roma 1857-62, i)—again with reference to birds. The first appearance in Europe of this problem seems to be marked by a MS composed about 1000 A.D. in the monastery of Reichenau. Later European algebraists, in particular the German “Cossists” (Adam Riese, etc.) usually substitute men, women, or virgins for the birds, and therefore the term “regula virginiun” (or “r. potatorum”, “r. coeci” or “r. coeli”) was adopted by them to denote this kind of problem (cf. Bibl. Math., 1905, 112).

Abu Kāmil’s “Algebra” is known only in Latin (MS Paris 7377 A, fol. 71v-93v) and Hebrew (Paris 1029, 7 and Munich 225, 5) translations. The two MSS of the Arabic original noted by Brockelmann have not yet been examined. It is above all upon this work that his fame rested. It was commented by al-Iṣṭakhrī and al-Imrānī, but both commentaries led on by his philological inclinations, have inter-...
ABU ‘L-KHATTĀB MUHAMMAD B. ABI ZAYNAB MIKLAS AL-AGIDA AL-ASADI, Muslim heresiarch.

According to al-Kashshi, his father was Miklas b. ‘Abi ‘l-Khattāb, and he himself used the kunyas ‘Abi Ismā‘īl and Abu ‘l-Zubayr. He was a Kūfī and a mawālī of the tribe of Asad. In the Nusayri writings he is also called al-Kāhilī. He was one of the chief dā‘īs of the Imām Dja‘far al-Ṣādiq, but fell into error and taught false doctrines, as a result of which he was repudiated and denounced by the Imām. Seventy of his followers, assembled in the mosque of Kūf, were attacked by order of the governor ʿĪsā b. Mūsā, and after a bitter struggle, were killed.

Abu ‘l-Khattāb himself was arrested and brought before ʿĪsā b. Mūsā, who had him executed and crucified at Dār al-Riżq, on the Euphrates, together with a number of his followers. Their heads were sent to the Caliph al-Manṣūr and impaled by the gate of Baghdad for three days. The date of these events is not precisely known, but a conversation recorded by al-Kashshi as having taken place in 138/755 appears to refer to the externalization of Abu ‘l-Khattāb and his followers (fa‘nabaja‘at ilāhārum wa-faniyat al-dīdāhum: al-Kashshi 191; cf. Lewis, 33; Ivanow, however (p. 117) interprets this tradition as referring to the repudiation of Abu ‘l-Khattāb by Dja‘far al-Ṣādiq).

According to the Nusayris, who still regard Abu ‘l-Khattāb, ‘he manifested the daw‘a at Dār al-Riżq on 10 or 12 Muḥarram, and both this and the day of his ‘appointment’ by Dja‘far al-Ṣādiq (11 Dhu ‘l-Hiḍḍa) are sacred anniversaries. He seems to have played a role of some importance in the early development of extremist Shi‘ite doctrine, and is named by the Central Asian Imami book Umm al-Khitāb (Ist., 1936, pts. 1 and 2; cf. W. Ivanow, REI, 1932, 428-9), as well as by a number of Sunni and Iḥnā‘-asharī sources, as a founder of the Iḥnā‘ī faith. He is however condemned in later Iḥnā‘ī writings of the Fāṭimid period, in much the same terms as in the books of the Iḥnā‘-asharīyya. For a discussion of his doctrines see Ihtittihya.


ABU ‘L-KHATTĀB AL-KALWADDĀNĪ [see “ABU‘L-KHATTĀB AL-KALWADDĀNĪ.”

ABU ‘L-KHATTĀB ‘ABD AL-‘ALĀ B. AL-SAMH AL-MA‘ĀFĪRĪ AL-‘IMHARĪ AL-YAMANI, governor of al-Andalus, who arrived in that country from Irkīya in 1257/743, to replace the wāli Thā‘ab b. Salāma al-‘Umīl. He carried out a liberal policy, and skilfully removed from Cordova the representatives of the Syrian djundīs, who had come to Spain under the leadership of Bādi b. Bishr [q.v.]. On the advice of Count Ardabast (Arτābās), son of the Visigothic prince Witia, he settled these djundīs on fiefs, requiring from them in return that they should respond to mobilization appeals that might arise in the west, he allowed them to disband. When Abu‘l-Khattāb shortly afterwards reached the neighbourhood of Tripoli, the imām hastily assembled the nearest tribes to check his advance. The battle took place at Tāwurgha (on the coast, a few days’ journey to the east of Tripoli) in Sa‘ar 144/May-June 761. It was very bloody: Abu‘l-Khattāb with twelve or fourteen thousand of his followers were killed. In Dju‘nādā l’August, Ibn al-‘Ash‘ath reoccupied al-Kayrawān.
ABU 'L-KHAṬṭĀR — ABU 'L-KHAYR AL-ISHBĪLī

Sidona, those of the ḍīnawd of Ḥimṣ (Emesa) in the district of Seville and Niebla, those of the ḍīnawd of Kinnasrin in the district of Jaén, and those of the ḍīnawd of Egypt in the Algarve and in the region of Murcia (Tudmir). A little later Abu 'l-Khaṭṭār entered into conflict with a powerful chief of the ḍīnawd of Kinnasrin, al-Sumayî [q.v.] b. Ḥātim al-Kilibī, who mustered troops and defeated the governor in Radjab 127/4 April 745 on the Guadalete. In vain did Abu 'l-Khaṭṭār afterwards attempt to regain his office; it was seized by the Djiḏūḥmite chief Thawābā b. Salāma, who himself died the next year.

**Bibliography:** E. Lévi-Provençal, *Hist. Esp. mus.*, i, 48-50. (E. Lévi-Provençal)

ABU 'L-KHAYR, ruler of the Ozbegs [see uzbek] and founder of the power of this nation, descendant of Ṣhābān, Djiḏū's youngest son [see muṣābit], born in the year of the dragon (1422; as the year of the hijra 876/1434-35 is erroneously given). At first he is said to have been in the service of another descendant of Ṣhābān, Djiamaḍūk Khān. The latter met his death in a revolt; Abu 'l-Khayr was taken prisoner, but was released and shortly after proclaimed khān in the territory of Tura (Siberia) at the age of 17 (year of the aṭ-qaʿa, as year of the hijra 833/1429-30 is given). After a victory won over another khān of the family of Djiḏū the greater part of Kipāḵā submitted to him. In 834/1430-1 he conquered Khbāzām with his capital Urgandi, which was plundered, but soon afterwards he gave it back. According to his biographers, Abu 'l-Khayr later vanquished two more princes, Maḥmūd Khān and Ahmad Khān, conquered the city of Urdū-Bāzār, and seized (though for a short time only) the "throne of Ṣūyūn Khān", i.e. that of Batu. Shortly before the death of Sultan Shahrūkh (850/1447) Abu 'l-Khayr established himself firmly through the subjugation of the fortresses of Sīghan (at present the ruins of Sunak-Kurgan), Arkūk, Sūzaḵ, Āḵ-Kurgan and Uskand or the Šīr Dāryā—the most significant event in his reign for the further history of the Ozbegs. Sīghan seems to have been his capital from that time. South of this region formidable conquests were made under Abu 'l-Khayr; even the neighbouring town of Yasī (now Turkistan) remained in the power of the Timūrids. Marauding expeditions were frequently undertaken, even as far afield as Buḥbūrā and Samarqand. Abu 'l-Khayr appeared with greater forces in 855/1451-2 as an ally of the prince Abū Saʿīd against the then ruler of Samarqand 'Abd Allāh; with his aid 'Abd Allāh was defeated and killed and Abū Saʿīd was installed as ruler in Samarqand; Rābiʿa Sūltān Bēgūm, daughter of Ulugh Beg, was given in marriage to Abu 'l-Khayr. A second attempt to interfere in the disputes of the Timūrids fell out less happily; Muḥammad Djiḏū, favored by Abu 'l-Khayr against Abū Saʿīd, was forced in 865/1460-1 after some successes to raise the siege of Samarqand at the approach of his enemy, to quit the country ravaged by Abu 'l-Khayr's auxiliary troops (under Burke Sūltān) and in 866/1463—having, it seems, received no assistance from Abu 'l-Khayr—to surrender to his adversary. Shortly before, probably about 861/1456-7 (Abu 'l-Khayr's grandson, Maḥmūd, born in 858/1454, is said to have been then three years old), Abu 'l-Khayr's power received a severe blow from the Kalmāk (Kalmucks); beaten in the open field, he had to flee to Sīghan and let the enemy ravage the whole country up to the Sr. About 870/1465-6 there appears to have taken place among the Ozbegs that split, through which the proper inhabitants of the steppes, since called Kazak, separated from the other portion of the nation. The year of the rat (1488; erroneously identified with 874/1469-70) is given as the year of Abu 'l-Khayr's death; the power founded by him was after a short interruption restored and extended by his grandson Muhammad Shaybānī.

**Bibliography:** Abu 'l-Khayr's biography was written towards 950/1543-4 by Masʿud b. ʿUṯmān al-Kuḫistānī (Ṭawārīḵ-i Abu 'l-Khayr Khan); the statements in Howorth, *Hist. of the Mongols*, ii, 687, are correct only so far as concerns the MS. of the British Museum, but not the work itself; cf. Rieu, *Cat. of Pers. MSS.*, i, 102; the Leningrad MSS, including that of the University Library or. 852, used here, have also the beginning of the biography. Masʿud was also able to utilize the oral narratives of Abu 'l-Khayr's son Sūyūn Khān (d. 931/1525), who seems to have drawn his information from written sources, as for example the Maṭlaʾ al-Sādāyān of ʿAbd al-Razzāk al-Samarkandī. Information about Abu 'l-Khayr is also to be found in the historical works on his grandson Shaybānī and his successors, especially in the Taḳdīrāt-i Nūrāt Nūmā (cf. Rieu, *Cat. of Turkish MSS.*, 276 ff.) and the writings dependent on it. (W. Barthold)

ABU 'L-KHAYR AL-ISHBĪLī, surnamed al-Shaṭḏḏaḏ, "the arboriculturist", author of a book on agriculture, was a native of Seville (Ishbiliya). Neither the date of his birth or that of his death are known, and one can only say that as he is quoted by Ibn al-ʿAwwām [q.v.], who lived in the second half of the 6th/12th century, he must have belonged to an earlier period. He was probably the contemporary of the botanist-physicians and "gardener" of the 5th/11th century, such as Ibn Wafīd al-Lakhmī, Ibn Bāṣāl, Ibn Ḥaḍḏīḏḏī al-Iṣbīlī and al-Tighrānī. His *K. al-Fīlāhā* is preserved in MSS in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, in the Zaytūnā mosque in Tunis and some private libraries in North Africa.

The following are the main contents of Abu 'l-Khayr's book. (i) General considerations on planting (*gharāsā*): favourable months; influence of the moon; the time needed for plants to grow and to yield fruit; age of trees; damage (weather, animals, fire, water); special treatment of olive-trees, vines, fig-trees, palm-trees, (ii) Plantations proper: trees, bushes, grain, seeds; layering, pruning, grafting; fruit and vegetable conserves; growing of vegetables; aromatic plants, flowers; flax and cotton; banana and sugar-cane. (iii) Animals: of the back-yard, especially pigeons; bees and wild animals; harmful animals (reptiles, rodents and insects). (iv) Finally two pages on the *nāḏārīb al-ʿām*, i.e. meteorological or astrological prognostications.

Abu 'l-Khayr appeals to his personal experience and observations in the gardens, parks, fields, vineyards and forests of the Aljaraf (al-Sharaf, district of Seville). His literary documentation consists in quoting, no doubt at second hand, the *K. al-Nabāt* of Abū Ḥanīfa al-Dinawarī (which had been expounded in 60 vols. by Ibn Ukhṭ Ghanī—cf. Makkar, *Anelectes*, ii, 270); Aristotle, Anatolius, "Kastūs" (Cassianus Bassus Scholasticus), Philemo—through adaptations of the Geopomicon and through the *Filāhā al-Nabāṭīyya* of Ibn Wāḥshīyya [q.v.]. (For this agronomical literature see *Filāhā*.) On the whole, the book is an empirical work of technical science, but, like the agronomical literature in general, is not without its popular and superstitious
side, and formulas for amulets and descriptions of talismans are given.


(H. Perès)

**ABŪ KHIRĀSH** Khuwaylid b. Murra al-Hudhaïl, muhāqad Arāb poet, who was converted to Islam and died under the caliphate of ’Umar, from the bite of a snake while he was drawing water for Yamanite pilgrims (who were then required to pay his dniq). Abu Khirāsh is counted among the pre-Islamic warriors who could run faster than horses, sharing this distinction with his nine brothers Abū Djiyandab, ’Urwā, al-Abābī, al-Aswad, Abu ’l-Aswad, ’Amr, Zuhayr, Diijānad and Suwayf, who also were poets of rank.


(CH. PELLAT)

**ABŪ KUBAYS,** a sacred hill on the eastern edge of Mecca. Rising abruptly from the valley floor, it overlooks the Great Mosque a few hundred meters away. The Ka‘ba corner containing the Black Stone points towards the hill, at the foot of which is *al-Safâ*, the southern end of al-Masâ‘. Buildings now hem the hill in on nearly every side. Muslim tradition holds that this was the first mountain created by God. Adam and other ancients are sometimes said to be buried there. The hill’s older name was al-Amin, given because the Black Stone was kept safe there during Noah’s Flood. Various stories explain the origin of the name Abū Kubays (Yākūt, s.v.; al-Azraqī, 477-8, inclines towards the version identifying Abū Kubays as a man of Yāyd, the first to build on the hill. Diabl Abū Kubays and al-Abmar on the western side of the valley were together called al-Akhsabān (the Two Rough Ones); a *hadīth* says that Mecca will last as long as these two. According to popular tradition, the Prophet was standing on Abū Kubays when the moon was rent in twain (Kur., liv, 1). The Ka‘ba was destroyed in 64/683-4 by shots from a *mandjantik* fixed on Abū Kubays, and in medieval times a castle crowned the hill; no fortifications now remain there. The first *zāma* of the Sanūf order was built on Abū Kubays c. 1252-3/1837, and in Snouck Hurgronje’s time a large Nakḥbandî establishment also stood on the slopes (Mecca, ii, 285).

For bibliography, see *Makka.* (G. RENTZ)

**ABŪ KURRA** Theodore, Melkite Bishop of Harrān, said to be the first Christian writer of importance to produce works in the Arabic language. He was born at Edessa c. 740 and must have died c. 820. He refers to himself in his writings as a disciple of John of Damascus (d. 749), but though he studied as a youth in the monastery of St. Saba in Palestine, he can hardly have been a student under the Damascene. Like that of John, however, his name is associated with the early stages of Christian apologetics against Islam, and with that Christian learning which played so large a part in moulding the development of Islamic theology. He wrote in his native Syriac, in Greek and in Arabic. His writings are for the most part polemical in nature, which may be explained by the fact that in his days the city of Harrān was a centre of vigorous intellectual life in which pagans and Manichees, Jews, Muslims and Christians of orthodox and of non-orthodox persuasion all shared. In his extant treatises he defends his orthodox faith against the teachings of all these opposing traditions. His Greek tractates have been edited in Migone, *Pair. Gr.*, xevii, and the Arabic by Constantine Bacha, *Oeuvres arabes de Théodore Abooucara, évêque de Haran*, Beyrouth, n.d., though there is some doubt as to the authenticity of certain tractates included in each of these collections (see Peeters, in *Acta Bollandiana*, 1930, 94, and H. Beck, in *Orientalia christianana analecta*, 1937, 40-3).


**ABŪ LAHAB,** son of ’Abd al-Muṭṭalib and Lubāna bint Ḥādji[r of Khuzâ‘a], and half-brother of Muḥammad’s father. His name was ’Abd al-’Uzza and his *hunya* Abū Ḥutba; Abū Lahab (literally “father of the flame”) was a nickname given by his father on account of his beauty. At one time, doubtless before Muḥammad’s preaching had roused opposition, he was friendly with his nephew, for his sons ’Uṭba and Ḥutba were married (or perhaps only betrothed) to Muḥammad’s daughters Ruṣayyaa and Um’m Kūlqum respectively. During the boycott of Ḥādji[r and al-Muṭṭalib by the other clans Abū Lahab dissociated himself from Ḥādji[r, probably because through his wife, a daughter of Ḥādji[r, Um’mayya, he was connected with Abū Shams. On the death of Abū Tālib, shortly after the end of the boycott, Abū Lahab became head of the clan and at first promised to protect Muḥammad, presumably for the sake of the honour of the clan. He withdrew his protection, however, when Abū Ĕahl and Ḥutba b. Abū Muqṭay managed to convince him that Muhammad had spoken disrespectfully of deceased ancestors like ’Abd al-Muṭṭalib and said they were destined for Hell. This loss of protection probably led to Muḥammad’s attempt to settle in al-Ṭālîb; when it proved vain, Muḥammad,
before entering Mecca again, had to obtain the ḍiyār of the head of another clan. This hostile conduct was doubtless the occasion of Sūra exi which, with a play on the name, consigns Abū Lahab and his wife to the flames of Hell. He died shortly after the battle of Badr to which he is said to have sent in his place a man who owed him money. There is a long story about his reaction to the news of this defeat. His sons 'Utba and Muḥammad became Muslims in 8/630, and 'Uthma's grandson, al-Ŷaḏl b. al-Abbās, was known as a poet (Abūlāhān, xv, 2-11).


Abū 'l-Layth al-Samarkandi, Naṣr b. Muḥ. b. Ahmad b. Ibrāhīm, known as 'Imām al-Ḥudā, a Ḥanafī theologian and jurisconsult of the 4th/10th century. The date of his death is variously given as between 373/983-4 and 393/1002-3. He must not be confused with his slightly older contemporary al-Ḥājīṣ al-Samarkandi, whose name was also Abū 'l-Layth Naṣr. The oldest known bibliographical source, 'Abī a-ṣ-Ṣādir (d. 275/1373), attributes to this latter person some of the main works that generally under the name of the 'Imām al-Ḥudā, but this seems to be a mistake.

Abū 'l-Layth was a very successful author in several fields of the Islamic sciences, and his books have become popular from Morocco to Indonesia. His main works are: (1) a Tafsīr, printed Cairo 1310/1892-3; this was translated into old Ottoman Turkish by Ibn 'Arābghā (d. 854/1450-1), and Ibn 'Arābghā's work was expanded by Abū 'l-Ŷaḏl Mūsā al-Īnāqī, a contemporary, under the title Anfas al-Dīwāhār; manuscripts of these Turkish editions are among the oldest dated Ottoman Turkish manuscripts; (2) Khisānat al-Fīḥḥ, a handbook of Ḥanafī law; (3) Muḥājīf 'l-Risāya, on the divergent doctrines of the ancient Ḥanafī authorities, in three editions; (4) al-Mubaddāma fī 'l-Salāḥ, on the duty of ritual prayer, with many commentaries; (5) Tanbih al-Ṣāḥīḥīn and (6) Bustān al-Ārifīn, both on ethics and piety, often printed; (7) an 'Abīda, in the form of question and answer (ed. A. W. T. Juynboll, BTLV 1081, 215 ff., 267 ff.), with a commentary by Muhammad b. 'Umar al-Nawāwī (d. after 1305/1888), under the title Kafir al-Ghayth (Broekelmann, S II, 814; C. H. Becker, Isl., 1911, 23), often printed, also Malay and Javanese interlinear translations. This 'Abīda is authentic (against Juynboll, i. c., and F. Kern, ZA 1912, 170) and represents a popular, Ḥanafī current of theological thought (Schacht, in Studia Islamica, i).


Abū 'l-Maʿalī Muḥammad b. 'Ubayd Allāh, Persian writer. His sixth ancestor was Husayn al-Asghar, traditionist and son of the Īmām Zayn al-Ŷabīn. His family lived for a long time in Balkh. He was a contemporary of Nasir-i Khusrūw, whom he may have known and about whom he gives us the earliest information available.

From two passages of his only work Ch. Schefer assumed that he was at the court of the Ghurid sultan Masʿūd III when he composed his Bayān al-Aḏwān, dated 485/1092, the earliest known work on religions in the Persian language. The first two chapters are devoted to religions before Islam and to some heresies; the third and fourth to the exposition of the Sunni and Shī'ite doctrines and to the Islamic sects (especially Ismāʿīlīsm); the fifth chapter, dealing with the Jews (which may, therefore, have been of importance) is lost. He mentions his main sources. His work has not the bulk of the Tābiʿīrat al-ʿĀsalm of Sharīf Murtadā (second half of 12th century), but it commends itself by its clear precision and by the sober vigour of its style. It is among the best of the rare prose works in Persian from the Ghurid period. Editions by Ch. Schefer (Christiömтicae persanae, i, 131-71) and Abbas Iqbal, Tehran 1324 (detailed genealogy of Abū 'l-Maʿalī in the introduction); transl. H. Massé, RHR, 1926, 17-75. (H. Massé)

Abū 'l-Maʿalī ʿAbd al-Malik [see Abu Dukayn].

Abū Madyan, Shusayb b. al-Ḥusayn al-Andalusi, famous Andalusian mystic, born about 520/1126 at Cañillana, a little town about 20 miles NNE of Seville. Sprung from a very modest family, he learnt the trade of weaver, but, impelled by an irresistible taste for knowledge, he learnt the Qurʾān and, as soon as he was able, went to North Africa to complete his education. At Fez he was the disciple of renowned masters, who owed, however, their fame less to their theological learning than to their piety and their ascetic lives—men such as Abū Yaʿṣūf al-Hāzinārī, Allāh b. Ḥizbān, and Abd al-Ḍuqkānī. This last invested him with the khirba, the robe which bore witness to his vocation of ṣūfī; but his real initiator into the theories of mysticism seems to have been Abū Yaʿṣūf al-Hāzinārī. With the permission of this master, he left for the Orient. There he succeeded in absorbing the tradition of al-Ghazālī and of the great mystics. At Mecca he may have encountered the famous ʿAbd al-Kādir al-Gilānī (d. 561/1166). He returned to the Maghrib, and settled at Biqāya (Bougie), where he became known for his teaching and his exemplary life. His fame reached the ears of the Muʿminid ruler Abū Yūsuf Yaʿṣūf al-Mansūr, who summoned him to the court at Marrākuṣh, no doubt apprehensive about such religious pretexts outside the Almohad sect. When within sight of Tīlīmsān (Tlemcen) Abū Madyan was taken ill and died (594/1197). Following his expressed wish he was buried at al-ʿUbābā, a village on the outskirts of Tlemcen, which was apparently already frequented by ascetics, but which, as his burial-place, was to become especially venerable.

The place which he occupies amongst the most important figures in western Islam is not due, strictly speaking, to his writings; at least, his only surviving writings are "a few mystical poems, a wasiyat (testament), and an ʿabīda (creed)" (A. Bel). It is because of the memory of him handed down by his disciples, and the maxims attributed to him, that he has been considered worthy to be regarded as a ṣūfī (pole), a ṣūfī (supreme succour), and a wall (friend of God). The maxims proclaim the excellence of the ascetic life, of renunciation of this world's goods, of humility, and of absolute confidence in God. He used to say: "Action accompanied by pride profits no man; idleness accompanied by humility harms no man. He who renounces
calculation and choice lives a better life”. He often repeated this line: “Say: Allah! and abandon all that is material or has to do with the material, if thou desiriest to attain the true goal”. Actually there is nothing original in his conception of sufism, but the success of his doctrine and its long-continued influence can be explained by its conciliation of various tendencies and by the type of society which he had undergone. With him the moderate sufism that Ghazali had already, a century earlier, received it. “His great merit and his great success is nothing original in his conception of sufism, but the use of a privileged elite, is now adapted to the mentality of the North African believer, whether man of the people or literate... Abū Madyan... gave once and for all the keynote for North African mysticism” (R. Brunschvig).

The books of hagiography attribute miracles to him, and Tlemcen, where he died, adopted him as patron. His tomb, which became the centre of a fine architectural complex (mosque of al-ʿUbbād 737/1339, madrasa 747/1347, little palace, hammam) mainly built by the Marinid sultan of Fez Abu ʿl-Ḥasan, ruler of Tlemcen, is still a place of pilgrimage for the country people of the province of Oran and eastern Morocco.


ABU 'L-MAHĀSIN DIYĀM AL-DIN YÚSUF B. TĀGHİRIBĀDI, Arabic historian, born at Cairo, probably in 812/1409-10 (exact date doubtful). His father was a mamlūk from Asia Minor (Rūm) bought and promoted by Sultan al-Zahir Barkūk; under Sultan al-Nāṣir Farāju he became commander in chief of the Egyptian armies (amīr ḥārī, al-bāḥk) in 810/1407, and in 813 viceroy (amīr kabīr, at-dabak) in chief of the Egyptian armies bought and promoted by Sultan al-Zahir Barkūk; he made the pilgrimage to Mecca in 826/1423, in 836/1432 he took an active part in the Syrian campaign of Sultan Barsbāy, with whom he was on intimate terms (as he was with later sultans), and turned to the writing of history after he had heard al-ʿAynī’s works read to that sultan.

One of his first important works was al-Manhāl al-Sāfī wa ‘l-Mustawfi baʾd al-Wāfī, biographies of the sultans and important amirs and scholars from 650/1251 to 855/1451, but with some additions as late as 862/1458; an annotated résumé was published by G. Wiet in MIE, 1932, 2-4.8. Next came al-Nudjām al-Zaḳī al-Mulāk Miṣr wa ‘l-Kāhira, a history of Egypt from 20/641 to his own times, and continuing also the biographical series of the Mankal. It was written, he says, for himself and his friends, especially Sultan Dījakmāk’s son Mūḥammad, and at first went only to the end of Dījakmāk’s reign, Mubarram 857/Jan. 1453. Later he continued it to 872/1467 (see below). Editions: Abū ʿl-Mahāsīn ibn Taghrī Birdī’s Annals, from 20/641 to 365/976, ed. Juyboll and Matthes, 2 vols., Leiden 1855-56; Abū ʿl-Māḥāsīn ibn Taḡhrī Birdī’s Annals, from 366/977 to 566/1171 and from 746/1345 to 872/1467, ed. W. Popper (Univ. of California Publ. in Semitic Philology, ii, iii part I, v, vi, xii). Berkeley 1909-29; al-Nudjām al-Zaḳī al-Mulāk wa ‘l-Kāhira, from 20/641 to 799/1397, Cairo 1348/1929 ff. (Dār al-Kutub al-Misriyya, al-Kām al-Asābī).


Two other extensive historical works, not mentioned by him or his biographers, are ascribed to him: Nuzhat al-Raʾy, from 20/641 to 365/976, ed. W. Popper (Berkeley 1909-29); Waliyaʾl-Saltana waʾl-fithilfa, ed. with Latin translation by J. E. Carlyle, Cambridge 1798.

He wrote also several condensations or extracts from his main works: al-Dalʿī al-Shāfiʾi alaʾl-Manḥal al-Sāfī; Ṭabbūl al-Wustārī; ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Ṭahābī ʿl-Idāhāra (supplement to al-Dhahabī’s Ishārāt); al-Kawākh al-Bāḥrī; Manāṣir al-Lajīfī fi ʿl-Dirr man Walīyaʾl-Saltana waʾl-Khālīfa, ed. with Latin translation by J. E. Carlyle, Cambridge 1798.

His other works other than on history were: Tahārī Fawād al-ʿArab ju ʿl-ʾAsmāʾ al-Tūrkhūya; al-Amṯāl al-Sārīra; Ḥiyāt al-Šīfātī fi ʿl-ʾAsmāʾ waʾl-Sināʾat (anthology of poetry, history and literature); al-Sukhar al-ʾAbādī waʾl-ʿifr al-Fāṭīh (a poem of mystic content); and a short treatise on vocal music. He left the manuscripts of his works to the tomb-mosque which he had built for himself. He died on 5 Dhuʾl-Hijja, 874/5 June 1470.

Bibliography: Abū al-Mardīl (the author’s pupil and copyist of the Manhal), in Nudjām, Cairo, i, Introd., p. 9; Sakhāwī, Dawʾ, x, 305-8; Ibn al-Imād, Saghārdī, ii, 317; Ibn Ḥyāʾ, Badīʾ (Kahle and Mustafa), iii, 56, 43; Well, Chalifūn, iv, pp. xvii-xlxi; v, pp. xxiv-xvii; E. A. Amar, in Mélanges H. Derenbourg, 1909, 245-54; G. Wiet, in BIE, 1930, 89-105; Brockemann, II, 41, S II, 39; F. Wüstenfeld, Die Geschichtsschreiber der Araber, no. 490; Ḥādīth Khalfā (Fügel), index, no. 4301; Babinger, 61. (W. Popper)

ABU 'L-MAHĀSIN YÚSUF B. MŪḤAMMAD B. YŪSUF AL-FĀSĪ, Moroccan scholar, and Şāfi shaykh of repute, born in 938/1530-31, the ancestor of the Fasiyyūn (vernacular Fāsiyyūn) family, which, since the 16th century, has provided the town of Fāṣ with a long succession of scholars and jurists.
Abu'l-Mahasin al-Fasl himself belonged to the Fihrite branch of the Fasiyyun family at Fas (this is how he came to acquire the appellative al-Fasl, which remained that of all his descendants). But it was to the capital of North Morocco that Abu'l-Mahasin al-Fasl went to study, and there he finally settled, from 988/1580 onwards. He soon acquired there an exceptional reputation for learning and piety, and founded a zawiya which has been much frequented ever since. In 986/1578, he took part in the famous battle of Wadi' al-Makhazin against the Portuguese (see sa'īdīn). He died on 18 Rabi' I 1013/14 August 1604. Among his most famous descendants should be mentioned his son Muhammad al-'Arab al-Fasl, author of a monograph on Abu'l-Mahasin, the Mir'āt al-Mahāsin (lith. at Fez in 1324), his grandson 'Abd al-Kādir b. Ali (q.v.), and the son of the latter, 'Abd al-Raḥmān (q.v.). A genealogical table of the Fasiyyun family will be found in Hist. Chorfa, 242.


Abū Manṣūr Iyās Al-Nafṣūsī, governor of Djebal Nafusa and Tripolitania, on behalf of the Rustamid sīdām of Tāhār, Abu'l-Yākzan Muhammad b. Aflah (d. 281/894-5). He came from Tindemira, a village in the Djebal Nafusa, but the exact dates of his birth and death are unknown. His province comprised the whole of Tripolitania, excepting the town of Tripoli which belonged to the Aghlabids. He had immediately to engage in conflict with the Berber Ibādī tribe of Zawāgha, who occupied the coast between Tripoli and Eljerba. This tribe, which sought to free itself from dependence on the Nafusa and had adopted the dissident doctrines of Khalaf b. al-Samli, revolted against Abu Manṣūr under the leadership of the son of Khalaf, who had taken refuge with them. Abu Manṣūr, attacked by the Zawāgha, defeated them with severe losses; their leader fortified himself on the island of Djebra, but his followers were bribed and delivered up to Abu Manṣūr.

According to Ibn al-Raḳīq, quoted by al-Sham-mākhī, when in 266/879-80 the invader Abu'l-Abbas Ahmad b. Tūlūn defeated the Aghlabid governor of Tripoli, Muhammad b. Kurhub and besieged the city for forty three days, the inhabitants called Abu Manṣūr up to Abu Mansūr. He arrived with twelve thousand men, attacked Ibn Tūlūn outside the city and routed him.

Bibliography: E. Masqueray, Chronique d'Abou Zakaria, Algiers 1878, 188-94; Darījīnī, Tabakat al-Maghābh (MS); Shamākhī, Siyar, Cairo 1301, 224-5; A. de Motylinski, Le Djebel Nefusa, Paris 1899, 91, n. 3; R. Basset, Les sanctuaires du Djebel Nefusa, JA, 1899, 432. (T. Lewicki)

Abū Ma'shar [see also 'Alīnī].

Abū Ma'shar Dā'far b. Muḥammad b. 'Umar al-Balkhī, astrologer, usually known in western Europe as Albumasar, was born at Balkh in eastern Khurasan, studied at Baghdād, and was a contemporary of the famous philosopher al-Kindī (first half of 3rd/9th century); after studying the Islamic traditions, he devoted himself particularly to the study of astronomy and astrology, and it is to the latter that he owes his celebrity. He benefited fully from the very flourishing state of astronomical studies in Baghdād, but had a decided preference for astrology. In any case, in his various astrological works it is possible to pick out the astronomical principles and laws that he derived from contemporary scholars. He died at Wāsīt, almost a centenarian, in 272/886.

In the works of Abū Ma'shar can be observed the influences exerted at that time on Arab learning by cultural currents from Persia (in the Pahlawi tongue), and, more indirectly, from India. But Abu Ma'shar not only benefited from the learning of his contemporaries; even in his own time he was reputed to be a plagiarist. The author of the Fīrūt, on the authority of Ibn al-Muktafi, tells us that Abū Ma'shar plagiarized various authors, particularly the works of Sind b. 'All, and these accusations are corroborated by modern criticism.

Among his numerous works may be cited:

1. A collection of astronomical tables (ṣidī), unfortunately lost, in which the movements of the planets were calculated for the meridian of Gāndīz (or Gandezi in Pahlawi), and in agreement with the Indian theory of millenary cycles (kaṇārādī).

2. (al-Madhīb al-Kabīr) (The great introduction to Astrology), a treatise divided into eight books and still unpublished in Arabic, twice translated into Latin, first in 1310 by Johannes Hispalensis, then, in 1550, by Hermannus Secundus or the German. This work was to have a great influence in Christian Europe; the Latin manuscripts of it are numerous, and Hermann's translation was printed at Augsburg quite early, in 1489, under the title Introductorium in astronomiam Albumasaris Albaci de octo continens libros particulas; it was also printed in Venice in 1495 and again in 156. It is important to note that this corpus of astrology contains an exposition of the theory of tides, and it can be said that medieval Europe learned the laws of the ebb and flow of the sea from it. There is in this theory, side by side with true observations, some completely fantastic explanations. The moon is made to influence also the nations. The moon is made to influence also the winds, rainfall, and the whole sublunary world.

3. (Abhām Tabāwīl Sinn al-Masāli'd, translated by Johannes Hispalensis under the title De magnis coniunctionibus et annorum revolutionibus ac coron protectionibus octo continens tractatus, printed at Augsburg in 1489, and at Venice in 1515. The Arabic text is found in Escorial ms. 917 (Broeckelmann, i, 221, is wrong in supposing that this is a ms. of the preceding work), and also in ms. 2988 of the Bibl. Nat. of Paris. Nallino believed that the translation of De magnis coniunctionibus . . . was from an Arabic original, Dalālāt al-Aghābūs al-'Uhmīyya ('Indicazioni date dalle persone superiori dagli astri'), and Suter denied any connection between the De magnis coniunctionibus and the Kitāb al-qārinīs which is also attributed to Albumasar; but, as J. Vernet points out in a recent article, there is a large measure of correspondence between the two works.

4. Al-Nukat, a sort of summary of the previous treatise, translated by Johannes Hispalensis under the title Flores astrolæum: the Arabic text is in Escorial ms. 918, 1, and 938, 5, and also in folios 1-9 of ms. 2988 of the Bibl. Nat., Paris. The Latin
won for him the general's pardon. It is possible that Abū Mihdjan also took part in the battle of Vologesias (Ullays). In 1637 he was again exiled by 'Umar to Nāṣir, and died shortly afterwards; it is said that his tomb was to be seen on the frontier of Ḍāḥabāyḍīn or of Dījrān.

The fragments of his poetry that have been preserved show no originality, but his reputation as a poet is upheld mainly by his bacchanalian songs (the famous line: ‘When I die, bury me at the foot of a vine . . .’ is attributed to him) and a group of poems in which he openly challenges the Kuṭān’s prohibition of wine must be taken seriously. It was this attitude that led to his being banished several times by ‘Umar.

This poet should not be confused with his namesake Abū Mihdjan Nusaybi b. Rabād, on whom see NUSAYB.

Bibliography: The diwan of Abū Mihdjan has been edited by C. Landberg, Primeur arabes, i. Leiden 1886 (another ed., Cairo n. d., with a commentary by al-’Askarl), and by Abel, Leiden 1887 (with a biography and a Latin translation). Accounts of him are to be found in Dījrānī, Tabadāl (Cairo, 1056; Ibn Kūtayba, 351-2; Mas’ūdī, Murādī, iv, 213-19; Aḥānim, xi, 137-43, xx, 210-21; Ibn Ḥadjar, Isḥāq, iv, no. 1017; Baḥdānī, Ḥizānā (Būlāk), iii, 550-6; Āṣfānī, Annales, v, 224 sqq.; Brockelmann, i, 40, s 1, 70; O. Rescher, Abriss, i, 105-7; Nallino, Scrilli, vi, 46.

(N. RHODOKANAKIS-C. PEILLAT)

ABŪ MIKHNĀF LŪṬ B. YĀḤĪYA B. SA‘ĪD B. MIṢĞNAF AL-‘АЗDĪ, one of the earliest Arabic traditionists and historians, d. 157/774. He is credited in the Fihrist with 32 monographs on the diverse episodes of Arab history, relying mostly on ʻIrākī and on the chronicles of al-Baladhurī and al-Tabari. The separate works which have come down to us under his name are later pseudographs. His great-grandfather Mikhnāf was the leader of the ʻIrākī Azd on the side of ‘Alī (for him see Ibn Sa‘īd, vi, 22 and Nag b. Muṣāḥīm, Waqfa’at Sīfang (Cairo 1369), index). On the whole, however, Abū Mikhnāf presents an ʻIrākī point of view.

Bibliography: Fihrist 93; Tüsl, List, no. 575; Kutubī, Fawādi, ii, 175 (ed. Cairo 1951, no. 360); Brockelmann, i, 65, s 1, 101-2; Storey, ii, 229; J. W. Perowne, ‘Arab. Arch. Quart., vii, 1930, 229; H. R. Brünnow, Die Charidschiten, Leiden 1884.

(AGGW, 1883); Bartold in Zapiski Vostoch. old. imper. archey. obsch., xvii, 147 ff.; R. E. Brünnow, Die Charidschiten, Leiden 1884.

ABŪ MUHAMMAD ʻABD ALLĀH B. MUḤammad B. BARAKA AL-ʻUMĀNĪ, commonly called Ibn Baraka, Ibāḍīte author from the township of Bahil in ʻUmān. The precise dates of his life are not known, but an ʻUmānī Ibāḍīte writer, Ibn Muddād, regards him as a disciple and partisan of the imām Sa‘īd b. ʻAbd Allāh b. Maḥbūb, killed in 328/939-40. He himself played a considerable part in the political life of ʻUmān and composed several historical and juridical works, of which only the following are extant: 1. al-Ḍjāmī’, on the principles of law; 2. al-Muwāṣṣana, on the condition of ʻUmān at the time of the imām al-Ṣalt b. Maḥīk, and dealing also with certain points of principle and their juridical solutions; 3. al-Sīrā, somewhat similar to the preceding work; 4. Maḥb al-ʻilm, in praise of

translation was printed at Augsburg in 1488, at Venice in 1488, 1485, and 1506. 


Abū Mas'har Nādhī b. ʻAbd al-Raḥmān al-Madhani, a slave from the Yaman, possibly of Indian parentage, who purchased his freedom and lived in Medina. He was considered a rather ‘weak’ hadīth scholar, but he is deservedly famous as the author of a Kitāb al-Maghāzī. Numerous fragments of it have been preserved by al-Wākīlī and Ibn Sa‘īd. Among his authorities he mentions Nāfī (who at al-Kadisiyya. The story goes that, in order to part in the defence of al-Ja‘if against Muhammad, he escaped first from his c. c. d. had imprisoned him for drunkenness, and on Muhammad’s life and especially chronological statements, the latter going down to the very year of his death.

Bibliography: Brockelmann, S, 207; Bukhārī, Taḥrīr, Haydarābād 1360, 114; Ibn Hibbān, Madārij (ms. Ayūbī Shāhya 460, fol. 234); Ibn ʻAdī, Dā’ūf (ms. Topkapu Saray, Ahmet iii, 2943, iii, fols. 183b-185a); al-Khatib al-Baghdādi, Madīrufiḥ Layb (Der Tod Husains und die Rache (AGGW, 1883); Bartold in Zapiski Vostoch. old. imper. archey. obsch., xvii, 147 ff.; R. E. Brünnow, Die Charidschiten, Leiden 1884.

(AGGW, 1883); Bartold in Zapiski Vostoch. old. imper. archey. obsch., xvii, 147 ff.; R. E. Brünnow, Die Charidschiten, Leiden 1884.

(AGGW, 1883); Bartold in Zapiski Vostoch. old. imper. archey. obsch., xvii, 147 ff.; R. E. Brünnow, Die Charidschiten, Leiden 1884.
knowledge and those who pursue it; 5. al-Tahānī; 6. al-Yānī; 7. al-Sirāfī; Ibn Dā'far, doubtless a commentary on al-Dā'f, a work by Abū Dā'far Muhammad b. Dā'far al-Azkarī of Umān, dealing with the application of legal principles.


Abū Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ b. Yāsārān b. Gharīyūn al-Durqālī al-Madājrī, famous Moroccan saint of the 6th-7th century A.H., patron of the town of Āsfī [q.v.], the present-day Safi. Born about 550/1155, his principal master was Mecca and is believed to have stayed in Alexandria [q.v.], instructing him, the Imam sent him in 128/745-6 to instruct in Kufa. In 124/741-2, the Khurasanian al-Mughīra b. Saʿīd. In 124/741-2, the Khurasanian al-Mughīra b. Saʿīd. In 124/741-2, the Khurasanian al-Mughīra b. Saʿīd.

Abū al-Muṭḥir ibn al-Salt b. Khāmis al-Bahlawi al-Ummānī, Ibāḍī historian and lawyer, native of Bahla in Umān. His exact dates are not known; but he is counted among the Ibāḍī scholars of the second half of the 3rd/9th century. He left valuable literary materials, especially in the field of history, and also took an active part in the political life of his time, being a zealous partisan of the imām al-Salt b. Mālik, deposed in 273/886-7. Among his works, the following are worthy of note: (1) al-Abdāl wa l-Sifālī, devoted to events in Umān at the time of al-Salt b. Mālik, and to the circumstances of his deposition; (2) al-Bayān wa l-Burkān, on the principle of the institution of the Imāmate in connection with the affair of al-Salt; (3) al-strā, containing information about the important figures of the earliest period of Ibāḍīsm. MSS of these three books were in the possession of S. Smorgorzewski. (4) Taṣfīr al-Khams miʿat Āya, commentary on five hundred verses dealing with forbidden and permitted things.


Abū Naḍārā, Yaḥyā b. Rāfāʾil Șānō (also James Sanu), prolific Jewish Egyptian journalist and playwright (1839-1912). He indirectly influenced the ʿUrabi Revolt by teaching, lecturing, writing and performing short satirical plays and first starting the publication of Abū Naddārā Zarkā, entitled "the man with green spectacles", after making use of Abū Muslim against his uncle Abū Allāh b. Allāh [q.v.], he invited him to present himself at court. Abū Muslim, after long hesitation, suspecting, but not fully crediting, what was waiting for him, decided to do as he was bid, and was treacherously killed. His memory remained alive in the Eastern provinces, and, starting with the movement of al-Muḥanna [q.v.], gave rise, during many years, to political and religious agitation.


Abū l-Muṭḥir ibn al-Salt b. Khāmis al-Bahlawi al-Ummānī, Ibāḍī historian and lawyer, native of Bahla in Umān. His exact dates are not known; but he is counted among the Ibāḍī scholars of the second half of the 3rd/9th century. He left valuable literary materials, especially in the field of history, and also took an active part in the political life of his time, being a zealous partisan of the imām al-Salt b. Mālik, deposed in 273/886-7. Among his works, the following are worthy of note: (1) al-Abdāl wa l-Sifālī, devoted to events in Umān at the time of al-Salt b. Mālik, and to the circumstances of his deposition; (2) al-Bayān wa l-Burkān, on the principle of the institution of the Imāmate in connection with the affair of al-Salt; (3) al-strā, containing information about the important figures of the earliest period of Ibāḍīsm. MSS of these three books were in the possession of S. Smorgorzewski. (4) Taṣfīr al-Khams miʿat Āya, commentary on five hundred verses dealing with forbidden and permitted things.
ABŪ NADDĀRA — ABŪ NU‘AYM AL-ISFĀHĀNĪ

an anonymous lithographic sheet, enlivened by cartoons, in the Egyptian fallahm dialect. Because he had criticized the Khedive and his counsellors, he had to leave Egypt in 1878; but he continued to publish his newspaper in Paris intermittently, in Arabic and French, and smuggled it into Egypt under various names. Copies also reached North Africa, Syria and India. Besides Abū Naḍḍāra himself, many characters drawn from Egyptian life appeared in his newspapers, notably the greedy ḥāḇīr al-ḥāṣ (the Khedive Isma’il), officials, merchants, brokers, beggars, etc. They expressed their views in conversation form, letters, short plays, and minutes of meetings. He also contributed articles to various French newspapers. Besides his plays—of which he claims to have written over 30 (one preserved in Arabic)—he published a few stories and pamphlets, of little literary value. His political-journalistic activity in his exile had two phases. In the first, until 1882, he attacked the Khedives Ismā’il and Tawfīk, and the Egyptian supporters; called on France and Turkey to oust the British; proposed Prince Ḥālim, son of Muḥammad All, for the throne of Egypt; and campaigned, albeit perversely, for the beheading of the lot of the fallāḥīn. All in all, he was the creator of the satirical newspaper and the modern satirical Arabic.


ABŪ ’L-NAJJĪM AL-FAḌL (AL-MUFAḌḍAL) B. KUDAMA AL-ṢIḌĪQ, Arab poet of the first/7-8th century (d. after 105/724). Although he composed several ḥaḍāṣas, he owes his celebrity to his verses in raǧīs in which he treats of bedūin subjects (description of camels, horses, oases, etc.), and eulogizes the Umayyads ʿAbd al-Malik, Ḥāšm, ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ṣabh, and the governor al-Nadīḏīḏī. The critics, who include him among the four best ṣaḥīḥ (with his fellow-tribesman al-Aghlab and the two Tamīlites of al-ʿAṣra, al-ʿAḏīḏīḏī and his son Ruʿbā), rank him highest for description, and praise his facility for improvisation. His rivalry with al-ʿAḏīḏīḏī (Muḥammad against Rabīʿa) is famous, and the biographers describe a grotesque scene in which, at the Misrāb, Abū ʿl-Najjīm mounted on a he-camel puts to flight his rival and his she-camel, and recites the well-known line: ‘I and every poet of the human race [have demons to inspire us]: his is female and mine male’. Nevertheless it was Ruʿbā who gave the name Umma raǧīs to a long raḡīs which Abū ʿl-Najjīm recited to Ḥāšm, whose wrath was aroused by an ill-chosen word; he was soon received back into favour, however, and received from Ḥāšm an endowment in the Sawād of al-Kūfa.

Bibliography: Brockelmann, S I, 90; Rescher, Abrīs, i, 223; Nallino, Sensiti, vi, 98. A biographical account and some verses are to be found in Ibn Sallām, Taḥābāt (Heil), 148, 149-50; Ibn Ḥaṭṭāb, Shārīʿ, ii, 386; Abū Ḥāfiz, al-Taw f, ix, 95-98; Baghdādī, Khidma, i, 103, ii, 340-53; M. M. I, 928, collects together the biographical data (385-94), and publishes the Umma al-raḡīs (472-9).

A lāmiyya has been published by Maymann, al-Ṭārāḥ al-adabiyya, Cairo 1937, 55-71, and there are scattered verses in a number of works, particularly al-Ḏaḥif, Bāyān and Ḥayyānīn, in the indexes; A. ʿArabi, Fuhula, 1921, 499, 503, 511, 515; Abū Tammān, Hamadā (Freytag), 145, 144, 755; Marzubān, Muʿjīdūm, 310; ʿAskarī, Dīwān al-Muṣṭaʿfīn, i, 113, 279. (CH. FELLAT)

ABŪ NASR [see AL-FĀRAĪB].

ABŪ NU‘AYM AL-ISFĀHĀNĪ, AḤMAD B. ABD ALLĀH B. ḤISHĀ K B. MUṢĀ B. MĪRĀN AL-SHĀFIṢ, born in Ifṣāḥān in Raġāb 335/Jan.-Feb. 948 (Ibn Ḥallikān: or 334, ʿAqīl, al-Tabākī, i, 298, 330), d. Monday 19 Muḥarram (Ibn Ḥallikān: or Ṣafar; ʿAqīl: Monday 20 Muḥarram; ʿAbābī, Subkī: 20 Muḥarram) 430/23 Oct. 1038, an authority on fiḥk and ṣaḥāwa. His grandfather Muḥ. b. Yūsuf was a well known ascetic, the first of his kin to accept Islam (Ibn Ḥallikān). Abū Nuʿaym mentions him as his forerunner in Ḥiyya at-Tabākī (i, 4). His father who also was a scholar (ʿAqīl, al-Ṭabākī, i, 334) had taught by important teachers, as ʿAqīl al-Khulīlī and al-ʿAṣāmī, from his sixth year. From 356/967 he travelled and studied in TaFra, Hindūz and Khurāsān, and for 14 years he was reckoned as one of the best ḥadīth authorities. This is stated by his contemporary al-Khaṭīb al-Baḡdādī who quotes him (Taḵrīr Bagdādī, xii, 407, 412) and by al-Ḥaṭīb and al-Ṣabīkī, but neither al-Khaṭīb nor ʿAqīl include him in their biographies of learned men. The number of those who transmitted ḥadīth from him is said to be about eighty. Abū-Sulaim, his older contemporary, quotes one ḥadīth on his authority with one intermediary (Tabākī al-Ṣūfīyyah, sub Abru l-Abābīs b. Ṭāʿāt). Al-Khaṭīb, according to al-Ṣabīkī one of his nearest pupils, criticizes him for treating ṣaḥāwa's lightly, but is in this contradicted by al-Ṭabākī. A ḥadīth about Hanbalites and Ṣǎffīmites caused sharp criticism of him by his fellow townsman Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. Mandāḥ (cf. Brockelmann, S I, 281) and led to bodily attacks on him. He was even expelled from the mosque of Ifṣāḥān, which saved his life as, according to tradition, Subukṭīn, when he conquered the town, massacred the people assembled in the mosque at the Friday-service; this is reckoned one of his ḥāḍim. Abū al-ʿNabībī al-Mishābī, cf. Brockelmann, S II, 763 f.) relates that the mosque fell down twice and crushed the crowd because A. N. had cursed it. Abū Nuʿaym's work Ḥiyyat at-Ṭabākī wa-Tabākī al-Ṭabākī wa-Ṭabākī al-Ṭabākī (Cairo 1351/1932-1357/1938) was finished in 422/1031 (see x, 408). It was written to strengthen what he regarded as the true ṣuffism (i, 4). After a general description of ṣūfism he mentions the different etymologies of the word, above all its derivations from šīf, on which he had written a book Labs al-Shīf, stressing its connotation of humility (i, 20, 23). The rest consists in accounts of and sayings by 649 pious people (waṣṣāk) reckoned as ṣūfis, beginning with the four "righteous caliphs"—evidence of the interpretation of ṣūfism and orthodoxy. Every section begins with "the ṣāḥib (Abū Nuʿaym) said". It differs from al-Sulami's Ṣabākī, which gives only sayings with few or no anecdotes. It is told that he brought the work personally to Niṣābūr...
where he sold it for 400 dirhams. Extracts from it are used in Ibn al-Djawzī, Șafwat al-Șafwa.

His second large work, Dhikr Al-Abbas al-Iṣbahānī (ed. S. Edering, Leiden 1931) contains biographies of people who had connections with Iṣbahānī, mainly scholars, after a short history and topography of the town. On this topic he had several forerunners (cf. Edering ii, p. viii-x). Besides these works he wrote several smaller books on the proofs of prophecy, the medicine of the prophet, the excellence of Muhammad's first followers, with extracts from al-Buhkārī and Muslim etc. He died in Iṣbahānī and his tomb is said by Yākūt (î, 28b) to be in Mūrdbāb.
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(A. PEDERSEN)

ABŪ NUʾAYM AL-FADL B. DUKAYN AL-MULĀṬ, ḥadīṯ scholar and historical informant (b. 130/748, d. 29 Shabaʿa 219/8 Sept. 834). He was a client of the family of Muhammad’s Companion Ṭalḥa. He lived in al-Kūfah and made occasional visits to Baghdād, where he was once received by al-Māmūn. Dukayn’s actual name is said to have been ʿĀmir. A son of Abū Nuʾaym, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (perhaps the author of the Kurʾān commentary, referred to in Fihrist, 34), and a grandson, ʿĀhmād b. Mīṭḥam, are mentioned.

Abū Nuʾaym is considered a very reliable transmitter of traditions. He is also highly praised for the courageous way in which he stood up for the unconnectedness of the Kurʾān against the Mutanūna inquisitors. On the other hand, he was suspected of being a Ṣhīʿī. He admitted his secret veneration of being a Shiʿaite. He expressed his dislike of the Ṣaḥḥābīs and Ṣaḥḥābīs also, and studied under the grammarians Abū Ḫayyān, Abū Zayd, etc. He is also said to have spent, according to the old custom, some time among the beduins in order to improve his linguistic knowledge.

His education finished, Abū Nuʾaym came to Baghdād, to gain the favour of the caliph with panegyrics. He found, however, little favour at the court, but was better received by the Barmakids. After the fall of the Barmakids he had to flee to Egypt, where he composed panegyrics on the head of the diwan al-ḥanāfī, al-Ḵalīfah b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd. Soon, however, he was able to return to his beloved Baghdād, where he now spent, as a boon companion of al-ʾĀmin, the most brilliant years of his life. Nevertheless, even al-ʾĀmin once prohibited him from wine drinking and even imprisoned him on that account.

There are different reports about his death. According to one tradition he died in prison, to which he had been sent on account of a blasphemous verse, according to another in the house of a woman tavern-keeper, according to a third in the house of the learned Shiʿī family of the ʿAl Ṣawbakht. He was linked to this family, especially to Ismāʿīl b. Abī Sahl al-Ṣawbakhtī, by close friendship, though this did not prevent him from composing some amusing lampoons on Ismāʿīl (Dīwān, 171 f.). The assertion, therefore, that he was murdered by the Sawbakhtīs is probably mere slander, especially as this family interested itself even later in the collection of Abū Nuʾaym’s poems and Ḥamza al-Iṣbahānī made use of information derived from them (cf. MS Fāṭih 3773, fol. 3v).

The Arab literary critics themselves regarded Abū Nuʾaym as the representative of the modern school of poets, the muhdathūn. “What Imrāʿ al-Kays was for the ancients, that is Abū Nuʾaym for the moderns” (Fāṭih 3773, fol. 71). At most, only ʿAḅshābī b. Burd could possibly compete with him. Although in his panegyrics Abū Nuʾaym still uses in general the classical form (cf. e.g. Dīwān, 77), the panegyric known as maḥāna, addressed to Al-ʾAfḍāl b. al-Rahlī, to which Ibn Dīmī devoted an extensive commentary, otherwise the old forms, especially that of the maṣbē, serve as a butt for his ridicule. Once he begins abruptly: “I do not weep because the dwelling-place has become an inhospitable desert” (Fāṭih 3775, fol. 12r); instead of the...
former dwelling-place of the beloved he weeps for the taverns that have disappeared and bewails the delights of both, but also depicts with humorous realism his adventures in this field. Nor does he avoid self-irony, as when he describes the thrashing which he received at the hands of youths whom he had made drunk in order to amuse himself with them (cf. e.g. Fāṭīh 3775, fol 21). Equally ironical are the dirges which he composed about his own body, wasted by illness (Diwān, 131 f.).

Abū Nuwās confesses his sins with remarkable frankness and often also invites his fellow-men to repent likewise. He calls upon those who reproach him to leave him alone as their blame only incites him all the more; nor does he intend to mend his ways until the grave. He boasts of having omitted nothing that displeases God, except polytheism (Diwān, 281), and ridicules all the institutions of Islam. His verses against Islam do not serve to prove for God to take notice of his deeds (Fāṭīh 3775, fol. 16). His ascetic poems do not serve to prove that he repented in old age; they could have been composed in transient moods or as occasional poems due to special impulses. Otherwise, too, there are frequent contradictions in the diwān; they ought not to be taken as proofs of a change of mind or of dishonesty, as Abū Nuwās was more interested in the witty formulation of his ideas than in the content of the idea itself.

Poems about love of women are rare in comparison with those on love of boys. It is said that only once Abū Nuwās fell in love with a girl, a slave called Dījān. It is true that ʿHamza al-Iṣbahānī denies this emphatically and enumerates a long list of women with whom Abū Nuwās was allegedly in love (Fāṭīh 3774, fol. 76 v); but these are only names taken from the poems and are perhaps even fictitious.

The diwān of Abū Nuwās contains, for the first time in Arabic literature, a special chapter containing hunting-poems. They mostly describe hounds, falcons and horses, but also various kinds of game, and are remarkable for the richness of their vocabulary. Abū Nuwās had models for this genre in the descriptions of animals in the old beduin poetry, but he seems to have made it into an independent genre. Later on it was further developed by Ibn al-Muṭazz.

The language of Abū Nuwās, though he uses some contemporary vernacular expressions, is on the whole correct. The mistakes which he makes were already usual among his predecessors (cf. J. Fück, Arabiya, 51 ff.). In certain groups of his poems Persian words occur very frequently (e.g. in dāḏ-i biyābin, Fāṭīh 3775, fol. 29, a whole idāfat-construction). Altogether, Persian civilization plays a considerable role in his poetry (cf. Gabrieli, OM, 1953, 283). We often find him referring to the heroes of Persian history, but as the old Arabs are also mentioned, this has certainly no special significance, and Abū Nuwās can hardly be called a poet of the shuʿbāṭiya. His work only reflects the cultural background of the ʿAbbāsid epoch, in which the influence of the Iranian element gradually increased. In the imagination of the Arabic world the figure of Abū Nuwās is intimately connected with that of Hārūn al-Raṣīlī, who personifies in his turn the glory of the caliphate. Thus he entered the *Arabian Nights* and still today he is a favourite figure of popular stories, where he most often plays the role of a court jester. (Cf. A. Schaade, Zur Herkunft der Urform einiger Abū Nuwās Geschichten in 1002 Nacht, ZDMG, 1934, 299 ff.; idem, Weiteres zu Abū Nuwās in 1002 Nacht, ZDMG, 1936, 602 ff.; W. H. Ingrams, Abū Nuwās in Life and in Legend, London 1933, cf. Schaade in OLE, 1935, 545-7.)

Abū Nuwās did not himself make a collection of his poems. Thus, on the one hand much has been lost—more especially his poems written in Egypt remained unknown in ʿIrāk (cf. Fāṭīh 3773, fol. 47); on the other hand, many poems, especially on wine and pederasty, were falsely attributed to him. His diwān is extant in several recensions, of which the two most important are due to al-Sūlī and ʿHamza al-Iṣbahānī (for the latter, see E. Mittwoch, in MSOS, 1909, 156 ff.). While al-Sūlī aimed at excluding all spurious poems and arranged the poems, within the separate chapters, in strict alphabetical order, ʿHamza shows a less critical sense, as one could never know if a suspect poem as not after all genuine. Thus his collection is about three times as large as that of al-Sūlī, and contains about 1500 poems with 13,000 lines. Moreover, he adds many abhār, which are missing in al-Sūlī, and to some chapters adds a commentary. He also incorporated in his collection the so-called *Risāla of the Syri'an on the sarkāb of Abū Nuwās*, addressed to him by Muḥānī b. Yāmūt. Ahlwardt's edition of the wine-songs follows the recension of al-Sūlī, while the printed edition of Cairo 1898 is based on that of ʿHamza. Today we have for both MSS—especially in Istanbul—than those that were available at the time of these editions.


**Abū Righāl**, mythical person, about whom two entirely different traditions can easily be distinguished. According to the first, he was a Ṭhakafite of Tāḥīf who guided Abraha [q.v.] on his
way to Mecca. He died in al-Muğḥammas [q.v.] and was buried there. It was the custom to stone his tomb. (For a similar custom cf. Al-Ḍāmāmah.) The story is sometimes told with the object of slandering the Thaḳafītes. The earliest mention would be a verse of Ḥāṣṣān b. Ṭḥābīt (ed. Hirschfeld, ii, i, l), if it is not an anti-Thaḳafīte falsification. The early date of the custom of stoning Abū Rīḡāl’s tomb is proved by a vers of Ḍīarīr: “If al-Farazdāk dies, stone him as you stone the tomb of Abū Rīḡāl.” In the second tradition, found in its simplest form in al-Ṭabarī and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Abū Rīḡāl was the only survivor of Thaḳūd, and at the time of the death of Thaḳūd b. Ṭabarī he was staying in Mecca and was saved by the sanctity of the place; he died, however, as soon as he left Mecca. His story was told by the Prophet as he was passing al-Ḥijḍr with his army. In the earliest form, this version knows of no connection of Abū Rīḡāl with Thaḳūf, but this feature was later introduced, possibly under the influence of the first story. In one of the stories in al-Abūl Ḥāfīẓ he is even said to have been a king of Tāʾif and ancestor of Thaḳūf. On the other hand, authors like al-Ḍāḥīṣ, Ibn Kūṭayba and Aḥmad b. Abī Ṣa’dīd quote a version which is evidently meant as a defence of the Thaḳafītes: it was they who killed Abū Rīḡāl, a cruel and unjust person. Later authors still further confuse the two traditions. Al-Dīyārbakrī gives as the name of Abū Rīḡāl Zayd b. Muḥṭalīf.
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(S. A. Bonerbakker)
Abu Sa'id b. Abu 'l-Khayr

St. Petersburg 1899, after two defective manuscripts; reprint Teheran 1313 H. Sh., new ed., St. Petersburg 1899, after two defective manuscripts; reprint Teheran 1313 H. Sh. (quoted as AT). Manuscripts also Skutari, Hadâ'î, Taş, 238; Istanbul, Şehîd 'Ali Pasha 1416.) This was the source used in the Tadhkirat al-Awliyâ’ of 'Attâr and the Naqdahâl al-Uns of Dilâm. The father of Abu Sa'id was a druggist known as Babu Bu 'l-Khayr. He took the boy with him occasionally to the sacred performances of dances (samâ‘) which the süfis of the town gave by turns in their boxes. Abu Sa'id received his first instruction in mystical devotion from Abu 'l-Kâsim Bîghrî-î Vâslûn (d. 380/990), who had a poetic streak in him and is the author of the majority of the verses which Abu Sa'id later quoted in his sermons. As a young man Abu Sa'id studied Shâfi‘ite law in Marw under Abu 'Abd Allâh al-Husûl and Abu Bakr al-Kaffâl (d. 417; al-Subki, Tabakât, iii, 194-200). Among his fellow-students was Abu Muhammad al-Dâwâyînî (d. 438: al-Subki, iii, 208-19), the father of İmân al-Haramayn. Then he studied exegesis of the Kurâ’n, dogmatics and Hadîth in Sarakhs under Abu 'All Zâhirî (d. 389; al-Subki, ii, 223), who succeeded in rooting out the social motive of sufism, the “service of the people,” from his household, and converted many of them into followers instead. He liked to arrange lavish, even extravagant entertainments for his followers, culminating in sacred dance music (samâ‘). During these, dancing and crying out (na‘ra zadan) were, as was customary, the order of the day. In the throes of ecstatic dances were thrown off, torn up, and distributed around.

To finance these luxurious occasions, at which as much as a thousand dinârs is supposed to have been spent in a day, and which moved 'Awwâl to remark that in later years Abu Sa'id lived hardly as an ascetic but rather as a sultan (Barthold, Turkistan, i, 211), he did not hesitate to invent the cause of frequent embarrassment to his household manager Hasan-i Mu‘addib. Some wealthy devotee, however, was always found, who, often at the last moment, provided the requisite money. Sometimes he sent Hasan to followers, even to opponents, with whom he stayed, in order to raise money in an almost barefaced manner. The money was immediately spent, as it was regarded as a privilege to possess no assured property (ma‘lâm) and to accumulate nothing. His way of living caused offence to the Karrâmî Abu Bakr Muh. b. İshâb b. Mîmahâd, made common cause with the Hanafî Khâdî Sa'idî b. Muhammad al-Ustuwâlî (d. 432; on both see ‘Utîl-Manûnî, ii, 309 ff., Persian translation by Dîrufâkânî, Teheran 1272, 427 ff.; W. Barthold, Turkistan, 289-90, 312; on the latter ibn ‘Abîl ‘Walî, al-Dâwâyînî al-Mud‘âtî, no. 685, and al-Sâmânî, Anwâr, under al-Ustuwâlî) and laid information about Abu Sa'id before sultan Maḥmûd b. Subûktîgîn, who ordered an inquiry, perhaps in conjunction with a universal heresy hunt carried out by the aforementioned Karrâmî governor Abu Bakr (Barthold, Turkistan, 290). However, Abu Sa'id contrived to disarm both through his skill in thought-reading, with the result that they abandoned the prosecution. The indictments were, that the ṣâyikî recited on the pulpit verses in place of the Kurâ’n and Hadîth, that he gave too luxurious feasts and that he had made the young people dance. The great al-Kûshârî, who encountered Abu Sa'id in Nîşâbûr, took exception to the excessively liberal way of life of the young man and to his dance music. The contrast between the characters of the two men is illustrated by an apt anecdote: al-Kûshârî had repudiated a derwîsh and banished him from the town. Abu Sa'id showed him at a banquet how by very much gentler methods a derwîsh may be sent travelling (Nicholson, 35-6). A strong kindliness of nature and an affection for his fellow-men were conspicuous characteristics of Abu Sa'id. He was no preacher of repentance; seldom, if ever, did he refer in his sermons to the verses of the Kurâ’n threatening the tortures of Hell. Numerous stories were related of how by means of his firdâsî he saw through the intimate thoughts of sinners and opponents and thoroughly
abashed them. The guiding motif of his life is said to have been the hadith: "If man kia'ah was-a'i man karamak wa-l-makan (AT, 311). The celebrated sūfī Ibn Bākūya (d. 442/1050) reproached him for allowing young people to sit together with old and for treating them just as he did the old, for allowing them to dance and for giving back the cast-off khirba to its owner, whereas it should be being cast off have become common property. Abū Sa'id contrived to give plausible reasons for these innovations (AT, 70-71). Ibn Ḥazm brands him as an unbeliever, since he wore now wool, now silk, sometimes a thousand rakās a day, sometimes not at all ( Ṣafi, iv, 188). At all events social work played a very much greater role in the second period of his life than individual mystic experience: and from this point of view he is comparable (in spite of substantial differences) with Abū Iṣḥāq al-Kāzarīnī (q.v.). However he once gave tongue to a pronouncement similar to al-Hallājī's Ana 'l-Hākāb. In the course of a sermon he was overcome by a state of inner excitement and called out Layst fi l-djūbati ilā 'llāh, "There is none other than God in this robe". So saying he ran his forefinger through the gown. It was divided and the portion with the hole made by his finger preserved.

Abū Nāṣrārī he also met the philosopher Ibn Sīnā and is supposed to have held lengthy conversations with him. A correspondence between the two is preserved. Abū Sa'id asked the philosopher what was the way to God according to his experience, and received a reply (printed by H. Ethe, SBBayr. Ak., 1878, 52 ff.; Ibn Sīnā, al-Nādīr, Cairo 1331, 12-5; Ibn Abī-'Uṣaybi'a, ii, 9-10; al-'Amīlī, al-Kašgālī, Cairo 1318, 264-5). At the end of his stay in Nīshāpūr he wished to accompany his son Abū Taḥīr on the pilgrimage, but was restrained from this in Kharakān by the celebrated sūfī Abu 'l-Ḥasan Kharakānī. He then went to Bistām where he visited the grave of Abū Yazīd, and to Dāmghān, eventually returning Rayy before returning with his son. He spent the rest of his life in his home town of Mayhāna.

Abū Sa'id is supposedly the author of a great number of quatrains. In several manuscripts (AT, 311, 48, note; also editions Bombay 1294 and Lahore 1934.) However it has been expressly stated that he composed only one verse and one quatrain (Nicholson, 4). The quatrains may not then be attributable to him. One of them, with which he is supposed to have cured his Kūrān-teacher Abū Sālih of an illness (AT, 229) and which opens with the word haurūdi was made the subject of a commentary by 'Abd Allāh b. Mahmūd al-Sāhīshī under the title Risāla-yi Haʻarūdīyya (AT, 32-5).

Abū Sa'id left a numerous family, who tended his grave for more than a hundred years and were held in great respect in Mayhāna. His eldest son Abū Taḥīr Sa'id (d. 480) continued the "service of the poor" and thereby involved himself in debts which were paid by Niẓām al-Mulk. He was an uncultured individual, however, who left school before he was ten years old and knew by heart only the 48th sūra of the Kūrān, and did not have the personality to find an order after his father's death (as did the son of Djamāl al-Dīn Rūmī, Sultān Walād), although Abū Sa'id did leave behind a kind of statute for an order (Nicholson, 46). The tradition was however broken by political events. Abū Sa'id lived to see the entry of the Saljuḳs into Khurāsān. They occupied Mayhāna, and Abū Sa'id was on friendly relations with Tughrīl and Čağhrī Beg. Sultan Mas'ud laid siege to the town and captured it shortly before his decisive defeat at Dāndānākān in the year 431/1040. During the devastation of Khurāsān by the Ghurī in the year 508/1113 the place was absolutely laid waste, no fewer than 115 members of Abū Sa'id's family being tortured and put to death. A follower of Abū Sa'id, Dūst Bū Sa'd Dāda, whom the shaykh had sent to Ghazna not long before his death to have the Sultan discharge his accumulated debts, found Abū Sa'id dead, went to Baghdad on his return, and founded a daughter monastery there. At the time of Ibn al-Muqarrabī his family held the position of shaykh al-shaykh in Baghdad, but nothing is known of the subsequent destiny of this offshoot (AT, 294-300).

Bibliography: Besides the sources quoted in the article: Subkī, al-Taḥāṣāt al-Kubrā, iii, 10; R. A. Nicholson, Studies in Islamic Mysticism, Cambridge 1921, 1-76.

ABŪ SAID AL-DJANNABĪ [see AL-DJENNABĪ].

ABŪ SA'D B. MUHAMMAD B. MIḤAḴHĀR B. TIMŪR, Timūrid sultan. In 853/1449, at the age of twenty-five, Abū Sa'id, taking advantage of the desperate situation of Ulugh Beg, at whose court he lived, tried his fortune in Transoxiana. A siege of Samarkand (1449), then a rising at Bāḵhtar (May 1450) both ended in failure. Not long afterwards he seized Yaš (Turkistan), and held it against the troops of 'Abd Allāh b. Ibrāhīm Sultan b. Shāhīrūkh. In Dīnāmād I 855/June 1451 he drove the latter out of Samarkand with the help of the Özbeg khan Abū 'l-Khayr. In spring 858/1454 Abū Sa'id crossed the Oxus and took Bāḵtūr. Abū 'l-Kāsim Bābur, ruler of Khurāsān, invaded Transoxiana and laid siege to Samarkand (Oct.-Nov.), where resistance was organized by the famous Nakhshbandi šaykh 'Uḥayd Allāh Ahrār, who is said to have restrained Abū Sa'id from deserting his capital. Peace was made, Abū Sa'id keeping the right bank of the Oxus. The relations of the two princes remained cordial until the death of Bābur (Rabī' II 861/ March 1457).

Abū Sa'id then tried to take Harāt, where Ibrāhīm b. 'Alī al-Dawla b. Bayṣungūr had succeeded in having himself proclaimed. The siege (July-August 1457), marked by the execution of Gahwar Shād, who was accused of intelligence with Ibrāhīm, was raised without result. Defeated by the Kara Köyünün Dījahānshāh, Ibrāhīm sought an alliance with Abū Sa'id (beginning of 862/winter 1457-8), and a defensive treaty was concluded. At the end of June 1458 Dījahānshāh occupied Harāt. Abū Sa'id, who had stationed his army on the Murghāb to watch the course of events, took advantage of Dījahānshāh's difficulties to get possession of the town peacefully (Nov. 1458), and thus became master of Khurāsān, which he had always coveted. In Dīnāmād I 863/March 1459 the three Timūrid princes 'Alī al-Dawla, Ibrāhīm b. 'Alī al-Dawla, and Sultān Saṅgarī were defeated at Sarakhs.

The year 1459 was spent in mopping up Khurāsān. In 1460 Abū Sa'id occupied Māzandarān; in his rear the amīr Khallī came from Sīstān and laid siege to Harāt (summer 1460); and when calm had been restored in Sīstān (autumn 1460), Abū Sa'id had to deal with a revolt in Transoxiana (winter 1460). Sultān Ḥusayn took advantage of this to reoccupy Māzandarān and besiege Harāt (Sept. 1461), but Māzandarān was retaken by Abū Sa'id in the same year.

Abū Sa'id's power extended theoretically over Transoxiana, Turkistān (to the confines of Kāšghār and of the Dašt-i Kīpāk), Kābulistān and Zābu-
Abū Sa'id b. Timūr — Abū Sakhr al-Hudhali

Abū Sa'id was more fortunate in the north-east, and succeeded in averting the Mongol threat to his frontiers. During his reign in Samarkand he had repulsed two attacks by the Mongol Mūsā Esen Buγha. In 1456 he recognized Yūnus, the elder brother of Esen Buγha, and on several occasions gave him help in establishing himself in the western part of Mughulistan. In 1468/64 Yūnus once again sought refuge with Abū Sa'id, who lent him troops.

Real though the personal qualities of Abū Sa'id were, they had been exaggerated, and his reign revealed no very impressive trends. Among the Turkish aristocracy of his entourage, pre-eminence was normally to be paid in three instalments. At Samarkand, Bukhara, and Karat the tamghād was normally to be paid in three instalments. Each year the Khurasanian infantry, in the rearguard, was attacked by deserters. When the news of the death of Abū Sa'id reached Harāt the troops raised in 'Hindūstān' (i.e. Afghanistan) were not yet organized. Notwithstanding this lack of preparation Abū Sa'id made the mistake, when caught by the winter, of penetrating too deeply into 'Adharbāyjān. He was cut off and captured near Mūshān by Ḫūn Ḥasan. A few days later the Timurid Yādgār Muhammad, a dependent of Ḫūn Ḥasan, had him executed (Feb. 1469) to avenge the death of his grandmother Gawhar Shād.


Studies. In the absence of monographs on the period, works dealing with questions or periods bordering on it must be used. See particularly V. V. Barthold, Ulug Beg i jego wremię, 1898 (Germ. transl. by Hinzz, Ulug Beg und seine Zeit, 1913), and Mir Ali Šīr i političeskaja súiet (transl. Hinzz, Herat unter Husain Baqirā), the articles (by Yakubovskii, Molfanov, Belenitskii, etc.) in the two collections Rodonadalnik uzbekskoj literatury, Taṣkent 1940, and Ali Šīr Navaţ Šarbeh, Taṣkent 1945; Bilenijskii, K ishiri toqul-nagro zemleoladaniya Srednej Azii pri Timuridakh, in Istorič-Markistič, 1941/4; the works of I. P. Petruševskii; W. Hinzz, Iran i Ausstieg zum Nationalstaat, 1936. On the Russian embassy to Harāt in 1464 cf. *ZVO*, i, 30 sqq. See also Browne, iii; Grousset, Empire des Steppes. Bouvart, Essai sur la civilisation timouride, J., 1926, and L'Empire mongol (2e phase), Paris 1927, may be disregarded.

(J. Aubin)

**Abū Sakhr al-Hudhali, 'Abd Allāh b. Salama, Arab poet of the second half of the 1st/7th century. He belonged to the tribe of Saba, a branch of the Hudhayl of the Ḥidżāz, and embraced the Marwānid cause; imprisoned by the anti-caliph 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr, he regained his liberty when the latter died, and, according to his own account, took part in the capture of Mecca in 72/692. He celebrated in his verse the caliph 'Abd al-Malik, as well as his brother, 'Abd al-ʿAzīz; see Aghānī, xxii, 144. Above all he praised the amīr Abū Kālid 'Abd al-ʿAzīz of the Aslān clan, whose brother, Umayya, had been governor of al-Baṣra from 71/950**
ABU SAKHR AL-HUDHALI — ABU 'L-SARAYA AL-SHAYBANI

until 73/end of 692; see al-Tabari, index; on the favour in which this family was held by the Caliph, see Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, 'Abd, Cairo 1359, viii, 55. Some poems and fragments by Abû Sakhr are known, which were included by al-Sukkari in his dīwān of Hujjāyl. A number are baṣīdas of the classic type; others are erotic-eligiac compositions recalling those of Abu Rabī’.n

Bibliography: Akgâni, 221, 144-54; J. Wellhausen, Letter 6 to the Lieder der Hujjāyliden, Berlin 1884, i, Arabic text, nos. 250-269; al-Buhurtî, Hamāsa, no. 1009; Kudāma b. Dī'far, Nakāb al-Shaybānī, 13, 44-55. (R. Blachère)

ABŪ SALĀMA ḤĀFIS B. SULAYMĀN AL-KHAL-LĀL, vizier. A freed slave from Kūfā, he was sent in 127/744-5 to Khūrasān with ample powers, as one of the chief ‘Abbasid emissaries. He took part in the armed insurrection which put an end to the Umayyad dynasty, and was appointed governor of Kūfā. At the culminating point of the revolution he inclined towards the ‘Alids and seems to have attempted to set up an ‘Abbasid caliphate. In this, one can perhaps see a consequence of the deliberate ambiguity about the rights of ‘the house of the Prophet’, put into circulation by the revolutionary propaganda. Al-Salām, however, was chosen as caliph and Abū Salāma gave him his allegiance (132/749). The caliph appointed Abū Salāma vizier, without, however, losing his suspicions, and in the same year planned to remove him. Fearing that this might irritate Abū Muslim, the powerful governor of Khūrasān, who was Abū Salāma’s companion in the dā’wa and might have been acting in agreement with him, he sent his brother Abū Ṭāfīr (al-Manṣūr) to consult Abū Muslim. Abū Muslim made no difficulties; on the contrary, he himself sent a hired assassin to kill Abū Salāma. The crime was subsequently attributed to the Khāṭīfdites. Abū Salāma is described as an educated and capable man, and his services in the ‘Abbasid cause are indisputable. Nevertheless, the fears of the caliph concerning him seem, by the common witness of the sources, to have been justified.

Bibliography: Dinawarī, al-‘Abbâr al-Tawâlī (Guirgass), Yaḵṭūbī, Ṣāḥib, Murādī, indexes; Ibn Khallikān, no. 200; Ibn al-Tiktaḵāk, Fakhrī (Dèrenbourg), 205-10; S. Moscati, in Rend. Linc., 1949, 324-31. (S. Moscati)

ABU’L-SALĂT UMAYYAH B. ‘ABD-AL-ÂżĪZ B. ABD AL-ÂżĪZ AL-ÂMÎL, was born in 446/1057 in Denia (Dâniyya), in the Levante, and studied under the kāfi al-Wâkkâši from whom he inherited his encyclopaedic knowledge. About 489/1096 we find him in Alexandria and Cairo, where he continued to pursue his studies. In consequence of an unsuccessful attempt to refoat a sunken ship, he was imprisoned by the vizier al-Âḍîl. Exiled from Egypt, he went (in 505/1112-3) to al-Mahdiyya, where he was well received by the Zirid amīrs Yahyā b. Tamīm, and his son ‘Abbâr. Yahyā, and he remained in al-Mahdiyya, an honoured and respected figure, until his death on 1 Muharram 529/1134 (other dates are also mentioned).

The following may be mentioned of his numerous works. (i) Taḥfīz al-Dīrām, a short treatise on Aristotelian logic, edited and translated into Spanish by A. González Palencia, Madrid 1915 (with bibliographical introduction). (ii) Risāla fi l-‘Âmal bi l-Âṣturâb, on the use of the astrolabe; a short analysis with a list of the chapters, in Millâs, Assâiq. (iii) Answers to scientific questions (masâ‘il) concerning different problems of physics, cosmography and mathematics; short summary ibidem. (iv) A summary of astronomy, composed for the Egyptian vizier al-Âḍîl, which, according to the judgment of his contemporaries, was a manual without educational value and useless for teachers. (v) Al-ÂdÎyâ fi ‘l-Murâdâ, on simples, was translated into Latin by the famous physician Arnaldo de Villanova and into Hebrew by Yehuda Natan. (vi) Al-Ârâsî fi-l-Miṣâriyya, dedicated to Abu ’l-Âţāhir Yahyā b. Tamīm, and giving vivid information about the affairs and the customs of Egypt; ed. by ’Abd al-Salām Hūrūn, Naqd al-Maghdūbud, Cairo, (vii) Risâla fi l-Mâšīḥi; the Arabic original is lost, but an anonymous Hebrew translation is preserved in Paris, Bibl. Nat., Hebrew MS no. 1036.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Kiftī, 80; Ibn Abī Usaybi‘a, ii, 52 ff.; Yaḵṭūbī, Fâhīd, ii, 361; Ibn Khallikān, 101; Maḵkārī, Analectes, i, 530 ff., 218-9; Brockelmann, i, 641, S 1, 890; Suter, 175; M. Steinschneider, Die Hebräischen Übersetzungen, 735, 885; L. Leclerc, Médicine arabe, ii, 74-5; J. M. Millâs Vallacrossa, Assâiq d’Histoire de les idées fisiques i matematiques a la Catalunya medieval, i, 75-81; G. Sarton, Introduction to the Histo. of Science, i, 230. (J. M. Millâs)

Abu’l-Sâlît also wrote for al-Hasan b. Yahyā, a historical work, viz. a continuation of the History of Ifrīqiya by Ibn al-Raḵḵ, bringing it down to 517/1123. Extracts are to be found in Ibn Ṭabārâh, al-Bayān al-Muḵtârī, i, 274 ff., 292 ff., al-Tidjānī, Riḥlā, Tunis 1927, 51 ff. (= JA, 1852/ii, 131), 90 (= ibidem, 176), 237 (= JA, 1853, 375 ff.), and Ibn al-Khaṭîb (Centenario di Michele Amari, i, 455-9). (S. MOSCATI)

ABU’L-SÂRÂYÂ AL-HAMDÂNĪ [see Hamdânî].

ABU’L-SÂRÂYÂ AL-SÂRÎ B. MÂNṢūR AL-SHAYBÂNĪ, Shi‘ite rebel. Said to have been a donkey-driver, and afterwards a bandit, he entered the service of Yazīd b. Marṣayd al-Shaybānî in Armenia, and was engaged against the Khurramiyya [g.n.]. Later he commanded Yazīd’s vanguard against Harthama in the civil war between al-Âmīn and al-Ma’mūn, but subsequently changed sides and joined Harthama. Obtaining permission to go on pilgrimage to Mecca, he openly revolted, and after defeating the troops sent against him went to al-Raḵḵ. Here he met the ‘Aḥid Muḥammad b. Ibrâhîm b. Ṭaḥtâbâ [g.n.] whom he persuaded to go to Kūfā, and himself joined him there on 10 Džumâdâ l-ÂI 150/26 Jan. 815. Three weeks later he defeated the army sent by al-Hasan b. Sahīl to put down the revolt at Kūfā, and on the following day (1 Râṣâb/15 Feb.) Ibn Ṭaḥtâbâ died. The Sunnī sources accuse Abu’l-Sârâyâ of poisoning him, but the accusation is not borne out by the Shi‘ite tradition. Another ‘Aḥid, Muḥammad b. Mūṭ. b. Zayd, was chosen as Îmān, but the effective power remained in the hands of Abu’l-Sârâyâ. He had dirhams coined in Kūfā (ZDMG, 1868, 707) and sent detachments to take Wâṣīt, Baṣrâ, al-Ahwätz, Mecca, etc. When he next marched on Baghdâd, al-Hasan b. Sahīl appealed to Harthama, then on his way back to Khūrašān. Harthama at once turned back, defeated Abu’l-Sârâyâ at Kār Ibn Ḥuṣayn (Shawwal/May-June), and besieged him in Kūfâ. Since the Kufans refused to support him, Abu’l-Sârâyâ fled with 800 horsemen (16 Muḥarram 200/26 Aug. 815), made for Sûsâ, but was there defeated and himself wounded by the forces of the governor of Khâbizān, al-Hasan b. ‘Abbâr al-Ma’mūn, and his followers dispersed. He tried to reach his
home at Ra'ā's al-'Ayn, but was overtaken at Djalula by Hammad al-Kundaghush, who captured him and handed him over to al-Hasan b. Sahîh at Ra'ā's al-
râwân. Al-Hasan had him beheaded (10 Rabi' I 200/18 Oct. 815) and his body was hung at the bridge of Baghdad.

**Bibliography:** Tabari, iii, 976 ff.; Ibn al-

(H. A. R. Gibb)

**Abū Shâma Shâmar Al-Dîn Abû 'l-Kâсим Abû al-
Râmah b. Isâm b. al-Mâkdi, Arab his-
tor ian, born in Damascus on 23 Rabi' II 599/10 Jan. 1203. All his life was spent in Damascus except when he stayed for one year in Egypt for the purpose of study, and visited Jerusalem for fourteen days, and al-Hidâjî, twice, on pilgrimage. He obtained a professorship in Damascus, in the madrasas al-Rukniyya and al-Ashrafiiyya, only five years before his death on 19 Ramaḍân 665/13 June 1268. Like most scholars of his time he had a varied education, on a Sunni basis, and his works, consequently, dealt with several subjects, but his reputation rests on his historical writings.

His main works are: 1) *K. al-Rawdatayn fi Âḥbâr al-Dawlatayn*, a history of Nūr al-Dîn and Shâhâr al-Dîn (printed in Cairo, 1288, 1292; extracts, with French translation by Barbier de Meynard, in *Recueil des historiens des croisades, Hist. Or.*, iv, v, Paris 1896, 1906; German translation—careless and incomplete—by E. P. Goergens, entitled *Buch der beiden Garten*, 1890). It is biographical rather than historical work, especially in the period, was born in Basra in the quarter of the Muslim authorities and preserves, in parts, the important works of al-Bark al-Shdmi by 'l-Mâṣār, or al-Mukhtasar, or al-Takrib. This became the starting-
point of one of the great literary traditions of the

2) *Al-Dhayl âla 'l-Rawdatayn*, a continuation to the preceding. In the first part of this book Abû Shâma draws mainly on the *Mirād al-Zamān* of Shbîn Ibn al-Djawzî. In the later part he himself as an eyewitness is the main source. This book is more of a biographical than historical work, especially in the second part, and is less important than K. al-Rawdatayn.

Mâṣân*, Cairo 1352, i, 255, ii, 123, 198-9, 252; see also O. Rescher, *Abriss*, ii, 28-9; Brockelmann, i, 83, s 1, 133.*

(A. Schaad-ch. Pellat)

**Abû 'l-Shâma Shâmar Abû Muḥammad Mar-
wân b. Muḥ. Arabic poet of the early ʿAbbâsîd period, was born in Bagdad in the quarter of the Banû Sa'd as a mawâd of the Banû Umayya. No date is given for his birth. His ʿabbâsîd would seem to flâde to his big nose and big mouth. He must have migrated to Baghdad somewhat considerable time before the accession of Hârûn al-Rashîd (170/786). Ibn al-Mu'tazza, *Tabâkît al-Shyurî al-Muḥdathîn* (A. Eghbal), 55, puts his death in or about 180/796. Like other poets of his time Abû 'l-Shâma Shâmar is credited with undertaking an occasional public duty. He appears to have served as transmitter of the *hadâdi* of Madnît Sâbîr to the caliph. On the whole, however, he made his precarious living by means of eulogies and lampoons. A number of anecdotes illustrate his position on the margin of the contemporary world of letters. Ibn 'Abd Râbiḥ, *ʾIthār al-Farîd*, Cairo 1333/1935, iv, 255, lists Abû 'l-Shâma Shâmar among the "luckyless wits." His originality, which was most effective in parody and to which the introduction to Arabic poetry of the talking cat that deserts its impoverished owner may be owed, went unrewarded and constant frustration induced frequent descents into unmitigated vulgarity.

**Bibliography:** A collection of his fragments with a critical introduction and a biography was published by G. E. von Grunebaum, *Orientalia*, 1935, 262-85; (G. E. von Grunebaum)

**Abû 'l-Shawâ**

**Abû Musâmah (b. ʿAbd Allâh) B. Rashîd al-Khuzâî, Arab poet, died about 200/915.** Like his relative DÎ Bilî (v.), he lived at the court of Hârûn al-Rashîd for whom he wrote panegyrics, and afterwards dirges. He then went to al-Râkî and obtained the favours of the amir 'Ukba b. al-
Aṣâhî, remaining his boon-companion and court poet until 196/811.—To justify by the care taken of his work that have been preserved, Abû 'l-Shis does not appear as an origional poet in his panegyrics, hunting poems and wine songs, though these poems were valued by his contemporaries, notably by Abû Nuwâs, who did not hesitate to plagiarize him. The elegies on the infirmities of old age which he composed at the end of his life, when he became blind, are of greater value as they express real feeling. Similarly, when he makes fun of himself or mocks at the poets who imitate the poetry of the desert (e.g. Ibn Kutayba, *Shyri*, 536, concerning the *guurab al-bayn*), he is not lacking in humour.

Mâṣân*, Cairo 1352, i, 255, ii, 123, 198-9, 252; see also O. Rescher, *Abriss*, ii, 28-9; Brockelmann, i, 83, s 1, 133.*

(A. Schaad-ch. Pellat)

**Abû Shudjâ**

**Abû Ahmad b. Ḥasan (or Husayn) b. Ahmad, a famous Shâfi'i juricconsult.** His family came from Isfâhân, his father was born in 'Abbâdân. He himself was born in 434/1042-3 in Baṣra, and there taught Shâfi'i law for more than 40 years; he was alive in 500/106-7, but the date of his death is not known. At some time, he was a kāfi. He is the author of a short compendium of Shâfi'i law, called al-Ḥâyâ fi 'l-ʾIkhâṣār, or al-
Muḥtâsîr, or al-Ṭabrî, This became the starting-
point of one of the great literary traditions of the

**Bibliography:** Yākūt iii, 598 f.; Tājī al-Dīn al-Sulṭān, *Ṭabābāl al-Shāfi‘īyya*, Cairo 1324, iv, 38; Juynboll, *Handeling*, 374 f.; Brockelmann I, 492 f.; S I, 676 f. (J. Schacht)

**Ābū Shudžā‘**

ABŪ SULAYMĀN MUḤAMMĀD B. AL-HUṢAYN [see al-Rūḍḥawārī]

**ABŪ SUFYYĀN B. ḤABB B. UMAYYA,** of the clan of *Abū Shams* of Kuraysh, prominent Meccan merchant and financier (to be distinguished from Muhammad's cousin Abū Sufyān b. al-Harith b. Utbā). He realized that the result of the settlement of Medina by Safwan b. Umayya and the submission of the main settlement of Medina by Shahrastānī b. al-Subkī, who had business and family connections there, helped to destroy the idol of al-Lāt. He was appointed governor of Nadīrān and perhaps also of the Hijāz, but whether by Muhammad or Abū Bakr is disputed. It is true that he was in Mecca at Muhammad's death and spoke against Abū Bakr, he cannot have been governor of Nadīrān then; but the alleged speech, like many other statements about Abū Sufyān, may be anti-Umayyad propaganda. He was present at the battle of the Yarmūk, but may have done little more than exhort the younger men, as he was about 70. He is said to have died about 32/653 aged about 88. Of his sons, Yāzīd died as a Muslim general in Palestine about 16/639, and Mu'āwiya was the first Umayyad caliph.


**ABŪ SULAYMĀN MUḤAMMĀD B. ṬĀHIR B. BAKRĀM AL-SIDJIṢṬĀNĪ AL-MANȚIKĪ, philosopher, b. about 300/912, d. about 375/985. He was a pupil of Matta b. Yunus (d. 328/939) and Yahya b. Ṭalhā b. Abī Ṭalhā. His name is sometimes given as Abū Ḥanẓala. Abū Shams had been at one time a member of the political group known as the Mutayyabūn (which included the clan of Ḥāshim), but about Muhammad's time he had moved away from this group and in some matters cooperated with the rival group, Makhshīm, Dāmūs, Sāḥib, etc. As head of *Abū Shams* of Kuraysh, prominent Meccan clan of al-Ṭaḥfūl, he led caravans in person, notably in 2/624 when a caravan of 1000 camels returning from Syria under the command of the old Greek philosophers (cf. P. Kraus, in *Islamica*, 1931, 534-8; add Brit. Mus. Or. 9033; cancel Bodl. Marsh 539; Leiden 133 contains an abbreviation is extant in several MSS (cf. M. Plessner, *Abregé de la loi jurisprudence musulmane*, *Revue de l'Institut de Droit de l'Université d'Alger*, II, 1935; edition and (faulty) translation of the corresponding chapters of the text, by E. Sachau, *Muhammadanisches Recht*, Berlin 1897). Various other authors also quote Abū Sulayman for information concerning the history of the old Greek philosophers, *Siwān al-Ṭikmā*, to "Abu Hayyan al-Tawhīdī" [q.v.], and lived in Baghdad (he was patronized by 'Adud al-Dawla, to whom he dedicated some of his treatises), occupying an eminent place among the philosophers of the capital. His system, like that of most of the other members of his environment, had a strong Neo-platonic colouring. For the content of his teaching we are mainly indebted to "Abu Hayyan al-Tawhīdī" [q.v.], whose works, especially *Muḥākāʿa* and *al-Mudīq al-Muṣafīr* ("Munya*), are filled with reports of Abū Sulaymān's utterances on philosophical as well as many other topics, usually expressed in a rather involved and obscure style. A few of Abū Sulaymān's shorter treatises have survived in MS. Of his history of Greek and Islamic philosophers, *Siwān al-Ṭikmā*, only an abbreviation is extant in several MSS (cf. M. Plessner, in *Islamica*, 1931, 534-8; add Brit. Mus. Or. 9033; cancel Bodl. Marsh 539; Leiden 133 contains an even shorter version by al-Ghaḍānfar al-Tibrīzī). The *Siwān al-Ṭikmā* was one of the sources of al-Shahrastānī, *al-Milal wa 'l-Nihal*, for the description of the old Greek philosophers (cf. F. Kraus, in *BIE*, 1937, 207 = IC, 1938, 146). Various other authors also quote Abū Sulaymān for information concerning the history of philosophy: Ibn al-Nadim (who was a disciple of his), *Fihrist*, 241, 243, 248; Ibn Maṭrān, see P. Kraus, *Jābir ibn Hayyān*, i, p. ixii; Ibn Abī Usaybi‘a, i, 9, 15, 57, 104, 180-7.

**Bibliography:** *Fihrist*, 264, 316; Abū Shudžā‘, *Ṭaḍāl al-Ummām* (Amedroz-Margoliouth), 75-7; Bayhaḵī, *Tabīkh al-Šāwī al-Ṭikmā* (M. Shafi), 74-5; Yākūt, *Iṣāba*, ii, 89, iii, 100, v, 360, 398 (after Abī Hayyān); Sāḥib al-Andalūs, 81; Ibn al-Kiṭīb, 282-5; Ibn Abī Usaybi‘a, i,
321-2; Brockelmann, I, 236, S I, 377; Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb Kazzwīnī, ʿSharḥ-i Ḥāl-i Ābu Sulaymān Mānūšī Sīyāṣīdānī (Publ. de la Société des Études Iranennes, no. 5), Chalon-sur-Saône 1933 = Bītā Makālah, Teheran 1934, 94 ff. (S. M. Stern)

ABŪ 'L-SUʿŪD MUḤAMMAD b. MUḤYĪ ʿL-DĪN MUḤ. B. AL-ʿIMĀD MUṢṬAPĀ AL-ʿIMĀDĪ, known as Khodja Celebi (Hoca Celebi), famous commentator of the Kurān, Hanafi scholar and Shaykh al-Islām, born 17 Shahrūd 969/30 December 1460, died 5 Dhimādād 952/23 August 1543. He was of Iskilib (Iskilip, west of Amasia) and native of Iskilib. He became Muslims, while Talib fought against Muḥammad. Abu Ṣuʿūd began his career as a teacher, being eventually promoted to one of the “Eight Madrasas” of Sultan Muḥammad II. In 939/1533 he was appointed kādi, first in Brūsā (Bursa), then in Istanbul; in 944/1537 he became kādi ʿasker of Rumelia, and in 952/1545 Sultan Sulaymān I. made him Grand Mufti or Shaykh al-Islām. He kept this post for the rest of his life, under Sulaymān and his successor Qāsim. Abu 'l-Suʿūd was bound to Sulaymān by real friendship, and though he could not quite maintain his exclusive influence under Sulaymān, this Sulaymān too held him in high esteem. The one reproach that is made against him is his scheming and his eagerness for the intimacy of the great. To Sulaymān, he justified the killing of Yaʿḥīdī, and to Qāsim the attack on Cyprus, in breach of a treaty of peace with Venice. He was buried in the Abu Ayyūb quarter of Istanbul, where his tomb still exists. When the news of his death reached the Holy Cities, funeral prayers for an absent person were said for him. Several of his disciples held important positions under Sulaymān, Qāsim and Muḥammad III.

As Shaykh al-Islām, Abu 'l-Suʿūd succeeded in bringing the kānān, the administrative law of the Ottoman Empire, into agreement with the ǧarīrā, the sacred law of Islam. Supported by Sulaymān, he completed and consolidated a development which had already started under Muḥammad II. He formulated, consciously and in sweeping terms, the principle that the competence of the ǧarīrā derives from their appointment by the Sultan, and that they are therefore bound to follow his directives in applying the ǧarīrā. Already as kādi ʿasker he had begun, on the orders of the Sultan, to revise the land law of the European provinces and to apply to it the principles of the ǧarīrā. (On the effects of this revision, see P. Lemerle and F. Wuitek, in Archives d’Histoire du droit oriental, 1945, 466 ff.) His ǧafurā, of which a number still exist in the original, were brought together in several semi-official and private collections. In keeping with his general aim, Abu 'l-Suʿūd took account of the practice in authorising the waḥy of movables and in particular of money, the giving and taking of remuneration for teaching and other religious duties, on these two questions, he became involved in polemics, in allowing the Kārgūs play, and in refraining, in the end, from giving a ḥattā against the use of coffee. Whilst he appreciated orthodox orthodox Sūfism, he did not hesitate to authorise the execution of extremist sūfīs.

In his spare time, Abu 'l-Suʿūd composed a commentary on the Kurān, drawn mainly from al-Baydāwī and al-Zamakhshārī, with the title ʾIrshād al-ʿAṭīq al-Salīm; it became popular in the Ottoman Empire and beyond its frontiers, found several commentators and was printed a number of times. Among his other, smaller works, a book of prayers drawn from traditions and meant to be learned by heart (Duʿā-nāma, or R. b. ʿl-Aḍīya al-Maʾṣūmah, may be mentioned. He also wrote some poetry in Arabic, Persian and Turkish.


ABŪ TĀHIR SULAYMĀN AL KARMAṬI [see AL-DAVƏNNA]\n
ABŪ TĀHIR TARSUSİ (TARTOŞI, TOSI) MUḤAMMAD b. ḤASAN b. ʿĀṣI b. MŪṢĀ, a person otherwise unknown, said to be the author of several novels in prose, prolix in style and of great length, a confused mixture of Arab and Persian legendary traditions, written in Persian and afterwards translated into Turkish. These include Kahramān-nāma (about Kahramān, a hero from the epoch of Hūghang, semi-mythical king of Iran), Kirən-i Həbəğəi (the story of a hero from the time of the Kayänid king Kay Kubād), Dārāb-nāma (history of Darius and Alexander).


ABŪ TĀKA [see SİKKĀ]

ABŪ TĀLĪB, son of ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib b. Ḥāšim and Fāṭima bint ʿAmr (of Makhzūm), and full brother of Muḥammad’s father. His own name was ʿAbd Manāf. He is said to have inherited the offices of sīkāya and riḍāda (providing water and food for pilgrims) from his father, but at the Hilf al-Fuḍūl and war of the Fīḏjar his brother al-Zubayr seems to have been the leading man of Hāšim. He fell into debt, and to meet this surrendered the sīkāya and riḍāda to al-ʿAbbās. Nevertheless he seems to have remained chief of the clan of Hāšim, and their quarter of the town was called the ḥār of Abū Tālib. When ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib died, he looked after Muḥammad, and is said to have taken him on trading journeys to Syria. He continued to protect Muḥammad when he came forward as prophet, even when most of the other clans of Qurayšy boycotted Hāšim and al-Muṭṭalib; there were presumably also economic reasons for the boycott. He died shortly after the end of the boycott, about 619, and was probably succeeded as chief by his brother Abū Lahab. Of his sons by Fāṭima bint ʿAsad b. Ḥāšim, ʿAlī (who is said to have been brought up by Muḥammad) and Dišāfār became Muslims, while Tālib fought against Muḥammad-
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mad at Badr. He himself, though protecting Muhammad, clearly did not become a Muslim; but the point was much discussed and varying traditions circulated, in connection with the theological question of the fate of those who lived before Muhammad’s mission.

Bibliography: Ibn Hisām, 114-7, 167-77; Ibn Sa’d, ii, 75-9, 134-5, 139-41; Tabarî, i, 1123-6, 1173-5, 1198-9; Ibn Ḥajar, Isbā’a, iv, 211-9; Th. Nūdeke, in ZDMG, 1898, 27-8; Goldzaher, Muh. Studien, ii, 87; Caetani, Annales, ii, 158, 298, 307, etc.; F. Buhl, Das Leben Muham-
mads, 115-8; Montgomery Watt, Muhammad at Mecca, index. (W. Montgomery Watt)

ABŪ TĀLĪB KALĪM [see kālīm].

ABŪ TĀLĪB MUHAMMAD B. ‘ALI AL-HĀRITHI AL-MARKK, d. in Baghdad in 386/998, muḥādīth and mystic, head of the dogmatic madhab of the Sāliḥiya [q.v.] in Basra. His chief work is the Kūt al-Kulub, Cairo 1310, whole pages of which were copied by al-Ghazzālī in his Ihyā’ Ulum al-Dīn.

Bibliography: Brockelmann, i, 200, S 1, 159-66; Sayyid Murtaḍā, Ḩāfī, Cairo, ii, 67, 69 and passim; Ṣā’āravī Ḥāfī, Cairo, ii, 28; Ibn Ḥabbād al-Rundi, al-Rasā’il al-Kubrā, līth, Fez 1530, 149, 200-1; L. Massignon, Études sur les origines du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane, and ed., index and refl. cited. (L. Massignon)

ABŪ TĀLĪB KHĀN (1752-1806), the son of Hāḍīj Muhammad Beg, of Turkish descent, was born at Lucknow. His early years were spent in Mūrghbādā at the court of Muzaffar Dīwān. With the accession of ʿĀṣaf al-Dawla (1775) he returned to Oudh and was appointed a mādīd of Ḥāwā, and other districts. He also served as a revenue official under Colonel Hanney who farmed the country of Sarwār. He was later employed by Nathaniel Middleton, the English Resident, and was connected with Richard Johnson in the manage-
ment of the confiscated diqāis of the Begams of Oudh. He remained in Oudh until 1796. In February 1799 he sailed from Calcutta to Europe where he visited England, France, Turkey, and other coun-
tries, returning to India in August 1803. An account of his travels, the Masir-i Tālibī fi Bilād-i ifrādij was published in 1812 and translated into English by C. Stewart (1814) and into French by Ch. Malo (1819). He also wrote the Lubb al-Siyar wa-duqān-nāmā and the Ḥalqāsāt al-Āfār. His Taṣfī al-
Ghīlān, a history of Oudh under ʿĀṣaf al-Dawla, is an important source for the careers of Ḥāwār Beg and the various English residents, and contains a spirited defence of Hanney’s revenue administra-

Bibliography: Elliot and Dowson, History of India, viii, 298 ff.; Rieu, Cat. of Persian Ms., i, 1, 378 ff. (C. COLLIÈRES)

ABŪ TAMMĀM ḤABĪB B. AWS, Arabic poet and anthologist. According to his son Tammām he was born in the year 188/804; according to an account deriving from himself, in the year 190/806 (Akbār, 272-3) and in the town of Dīsām between Damascus and Tiberias. He died according to his son in 253/865, according to others 2 Muḥarram 234/23 Aug. 846 (ibid.). His father was a Christian by name Thādūs (Thaddeus, Theodosios?) who kept a wine-shop in Damascus. The son altered the name of his father to Aws (Akbār, 246) and invented for himself a pedigree connecting him with the tribe of Tāyyī. He was mocked on the score of this false pedigree in satirical verses (Akbār, 235-8); later, however, the pedigree appears to have found ac-
cceptance, and Abū Tammām himself, in the happenings mentioned in his poetry and the biography of the men eulogised by him are accurately established. According to one tradition he composed his first panegyrics in Damascus for Muh. b. al-Ḍāḥm, brother of the poet ʿAlī b. al-Ḍāḥm (al-Muwaṣṣāḥah, 324). This, however, can hardly be correct, as this personage was only in 225 appointed governor of Damascus by al-Muṭṭāṣim (Khallī Mardām Bek, in the preface to the Dīwān of ʿAlī b. al-Ḍāḥm, 4). According to the poet’s own account (Akbār, 121), he composed his first poem in Egypt for the tax-collector ‘Ayāṣh b. Lahlī (al-Badi’, 181). He was, however, disappointed by him and repaid him, as often in similar circum-
stances, with lampoons (cf. al-Badi’, 174 ff.). Al-
Kindī (Governors and Judges of Egypt, ed. Guest, 181, 183, 186, 187) quotes some verses of Tammām referring to events in Egypt in the years 211-4. From Egypt Abū Tammām returned to Syria. At this time are to be placed, apparently, the encomia and lampoons on Abu ʿl-Mughīth Mūsā b. Ibrāhīm al-Rāfīkī. When al-Maʿmūn returned from his campaign against the Byzantines (215-8), Abū Tammām, clad in the bedouin attire beloved by him all his life, offered him a ḥāṣida, which however was not to the caliph’s taste, since he took exception to the fact that a bedouin should compose urban poetry (Abū Hīlāl al-ʿAṣkari, Dīwān al-Maʿmānī, ii, 120). At this time the young Buṭūrī perhaps came into contact with him in ʿAṣkār (Akbār, 66, cf. 105).

Abū Tammām first rose to fame and became generally known under al-Muṭṭāṣim. On the de-
struction of Amorium in the year 243/856 (cf. ʿAmīrīYAYA) the Muṭṭāṣim, chief of the August before the caliph in Sāmarrā. The caliph recalled the harsh voice of the poet, who had heard in Maṣṣa, and granted Abū Tammām an audience only after making sure that he had with him a rāvek, or reciter, with a pleasant voice (Akbār, 143-4). Then began Abū Tammām’s career as the most celebrated panegyrist of his time. In addition to the caliph he eulogised in his ḥāṣidas the highest dignitaries of his epoch. One of these was Ibn Abī Duʿūd, whom, however, he offended temporarily through a poem in which the South Arabs (to whom the tribe of Tāyyī belonged) were greatly extolled to the disadvantage of the North Arabs (from which the chief kāfi claimed descent). An apologetic ḥāṣida had to be addressed to the patron before his reinstatement was effected (Akbār, 147 ff.). Other personalities eulogised by him were, for example, the general Abū Saʿīd Muḥ. b. Yūsuf al-Marwazi, who had distinguished himself in the war by Byzantium and in the operations against the Khurramite Bābak, and his son Yūsuf, killed by the Armenians in 237 while governor of Armenia; Abū Dulāf al-Kāfī, a chief (Akbār, 285; Ḥāṣāh b. Ṣāḥib al-Muṣlīm; police chief (Akbār al-
dījir) of Ḍaghdāg by Baghdād from 207 to 235. Hasan b. Wāḥib, secretary to the wazīr Muḥ. b. ʿAlī al-Malik al-
Zayyāt was a particular admirer of Abū Tammām. Abū Tammām also travelled several times to visit
up his merits and demerits. Al-Marzubānī (d. 384) in al-Muwṣahābāt, Cairo 1343, 303, 329, brings into prominence rather his weak than his strong points. Al-Shirāzī, al-Murtadā in his al-Shīrāzī fi l-Safāy wa l-Ṣabbāt, Istanbul 1932, defends the poet against al-ʿĀmidī’s strictures. The modern reader will follow the judgement of the old critics. Abū Tammān’s kaṣīdas contain, side by side with brilliant conceits which have established the poet’s fame, much that is unpleasant. He has a penchant not only for queer words but also for artificial, frequently tortuous, sentence construction, the understanding of which exercised the Arabic commentators. Unhappy personifications of abstract ideas, affected, far-fetched and unconvincing metaphors harass the reader often for many verses at a stretch till he stumbles on an excellent poetical figure. Added to this is an unfortunate tendency towards paronomasia and subtly-reasoned antithesis, to which he all too frequently sacrifices the clarity and attractiveness of the phrase (cf. Abū al-ḤāIR al-Dūrjānī, Asrār al-Balāgha, ed. Ritter, 15). The Diwān was collected by al-Sūlí (alphabetically), by Abū b. Hāmza al-Īṣfahānī (under subjects), also handed on by al-Sukkārī (Oriens, 1949, 268) and others. Unsatisfactory editions Cairo 1299, Beyrut 1889, 1905, 1923, 1934. Index by Margoliouth in JRAS, 1905, 763-82. No edition exists as yet of the numerous commentaries, absolutely indispensable for the understanding of his poetry, by al-Sūlí, al-Marzūkī, al-Tibrīzī, Ibn al-Mustawfī (Akbhār, intr. 8; H. Ritter, Philologica, iii, in Oriens, 1949, 266-9; Hādīdī Khalīfī, under Diwān Abū Tammān, and Ismāʿīl PāSHA, Idāḥ al-Maknūn fi l-Dhayl al-ʿAṣkallī, i, Istanbul 1945, 422). [The commentary of al-Tibrīzī is in course of publication in Cairo; vol. i, 1952.]

Abū Tammān collected in addition several anthologies of poetry. The best known is a collection of fragments (muballāṯaʿāt) by less known poets, which he made during his involuntary halt in Hamadhān, the Ḥamāsā. Edited with the commentary of al-Tibrīzī by G. Freytag, Hamasae Carmina cum Tibrizii scholis, Bonn 1828, Latin transl. 1847-51, reprinted with all the errors Bulak 1284, Cairo 1938. On the numerous commentaries see Brockelmann, i, 134 ff.; H. Ritter, Philologica, iii, in Oriens, 1949, 246-67; Hādīdī Khalīfī, s.v. Ḥamāsā, and Ismāʿīl PāSHA, Idāḥ al-Maknūn, i, 422. Of the other anthologies there are preserved in manuscript the Ḥamāsā al-Ṣuḥrāʾ or al-Ḥuṣaynīyyāt (see Oriens, 1949, 261-2), not to be identified with any of the ʾIḥtiyyārāt mentioned by al-ʿĀmidī; and ʾIḥtiyyār al-Ṣuʿwārāʾ, which he made during his involuntary halt in Mashhad (see MMIA, xxiv, 274). We know only the names of the remainder: al-ʾIḥtiyyārāt min Shīr al-Ṣuʿwārāʾ wa Madḥ al-Khulafāʾ wa Akhkh Dīwān az-Zamīm (Fīrist, 105, Maʿṣūdī al-Tanṭūsī, 18); al-ʾIḥtiyyārāt min Asghar al-Kabūlī al-Kabīr (Fīrist) = al-ʾIḥtiyyār al-Kabīr al-Kabīr (Mawṣūla, 23); ʾIḥtiyyār al-Muṣalāfāt, beginning with ghasal (ib.); al-ʾIḥtiyyār min Asghar al-Muṣalāhīn (ib.). Also the Nakṣūd Dīwār wa l-ʾAṣkallī, ed. Salhānī, Beyrut 1922, derives from him.

ABŪ TAMMĀM — ABū 'UBAYD AL-BAKRĪ


(AB. RITTE)

ABŪ ŞAHİFÎN I, ‘Abd al-Rahmân b. Abi Hâmmû, fifth sovereign of the ‘Abd al-Wâdîd dynasty. Proclaimed 23 Dhîhânâdâ 178/23 July 1318 after the murder of his father Abū Hâmmû I, he exiled to Spain all those of his relatives who could claim the throne and thus freed his hands to lay siege to Constantine and Bidjâya (Bougie) and to make an attempt at extending his kingdom towards the east. The Şâhidîs, however, allied themselves with the Marinids and the Marinid sultan Abū ‘l-Hasân seized Abû Şahîfîn’s dominions and besieged Tlemcen in 735/1335. Two years later the capital was taken by assault and the king was killed in battle.

Bibliography: see ‘ABD AL-WÂDÎDS.

(A. BEL)

ABÛ ŞAHİFÎN II b. Abi Hâmmû Mûsâ, sovereign of the ‘Abd al-Wâdîd dynasty. Born in Rabî’ I 732/4-Apri May 1331, he passed his youth in Nedroma. After the flight of Abû Hâmmû II to Tunis, the Marinid sultan Abû ‘l-‘Inân sent him to Fes; he returned to Tlemcen only in 760/1359. In spite of his father’s concessions to him, his impatience to accede to the throne drove him to attempts to get rid of Abû Hâmmû. But Abû Hâmmû, put into prison in Oran, escaped; and when sent on pilgrimage, returned triumphantly to Tlemcen. Finally Abû Şahîfîn took command of a Marinid army which defeated Abû Hâmmû and enabled him to accede to the throne in Dhî ‘l-Hijdâja 791/10 May 1389. He remained faithful to his obligations as a vassal of the Marinids and died on 17 Radjab 795/29 May 1393.

Bibliography: see ‘ABD AL-WÂDÎDS.

(A. BEL)

ABU ‘l-ṬAYYIB [see AL-MUBÂDÎL].

ABU ṬAYYIB [see AL-MUTANÂBÎ, AL-TABÂRÎ].

ABÛ THÂWR Ibrahim b. Mâlikî b. Abi ‘l-Yâmân al-Kalbî, prominent jurist and founder of a school of religious law, died in Baghdad in Safar 290/July 854. Living in ‘Irāq one generation after al-Šâhîfî, Abû Thâwr seems to have been influenced by al-Šâhîfî’s methodological insistence on the authority of the hadîth of the Prophet, without, however, renouncing the use of ra’y [q.v.], as had been customary in the ancient schools of law. The later biographers represented this as a conversion on the part of Abû Thâwr from the ra’y of the ancient ‘Irâqîs to the school of al-Šâhîfî, and he is, indeed, often counted among the adherents of the Šâhîfîs’s school. But his opinions, which often diverge from Šâhîfî’s doctrine, are not regarded as variants (ru’dûk) of the doctrine of the school, nor does he, indeed, enjoy a particularly high reputation as a traditionist. Some cautious praise of him as a jurist and is attributed to his former contemporary, Ahmad b. Hanbal. A limited number of Abû Thâwr’s opinions on religious law are quoted in the works on Šâhîfî [q.v.], particularly in the two fragments of al-Tabârî’s Ittihâdî al-Fuhaðîn (ed. Kern, Cairo 1902, and Schacht, Leiden 1933). The school of Abû Thâwr was still widely represented in the 4th/10th century, particularly in Armenia and Adharbâyjan.


ABÛ TûRÂB, nickname of ‘Ali b. Abî Ta’lîb [q.v.].

ABU ‘UBAYD AL-BAKRĪ, Abû Allâh b. Abû ‘l-‘Azîz b. Mûh. b. Ayyûb, was, with al-Shârîf al-Idrisî [q.v.], the greatest geographer of the Muslim West, and one of the most characteristic representatives of Arab Andalusian erudition in the 5th/11th century.

Although little is known about the details of the life of Abû ‘Ubayd al-Bakrî, it is possible to describe the various aspects of his scientific activity, all of which seems to have taken place in his own country; in fact, he appears never to have travelled in the East, or even North Africa, which he nevertheless described so minutely. According to the information which has come down to us, the principal facts of his biography amount to the following: his father, Izz al-Dawla ‘Abd al-‘Azîz al-Bakrî, was the only sovereign (or else the second, after his brother Abû Muş’ab Muh. b. Ayyûb) of the diminutive principality of Huelva (Walba [q.v.]) and Saltes (Shalîsh [q.v.]), founded in 403/1012, at the time of the fall of the Marwânîs’ caliphate of Cordova, on the Atlantic coast of the south of the Iberian peninsula, not far west of Niebla (Labla). In 443/1051, ‘Izz al-Dawla, under the political pressure exerted against him by al-Mu’âthîdî b. ‘Abd al-Mu’âthîdî [q.v., ‘ABBÂIDS], was forced to give up his principality to the king of Seville, who annexed it to his possessions. Abû ‘Ubayd, the exact date of whose birth is unknown, must at this time have been at least thirty. He accompanied his father to Cordova, which was chosen by him for his new place of residence, under the more or less effective protection of its ruler Abû ‘l-Walîd Muh. b. ‘Abd al-’Azîz [q.v., ‘QAWÂRÎDS]. These, anyway, are the particulars given by Ibn Ḥâjâr al-Mâshî, in Ibn Bassâm, al-Dhakhîra, ii, reproduce by Ibn ‘Ukhîrî, al-Raydîn, iii, 240-2, and Dozy, Abbâd, i, 252-3), and which there is no reason to doubt, but another source (append. to al-Raydîn, iii, 299) asserts that Abû ‘Ubayd and his father, who died about 456/1064, withdrew to Seville itself, which is not improbable. However that may be, Abû ‘Ubayd very quickly became known as a distinguished writer. He was the pupil of the chronicler Abû Marwân b. Ḥâyyân and of other masters of repute, and moved in provincial court circles, especially that of the Banû Shumâdî of Almeria. When he later witnessed the military and political intervention of the Almoravids in Spain, and the successive depositions of the Mûthûk al-Jawâlîfî, he had already written most of the numerous works for the preparation of which he had collected innumerable notes. He settled at Cordova, which had been restored by the sultan Yûsf b. Tâhîfîn to the position of capital of al-Andalus: and there he died, full of years, in Ḥajwâlî 487/Nov.-Nov. 1094 (496 according to al-Dabbî, who attributes to him the title of ‘abû ‘l-wallâlîyân).

Abû ‘Ubayd al-Bakrî, to judge by the variety of his works, appears as a perfect type of mûshârikh, having acquired an extensive knowledge of widely different branches of learning. He was principally a geographer, but also at the same time a theologian,
philologist, and botanist. He even cultivated the art of poetry, since certain of his biographers have reproduced some of his bacchic verses, and he has been given the reputation of a confirmed drinker. He has also been depicted as a bibliophile, who preserved his valuable manuscripts in envelopes of fine fabric.

In the religious sphere, Ibn Başḫuwwāl attributes to himself, without giving the title, a work on the "signs of the prophetic mission" of the Messenger of God (fi ʾaḥlām nubuwwat nabiyyīn). As a philologist, Ibn Kháyır (Fahrara, B A H, ix-x, 325, 326, 343, 344), attributes to him four works: (1) a criticism of Abū ʾAlī al-Kālí (q.v.), -tā nbannāt Abī ʾAlī fī Kitāb al-Nawādīr, ed. A. Ġalhānī, 4 vol., Cairo 1344/1926; cf. Brockelmann, S 1, 202; (2) a commentary on the Amālī of the same, Simīn al-Lāʾlī fī Sharḥ al-Amālī, ed. Abū al-Aʿzīz Maymūn, Cairo 1354/1936; cf. Brockelmann, loc. cit.; (3) a commentary on the verses quoted in al-Gharīb al-Musannāf of Abū ʿUbayd al-Kāsīm b. Sallām, entitled Siyat al-Mafṣūl; (4) a commentary on the collection of proverbs by the same Abū ʿUbayd b. Sallām, entitled Faṣl al-Makālī fī Sharḥ Kitāb al-Amālī (MS at Istanbul; cf. M G, vii, 123; Z D M G, 1910; Brockelmann, S 1, 166 f. n.). Lastly we may mention another work, semi-historical, semi-philological, which seems to be lost: al-Muṣallal wa-l-Muṣalalāt on the names of the Arab tribes.

The botanical work of Abū ʿUbayd al-Bakrī, Kitāb al-Nabāṭī, also indicated by Ibn Kháyır, Fahrara, 377, seems not to have been found yet in MS. It has its place, in any case, in the series of Andalusian treatises on descriptive botany, made up of alphabetically-arranged items, and it served as a direct source for the naturalist of the 6th/12th century Ibn ʿAbdūn (q.v.) al-Ishbīlī, for the composition of his ʿUmādat al-Tāḥā fī Sharḥ al-Aṣāḥib (cf. M. Asīn Palacios, Glosario de voces romances registradas por un botánico anónimo hispano-musulmán, Madrid-Granada 1943, xxvii and n. 1). This botanical treatise, which Ibn Abī ʿUṣaybīn described in a few lines (cf. M. Meyerhof, Esquisse d'histoire de la pharmacologie et botanique chez les Musulmans d'Espagne, in And., 1925, 1926; the same, Un glossaire de matières médicales de Maïmonide, in Mém. Inst. d'Égypte, xlii, 1900, xxviii), mainly concentrated, as did that of Ibn ʿAbdūn, on the peninsula of Andalus; it was made use of not only by the latter, but also by the naturalists al-Ghālīkī and Ibn al-Bayṭārī.

Abū ʿUbayd al-Bakrī's geographical work, on which his renown in the Arab world was mainly based, consists of two books of unequal length and importance: Muḍījam maʿ istādījam wa-l-Masdīlīk wa-l-Maṣālik wa-l-Maṣālikī. The Muḍījam, which was published by F. Wüstendörfer in an essay entitled (Das geographische Wörterbuch, Göttingen, 1876-7; covers, 1945-51), is a list of toponyms, mostly referring to the geographical data of the kādirtd and the spelling of which had given rise to discussions. This list is preceded by an interesting introduction on the geographical setting of ancient Arabia and the respective habitats of the most important tribes.

As regards the al-Masālik, the main work of al-Bakrī, we have so far only part of it, in the form of extensive fragments, not all of which have yet been published. Of the introductory volume, which deals with general geography and the Muslim and non-Muslim peoples (MS at Paris, B. N., 5905), the greater part is still unpublished (fragment on the Russians and Slavs published at St. Petersburg in 1878 by A. Kunik and V. Rosen, Izvestiya al-Bekri i drugikh autorov o Russi i Slavyanakh, i; cf. also A. Seippel, Rerum Normannicum Fontes Arabici, Oslo 1896-1928). But the portion which is undoubtedly the most important, that dealing with the Muslim West, has long been known, as far as Africa is concerned, through the edition and French translation (both today very outdated) of MacGuckin de Slane (Description de l'Afrique septentrionale, Arabo-espagnole, Algiers 1857; 2nd ed., Algiers 1910; Fr. tr., J A, 1857-8, 2nd ed., Algiers 1910). Before that, in 1831, an abridged translation had been published in Paris by Quatremère (Not. et extr., xiii). The author of this article has published some unpublished parts of al-Masālik relating to al-Andalus, and identified the quotations included in the historico-geographical compilation entitled al-Rauš al-Miṣrī by Ibn ʿAbd al-Munīm al-Hūnīyārī al-Sabītī (La Péninsule ibérique au Moyen-Age, Leyden 1938, 254-52; cf. also La 'Description de l'Espagne' of Ahmad al-Rāzī, in And., 1953, 100-4), using a MS in the library of the Djāmīʿ al-Karawīyīn at Fīz, in which is to be found the most extensive fragment that we yet possess on the description of the Iberian Peninsula. Following the usual practice of geographers of his own time and preceding centuries, Abū ʿUbayd al-Bakrī aimed first and foremost at giving his work, as its title, descriptions of 'itineraries and kingdoms', indicates, the form of a roadbook, including an estimate of distances between each town or staging-post. A dry list of names might have been the result, interesting enough, but only a bare outline, if the author had not set upon it his personal stamp and made a discriminating choice among the mass of particulars which he had contrived to collect. These particulars are not only geographical; they concern to a considerable extent political and social history and even ethnography, and this is what gives to the Masālik of al-Bakrī, at least as far as the West is concerned, its inestimable value. His was an inquiring and methodical mind, and he thus drew some historical sketches that he never since equalled: his accounts of the Idrisids or the Almoravids, for example, still constitute the most reliable basis of our documentation on the first of these dynasties and on the origins of the second. Most of his descriptions of towns are remarkably precise; his toponymic material for the Magrib, Ifriqiyyā, and the bidda al-Ṣadāb is of a fulness no less worthy of interest.

It goes without saying that, when writing his valuable description of North Africa, Abū ʿUbayd had at his disposal, in his residence at Cordova or Seville, not only the verbal information afforded him by people coming from Ifriqiyya or the Magrib but also the work of other authors who had dealt with the same regions. The basic source, which he actually mentions several times in his work, was in fact al-Masālik wa-l-Maṣālikī by Muḥ. b. Yūsuf al-Warrākī, on the geography of Ifriqiyya. This man (see al-Warrākī and R. Brunschvig in Mélanges Gaudentroy-Demombrynes, Cairo 1935-45, 151-3), who lived for a long time in al-Kawārān before going to settle at Cordova in the reign of the caliph al-Ḥakam II and at his invitation, thus enabled al-Bakrī, who used his work (which now appears to be lost) to furnish us with information that goes back to the 10th century, and on which the geographer could draw at will. Moreover, he doubtless had at his disposal documents of the Cordovan archives...
for example on the heretical sect of the Barghawata [q.v.]). On the other hand, the fact that he makes no allusion to the intervention of the Almoravids in Spain confirms the indication that al-Bakri finished his _Masalik_ in 460/1068, i.e. eighteen years before the battle of al-Zallâqa.

Another source, not less important than al-Warrâk's book, was the geographical work of one of Abu 'Ubayd's own masters, Ahmad b. 'Umar al-'Udhri, a native of Dâlâyra (Dâlâyra, hence his _maṭrīja_ Ibn al-Dalâyri), who died at Almeria in 478/1085 (cf. Ibn Tâkim, _ibid._, xxiv, n. 2). This work, which was entitled _Nisân al-Mardûn_, and was later to be used as a source by al-Kazwîni also, gave much space to the _'aḍīdat_ [q.v.], which were not omitted likewise by al-Bakrî himself. Finally, a further source should be mentioned, of uncertain provenience but which may conceivably be simply another of Abu 'Ubayd's own works: the _Madjamâ_ al-Müsârâh, from which, in their turn, Ibn 'Ubaydî and al-Maṣârî were later to make borrowings.

For his documentation on Christian Spain and the rest of the Europe, it may be noted finally that Abu 'Ubayd 'quotes' — doubtless, however, through the intermediary of al-'Udinî, since al-Kazwîni also refers to him by the same indirect means — a Jew of Tortosa, Ibrahim b. Yaḥya al-Mâshî al-Turtushi, whose work (perhaps written in Hebrew, then translated into Arabic or Latin?) appears to be lost.

The parts of al-Bakrî's _Masalik_ that have been preserved amply merit a complete critical edition and systematic study. A study of the author's language has also yet to be undertaken; al-Bakrî is, together with the authors of _kibâ_ treatises such as Ibn 'Abdîn al-Hâfîzî, and al-Sâkâtî of Malaga, and authors of treatises on husbandry, the Andalusian writer whose vocabulary contains the greatest number of Hispanicisms.

From the point of view of the economic position of the West in the 10th and 11th centuries (data on metrology, the cost of living, commercial relationships and trade in commodities and luxury articles), his works form a very rich source. They provide a mass of information which would give scope for the drawing up of analytical lists and maps, as does the _Nuzhat al-Mushtâq_ of al-Shârî al-Idrisî, that other standard work on these subjects, which superseded his forerunners and were used and frequently quoted by all the later authors. — Only al-'Amâdisî, Cairo 1553, has been published in its entirety, and provides a mass of information which would give scope for the drawing up of analytical lists and maps, as does the _Nuzhat al-Mubtak_ of al-Shârî al-Idrisî, that other masterpiece, of a somewhat later date, on the historical geography of the Islamic world in the middle ages.

**Bibliography:** Biographical accounts of al-Bakrî, all short and with little details: Ibn Bashkawal, _Šila_, n. 628; Ḍabbî, _Bughya_, n. 930; Ibn al-Abbâr, _al-Bulla al-Siyâr_ (in Dory, _Corrections ..., Leyden_ 1883, 118-23); al-Fath b. Ḥâlîk, _Kallâdî al-Tîyân_, 218; Ibn Saḥîd, _Mughrîb_, i, Cairo 1953, 347-8; Ibn Bassâm, _Mâkkâri_ ii (account reproduced by the preceding); Suyûṭî, _Bughya_, 285; Ibn Abî Uṣayyibî, ii, 52; Maṣârî, _Nath_ ( _Amalecot_ ), ii, 125. See also Pons Boüges, _Ensayo_, p. 125; J. Alemany Boüfer, _La geografia de la Península Ibérica en los escritores árabes_, Granada 1921, 45-6; R. Blachère, _Extrait des principaux géographes arabs_, Paris 1932, 183, 253 (with a very dubious appreciation on the documentary value and style of al-Bakrî); _Lévi-Provençal, La Península Ibérica en los escritores árabes_, Leyden 1938, xxii-xxi; Brockelmann, i, 476, S. I, 875-6. The accounts by Reinaud, _Intr. à la Géogr. d'Abûlîfîda_, ciî, and by M. G. de Slane in the preface to his incomplete edition, are today very much out-of-date. Finally, for the materials relating to eastern Europe in the works of al-Bakrî, via his borrowings from Ibnâbirî al-Târîkî (see C. E. Dubler, _Abû Ubâyda al-Granadino y su relación de viaje por tierras eurasíaticas_, Madrid 1932, 161-2. (E. _Lévi-Provençal_)

**ABU 'UBAYD AL-KÂSIM B. SALLÂM** (the _nâsha_ varies between _al-Baghîdâdi_, _al-Khûrâsânî_ and _al-Anşârî_), grammarian, Kur'ânic scholar and lawyer, was born at Harât about 154/770, his father, of Byzantine descent, being a _muâlîd_ of the tribe of Azd. He studied first in his native town, and in his early twenties (about 179/795) went to Kûta, Baṣra and Baghdâd where he completed his studies in grammar, _hirâdāt_, _hadith_ and _fiḳh_. In none of these fields did he adhere to one school or group, but chose a middle position in an eclectic way. Returning home he became tutor in two influential families in Khûrâsân, and in the year 192/807 was appointed _kâdî_ of Tarâsî in Cilicia by its governor Tahît b. Naṣr b. Mâlik. Abu 'Ubayd remained in office until 210/825 and after some travelling settled for the next ten years in Baghdâd, where 'Abd Allâh b. Tâhir became his generous patron. In the year 219/834 he performed the pilgrimage and afterwards stayed on at Mecca to die there in 224/838 and to be buried in the house of Dâ'far b. Abî ' Tilîb. Twenty titles of Abu 'Ubayd's books are mentioned in the _Fihrist_, several of which have survived in MS. His three main works deal with the _gharîb_, the difficult linguistic passages, especially in the _kurâ_ and the _hadith_, and are entitled _Gharîb al-Muṣârâna_, _Gharîb al-Kurâ_ and _Gharîb al-Hadîth_ respectively. _Gharîb al-Muṣârâna_, the first great dictionary of the Arabic language, is said to consist of 1000 chapters, 1200 _gharîba_ and _gharîb_ words; 'Abd Allâh b. Tâhir granted the author a pension as a sign of recognition for it. This and all his other works are based on the previous research of other scholars, but Abu 'Ubayd in using them wrote the standard works on these subjects, which superseded his forerunners and were used and frequently quoted by all the later authors. — Only _al-'Awaṣâl_, Cairo 1553, has been published in its entirety, and provides a mass of information which would give scope for the drawing up of analytical lists and maps, as does the _Nuzhat al-Mubtak_ of al-Shârî al-Idrisî, that other masterpiece, of a somewhat later date, on the historical geography of the Islamic world in the middle ages.


**ABU 'UBAYD ALLâH MU'AWIYA B. 'UBAYD ALLâH B. YÂSÅR AL-AGHâRî, VIZIER.** Appointed by the caliph al-Mu'āṣir to the retinue of his son al-Mahdî, he was made vizier on al-Mahdî's accession (158/775). He held the office probably up to 163/779-80, but already in 161/777-8 the accusation of heresy brought against his son Muḥâmmed, which led to the latter's execution, compromised his position. The enmity of the powerful chamberlain al-Râbi' b. Dâ'ūd consummated his downfall. Removed from the vizierate and replaced by Yaḥûb b. Dâ'ûd, he was nevertheless left in the charge of the _diwan al-râṣîl_ until 167/783-4; he died in 170/787-8. According to the unanimous witness of the sources, he was a man of the first rank, competent and honest. Ibn al-Ṭâṣkāt gives an account of his organizing and administrative achievements, culminating in the reform of the _khârijâ_, substituting
for land tax in the Sawdd of al-'Irâk a proportional tax on the produce, payable in nature; he is also stated to have written a book on this subject.

Bibliography: Ya'qûbî, Tabarî; Dîbajîyâr, Wusârî (Cairo 1938), 102-118; A. Tâbi', Tables; Ibn Khalkînî, xi, 88; Ibn al-Tîkâkî, Fâhîrî (Dârânegb), 246-50; S. Mocásti, in Orientalia, 1946, 162-4.

Abû 'Ubaydâ Ma'mâr b. al-MuTâhâna, Arabic philologist, born 110/728 in Başra, d. 209/824-5 (other dates also in Ta'rikh Başra and later works). He was born a member of the Kurayshite clan of Taym, in the family of 'Ubayd Allâh Ma'mâr (cf. Ibn Ťâmî, Dhikhrat Asâbî al-'Arâb, Cairo 1948, 130); his father or grandfather originally came from Bâdâwarûn (near al-Râkîa in Mesopotamia, less probably the village of the same name in Shîrwân) and was, on dubious authority, to have been Jewish. He studied under the leading philologists of the school of Başra, Abû 'Amr b. al-'Alî and Yûnus b. Hâbbî, and composed a number of treatises on points of grammar and philology, none of which have been preserved. Breaking away, however, from the narrow philological interests of his teachers, Abû 'Ubaydâ took as his field of study everything that had been transmitted on the history and culture of the Arabs. Applying to these scattered oral materials the systematic methods employed in the philological schools, of collecting and grouping together items of the same or similar kinds, he composed a number of treatises on points of Arab and early Islamic history and tribal traditions, which served as the starting point and supplied most of the data for all future studies relating to pre-Arab and early Islamic history and tribal traditions, for example, in the Kitâb al-Khayl, composed some dozens of treatises on points of grammar and philology, none of which have been preserved. Breaking away, however, from the narrow philological interests of his teachers, Abû 'Ubaydâ took as his field of study everything that had been transmitted on the history and culture of the Arabs. Applying to these scattered oral materials the systematic methods employed in the philological schools, of collecting and grouping together items of the same or similar kinds, he composed a number of treatises on points of Arab and early Islamic history and tribal traditions, which served as the starting point and supplied most of the data for all future studies relating to pre-Islamic Arabia. His materials were arranged under general heads and these again by sub-categories, as, for example, in the Kitâb al-Khayl, on famous Arab horses, still preserved (ed. Hyderâbad 1358). Similarly, materials relating to the tribes were most frequently arranged under the categories of "virtues" (manâkîb), "vices" (matâkâmîb); by the latter he gave much offence to the tribal pride of the Arabs, the more so because they provided ammunition for the anti-Arab polemics of the Persian shu'ubiyya for the anti-Arab polemics of the Persian shu'ubiyya.

Moreover, as a convinced Kharijite (cf. with shu'ubiyya) he gave much offence to the tribal pride of the Arabs, the more so because they provided ammunition for the anti-Arab polemics of the Persian shu'ubiyya for the anti-Arab polemics of the Persian shu'ubiyya.

Abû 'Ubaydâ, however, refused the support of his authority. Tradition asserts that 'Umar intended to nominate Abû 'Ubaydâ as his eventual successor, and when a serious epidemic broke out in Syria in 18/639 he summoned Abû 'Ubaydâ to Medina. Abû 'Ubaydâ, however, refused to instruct the Yamanite converts, but returned to Medina before the death of Muhammad and together with 'Umar b. al-Khaţţâb played a decisive part in the election of Abû Bakr as Muhammad's Khâlîfa. After 'Umar's accession to the Caliphate (13/634) Abû 'Ubaydâ was despatched to Syria to join the campaigns against the Byzantine forces, and some time later, probably in the year 15/636, was given the supreme command there. After the victory on the Yarmûk in that year, Abû 'Ubaydâ completed the conquest of northern Syria (Hims, Aleppo, Antioch). In 17/638 the caliph himself visited the headquarters of the Syrian army at Dâbiyâ, to regulate the administration of Syria and to give Abû 'Ubaydâ the support of his authority. Tradition asserts that 'Umar intended to nominate Abû 'Ubaydâ as his eventual successor, and when a serious epidemic broke out in Syria in 18/639 he summoned Abû 'Ubaydâ to Medina. Abû 'Ubaydâ, however, refused
to leave Syria and himself fell a victim to the plague. He was 58 years of age, and left no descendants.

He was clearly a man whose personality impressed his contemporaries, but he is presented by later traditions in a rather colourless fashion.

Bibliography: Ibn Sa'd, iii/1, 297-301; vii/2, 111-2; Tâbarti, index; Nasafi, 410, 445; Abu Nu'aym, Hitayt al-Awlia', i, 100-2; Ibn al-Athir, Usd al-Qibla, iii, 84, v, 249; Caetani, Annali, i, ii, passim; idem, Chronographeia, A. H. 16, para. 32; C. H. Becker, in Camb. Med. Hist., ii, 1913, 341-6 (= Islamistud., 1, 81-7); H. Lammens, Le villemois, 1892; Abu Bekr, Oman et Abû Qabda, MFOB, 1910, 113 ff. (exaggerated, but contains many references to traditions in later sources).

(H. A. R. Gibb)

ABU 'UBAYDA AL-TAMIMI (see IBADIYYA)

ABU 'L-WAFÄ' AL-BUZÂJÂNÎ, MUHAMMAD B. MUH. B. YAHYA B. ISMÄ'IL B. AL-'ABBAS, one of the greatest Arab mathematicians, very probably of Persian origin, born in Buzâjian in Kuhistan, 1 Ramadân 382/10 June 1400. His first teachers in mathematics were his uncles Abu 'Amr al-Mughâzill and Abu 'Abd Allâh Muhammad b. 'Anbasâ, the former having in his turn studied geometry under Abu Yahyâ al-Mawuzâbî (or al-Mawardi) and Abu 'l-'AÂla' b. Karmîn. In the year 349/960 Abu 'l-WafÄ' emigrated to Irâq, and lived in Baghdâd until his death, which took place there in Radjab 388/July 998; according to Ibn al-Athîr and Ibn Khallikân, who follows him, in 387/997. It was Abu 'l-WafÄ', who introduced in 370/981-2, Abu Hayyân al-Tawhîdî to the vizier Ibn Sa'dân, and for whom Abu Hayyân wrote his al-'Imdâd wa'l-Munâ'asa.

Of his mathematical and astronomical works the following are extant: i. An arithmetic book, entitled Fîmâ yahdâ iHayy al-Kutdb wa'l-Ummâl min 'Ibm al-Hisâb, identical with the Al-Mansûrî fîl-Hisâb mentioned by Ibn al-Kâtîf; Woepke published in JA, 1855, 246 ff. the titles of the "stations" and of the chapters of the book. — 2. Al-Kâmîl, probably identical with the Almâqâsî mentioned by Ibn al-Kâtîf; certain parts of it have been translated by Carra de Vaux, JA, 1892, 408-71. — 3. Al-Handasa (in Arabic and Persian), probably the same as the Persian Book of the geometrical constructions of the Paris Library, reviewed by Woepke, JA, 1855, 218-56, 309-59; the latter is of the opinion that this book was not written by Abu 'l-WafÄ' himself, but by one of his pupils summing up his lectures. (See also H. Suter, in Abh. z. Gesch. der Naturwiss. u. d. Med., Erlangen 1922, 94 ff.) — Nothing unfortunately has further development of trigonometry; it is to him we owe, in spherical trigonometry, for the right-angled triangle, the substitution, for the perfect quadrilateral with the proposition of Menelaus, of the so called "rule of the four magnitudes" (since \(a = s + c = s A : t\)), and the tangent theorem \(\tan a = \tan b\); from these formulae he further infers \(\cos c = a \cos a \cos b\). For the oblique-angled spherical triangle he probably first established the sine proposition (cf. Carra de Vaux, loc. cit., 408-40). We are also indebted to him for the method of calculation of the sine of 30°, the result of which agrees up to 8 decimals with its real value (Woepke, in JA, 1860, 296 ff.). His geometrical constructions, which are partly based on Indian models, are also of great interest for Woepke (JA, 1855, 218-56). On the other hand, the merit of introducing tangents, cotangents, secants and cosecants into trigonometry does not belong to him, as these functions were already known by Habâb al-Hâsîb. Neither was he the discoverer of the variation of the moon, as asserted by L. A. Sedilliot in 1836. (A passionate dispute followed between Sedilliot and Chasles on the one side and Biot, Munk and Bertrand on the other, until Carra de Vaux, JA, 1892, 440-71, elucidated the truth of the matter.)


(H. Suter*)

ABU YA'AZZÂ (or YA'AZA) YALANNÛR B. MAVNÎN, sprung from a sub-Arabic Berber tribe (Dukkâla, Hasmîra or Haskûra), famous Moroccan saint of the 6th/12th century. After living for a time at Fez, where his zawiyâ in the al-Bi'da quarter (a dialect form of al-Bulayda) is still frequented, he settled in a village of the Middle Atlas, half-way between Rabat and Kaşâbat Tâddâl, Tâghya, which is today a small administrative centre bearing the name of the saint, as pronounced now in that region: Mûlay Bû'azzâ. He is said to have been the disciple of the patron saint of Azamûr Abu Shû'ayb Ayyûb b. Sa'dîn al-Sinâjdî (in the vernacular Mûlay Bûshîb), and himself to have had as pupil the famous Abu Madyan [q.v.] al-Ghâwî. He died of plague on 1 Shawwâl 572/3 April 1177 in his hermitage at Tâghya, where he led an ascetic life, among adepts of his sîfî doctrine. His funerary zawiyâ is the object of an annual pilgrimage (ma'sum); it was built and decorated at the end of the 17th century by the order of the 'Alawi sultan of Morocco, Mawliy Ismâ'îl.

Apart from a long notice on him by al-Tâdîlî in his al-Taşawwuf ilâ Râjîl al-Tašawwufu, Abu Ya'azzâ was the subject of a monograph, entitled al-Mu'âtî fi Manâbîb Abu Ya'âs, by a Moroccan sîfî author, Ahmad b. Abu 'l-Kâsim al-Sawmâ'î, who died in 1014/1604. See also E. Lévi-Provençal, Fragments historiques sur les Berbères au Moyen Age, Rabat 1934, 77.


(E. Lévi-Provençal)

ABU YA'KUB AL-KHURAYMÎ, ISMÄ'IL B. HASSÂN B. KÜH!, Arab poet, died probably under the caliphate of al-Ma'mûn, about 208/821. The scion of a noble family of Sogdiana, which he sometimes mentions with pride (Ya˒kûb, v, 363), al-Khuraymî (the form al-Khuwarismi is erroneous) derived his nisba from his being a mawla, not directly of Khuraym al-'Nâ'im, as most of his biographers
have it, but of his descendants, viz. Khuraym b. ʿAmir and his son ʿUthmān (see Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʾrīḥ, ii, 434-7; v, 126-8). He seems to have lived in Mesopotamia, Syria, al-Ǧarāʾa, where he frequented dissolute poets such as ʿ(storage) ʿAdhrāʾ, Mutūʿ b. ʿiyās etc. (Aǧhānī, v, 170, xiii, 82), and finally in Baghda. In Baghda he was connected with the entourage of the Rashīd (Aǧhānī, xii, 21-2) and especially with the Barmakids ʿAlī b. ʿUmar b. ʿAmir and his son ʿUthmān. Ibn al-Ḫalīfa, ʿAbd al-Qaybūṭ (al-Masʿūdī, Amlān, i, 64-5; O. Rescher, Asr al-Maʾmūn, 1293, 97; Rifaʿa al-Askari, Fihrist, index; Caire 1940, viii, 146; Askari, Sindʿatayn, 345; Thaʿālīfa, Khāṣṣ al-Khutba, Tunis 1293, 97; Rīfāʿ, Ṭarʿ al-Maʾmūn, iii, 286-94; A. ʿAmin, Ḱuḥaʾ ʿl-Īslām, i, 64-5; O. Rescher, Abrīṣ, ii, 37-8; Brockelmann, i, 111-2. (Ch. Fehlt.)

ʿAbū Yaʿqūb ibn ʿAbd al-Muʾmin, second ruler of the Muʾmīṇīd [q.v.] (Almohad) dynasty, reigned 558-80/1163-84. He succeeded to the throne by a coup d’état, in spite of the official proclamation of his elder brother Muhammad as crown-prince in 549/1154. It is true that Muhammad ruled for about two months, a fact that has been passed over in silence by almost all the historians of the dynasty; but the powerful vizier ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-Muʾmin, alleging that his father, four days before his death, had ordered the name of the heir-presumptive to be suppressed in the Ḳanūba, and that he had declared to himself (ʿUmar) on his death-bed that he wished Yūsuf to succeed him, summoned Yūsuf in all haste from Seville, where he had resided as governor for the last six years, and had him proclaimed by the Shaykhūs and the army, in Ribāt al-Ǧāt (Raḥbat), as the new caliph.

The accession of Yūsuf was by no means received with unanimous approval. His brother ʿAll, governor of Fez, who went to bury his father in Tinmailla, protested against this arbitrary nomination, but died mysteriously on his return from the Atlas. Two other brothers, ʿAbd Allāh, governor of Bīlāya, who died shortly afterwards by poison, and ʿUthmān, governor of Cordova, also refused to recognize him. Thus Yūsuf did not dare to take the caliphal title of amīr al-muʾminīn, but confined himself for five years to the title of amīr al-muṣalīmīn.

Establishing himself in Marrākush, after dismissing the enormous army concentrated by his father in Rabat, Yūsuf had to suppress a revolt that broke out among the Ghumāra, between Ceuta and Alghara, while thebayt of Ibn Mardanish [q.v.], the sayyid ʿUmar and ʿUthmān were leading a vigorous campaign in al-Andalus against Ibn Mardanish [q.v.] and his Christian mercenaries. Invading his territory, they defeated his army in 560/1165, ten miles outside Murcia. The
city resisted, however, and preserved its independence for another five years.

When the hostile sayyids had submitted or had been eliminated, Ibn Mardanîsh had been defeated and the revolt of the Ghunmâra had been suppressed, Yûsuf assumed in 565/1172 the caliphal title. Yet at the very moment that his proclamation was celebrated, the warlike little state of Portugal caused him grave concern. Giraldo sen Pavor, the famous captain of Afonso Henriques, captured the celebrated, the warlike little state of Portugal, and submitted tawfyid at the very moment that his proclamation was reached Huete in July. The siege at once revealed the caliph's lack of energy and the hesitant and unwarlike spirit of his troops, who failed completely. It seemed that the besieged, who withstood courageously the Almohad attacks, would have to surrender owing to lack of water, but violent summer storms filled their cisterns and threw the enemy's camp into disordered. Owing to lack of food and the approach of the Castilian army, the Almohads lifted the siege and returned, via Cuenca, Jâti, Elche and Orihuela, to Murcia; there the army was disbanded.

Yûsuf rested in Seville during the winter of 568/1172-3. But the count Jimeno “the hunchback” (al-ahdab), who, with the men of Avila, had caused severe damage in the valley of the Guadalquivir, penetrated, in Sha'ban 568/April 1173, into the region of Ecija and took enormous booty. The troops that had come back from Huete were collected again, and the indefatigable Abu Ya'qûb 'Umar Intî [q.v.], together with the two brothers of the caliph, Yahyâ and Ismâ'il, overtook the count near Caracuel, defeated and killed him. Subsequently, Badajoz was furnished with supplies and the whole left bank of the Tagus ravaged, from Talavera to Toledo; in consequence, Afonso Henriques, on behalf of Portugal, and the count Nuño de Lara, on behalf of Castile, were compelled to ask for and to sign an armistice for five years. The winter of 569/1173-4 was spent in resettling and fortifying Beja, in the Algarve, which had been recently repopulated by Christians. The armistice with Portugal had expired short the ever-increasing aggressiveness of the Christians. The armistice with Portugal had expired, and the crown-prince, Sancho, earned his spurs by invading the valley of the lower Guadalquivir, attacking Triana, then Niebla and the whole of the Algarve. Beja had again to be evacuated.

Yûsuf found no other way to withstand these attacks but to transport to Morocco and al-Andalus the Arabs of Ifrikiya, but seeing that they were becoming more and more turbulent, under the leadership of 'Ali, a descendant of the Banu 'l-lland, lords of Kafsa [q.v.] (Gafsa), who had revolted there, he took the field to stifle that dangerous centre of dissidence and to force the Arabs to join the holy war in Spain. He left Marrakûsh for Ifrikiya, and after a siege of three months took Kafsa, in the winter of 576/1180-1. 'Ali, who had surrendered and capitulated, and the Riyâb pretended to submit. Only a small section of them, however, followed Yûsuf; the greater part remained in Ifrikiya, ready to support any attempt at revolt against the Almohads, and to lend assistance to Karakksh [q.v.] and the Banû Ghâniya [q.v.].

In the meantime, in the Iberian peninsula, an advance of Alfonso VIII towards Ecija and the taking of Santafila, near Lora del Río, coincided with a Portuguese invasion towards San Lucar la Mayor, Aznalfarche and Niebla, and with the revolt in the Anti-Atlas of the Banû Wâwazgit, who occupied the silver mine of Zaqjundar. The caliph had to go in person to subdue the rebels, while Ibn Wânûdîn led a razzia against Talavera. Finally Yûsuf, after undertaking the extension of Marrakûsh to the southward and enlarging the range of the Almohads, moved in the summer of 579/1183—an enterprise continued later by his son, Ya'qûb, by the building of the imperial quarter of al-Shâliha—decided, in spite of the discouraging example of Huete, to engage all his forces in a campaign designed to put a brake to the audacity of the Portuguese.

The preparations for the expedition and the concentration of the troops were very ample, but also took a long time. In May, Castile and Leon had concluded the peace of Fresno-Lavandera and engaged themselves to fight together against the Muslims—Ferdinand on his part renouncing his old alliance with the Almohads. Three months later, Yûsuf started collecting his troops. On 16 Rabî' I 580/27 June 1184, he appeared before Santarem (Shantarla). The Portuguese had had about ten months to prepare the defence of the fortress, almost impregnable without a long siege. It cost the Almohads much trouble to take the suburb near the river, and at the end of a week's useless efforts and tenacious resistance, the approach of Ferdinand II with his Leonese spread terror in the Almohad army which, in panic, re-crossed the river. The caliph was mortally wounded when raising camp and died near Evora, on the road to Seville, on 18 Rabî' II 580/20 July 1184. Abû Ya'qûb Yûsuf was considered as the most...
girted of the Almohad caliphs. The son of a Masmud woman—the daughter of the šāhīd Ibn Imrān—and born in the heart of the Atlas, in Timmellal, he was instructed in Marrākūsh in the doctrine of the sawābkī. Nevertheless, in spite of his Maghrībi birth and education, his long stay in Seville, where he arrived at the age of seventeen years, made of him an Andalusian litterateur as refined as one of the muḥākb al-fawāfi. Surrounded by famous philosophers, physicians and poets, he perfected his literary knowledge and developed his artistic taste. Seduced by the charm of Seville, he gave it back the title of capital of al-Andalus, which had been taken away by his father at the end of his reign, and endowed it with numerous monuments and works. He took pleasure in taking part in the scientific meetings adored by men like Ibn Ῥufayl, Ibn Rūghād and Ibn Zuhūr, who, encouraged by him, produced their most celebrated works.

At the same time, thanks to the terror with which his father had imposed his authority, this friend of scholarship was able to enjoy an absolute power in the Maghrib. Irfīkīya was still under his control and the dangerous enclave of Ibn Mardānshī disappeared. Yet in spite of appearances, the ceaseless war against the Christians in al-Andalus made manifest his incapacity as a military leader, the low morale of his enormous armies and the inefficiency of his commissariat. The small Christian states of the Peninsula, though divided by internal warfare, did not suffice to check the Christians’ drive, and led to his death out to the damned, who are, after all, but a handful of dust. The “numinous” sense is extremely highly developed in him, together with a sense of horror and awe before the Deity, in whose presence he always felt himself an unbeliever, just about to lay aside the girdle of the magians (zummār). His passionate aspiration is aimed at absolutely freeing himself through systematic work upon himself (“I was the smith of my own self”: haddaḏ naṣūf), of all obstacles separating him from God (kwāḏ), with the object of “attaining to Him”. He describes this process in extremely interesting autobiographical sayings with partly grandiose images. The “world” (dunyā), “flight from the world” (rūḥ), “work of God” (kwāḏ), miracles (karmāt), qāṯr, even the mystic stages (makāmāt) are for him no more than so many barriers holding him from God. When he has finally shed his “I” in jamā, “as snakes their skin” and reached the desired stage, his changed self-consciousness is expressed in those famous hybrid utterances (khuṭḥālād) which so scandalized and shocked his contemporaries: “Subhānā! Mā aṣmaṣa šu’ārā’!”—“Glory be to me! How great is My majesty!”; “Thy obedience to me is greater than my obedience to Thee”; “I am the throne and the footstool”; “I am the Well-preserved Tablet”; “I saw the Ka’ba walking round me”; and so on. In meditation he made flights into the supersensible
world; these earned him the censure that he claimed
to have experienced a mi*rdi in the same way as the
Prophet. He was in the course of the battle decorated
by God with His Singleness (wakfedmiyya) and
clothed with His "I-ness" (ananiyya), but shrank
from showing himself in that state to men; or
flew with the wings of everlastingness (daymamiyya)
through the air of "no-quality" (lufayfiyya) to the
ground of eternity (asalayya) and saw the tree of
"one-ness" (ahadiyya), to realise that "all that was
illusion" or that it "was himself" who all was that,
etc. In such utterances he appears to have reached
the ultimate problem of all mysticism. A later legend
makes him solve with ease conundrums put to him in
a Christian monastery, thus effecting the wholesale
conversion of the monastery to Islam.
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Masila on 10 Shawal, al-Mansur besieged the fortress of Khyana (overlooking what was later to be al-Katat Bani Hammadan). On 2 Shawal al-Mansur besieged the fortress, which was entered on 22 Muharram 336; at night, the last remaining warriors carried Abû Yazid and Abû 'Amr from the citadel. Abû 'Amr was killed, while Abû Yazid had a fall and was captured. The curious conversation that passed between al-Mansur and his captive has been recorded. Abû Yazid died of his wounds in 27 Muharram, at night, the last remaining warriors carried him back to the fortress, which was entered on 22 Muharram 19 August 947. His body, stuffed with straw, was exposed to the insults of the mob in al-Mahdiyya. Facjl, the son of Abû Yazid, gave some further trouble in the Awtas and the district of Kafsa, till he was defeated and killed in Dhu 'l-Ka'da 336. Other sons of Abû Yazid found a shelter in the court of the Umayyads in Cordova.

**Bibliography:** The main source is a contemporary Fatimid chronicle of which the substance has been preserved in Idris Imad al-Din, *Uyun al-Akhbar*, second half of vol. v. The same substance is used by Ibn al-Ra'ik in his lost history of Hiflikya. The whole account of Ibn Hammad (Vanderheyden), 18 ff., is no doubt taken from Ibn al-Ra'ik. Ibn Shaddad, in his lost history of al-Kayrawan, also no doubt copied Ibn al-Ra'ik, while Ibn al-Ahwar's account, viii, 315 ff., still easily recognizable as an abstract of the Fatimid chronicle, evidently goes back to Ibn Shaddad. The passages in Tidjani, *Rihla*, Tunis 1927, 17-19, 20-1, 233-5 (transl. in *JA*, 1852, 96 ff., 101 ff, 106 ff., 1953, 563 ff) are taken from Ibn al-Ra'ik. Further references: Abû Zakariyya (Chronique d'Abou Zakaria, transl. Masqueray), Algiers 1879, 226 ff; Ibn 'Idjarî, *al-Baydân al-Mughrîb* (Colin and Levi-Provenca), i, 316 (quotes Ibn Hammadâd–6th/12th century, not identical with the Ibn Hammadâd quoted above—Ibn Sa'dun and Ibn al-Ra'ik); Ma'ârif, *Il'mâr* (Bunz), while mainly deriving from Ibn al-Ahmar, has some additional notes (55-57).—Cf. Zakariyya (ed. Schacht, Leipzig 1930). Several early accounts are based on Ibn Laidy's comparison of the opinions of the two authorities of Kufa mentioned in the title (Cairo 1355), the Kitab al-Athar, a collection of the Kufan traditions that Abû Yusuf transmitted (Cairo 1357; also in al-Shâfi'i, Kitab al-Umm, vii, 87-150), and the Kitab al-Radd 'ala Siyar al-Awsat, a reasoned refutation, with broad systematic developments, of the opinions of the Syrian scholar al-Awsat, on the law of war (Cairo, n.d.; also in al-Shâfi'i, ed. Schacht, Leipzig 1930). The *Fihrist* mentions at least two titles of the same comparative and polenical kind: the Kitab al-Asrâr and the Kitab al-Radd 'ala Malik b. Anas. Finally, extracts from Abû Yusuf's Kitab al-Hiyal (Book of legal devices) were incorporated by his disciple al-Shaybanî in his *Kitab al-Mahdird fi 'l-Hiyal* (ed. Schacht, Leipzig 1930). Several statements on principles and methods in his potential treatises (e.g. *Kitab al-Radd 'ala Siyar al-Awsat*, par. 5) show Abû Yusuf's interest in legal theory (cf. *Fihrist*, 203 ff), but, contrary to what is sometimes affirmed, he did not write special works on the subject.

The doctrine of Abû Yusuf, on the whole, presupposes the doctrine of Abû Hanifa, whom he regarded as his master. The points on which Abû Yusuf diverged from him are therefore more significant for appreciating Abû Yusuf's own legal thought than those on which both are in agreement. The most prominent peculiarity of Abû Yusuf's doctrine is that he is more dependent on traditions than his master, because there were more authoritative
Secondly, the doctrine of Abu Yusuf often represents a reaction against Abu Hanifa's somewhat unstrained reasoning; but Abu Yusuf was by no means consistent, and in a certain number of cases he abandoned, by diverging from Abu Hanifa, the sounder or more highly developed doctrine. Thirdly, we can discern in Abu Yusuf's legal thought certain favourite processes of reasoning, such as the reductio ad absurdum, and a habit of rather acrimonious polemics. Finally, a remarkable feature of Abu Yusuf's doctrine is the frequency with which he changed his opinions, not always for the better. Sometimes the contemporary sources state directly, and in other cases it is probable, that Abu Yusuf's experience as a judge caused him to change his opinion. Abu Yusuf represents the beginning of the process by which the ancient school of the 'Irākians of Kūfa was replaced by that of the followers of Abu Hanifa.

On his return to Marrakush, worn out by illness, he appointed his son Muhammad as his heir and retired from public life, to spend his time in devotional exercises and pious works, such as the foundation of a magnificent hospital and distributions of alms. He obliged the Jews to wear a special sign to distinguish them from the Muslims. During the last days of his life he was assaulted by remorse for having ordered the execution of some of his nearest relations. He assembled in his palace in al-Sāliha the Almohad shaykhâhs and the members of his family and informed them of his last wishes. It seems that the date of his death can be fixed with certainty on 22 Rabî‘ I 595/23 Jan. 1199.

The reign of Ya‘qūb al-Manṣūr marks the apogee of the Almohad empire. His energetic character, the care and rigorosity with which he supervised the administration of his dominions and his personal courage made it possible for him to defeat all his enemies, in Ifriqiya as well as in Spain, to raise the moral of his armies and to pass into the memory of posterity surrounded by an aureole of legend. His magnificent constructions in the imperial suburb of al-Sāliha and the mosque of the Booksellers (Ajami al-Kutubiyyin) in Marrakush with its splendid minaret, the Giralda of Seville and the ensemble of the mosque of Hassan in Rabat show that he was the glorious continuator of the monumental work undertaken by his father and grandfather. His riches, the splendour of his court, his desire to be surrounded by scholars, his success in the holy war, have blinded his admirers and prevented them from observing the germs of decomposition hidden behind such a brilliant façade. In al-Andalus, in spite of his success in Portugal and Castile, he could hardly contain the Christian drive, while in Ifriqiya the Arabo-Majorcan revolt, stifled but always reviving, opened in the flank of the empire the deep wound which soon drained it of all force and energy. When the vigour and the skill of Ya‘qūb al-Manṣūr were no longer at the helm of the Almohad ship of state, it was inevitable that it should run upon the rocks.

Relations. He assembled in his palace in al-Sāliha the shaykhâhs of the town, the only settlement of any size in the interior until the accession of Shakhbūt b. Dhiyāb of Āl Bū Falāh, the ruling clan, about 1209-10/1795. About 1214-5/1800 the Wahhābîs of Nagīd first appeared along the coast, but they disappeared, close ties with the Kāwāsîm and the people of al-Burayn rather than with Ābū Zabl. Bani Yās do not appear to have come under Wahhābî influence until the accession of Khalfâ b. Shakhbūt in 1248/1833.

Shakhbūt signed the General Treaty of Peace sponsored by the British in 1235/1820 following the British expedition against Ra’s al-Khayma [q.v.]. In 1251/1835 Ābū Zabl adhered to the first Maritime Truce, from which the Trucial Coast takes its name [cf. BAHIR PARIS]. An Exclusive Agreement in 1309/1892 gave Great Britain special rights in Ābū Zabl, which like the other Trucial States is considered to be independent while under British protection. In 1357/1939 the Shaykh of Ābū Zabl granted an oil concession for 75 years which is operated by Petroleum Development (Trucial Coast) Ltd., an Iraqi Petroleum Company associate; in 1372/1952 oil had not yet been found. Offshore drilling rights are held by other interests.

Zāyîd b. Khalfâ (d. 1326/1908) during his reign of 53 years made Ābū Zabl the leading power on the Trucial Coast, but during the successive reigns of his four sons Ābū Zabl was surpassed in importance by al-Shāri‘î [q.v.] and Durbayî [q.v.], which developed more rapidly their relations with the modern world. The present ruler (1952) of Ābū Zabl is Shakhbūt b. Sultān (acc. 1346-7/1928), a grandson of Zāyîd.

Ābū Zabl is by far the largest of the Trucial States, though most of its boundaries in the interior remain undefined. It claims a common land border with Kātār in the vicinity of al-Udāy [q.v.] and extensive territory in al-Zâfra, where members of Bani Yās still reside in some of the tiny villages of al-Diwayî [q.v.]. Several villages of al-Buraynî belong to Āl Bū Falāh. Bani Yās are settled on some of the islands in the Gulf between the Trucial Coast and Kātār, and they visit others while engaged in pearling, fishing, and gathering firewood. Āl Bū Falāh are on friendly terms with many of the beduins of the hinterland, though in recent years the once firm connections with the Manāṣîr [q.v.] have grown weaker.

(B. RENTZ)

Abū Zabi is by far the largest of the Trucial States, though most of its boundaries in the interior remain undefined. It claims a common land border with Kātār in the vicinity of al-Udāy [q.v.] and extensive territory in al-Zâfra, where members of Bani Yās still reside in some of the tiny villages of al-Diwayî [q.v.]. Several villages of al-Buraynî belong to Āl Bū Falāh. Bani Yās are settled on some of the islands in the Gulf between the Trucial Coast and Kātār, and they visit others while engaged in pearling, fishing, and gathering firewood. Āl Bū Falāh are on friendly terms with many of the beduins of the hinterland, though in recent years the once firm connections with the Manāṣîr [q.v.] have grown weaker.

(G. RENTZ)

Abū Zabi is by far the largest of the Trucial States, though most of its boundaries in the interior remain undefined. It claims a common land border with Kātār in the vicinity of al-Udāy [q.v.] and extensive territory in al-Zâfra, where members of Bani Yās still reside in some of the tiny villages of al-Diwayî [q.v.]. Several villages of al-Buraynî belong to Āl Bū Falāh. Bani Yās are settled on some of the islands in the Gulf between the Trucial Coast and Kātār, and they visit others while engaged in pearling, fishing, and gathering firewood. Āl Bū Falāh are on friendly terms with many of the beduins of the hinterland, though in recent years the once firm connections with the Manāṣîr [q.v.] have grown weaker.

(G. RENTZ)
famous in Ibadite literature by the breadth of his learning and by his works, mainly on jurisprudence. Abū Zakariyya quotes in his catalogue of Ibadite books written shortly after 775/1372-3, a work by Abū Zakariyya, without giving its title. According to him the work contained seven parts, on fasting, marriage and divorce, testaments, salaries, judgments, preemption and security. The K. al-Saum, on fasting, has been autographed in Cairo, 1320, and the K. al-Niṣāḥ, about marriage and divorce, has been published in Egypt, with a marginal gloss by Muhammad Abū Sitta al-Kaššāl; the other parts are unpublished. Abū Zakariyya wrote also al-Lamā' (or al-Wādī), printed in Cairo (with a marginal gloss by Muhammad Abū Sitta al-Kaššāl) in 1305. It deals with dogmatics (1-116) and ritual law: ablutions, purification, prayer, alms, pilgrimage, etc. (117-692).


Abū Zakariyya al-Wardīlānī, Yahyā b. Abī Bakr, historian of the Ibadīs of the Maghrib. The Ibadī chroniclers al-Dardīnī (7th/13th century) and al-Shāmmakhī (d. 928/1522) who took the chronicle of Abū Zakariyya as the basis for their own works, give but scanty details about him and do not indicate the date either of his birth or of his death. From al-Dardīnī it is known at least that he was a native of Wardīlān (Ouargla), and that he studied in the Wadl al-Rīgh (Oued Rīgh) or perhaps in the neighbouring oasis of Sadrāta. He was also a pupil of the Ibadīs against the Fatimids, as well as on the lives of the famous Shaykhs of the community up to the time of the author. The work, not yet published, consists of two parts; the not very numerous manuscripts are generally modern; those especially of the second part are rare and very faulty. The most important part has been translated by E. Masqueray (Chronique d’Abou Zakaria, Algiers 1878) in a rather mediocre way, after a very bad manuscript. A table of contents has been given by A. de Motylinski.

According to al-Barrādī’s catalogue of Ibadī works (8th/14th century) Abū Zakariyya was also the author of letters and decisions on dogmatic theology.


An edition and new translation of the chronicle of A. Z. by Dalet and R. Le Tourneau is in preparation. (A. de Motylinski-T. Lewicki)
sinated in 801/1398 after being driven from the throne by his brother Abd Allah. 

_Bibliography:_ see 'ABD AL-WADIDS.

(A. COUR *)

**ABU ZAYYAN III AHMAD b. ABU MUHAMMAD 'ABD ALLAH, second last 'ABD al-Wadid ruler of Tlemcen. Thanks to the support of the Turks of Algiers he seized the power and was proclaimed in 947/1540. The Spaniards of Oran who supported his brother Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad undertook an expedition against Tlemcen, which failed (949/1543). After a second, victorious expedition, the Spaniards made it possible for Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad to seize the power (30 Dhu 'l- Ka'da 949/7 March 1543), but he was soon driven out by his own subjects, who restored Abu Zayyan to the throne. He declared himself a vassal of the Turks and reigned until his death in 957/1550.

_Bibliography:_ Marmol Caravajal, _Description d'Africque_, (Fr. transl. by Pesnot d'Ablancourt), Paris 1667, ii, 345 ff.; Haedo, _Epitome de los reyes de Argel_, Fr. transl. by Grammont, in _RAfr._, xxiv, 231 ff.; Fey, _Hist. d'Oran, 85 f.;_ Sander-Rang and Denis, _Fondation de la regence d'Alger_, Paris 1873; Barges, _Complement de l'Histoire des Beni Zeyan_, 449 ff.; Ruff, _Domination espagnole a Oran sous le gouvernement du comte d'Aleacada_, Paris 1900, 90 ff.; Cour, _L'Etablissement des dynasties des Chérifs au Maroc_, Paris 1900, 84 f. (A. COUR *)

**ABU ZAYYAN** [see MARINIDS].

**ABU ZIYA TEWFEK BEY** [see TEFEEK BEY].

**ABU'AM** [see TAFILALT].

**ABUBACER** [see IBN TUFAYL].

**ABUKIR**, or Bukir, small town on the Mediterranean coast, 75 m. east of Alexandria, on the railway which links this town with Rosetta (Rashid). The earliest Arab geographer to describe the position of Abukir was al-Idrisi. But before him Arab texts on Ancient Egypt refer to the building of a light-house and European travellers certainly mention on this route, towers intended to serve as landmarks. Eutychius tells of the passage to Abukir of the relieving fleet which had been summoned from Tarsus to protect Egypt against the Fatimids. All Pasha Mubarak, according to a source that has not been traced, relates that European pirates raided Abukir on 27 Shaban 764/11 June 1363, and carried off about sixty inhabitants, who were put up for sale at Sidon. It was the period of Bonaparte's expedition that made Abukir famous, by Nelson's naval victory on 1 August 1798 and the extermination of the Turkish army on 25 July 1799. At Abukir, on 8 March 1801, disembarked the English army which was to end the French occupation; and, finally, Abukir was again an English operational base in March 1807. There was an excellent anchorage and good shelter at Abukir at that time, but the village itself was miserable.

Amelineau erroneously believed that he had found the name Abukir in the _Jacobite Synaxary_; the reference there is to a church in Old Cairo, dedicated to Apa Kyros.

Etienne Combe has studied at length the problem of the Alexandria-Rosetta route, as well as of the lakes along the coast, and has provided a rich bibliography of Arab writers and European travellers. In this work will be found the various transcriptions of the name of the locality, and the monotonous description of a somewhat difficult journey: a sandy region had to be crossed, uncultivated and uninhabited, with only a few palm-trees here and there to enliven the prospect. The three lakes, from west to east, bore the names Maryut, Abukir and Atkut. The only account of the lake of Abukir which is at all detailed in the _Suhb_ of al-Kalkashandi, but he refers to the prosperity of the region as a thing of the past. Some few birds lived on the shores of the lake, whose waters teemed with fish. The mullet (būrū) which was caught there formed part of the food supply of Alexandria. On the banks were some large salinas, whose product was exported to Europe.

A strong casueway, often reinforced, separated the lake of Abukir from Lake Maryūt; the Maḥmūdiyya canal and the railway from Cairo to Alexandria were built along this. Since 1887 the lake of Abukir has been drained and the land cultivated.

_Bibliography:_ Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam (Torrey), 40; Eutychius, ii, 81; Makrizi, _Kālit, MIFAO_, xlvi, 82; _Synaxaire, Patrologia orientalis_, iii, 404; Amelineau, _Geographie_, 6, 579, 581; U. Monneret de Villard, in _Bulletin de la societe de geographie d'Egypte_, xiii, 74, 76; E. Combe, _Alexandrie musulmane, Bulletin de la societe de geographie d'Egypte_, xv, 201, 238; xvi, 111-71, 269-92; Déchérain, _L'Egypte turgue, Hist. de la nation egyptienne_, v, 275, 277, 281-285, 433, 440, 458-510, pl. xi; Durand-Viel, _Les campagnes navales de Mohammed Aty_, i, 49, 63, 65, pl. x, xi, xiii, xix.

Other places of no importance in Egypt have the same name.

Worthy of mention, however, is the gorge of the Būkhr (Būkhrān—Būkhrāt), in the Ḍjabal al-Ṭayr (Mountains of the Birds), in Middle Egypt, north of Minya. The Arab authors associate a curious legend with this locality. The mountain was, on a given day each year, the meetingplace of the birds called būkhr. They put their heads into a cleft in the mountain, which closed on one of them: that bird remained suspended and died there.

_Bibliography:_ J. Maspero and Wiet, _Materiaux pour servir à la geographie de l'Egypte, MIFAO_, xxxvi, 64-66. (G. Wiet)

ACABUL, misspelling for Abu Tulayh, so called after the _talh_ tree (_Acacia seyal_), the name of a well-centre on the road through the Bayūda desert which, avoiding the Nile bend of Abū Hamad, leads from Korti (Kurti) south of Dongola to al-Metamna, a distance of 192 miles. The place is famous as the scene of a battle fought on 17 Jan. 1885 between the darwīsh forces of Muhammad Aḥmad [g.v.] and a “desert column” of some 1800 British troops who were advancing from Korti to the relief of Ḫaṭrūm where the Egyptian garrison and General Charles Gordon were besieged by the Mahdists. The British under Sir Herbert Stewart found a large body of the Mahdi’s best troops (some 3000 Bakkara and 5000 Ḫaṭrūmi) in possession of the wells. Advancing in square formation they were fiercely attacked, and after desperate hand-to-hand fighting the Mahdists withdrew leaving about 1000 dead behind. The British casualties were 74 dead and 94 wounded. The way was now open to al-Metamna where the British forces were joined by four river steamers which Gordon had despatched from Ḫaṭrūm. A fatal delay of a few days enabled the Mahdists to take Ḫaṭrūm by storm (28 Jan.), and the relieving force was obliged to retrace its steps without achieving its object.

_Bibliography:_ N. Shoucair (Shukayr), _Tārikh al-Sūdān_, Cairo 1903; H. E. Colville, _History of the Soudan Campaign_, London 1889 (the official
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ABULCASIS (see al-Zahrawi).

ABUMERON (see Ibn Zuhr).

AL-‘ABUR (see Nujum).

ABUSHAHIR (see Busmah).

ABUSHAKA (see ‘Ali shir Nava’).​

ABUSIR (see Busir).

AL-‘ABWA’, a place on the road from Mecca to Medina, 23 miles from al-Juhiya in the territory of Banu Damra of Kainasa. According to some authorities the name really belonged to a mountain situated there. Muhammad’s mother, Amina, is commonly said to have died there while returning from Medina, and to be buried there; but she is sometimes said to be buried in Medina (Tabari, i, 260). The first expedition from Medina in which Muhammad himself took part was to al-‘Abwa and Waddan nearby. It is said that at al-‘Abwa, as the Meccans marched against Medina in 3/625, some proposed to dig up Amina’s body, but the majority opposed this.


ABWAN (see Darran).

ABYAN (or Ibyan, cf. Yafik, i, 110; Nashwan, i, 208; C. Landberg, *Etudes*, ii, 1803), 1) district (*muhadda*) in Yaman in the Wadi Bana, comprising several castles and the seaport of ‘Adan (*q.v.*), hence the full name ‘Adan Abyan; 2) small place, now abandoned, ca. 18 km. NE of ‘Adan, (b) (Dhu) Abyan (Ibyan) b. Yakdum b. Hamysa, c

It cannot be shown with certainty what more ancient traditions are at the base of the Kur'anic story. The old poets knew ‘Ad as an ancient nation that had perished (e.g. ‘Arfa, i, 8; al-Mutawakkaliyyah, viii, 40; Ibn Higham, i, 468; cf. Zuhayr, xx, 12 and Luqman); hence the expression: “since the time of ‘Ad”, *Hamasa* (Freytag), 195, 341. Their kings are mentioned in the *Dhu‘aylites*, lxx, 6, and their prudence in that of Nabiha, xxv, 4. The mention of the ‘Adite Abmar by Zuhayr, *Mus’alaqa*, verse 32, and in the *Dhu‘aylites*, p. 31, merits consideration, as the Muslim legend connects (Kudar) al-Abmar with Thamud (*q.v.*). Whether there really existed, and where, a nation called ‘Ad, is still an unanswered question. The genealogies of the Arabs relating to the Adites are naturally valueless, just as is their locating of that people in the large and uninhabitable sandy desert between ‘Urmân and Hadramawt. The identification of Iram with Aram, adopted by the Arabs and several modern scholars, is not at all likely. Of the latter, Lot has identified ‘Ad with the wellknown tribe of Iyad; on the other hand Sprenger sought for ‘Ad in the Oadites, who according to Ptolemy lived in N.-W. Arabia; this recalls the well of Iram in Hisma (al-Hamdanî, *Sifa*, 126; A. Sprenger, *Die alte Geogr. Arabiens*, § 207; A. Musil, *Arabia Petraea*, ii/2, 128). The excavation of the second-century Nabataean temple at Djabal Ramm, about twenty-five miles due east of ‘Akhaba, brought to light Nabataean inscriptions giving the name of the place as *rum*; Savignac, very plausibly, connected this with Iram. Cf. H. W. Glidden, in BASOR, no. 73, 1939, 13 ff.; Ramm would also be identical with al-Hamdanî’s Iram and Ptolemy’s Aramaua. But Wellhausen pointed out that instead of the expression “since the time of ‘Ad” the expression *min al-‘ad* also occurs; therefore he supposed that originally ‘Ad was a common noun (“the ancient time”); adj. ‘Adî, “very ancient”) and that the mythical nation arose from a misinterpretation of that expression.


ADÂ (l.), lit. “payment”, “accomplishment”, a technical term used in the *sûkh* to designate the accomplishment of a religious duty in the time prescribed by the law, in opposition to *baḍa‘*, which designates the belated accomplishment of a religious duty (of course when the delay is permitted). A distinction is also drawn between a perfect and an imperfect accomplishment (*al-adâ‘ al-kâmîl* and *al-adâ‘ al-nâbiq*). In the reading of the Korân *adâ‘* means the traditional pronunciation of the letters, synonymous with *khârâ‘* (*q.v.*).
AADA (A.) custom, customary law.

i. — General. The realities of social life have never exactly reflected the *gari'a* [*q.v.*], or *shar'i*, the ideal Muslim Law corresponding to God's will. This is true not only in regard to the ritual provisions of this Law, but also and even more so in regard to its juridical aspects. It is not, of course, the modern reforms of Muslim law in various countries that are envisaged here, but the survival of pre-Islamic custom (*'ada* or *urf* [*q.v.*]). The words *'ada* and *urf* have the same meaning, but the usage varies from region to region (e.g. the first is used in Indonesia, the second in North Africa, and in East Africa one says *dasar*). In addition, the Muslim rulers have often issued administrative regulations on matters of law, called, e.g. in Persia *urf*, in Turkey *hânûn* [*q.v.*] (for the meaning of this word in North Africa, see below ii), sometimes also *siyâsa* [*q.v.*]. Also the innumerable regulations made by rulers, establishing various taxes contrary to the Law (*maks* [*q.v.*]), must be recalled here.

What is, then, the exact role of custom in Muslim countries?

a) There is first of all the case where the *fiqh* itself expressly refers to customary usage, e.g. to determine what is to be understood by equivalent dowry, or by ordinary standards of nourishment (e.g. for the *zakîli al-fîr*) etc. Some lawyers even felt justified in advancing the view, following the principle according to which everything that is not forbidden is permissible, that the Muslim Law could admit customary law in every case in which the *urf* was not contrary to the *shar'i*; in fact, however, custom has not been admitted as one of the sources (*usul*) of the law [cf. *usul*].

b) A juridico-sociological analysis of social reality allows us to make the following distinctions.

1) In the most classically Muslim countries it can be observed that alongside the religious jurisdiction there exists an administrative ("political" = *siyâsa*) jurisdiction, varying in forms and names, which need not be treated here, e.g. in matters concerning penal law, obligations and contracts; in its customary law or the regulations (hânûn) of the princes are applied to a greater or lesser extent. So for example in Turkey marriage, from the 17th century onwards, had to be concluded obligatorily, from the penal point of view, before the authorities.

2) Sometimes even the religious courts are compelled to sanction local usage, either because, thanks to a juridical artifice (*hila* [*q.v.*]) the act, though contrary to the spirit of the Law, has been put into a legally unchallengeable form (e.g. in the matter of usury, or the conditional repudiation in favour of the wife in Java, and especially the use of the *wajib*, in North Africa and elsewhere, to disinherit women); or even without that expedient—which is even more characteristic; thus in Java the pre-Islamic marriage arrangement is considered as a *sarkat* (i.e. *shirkah*), a contract of commercial partnership between the husband and wife. On the island of Great Comore, there exists a kind of *wâfi*, the *magnahuli*, in favour of women only, the validity of which is well recognized. (For the *samâl* in North Africa, see below, ii.)

3) There exist religious courts administering the Law, but, except in case of litigation, the population ignores them and follows local custom. This is the case, among others, in the Avars (cf. below, ii), to a large extent; in the same way, the religious courts were competent in matters of succession in Java up to 1938, but the population did not follow the *Kur'an* in this field; also the persistence of the *lekh dukagini* among the Muslims of North Albania can be quoted in this connection.

4) The clearest case of the persistence of a customary law is that where there is no religious jurisdiction at all, but only that of the customary courts, and these apply customary law. It is, however, essential to realize that this custom can be more or less Islamized (see below, ii, concerning the Berbers). One point, especially, can be taken more or less for granted: viz. that there is no Muslim country where the marriage formalities, which are, to be sure, very simple, are not performed according to Muslim law.

It can be said that in general it is among populations which are still imperfectly Islamized (in the objective meaning of the word, as those in question may have a very fervent faith) that the predominance of customary law and the absence of religious courts can be observed. There is, however, at least one very remarkable exception: until recent times, the region of Menangkabau (Central Sumatra) was strongly attached to its matriarchal customs, which were quite contrary to Islam, and yet Islamic learning was very widely spread in that region. The same matriarchate can be observed also e.g. among the Tuaregs of the Hoggar, who are, it is true, rather lukewarm Muslims. In the Laccadive islands, inheritance follows the female line. Thus the effective manifestations of the survival of custom among the Muslim community are innumerable.

As regards the future, something on the following lines may be said. If, on the one hand, the control of Muslim Law over practice is on the decline—total abolition in Turkey and in the countries under Soviet rule, reforms in Egypt, India etc.—on the other hand the Law is almost everywhere gaining ground at the expense of custom. Custom is thus on the way of slow disappearance, partly due to the influence of European colonization and European civilization. Custom is being Islamized, because the means of communication are improving and religious courts are installed in place of the old customary jurisdictions. As a matter of fact, almost everywhere the European colonizers believed that the law of the local Muslims was essentially the theoretical religious law.

In the following sections more detailed descriptions are given of the role of customary law in three representative areas of the Islamic world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: NORTH AFRICA IN GENERAL:
G.-H. Bouquet, in. Hesp., 1952, 508 ff. (bibliography);
G. Marcy, Le probleme du droit coutumier berbere, in La France Mediterraneenne et Africaine, 1939, 7 ff. (to be reprinted in Revue Algerienne, Tunisienne et Marocaine, de jurisprudence); E. Ubach and E. Rackow, Sitte und Recht in Nord-Afrika, Stuttgart 1923 (Fr. transl., Rabat 1924).
Adoption is not recognised by Islamic law, but in some parts of the Pandjab and Sind where it is supported by custom it has prevailed over this prohibition. In U.P., also, the custom of adoption has been upheld and the Oudh Estates Act of 1869 permitted a Muslim talubâdār to adopt a son. In other provinces, where some of the communities have retained the Hindu law of inheritance and succession, the courts have refused to accept the plea that the retention of Hindu law of inheritance implies, at the same time, the retention of the Hindu law of adoption. So when, in provinces where the custom has no legal force, a child is adopted—the practice being for wealthy families to adopt children from poor families—he cannot expect to receive an inheritance from the adopting parents under Islamic law, and gifts of property are made to him during their lifetime. The Khodjas, of course, need not resort to this expedient but do so by will.

The Muslim law of pre-emption (ādād) is more or less applied in the light of customary practices. The Madras courts refused to apply it on the grounds of it being opposed to justice, equity and good conscience. In U.P., Bihār, Assam and Gujārāt it was recognised by the courts that the right to pre-emption exists not only between Muslims, but also between a Muslim and a Hindu, and between Hindus if the custom so warrants.

In the law of marriage, custom usually tends to make divorce and polygamy difficult. In some marriage contracts the husband delegates to the wife the right to divorce (talâk al-tafram) which she can use if any of the conditions mentioned in the marriage contract is broken; the marriage contract generally includes the right of the wife to use her powers of divorce if the husband should remarry. Another common device is to name an enormous dower sum (mahr), of which only a token amount (muw'adjal = prompt dower) is paid at the time of marriage, the remainder—the deferred dower (muw'adjal)—becoming payable when the wife is divorced or widowed. When both these conditions are combined within a marriage contract they serve as a potent weapon in the hands of the wife.

In contrast to this in some parts of Southern India a large sum of money must be paid to the bridegroom by the bride’s people, and in this the influence of Hindu custom is to be seen. It has often brought financial ruin to the family or compelled its daughters to remain unmarried.

The 'idda, the waiting period of a divorced or widowed woman laid down by the Islamic law, was in one of the cases in the Pandjab held to be outside the requirements of the customary law of certain Muslim communities (Bhagwat Singh vs. Santi so. I.C. 654).

Though taking of interest is prohibited by Islamic law, it is a practice of long standing among most Indian Muslims, and in particular among the trading communities, and would seem to have gained legality.

Most of such customs which were contrary to Muslim law have been deprived of their legal validity by the Shariat Act of 1937. The force of the custom is almost wholly excluded from most matters of Muslim family law. But the Act excepted from its scope the devolution of agricultural lands which it would appear, still devolve according to custom.

The Act does not summarily abolish customs pertaining to adoption, wills and legacies. But it lays down that if a Muslim who has reached majority makes a declaration to the effect that he and his descendents wish to be governed by Muslim law in the
matters stated above, Muslim law would be applicable
to them.

In addition, there exist in India communities
which are neither completely Muslim nor Hindu,
retaining some elements of both religions. Such is
the sect of Satpanthis and Firpanthis [qq.v.] (the
"followers of truth" and the "followers of Pi") in
Gujarat, Kachch and Mvndesh. They claim to belong
to the Hindu caste of Mathia Kunbis and follow
the Atherva-veda; yet they observe the fast of
Ramadn and other Muslim practices and bury
their dead with both Muslim and other ceremonies.
Other such communities are the Nyitias in Malwa,
the Kanchandas in Sind, and the Usayin Brahmins
in U.P. the Bhagwans or Satyadharmas in Bengal
and the Chauhars in the Pandjab. (See Census of
India, 1931, i, 380 ff.)

With the partition of India, it may be assumed
that henceforth customs will cease to have any
legal sanction in Pakistan, though the same may
not be said with certainty about India. However,
whether or not custom is granted any legal sanction,
it would not be possible to eradicate its deep rooted
influences for generations to come.

Bibliography: Sir George Rankin, Custom and the
Muslim India, in Transactions of the Grecian
Society, xxv; S. Roy, Customs and Customary Law
in British India, Calcutta 1911; Hamid Ali,
Custom and Law in Anglo-Muslim Jurisprudence,
Calcutta 1938 (mainly on the Memons); L. Moore,
Malabar Law and Custom, Madras 1905; R.V.
Russel and Hira Lal, Tribes and Castes of the
Central Provinces, London 1916; R. E. Enthoven,
Tribes and Castes of Bombay, Bombay 1920;
Punjab Customary Law, 24 vols., Calcutta-Lahore,
1881-1911; W. H. Rattigan, A Digest of Civil Law
H. A. Rose, A Compendium of the Punjab Customary
Law, Lahore 1911; C. L. Tupper, Punjab Customary
Law, Calcutta 1881; Customs in the Trans-border
Territories of the North-West Frontier Provinces, in
JASB, 1904, pt. 3, extra number, 1 ff.; H. H.
Risley, Indian Census Report of 1901; Census of
India 1931, i; A. A. A. Fysee, Outlines of Muham-
dadan Law, Oxford 1949.

(Shamoon T. Lokhandwalla)

iv. — Indonesia. 1. The word, in the form adat,
had been adopted, not only in Malay but also in
many other languages of the Indonesian archipela
go. It comprises all things Indonesian that are custom,
usages, practice.

2. Adat thus includes also the juridical customs of
countries or regions. The scholars who studied the
juridical parts of the general adat in Indonesia used
the now well known word "adat law" (Adatrecht),
and not the wider term "customary law", because at
least among the Muslim population of Indonesia, not
all the juridical customs in force were "customary"
by origin.

Some rules concerning marriage and divorce and
law of inheritance are due to the impact of the
shari'a on the Muslim Indonesian world. From the
shari'a the Indonesians also took the institution of
"pious foundations" (wakf). In some regions the
influence of the shari'a on general rules of the law
of relationship is visible. But otherwise some regional
rule or institution was originally not unwritten law
but due to a princely edict or order (viz. the older
pesuara of the Balinese princes). Moreover in some
regions one may find that parts of the law in the
closed legal communities (desa, subak) are formulated
in written local regulations (awig-auwig desa in Bali),
The famous adat-institution of Java—see § 4—
is still often called by Javanese the djandji dalem,
that is "the royal promise", because according to
their tradition it was a seventeenth century king
(susuhunan) of Mataram, who gave this order to his
subjects in that way.

So far the situation in Muslim Indonesia is mutatis
mutandis the same as in the older and central
countries of Islam. For, notwithstanding the totali-
tarian pretention of the shari'a to be the formulation
of God's eternal will, which is followed by every
Muslim in any country, time or circumstances, only
some chapters of the fikih system were actually
enforced.

2. The particular situation in Muslim Indonesia,
however, is that an incessant discussion is going
on about the worth of adat law and about the
relation of adat law and the shari'a.

Moreover those departments of juridical life which
have been entirely Islamized in other countries:
mobile law, law of relationship, law of
inheritance—are not the unchallenged domain of
shari'a in Muslim Indonesia, as will be shown below.
Before the second world war the more radical
adherents of the nationalist parties argued that the
uniform adat law in the 18 juridical regions of the
East Indies was an obstacle to the unification and
modernization of the country. Their ideal became:
one pan-Indonesian state, one (official) language
and one law. They rejected the shari'a as well as
adat law. Notwithstanding their anti-western attitude
they believed—and partly still do—that western law
should be introduced entirely. The former Dutch
government often had (for its Indonesian subjects)
considered the possibilities of westernization of private
law but projects of codes were never carried out.
Even unification of the adat law in force proved to
be a troublesome experiment. Notwithstanding that,
elements of western law began, rather long ago, to
penetrate into Indonesian life as a consequence of
modernization of the country. Their ideal became:
one pan-Indonesian state, one (official) language
and one law. They rejected the shari'a as well as
adat law. Notwithstanding their anti-western attitude
they believed—and partly still do—that western law
should be introduced entirely. The former Dutch
government often had (for its Indonesian subjects)
considered the possibilities of westernization of private
law but projects of codes were never carried out.
Even unification of the adat law in force proved to
be a troublesome experiment. Notwithstanding that,
elements of western law began, rather long ago, to
penetrate into Indonesian life as a consequence of
modernization of the country. Their ideal became:
one pan-Indonesian state, one (official) language
and one law. They rejected the shari'a as well as
adat law. Notwithstanding their anti-western attitude
they believed—and partly still do—that western law
should be introduced entirely. The former Dutch
government often had (for its Indonesian subjects)
considered the possibilities of westernization of private
law but projects of codes were never carried out.
Even unification of the adat law in force proved to
be a troublesome experiment. Notwithstanding that,
elements of western law began, rather long ago, to
penetrate into Indonesian life as a consequence of
modernization of the country. Their ideal became:
one pan-Indonesian state, one (official) language
and one law. They rejected the shari'a as well as
adat law. Notwithstanding their anti-western attitude
they believed—and partly still do—that western law
should be introduced entirely. The former Dutch
government often had (for its Indonesian subjects)
considered the possibilities of westernization of private
law but projects of codes were never carried out.
Even unification of the adat law in force proved to
be a troublesome experiment. Notwithstanding that,
elements of western law began, rather long ago, to
penetrate into Indonesian life as a consequence of
modernization of the country. Their ideal became:
one pan-Indonesian state, one (official) language
and one law. They rejected the shari'a as well as
adat law. Notwithstanding their anti-western attitude
they believed—and partly still do—that western law
should be introduced entirely. The former Dutch
government often had (for its Indonesian subjects)
considered the possibilities of westernization of private
law but projects of codes were never carried out.
persons, adat-functionaries and politicians tried to find a way out, that is to say a conciliation between both juridical complexes (on this occasion in the section of the law of inheritance) but without success. The view-point of the above-mentioned Minangkabau ‘ulamā, notwithstanding their concessions to adat law, was thoroughly traditional (orthodox).

4. There is however one outstanding problem that was already before the war—to quote a Javanese politician—"an inexhaustible source of disputes". This is the position of the woman, especially in Javanese life. From a social point of view the position of the Javanese woman is fairly high. But her position as a wife is extremely unsafe. The peculiar situation as far as this point is concerned is that in Java (and in Minangkabau) more than 50\% of all marriages are dissolved by the husband’s act of repudiation. Of course the shari’a gives the husband that right everywhere. It is remarkable however that in the Muslim regions where a patrilineal system of relationship is in force the matrimonial bond is strong, because the husband has to pay a considerable bride-price. In Java the so-called “tuku” (remnant of a bride-price) is only a combination of cheap presents, and even the mahr of the sharī’a often remains unpaid. The socio-familial system in Java is bilateral.

If a score of years ago polygyny has not yet found its place against polygyny. Not in the first place against simultaneous polygyny (which is not at all frequent: ± 2\% but mainly against “successive” polygyny: the habit of the man (who can marry quite “cheaply”) to exchange his wife for a younger one. The tašh-taldk-institution is not effective against this most serious social evil. This tašh-regulation is as follows: Immediately after contracting his marriage the husband has to declare to his wife’s wali and the witnesses that, if he leaves his wife for a certain time without providing for her and without sending her tidings, if he severely illtreats her or commits another unseemly act—then his wife is free, if she likes to do so, to complain before the Muslim authority concerned. If there is evidence of her husband’s failing in these respects the authority states one falsūd to have taken place.

The republic has improved the (officially edited) forms for the tašh-statements and given them by means of wadāl-paying the character of an eventual khulul. And a bill is being prepared which is an interesting combination of elements of western law, Muslim religious law and adat law, although the prospects of its enactment are doubtful.

This bill has the following salient points: (a) child-marriages (not frequent in Indonesia) are forbidden; (b) each marriage is to be registered in a registrar’s office in accordance with the European continental system; (c) the future married couple have to give each other certificates as to their health (influence of “eugenics”?) (d) the mutual rights and duties of husband and wife are circumscribed partly (mutatis mutandis) in the words of the Dutch code, partly in the terminology of the sharī’a, especially the duties of the “polygamous” husband; (e) As to polygyny in general: 1. polygyny is to be allowed only in the interest of society; 2. no man can take a second or third wife (etc.) without the consent of the wife (wives) he already has; 3. he requires a medical certificate (on this occasion in Java) that his health allows “polygamy”; 4. he must prove himself to possess the financial means to entertain more than one household; 5. the polygami in spe must promise to be “righteous” in his conduct. Otherwise the judge is given a considerable power to dissolve marriages in well-defined cases, again partly derived from articles of the Dutch code, partly from regional rules of adat law and the usual sharī’i-influences. Whether, however, in the intention of the bill, a Muslim husband can still repudiate his wife depends on the ultimate legislative elaboration of the bill.

5. There are of course other points in the incessant disputes. As was already mentioned in § 3 above, there is the question of succession-law. Notwithstanding the fact that in Java Muslim courts exist (since centuries) which deal with all suits concerning Indonesian Muslim estates, it is well-known that in reality the Javanese, as well as the Sundanese and Madurese—outside the court—followed in case of partition of estates the lines of adat law. For this reason suits of this kind belong since 1937 to the competence of the common “secular” judge. There is still Muslim propaganda against this “colonial” measure.


ADA KAI’E, island in the Danube in Rumania, inhabited by Turks, 4 km above the Iron Gates and 1/4 km below Orsova; 800 by 200 m. In the 19th century the Ottoman Turks occupied the strategic points of the river in this region, but the island is mentioned for the first time only in 1691, when the vizier Dursun Mehmēd Paşa conquered the “little island in the straits of Işăhowa (Orsova)”, which was then occupied by 400 soldiers and called Şanas adası, i.e. “entrenchment island”, from German Schanz (Slibid Brdgftluy Mehmed Agha, Ta’vrik, Istanbul 1928, ii, 540). In 1776 the first durable fortifications were built by the muhalıs of the Iron Gates, Çerkes Mehmēd Paşa (Mehmed Rashid, Ta’vrik, Istanbul 1913, ii, 153). After occupation by the Austrians, it was retaken by ‘Ali Paşa, called serdar-i eatham, in 1738; it is on this occasion that the name Ada Kai’es appears for the first time (cf. Mehmēd Subhl, Ta’vrik-i Wekâh 15, Istanbul 1198, 131, 134). It depended from the wali of Vidin. The last struggles round Ada Kai’s took place in 1788, when during the expedition of the şadır a’şam Kōdja Yuṣuf Paşa against the army of Laudon, the last time when Ottoman troops appeared in the Danat, the island played the role of a river base. Yuṣuf Paşa built a large bridge between Orsova and Tekye (Tekijia) and reinforced the “fortress of the Great Island (Ada-i Kebr Kai’es)”. (The expedition is described in detail by an anonymous writer in Safa-nāme-yi Serdar-i Ekrem Yuṣuf Paşa, MS Istanbul, Univ. Kitapsaray, T.Y. 3254; another
MS in the possession of the writer). During the revolt of the Serbians, the island became an important stronghold of the Empire. The Dayr, who surrendered in Belgrade, were executed in Ada Kal'è by the muhafiz Redjeb Agha in 1809 (Ahmed Djiwedet, Ta'rikh, Istanbul 1909, ix, 126, 128). Somewhat later Redjeb Agha himself, following the example of his brothers, Adem, Bekir and Şüllü, who occupied the fortress of Feth Islam (Kladovo), had to retire to the island. Well Pasha, son of 'Ali Tepeledeni, who had been charged with the pacification of Serbia, granted them pardon, on which they surrendered the island. After 1867, when the Turkish garrisons evacuated Serbia, Ada Kal'è remained without direct communication with the capital. At the Congress of Berlin (1878) the island was forgotten, and so remained an isolated possession of the Ottoman Empire, administered by a nâhiye müdürü. Its inhabitants elected deputies to the Turkish parliament. By the treaty of Trianon (1920), it was incorporated, with the Banat, into Rumania; but this was recognized by Turkey only by the treaty of Lausanne (1923).

At the present day, the island has 640 Turkish inhabitants. There are schools for the Muslim population. The fortifications, in red brick and stones, with their basements and cisterns, are noteworthy, as well as the mosque built by Selim III, with a ziyârîd-gâh of Miskin Bâbâ, a dervîsh who came in the 18th century from Turkestan and died on the island.


(Àurel Deceri)

**ADA PÂZARÌ, flourishing town in the province of Koçka-ei, Turkey, situated at 40° 47' N., 30° 23' E., in the fertile plain known as Akowa on the lower course of the Sakarya river. Originally it lay between two arms of this river (hence the earlier name Ada, "Island"), but now lies between the Sakarya and the Carâb şâyu. It was occupied by the Turks under Orkhan and is mentioned for the first time in a waṣf-foundation which goes back to him (T. Gokbili, XV, v XVI, 1907, apud; T. Gokbili, XV, v XVI, 1907, apud). In 1795 it appears, with the modern name of Adapazarî, as the seat of a nâlîb. In 1852-3 it was raised to the rank of a town, and about 1890 had 24,500 inhabitants, according to V. Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie, iv, Paris 1899, 372 ff. By the census of 1950 the population had risen to 36,310. It is a trading centre for local produce, especially tobacco, vegetables and fruit. There are no Islamic monuments of importance.


**ADA (A.).** The history of this word reflects, parallel to and even better than the history of the words 'ilm and din, the evolution of Arab culture from its pre-Islamic origins to our own day. In its oldest sense, it may be regarded as synonym of the sunna, with the sense of "habit, hereditary norm of conduct, custom" derived from ancestors and other persons who are looked up to as models (as, in the religious sense, was the sunna of the Prophet for his community). The etymology of the word put forward by Vollers and Nallino agrees with this earliest meaning: both considered that the plural adab was formed from dab ("custom, habit"), and that the singular adab was subsequently derived from plural. (Indigenous lexicographers connect it with the root 'db, meaning "marvellous thing", or "preparation, feast"). In any case, the oldest meaning of the word is that already given: it implies a habit, a practical norm of conduct, with the double connotation of being praiseworthy and being inherited from one's ancestors.

The evolution of thisprimary sense accentuated, on the one hand, its ethical and practical content: adab came to mean "high quality of soul, good upbringing, urbanity and courtesy", in this acceptation corresponding to the refining of bedouin ethics and customs as a result of Islam (cf. Wensinck, Handbook, s.v. adab) and contact with foreign cultures during the first two centuries A.H. Thus, at the beginning of the adab, in this sense was the equivalent of the Latin urba-nitas, the civility, courtesy, refinement of the cities in contrast to beduin uncouthness. (In this sense, the lexicons use the word zarf, courtesy and elegance, to explain adab.) The word kept this ethical and social meaning during the whole period of medieval Muslim civilization. So, for example, adab, etiquette, of eating, drinking, dressing [cf. ta'dim, adab, libas]; adab, etiquette, of the boon companion (cf. the treatise Adab al-Nadîm by Kühaldîm and Nadîmid; from another sphere: adab, etiquette, of disputation: cf. several treatises entitled Adab al-Bahth and Bahth; etiquette of study (cf. books on Adab al-Dars, Adab al-Al'm wa'l-Musa'allim, and Tadris).

However, from the first century of the hidgra, adab, in addition to this ethical and social meaning, acquired an intellectual meaning, which was at first connected with the first meaning, but then became increasingly differentiated from it. Adab came to imply the sum of knowledge which makes a man courteous and "urban", profane culture (as distinct from 'ilm, learning, or rather, religious learning, Kûrân, hadith, twârîz, tasvir ve fasîha lâzîm) based in the first place on poetry, the art of oratory, the historical and tribal traditions of the ancient Arabs, and also on the corresponding sciences: rhetoric, grammar, lexicography, metrics. Consequently this humanistic concept of adab was at first strictly national: the perfect adab, in the Umayyad period, was the man who excelled in knowledge of the ancient poets, in the ayâm al-'Arab, in the poetical, historical and antiquarian sphere of Arab culture. But contact with foreign cultures widened the content of adab, or Arab humanitas, into humanitas without qualification; it now included a knowledge of those sections of non-Arab (Indian, Iranian, Hellenistic) literature (i.e. gnomic and technical literature) with
which Arab Muslim civilization became familiar from the early Abbasid period onwards. The adab of the 9th century, of which al-Dījahīṣī was the most perfect example, was therefore not only cultivated in Arabic poetry and prose, in maxims and proverbs, in the genealogy and tradition of the djīhāḥisyya and of the Arabs at a time when they were hardly yet Islamized, but broadened out his range of interest to include the Iranian world with all its epic, gnomic, and narrative tradition, the Indian world with its fables, and the Greek world with its practical philosophy, and especially its ethics and economics. It was thus that in the 3rd/9th century there came into being the great literature of adab, with its varied and pleasing erudition, which is not pure scholarship although it often also touches on, and handles scientific subjects, but which is centred above all on man, his qualities and his passions, the environment in which he lives, and the material and spiritual culture created by him. Within this domain al-Dījahīṣī and his followers (Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī, al-Tanukhī, etc.) turned to account and extended the heritage bequeathed to Muslim society in the previous century by the Iranian genius Ibn al-Mukaffa, who can be described as the true creator of this enlarged conception of adab, with his versions of foreign historical and literary works (Khudayyī-Dimna) and his original ethical and didactic tracts (al-Adab al-Kabīr) and his original ethical and didactic tracts (al-Adab al-Kabīr and al-Šāqīr) (though the authenticity of the latter is very questionable). The literature of adab is the very backbone of high ʿAbbāsid culture.

The richness and complexity of this concept of adab, as humanity or culture, was on the other hand reduced, already in the ʿAbbāsid epoch, to a narrower acceptation. From its meaning of the "necessary general culture" expected of any man of superior education, it took on the specific meaning of "the knowledge necessary for given offices and social functions". Thus one could speak of an adab al-kātib or culture specially required for holding the office of secretary (such is the title of a treatise by Ibn Kūţāya [cf. also Kātib]; or of the adab or ādāb of scribes, in the sense of the sum of special knowledge and experience proper to this office. [For the adab of the kādī, cf. also Kādī]. On the other hand, the concept adab ended by losing the wide humanistic acceptation that it had had during the golden age of the caliphate and became restricted to a narrower, and more rhetorical sphere of "belles-lettres": poetry, artistic prose, paremiography, and anecdotal writing. This was the kind of adab at which al-Ḥarīrī was an adept, with his verbal virtuosity and his entirely formal and purist interests. From humanitas, adab became merely the literature of the academy, and remained so throughout the long decadence of Arabic letters and spirit right up to the time of the modern renaisance.

In the modern age adab, and even more so its plural ādāb, are synonyms of literature in the most specific sense of the word. Taʾrīkh al-Ādāb al-ʿArabīyya is the history of Arabic literature; kuliyāyat al-ādāb is the faculty of arts of letters in the universities organized in the European manner. But beyond the limits of technical nomenclature, the conscious usage of certain writers (e.g. Tāḥā Ḥusayn) tends to give back to the word something of its former elasticity and amplitude.

Bibliography: Nallino, Scritti, vi, 2-17. For books on various species of etiquette, cf. also Brockelmann, iii, index s.v. adab, ādāb; Hājjī Khaṭṭāf, s.v. ādāb and adab. (F. Gabrieli)
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'ADAD [see ʾıṣār].

ADAL, one of the Muslim states in East Africa that played an important part in the wars between Islam and Abyssinian Christendom. Al-Makrizī (al-Imām bi-ʾIḥṣāb man bi-Ard al-Ḫabashā min Mulūk al-Īslām, Cairo 1895, 5) enumerates the following seven Islamic states in Southern and Eastern Abyssinia, which he designates as madāʾīkh bilād Ṣaylāt: Awfāt (the common form is ʿĪfāt), Dawārō, Arayabīnī (Arabaynī, Arabaybīnī), Ḥadhā, Ṣahrā, Bālī, Dāra. From Abyssinian chronicles, other states are known which stood on the same footing as the above, one of them being Adal.—Adal ('Adal) is the farthest east of those states, and is approximately identical with the present “Côte française des Somalis”. The inhabitants are partly Somali, partly ʿAfār (Danākīl [see Danākīl]). It is mentioned for the first time in the wars between the Abyssinian king ʿAmda ʿṢeṣōn (1314-44) and the Muslims. In the march of ʿAmda ʿṢeṣōn upon Ṣaylāt (1332), the king of Adal, who attempted to bar his passage, was vanquished and killed. The rulers of Adal have the title of amīr, later on also the title of imām, in the Arabic texts, but of negūs, “king”, in the Ethiopic chronicles. In the 15th century Adal was part of ʿĪfāt (Awfāt [q.v.]); in the 15th century the amīr of Adal ruled over ʿĪfāt and had his capital at Dakar to the east of Ṣaylāt. Under the Māṣjīd-Zarāʾ Yʿsākīb (1434-68) and Baʿṣada Mārjām (1468-78) negotiations took place between the Abyssinians and Adal; afterwards there was fighting between them with changing fortune. Adal frequently served also for the Muslims from districts further to the west as a refuge from the Abyssinians, who, however, often followed them thither. The Muslim writers (al-Makrizī and ʿArabāfashī, Ḥuṣayn al-Ḥabashī) do not mention Adal—unless it is meant by 'Adal al-ʿUmārā' (al-Makrizī, loc. cit., 2)—but refer only to the sultanate of Ṣaylāt' in that region. Further, the king of Adal, Mehmād son of Arwē Badāyī (Perruchon, Chroniques de Zarāʾ Yʿsāqīb et de Baʿṣada Mārjām, 131), belonged to the family of the sultans of Ṣaylāt; he was a grandson of the celebrated Saʿd al-Ḍīn, after whom the dynasty and the land were called (Barr Saʿd al-Ḍīn). The latter reigned 1386-1415; he fell in 1415 in the battle with King Yeshāk of Abyssinia (1414-29). "Adal" and "empire of Ṣaylāt" are often synonymous, and their histories are closely connected with each other [cf. Zayla]. With regard to the 16th century see also AHMAD GRAN. In the later history of those countries, the wars with the Muslim Somalis and 'Āfār are thrust into the background by those with the Gall, who since 1540 warred with the Christians and Muslims of Abyssinia. Adal is still mentioned a few times in the chronicles. Even in the 19th century, before England, France and Italy took possession of the Abyssinian littorals, King Sāḥib-Ṣellāb of Ṣoo called himself also "King of Adal".


ADALYA [see ANTALYA].

ĀDAM, the father of mankind (Abūl-Bashār). In the Kurān it is related that when God had
created what is on the earth and in the heavens he said to the angels: "I am about to place a substitute (khalifa) on earth", and they said: "Will thou place thereon one who will do evil therein and shed blood, whereas we celebrate thy praise and sanctify thee?" Then God taught Adam the names of all things, and as the angels did not know the names Adam taught them these (ii, 28-32 FL). Thereafter God ordered the angels to prostrate themselves before Adam, and they did with the exception of Iblis who in his heart imagined that he was of higher rank, since he was created of fire, whereas Adam was created of clay (golem). Some authors tell that Iblis went into his mouth and emerged from his anus and vice versa; then the spirit was blown into him by God and went into his brain, from where it went into his eyes, his nose and further through the whole body, whereafter the body became flesh, blood, bone, veins and sinews. According to a tradition ascribed to the prophet the dust for the head was taken from the Ka'ba, for breast and back from Jerusalem, thighs from Yaman etc. (al-Tabari, i, 87 ff.; idem, Taşfir, i, 159; al-Masʿudi, Murūjī, i, 51-3; al-Kisāʾi, 23-7; al-Thaʾlabī, 17). In Jewish tradition the clay for Adam's body was taken from the place of the temple or from the whole world, in different colours (golem) (Targum Yerushalmi, to Gen. ii, 7; Sanhedrin, 38a; Pirke R. Eliezer, c. 11); a similar Christian tradition is found with Cyprian and evidence of it in the garden to cover them (vii, 20; xx, 120 f.). Then God sent them down on earth to live there as enemies, but when Adam asked for forgiveness, God promised him guidance (ii, 36-37; vii, 24-26; xx, 122-123). It is said that God had a covenant with Adam at first, but Adam forgot it (xx, 115), and God said "Have I not had a covenant with you, sons of Adam, that you will not serve Satan" (xxxvi, 60, cf. v, 172). Adam was chosen by God, as later Nūb and the families of Ibrāhīm and `Imrān (iii, 23). Like Adam only ʾĪsā was created in a special way (iii, 59).

The non-Biblical elements in this account are to be found in Jewish, in some cases in Christian tradition. God's conversation with the angels before Adam's creation and Adam's superiority because of his knowledge about the names is known from Berešīt Rabba, xvii, 4; Bemidbar Rabba, xix, 3; Pesikta, ed. S. Buber, 34a; Vīta Ađami (Kautzsch), 513. The προσωνύμησις of the angels before Adam is not commanded by God in Jewish writings. The angels wanted to honour him as God, but were prevented from doing so as God made Adam sleep (Berešīt Rabba 8, 10; Pirke R. Eliezer, 19). On the other hand Athanasius (Quaestio X ad Antiōchum) refers to the idea (which he rejects) that Satan fell because he refused to προσωνύμησις before Adam. In Vīta Ađami, i. c., whose origin is uncertain, the angel Michael prostrated himself to Adam and called upon the other angels to do so, and it is understood, but not said, that God approved of it. In the Christian Syriac (ed. Bezold, 14 f.) God gave Adam power over all beings, and the angels worshipped him except the jealous devil who then was turned out from the heavens. God's covenant with Adam is mentioned Sanhedrin, 38b; Augustin, De civitate dei, xvi, 27, and Adam's remorse ʾErubin, 18b; Ṣaboda Zarr, 8a; Vīta Ađami, 512.

In the post-Kurāʾic tradition the kisāʾ about Adam were growing, and these also reflect to a great extent Jewish and Christian influence. They are mainly found in kathīt-collections, in kisāʾ-collections, in the works of general history, and in the commentaries to the Kurāʾīn.

As a preparation for the creation of Adam it is related that God sent Gabriel and after him Michael to the earth to take a handful of clay (hin), but the earth refused to give it for that purpose, then the angel of death was sent and took by force red, white and black clay; this is why men have different colours. Adam got his name because he was taken from the surface, ađam, of the earth. The clay was kneaded and worked on until it became sticky, then slimy, and instead of the body of dry clay (golem). Some authors tell that Iblis went into his mouth and emerged from his anus and vice versa; then the spirit was blown into him by God and went into his brain, from where it went into his eyes, his nose and further through the whole body, whereafter the body became flesh, blood, bone, veins and sinews. According to a tradition ascribed to the prophet the dust for the head was taken from the Ka'ba, for breast and back from Jerusalem, thighs from Yaman etc. (al-Tabari, i, 87 ff.; idem, Taşfir, i, 159; al-Masʿudi, Murūjī, i, 51-3; al-Kisāʾi, 23-7; al-Thaʾlabī, 17). In Jewish tradition the clay for Adam's body was taken from the place of the temple or from the whole world, in different colours (golem) (Targum Yerushalmi, to Gen. ii, 7; Sanhedrin, 38a; Pirke R. Eliezer, c. 11); a similar Christian tradition is found with Cyprian and evidence of it in the garden to cover them (vii, 20; xx, 120 f.). Then God sent them down on earth to live there as enemies, but when Adam asked for forgiveness, God promised him guidance (ii, 36-37; vii, 24-26; xx, 122-123). It is said that God had a covenant with Adam at first, but Adam forgot it (xx, 115), and God said "Have I not had a covenant with you, sons of Adam, that you will not serve Satan" (xxxvi, 60, cf. v, 172). Adam was chosen by God, as later Nūb and the families of Ibrāhīm and `Imrān (iii, 23). Like Adam only ʾĪsā was created in a special way (iii, 59).
who according to a tradition founded the Jewish festivals (‘Aboda Zara, 8a), accomplished the ¡ark and ceremonies, the black stone being sent to him from heaven, whereafter he built the Ka‘ba (al-Tabari, i, 122; al-Ya’kubî, i, 3; al-Tha‘labî, 23). He also learned, with Eve, the use of fire, agriculture and handicraft, according to a tradition of Jewish origin (Hamza al-Íslâîhîn (Gottwald), 84, Berlin 1340, 57; al-Tabari, i, 123, 126 ff.; al-Tha‘labî, 23). According to al-Tha‘labî he even coined dirhams and dinârs, as they are necessary for normal life. In continuation of the name-giving it is said that Adam learned all nouns and greetings and religious formulas (al-Tabari, i, 93 ff.; al-Ya’kubî, 3). The presupposition is that Adam spoke Aramaic (Sanhedrin, 38b; Barhebræus, Chron. Syr., 5). Al-Halabi (al-Sira al-Halabiyya, Cairo 1259, i, 40) says that Adam spoke Arabic in Paradise, but on the earth he spoke súryâsiyya, and he wrote the 12 known kinds of writing, al-Kisa’ (28) that he spoke 700 languages, of which Adam was Arabic. He also wrote books (al-Dinawari, 8).

When Adam and Eve were united they begot children, first Kâblî and Háblî (q.v.), each with a twin-sister. Adam married each to the brother of his twin-sister, therefore Kâblî was jealous and killed Háblî (q.v.), who was born without a sister, was the favourite of Adam and his spiritual heir (wasî). Adam begot many other children, one of whom was named ‘Abd al-‘Hârijî; al-Tha‘labî says that Eve bore a boy and a girl twenty times and that the number of Adam’s offspring was 40,000 before he died. Al-Halabi mentions five gods of the Arabs who were sons of Adam; Iblîs made images of them and these were worshipped by later generations (al-Tabari, i, 149 ff.; 160 ff.; al-Masûdî, i, 62 f.; al-Ya’kubî, 4 f.; al-Tha‘labî, 27; al-Halabi, Sîra, i, 12).

God rubbed the back of Adam, and all his offspring appeared to him, amongst them David. When Adam heard that David should live only a short time he gave him 40 (50 or 70) years of his own life-time, so that he did not reach the 1,000 years that were destined for him (al-Tabari, i, 156 f.; Ibn Sa‘îd, i, 7 f.; al-Tha‘labî, 26). The same occurs in Jewish tradition (Bemidbar Rabba, xvi, 12; Yalkut Shim‘oni, § 41; Pirke R. Eiseler, c. 19), and a related idea is the Christian tradition that everything was created at the same moment (Barhebræus, Ta‘rif al-Mukhîsâr al-Duwal, 7).

Adam was created on Friday, the 6th of Nîsân, year 1. On the same day he was expelled, and he died on a Friday at the same date of the month (al-Tabari, i, 155 ff.; al-Masûdî, i, 60, 69; al-Ya’kubî, i, 4). He was buried, with Eve, in a cave, maghârat al-humad; at the foot of Abû Kûbays near Mecca (al-Tabari, i, 163; al-Ya’kubî, 4). Al-Tha‘labî, 30, relates that after the flood he was brought to Jerusalem, following a Christian tradition that he was taken from the ark to Golgotha, the centre of the earth (Cave of Treasures, 38-42, 84, 112, 148), where the “chapel of Adam” is situated in the church of the holy sepulchre (see W. H. Roscher, Der Omphalosgedanke, Leipzig 1918; E. Wilamowitz, Konstantin’s Kirche am heiligen Grabe, Göttingen 1922; 30 ff.).

Adam was not only the first of men, but also the first of prophets, and so his position became influenced by the Muslim way of thinking. Just as Jesus was the second Adam in Christianity, a connexion was established in Islam between Adam and Muhammad, with Adam as the first, Muhammad as the last apostle (rasûl). In the Sab’îyya system Adam is the first of the 7 nāsîts, and some say there were men and nāsîls (existing before him). Seth was his nāsîl. They distinguish between Adam al-kull, “all-Adam”, identical with the intelligence (‘abîl), from whom the emanation began, and Adam al-djûsî, the first one in the period of veiling. It is this ideal Adam before whom the angels prostrated themselves because he was godly, God’s spirit being in him. This is sometimes designated as an incarnation (hadîl), which was continued by transmigration (panatsûkh). This ideal man was identified with “the perfect man” of Hellenism, and the same was by al-Hâllâğî named nâsît. As Muhammad became the centre of mankind, an idea especially emphasized in šûfism, it became his essence (haqîqa) or his “light” (nur) that manifested itself in Adam. All creatures were created for the sake of Muhammad, and Adam and his offspring were created of his light (al-Masûdî, i, 56; al-Sira al-Halabiyya, 23; al-Tha‘labî, 16).

Among the philosophers al-Fārābī and Ibn Sīnā regard, like the Muḥtazilites, existence as an accident, whereas for Ibn Rushd, as for the Ashʿarites, existence is an essence.

Bibliography: The theory of 'adam as professed by the Muḥtazilites is found in the works dealing with that sect (e.g. Ibn Hazm, Ḥaṣanī, v, 45); a good discussion is found in Shahrastānī, Nihāyat al-Islām (Guillaume), 130 ff. For a general discussion of the problem I refer to S. van den Bergh, tradn. of Ibn Rushd’s Tahāfut al-Tahāfut, ch. i and ii; see also S. Pines, Beiträge zur islamischen Atomenlehre, 116 f.

(S. Van den Bergh)

ADAMAWA, the name—deriving from the local leader of the Fulani ḍiḥād in 1809 (see para. 5 below)—given to a region in the hinterland of West Africa, and used:

(a) of an area never precisely defined in geographical terms but including the conquests of this ḍiḥād and the resulting sphere of Fulani influence in the region, extending from Marua in the north to well beyond Ngaundere in the south and from Rei Duba in the east to west of Yola,—approximately from 11° to 6° N. and 14° to 15° E. With the European occupation of this part of Africa early in the present century, the smaller and more closely populated western part came under the British administration of Nigeria,—the eastern section became part of the German Kamerun, which, after the German defeat in the 1914-18 war, were mandated to Great Britain and France by the League of Nations;

(b) of a Province, area according to 1931 census 251, 778 sq. miles—known until 1927 as the Yola Province—in Northern Nigeria, containing that part of (a) west of the original Anglo-German international boundary, plus those areas of the former German Kamerun mandated to Great Britain. These consist of a small area north of the river Benue, and a larger area to the south of it. The Adamawa Province also includes the Amirate of Muri in its south west corner and some tribal areas, not covered by the old name Adamawa. It lies south of the Bornu Province and east of the Bauchi Province.

2. Geography. The main features of Adamawa are the river Benue—the principal tributary of the river Niger and an international water-way which is navigable by steamers at the height of the wet season (August to October), and by large canoes and barges at all times,—running across its centre from east to west; the Mandara Mountains, over 3,000 feet, running north and south, north of the river Benue; and an extensive crescent-shaped massif,—over 5,000 feet at its higher western end,—curving from east to west, south of the river Benue.

3. Transport and Trade. The river Benue is itself extensively used for transport; the main caravan routes and modern motor roads run from south to north through the region. In earlier days, slaves and some ivory were the main exports; nowadays ground nuts and hides have replaced these, though there are numerous other items, including cotton, gum, sesame, etc. Imports consist of manufactured articles, especially cotton goods.

4. Economy. The region is not industrialised, and contains no large towns. It is self-contained so far as the necessities of life are concerned. Its population is mainly agricultural and pastoral. Its capital wealth consists in the numerous herds of cattle, sheep and goats.

5. Ethnography. (a) The population of the region comprises the Fulani (see article FULBE), both nomad and settled, and numerous pagan tribes. It is not possible to give figures with any accuracy for the indefinite region described in para. 1 (a) above. At the census of 1931, the salient figures for the Adamawa Province of Nigeria (para. 1 (b) above) were as follows: Fulani 150,936; Hausa (q.v.) 21,560; Kanuri (q.v.) 10,495; other tribes 467,138; these plus some minor groups gave a total population of 1,024,755.

The figures for the main pagan tribes were then: Bachama 19,703; Chamba 51,224*; Hama 6,604; Bata 23,003; Hilij 6,284; Kilba 22,799; Lala 7,539; Longuda 11,808; Mambilla 19,348; Mumuye 79,272; Vere 10,866; Wuruk 23,472; Marghi 151,223*.

[Starred figures include members of the tribe outside the Provincial boundary, but inside the old “Adamawa”]

(b) Languages. Fulani (Fuffulde, see under fulbe) is the major language of the region, and the nearest approach to a lingua franca in it. Many of the pagan tribes now use it as such, though they have their own tongues, some of which are interconnected in varying degrees (e.g. Bura and Marghi with Kilba more remotely akin). Hausa is not much spoken outside the towns, and in them mostly by the trading elements. English and French are spoken only by those educated in the more advanced schools in the west and east of the region respectively.

6. History. Prior to the Fulani ḍiḥād, we have only orally transmitted tribal traditions. Most of the major tribes north of the river Benue do not claim to be indigenous and have traditions of immigration from the north and/or east. It seems clear that this was formerly the general direction of tribal movement, owing to the increasing desertification of the Saharan areas further north, and a consequent thrust of those tribes least able to survive southwards to the tsetse ridden coast. The Fulani must have entered Adamawa centuries before the ḍiḥād. Local pagan tradition speaks (i) of an offshoot from the main Fulani trek (round the north and west African coasts, subsequently entering the West African hinterland from the direction of Senegambia), which entered the Bornu north, then Adamawa from the north, having crossed the central Sahara by the westerly caravan route via Murzuq and Bilma, and (ii) of these Fulani arriving cattleless, having lost their herds en route, and then of their obtaining cattle from the local pagans. With the ḍiḥād we come to firm historical ground. When Usmanu bi Foduye (see uthman u. fud,l) started a dīḥād in the Sokoto area in circa 1804, his reputation spread, and he was joined by a certain Modibbo (Fulani for muʿalim) Adama. This Modibbo Adama was born near Gurin, east of the Vere hills on the west bank of the Faro tributary and just south of the river Benue, had studied in Bornu as a youth under a certain Modibbo Kiari thereafter returning to a village called Weltunde in the Benue region. In 1866, Usmanu gave M. Adama a flag and a few warriors with instructions to return to his own country and to start the ḍiḥād there. In 1809 Modibbo. Adama began a ḍiḥād from Gurin, thus embarking on a career of conquest and slave raiding amongst the local pagan tribes. Speaking generally, the Fulani horsemen achieved success except where the pagans could avail themselves of mountainous features unsuitable for mounted men. In such areas, many pagan tribes, such as the Hilij, Margh and Kilba north of the Benue and the Mambilla, Chamba and others south of it, maintained actual or virtual independence until the European occupation.
In 1838, Modibbo Adama transferred his headquarters from Gurin (now only a tiny village, but still hallowed for its associations), to the nearby Ribadu, in 1839 to Jobolowo a little to the west, and, finally, in 1841, he founded Yola still more to the west (in Fulani the name means a raised area in a marsh), where he died in 1848. All these places are just south of the Benue river, and it is obvious that the intention was to control the river crossings. Details of the dynasty founded by Modibbo Adama are given below. The Fulani conquests, often amounting to little more than raids, were never closely organised except near to the capital. The administrative system was one of fiefs, feudal in character, the lesser chiefs owing allegiance to the lamido (Fulani = lambe), and rendering tribute. But the tendency was centrifugal, and these fief holders (Fulani = lamido plur: lambe) often achieved virtual though not nominal independence, in proportion to the distance of their fief from the capital. Good examples of this tendency were found in Madagai and Rei Buba in the north and east of the region respectively. Adamawa as a name for the region seems to have been in use in Bornu when Clapperton was there in 1853.

ADAMAWA — ‘ADAN


The Amirs of Yola

Hassan

(1) Modibbo Adama 1809-48

(2) Lauwai 1848-72 (3) Hamidu 1872-90

(4) Zubayru 1890-1901 (5) Bobbo Ahmadu 1901-9

(6) Iya 1909-10 (7) Muhammadu Abba 1910-24

(8) Muhammad Bello 1924-8

(9) Mustafa 1928-46

(10) Ahmadu 1947

(11) Aliyu Mustafa 1953

‘ADAN (ADEN) (i) town, (ii) British crown colony, (iii) British protectorate in S.W. Arabia.

1. Town and support on the South coast of Arabia, in British possession since 1859, with a mixed population of ca. 35,000. ‘Adan (cf. akkad. edilmu “steppe”), more precisely ‘Adan Abyan (by way of distinction from ‘Adan Lā‘a, and al-‘Adan in a verse of Ufnun al-Taghlibi; cf. Yaqūt, iii, 622 f., Kay, 231, AM, ii, 17, 284), or Ḥaḍar ‘Adan from its being strongly fortified, is the Athone of Pliny, ‘Ὲθηνη of Philostorgius, 'Ευδασίμου Ἀραβία of the Periplus, ‘Αραβία ἐκπολείου of Ptolemy (cf. Pauly-Wissowa, Suppl., iii, 6), and most probably the ἐκδομ of Ez., xxvii, 23 (see recently v. Wissmann-Höfler, Beiträge 206 (88), where also the triple ἐκδομ of CIH 550, which may, however, be a fake, is quoted). For other names of the place see al-Makdisi, 30, 1M, 110 (= Löfgren, Arab. Texte, i, 29).

The peninsula of ‘Adan is an extinct volcano, nowadays called Shamshān (vulg. Shamshām), in earlier time al-‘Urr “the mountain” (Urr ‘Adan); it is 1775 feet (ca. 550 m.) high. On the east side is a gap in the range opposite to the island of Ṣərā: here is the main part of the town, and the habitations reach the sea. ‘Adan was once an island: the low and narrow isthmus is still nearly covered at high spring tide. This disadvantage was removed by means of a bridge, al-Makṣir, built by the Persians (cf. “Khor Makṣir” west of the isthmus). Beside the main volcano there are several minor heights, e.g. Djabal Ṣərā, Hukkāt, Marshak (with a large light-house) and Dī Ḥadid (west of the isthmus). The old harbour was on the east side, in connexion with the town; a mole (gašma) was constructed to protect it against the SE wind (asyyab). The excellent harbour to which ‘Adan now owes its importance is the large and well protected bay between the peninsula of ‘Adan and that of “Little Aden”, with the mountains Muzalkam ‘Sugarloaf Peak” and Dāsān “Ass’s Ears”. Bandar Tawayih (Tawwāl),
as the modern port is called, extends along the
NW shore (for details see Red Sea and Aden pilot
135). The habit of constructing dams and cisterns,
typical of old Sabean culture, has left traces in the
ʿAdan territory. There are remains of some fifty
reservoirs scattered over the peninsula. According
to IM they were built by Persians from Sirāf. They
are attested by Salt in 1809 and by Haines, the
future conqueror of ʿAden, in 1835, to be in a tolerable
state; but from 1839 on they were neglected, and
much of their stonework was carried away until
1856, when the restoration of those inside the
crater was begun. There are thirteen tanks holding
nearly two millions litres of water, but the scanty
and irregular rainfalls seldom fill them completely.
There are numerous wells within the crater and in
the west part of the peninsula (cf. IM, 131 ff.),
but they cannot supply the need of drinking water,
being for the most part brackish. In the Middle
Ages al-Ḥayq (= al-Ḥiswa of to-day?) was "the
watering-place (makhāl) of ʿAdan" (al-Ḥamdānī, 53).
In 1867 the British government got the permission
of the sultan of Labādī [q.v.] to build an aqueduct
from the village of Shaykh ʿUthmān. Later on
condensers were installed.

Legend usually ascribes the foundation of ʿAdan
to ʿAdaddī b. Sād [g.n.], who is said to have caused
the famous tunnel to be cut through the mountain
range and to have used the place as a prison. We
are told the same of the Tubbahs and the Pharaohs
of Egypt, whence the name al-Ḥabs or Habs Firʿawm.
According to old tradition (e.g. al-Ṭabarī, i, 144)
Kābīl, having killed his brother Hābīl [g.n.], fled
with his sister from India to ʿAdan, where he was
visited by Harīs on Djī Sīra and taught the use of
musical instruments. His grave is shown to-day
above the Main Pass gate. The "abandoned well"
(bīr muṣṭaṭṭalā, Kūr., xxiii, 44) and Iram Dhdt al-
ʿImād [q.v.] (Kūr., Lxxxix, 6) are located in or near
ʿAdan. The tradition of a fire coming from Yaman
or ʿAdan (Ṣirā) and portending the day of judgement,
ascribed in Ḥadīth to Muhammad, may be some
sort of reminiscence of volcanic activity. IM makes
Hanuman, the Indian ape-god who has a temple in
ʿAdan, fetch the wife of Rāmacandra along a subway
back to Uqūjīyān from Sīra, where she had been
brought by a demon (Rāvāna).

Population. According to al-Ḥamdānī (53, 124)
the Arabs of ʿAdan were divided into three factions:
Marāb, Ḥumāhīm (var. Ḥamāġīm, IM) and Mālāb
(cf. Yākūt, iii, 622; BQA, iii, 102, iv, 206). The great
number of Hindus and Somalis indicates a constant
immigration by sea. IM 117 ff., has details on early
migrations from Madagascar (Kumr) via Mogadishu
and Kīlwa, and of Persians from Sirāf and Kays
(Kish). Cf. Ferrand, Le Kʿoum-Loun etc. (JA, 1919);
Goitein, in BSOAS, 1954, 247 ff.; idem, in Speculum,
1954, 182 ff. A considerable number of the Jews of
ʿAdan after the Ziyādīds, were left in charge of the place until 1676/1673, when they
rebelled and were replaced by two brothers of the
Ḥamdānī family of al-Karam (Mukarram) b. Yām,
the founders of the Zurayyīd [q.v.] dynasty. ʿAbbās
took up his residence in the fort of Taʿkar, con-
trolling the isthmus gate, while Masʿūd held the
castle of Ḫadīrāt and superintended the sea trade.
Later on the town was united in the hands of Muḥ.
b. Sabaʿ (534-48/1139-53) and his son ʿImrān
(-560/1165). The ḥarādāt of ʿAdan by this time is
given as 100,000 dinārs a year. In 569/1173 Tūrān
Shāh, the brother of Saladin, conquered Yaman by
means of Turkish mercenaries (Qhuzz). The periods
of Ayyūbīd (-625/1228), Rasūlīd (-858/1454) and
Ṭahirīd (-923/1517) dominion were a golden time
for the trade of ʿAdan. A new tax, collected by
galleys (ṣaʿfiʿd), was introduced by the Ayūbīds.

The discovery of the sea-route to India and the
rise of the Ottoman power mark the beginning of
decline in the trade of ʿAdan. The Portuguese
admiral Albuquerque attacked the town on Easter
Eve 1513 with twenty ships, but did not succeed in
taking it. In 1538 a Turkish armada on its way to
India outwitted the defenders, and the Turks
dominated Yaman for nearly a hundred years. ʿAdan
was lost to the Zaydi imams of Ṣanāʿa in 1568 and
in 1630 the Turks left it finally. In 1735 ʿAdan
passed into the hands of the ʿAbdallī sultan of
Labādī, whose descendant Muḥsin was forced to
cede it to the English expedition under Captain
Haines, which had been sent to get an indemnity
for the plundering of a British ship. In view of the
sultan's treacherous attitude the place was taken
by storm on the 20th January 1839. Of the pros-
erous town visited by Marco Polo in 1276, with
80,000 inhabitants and 360 (!) mosques, there was
now left a miserable village of 600 persons living
in huts. Since then the development of ʿAdan has
progressed rapidly, especially after the opening of
the Suez canal in 1869, and this "Arabian Gibraltar"
is now a mercantile centre of great and increasing
importance.

Buildings. A wall was built by the Zurayyīds for
the protection of trade, and houses of stone increased
in number. After the departure of Tūrān Shāh his
vicecy in ʿAdan ʿUthmān al-Zandīlī (Zandīllī)
built a larger wall, with six gates, and a custom-
house. Other secular buildings of Tughekwīn, b. Ayyūb,
his son Ismāʿīl, the Rasūlīd ʿAll al-Mudjīhīd, and
the Tāhirīd ʿAbd al-Wahhāb are recorded. AM,
10 ff. Of the "handsome baths, lined with marble
and jasper, and covered with a dome", which were
seen in 1708 by de Merveille (Playfair, from La
Roque), nothing is left. Among the mosques of
ʿAdan the most celebrated is that of Abu Bakr al-
Aydarūs [q.v.], the patron of the town, whose
miḥrāb is held on 15 Rabīʿ II. Other masjīds are men-
tioned by Hunter (175 f.) and in AM.

Bibliography: F. M. Hunter, An account of
the British settlement of Aden, London 1877;
F. Apelt, Aden. Eine kolonialgeographische u.
kolonialpolitische Studie, Diss. Leipzig, 1929.
Adana was occupied by the Arabs in the middle of the 7th century, but frequently changed masters in their struggle with the Byzantines. Depopulated by the constant frontier wars, it was rebuilt by Hārūn al-Rashīd and his successors and became a bastion in the chain of fortresses of the "Syrian marches" (thughār al-Shām). In 875 it was temporarily taken by Basil I, and again in Byzantine possession in 944-6, but recaptured by the Arabs after a siege in 964. In 1025 Cilicia was again occupied by the Byzantines, who could however hold it permanently; nor apparently were the victorious Seldjuks (1071) able at first to establish themselves in the province (cf. J. Laurent, *Byzance et les Turcs ... jusqu’en 1081*, Paris 1913, 11). At any rate, in 1082 Adana again belonged to the Byzantines, but was taken by Sulaymān b. Kūlumādī in 1085 (J. B. Chabot, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien*, Paris 1905, 170). After its occupation by the Crusaders in 1097, it belonged at first to the principality of Antioch, but in 1104 was detached by Alexis I and came under Byzantine administration. In 1132 it belonged to Leo of Little Armenia, in 1137 became Byzantine, in 1138 was occupied by the Rūm Seldjūk Masmādī, in 1153 (at the latest) again Byzantine, in 1172-5 incorporated by the Rūm Seldjūk Mas'ud, in 1177-9 occupied by the Mamluks, and finally in 1238-9 by the Turco-Egyptian state, in which it remained for a long time, although exposed to repeated Muslim attacks. Baybars, after his victory at Antioch in 1166 appeared before Adana; the Mamluks also sacked the town in 1275 and 1304, and attacked it in 1355. It remained, however, in Armenian hands (except for 1347-4, when it fell by inheritance to Guy de Lustigan), until in 1359 it was occupied by the Rum Seldjūk Masmādī and Baybars. In 1378 the governor was the Turkmen Yüregir-oghlu Ramādān, who, acknowledging the suzerainty of the Mamluks, extended his dominions and founded the buffer-state of the Ramādān-oghlu (q.v.). He and his successors followed sometimes a pro- and sometimes an anti-Mamluk policy, securing for Adana a relatively quiet time.

The inner conflicts and the invasion of the Dhu 'l-Qarnayn state, in which it remained for a long time, although exposed to repeated Muslim attacks. Baybars, after his victory at Antioch in 1166 appeared before Adana; the Mamluks also sacked the town in 1275 and 1304, and attacked it in 1355. It remained, however, in Armenian hands (except for 1347-4, when it fell by inheritance to Guy de Lustigan), until in 1359 it was occupied by the Rum Seldjūk Masmādī and Baybars. In 1378 the governor was the Turkmen Yüregir-oghlu Ramādān, who, acknowledging the suzerainty of the Mamluks, extended his dominions and founded the buffer-state of the Ramādān-oghlu (q.v.). He and his successors followed sometimes a pro- and sometimes an anti-Mamluk policy, securing for Adana a relatively quiet time. The inner conflicts and the invasion of the Dhu 'l-Qarnayn state, in which it remained for a long time, although exposed to repeated Muslim attacks. Baybars, after his victory at Antioch in 1166 appeared before Adana; the Mamluks also sacked the town in 1275 and 1304, and attacked it in 1355. It remained, however, in Armenian hands (except for 1347-4, when it fell by inheritance to Guy de Lustigan), until in 1359 it was occupied by the Rum Seldjūk Masmādī and Baybars. In 1378 the governor was the Turkmen Yüregir-oghlu Ramādān, who, acknowledging the suzerainty of the Mamluks, extended his dominions and founded the buffer-state of the Ramādān-oghlu (q.v.). He and his successors followed sometimes a pro- and sometimes an anti-Mamluk policy, securing for Adana a relatively quiet time. The inner conflicts and the invasion of the Dhu 'l-Qarnayn state, in which it remained for a long time, although exposed to repeated Muslim attacks. Baybars, after his victory at Antioch in 1166 appeared before Adana; the Mamluks also sacked the town in 1275 and 1304, and attacked it in 1355. It remained, however, in Armenian hands (except for 1347-4, when it fell by inheritance to Guy de Lustigan), until in 1359 it was occupied by the Rum Seldjūk Masmādī and Baybars. In 1378 the governor was the Turkmen Yüregir-oghlu Ramādān, who, acknowledging the suzerainty of the Mamluks, extended his dominions and founded the buffer-state of the Ramādān-oghlu (q.v.). He and his successors followed sometimes a pro- and sometimes an anti-Mamluk policy, securing for Adana a relatively quiet time.

The inner conflicts and the invasion of the Dhu 'l-Qarnayn state, in which it remained for a long time, although exposed to repeated Muslim attacks. Baybars, after his victory at Antioch in 1166 appeared before Adana; the Mamluks also sacked the town in 1275 and 1304, and attacked it in 1355. It remained, however, in Armenian hands (except for 1347-4, when it fell by inheritance to Guy de Lustigan), until in 1359 it was occupied by the Rum Seldjūk Masmādī and Baybars. In 1378 the governor was the Turkmen Yüregir-oghlu Ramādān, who, acknowledging the suzerainty of the Mamluks, extended his dominions and founded the buffer-state of the Ramādān-oghlu (q.v.). He and his successors followed sometimes a pro- and sometimes an anti-Mamluk policy, securing for Adana a relatively quiet time.
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there set in a period of rapid progress (72,577
Adana has been the capital of the province of Seyhan.

Population. Christianity was established in
Adana from an early date, and it was an
episcopal see. Since the government of the
Armenian Rubenids

the Armenians had greatly outnumbered the Greeks
and the Armenian church acquired a preponderant
position. Its Christian population, already
affected by the constant Muslim attacks, steadily decreased
after the Mamluk conquest and under the Ottomans
(see the reports of travellers, and data in Ritter and
Alishan). During the 19th century the Christian
population increased, but the victory of the Turks
in 1923 brought about their total expulsion. Little
is known of the Jews of Adana (cf. A. Galante,

Arab elements penetrated into Cilicia with the armies
from the 8th century, but could scarcely maintain
themselves in Adana itself when Turkish nomads
had already gained a firm foothold in the
neighbourhood. Adana is described by P. Belon
(1548) as

lying on the linguistic frontier between Arabic and
Turkish. Thereafter the Arab elements in the
population were almost wholly displaced, and this
situation could not be changed by the brief Egyptian
occupation in the 19th century.

Culture. Adana has not played in the past, nor
does it play at present, an important cultural role.
It has an interesting museum, founded in 1924 in
the madrasa of Dja’far Pasha. The main monuments
are due to the Ramađân-oghlu: Eski or Yagğ Djamîî,
with a monumental gateway (inscription from 1553)
and madrasa in the E. and S. sides of the court,
domed iwâdâ with finely sculptured ornaments.
The mosque itself is of uncertain date (before 1500).

Ulû Djamîî, built by Ramađân-oghlu Khalîl, 1507-11,
and enlarged by his grandson Mustafa, 948/1541
(for a legend relating to its construction, cf. Baki
T. Arik, Adana Fethinin destanî, Istanbul 1943,
47 ff.), mosque, madrasa, ürûb and ders-khâne,
enclosed by high wall; emphasis on eastern facade
with main entrance. The groundplan, various
details, coloured ornamentation and minaret indicate
the influence of Syrian models; Seljûk tradition
is particularly apparent in the dragons at the base
of the dome; richly elaborated mîkrâb; Ottoman
tiles of the finest quality; these various stiliic
elements are united into a convincing whole. Turos
with graves decorated with tiles of the Ramađân-
oghlu Khalîl, Pîrî and Mustafa. Of the many
foundations of the dynasty the following are wholly
or partly preserved: the so-called Wakîl Serâyîl
residence of the dynasty since 1495; Selâmlık Dayresi,
today Tuz-khanî. Also noteworthy are the Carshî
Hammâmî, the bedestân (frequently mentioned by
travellers, but rebuilt in the middle of the 19th
century, and Aşhulî Memâlîk, of 1409-10, the oldest
mosque in the town, with carved door.

Bibliography: No special monograph exists.

Scattered references, in addition to works cited in
the article, in the following: IA and Türk (formerly
Inönü) Anisiklopedisi, s.v.; R. A. Chesney, The
Expedition for the Survey etc., i, London 1850;
Ebü Bekir Fehâni, Khulûsa-yi Aşhulî al-Buldân fi
Memâlîk-i Doulât-i Âlî-âl-Îmân, (1st. Univ. Kütûb-
hanesi, Fotokopîler no. 26, p. 90); V. Quinet,
La Turquie d’Asie, ii, 3-40; Ch. Tastier, Asie Mineure,
731; E. Reclus, Nouv. géogr. univ., i, 656; Sâmi
Bay Frasâhi, Kâmûs al-Aşdâm, i, 290 f.; W. M.
Ramsay, The Historical Geography of Asia Minor,
iv, London 1890; Le Strange, 131; E. Reitmeyer,
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(R. Ahnegg)

(ii) The old name of the wildyê embracing in general the Cilician plain (Çukurova)—now called Seyhan—with the capital of the same name. The old Ottoman eyâlet of Adana (see Hâddi id-î Kilâfl, Dihân-nûmû, 601) comprised in addition to Adana only the sandjâks of Sis and Tarsus; the later eyâlet of Adana (since 1867) the sandjâk of Seyhan—with the capital of the same name. The general the Cilician plain (Çukurowa)—now called the Tuz-Khurmatli into the river of Ta'uk. From this junction onwards the river is called al-Tâbîn, or A(jaym (ca. 1340). For the identification of the A(jaym with the Turnat of the cuneiform inscriptions and the Tornadotus (Tornas) of the classical writers, see F. Hommel, Grundriss der Geogr. und Gesch. des älen Orients, Munich 1904, 5, 293 ff.; Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. Tornadotus; for Radânû (= Nahr Râdhân) in the cuneiform inscriptions, which may have at one time denoted also the lower A(jaym, see Streek, in ZA, 1900, 275 and Hommel, 293 ff. It is questionable wheter we may also identify the Gyndes of Herodotus with the A(jaym; cf. Billerbeck, 72 ff.; Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. Gyndes.


(M. Streck*)

ADDAD (pl. of didd = "a word that has two contrary meanings"), words which, according to the definition of Arab philologists, have two meanings that are opposite to each other, e.g. the verb bâl which may mean "to sell" and also "to buy" (= fâlîd); even the word didd itself belongs to the same category of words, for in such an expression as là diddî bahî it has not the meaning of "opposite", but that of "equal". The addâd, from their point of view, belong as a particular class to the homonyms (al-muqallad (q.v.)), except that the latter class comprises two words that have the same sound but two different meanings (mu,kallad (muqallad)), while in the addâd the two meanings are directly opposite to each other. The Arabs treated of this lexical question with the passion and accuracy which they applied to all the other domains of their language, and they devoted to it either special chapters of general works (e.g. al-Suyûtî, al-Muqaddam, Bûlûk, i, 186-93; Ibn Sîdî, al-Muqaddam, iii, 258-66), or separate monographs. The latter were enumerated for the first time by M. Th. Redslob, Die arabischen Wörter mit entgegengesetzter Bedeutung, Göttingen 1873, 7-9 (the name of al-Dilîbî, however, is to be cancelled). While some of these works are known from citations, books called Kîthâ al-Addâd by the following authors are preserved, and in part published: 1) Kutrub (d. 206/821), ed. H. Kofler, Islamica, 1912; 2) al-Amiri (d. 210/823), ed. A. Haffner, Drei arabischen Quellenwerke über die Addâd, Beirut 1913, 45-61; 3) Abû Ûbayd (d. 223/836), see Brockelmann, S I, 167; 4) Abû Hâmîd al-Sîdîjânî (d. ca. 250/864), ed. Haffner, ibid., 71-157; 5) Ibn al-Sîkitî (d. 243/857), ed. Haffner, ibid., 163-209; 6) Abû Bakr b. al-Anbâî (d. 257/939), ed. M. Th. Houtsma, Leiden 1881; also Cairo 1355; 7) Abû ‘l-Tâyîbî al-Halâbî (d. ca. 791), see Brockelmann, S I, 190; 8) al-Saadîânî (d. 650/1252), ed. Haffner, ibid., 221-48.

The opinion which has long been maintained that Arabic, contrary to all the other Semitic languages, contains a very large number of such addâd is no
longer tenable. If all that is false and all that does not belong there are cut out of the list, there remains also in Arabic only a small residue. Hence al-Mubarrad (MS Leiden 437, p. 180) and Ibn Durustawawiy (quoted by al-Suyuti, al-Mukhtar, i, 197) went so far as to deny entirely the existence of the addād in Arabic. Ibn al-Anbārī enumerates in his book more than 400 such addād; but in spite of the fullness of the work such words as ankara, wald, etc. are missing. Redelb already pointed out that a considerable part of this must be eliminated, as the authors either extend too far the concept of the addād, or artificially accumulate as much matter as possible:

1. First of all it must be noted that most of the words quoted were known to or currently used by the Arabs only in one meaning, and the contrary meaning can be evidenced only by scanty and sometimes even contested citations. If it were not so, many misunderstandings would arise in everyday life, while Ibn al-Anbārī in his introduction (p. r) denies any ambiguity. 2. It is absolutely false to consider the words not only in themselves, but also in their syntactical construction in the sentence, and to establish a didd when, through various constructions or interpretations of the sentence, two contrary meanings are possible (Ibn al-Anbārī, loc. cit., 167-8). 3. Particles like in, min, an, au, mà, hai, must be struck out from the list of addād. Such arguments as that in means “if” and “not”, that is to say, can both indicate the possibility of a thing and negate it, are feeble. Equally trivial are the considerations that verbal forms (hāna or yahāna) indicate different tenses, or that proper names (Ishāh, Ayyāh, Yaḥāb) may also have secondary meanings. 4. Forms which only in certain circumstances may have a meaning contrary to their usual one could be enumerated in large numbers. Here belong words such as haś, goblét, and also its contents, naḥnu, we, i; further all the fāʿil forms which are also passive (e.g. wāmīka, bāhṭī) and the jāʿil forms that are also active (e.g. amin); the relatives which may be formed from participles of the first and augmented roots; the verbs that sometimes also in the first form have a causative meaning (e.g. salla) etc.; but none of these cases represent any real addād. 5. Equally to be excluded are words which in certain cases are used ironically (ḥukma mawt or tahakkum mawt) e.g. yā ḍiḥi (“intelligent one”) for a fool, or euphemistically (laḍḍul), as yā ṣālim (“healthy one”) for a sick person. The use of both tropes is at the will of the speaker. 6. The highest degree of arbitrariness and artifice was finally attained by the grammarians who count among the addād words like talʿa (in the meaning of “waterpipe” and “hill”), on the grounds that water flows downwards and the hill rises upwards.

Most of the meanings fall under one or other of the points just quoted and therefore ought not to be considered as addād; only a small residue remains.

The Arabs themselves already sought for explanations for these phenomena, but only one desire consideration in so far at least as in the interpretation it leads back to the root, whence both meanings have branched out (Ibn al-Anbārī, loc. cit., 5; al-Mukhtar, i, 193 ff.). The other explanations account only for the actually occurring meanings, and either regard all the addād as meanings borrowed by the roots from one another (Ibn al-Anbārī, loc. cit., 7; al-Mukhtar, i, 194), or attempt, often clumsily, to harmonize the meanings; for instance, the Arabs explain ṣāḥi in its meaning “whole” by arguing that the whole thing is only a part of something else (Ibn al-Anbārī, 6).

C. Abel, Über den Gegensinn der Urworte, Leipzig 1884 (reprinted in his Sprachwissenschaftlichen Abhandlungen, Leipzig 1885) made an attempt to find a general explanation, starting from a single point of view, for the linguistic phenomenon of the “enantiosemia” as a whole. According to him the words used by primitive men were not expressions for certain unambiguous concepts, but described rather the mutual relation between two opposites; e.g. the concept of “strong” could only be understood by a comparison with “weak”, and the two sides of the opposition was only gradually distinguished by phonetic changes. The theory of Abel was not accepted by linguists, but found recognition among the psychoanalysts.

R. Gords, Words of mutually opposed meaning, Am. J. Semit. Lang., 1938, 270-80, also endeavours to find an explanation that should be valid for all addād. Starting from modern anthropological theories, he connects the addād with taboo and mana and concludes that “by and large, words of contradictory meaning endure in the speech of mankind only as survivals from primitive ways of thought.”

Against such theories, the prevailing opinion in general linguistics is that the entantiosemia cannot be explained from a unique principle. Words have from their origin a fixed meaning; in the case of each didd, therefore, one of the meanings must be considered as original, the other as secondary. The task of linguistics is to trace out in each case the gradual change of meaning, although it is immediately evident that the facts cannot be established for each didd. As a matter of fact, the Arab philologists already admitted in principle this doctrine: al-asl li-maʿna waḥidūn. That their works, in spite of the richness of their materials, make so slight a contribution to the solution of the problem is due, among other reasons, to the fact that for them the explanation of the addād was not so much a scientific task as a purely practical one. To the Arabs it was of prime importance to give as complete an index as possible of all the words destined for daily and literary use, which have contrary meanings; they are therefore often guided simply by exterior consonance; thus for instance they put among the addād the word mūdī, i. “perishing” root udy, 2. “vigorous”, “strong”, root nāʾ. F. Giese, in Untersuchungen über die Addād auf Grund von Stellen aus altarabischen Dichtern, Berlin 1894, explained, for most of the addād which he found in old poetry, how they passed to the opposite meaning, by arranging them under various semasiological categories: 1. Metonymy, when one meaning of the word is to be explained as being a causal or temporal consequence of another meaning: e.g. naʿa, to lift a burden with difficulty, to carry it away; nāḥil, he who goes to the water, the thirsty one; he who returns from the water, having his thirst quenched. 2. Concatenation of concepts of various kinds; for instance bayn, separation and union (according to whether one is separated alone from a group or in union with another), or dāʿal “to be rolled”, hence “heavy”, but also “to be rolled and whirled up”, hence “insignificant”, “light”. 3. Contraction of concept, either by refining or coarsening it, as for instance rammā “to be marrow-like, strong”, and “to be marrowless, feeble”. 4. For the words of emotion and odour the neutral original meaning “to be excited” is to
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be supposed, no matter whether it is applied in a good or bad sense; thus for instance ra'a “to be afraid” and “to be pleased”; faraba “to be sad” and “to be joyful”; radja, ḫibā, “to hope” and “to fear”; ḥafar, banna, a “good smell” and a “bad smell”. To this class belong also the verbs of conjecture in their double meaning of “to know” and “not to know”, e.g. sanna, basiba, ḫibla. 5. Cultural influence has often caused the later differentiation of words originally meaning the same thing in ba', ḥarā, “to sell” and “to buy”, originally “to exchange”. 6. Denominatives, especially in the 2nd and 4th forms, originally meant: “to undertake an action with the object in question”, and therefore may be applied both positively and negatively; e.g. jararaja, “to rise”, “to sink” (cf. Hebrew ḥabar, ḥabir, dhafar, banna, jariba “to be afraid” and “to be pleased”; ḥālib, “to be joyful” and “to hope” and “to fear”).

Jariba “to be joyful” and “to hope” and “to fear” and “to be pleased”; ḥālib, “to be joyful” and “to hope” and “to fear” and “to be pleased”.

The divine judgments, which are also love of justice, also “punishment, chastisement (ʾuḥāb)”.

The idea is based on the conception that the dead have a continued and conscious existence of a kind between death and resurrection. At the beginning of the Muslim administration the town was incorporated in the hāra of Aswān. It was on the caravan route from Cairo to the south, but Ibn Battuta is the only medieval traveller who refers to it, as being a day and a night’s journey south of Armant. The temple of Adfū is merely mentioned by al-Dimashqī, but without any description, for it must have been buried in sand. Indeed, Granger’s reference to it, in 1730, is the first allusion to it by a European: he saw there “the remains of a temple which one could not enter, and it was full of earth and rubbish”. We must wait for Vivant Denon to obtain a less rudimentary account; on him the temple made a tremendous impression. In the year 700/1300 some brickworkers brought to light the statue of a woman seated on a throne, on which were hieroglyphic inscriptions.

The district of Adfū seems to have been very fertile, and particularly rich in palm-trees. Its dates were made into cakes, after first being pounded.

In the Mamlūk period its annual revenue was 17,000 dinārs from an area of 24,762 faddāns.

Adfūwī is full of praise for the good qualities of the people of Adfū, whom he describes as generous, discreet, sincere, welcoming to strangers, and charitable.

No events memorable in history seem to have taken place in the town.

**Bibliography:** Makrī, Ḵbih, MIFAO, xliii, 125 (with bibliog.); Yākūt, i, 168-9; Ibn Ducampo, v, 29; Égypte de Murtagi, ed.-wet. introd., 113-4; Carré, Voyageurs français en Égypte, i, 65, 89, 134. (G. Wiet)

'ADHĀB [see 'Ad al-adhāb].

'ADHĀB (a), “torment, suffering, affliction”, inflicted by God or a human ruler, and in so far as it expresses not only absolute power but also love of justice, also “punishment, chastisement (ʾuḥāb)”.

The divine judgments, which are often mentioned in the Kūrān, strike the individual as well as whole nations in the life of this world as well as in the life to come. It is mainly unbelief, doubt of the divine mission of the prophets and apostles, rebellion against God, that are punished in this manner [see ʾAD, FĪRĀWN, LŪT, NŪH, THAMŪD, and others]. With regard to the punishments in the life to come, which begin already in the grave, see 'ADHĀB AL-KĀBR, DISSHAN-NAM.

For legal punishments, see ṬIRĪBAH.

'TH. W. JUYNBOLL

'ADHĀB AL-KĀBR, the punishment in the tomb, also called punishment in barsakh [q.e.]. The idea is based on the conception that the dead had a continued and conscious existence of a kind in their grave. So arose the doctrine of the two judgements, one which involves punishment or bliss in the grave and a subsequent judgement on the Day of Resurrection [for which see AL-KIYAMAH]. There are various ideas of what happens between death and resurrection.

1. The grave is a garden of paradise or a pit of hell; angels of mercy come for the souls of believers and angels of punishment for the infidels. The souls of believers are birds in the trees of paradise and will be united with their bodies at the resurrection; martyrs are already in paradise.

2. The dead are tortured by the weeping of the mourners, especially the wicked, hearing the steps of the mourners as they leave; the believer finds his grave spacious, 70 cubits by 70, while the unbeliever is crushed by his grave till his ribs inter...
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lock. The grave asks the dead man about his religion and the believer’s good works answer for him. A sinner may be tormented by a snake of fire which bites him till the day of judgement.

3. Two angels, Munkar and Nakr, black with blue eyes, make the dead man sit up and ask him about his religion. The believer answers with the “steadfast word” (Kūr’ān, xiv, 26) and is shown the place in hell from which he is delivered and the place reserved for him in paradise; there upon he is left alone till the Day of Resurrection. The unbeliever cannot answer, so the angels beat him with iron whips which cause flames, and the blows are heard by all creation except men and djinn. It is a less reliable doctrine that punishment is of the spirit only. There are elaborate arguments to prove that those whose bodies are left impaled and those who were eaten by wild beasts suffer from it. The punishment lasts as long as it will please Allah, according to some authorities till the Day of Resurrection, except on Fridays. It may be eased as long as a branch planted on the grave is green. The angels draw the souls out of the bodies; those of unbelievers come out easily while those of unbelievers have to be dragged out causing severe pain. Variations in detail are many. The questioning of believers lasts seven days, that of unbelievers forty; or unbelievers are not questioned and the angels proceed at once to punishment: martyrs, infants, and those who have performed certain acts of supererogation are not questioned.

In some sources a distinction is made between the punishment and the pressure (dāghia) in the tomb, the righteous being exempt from the former, but not from the latter, whereas the infidels and the sinners suffer punishment as well as pressure. The prophet’s daughter, Fāṭima, and some others escape being crushed.

The punishment in the tomb is not plainly mentioned in the Kur’ān. Allusions to the idea may be found in several passages, e.g. Kur’ān, xlvii, 26: “But when the angels, causing them to die, shall make them smell on their faces and backs!”, vi, 92: “But couldst thou see, when the ungodly are in the floods of death, and angels reach forth their hands, promising him bliss or misery. The idea of the examination and the punishment in the grave is green. The angels draw the souls out of the bodies; those of believers come out easily while those of unbelievers have to be dragged out causing severe pain. Variations in detail are many. The questioning of believers lasts seven days, that of unbelievers forty; or unbelievers are not questioned and the angels proceed at once to punishment: martyrs, infants, and those who have performed certain acts of supererogation are not questioned.

In some sources a distinction is made between the punishment and the pressure (dāghia) in the tomb, the righteous being exempt from the former, but not from the latter, whereas the infidels and the sinners suffer punishment as well as pressure. The prophet’s daughter, Fāṭima, and some others escape being crushed.

The punishment of the tomb is very frequently mentioned in Tradition (see Bibliography), often, however, without the mention of angels. In the latter group of traditions it is simply said that the dead are punished in their tombs, or why, e.g. on account of special sins they have committed.

The names of Munkar and Nakr do not appear in the Kur’ān, and once only in canonical Tradition (al-Tirmidhi, Diwan’s, báb 70). Apparently these names do not belong to the old stock of traditions. Moreover, in some traditions one anonymous angel only is mentioned as the angel who interrogates and punishes the dead (Muslim, Ḥadīth, trad. 165; Abû Dīrād, Sumā‘, báb 358; Ash-Sunna b. Hanbal, ii, 333, 346; ii, 150; al-Tayyibī, no. 753). So there seem to be four stages in the traditions regarding this subject: the first without any angel being mentioned, the second mentioning “the” angel, the third two angels, the fourth being acquainted with the names Munkar and Nakr.

This state of things is reflected in the development of the creed. The Fiḥk Akbar I, which may date from the middle of the 2nd/8th century, gives only a short reference to the punishment of the tomb (art. 10). The Wasiyyat Abī Ḥanīfa, which may represent the orthodox views of the middle of the 3rd/9th century, mentions both the punishment and the interrogation by Munkar and Nakr. The Fiḥk Akbar II, which may represent the new orthodoxy of the middle of the 4th/10th century A.D., is still more elaborate (art. 23): “The interrogation of the dead in the tomb by Munkar and Nakr is a reality, and the reunion of the body with the spirit in the tomb is a reality. The pressure and the punishment in the tomb are a reality that will take place in the case of all the infidels, and a reality that may take place in the case of some sinners belonging to the faithful”.

In the later creeds and works on dogmatics the punishment and the interrogation in the tomb by Munkar and Nakr are treated in a similar way.

The Khawāridjī, some Mu’tazilīs and some of the extreme Shī‘a do not believe in punishment in the grave. Some Mu’tazilīs explained Munkar as the puttering of the unbeliever as he stumbles in his reply and Nakr as the violence done to him. Others said that Munkar and Nakr were not individuals but two classes of angels because men were dying every minute in all parts of the world and individuals could not be everywhere at once. Another rationalisation was that the two were personifications of a man’s good and evil deeds, promising him bliss or misery.

The Karrāmiyya [q.v.] taught the identity of Munkar and Nakr with the two guardian angels who accompany man (‘Abd al-Kāhir al-Baghdādī, Usul al-Dīn, Istanbul 1928, p. 160). Al-Ghazzālī holds that all eschatological ideas are a reality that takes place in the malakūt.

The origin of the names Munkar and Nakr is uncertain; the meaning “disliked” seems doubtful. The idea of the examination and the punishment of the dead in their tombs is found among other peoples also. The details to be found in Jewish sources (ḥabbūt hak-keber) are strikingly parallel to the Muslim ones; the idea is, however, rather late among the Jews and apparently belongs to the post-Islamic period. (See J. C. G. Bodenschatz, Kirchliche Verfassung der heutigen Juden, Erlangen 1748, ii, 95 f.; Jewish Enc., s.v. Ḥabbūt ha-Keber.)


( A. J. WENSINCK—A. S. TROTTON)

ADHĀN, “announcement”, a technical term for the call to the divine service of Friday and the five daily salāds (see Sāʾlāt).

According to Muslim tradition, the Prophet, soon after his arrival at Madīna (1 or 2 years after the
Hidjra), deliberated with his companions on the best manner of announcing to the faithful the hour of prayer. Some proposed that every time a fire should be kindled, a horn should be blown or a nãbãs (i.e. a long piece of wood clapped with another piece of wood; with such a nãbãs the Christians in the East used at that time to announce the hour of prayer) should be used. But one Muslim, ‘Abd Allah b. Zayd, related that he saw in a dream somebody who from the roof of the mosque called the Muslims to prayer. ‘Umar recommended that manner of announcing the salát, and as all agreed to it, this adhán was introduced by order of the Prophet. From that time the believers were convoked by Bâlî and, up to our days the adhán is called out at the time of the salát.


The adhán of the orthodox Muslim consists of seven formulas, of which the sixth is a repetition of the first:

1. Allâh akbar: "Allâh is most great".
2. Aghhadu an la ðâkh illa ðâkh: "I testify that there is no god besides Allâh".
3. Aghhadu anna Muhammadu rasûl Allâh: "I testify that Mohammad is the apostle of Allâh".
4. Hâyya ‘ala l-salát: "Come to prayer!"
5. Hâyya ‘ala l-salát: "Come to salvation!"
6. Allâh akbar: "Allâh is most great".
7. Lâ ðâkh illa ðâkh: "The is no god besides Allâh".

The first formula is repeated four (by the Mâlikîtes two) times one after the other, the other formulas are repeated twice each, except the last words: lâ ðâkh illa ðâkh, which are pronounced only once. The 2nd and 3rd formulas after being pronounced twice are repeated a third time in a louder voice. This repetition (lardîf) is generally considered as recommended by the law, only the Hâfîzîtes forbid it. At the morning prayer (salât al-suhb) the words al-salât kâhry min al-nasîm ("prayer is better than sleep") are added in the adhán. This formula, also pronounced twice times and called tâthwîb (repetition), is inserted between the 5th and 6th formulas, but the Hâfîzîtes pronounce it at the end.

The adhán of the Shi’ites differs from that of the Sunnites in that the former has an eighth formula (inserted between the fifth and the sixth): Hâyya ‘ala Allâh kâhry al-amal, "Come to the best work!" These words have at all times been the shibboleth of the Shi’îtes; when called from the minarets in an orthodox country, the inhabitants knew that the government had become Shi’îte (cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, i, 63; S. de Sacy, Chrestomathie arabe i, text, p. 60; transl., p. 160). The Shi’îtes pronounce also the final formula two times.

The Muslims who hear the adhán must repeat its formulas, but instead of the fourth and fifth, they recite: lâ ðâkh illa ðâkh huwwam illa bi-llâh, "there is no strength nor power but in Allâh", and instead of the tâthwîb formula in the morning adhán, they say: sa’dhata wa-bararta, "thou hast spoken truthfully and rightly".

The adhán is followed by formulas of glorification which are recommended and precisely determined by the law. They are omitted only after the call to the maghrib salât, because that time, in which this prayer must be said, is very short. There is no fixed melody for the adhán. Every adhán may be modulated at will with any known tune, provided that the right pronunciation of the words is not impaired by it. Cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, ii, 87: "In Mecca one hears different airs at the same time. Like the recitation of the Kur’ân, the singing of the adhán is in Mekka a highly developed art". Only among the Hanbalîtes there are doctors who do not allow any melody for the adhán, and the Wahhâbîs follow this doctrine. The Ibâdis, too, do not sing the adhán. [For the melody of the adhán see also Ghina.]

Every Muslim who, alone or with others, recites the above-mentioned salât at home or in the field should pronounce the adhán in a loud voice as is recommended by the law (cf. Snouck Hurgronje, Mehmânische Sprichwörter und Redensarten, 87 = Verspr. Geschr. v, 83). At mosques, a mu’adhîhin (q.v.) is often appointed to perform the adhán.

The call to the other public salât, e.g. those of the two feasts, those at sun and moon eclipses, etc., has only one formula: al-salât diîmânîm, "come to the public prayer"! This formula is said to have been current already in the time of the Prophet. Cf. I. Goldziher, in ZDMG, 1895, 325.

Important information on the modifications of the adhán formulas introduced at various times and in various places from the beginning of Islam is to be found in Makrizî, Khâlî, ii, 269 f.

Owing to the profession of faith frequently occurring in the adhán, the Muslims pronounce it in the right ear of a child shortly after its birth (cf. Lane, Arab. Society in the Middle Ages, 186; Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, ii, 138) as well as in the ear of people supposed to be possessed of djîmîn (evil spirits).

The salât in the mosque is immediately preceded by a second call, the i’àsha (q.v.), which contains the same formulas as the adhán.


ADHâR (see tâhîn). ADHARBAYJDÂN (AZARBAYJDÂN) (i) province of Persia; (ii) Soviet Socialist Republic.

(i) The great province of Persia, called in Middle Persian Atrapatskân, older new-Persian Adharbâyjan, Adharbâyyan, at present Azarbaydzjan, Greek 'Atropatêon, Byzantine Greek 'Athrapêtôn, Armenian Atrapatan, Syriac Adhâbâyîn. The province was called after the general Atropates ("protected by fire"), who at the time of Alexander’s invasion proclaimed his independence (328 B.C.) and thus preserved his kingdom (Media Minor, Strabo, xi, 13, 3) in the north-western corner of later Persia (cf. Ibn al-Mu’taﬁfîn, in Yâkût, i, 172, and al-Mâqdisî, 375: Adharbâyân b. Bîwarsîf). The dynasty of Atropates flourished under the Arsakids and married into the royal house. The last scion of the house, Gaius Julius Artawâzdr, died in Rome in A.D. 38, when the kingdom was already incorporated by the Arsakids. (For the ancient history cf. Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. Atropatene.) Under the Sassanians Adharbâyjân was a big province and towards the end of the period belonged to the family of Farrakh-Hormizd, (see Marquart, Erasm. 108-14). The capital of Adharbâyjân was at Shîls (or Ganzak), which corresponds to the ruins
of Laylān (south-east of Lake Urmia). It possessed a famous firetemple which the Sasanian kings visited on their accession. Later the fire was removed to the less accessible Arshakid castle of Badżarān, ΘΒάζαραν (now Takht-i Sulaymān).

The Arab conquest of Adharbaydjan is variously recorded under the years 18-22/639-43. In the days of 'Umar, Ḥudhayfa b. al-Yāmān is said to have conquered Adharbaydjan coming from Nihāwān; other expeditions came from Shahrazur. Ḥudhayfa made a treaty with the mawāḏān whose capital was in Ardabil. He agreed to pay 300,000 dirhams and the Arabs promised not to enslave anyone, to respect the fire-temples and the ceremonies held in them, and to protect the population against the Kurds (nomads) of Bālāsagnān, Sābālān and Shāh-i Rūdān.

The population of Adharbaydjan (of Iranian origin) spoke a multitude of dialects (al-Makdisi, 375: 70 languages near Ardabil). Arab chiefs settled in various districts: Rawwād al-Azdī in the region of Tabriz; Bašīr al-Rabī‘a in Marand; Mūr b. ‘Alī al-Rudaynī south of Lake Urmīya, etc. They were gradually absorbed by the native population and towards the middle of the 4th/10th century the Rawwādīs were considered as Kurds. (See in detail Sāyyīd A. Ḵasrawī, ʿPāṭdāḵān-i gumnān, ii 263-8, Teheran 1928-9.)

After the revolt of Bābāk [q.v.], the grip of the caliphate on Adharbaydjan weakened. The last energetic governors of the province (276-317/889-929) were the Šaḏiqīs [q.v.] who themselves ended in revolt. After their fall native dynasties sprang up in Adharbaydjan. After the Khārīqīs Daysam (half Arab and half Kurd), Adharbaydjan was occupied by the Daylamite Marzubān b. Muḥammad, of the būḏīce creed (see MUSAFIRIDS). The Daylamites were succeeded by the Kurdish Rawwādīs [q.v.] (373-643/983-1070).

In the beginning of the 5th/11th century the Ghuzz hordes, first in smaller parties, and then in considerable numbers, under the Seljūq leaders occupied Adharbaydjan. In consequence, the Iranian population of Adharbaydjan and the adjacent parts of Transcaucasia became Turkophone. In 531/1136 Adharbaydjan fell to the lot of the āḏāb-e ʿIldīgīz [q.v.] (better ʿEldīgīz) whose descendants ruled, in competition with the ʿĀbdālūs [q.v.], till the short-lived invasion of the Khārīḏīs-gūrān ʿJālāl al-Dīn (622-8/1225-31) at whose heels came the Mongols. With the arrival of the Ilḵān Ḥūṣūl (654/1256) Adharbaydjan became the centre of a great empire extending from the Oxus to Syria. The residence of the Mongols was first in Marāqā [q.v.] and then in Tabriz [q.v.] which became a great centre of trade and cultural life. After the Mongols and their successors the ʿAjāʾib [q.v.], Adharbaydjan was occupied by the Turkmens returning from the west (the ʿḴᵛār ʿḴoyūn [q.v.] and ʿḴᵛār ʿḴoyūn [q.v.]) whose capital was in Tabriz (780-908/1378-1502).

After 907/1502 Adharbaydjan became the chief bulwark and rallying ground of the Safawids, themselves natives of Ardabil and originally speaking the local Iranian dialect. In the meantime, between 1514 and 1603, the Ottomans frequently occupied Tabriz and other parts of the province. The Persian control was restored by Shāh Ḫosrāv but during the Afghan invasion (1355-42/1722-9) the Ottomans recaptured Adharbaydjan and other western provinces of Persia, until Nādir Shāh expelled them.

In the beginning of the reign of Karīm Khan Ṭabāgha the Afghān ᴾâḏ Khan revolted in Adharydjan and later the Dumbuli Kurds of Khoy and other tribal chiefs lorded it over various parts of Adharbaydjan. With the advent of the Kāḏārs Adharbaydjan became the traditional residence of the heirs-apparent. In the north the final frontier with Russia (along the Araxes) was established in 1828 (treaty of Turkmān-čay). The western frontier with Turkey was delimited only in 1914, and under Rīdā Shāh Persia ceded to Turkey a small area north of the Ararat. After 1905 the representatives of Adharbaydjan took a lively part in the Persian revolution. On 3 April 1908 Russian troops arrived in Adharbaydjan, by agreement with Great Britain, to protect the foreign colonies in Tabriz, but then prolonged their stay under various pretexts, and in 1914-7 warned with the Turks with varying fortune. They evacuated Adharbaydjan after the Russian revolution (1917), and on 8 June the Turks arrived and installed in Tabriz a Turco-Persian government. About this time there appeared the first traces of Adharbaydjan self-consciousness. The Persian control was restored by the future Rīdā Shāh on 5 September 1921. After the events of 1947 (see Iran) the Soviet forces occupied the northern provinces, including Adharbaydjan. Under cover of the occupation, there developed a movement for the autonomy of Adharbaydjan within the limits of the Persian state. The Russians evacuated Adharbaydjan by the beginning of May 1946 (instead of March 1946, as first agreed) and this delay led to a great discussion in the United Nations and to the first official split among the Allies. After the evacuation, the Premier Ḵawāmīnī recognised the provincial autonomy of Adharbaydjan in an agreement signed on 13 June 1946, by which the rights of local self-government and the use of the local Turkish dialect were guaran-
teed. However, on 4 November, Persian troops moved into Adharbaydjan and the status quo ante was restored.

Geography. The list of towns and districts of Adharbaydjan in Ibn ᴷ хрўṭāḏābīhīb, i19, is important for the composition of the province (bārā) soon after the conquest and possibly under the Sāfāvīs: 1. Ṭabārīz; 2. Miḵwān; 3. Ardabil; 4. Ṣūr (= Sena); 5. Barza (= Sakkitz?); 6. Ṣābūr-ḵašt; 7. Tabriz; 8. Marand; 9. Khoy; 10. Kūlsara; 11. Miḵūn; 12. Barzand; 13. Ḏanā (Ganzak); 14. Ḏābārwa; 15. Niţz; 16. Urmīya; 17. Salmās; 18. Shīr; 19. Rustāk al-Salak; 20. Rustāk Ḯind-bīya (= Ḯind-pīye); 21. al-Badḏāh; 22. Urm; 23. Balwān-Ḵarāḏ (= Ḭarāḏ-dagh?); 24. Rustāk Ṣarāh (Sarāb); 25. Daskiyaḵwār (?); 26. Rustāk Ḫay-pḥraḏā. Of these nos. 4, 5, 6, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19 and 26 lie to the south of Lake Urmīya (in the direction of Daynamar); nos. 7, 8, 9, 16 and 17 in the north-western corner; nos. 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 12, 21, 22, 23 and 24 east of the meridian of Tabriz. Nos. 20 and 25 cannot be located. The frontier in the south was no. 26 “the watch of Media” (possibly the present day Sunkur [q.v.]; in the east, it passed between Ḫiynān and Ḿandān [q.v.]; in the N.E. Ibn ᴷχروحāḏābīhīb, ii11, names Ḿarāḏ (now Altan on the south bank of the Araxes) as “the end of the ʿāmal of Adharbaydjan”. Thus the territory of the province closely corresponded to its present extent, but as Adharbaydjan was usually governed jointly with the neighbouring Armenia and Ardān ʿAbd al-Makdisī, 374: (Ḵhm al-rāḥīb comprising the three provinces), administrative frontiers were subject to temporary changes, especially in later times. In al-Makdisī, 374, Ḫoy,
Urmiya and even Dəkəhərəxan (southeast of Tabriz) are reckoned to Armenia. According to Yākūt (13th century), Adhargon extended down to Banga’s (Parthav). In *Nuwat Al-Kalāb* (730/1340), 89, Nakhibewan and Ordubād, on the left bank of the Araxes, are mentioned under Adhargon.

Very characteristic for Adharyun are the high peaks rising in various parts of the territory, with ranges of mountains connecting them: Mt. Səwələn west of Ardabīl (15,792 feet), Mt. Sahand, southeast of Tabriz (12,840 feet), the Lesser Ararat (12,840 feet) south of which runs the long range which forms the frontier with Turkey and ʿIrāk, and which in its southern part is studded with high peaks. The central parts of Adharyun consist both of considerable plains (Tabriz, Marand, Ḫoy, Salmās) and of high plateaux burrowed by deep gorges.

The territory of Adharyun belongs to the basins of the Caspian, of Lake Urmiya and of the Tigris. Towards the Caspian flow: (i) the tributaries of the Səfəd Rūd having their sources on the south-eastern face of Mt. Sahand, and (ii) the southern tributaries of the Araxes (the river of Ardabīl, Kara-su; the rivers of Karadja-dagh; the river of Ḫoy and the river of Məkət, Zangī-čay). The internal Lake Urmaya drains an area of 52,500 sq. km (the rivers of Marāgha, Sefīda-čay; the river of Tabriz, Aqlī-čay; the numerous rivers of Salmās and Urmaya; the important rivers of the Kurdish districts, Diğəhtu, Tətəwū, Gədər). The Lesser Zāb rises on the Persian side of the frontier range and, through the gap of Alān, enters into the plains of Northern ʿIrāk to join the Tigris.

The population of Adharyaun lives chiefly in villages. The largest towns are Tabriz (280,000 inhabitants), Ardabīl (63,000), Urmaya (49,000), Marāgha (35,000). The semi-nomads are found on the Məğən steppe (the Turkish Shāhsəwān) and in the Kurdish districts along the Turkish frontier and south of Lake Urmaya. The population in its great majority speaks the local language learnt at school. Armenians and Assyrians (tag “ʿAyos”) are found in the districts to the west of Lake Urmaya. Kurdish is spoken along the western frontier and in the southern districts, to the west of the Tətəwū river.


See also ARDABIL, BAREZAD, GANZA, KHAY, MARAGHA, MARAND, MUIKHAN, NIKIY, SALMĀS, SAʿUD-BULAK (Maḥābād), SĪH, SĪSAR, SUDSUZ, TABRIZ, URMIYA, USBHAN (V. Minorsky)

(ii) Azerbayan, Soviet Socialist Republic (AZ. SSR) in the eastern part of Transcaucasia, between the south-eastern branches of the Caucasus, the Caspian coast and the Araxes (which separates it from the Persian province of the same name). In the north-east it borders on the Dəghəstān Autonomus republic (part of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic, RSFSR). In the north-west it borders on the Georgian S.S. Republic (along the Alazan) and in the west on the Armenian S.S. Republic (along the line running east of Ləsən = Gökçe). In the south-west the autonomous republic (ASSR) of Nakhčewan, locked within the Armenian territories, is part of the Azerbayan republic, whereas the highlands of Kara-baḡ (with a considerable Armenian population) form an autonomous territory (oblast) within Azerbayan.

Historically the territory of the republic corresponds to the Albania of the classical authors (Strabo, xi, 4; Polyemy, v, 11), or in Armenian Alvān-kʿ, and in Arabic ARRĀN [q.v.]. The part of the republic lying north of the Kur (Kura) formed the kingdom of Sərwān (later Sərwān [q.v.]).

After the collapse of the Imperial Russian army Bākū was protectively occupied by the Allies (General Dunsterville, 17 August-14 Sept. 1918) on behalf of Russia. The Turkish forces under Pasha occupied Bākū on 15 Sept. 1918 and reorganized the former province under the name of Azerbayan— as it was explained, in view of the similarity of its Turkish-speaking population with the Turkish-speaking population of the Persian province of Azerbayan. When after the Mudros armistice the Allies reoccupied Bākū (17 Oct. 1918), General Thomson (28 Dec. 1918) recognized the existing Azerbayan government of the Muslim party as the only local authority. After the evacuation of the Allies, the Soviet regime was proclaimed in Bākū on 28 April 1920, without armed opposition, and Azerbayan became one of the three republics of the federated Transcaucasia. In 1936 the federation came to an end and on the 5 Dec. 1936 Azerbayan was admitted into the U.S.S.R. as one of the sixteen constituent republics of the Union.

The present-day republic possesses an area of 87,700 sq. km and a population of 3.2 million, of which 28% live in towns. Local Turks are in a majority of 3/5, whereas the Armenians form 12% of the population, and Russians 10%. The capital of the republic, Bākū [q.v.], counts 809,000 inhabitants, Gandja [q.v.] (formerly Elizavetpol and Kirovabad) 99,000. Other large towns are Shamakhi, Kuba, Səliyān, Nukh, Mingečwar, etc.


AHDARGUN (P. *flame-colored* campaigns in Atropatene), a plant about 2-3 feet high with finger-long elongated leaves, of a red-yellow colour, and malodorous blossoms with a black kernel. The identification of this plant is not yet well established: in Greek κῆρος Αżyczου occurs synonymously with senecio vulgaris, the common groundsel (B. Langkavle, *Botanik der späten Griechen*, 1866, 74; 1. Löw, *Aramäische Pflanzennamen*, 1879, 47). The descriptions of the Arabian authors leave a choice between the dark yellow *upklhmos*, for which Clément-Mulet decided, and the calendar *cenklhmos*, marigold, which indeed unites the characteristic features of shape, hue and smell and which formerly was officinal. In Arabic medicine adharyun passed for a
cordial, an antidote, etc. The plant played in popular belief a greater part than in medicine: it was believed that its odour alone was sufficient to cause or to facilitate delivery as well as to drive away flies, rats and lizards.

**Bibliography:** Ibn al-Baytār, *Dārāmī,* Būlāk 1291, i, 16; Ibn al-Awāmī, Fālidhā, transl. Clément-Mulet, Paris 1866, i, 269; Karwīnī (Wüstenfeld) i, 271; L. Leclerc, in * Notices et extraits des manuscrits,* xxii, 38; Meyerhof and Sobhy, The abridged version of "the Book of Simple Drugs" etc., i, 146 ff. (J. Hell)

**ADHARI (AZERI),** a Turkish dialect.

(i) Language, (ii) literature.

(i) LANGUAGE

The word *Adhari,* which means "pertaining to Adharbaydžan," has been used to denote various ethnic groups from the 10th century onward. It was applied to the Adharbaydžan Republic founded in the Caucasus in 1918, and is extended in the present day to cover not only the Soviet Republic of Adharbaydžan and Persian Adharbaydžan but also the Turkish populations of Khurasan, Astarabad, Hamadān and other parts of Persia, Dāğhestān and Georgia.

Adhari Turkish has long maintained its identity as a literary language. According to the latest morphological classification of the Turkish dialects (Radloff, Šamoliovich), it forms the "Southern Turkish" group, along with the Turkish of Anatolia, Turkmenistān, the Balkan peninsula and the Crimean littoral. Although the last word on the subject has not yet been said, the dialects of spoken Adhari seem to fall into the following main groups:

(i) Bāktū-Shirvān; (ii) Gangdīa-Karabāgh; (iii) Tabrīz; (iv) Urmīya.

The chief phonetic and morphological characteristics of Adhari are summarized below (the forms in brackets are those of the Turkish of Turkey).

a. **Vowels:**

- There are two e-sounds an open [e] and a closed [e] (here shown as ē). The former represents the sound of *fatka* in Arabic and Persian borrowings: *jeget* (fakč), *veten* (veten). So too in conjunction with *a* (which medially is heard as a pause): *etir* (itir), *elī* (Allī), *meḥdīn* (madīn), *yeṇī* (yānī), *meţwāq* (medvūk).

Closed e occurs in initial syllables where other dialects of the group have: *esii* (isinīs), *endir* (indir-), *phis* (hêz), *elm* (ilīm), *etibar* (itibar). It is also heard in the diphthong in *ayn* (aynī), *yaynī*.

b. **Initial i has become in modern Adhari:** *ivāx* (ivāx), *iyyāx* (iyāx).

- Initial i disappears in some words in the various dialects, with no definite rule, and in the Adhari of Persia is regularly dropped from the 2nd person singular and plural and the 3rd person plural of verbal forms: see under Verbs, below. *diriṭ* loses its r, becoming *diṭ.*

- l is commonly dropped from *değil:* *důyū,* *dey,* *deyi.* In some words it replaces *r:* *hančal* (*hançar,* *inč*), *serel* (*sara,* etc.)

c. **Vowel Harmony** is generally observed in Adhari, except in the dialects of Bāktū, Nūkha and Persia, where we find velar suffixes added to palatal stems—*olmač,* *viyacač,* *gödač,* *bildič*—and rounded vowels in suffixes: *atön,* *baban,* *alduc* (*aldax*).

d. **Morphology:**

The chief morphological peculiarities are these:

1. The accusative suffix of all vowel-stems except *su* is *niñt:* *arabant,* *dērēn.* Consonant-stems are treated as in the Turkish of Turkey: *ayac,* *demirَ,*

2. The suffix which denotes a regular occupation or forms a noun of agent is *-piñ:* *demirpi,* *arabapi,* *albapi,* *yaslc.* (3) *kimî* or *kimîn* is always used in place of *gibi,* and *ten* or *cenčan* in place of *hadar* or *deki:* *indiyen,* *indiyenc,* *aznamac,* *iünene*c.

3. The interrogative *mi* generally comes after the verbal suffixes: *nukčum,* *nukčen,* *gelemmir,* *gelemmesen,* *gelir,* *gelirik* ([geliru%], *gelemmiller*); *almarnik,* *almayzn,* *varafy,* *varacag* ([varacag]), *sata b skirm* ([sata-smir], etc. (6) With personal names, instead of the plural _-ni/ni:_ *arabanl,* *dereni.*

- Adhari has no necessitative mood; instead, it uses *serek* with the optative: *serek alam,* *serek idam,* *gerek alam,* *gerek idam,* etc.

The suffix of the 2nd person of the imperative is an invariable _gicen,_ found only in Adhari: *gelicen,* *agicen.*

The suffix of the present 1 tense is _-irt:_ *gelirem,* *geliren/gelisen,* _-ir:_ *gelir,* _-ir:_ *gelir/gelirken,* *gelirsi,* *gelisiz,* *geliler/gelileen.* The negative suffix is _-mir:_ *gelirmez,* *gelirmesen/gelimesen,* *gelmir,* *gelimir/gelimli.*

The suffix of the present 2 or aorist tense is formed with _-er-:_ *geliremek,* *gelere,* *gelere,* the negative: *gelermem/gelirmen,* *gelimesen/gelimesen,* *gelmes,* *gelmerik* _-gelmeruy,* _gelmesisiz/gelmesiz,* _gelmesler/gelmesle*. The imperative potential is:_ *gellememrer,* _gellemersen/gellemersen,* _gellemir,* _gellemir/gelimele.*

The present II or aorist tense is formed with _-er-:_ *geliremem,* *gelere,** the negative: *gelermem/gelirmen,* *gelimesen/gelimesen,* *gelmes,* *gelmerik* _-gelmeruy,* _gelmesisiz/gelmesiz,* _gelmesler/gelmesle*. The imperative potential is:_ *gellememrer,* _gellemersen/gellemersen* etc. The idea of inability is also expressed by the use of
the auxiliary verb *bilmemek*: gele bilmirem, gele bilmirsen etc.

The optative: *olam/olum*, *olasan*, *ola*, ...

His poetic powers to castigating the fanaticism of the people.

The end of the 19th century may be described as a period of Adhari literature is regarded as closing with that of the people. This departure from the classical literary language has been explained as due simply to Shah Isma’l’s desire to find a large audience for his political and religious views. At all events he opened a new period in Adhari literature, both by his endeavour to escape from the Perso-Arabic vocabulary used by Fudül [q.v.], and by his own remarkable creative powers. The course taken by writers after him was towards the language and literature of the people.

In this new development, which continued through the 17th and 18th centuries, an important part was played by the political, social and cultural movements then afoot in Ādharbaydān. Classical literature began to develop side by side with the literature of the people, in the semi-independent khānates then coming into existence. Among the products of this folk-literature were romantic poems such as *Kor-oglu*, *Aşık Charh*, *Sa'id Isma'il* and Fudül's *we-kerem*. This genre, known as *dagışık* (dagışık) literature, made great advances in Adharbaydān and formed a bridge between the classical literary language and the local dialects.

The progress made by folk-literature had its effect on the development of the classical literature, as is particularly evident in the language of the 17th- and 18th-century poets Mesbıl, *Sa'īd Tabārī* [q.v.], Kawst, *Ağha Mesbıl Şirvānī*, *Nīght*, *Widādī* and *Wākī*. Of these, Kawst and Mesbıl are especially noteworthy for their poetic power. Above all, the creative writers Widādī and Wākī (18th century), who were steeped in the classical literature, secured a large public for their poems among the broad mass of the people. Wādī, a prolific lyric poet, greatly enriched Ādharī literature. His contemporary Molla Panāh Wākī (1717-97) is considered the founder of the modern school. He chose his themes from life and appears in his poems as an historian and a realist. The simplicity, sincerity and melodiousness of his sweet songs in praise of his beloved and other beauties, replete with the lyricism of the people, have won him a great and abiding fame among the Ādharīs. In the same category is Dhakir Khanīm (1837-97) on the one hand, and in Karabakh this folk-literature were romantic poems such as *dagışık*, *Ker-oglu* and *Aşık Charh*, then coming into existence. Among the products of *dagışık* literature, made great advances in Adharbaydān and formed a bridge between the classical literary language and the local dialects.

(ii) LITERATURE.

If we set aside the *Kūdī Dede Korkūd* [q.v.], whose composition is ascribed to the 11th century, although the text was probably not fixed before the 14th, the first great name in Adhari Turkish literature is that of *Shaykh ʿĪzz al-Dīn Asfāralāyini*, a renowned 13th-century poet who wrote under the *makhbās* of Ḥasan-oghlu or Fūr Ḥasan.

Two poets of the 14th century who played an important part in the development of Adhari literature were Kāḏī Burhān al-Dīn [q.v.] and Nesml. Nesml [q.v.], who sometimes used the *makhbās* of ʿHūsainī, was a contemporary of Timūr. A master of Arabic and Persian, as well as of Adharī, he used his poetic gift to propagate the Ḥurūfī doctrine. His simple and attractive diction made him the poet par excellence of his time. The mediaeval period of Adhari literature is regarded as closing with him, but the themes and lyricism of his poetry had their influence on the development of the new period.

The simple Turkish style introduced by Nesml was raised to its greatest heights by Ḩabībī, *Shāh Isma’īl* the Saʿfawi and Fuḍūl. Ḩabībī, poet, lyricist and scholar, who for a while enjoyed the patronage of *Shāh Isma’īl* Saʿfawi, constitutes a stage between
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Nesmlī, *Shāh Isma’īl* and Fuḍūl. The language of his matchless ṣūfī love-poems differs but little from that of his predecessors, whereas his contemporary *Shāh Isma’īl* [q.v.] (*“Khatāʾī”*, 1485-1524) made a literary vehicle of the real Adhari Turkīsh of the people. This departure from the classical literary language has been explained as due simply to *Shāh Isma’īl*’s desire to find a large audience for his political and religious views. At all events he opened a new period in Adhari literature, both by his endeavour to escape from the Perso-Arabic vocabulary used by Fudūl [q.v.], and by his own remarkable creative powers. The course taken by writers after him was towards the language and literature of the people.

The simple Turkish style introduced by Nesml was raised to its greatest heights by Ḩabībī, *Shāh Isma’īl* the Saʿfawi and Fuḍūl. Ḩabībī, poet, lyricist and scholar, who for a while enjoyed the patronage of *Shāh Isma’īl* Saʿfawi, constitutes a stage between
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the period of the development of the Adhari press. The appearance of *Ekindji*, the first Adhari newspaper, was followed by that of several others: *Diyâd* and *Diyâd-Ḳadib*, at Tishrin (1879-1884); *Khatēd* (1883-91), *ṣahrīb-i Rūs* (1903-05), all of which served as rallying-points for progressive men of letters. The tempo of this development quickened remarkably after the Russian revolution of 1905, conditions becoming then more favourable, and new topics, ideas and figures began to appear. A stream of new periodicals arose: *Hayād*, *Ishād*, *Tarākhât*, *Kaspiy*, *Adh Ṣūr*. Their publishers were Ahmed Agha-oghlu, 'All Bey Hüseyin-zâde, 'All Mardan Topël-bâzîl and Mehmed Emîl Resûl-zâde, nationalists and modernists with a knowledge of Ottoman, Russian and Persian literary and political life. Thanks to their labours and those of men like them, the common people became accustomed to the new cultural movement. The protagonist in the struggle was Alekper Şâbir (d. 1921), the unequaled master of Adhari satire, who used all the powerful resources of his pen to play reaction, fanaticism and ignorance. Support came to him from the poet Djell Matem Kull-zâde, editor of the progressive and democratic review *Molla Naṣr al-Dîn,* and from ‘Abbas Şîhât (1874-1918).

Meşmed Hâdî and Hüseyin Diâwîd were influenced by the literature of Turkey, emulating Nâmlâ Kemâl, Filâtû and Hâmid, and the poet Ahmed Diwâdî also showed the influence of the Turkish national literary movement. Nedjef Bey Wezîrî and ‘Abd ül-Râhîm Bey Haçekwî maintained a constant flow of dramatic works, while Magoma and members of the Hadîbîyî family composed operettas and operas for the Adhari theatre, laying the foundations of a national music.

The chief figures of the latest period, from the fall of the independent Republic of Adhârîbâdîyân to the present day, are Djell Matem Kull-zâde, Axkerwî, ‘Abd Allah Şâhîk, Diâfâr Djâbâbî, and, of the younger generation, the poets Sûleymân Rûştî, Şâmed Wurûgân, Raflîbîyî Nîgâr, Mirwârî Dîlbâzî. Bibliography: The most important studies of Adhari literary activity are listed in IA, s.a., Aser (M. F. Köprülü). Other notable works are: B. Çobanızade, Aseri edebiyatînî yeni devî, Baku 1930; M. Ali Nazîm, Aserbâyjânîskaya âbudıstênemaya literatura, Trudi Aserbâyjânîskovo filiâta, Baku, 1936; Muhasar Aserbâyjan edebiyatı turnih, 1943; Aniologiya azerbâyjânîskoy poezii, Moscow 1930; E. Nikîtin, La littérature des Musulmans en U.R.S.S., REI, 1934, cahier iii; M. E. Resulzade, Qâdîs azerbâyjan edebiyati, Baku 1930; A. Vâşap Yurtsever, Sîdîrîn Azerbâyjan edebiyatîndakî yeri, Ankara 1951. (A. Câfurîolu)

ADHRÂ (see NUDJÛN)

ADHRÂT, the Edrei of the Bible, to-day Derâ, chief town of Hawrân, 106 km. south of Damascus. Situated on the borderline between a basaltic region and the desert, the town, formerly renowned for its wine and oil, was always a great market for cereals and an important centre of trade routes. Before the Assyrian conquest (732 B.C.) the kingdoms of Damascus and Israel contended for it; some scholars have identified it with the Aduri of the Amarna tablets. The capital of Batanea, Adraa was taken by Antiocus III in 218 B.C.; then occupied by the Nabateans; next it came under Roman domination, and from 106 onwards was incorporated in Provincia Arabia. In the Christian era, Adraa became the seat of a bishopric of Arabia. In 613 or 614 the Persians, in course of their victorious campaign against the Byzantines, sacked the town and destroyed the olive-groves of the region (al-Tahari, i, 1005, 1007). On the eve of the bighûra, Adhîrât was the centre of an important Jewish colony; the tribe of Naḍîr, driven out of Medina by Muḥammad, took refuge there with their co-religionists. During the caliphate of Abû Bakr the inhabitants submitted to the Muslims, and acclaimed Umar when he passed through the region. It is stated that Muṣâwiya II b. Yazîd was born there. At the time of the Karmanî rebellion, 29/1306, the population was massacred.

We find the place, called 'City of Bernard d'Étampes', in the works of the chroniclers of the Crusades, in 1119 and 1147 in particular. During the Mamlûk and Ottoman epoch Adhîrât, capital of Bağhîniyya, formed part of the province of Damascus and was one of the stages of the Pilgrimage. The building of the railway linking Damascus, 'Amman, and Medina made it an important station, a junction for Buṣrâ and Hayâd; it was occupied by the British on 28 September 1918. At the present day Derâ is an important railway centre, the southern road from Damascus to Baghdad passes through it, and it is a Syrian frontier post on the Jordan border.


ADHRUB (cf. Aţţo), more rarely Muşhrûh, a place between Maṣân and Petra, a magnificent Roman camp (the surviving monuments are described by Brûnnow and Domaszewski), supplied by a gushing spring. This place, situated in pre-Islamic times in the Muhajir country, was visited by the Kurayshite caravans. It submitted to Muhammad on payment of tribute during the expedition to Tabûk (9/631); the treaty of capitulation handed down by our authorities is probably authentic. Muṣâwiya is said to have received there the homage of al-Ḥasan, the son of 'Ali. According to some Arab geographers Adhrûb was the chief town of the district of al-Sharât, in the province of al-Balkâ'. It is not mentioned since the time of the crusaders, who nevertheless possessed in that region Ahmant, Vaux Moyse (= Wâdî Mûsâ), etc.

Adhrûb became famous in Islamic history on account of the conference which took place there after the battle of Sîffîn, in order to reach a decision in the conflict between 'Ali and Muṣâwiya (see 'Alî and Muṣâwiya).

Bibliography: İstakhrî, 58; Mâskûl, 54, 155; Yâkûbî, Buldûn, 326; Hamdânî, 129; Bakrî (Wustfenfeld), 83; Yâkût, i, 184; Brûnnow and Domaszewski, Die Provincia Arabia, i, 443 ff.; Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, 35, 39, 384.—The statement in Ḫuddâd al-ʿAlâm, 150, that the site was inhabited by Khaṭîrîjîtes, is due to a confusion between al-Shurât and al-Abdîrî (= Khaṭûrîjîtes). (H. Lammens-L. Vecchia Vagliere)

AL-ADHWÂ', broken plural of ẓâhâ, denoting the kings and lords of Yaman whose names are
formed with Dhu. The most famous are the Mathamina, the eight princes (kayl [q.v.]) of Himyar (kayl [q.v.]) formed with Dhu. The most famous are the Mathamina, the eight princes (kayl [q.v.]) of Himyar (kayl [q.v.]) formed with Dhu. The most famous are the Mathamina, the eight princes (kayl [q.v.]) of Himyar (kayl [q.v.]) formed with Dhu. The most famous are the Mathamina, the eight princes (kayl [q.v.]) of Himyar (kayl [q.v.]) formed with Dhu. The most famous are the Mathamina, the eight princes (kayl [q.v.]) of Himyar (kayl [q.v.]) formed with Dhu. The most famous are the Mathamina, the eight princes (kayl [q.v.]) of Himyar (kayl [q.v.]) formed with Dhu. The most famous are the Mathamina, the eight princes (kayl [q.v.]) of Himyar (kayl [q.v.]) formed with Dhu. The most famous are the Mathamina, the eight princes (kayl [q.v.]) of Himyar (kayl [q.v.]) formed with Dhu. The most famous are the Mathamina, the eight princes (kayl [q.v.]) of Himyar (kayl [q.v.]) formed with Dhu. The most famous are the Mathamina, the eight princes (kayl [q.v.]) of Himyar (kayl [q.v.]) formed with Dhu.
passions and effort, rendered vain by the inexorable passage of time. Of the former category a few sparse but significant examples have been preserved; we know that they were appreciated and imitated by Walid b. Yazid and, later, by Abū Nuwās. On the second theme, which was probably inspired by the poet’s own misfortunes, we possess numerous fragments which are interesting not only for their pious and ascetic Stimmung (a curious contrast with the hedonism of the baccic poetry), but for the reflections on and evocation of Orient(al (Arabo-Iranian) history which are to be found there, exemplifying the vanity and feebleness of man. Instances of this are the famous fragment on al-Nu’mān I and the castle of Khawwān (Arābīn, ii, 138-9 and elsewhere), another on Hatra (al-Buhturi, al-Ḥamāsa (Cheikho), 198), and one in Ibn Kūtayba, 112-3, on Djiżhima al-Abrāh and al-Zabbā’s, which almost looks like a ballad. From all these relics, amounting to rather less than 400 lines, we receive the impression of a brilliant artistic personality, who contributed to give Arabic poetic form to the old themes of Semitic pessimism, and, at the same time, in contrast to the Biblical author of Ecclesiastes, to accompany them with a positive appreciation of some of the good things of life.


Adī b. Zayd, Arab Christian poet of al-Hira, of the second half of the 6th century. His life was spent partly at the Sāsānid court at Ctesiphon (al-Maddīn), where he was secretary for Arab affairs to Chosroes Parwiz, and partly at the Lahmīd court at al-Hira, where he was a courtier and counselor of al-Nu’mān III, whom he had helped to the throne. This last, however, as a result of the intrigues of his enemies, later had him incarcerated, and finally put to death in prison (about 600 A.D.). Adī is one of the most curious figures in pre-Islamic Arabic history and poetry. With Nābihīg al-Dhūḥyānī and al-ʿAjījī he represents the type of courtly and urbane poet familiar with a higher level of culture and civilization than those of the desert. Arab and historico-literary tradition accordingly regards him as being on the fringe of the mainstream of the poetry of the dhūḥyayn, because of his “un-Nāḏīdī” language, although the subjects with which he dealt and the form which he gave them had a long and profound influence on the development of Arab poetry in the Muslim epoch. As Adī’s date has been lost, only fragments of his work are known to us (collected in an incomplete fashion and without any critical sense by L. Cheikho, Shwarāt al-Nasriyayn, 439-74, to which should be added fragments in al-Dhīḥīb, al-Haywān, iv, 65-6, al-Makdis, al-Bad wa l-Tawīkh, i, 151, Ibn Kūtayba, al-Shīr, 112-3, and various quotations in the Hamasa of al-Buhturi). Among these verses, those describing Biblical episodes (the creation and man’s first sin) are of interest for the history of religion and culture: they, together with other evidence, confirm that the poet was a Christian (ʿibād). But the main themes of his poetry seem to have been, on the one hand, praise of wine, and, on the other, meditation on the decay of human
conferr the vizierate on Ruzzik [q.v.], the son of the dead man. Ruzzik had no intention of giving up any of his prerogatives, and the caliph established relations with a pretender, Shāwar [q.v.], in order to invite him to rid him of Ruzzik. Shāwar recruited troops and took the offensive; he succeeded in taking Cairo and assuming power in Rabī‘ I 558/February 1163. The caliph quickly perceived that he had made a blunder, as the new minister continued, like his predecessors, to seclude his brother. Shāwar was soon betrayed by one of his own officers, Dirghām [q.v.], who took his place in Ramadān 558/August 1163. There were indeed grounds for the sad reflection of a contemporary writer, ‘Umāra, who observed that in those times “any man who had received the confidence of his brother betrayed him”. Then followed the crucial event which was to bring about the fall of the dynasty, Shāwar had succeeded in making his escape; he took refuge at the court of the Zangid prince of Aleppo, Nūr al-Dīn, and asked his help to regain power. The prince of Aleppo did not hesitate, being fired with the idea of re-establishing Sunnism in Egypt and reconstituting Islamic unity. The expedionary force was commanded by Shirkhū [q.v.], “a man full of audacity to whom fear was unknown”, who took with him Sālah al-Dīn, the future founder of the Ayyūbid dynasty. Dirghām was beaten in the open country and killed, and Shāwar became vizier again in Ramadān 559/August 1164.

Difficulties arose in connection with Shirkhū, but it does indeed seem that he was not to blame for them. Shāwar had demanded help from Sunnis against the Shi‘ites whose chief minister he was; the moment his treachery was more serious, for he asked for the intervention of Amārical to drive the forces of Shirkhū out of Egypt. The temporary results of this are well known: Shirkhū capitulated at Bībayy and went back to Syria, the Franks occupied Cairo for a short time, and Shāwar had Fustāt set on fire, being unable to defend it. For the vizier had become alarmed and was trying to negotiate the withdrawal of the Frankish troops. The caliph, who still had absolutely no authority, had now for his part decided to appeal to Nūr al-Dīn, thus signing the warrant for his imminent fall.

This was the third invasion by Shirkhū. It was decisive; he had Shāwar assassinated on 17 Rabī‘ I 560/18 January 1169, and seized the viziership, which he held for only two months, for he died on 22 Dhu‘al-Ḥijjah 1123 March. His nephew, Sālah al-Dīn, succeeded yet him.

Sālah al-Dīn energetically repressed the internal disorders, and did not hesitate to accept the challenge of street fighting in the capital itself, in the course of which the remnants of the Fātimid army, the Sudanese and Armenian forces, were exterminated. Then, on the same day, the name of the ‘Abbāsid caliph of Baghdad was proclaimed in Cairo, in an atmosphere of complete indifference. A theologian of Persian origin, al-Khabūshānī, carried this out, and three years later Sālah al-Dīn rewarded him by opening a college for him. The dedicatory inscription has been preserved; it celebrates the importance of Shafi‘ism, “characterized by a solid doctrinal foundation, unified by the method of al-Aghārṣī, against vain reasoners and other innovators”. Perhaps the caliph ʿAntī never knew of his misfortune; he died a few days after the ʿAbbāsid proclamation, on 10 Mu‘arram 567/13 September 1171. He was not yet twenty-one.

Thus ʿAntī was far from being a caliph on the scale of some of his predecessors. Nonetheless, we possess some interesting information about his personal appearance, for he received a Frankish embassy led by Shāwar. The Franks were taken, in the royal palace, to a vast hall divided into two by a great curtain of silk and gold, “with a pattern of beasts, birds, and persons”. Shāwar prostrated himself three times before this hanging, the third time in an attitude of most humble adoration. Suddenly the great tapestry was raised and the caliph appeared, seated on a throne of gold, encased with precious stones. His face was veiled, and the removal of the glove of his right hand was an elaborate performance. The ambassadors were told that “the caliph was a youth whose beard was just beginning to appear, and that he was dark-skinned and very plump”.


ADIGHE [see AIRAKS].

Al-ʿAdil, title of two Ayyūbid princes:

1. AL-MALIK AL-ʿADIL ABU BAKR MUHAMMAD B. AYYūn, with the honorific title of SAVF AL-DIN (“Sword of the Faith”, called by the Crusaders Saphadin), the brother, assistant, and spiritual heir of Saladin (Salāh al-Dīn, [q.v.]). He was born in Mubarram 540/June-July 1145, or according to other accounts in 538/1143-4, in Damascus or in Baalbek, thus being six or eight years younger than his celebrated brother.

Al-ʿAdil accompanied Saladin to Egypt in the third and final expedition of Shirkhū (564/1169). His first important appointment was to the government of Egypt during Saladin’s frequent absences in Syria after the death of Nūr al-Dīn in 569/1174. In this position he proved himself an able and loyal administrator, and apart from sending enforcements and supplies, when called upon, for Saladin’s army, he enjoyed full and independent powers in both external and internal affairs, being “the real Sultan of Egypt” (ʿImād al-Dīn, in al-Bark Shāhī, v, fol. 1171). After the capture of Aleppo in 579/1183, Saladin at first gave it to his son al-Zahir Ghāzī, but a few months later, on al-ʿAdil’s own request, transferred it to him with full powers of government (diploma in ʿImād al-Dīn, ibid., 124-6, dated Shāhānīn 579), and appointed his nephew Taqī al-Dīn ʿUmar to Egypt, as regent for al-ʿAdal [q.v.]. Although al-Zahir loyally submitted to his father’s decision, his disappointment on this occasion probably contributed to his later strained relations with al-ʿAdil. Three years later, however, in 582/1186, again on al-ʿAdil’s suggestion, al-Zahir was reinstated in Aleppo, and al-ʿAdil himself reappointed to Egypt, this time as regent for Saladin’s son al-Azīz Uthmān. He remained in this post through the campaigns of 583-4/1187-8 and the ensuing Crusade, himself taking part in the conquest of southern Palestine and Karak, and sending ships, men, and supplies in support of Saladin’s attempt to raise the siege of ʿAkkā (585-7/ 1189-91). During the subsequent operations in Palestine he played a particularly important part in the negotiations with Richard Coeur-de-Lion, with whom he formed such friendly relations that it was even proposed that he should marry Richard’s
sister Joan, and that they should rule jointly over Palestine. In the following year (588/1192), in consequence of the disorders resulting from Taki al-Din's unauthorized campaigns in the Djaistra and Diyar Bakr, al-Adil was transferred to the government of these provinces (at the same time retaining Karak and Balka). Behind these frequent changes there may perhaps be discerned a consistent policy applied by Saladin. Of all his brothers, the one in whom he had the most complete confidence, and on whose advice he relied in all contingencies, was al-Adil. It was therefore natural that al-Adil should be placed in command of that province which, in the changing conjunctions of events, was for the time being the most vital for maintaining the unity and strength of Saladin's possessions.

On Saladin's death in 589/1193, al-Adil's first task was, in fact, to defeat an attempt by 'Aziz al-Din, atabeg of Mosul, to reoccupy the Djaistra. Having secured his own province, he next intervened as mediator in the rivalries between Saladin's sons al-Aziz of Egypt and al-Afdal of Damascus. Though at first he supported al-Afdal, the latter's incapacity became so manifest that he finally joined al-Aziz to drive out al-Afdal and himself took over the government of Damascus as the viceroy of al-Aziz (592/1196). He was thus on the spot and ready to deal energetically with the Crusaders of 1197. On the death of al-Aziz (595/1198) the Egyptian troops split into two factions, one supporting al-Afdal, the other al-Adil. Al-Adil was besieged in Damascus until relieved by his Mosopotamian troops under his son al-Kamil, when he pursued al-Afdal into Egypt, defeated him, and was proclaimed Sultan of Egypt and Syria (596/1200). His claim was challenged by al-Abbas, who again besieged Damascus, but al-Adil succeeded in forcing his withdrawal and pursued him to Aleppo, where al-Abbas was finally compelled to recognize his suzerainty (598/1200).

In 604/1207 his Sultanate was formally confirmed by the Caliph, and thereafter he distributed his own provinces between his sons: al-Kamil in Egypt, al-Mu'izz in Damascus, al-Afdal in the Djaistra and Diyar Bakr, himself living from place to place as circumstances required.

So far as can be judged, the cornerstones of al-Adil's policy were to hold Saladin's empire together, in face of the ever-present possibility of fresh Crusades from overseas, and at the same time to serve the interests of the Ayyûbid house. Although the major governments were placed in the hands of his sons, it cannot be denied that they were the most capable to administer them, but he maintained at Aleppo the only one of Saladin's sons who showed any capacity and even guaranteed the succession of his infant son (who was also his own nephew), besides maintaining the governments of the collateral branches at Hims and Hamah. His personal prestige was unrivalled, and he employed it to strengthen the moral and material welfare of his subjects, by patronizing religion and learning, fostering agriculture and commerce, and maintaining peace. He followed Saladin's policy of negotiating commercial treaties with the Italian states, with the double object of increasing his own military resources and discouraging them from supporting fresh Crusades.

When the local Crusader states had ensured peace by a series of truces which covered almost the entire period of his reign, at the same time strengthening his defences against the danger which materialized with the arrival of the Fifth Crusade in 614/1217. Leaving the bulk of his forces on guard in Egypt, he moved into Syria to assist the Mu'azzam to screen the approaches to Jerusalem and Damascus, and while organizing reinforcements for the defence of Damietta fell ill and died at al-Akilin, outside Damascus, on 7 Djamād I, 615/31 August 1218.


2. AL-MALIK AL-ADIL II ABU BAKR SAYF AL-DIN, son of al-Malik al-Kâmil [q.v.] and grandson of the preceding, b. 617/1221. He succeeded al-Kâmil in the government of Egypt (655/1258) but was dethroned by his elder brother al-Sâlîh Ayyûb [q.v.] in 657/1259 and died in prison at Cairo on 2 Shawwâl 645/9 February 1248. See AYYÛBIDS.
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AL-ADIL B. AL-SALAR, ABU 'L-HASAN, Fâtîmid vizier. He was the son of an Ayyûbid officer, who entered the service of the Fâtîmids after the taking of Jerusalem by the Egyptians, in 491/1098. He married the widow of a Zîrid prince who had died in exile at Alexandria.

He first appears in history as governor of Alexandria, at the beginning of the reign of the Fâtîmid caliph al-Zâfîr. We learn that he assembled troops, marched on Cairo, and, on 7 Shawwâl 544/10 December 1149, installed himself in the vizier's house, which had been abandoned by his predecessor, Ibn Masâl, an old man, who was killed in Upper Egypt on 19 Shawwâl/19 February 1150. In spite of his repugnance, the caliph al-Zâfîr was forced to accept him as vizier, with the title of al-Malik al-Adil. He tried, however, to foment a plot against his minister, but the latter got wind of it and took his revenge in a bloodthirsty way by wiping out the corps of pages. Before long he himself was to fall victim to a stepson, 'Abbas b. Abî 'l-Futûh [q.v.], who assigned to his own son, Nasr, the task of assassinating Ibn al-Sâlâr, on 6 Muḥarram 548/3 April 1153. Nasr carried out the crime with his own hand, and by carrier pigeon informed his father 'Abbas, who had just taken command of the garrisons of Ascalon. 'Abbas hastened back to Cairo to assume the office of vizier.

An important point about the political career of Ibn al-Salâr is that he was the first to consider the possibility of an entente with the prince of Aleppo, Nûr al-Dîn, for making common cause against the Franks. It was doubtless premature; Nûr al-Dîn had his own personal designs on Damascus, which the Crusaders had besieged some years previously. As proof of his good will, Ibn Salâr had, in 546/1151, sent the Egyptian fleets against the ports of Jaffa, Sidon, Beirut, and Tripoli, where great damage was caused. The expedition was also a reprisal against the Franks, who had sacked Farama the previous year.

"ADILA KHATUN — ADIYAMAN 199

ADILA KHATUN, daughter of Ahmad Pasha, wife of Sulayman Pasha Mirzâlî ("Abî Lâyîl), Ottoman governor of Baghdad. During the lifetime of her husband she took part in the government of the province, holding audiences where the petitions were presented to her through the intermediary of an eunuch. She had also a mosque and a caravanseray built, bearing her name. When on the death of Sulaymân (1175/1761) power was about to slip from her hands, she sought up against his successor, "Abî Pasha, first the Janissaries, then five of the principal Mamlûks, and succeeded in having 'Umar Pasha, her brother in law, appointed as governor in the place of "Ali (1764). It is not known when and where she died.


(Gr. Huart*)

ADIL-SHAHS, designation of the Muslim dynasty which ruled over Bûdhjîpur, one of the succession kingdoms to the Bahmânâli kingdom of the Dekkan. The independent history of Bûdhjîpur extends from 895/1489 to 1097/1686 when the kingdom was conquered and absorbed by the Moghal empire. The founder of the dynasty, Ýûsûf 'Adîân Khan, was a slave in the service of Mâhmûd Gâwân, the famous Bahmânâli minister. After rising to the position of master of the horse at the Bahmânâli court, Ýûsûf was appointed to the provincial government of Dâwlatâbâd. He took an active part in the intrigues and civil strife which marked the declining years of the Bahmânâli kingdom and, according to the historian Firîshtha, caused the khalifa to be read in his own name in 895/1489. The Muslim historians of the dynasty claim a royal lineage for Ýûsûf 'Adîân Khan, asserting that he was a son of the Ottoman Turkish sultan Murâd II and was saved by his mother from death at the hands of the succeeding Ottoman Sultan, his elder brother Muhammad II, by being entrusted to a merchant of Sâwâ, Khâdja 'Imâm âl-Dîn, who educated him. Eventually he found his way to India, took service under Mâhmûd Gâwân, the famous Bahmânâli minister. There is no independent evidence corroborating the testimony of historians partial to the 'Adil-Shâh dynasty. That his background was Persian is generally accepted. Ýûsûf 'Adil-Shâh introduced Şi'a doctrines, being the first Muslim ruler in India to do so. During his reign, 895/1489-916/1510, spent in almost continual warfare against rival Muslim Dekkan princes and the Hindu rulers of Vijâyânagar, the Portuguese made their appearance off the shores of India, taking possession of the port of Goa. The successors of Ýûsûf 'Adil-Shâh reigned as follows: Ismâ'îl b. Ýûsûf 916/1509-941/1534 Mâllû b. Ismâ'îl 941/1534-943/1535 'All I b. Ýûsûf 943/1535-955/1557 'All II b. Ýûsûf 955/1557-987/1579 'All III b. Ýûsûf 987/1579-1035/1626 Muhammad b. Ýûsûf 1035/1626-1066/1696 Muhammad b. Ýûsûf 1066/1665-1083/1672 'Ali 1083/1672-1097/1686

 Until the beginning of the 11th/17th century and the advent of the Moghal threat from the north, the political history of Bûdhjîpur is filled by continuous warfare with the neighbouring Muslim states of the Dekkan, Bidar, Ahmadnagar, Golconda and the Hindu empire of Vijâyânagar. However, in 972/1564 the four Muslim principalities combined against Vijâyânagar and at Talikot decisively defeated its forces and sacked the capital. The power and prosperity of Bûdhjîpur reached its zenith under 'Ibrâmîl II though it was never free from turbulence among the nobles. Bûdhjîpur escaped the direct attentions of the Mughals until the reign of Shâh 'Djâhân, attempting instead to acquire territory from Ahmadnagar which was disintegrating under the onslaught of the Mughals. Bûdhjîpur and the latter clashed and in 1046/1636 the Mughals invaded Bûdhjîpur and forced a peace at which Bûdhjîpur acknowledged Mughal suzerainty. For the next twenty years the kingdom enjoyed peace. In 1068/1656 when Muhammad 'Adil-Shâh died, Shâh 'Djâhân objected to the succession of 'Ali 'Adil-Shâh II, invoking his claims as suzerain, and ordered 'Awrangzîb to invade the kingdom. Operations were stopped, however, at the news of Shâh 'Djâhân's illness and Bûdhjîpur survived only to face further danger from the Maharrat chief Sîwâdîl who in 1069-70/1659 destroyed a Bûdhjîpur army and its leader 'Adîl Khan in an ambush. Thenceforth Bûdhjîpur was rarely free from Moghal depredations. With the accession of a minor, Sîkandar 'Adil-Shâh, the kingdom was progressively bereft by Moghal and Maharrat of its provinces until in 1097/1686, after a siege of more than a year, the capital itself was taken by 'Awrangzîb and the remnants of the kingdom absorbed into the Moghal empire. Sîkandar died in captivity in 1111/1700. The 'Adil-Shâhs were great builders and made their capital at Bûdhjîpur [q.v.] one of the most magnificent monuments to the architectural genius of Islam in India. They were also great patrons of literature and the important historian Firîshtha wrote under the patronage of 'Ibrâmîl 'Adil-Shâh II.


(ண. Hardry)

ADIYAMAN, formerly called हिसं मन्सूर, or हिसान मन्सूर (modern spelling हिसन मंसूर), according to CuiNet also called Korkûn, a small town in S.E. Anatolia, capital of the ḥâdâ of the same name in the sağaţâ, now mülâşet, of Malatîya (formerly it belonged to the mülâşet of Ma'mûrât u'l-'Azîz), 37° 45' N, 38° 15' E. The numbers of the inhabitants given in the past vary: according to Elî, 10,000, mainly Armenians; according to Sâml, 25,000, of which only 1255 Christians; according to 'Ali DîwÎdî in one passage 1150, in another more than 25,000 of which more than a half were Kurds; according to CuiNet 2,000 (in the whole ḥâdâ of हिसान मन्सूर: 42,134). The number in 1945 was 10,932.

The name हिसान मन्सूर derives from the Umayyad amir मन्सूर b. Dîjâwâna, who was killed in 141/758 on the orders of the 'Abbâsîd al-Mansûr. Later, Ĥârûn al-Râshîd had the place fortified and gave it a garrison. Thus हिसान मन्सूर, or Adiyaman,
became the heir of the ancient town of the neighbourhood, Perre, whose site is still marked by aqueducts and rock graves. Subsequently, Êsîn Manşûr is rarely mentioned; in the 6th/12th century it belonged to the Artûkids.

Bibliography: Balkhurl, Fudhâ, 192; Yâkût, ii, 278; Hâchîdî Khallîfa, Dâhîn-nâmâ, 601; Ewîlîâ Celebî, Siyâh-nâmâ, iii, 169; Sâmil, Kâmûs al-Yâmî, iii, 1962; Ali Dishûd, Ta'rîh wa-Dhikrîya Layhâh, 6, 332; C. Ritter, Erdurûnd, x, 885; Humann and Palme, Reisen in Kleinasië und Nordasien, 139 f.; Le Strange, 123; idem, Palestine unter den Muslîms, 454.

(A. TAECHNER)

*ADJ*; ivory.

1. From early times there was a demand for ivory in the civilizations of the Near East. The Assyrians excelled in the carving of ivory and excavations at Nimrud and elsewhere have revealed masterpieces seldom surpassed. In the eastern Mediterranean area a tradition of ivory carving persisted and surviving examples have been attributed to the great centres of Antioch and Alexandria during the later centuries of Roman rule. There is no evidence that the workshops of Syria were producing ivories in the century before Islam; but in Egypt the tradition persisted into the Islamic period.

Probably the main source of ivory in the Islamic period was East Africa, the greatest ivory producing area during the Middle Ages. It is unlikely that India exported ivory in any quantity to the Near East or Europe as it scarcely produced enough for its own needs (W. Heyd, Histoire du commerce du Levant au Moyen-Age, Leipzig 1885, ii, 29-31). Surviving Islamic ivories seem to be of elephant tusk. Walrus ivory was used for the handles of daggers (see R. Ettinghausen, The Unicorn, Washington 1950, 120 ff.) and there are examples of bone carvings from Egypt.

The size and shape of the elephant tusk limits its use to relatively small objects or to elements in larger scale decoration. In the Islamic period objects made entirely of ivory include caskets of both rectangular and cylindrical form, combs, hunter horns or hunting horns and chess pieces. Techniques of decoration were carving in relief or painting on the surface with coloured stains including gilding; intarsia in which shaped ivory plaques either carved or painted were counter sunk in a wooden surface; incrustation in which sheets of ivory were cut to the required shape and stuck to the wooden surface; and incised decoration usually consisting of dots and concentric circles sometimes filled with coloured pigments. Finally, ivory sculpture in the round are extremely rare.

2. It would be strange if ivory had not been in use in the early Islamic period. But so far excavations at sites of the Umayyad and Abbasid period have revealed no objects of ivory. There are very few ivories attributable to the Sâsânîd period in Persia and perhaps the lack of a tradition accounts for this absence of ivory carvings in Mesopotamia and Persia. The cylindrical box with conical cover in the treasury of St. Gereon, Cologne, was made, according to the inscription, in Aden for a governor of Yaman probably about 136/753; but its technique and style belong rather to Egypt (RCEA, no. 41, ill. in Cott, p. 79a). In Egypt Coptic craftsmen kept alive an earlier tradition. Large rectangular panels with both intarsia and incrusted decoration have been variously described as panels of a tabût (coffin) and as book covers; the former is more probable. Pieces have been found in Egypt, and from their style were made by Coptic craftsmen in the 9th and 10th centuries. (For examples in the Arab Museum, Cairo, see Zakî Muhammad Hasan, *Isâlimî Art in Egypt* (in Arabic), i, Cairo 1935, pl. 35; in the Kaiser Friedrich Museum, Berlin, ibid. pl. 34 and F. Sarre, *Islamic Bookbinding*, London 1923, pl. i and fig. 1 where it is described as a Kur'ân cover; and in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, M.S. Dimand, *A Handbook of Muhammadan art*, New York 1947, fig. 69.)

Bone and ivory carved panels have been found in the ruined mounds of Fustât and are associated stylistically with the wood carvings of the Fatimid period. These are cut in low relief and depict scenes of the chase, isolated animals and human figures set against a background of scrollwork. They were probably either panels of caskets or insets to larger wooden panels and can be dated to the 11th-12th century. (Examples in the Arab Museum, in Zakî Muhammad Hasan, *Kunûs al-Fatïmîyûn*, Cairo 1937, pl. 56; in the Victoria and Albert Museum, in M. Longhurst, *Catalogue of carvings in ivory*, i, London 1927, pl. xxviii; in the Metr. Mus., in Dimand, op. cit., fig. 70. For examples of carved woodwork, see E. Pauty, *Les bois sculptés jusqu'au xviie siècle* (C. gên. du Musée arabe du Caire), Cairo 1931.) Caskets of ivory both rectangular and round are mentioned by al-Mârkûzî, *Khiyat*, i, 414, in an eye-witness account of the treasures of the caliph al-Mustansîr.

Apart from these, it is impossible at present to attribute others with any certainty to Fâtîmid Egypt. A group which has the strongest claim to be represented by the beautiful panels carved in ajouré in the Bargello Museum, Florence, which are perhaps related in style and subject matter to the famous carved wood panels from the mâristân of Kalaûn now in the Arab Museum. In composition and workmanship they far surpass the Fustât fragments. (Well illustrated in *Meisterwerke Muhammedanischer Kunst*, Berlin 1910, iii, pl. 253. There is another example in the Louvre, see G. Migeon, *Manuel d'Art Musulman*, Paris 1927, fig. 148. For the mâristân panels, see Pauty, op. cit., pls. xlvi-viii.) Another group which has been ascribed to the Fâtîmid period comprises ivory oliphants or hunting horns and caskets. Their style is distinct and characterized by relief cutting in two planes; the decoration consists of interlaced circles each containing an animal or bird and, in the caskets, human figures too. Similar treatment of the decoration occurs in the repertoire of Fâtîmid ornament as well as in that of Muslim Spain. An attribution to Sicily or South Italy whose Norman rulers are known to have employed Muslim craftsmen should also be considered, for there are a number of oliphants of apparent western manufacture which reproduce in a general way the decoration of the oriental ones. If the latter were in fact made in Egypt it is at least possible that they were made for export to the West. (See O. von Falke, *Eifelsteinhörner*, 511-7, who attributes six horns and a fragmentary piece in the Metropolitan Museum to this group; also four caskets, seven plaques (in the V. and A. Museum) and an ivory box (in the Metr. Museum).) As has already been mentioned the technique of incrustation was practised in Egypt. A casket of wood with ivory incrustations in the Cappella Palatina, Palermo, has been attributed to Egypt since it is connected in style and technique with a
fragmentary wood panel incrusted with ivory found at Edfu and now in the Arab Museum. Its date would appear to be the end of the 12th and beginning of the 13th century. (See Monneret de Villard, *La Casetta*, pls. i-v; for the Edfu panel, pl. xxvi.)

While the technique of incrustation was being adopted by the Muslim craftsmen, the Copts maintained the more ancient tradition of intarsia decoration. Both techniques were used in the doors of the Church of the Virgin in the Dayr al-Suryānī (in Wādi al-Nāfrīn), which were made in the first half of the 10th century (see Monneret de Villard, pls. xxi-xxv). But incrustation was rarely used in later times and was confined to small objects. Intarsia, on the other hand, was frequently used in the Ayyūbīd and Mamlūk period for the decoration of large surfaces. The famous minbar made in Aleppo by order of Nūr al-Dīn in 1168-9 A.D. and sent to the Masḡīd al-Курсā in Jerusalem, is the first of a series of works in which panels of ivory or bone, either plain or carved, were inserted into a wooden ground so as to form geometric patterns, stars or polygons. Intarsia decoration is found in kursīs, minbars and dikbas of the Mamlūk period. The contrast between wood and ivory serves to emphasise the abstract pattern and the effect is heightened when the wood is stained or painted with arabesque or inscriptions. After the fall of the Mamlūks the technique was adopted in Turkey where there are fine examples of mosque furniture with intarsia decoration dating from the 17th century. (The minbar in al- kursā is illustrated in M. van Berchem, *CIA, Série du Nord, Jerusalem*, iii, no. 277 (p. 393 ff., pls. 29-30). Mamlūk examples in L. Hautecoeur and G. Wiet, *Les Mosquées du Caire*, Paris 1932, ii, pls. 172-3, and Turkish examples in E. Kühnel, *Meisterwerke der Archäologischen Museen in Istanbul*, iii, Berlin-Leipzig 1938, pl. 19.)

3. A group of ivories which has given rise to much discussion consists of caskets, combs and crosiers with painted and gilded decoration. Many of these found their way to the treasuries of European churches in the Middle Ages where the caskets were used as reliquaries or pyxes and the combs for liturgical purposes. P. B. Cott’s *Siculo-Arabic Ivories*, which can claim to be almost complete, illustrates some ninety pieces in which the painted decoration is still visible. All have certain common stylistic and technical features. In many pieces all trace of the original colour has disappeared and the well preserved state of the famous casket of Würzburg is exceptional. Generally patterns are outlined in black and filled in with a palette which includes red, blue and green, and gold applied in both liquid and leaf form. Many pieces are inscribed around the rim of the cover in Kūfī or Naṣīḥ script. Most of these inscriptions contain benedictory phrases addressed to the maker or owner. If it is generally agreed that the painted ivories can be assigned to the 12th and 13th centuries, opinions differ regarding the place of origin and unless a piece comes to light with a revealing inscription or a reference in some contemporary source is discovered there can be no final answer to this question. In the circumstances style and iconography are the only evidence.

On stylistic grounds they have been variously attributed to Persia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Egypt, Spain and Sicily. It is true that the decoration on the so-called minbar of Persia dating from the second half of the 12th to the 13th century has a superficial resemblance to that of the painted ivories, in the rather sparse arrangement of the decoration and in the figural representations, especially the horseman. Attenuated versions of the motives found in the decorative arts of Syria occur on the ivories. The decoration of one distinctive group of painted ivories contains star interlacements and geometric ornaments so similar to those found in the art of Granada during the Nasīrīd period that their attribution to a Granada workshop during the 14th and 15th centuries seems certain. (Ferrandis, nos. 89-103. Ferrandis accepts the Sicilian origin for the remainder but suggests that three of these were “imitations” made in Spain, viz. nos. 9 and 65 in Cott and a casket in the parish church of Fitero, Navarre, not mentioned by Cott: Ferrandis, no. 21.) Apart, however, from this small and somewhat isolated group, the closest parallels are to be found in the art of Fāṭimid Egypt: in the fragments of pottery from Fustāt, wood carvings, notably the mūrisīn panels, and the greatest surviving monument of Fāṭimid painting, the ceiling of the Cappella Palatina in Palermo. Kühnel (cf. Bibliography), however, argues for their Sicilian (and, in some pieces, Spanish) origin. In this connection, a casket found at Carroñón de los Condes in Palencia and now in the Museo Arqueológico, Madrid (Ferrandis, no. 9) is important. This is a rectangular box, the flat cover of which is inscribed on intarsia with a dedication to al-Mu‘izz, the last Fāṭimid to reign from Ifrīqiyah, and the interesting information that it was made in al-Manṣūrīyya, the Fāṭimid capital near al-Kayrawān. The maker’s name is unfortunately almost entirely obliterated except for the nisba al-Khurasānī. The casket can therefore be dated between 341/952 and 365/972. The sides are decorated with a border of scroll-work painted in green and red. Although the drawing is cursory and the style dissimilar to that of the group under discussion, it suggests that the technique of painting on ivory was already known and practised in the Maghrib in the third quarter of the 10th century and was presumably introduced from Egypt.

But the fact remains that these painted ivories give the impression of a style not entirely in accord with the canons of Islamic art. The sparse treatment of the decoration and the frequent carelessness in the drawing are in marked contrast with the careful presentation of decoration and precise drawing to which we are accustomed in Islamic art. Indeed, were it not for the Arabic inscriptions, there might well be doubt in assigning them to the Islamic world at all. For this reason it is likely that these objects originated in an area on the fringe of the Islamic world which was open both to oriental and occidental influences. The fact that certain caskets contain Christian figures, that there are two crosiers with painted decoration identical to that of the caskets, and that painted ivories are found exclusively in the countries of Europe suggests that they were, at least, made for the Western market. (Christian figures occur on nos. 38, 39, 42, 44, 80 in Cott; for crosiers see Cott, nos. 148, 149. The Arabic inscription on the “Granadan” casket in the Instituto de Valencia de Don Juan states that it was made to contain the consecrated Host (Cott, no. 138). It is usually agreed that the combs were for liturgical
Probably there was more than one centre where painted ivories were produced, and the poorer examples were copies of finer prototypes. But until we possess a documented piece, there can be no certain solution of the problem.

By far the most remarkable of the mediaeval Islamic ivories are the carved ivories made in Muslim Spain and among them are masterpieces which rival the Byzantine and Western ivories. Fortunately there are enough documented pieces to make it possible to trace their history over a period of little less than a century. Unlike most of the ivories which have been discussed so far, they were produced under royal patronage and include some made for presentation to royal personages. During the first half of the period, the centre of production was in Cordova and then moved to Madinat al-Zahrāʾ; thus they belong to the declining years of the Caliphate of Cordova. The earliest of the Hispano-Arabic ivories were probably made in Cordova and are characterized by the exclusive use of plant ornament (see Ferrandis, nos. 1-3). In the earliest surviving products of the new workshop at Madinat al-Zahrāʾ the decoration of one consists of paired birds and animals amid flowering plant scrolls and that of another includes paired dancers (see Ferrandis, nos. 4-5). The artists of both these groups were evidently familiar with the carved marble panels in the Great Mosque of Cordova and the marble revetments found at Madinat al-Zahrāʾ. Another group consists of pieces made in the Madinat al-Zahrāʾ workshop by an artist who signs himself Khalaf (Ferrandis, nos. 7-10). His masterpiece is the circular box belonging to the Hispanic Society in New York. His style is quite distinctive; birds, animals and figures are conspicuously absent and the flowers and leaves which are deeply cut are rendered with exuberance and a close attention to detail.

But undoubtedly the greatest achievement is the series of ivories with scenes with figures and animals which, indeed, must be numbered among the most precious examples of Hispano-Arabic art; for not only are they first-rate in artistic quality, but as social documents the scenes of court life and of chase which they depict give us a rare picture of the refinements of Andalusian civilisation. The three finest examples (Ferrandis, nos. 13-4, 19) are the two cylindrical boxes in the Louvre and the Victoria and Albert Museum, the first dedicated to al-Mughira, brother of al-Ḥakam 1 I and dated 357/968, and the second dedicated to Ziyād b. Aflah and dated 359/970, and the casket in the Cathedral of Pamplona, dedicated to a son of al-Manṣūr and dated 399/1008. The latest is the latest surviving piece from the Cordovan workshop. With these are associated some five other pieces (Ferrandis, nos. 15-6, 20-2). Scenes are enclosed in lobed circles, polygons or arcades. The plant decoration is subordinated to the animals and human figures which are proportionally large; the symmetrical arrangement of these does not preclude naturalistic effect. Scenes include the prince with attendant servants and musicians, huntsmen with falcons or at grips with their quarry and men performing rustic tasks such as gathering the date harvest, animals struggling with their prey; and in one case an elephant is depicted. None of these pieces is signed except the Pamplona casket which bears the name of more than one artist.

After the fall of the Caliphate of Cordova, the workers founded a new establishment in Cuenca where they were given an asylum by the Dhu 'l-Nūnis, rulers of Toledo. The earliest surviving product (Ferrandis, no. 25) is dated 417/1026 and signed with the maker’s name Muhammad b. Zayyān. From this it is clear that the workshop was already established before Ismāʿīl al-Żāfīr won the kingdom of Toledo in 427/1036. The last documented piece (no. 26) bears a dedicatory inscription to Husam al-Dawla son of Yaḥyā al-Maʾmūn and governor of Cuenca and is dated 441/1049. It is also signed with the maker’s name ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Zayyān and shows that the workshop was in the hands of a single family. The Cuenca ivories lack the vitality and invention of the Cordovan ivories. Cordovan motives recur but their presentation is monotonous. Animals and scenes are not enclosed by the lobed circles and polygons but are arranged in horizontal or vertical registers in which they are often repeated in identical form.

After the middle of the 11th century it seems that the Christian kingdoms of the North took the lead in ivory carving, although their products show the influence of Andalusian techniques. Yet the tradition of ivory carving was not entirely lost in Muslim Spain, for among the surviving examples of the decorative arts of the Nasrid kingdom of Granada are sword and dagger handles which incorporate carved ivory with floral and geometric designs and inscriptions resembling those of the Alhambra stucco revetments. (The most important pieces are illustrated in L. Torres Balbás, Arte Almohade — Arte Nazari — Arte Mudéjar (Arts Hispaniae iv), figs. 256B and C, and 257; also a bow with ivory in-crustations, fig. 255, and the staff of Cardinal Cisneros, said to be the sceptre of the Nasrid kings, fig. 246. For two other sword handles see Miguel, op. cit., fig. 167. Also attributed to Granada are the “eared” daggers with carved ivory plaques in the handles and “ears” of the pommel (see Torres Balbás, op. cit., figs. 256D and B.)

Besides ivory carving, Cordova had acquired a preeminence in ivory in-crustation which was to survive the fall of the Umayyads. Muslim historians and travellers describe the minbar, or pulpit, made by order of al-Ḥakam II for the Great Mosque. But neither this nor the minbar made some years later for the mosque at Fez by order of Hishām II have survived though from the descriptions both were evidently formed of wooden panels with ivory in-crustations. One of the earliest surviving Maghribi minbars with this kind of decoration is the magnificent example in the Kutubiyya of Marrakush. According to the inscription (see J. Sauvaget, in Hesp., 1949, 313 fl.) this was made in Cordova and dates from the time of the Almoravids. Technically derived from mosaics, the decoration consists of interlaced bands incrusted with contrasting wood and ivory cubes enclosing polygons of carved arabesques, larger flowing floral or geometric patterns and a frieze with inscription in which the letters are formed of ivory sheets. The ivory is either natural colour or stained. (For detailed study and illustration see H. Basset and H. Terrasse, in Hesp., 1926, 108-204; also Ferrandis, no. 159.) Other minbars, it technically less perfect, reveal a rich inventiveness. (The earliest is the minbar in the Mosque of al-Karawiyīn, Fez, made at the close of the Almoravid period in 1145. Others are the minbars in the mosque of the Kaṣaba, Marrakush, for which see Basset and Terrasse, 244-70, and Ferrandis, no. 160, and the minbars in the mosque of Tāzā (1292-3) and in the Madrasa Bā Ṣīnāniyya, Fez.
There is a copy of the Kasaba minbar in the mosque of al-Mawwasin, Marrakush, dating from the 16th century. In Spain, few large-scale works of incrustation have survived; but there is a particularly fine pair of doors from a cupboard in the Museum of the Alhambra (Torres Balbas, fig. 244-5; Ferrandis, no. 167; other examples, Torres Balbas, fig. 243, Ferrandis, nos. 172, 174). Equally remarkable are caskets with ivory incrustations, decorated either with figural representations or geometrical designs (Ferrandis, nos. 161-3, 168-71). All these caskets have been found in Spain and because of the similarity of their decoration to certain Toledan stucco work have been attributed to Andalusia and the 12th to 13th century. Finally the handle of the so-called raper of Boabdil in the Museo Historico Militar, Madrid, has delicate ivory incrustations, see above.)

The works of incrustation have survived; but there is an eloquent witness of the skill of the Granadan craftsmen. (See Torres Balbas, fig. 240, and E. Kühnel, **Maurische Kunst**, Berlin 1924, pl. 124. The staff of Cardinal Cisneros has also ivory incrustations, see above.)

6. In this account of ivory products in the Islamic world, Persia figures scarcely at all. No piece has yet appeared that can be attributed to pre-Mongol Persia. It would be rash to assume for this reason that the art of working in ivory was unknown for there are references in contemporary literature which suggest the opposite. (Monneret de Villard, *op. cit.*, 15, quotes al-Kazwini (Wüstenfeld), ii, 273, who remarks that the inhabitants of Tark, in the district of Iṣfahān, are skilled in making objects of ebony and ivory. M. de V. suggests that this implies a local industry of incrustation.) We can only blame the accidents and ravages of time for this absence. That incrustation was practised in later times is proved by the pair of wooden doors inlaid with ivory from the Gūr-i Mīr, Samarkand, now in the Hermitage Museum, Leningrad (Survey of Persian Art, vi, pl. 1470). Made about 808/1405, their decoration is typically Timurid. A pen-box (S. Lane-Poole, *The Art of the Saracens of Egypt*, London 1886, fig. 72) and dagger handles dating from the 18th century or later (P. Holstein, *Contribution à l’étude des armes orientales*, Paris 1931, ii, pl. lxi) imply the existence of a native school of ivory carving.


**ADJA** and **SALMA**, the two main ranges of the central Arabian mountain group of Djabalā Tāyyī, modern al-Dijabal. An old tale of the type of “metaphor as punishment for sin” is attached to them; the tale is connected with reality insofar as Adja and Salma occur in Old Arabic and in early North Arabic dialects as personal names.—According to Ibn al-Kalbi’s “Book of Idols”, and one of the two versions in the *Djambara* by the same author, the God Fals/Fils/Fulus was worshipped in the guise of one of the clifs of Adja. This cult is probably of great antiquity, as the cult of a certain cliff (Ra’n) in the valley of al-Ola/Dēdān, in the 2nd century B.C., and later between 30 and 130 A.D., is attested by the evidence of some proper names. **Adja** and **Salma**, the two main ranges of the central Arabian mountain group of Djabal Tāyyī, modern al-Dijabal. An old tale of the type of “metaphor as punishment for sin” is attached to them; the tale is connected with reality insofar as Adja and Salma occur in Old Arabic and in early North Arabic dialects as personal names.—According to Ibn al-Kalbi’s “Book of Idols”, and one of the two versions in the *Djambara* by the same author, the God Fals/Fils/Fulus was worshipped in the guise of one of the clifs of Adja. This cult is probably of great antiquity, as the cult of a certain cliff (Ra’n) in the valley of al-Ola/Dēdān, in the 2nd century B.C., and later between 30 and 130 A.D., is attested by the evidence of some proper names.

**Bibliography:** W. Caskel, *Liyyan und Liyyanisch*, Köln and Opladen 1954; Ibn Hishām, 56; R. Kühne-Kleinberger, *Das Götzentuch*, R. al-Asnām, des Ibn al-Kalībī, Leipzig 1941, 61 f.; J. Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidentums*, 52 ff.; Yākūt, i, 122 ff., iii, 912. (W. Caskel) **'Adja** and **'Salma**, “marvels”, are in the first instance the marvels of antiquity. In addition, the term and its derivatives comprise, already in the Kur’ān, the marvels of God’s creation. **'Adja** and **'Salma** are thus any kind of casual data about extraordinary monuments, the three realms of nature and meteorological phenomena, and the two aspects under which they are viewed come from the Greek spirit on the one hand and the eastern biblical ideas on the other.

Islam, the continuator of the classical tradition as it was formulated in the East, was interested in exceptional monuments, but in a spirit different from that of the Greek. Among the surprising buildings described as marvellous by the Arab authors, the Pharaohs of Alexandria acquired great notoriety. The monument, described by them in greater detail than by the Greek and Latin authors, existed until the 8th/14th century and was erroneously attributed to Alexander the Great. In general the Macedonian king represented a universal symbol, a mixture of Greek conqueror and of the spirituality of the ancient Orient, and many famous monuments were attributed to him.

As to the marvels of God’s creation, these are no wanton inventions of fancy, but are often based on a minute and exact observation of nature. Thus in the *al-Hayawan* of Dībhīz, there are rudiments of “Darwinism”, and Abū Ḥāmid describes beavers’ dams, which he considers to be miraculous; Ibn al-Fakhrī gives an account of the phenomena of magnetic and electrical phenomena to be observed on a mountain near Āmid.

It was, however, inevitable that these two conceptions of the **'Adja** and **'Salma**, so different from the ideological point of view, should fuse together to give rise, especially in the Arabic geographical texts, to a peculiar literary genre. The **'Adja** and **'Salma** by the captain Buzurg b. Shāhiyār (q.v.) deserves to be mentioned in the first place by its early date and by its incontestable documentary value for its period. It starts with the statement: “God has divided the marvels of creation into ten parts, of which nine belong to the East, one to the other points of the compass. Of the nine parts belonging to the East, eight belong to India and China and one only to the other regions of the East...” The book consists of stories by the navigators of East Africa, India, and the islands of S.-E. Asia; some of them show an admixture of real observation while others can be explained only by study of the folklore of the people in question. While the marvels of far-away countries found their literary form already in the 4th/10th century, the curiosities of the various Islamic countries were only described in excursus in the geographical treatises (e.g. in al-Maqrīzī). It was only in the 6th/12th century that these isolated zoological, ethnological, archaeological etc. accounts acquired a particular literary form, especially through Abū Ḥāmid al-Gharānī (q.v.) who collected them in his *Tuhfat al-Adab*. The Arabic literature of the 4th/10th and 5th/11th centuries called “classical”, is characterized by an equilibrium between erudition and aesthetic creation. When this equilibrium was disturbed by the decadence of Arabic literature, the writers increasingly disregarded science; the **'Adja** and **'Salma** thus came into greater favour and reached their full development in the cosmographies of the 8th/14th century. The greatest
author of this period was al-Kazwini [q.v. whose work is divided into two parts: *adjal* al-Maklukdt, "The Marvels of Creation", and *Adjāl al-Bulūdūn", "The Monuments"; thus the best representative of the genre bears witness, centuries later, to the two forms of *adjal* mentioned above. At this epoch the cosmographical works increasingly neglect geography; what remains are collections of entertaining stories. It was also in this period that the Sindbād cycle, which is but a literary adaptation of the accounts of Buzurg b. Shahriyar, was introduced into it.

In the first centuries of the *hijra* the *adjal* were correctly situated in geographical space by those who observed them or by the authors who copied the former; this is also the case with the earlier Arab geographers and with Abu Ḥamīd. As the scientific interest decreased, however, and the popular interest in amusing literature grew, the data lost their precision and their exact geographical localization. The items of real knowledge acquired in Islam and unknown in antiquity recur in general in the descriptions of the *adjal*; yet these *adjal* acquire a particular role in the history of thought in that they transport us from tangible reality to the realm of fancy constituted by the oriental tales. Abu Ḥamīd, the precursor of the popular cosmographers, is one of the authors who had most influence on the Arabic and Persian writers in the age of decadence of Islamic literature in the late Middle Ages; it is not for nothing that his books were among the main sources of al-Kazwini. On the other hand it is through the popular cosmographies that the *adjal* stories sought an essential contribution of the Muslim genius to world literature in the form of the tales of the *Arabian Nights*.


---

ADJAL, the appointed term of a man's life or the date of his death; a topic regularly discussed in the earlier *kalām* along with that of *rizk* or sustenance. The idea that the date of a man's death is fixed presumably belongs to pre-Islamic thought. The word *adjal* is used in the Kur'ān in a variety of ways, e.g. for the date when the embryo emerges from the womb (xxii, 3), for the period Moses had to serve for his wife (xxviii, 28 f.), for the date when a debt is due (ii, 282), etc. In creating the heavens and the sun and moon, God fixed an *adjal* for them (xlvi, 3; xxix, 5 etc.); with this is connected the coming of the Last Day. More especially it is used for the term of existence decreed by God for communities (xxiii, 43 etc.) and for individuals (ix, 5 f.; vi, 2). This term is neither to be anticipated nor deferred; its fixity explains why the wicked are not punished at once. "No one has his life prolonged or no one has his life cut short except (as it is written) in a book of God's decrees" (xxxv, 12). The *adjal* is not shortened even through sinning (xxxv, 44, xlii, 13), while on the other hand it may be concluded that Muhammad presupposed the shortness of the *adjal* as a punishment, but it might be restored to the original length through repentance (xi, 3, xiv, 11). The Kur'ān very often emphasizes the expression of *adjal* as the irrevocable period of life assigned by God with the epithet *musamamā* (xxxix, 43; xl, 69, and elsewhere), "enunciated" (without ambiguity) "through a word which had proceeded from God" (xlii, 3); the same epithet is applied to the course of the unchangeably operating phenomena of nature (xxxi, 28, xxxv, 14, xxxix, 7). The decreed duration of the world is also often designated by the same formal expression (vi, 2, 61, xxxv, 44). One may notice in the commentaries to the Kur'ān the tendency to refer the *adjal* *musamamā*, where it is possible, to the period of the end of the world.

According to tradition (al-Bukhārī, *Kadar*, 1; Muslim, *Kadar*, 3 etc.) *adjal* and *rizk* are two of the four things determined for a man while he is in the womb. Some of the early Mu'tazīlīs apparently suggested that a man who met a violent death had not reached the term decreed for him by God. Perhaps they said this because they hesitated to ascribe the evil of killing to God, just as they did not assert that sustenance consisting of stolen goods came from God. In a passage like Kur'ān xli, 67, *adjal* is capable of being interpreted as natural term or, as they put it, "the time at which God knew the man would have died had he not been killed" (cf. *Ibnāna*). This view, however, offended the deep-rooted feeling that the date of death was fixed. Even Abu 'l-Hudhayl said that, if the man had not been killed then, he would have died in some other way. Al-Nāḍждīdīr insisted that, whatever the mode of death, a man died at his term; and he was followed by the opponents of the doctrine of *kadar*, including al-Asbārī. Al-Albānī tried to avoid ascribing evil to God by distinguishing between the death and the killing. No fresh points were raised after this, but the old points were frequently repeated by theologians. — The dogmatists discussed in connection with *adjal* also the question, in how far God lengthens or shortens the *adjal* as a reward for obedience or as a punishment of disobedience respectively, a question to which the answer results in the harmonizing interpretation of the Kur'ānic verses quoted above and puts the problem of *adjal* in the domain of the debates on *kadar* (q.v.). An aspect of the problem of *adjal* concerns the death of great masses by elementary catastrophes, war, persecution, etc.

Jewish religious philosophy treats the problem from the same point of view.


(I. Goldziher-W. Montgomery Watt)
'ADJALA, Arabic word borrowed from the North-Western Semitic languages (Hebrew 'agîlâh, Phoenician ʿgîl, Jewish-Aramaic ʿgâlāt, Syriac ʿgâlāt, Old Egyptian loan-word of the New Empire ʿgrt = *ʿgâlta, whence Coptic âûlûc). See references in L. Kohler, Lexikon der Väterischen Texte, Leiden 1953, 679), derived from a root denoting rotundity or swiftness. In Arabic, as in these languages, it designates wheeled vehicles (chariots, carts, wagons) drawn by animals; but in Arabic it is a generic term. It is for this reason that the use of these vehicles in the Islamic Orient will be treated here, if only in a fragmentary way.

Before Islam, the use of various kinds of cars (among them those termed 'agîlâh, etc., in the Semitic countries of the west and in Egypt) is well attested in the whole of the Near East (cf. e.g. V. Gordon Childes, Wheeled Vehicles, in A History of Technology, i, Oxford 1954; A. G. Barrois, Manuel d'archéologie biblique, ii, Paris 1953, 98-100, 233; A. Salonen, Die Landfahrzeuge des Alten Mesopotamiens, Helsinki 1951; Erman and Ranke, Ägyptien, Tübingen 1923, 584; P. Montet, La vie quotidienne en Égypte, Paris 1946, 169). In spite of the decline of the chariot of war as early as the Persian period (Salonen, 21), chariages are frequently mentioned in the same region during the Hellenistic and Roman periods (cf., e.g., for Egypt, C. Prévost, L'économie royale des Lagides, Brussels 1939, 214; W. E. Crum, A Coptic Dictionary, Oxford 1939, 26; Jewish texts in S. Kraus, Talmudische Archäologie, Leipzig 1910-2, ii, 336-8 and G. Dalman, Arbeite und Sitte in Palästina, ii, 115-7, iii, 58 f., 88-90, vi, 193 etc.). The same applies for pre-Islamic North Africa (R. Capot-Rey, Géographie de la Circulation, Paris 1946, 87).

In Islamic times, the texts concerning wheeled traffic seem much less frequent. The word 'agîlal occurs but rarely in the Middle Ages. None of the passages allows the technology of these vehicles to be determined; at the most they mention the animals which draw them. The lexicographers do not seem to deal with the subject. The reference in Kalâla wa-Damna (Cheikhho), 54, to a vehicle drawn by two oxen is derived from the Syriac carraige, which is written in Middle Arabic carraige; so that 'agîlal is derived from ʿgâlāt. In historical and geographical texts one comes across references, e.g. for Egypt, to such vehicles used for heavy loads (Umâyjâd period: Yâkût, i, 260; al-Masâlik (Murâdî, iii, 28 f.) in the 4th/10th century mentions large wagons drawn by buffalo in the Syrian jâbgh; 7th/13th century: Ibn Saʿyid, in al-Mâlikâr, Anâlecès, i, 691; for Morocco in the 8th/14th century: al-Dzamâ, Zakrât al-Ās (Bel), 27, transl. 69 f.).

Most of the references, however, concern vehicles used in exceptional circumstances, and which appeared to cause considerable astonishment. E.g. in 424/1035, a pilgrimage from Basra to the holy cities on an 'agîlal drawn by camels (Ibn Taghrîbîrî, Cairo, ii, 307); a few years later, an 'agîlal drawn by men, which carried the sick Ahmad b. Tûlûn from Antioch to Egypt (Ibn Abî Uṣaybîs, ii, 84); in 307/919 the large vehicles prepared in Baghdad for the public humiliation of the rebel Yûsûl b. Abî ʿSâdî (K. al-Ṣûyûnî, in Ibn Miskawayh, ed. Amelodroz, i, 49, n.). The Christians during their feasts used state carriages, e.g. in Edessa on the eve of the feast of the cross (Husayn b. Yâqûbî, in al-ʿUmrî, Mâskâlî, i, Cairo 1924, 265). The animals mentioned as drawing these vehicles, which were perhaps of very different shapes, are varied: horses of several breeds, camels, oxen, mules, donkeys, buffaloes, perhaps also elephants; as noted above, human traction also was used on occasion.

The word often serves to designate foreign vehicles: Byzantine racing chariots (Ibn Rusta, 120, Ibn Khuwarîdâbhîb, 112), wagons of the Christians of the Iberian peninsula (Ibn ʿIdhârî, iii, 86; Aghbar al-ʿAgir, ed. M. J. Müller, Die letzten Zeiten von Granada, Munich 1863, 44, transl. 147-8), later Turkish arabas.

In Muslim Iran, literary references to carriages (garden) seem to be equally rare (B. Spuler, Iran in fruhislamischer Zeit, Wiesbaden 1952, 428-9, notes no examples). Firdawsî, however, transposes into the world of myth wagons drawn by buffaloes or oxen (refl. in F. Wolff, Glossar zu Ferdosîs Schahname, Berlin 1935, s.v.). A wooden chariot used by Isfandîyâr (Shâh-nâmâsh (Mohîl), iv, 500-2, 510) is often shown in miniatures (e.g. Survey of Persian Art, v, 832 D; La guirlande de l'Iran, Paris 1948, 30), generally as a cart with two spokeed wheels drawn by a horse tied between two shafts. Persian miniatures occasionally show other illustrations of wagons: a four-wheeled wagon drawn by a horse (MS from Tabrîz, end of 7th/13th century, in E. Blochet, Musulman Painting, London 1929, pl. xii); a cart with two spokeed wheels drawn by a horse tied betwveen two shafts on which are carried materials for building a mosque (miniature of Bihzâd, A.D. 1457, in E. Kühnel, Miniatures in the Islamic Orient, Berlin 1922, pl. 51); a kind of yurt probably mounted on wheels, drawn by horses, and used to carry to Tabrîz the corpse of Ghâsân Khan in 703/1304 (MS of 9th/15th century, reproduced in E. Blochet, Les peintures des manuscrits de la Bibl. Nat., Paris 1914-20, pl. xix, cf. p. 272).

On the other hand, carts (bâgghî, later also arabâ, arabâ) were very frequently used by the Turco-Mongols of Central Asia until the 14th century, after which the economic decline of the nomad world led to a lessening of their use. Ibn Battûta, ii, 361, mentions them in Southern Russia. This vehicle, the name of which was arabicised as araiba and even ʿaraibiyâ ("Arabian"), was introduced in particular into Mamlûk Egypt (see araiba). Its name supplanted in popular use the word 'agîlal as a generic term for carriage; so that 'agîlal is used not only for modern Arabia, but also for modern Egypt as a name for bicycle. In turcised Anatolia the byzantine wagon (kâghmûn) remained in use.

The medieval situation survived in the countryside up to modern times. In Syria, Volney states in the 18th century: "It is noteworthy that in the whole of Syria no wagon or cart is seen; this is probably due to the fear lest they should be seized by the government's men and a heavy loss should be suffered in a moment" (Voyage en Egypte et en Syrie, Paris 1825, ii, 254). In Palestine, before the first world war, only Circassians and foreigners had peasant vehicles (Dalman, Arbeite und Sitte, ii, 96 and fig. 40-2; A. Ruppin, Syrien als Wirtschaftsgebiet, Berlin-Vienna 1920, 424-5). On the whole, the situation was the same all over the Near East, except in Anatolia. For Morocco at the beginning of the 20th century, see Ch. René-Leclerc, Le Maroc septentrional, Algiers 1905, 87, 251-2; idem, in Renseignements colonies, 1905, 248; R. Le Tourneau, Fès avant le Protectorat, Casablanca 1949, 415. Various explanations have been offered, the most common being the bad state and insecurity of the roads (K. Brunschvig, La berberie orientale sous le Hafsid, ii, 256; J. Weulersse, Paysans de Syrie et du Proche-Orient, Paris 1946, 133-6; cf. Mes, Renaissance, 461, Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. mus., ii, 98). Yet the comparison with the condition of the same countries
in antiquity and with the Turkish countries makes this an unsatisfactory explanation. The increasing scarcity of wood, due to the loss of forests, should perhaps be taken into consideration, and one could perhaps establish a parallel with the degeneration of the plough (cf. A. G. Haudricourt, *L’homme et la charrue*, in the press, and Mihrath). Also the improvement of transport due to the increasing use of the camel and the pack-saddle must be taken into account.

Nevertheless, sooner or later in the various countries, European vehicles were introduced, together with their usually Romance names (in Persia with a Russian name, kâleşe), but were often adapted to local techniques and customs. Restricted to urban, official and military use, to public transport (for Persia, numerous descriptions and illustrations in C. Anet, *La Perse en automobile*, Paris 1906, 122, 180, pl. 19, 25, 36, etc.), they rarely penetrated into the countryside. As early as the 17th century, the Murādī bāy of Tunis travelled in a karrūṣa (Italian carrozza) (Ibn Abī Dīnār, Munīs, Tunis 1286, 224); this word is now in common use in North Africa and is found even in Berber dialects (L. Brunot, *Textes arabes de Rabat*, ii, Paris 1952, 712). Similarly karrūṣa (Italian carrozza) is used in Algeria for carts and wagons (Dessauier, *Dict. pratique arabe-français*; Algiers 1931, 793); the word was already used, in the plural form karrūṣā, to designate Portuguese wagons in the 16th century, *Chronique anonyme de la dynastie sa’dienne* (Colin), 59. In Egypt, the *‘arabīyyat bâṣūr, “cab”*, (from Hungarian hinto through Turkish hinto, cf. F. Miklosich, *Sehīn*. Wien, 1885, 5, 1889, 8) and the *‘arabīyyat kârîr* (Italian carro) were used (V. A. C. G. Haudricourt, *L’Atlas paritaire de l’Égypte*, Milan 1913, 247: cf. Ahmad Amln, Kā 홈 al-*‘addī wa’l-Takdīd*, Cairo 1953, 333 and pi. xvii).


(M. Robinson)

*‘Adjala* — *‘Adjami oğlan*, a term, meaning “foreign boy”, applied to Christian youths enrolled for service as Ottoman kapî bâsîs [q.v.], originally, according to the Pencî hâdîn of 1362, by the reservation of one in every five of those taken prisoner of war, and later by dewzîrme [q.v.] conscription. They were first placed for from five to seven years at the disposal of feudal sipâhs and others in Anatolia, and later also in Rumelia, in order to learn Turkish and accustom themselves to Muslim usages, and then posted to the *‘adjami oğlaq* of Gallipoli and, after the conquest, to that of Istanbul, being simultaneously selected for subsequent service, according to their abilities, in the sultan’s palace or in one or other of the odâks of the standing army, infantry and cavalry, or of the bostândîs [q.v.] of Edirne and Istanbul. Their actual appointment—known as *kapîlyâ čâmâ*—to the palace service or these various corps was by seniority on the occurrence of vacancies.

After preliminary training at Ghalaşar Sarây or Ibrîhim Paşa Sarây in Istanbul or at Edirne, *‘adjami oğlaq* appointed to the sultan’s household (and hence thereafter called *iç oğlaq* or *iç aghas*) might gradually rise from its lowest bokhûsh or dormitory to the kâhs oda [q.v.], from the chief posts in which those who attained them might be appointed beylerbeys and servetsirs. The two most important standing cavalry regiments (sipâhs and stâhârs) were likewise recruited from among the *iç aghas*, the other four (*‘ölêfişis and ghrâbâ*) being recruited from among those *‘adjami oğlaq* who, though selected for the palace service, were not in the event appointed to it.

Most of the *‘adjami oğlaq* not chosen for the palace were destined for service as Janissaries (see Yeni ğerî), whether after preliminary service in the ojak of the bostândîs or by immediate admission into one of the thirty-four oras [q.v.], under the command of the Istanbul aghaş, which were reckoned as forming part of the Janissary ojak.

The gradual abandonment during the 17th
the disappearance of Ṣa'di, one of the subdivisions of the Nadjadat (q.v.). Ḡālib al-Kārim was a native of Balkh and was imprisoned by the governor of Ṣīrāq, Khālid al-Kasrī (105-20/724-38).

The main religious tenets attributed to the Ḡāribādīyya were: the exclusion from ʿĪlām (baraʿa) of children (even of one’s own, according to Ibn Ḥazm) until they grow up and become believers; the duty to invite them to embrace the true faith when they reach puberty. The conclusion that ʿĀṣira is a meritorious act, not a duty; the profession of friendship (wādiʿa) towards the quietists (al-ḥaḍāda); the affirmation that sūra x (surat al-Yūsūf), which by its frivolity could not be the word of God, did not belong to the ʿArafā.

The prosperity of the town seems to have been lost following the great Hiālī and Sulami invasion in the 5th/11th century. The travelers (al-ʿAbdārī, al-ʿAyyābī, al-Warthōbī) who passed Ḡālibādīyya on their way from the Maghrib to the East, describe it as a town long since ruined, without any vegetation in the vicinity, with only a few visible, but abandoned, vestiges of habitation. During the Turkish, and especially the Italian, occupation, Ḡālibādīyya became a small village, serving as a stage between Benghāzl and Misrāṭa.

Bibliography:
Yaʿkūb, Baghdād 1918, 102, transl. G. Wiet, 201; Ibn Ṣuṭrī, 344; Ibn Ḥawqal, 67; Bakrī, 5 (transl. 16); Yaḥūkī, Cairo, i, 121; Ṣadrī, Riḥla (MS), vol. i; Warthānī, Algiers 1908, 219 ff. (H. H. Aḥmad-Waḥab)

AL-ʿĀBDULLAH, Abu ʿL-ṢĀTĪR ṢABĪHLU, Arab poet of the Tamīl tribe, who resided mainly in al-Baṣra; it is probable that he was born during the caliphate of al-ʿUthmān (300/912-3) and died in 375/985. Little is known about his life, except that he had to joust with his Rūbā (q.v.)—is the constant and exclusive use of the ṭarjāt metre in poetical compositions marked by a very rich vocabulary and a laborious construction made more difficult by the poet’s respect for the rules of prosody and the unusual number of lines (239 in one urdūjī). His arādīt on the model of the pre-Islamic ʿaṣīdī generally comprise a traditional nāṣib (replaced in one case by religious subject-matter), then descriptions of the desert and the animals found there (camels, horses, onagers, wild bulls), and end with the panegyric of a man, of the poet himself, or his tribe. The Al-ʿĀbdārī never cultivated either the satire or the elegy. His praises are addressed to eminent personages such as Yazīd b. Muḥtār, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Marwān, Bishr b. Marwān, Sulaymān b. Ḥālid b. Yūsuf, Ṣāfī b. ʿUbayd Allāh b. Maʿṣūr, a b. al-Zubayr. The Arabic critics unanimously praise the verbal richness of al-ʿĀbdārī, whose verses are frequently cited by the lexicographers; but he was guilty of an exaggerated use of alliteration, and an excessive addiction to rare words.

(Ch. Pellat)

*ʿAdliyn*, district of Transjordania, bounded on the north by the Yarmūk, to the east by the Ḫammād, to the south by the Wādī al-Zārakṣ and to the west by the *Ghawr*, partly corresponding to the old territory of *Gilead*, and included in Roman times by the towns of the Decapolis. The name seems to be of Aramaic origin. A mountainous and wooded district, it was first called *Djaḥbal Djarash*, later *Djaḥbal Awf* from the name of the turbulent *ancient monastery* a fortress which was since then dedicated on the north by the Yarmūk, to the east by the *Hamad*, to the south by the Wadi al-Zarka, and a small township near *Fīl* [q.v.]. The principal town, which occupies the site of an ancient monastery, a fortress which was since then dedicated on the north by the Yarmūk, to the east by the *Hamad*, to the south by the Wadi al-Zarka, and a small township near *Fīl* [q.v.], was probably *Thamugaih* (56 ft. high) of seven pointed arches gives the central arch, which stands higher than the others, is surmounted by two small minarets for the *muʿadhthin* similar in style, like the rest of the mosque, to the *Kūṭh Minār* and mosque at Delhi. Constructed by Sultan Ilutmish (probably in place, or as an extension, of an earlier mosque started in 1200), it represents one of the finest examples of early Indo-Muslim architecture. Other monuments include a fortified palace built by Akbar, a garden laid by *Djaḥāṅgr*, and marble pavilions erected by Shāh *Djaḥān on the embankment of Anāṣṣagār.

History. Founded by the Ṛājīpūt Ṛājḍa Aḍjlāya Cāwānīn around 1100, Aḍjnīṃr was conquered by Muʿizz al-Dīn Muḥammad Qūṭ in 1192, and annexed to the Sultanate by Kūṭh al-Dīn Aybak in 1193. Shortly after 1398, the Ṛājīpūts of Māwār captured it, but in 1455 the Sultans of Mālwa ousted them and held the place till 1531, when Rājīdī Mālāvyā occupied it. Aḍjnīṃr was annexed by Akbar early in his reign and attached to a *ṣūba* of that name. Surrounded as it was by Ṛājīpūt principalities, and lying on the route to Mālwa and Guḍrā, the town soon became a strategic and trading centre; while Akbar's frequent visits to the shrine of Khāṣṣa Muʿīn al-Dīn made Aḍjnīṃr one of the most important places of pilgrimage. After 1721, it was occupied first by the Ṛājīpūts and then by the Mahrattas, who ceded it to the British in 1818.

*Bibliography*: *Imp. Gazetteer of India*, 1908, i, v; *Arch. Survey of India, Annual Reports*, ii and xxiii; H. B. Sarda, *Aḍjmīr, Indian Antiquary*, 1897, 162. (Nurul Hasan)

*Aḍjnādāyn*, the traditional name for the site of a battle fought in *Djumādā I or II, 13/July-August* 634, between the Muslim Arab invaders and the Greek defenders of Palestine. Although located by the literary sources between Ramla and Bayt Dibyn, no place of this name is attested by the geographers. On topographical grounds, the site of the battle was located by Menedikoff on the Wādī al-Ṣaṃt in the vicinity of the two villages of al-Djannābā (Gharbiyya and Sharldyya), 34° 57' E., 31° 41' N., from the dual form of which (al-Djannābatayn) the traditional name seems to have arisen by conflation with the Ar. plural *ajnād* ("armies"). The Greek forces were commanded by Theodorus, brother of the Emperor Heraclius; some early Arabic sources mention also a certain Arṭābdūn (? Aratyūn = Aretion). The Arab forces were composed of the three separate contingents which had been operating in Palestine and Transjordan (see *Abū Bakr*), temporarily united under the command (most probably) of Khālid b. al-Walīd [q.v.], who had reached Syria from the Euphrates three months before. (A less probable version represents *ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ as the commander of the joint forces.) The numbers of the combatants, especially on the Greek side, are highly exaggerated in the Arabic sources; and it is probable that in reality the forces on either side scarcely reached 10,000 men. The Greek army was severely defeated and withdrew to Damascus, leaving the whole of the coast of Palestine open to the invaders, who again broke up into separate columns, until a further attempt by the Greek command to establish a defensive position at Fīl [q.v.] led to the renewed junction of their forces six months later.
Fig. 1. Plaquette from casket, Syria or Mesopotamia (Museo Nazionale, Florence). Photo: Alinari.

Fig. 2. Painted casket (Victoria and Albert Museum, London). Crown Copyright.

Fig. 3. Carved casket, Cuenca; enamel mount added in Christian Spain, 12th century (Museo Arqueológico, Burgos).
Fig. 1. Carved casket, Cordova. Courtesy of the Hispanic Society of America.

Fig. 2. Carved casket, Cordova (Victoria and Albert Museum, London). Crown Copyright.

Fig. 3. Intarsia panel from Kāʾitbay’s minbar (Victoria and Albert Museum, London). Crown Copyright.

(H. A. R. Gibb)

**ADJNADAYN — CADL**

In a great number of *kūrān*ic passages, *adīr* denotes the reward, in the world to come, for pious deeds. This concept seems to derive from Christian rather than from Jewish sources, and it has become one of the fundamental ideas of practical ethics in Islam. According to *kūrān*, vi, 160, ten good deeds are credited for each one accomplished, though the term *adīr* does not occur here. It is often stated in traditions that the well-intentioned, though imperfect, fulfilment of religious obligations gives right to one reward, whereas their successful accomplishment is rewarded twice or several times. The fulfilment of the religious duty of *idāfah* ([c.v.], and of the parallel duty of giving judgment according to religious law, in particular, entitles the judge to be rewarded twice or several times. The adjective is also employed substantively; it then means a *person* of good morals (pl. *adāl*).

*Adāl* enters into various juridical categories. In the theory of public law, *adāla* is one of the principal conditions for carrying out public functions recognized by the doctrine of the School. But it is in private law, in the theory of evidence, that the idea has been most fully developed and involves a most detailed system of regulations. The witness must be *adāl*; it suffices, however, that his *adāla* should be substantiated at the time when his evidence is given and not at the time of his observation of the fact in question. It is a disputed point, nevertheless, whether the witness is presumed to have *adāla* so long as it is not contested by the adversary, or whether, even if it is not called in question, it should be the subject of verification. The latter course has prevailed in practice and in doctrine. Consequently a procedure has been evolved for substantiation of the *adāla* of witnesses; it is known as *tazkiya* or *ta'dil*. In the latest stage of the law, this procedure involves two phases. In the first, the judge proceeds to a secret investigation, by sending a question in a sealed envelope to qualified persons; this is *al-tazkiya al-sirāyya*. It is afterwards necessary, in certain cases, for these persons to appear at the public hearing to confirm their former attestation; this is *al-tazkiya al-`aldniyya*. The substantiation of the *adāla* of a witness is called *ta'dil*; contestation of this *adāla* is called *gāhr*. However, the *tazkiya* procedure is not used exclusively as an accessory or as incidental to a law-suit. It functions also independently and as an end in itself, for recognizing in a positive and final manner the quality of *adāla* in given persons. Because of the small reliance placed on writing, as such, once its use became widespread, recourse was had, in order to give it once and for all conclusive force, to the procedure of testimonial proof. However, this method was not altogether reliable, for the witnesses of the instrument could always themselves be challenged on the ground of lack of *adāla*. This difficulty was overcome by the use of a preliminary *tazkiya*; the judge recognizes once and for all the *adāla* of a certain number of persons, who thus become in principle irreproachable witnesses, and has numerous applications. However, agreement has never been reached on a definition of the term, as the Mālikite jurist Ibn Rushd observes. Furthermore, the various definitions that have been formulated are too comprehensive and imprecise. In al-Māwardi's definition, *adīla*, the quality of *adāl*, is described as a state of moral and religious perfection. For Ibn Rushd it consists in not committing major sins, and also avoiding minor ones. But another author observes that such a state can be found only very exceptionally, in the saints; that *adīla* simply describes the state of a person who in general obeys the moral and religious law. This last conception is the one that came to be finally accepted. In the latest stage of Muslim law, as it appears in the codification undertaken in the Ottoman empire about the middle of the 19th century, the following definition is given: "The *adīl* person is one in whom good impulses prevail over bad" (*Magāsila* art. 1705). In short, one can translate *adīl* by “person of good morals”, with the essentially religious sense that this has in Islam. Whether this quality must be a natural inclination, innate or acquired, or whether it is sufficient for it to be achieved by an effort of will, is however a theoretically disputed point.—The antonym of *adīl* is *fāsik*.
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ADRAR, Berber geographical term meaning "mountains" and applied to a number of mountainous regions of the Sahara.

1. Adrar, 650 km to the south-east of Colomb-Béchar, capital of the Tawât (Touat) and main ksar (baştı) of the tribe of Timmi.

The centre of Adrar, on its present site, dates from the French conquest (30 July 1900). Since that time, the town developed as an administrative and commercial centre. In 1951, Adrar had 1,795 inhabitants.

Agriculture plays but a small part in the life of the baştı. Craftsmanship (fabrication of woolen and cotton wall covers called dokhali) is in decadence. The main role was always played by commerce, but the caravan traffic to the Sûdân (dates, tobacco) and to the oases of Algeria (skins, butter, live sheep) has greatly diminished owing to the competition of motor transport.


2. ADRAR OF THE IFOGHAS, an ancient massif in the southern Sahara (Sûdân), between 21° and 18° N, 30° and 3° E. Like the Ahaggar range of which it is an extension, it is made up of crystalline rocks of the pre-Cambrian age, but there is no trace of recent volcanic action.

The monsoon rains from the Gulf of Guinea come annually to the Adrar of the Ifoghas (Kidal: 123 mm.) and the vegetation already approximates to that of the coastal region, at least in the valleys; but the water points are rare because of the impermeability of the soil.

The massif is inhabited by Tuareg tribes, among which the noble tribe of Kidal, that of the Ifoghas, supplies the amenokal [g.v.]; by extension, the name Ifoghas is applied to all the tribes who inhabit the Adrar and its confines. In 1949 the subdivision of Kidal had 14,574 inhabitants, all nomads, breeding camels, oxen, and sheep. They nomadize close to the massif, but go to Tidikelt and Tawût (Touat), crossing the Tanzerift, to sell their sheep. The principal administrative centre is Kidal (683 inhabitants); not far from there the ruins of the ancient Songhay town of al-Sûk (Es Souq, Tademkett) can still be seen.


3. ADRAR OF MAURETANIA (also called Adrar Tmar to distinguish it from the Adrar of the Ifoghas).

A group of plateaus in the southern Sahara between 19° and 23° N, 10° and 15° 30' W, having a surface of 150,000 sq. km. These plateaus are formed by sedimentary layers, gravel, schist and limestone...
and are limited by graded slopes which overlook schistous depressions followed by wadis or traced by sebkhas; the main slope, the Qarār, reaches the height of 830 m.

By the scanty rainfall (81 mm. in Atar, 52 in Chinguitti), the absence of permanent drainage, the steppe vegetation consisting of thorny shrubs, the Adrar forms part of the desert. Nevertheless, the climate, the hydrography and the vegetation have features which are different form those of the Sahara. In the summer the humid air of the Gulf of Guinea invades the Adrar and tornadoes occur in July and August; the wadis flow and fill the closed depressions called gra’ir.

The first inhabitants of the Adrar were the Bafur about whom one knows scarcely more than that the Adrar was called by the Portuguese, as late as the 16th century, “Mountains of the Bafur”. From the 10th century, the Lamtuna [q.v.] penetrated into the Adrar and their chief Abū Bakr b. ʿUmār made himself master of Shinkīt [q.v.]; modern Chinguitti) and finally of Ghāna, though this conquest did not last. Three centuries later the Maʿṣilī [q.v.], driven by the first Marinids, retraced the steps of Abū Bakr and subjugated the Berber tribes. The maraboutic movement of the 15th century also contributed to the arabization of the western Sahara. At this period arose the hierarchical organization characteristic of the society of Mauretania; at the summit of the scale the warriors (Hasan), descendants of the Arab conquerors, followed by the Marabouts (Zwayā) and the Tributaries (Zenaga), both Berbers; finally the Ḥarkīn, the slaves and smiths, Bafur, negroes or of mixed-race. This organization survived up to the French penetration. In 1909 the Adrar was occupied by the column of Gouraud. In 1932 the amir of the Adrar rebelled and the region was only pacified two years later.

Animal breeding is the main source of livelihood. Warriors, Marabouts and Tributaries possess numerous herds of camels and sheep, which disperse during the cool season in the ergs, while in the summer they are assembled near the wells or graze in the coastal zone. Agriculture assumes two forms: raising of sorghum and water-melon in the graras, after the harvest, of millet, corn and barley under the palm-trees in irrigated gardens; the dates, harvested in July (gatna), are the object of a lively trade. There are a number of small oases, Azougui, Ksar Torchane, Toungad, Oujeft, Chunguiti, which used to be a religious and intellectual centre, the (gatna), harvested in July and August; the wadis flow and fill the closed depressions called gra’ir.

The first inhabitants of the Adrar were the Bafur about whom one knows scarcely more than that the Adrar was called by the Portuguese, as late as the 16th century, “Mountains of the Bafur”. From the 10th century, the Lamtuna [q.v.] penetrated into the Adrar and their chief Abū Bakr b. ʿUmār made himself master of Shinkīt [q.v.]; modern Chinguitti) and finally of Ghāna, though this conquest did not last. Three centuries later the Maʿṣilī [q.v.], driven by the first Marinids, retraced the steps of Abū Bakr and subjugated the Berber tribes. The maraboutic movement of the 15th century also contributed to the arabization of the western Sahara. At this period arose the hierarchical organization characteristic of the society of Mauretania; at the summit of the scale the warriors (Hasan), descendants of the Arab conquerors, followed by the Marabouts (Zwayā) and the Tributaries (Zenaga), both Berbers; finally the Ḥarkīn, the slaves and smiths, Bafur, negroes or of mixed-race. This organization survived up to the French penetration. In 1909 the Adrar was occupied by the column of Gouraud. In 1932 the amir of the Adrar rebelled and the region was only pacified two years later.

Animal breeding is the main source of livelihood. Warriors, Marabouts and Tributaries possess numerous herds of camels and sheep, which disperse during the cool season in the ergs, while in the summer they are assembled near the wells or graze in the coastal zone. Agriculture assumes two forms: raising of sorghum and water-melon in the graras, after the harvest, of millet, corn and barley under the palm-trees in irrigated gardens; the dates, harvested in July (gatna), are the object of a lively trade. There are a number of small oases, Azougui, Ksar Torchane, Toungad, Oujeft, Chunguiti, which used to be a religious and intellectual centre, the (gatna), harvested in July and August; the wadis flow and fill the closed depressions called gra’ir.

The first inhabitants of the Adrar were the Bafur about whom one knows scarcely more than that the Adrar was called by the Portuguese, as late as the 16th century, “Mountains of the Bafur”. From the 10th century, the Lamtuna [q.v.] penetrated into the Adrar and their chief Abū Bakr b. ʿUmār made himself master of Shinkīt [q.v.]; modern Chinguitti) and finally of Ghāna, though this conquest did not last. Three centuries later the Maʿṣilī [q.v.], driven by the first Marinids, retraced the steps of Abū Bakr and subjugated the Berber tribes. The maraboutic movement of the 15th century also contributed to the arabization of the western Sahara. At this period arose the hierarchical organization characteristic of the society of Mauretania; at the summit of the scale the warriors (Hasan), descendants of the Arab conquerors, followed by the Marabouts (Zwayā) and the Tributaries (Zenaga), both Berbers; finally the Ḥarkīn, the slaves and smiths, Bafur, negroes or of mixed-race. This organization survived up to the French penetration. In 1909 the Adrar was occupied by the column of Gouraud. In 1932 the amir of the Adrar rebelled and the region was only pacified two years later.

Animal breeding is the main source of livelihood. Warriors, Marabouts and Tributaries possess numerous herds of camels and sheep, which disperse during the cool season in the ergs, while in the summer they are assembled near the wells or graze in the coastal zone. Agriculture assumes two forms: raising of sorghum and water-melon in the graras, after the harvest, of millet, corn and barley under the palm-trees in irrigated gardens; the dates, harvested in July (gatna), are the object of a lively trade. There are a number of small oases, Azougui, Ksar Torchane, Toungad, Oujeft, Chunguiti, which used to be a religious and intellectual centre, the (gatna), harvested in July and August; the wadis flow and fill the closed depressions called gra’ir.
having overcome Abū Taghlib, ʿAḍūd al-Dawla determined on ensuring the subservience of all these, sending two expeditions against ʿImaraʾs son and successor al-Ḥasan, which resulted in the following year in his agreeing to pay tribute, and another against the sons of Ḥasanawayh, who had also died in the interval. On his addressing a letter of admonishment to Fakhhr al-Dawla, moreover, the latter replied with such truculence as to prompt ʿAḍūd al-Dawla to lead a force in person into the Ḏihat against him; on which so many of Fakhhr al-Dawla’s supporters deserted him that he fled to Karzin, whence he entered into a compact with Kābūs to oppose ʿAḍūd al-Dawla with Sāmānīd help, and moved to Nīshāpūr to obtain it. Whilst on this expedition ʿAḍūd al-Dawla fell gravely ill with epilepsy, and though he was able to reduce all the local Ḥasanawayhīd fortresses, he was then obliged to return to Baghdād. Finding, however, that, in contrast to Fakhhr al-Dawla, his other brother, Muʿyāyīd al-Dawla, was ready to acknowledge his suzerainty, he first conferred on him the government of Hamadān and Nīshāwand, and in 371/981, after receiving a defiant reply to his approaches from Kābūs, secured from the caliph a commission for Muʿyāyīd al-Dawla to replace Kābūs as governor of Tabaristān and Ḏūrdān. Muʿyāyīd al-Dawla, in due course drove Kābūs from both these provinces; and though Kābūs and Fakhhr al-Dawla obtained Sāmānīd assistance, they failed to dislodge him as long as ʿAḍūd al-Dawla and he remained alive.

In the last years of his reign ʿAḍūd al-Dawla was involved in negotiations with both the Byzantines and the Fāṭimidis. In 369/980 the rebel commander Basaras Sclerus sought refuge in Dīyāt Bāk and solicited ʿAḍūd al-Dawla’s support; but on the arrival in Baghdād of an embassy from Constantinople, to which a favourable reply was sent by the hand of the ḏābi Abū Bakr al-Bakillānī, ʿAḍūd al-Dawla not only refused it but held the rebel and some of his relatives captive for the rest of his reign. In the same year there likewise arrived in the capital an envoy from the Fāṭimid al-ʿAzīz, who had been disturbed at rumours that ʿAḍūd al-Dawla intended invading Egypt—a project that he in fact abandoned only because of his preoccupation with the defiance of Fakhhr al-Dawla and Kābūs, but which, despite ʿAḍūd al-Dawla’s eventual assurances of his good will, continued up to his death to occasion alarm in Čaʿīr.

ʿAḍūd al-Dawla’s death occurred in his forty-eighth year on 8 Shawwāl 372/26 March 983 at Baghdād, by which date he had not only united all the territory ever held by princes of his family in a single dominion, but had greatly enlarged it by the various conquests referred to above. He is generally regarded, with justice, as the greatest amīr of the Buwayhid dynasty, whose power reached its zenith after his acquisition of al-Ṭāʾīk. He then exacted from the caliph al-Tāʾīk, who married his daughter, various privileges not enjoyed by his predecessors in the amirate, namely designation by a second imāb, Tāḏi al-Milla; the introduction of his name after that of the caliph into the makhra; and the beating of drums before the entrance to his palace at the hours of prayer. These distinctions were well deserved. ʿAḍūd al-Dawla had been early instructed in the duties of monarchy by his father’s wāṣir Abū ʿl-Ḥaḍr b. ʿAmīd; and first in Fārs, and later in the other provinces which he acquired, he not only introduced such security and administrative order as had long been unknown in them, but exerted himself in the construction of public works, of which the most notable were the Band-i Amīr, a barrage across the river Kīr in Fārs, and the hospitals, called ʿAḍūd after him, in Shīrāz and Baghdād. To Baghdād indeed he restored much of its lost prosperity and magnificence. He also built a new mausoleum over the supposed grave of ʿAll b. Abī Taḥlib at Nāḍjīf, where he himself was buried. For various references to other buildings etc. of his, see in particular the indices to the Fārs-nāma of “Ibn al-Balajh” and al-Maḏkīsit and for references to his library at Shīrāz see both al-Maḏkīsit, 499 and Yākūt, Irštād, v, 446. ʿAḍūd al-Dawla was a liberal, though exacting, patron of the learned and of poets, including al-Mutanabbi, and himself wrote verse, some of which is quoted by al-Thaʿlībī in the Yūṭim al-Dbr. A convincing account of his character, daily life, and methods of government, is supplied by al-Rūḍūrwarī, iii, 30 f.

Bibliography: Miskawayh, Tahḏīb al-Umn, continued by Abū Shujī’s Rūḥ al-Rahīrārī (text and transl. in The Eclipse of the Abbasid Caliphate by Amedroz and Margoliouth), index; Maḏkīsit and Ibn Ḥawkal, indices; Utbi, Yaminī, i, 105-30 (citing the Tāḏī of Ibn Ḥaḍrīm b. Ḥilāl al-Sabī), the Fārs-nāma index; Ibn al-Aḍūr, index; Ibn al-Kaḏībī, Dhikr Tāḏī b. kufr (Amedroz), index; Ibn Khallikān, no. 543 (transl. de Slane, ii, 481 f.); Yākūt, Irštād, i, ii, iv, indices; cf. also buwayhīds. (H. Bowen)

ʿAḍūd al-Dīn, Abū’l-Faraḍī Muhammad b. ʿAbū Allāh, of the family of Ibn Muslima [q.v.], held the office of wāṣir dīr under al-Mustandīd until he had the latter assassinated in the bath and homage paid to al-Mustandī (566/1170). He was appointed vizier by the latter, but one year later he was dismissed and shortly afterwards re-established in his office. When ʿAḍūd al-Dīn prepared himself for the pilgrimage to Mecca in 573/1178 he was killed by the Ismāʿīls. — Ibn al-Taʿwīnsīhī [q.v.] was one of the poets who glorified him.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Aḍūr, xi, 219 ff.; Fakhri (Aḥwardī), 357 ff. ʿAḍūd al-Dīn [see al-Iṣīj].

Adultery [see zīnā].

Adwiya, pl. of adwiya, every substance which may affect the constitution of the human body, every drug used as a remedy or a poison. In accordance with Greek ideas, Muslim pharmacologists distinguished between simple drugs, adwiya mufrada (fāʿīma ḵalīlaughter) and compound drugs, adwiya muʿarrafika (fāʿīma ḵalīlaughter) and mineral (maʿdīnīyya).

Like medicine in general, Muslim pharmacology depends on Greek learning. An element of Persian tradition is also revealed in the pharmacological nomenclature. In many cases these Persian names of plants and drugs, some of them still in use (see e.g. Ahmed Issa Bey, Dictionnaire des noms des plantes, Cairo 1930) may date from the time of the celebrated medical school of Djiundisbūr, where Greek science flourished on Persian soil. This learning began to exercise an effective influence on the Muslims in the year 148/765, when the caliph al-Maṣrūq summoned to attend him the chief physician of the hospital of Djiundisbūr, Djiundisbū of the family of Bukhtyashîgī. Greek pharmacological learning was transmitted through Syriac translations of the fundamental works of Dioscorides, Galen, Orbiāsius and Paul of Aegina.
For the history of the Arabic translation of the *Materia Medica* of Dioscorides, see DIYUSKURIDIS. The Dioscoridean idea, clearly expressed by the great Iranian scientist al-Biruni in his pharmacological work cited below, that, theoretically, every plant had some medicinal virtue, whether actually known or not, caused pharmacological writers to include in their works plant descriptions which had a purely botanical interest, derived especially from Abû Hanîfa al-Dinawari. There is thus in Muslim tradition no clear difference between *materia medica* or works on *al-Adwiyah al-Mufrada* etc., and botany, *Nabût* (*q.v.*).

According to the autobibliographical *risâla* of Ḥunayn b. Isḥâq (*Über die syrischen und arabischen Galen-Übersetzungen*, (Bergstrasser), no. 53), the first five *makdâlât* of the *Book of Simple Drugs of Galen* were translated into Syriac, rather unsatisfactorily, by Yûsuf al-Khûrî, later on by Ayyûb (Job of Edessa, about A.D. 765–855), and, finally, in an abridged form (?) by Ḥunayn himself, who also made an Arabic translation of the text; of the second part a Syriac translation made by Sergius (Sargis of Rish'aynî, d. 536; a MS of the text in Brit. Mus., 1004) was corrected by Ḥunayn and turned into Arabic by his nephew Ḥubaysh. The *Book of Compound Drugs* also was translated into Syriac by Sergius and Ḥunayn, then into Arabic by Ḥubaysh; Ḥunayn, op. cit., no. 79. The synopsis and the *Ad Eunapium* of Oribasius were translated (into Arabic?) by Ḥunayn, who translated also, together with Ḥusâbî Yahyâ, into Syriac the first part of the *Collections* (= *al-Kunnâd al-Kabîr* mentioned by Ibn Abî Usaybi'â, i, 107). These translations are lost but frequently quoted by later authors.

The *Pragmatia* of Paul of Aegina was highly appreciated by Muslim physicians, who used an (abridged?) translation of its seven books by Ḥunayn (*al-Kunnâd al-Kabîr*), *Fihrist* 293; *Kunnâd al-Thurâyyâ*, Ibn Abî Usaybi'â, i, 103). Apart from small fragments no manuscript survives in Arabic, but there are frequent quotations in the works of later authors.

According to Bar Hebraeus (*The Chronography*, transl. by E. A. W. Budge, Oxford 1932,57), Aḥron the priest wrote his medical.pandect in Greek, and his work was translated into Syriac. An Arabic translation was made by Mâṣârdîjî (Mâṣârdîjâwî). The *Kunnâd* of Aḥron *al-kabîr* is often quoted by pharmacological writers, and its author had a great reputation as a scholar (*Dîhîz, al-Hayawân*; Cairo 1356, i, 250). Mâṣârdîjî/Mâṣârdîjâwî (see Steinschneider, in *ZDMG*, 1899, 428–34), the first translator of medical works into Arabic, was also the author of two books, one on food and the other on simples (*al-Akâshîr*), perhaps identical with the two *makdâlât* added to his translation of Aḥron (cf. Ibn al-Khîfî, 80).

After the time of Ḥunayn, pharmacology rapidly developed in the Eastern countries of the Muslim world. About a hundred Arabic authors on *materia medica* are mentioned in the bibliographical works of Ibn al-Nâdim, Ibn Abî Usaybi'â and Ibn al-Khîfî. Some thirty are represented by manuscripts in Eastern and Western libraries. Only a few of these works have been studied by Western scholars. For the history of the Greek text of Galen etc. these Arabic texts will certainly prove to be of importance.

In the course of time, many hundreds of names of simple drugs, not known to the Greeks, were incorporated in the body of learning transmitted by the Greeks to their Arab and Persian disciples. (For a preliminary list of such drugs see L. Leclerc, *Histoire de la médecine arabe*, Paris 1876, ii, 232–3.) Serious confusion in terminology inevitably followed from the great influx of names of Arabic, Iranian, Greek and Indian names of plants and drugs which were current in theory and practice. In the course of time many works were written with the purpose of determining their true significance and of putting together synonyms. For practical purposes the translation of Dioscorides made in Baghhdâd was of little use to readers, as long as the Greek names were for the most part only transliterated in Arabic characters. Arabic equivalents were introduced into the text by Spanish scholars in the middle of the roth century. About the same time the Arab translator of the Syriac *Kunnâdât* of Yûbânnâ b. Sarâbiyûn (Serapion, Ibn Abî Usaybi'â, i, 109) gave Arabic equivalents to the great number of Greek and Syriac names of simples contained in that work (MS Aya Sofiya 3716; P. Guiges, *Les noms arabes dans Sârâpión*, JA, 1905–6). One of the oldest prose works written in Persian is the *al-Abnîsî 'an Hašâbbî al-Adwiyah* of Abû Maṣûr Muwaffak b. 'All al-Harawi explaining, in alphabetical order, the Arabic, Persian, Syriac and Greek names of 584 different simples (ed. F. R. Seligmann, Vienna 1893; German transl. by A. C. Achundow, Dorpat 1893).

The most interesting work on pharmacological synonyms written in the East is certainly that of al-Bîrûnî (361/972–1048), *al-Seydana il-Tibb* (M. Meyerhof, *Das Vorwort zur Drogenkunde des Beruni*, Quellen und Studien zur Gesch. der Naturwiss. und der Med.*, iii, Berlin 1933; idem, BIB, 1940, 133 ff., 157 ff.). Apart from two MSS of a Persian translation, this work has come down to us in a single, mutilated MS in Brusa, representing the author's rough draft of the work, probably written in his old age and never completed by him. In its unfinished condition it contains 720 articles, in the common order of the Arabic alphabet, dealing with vegetable, animal and mineral simples with numerous remarks on their names in Greek, Syriac, Persian and other Iranian languages, philological notes on the meaning of plant names and their synonyms used in Arabic poetry, and copious quotations from medical and botanical works (many of them quite unknown to us) on the quality and origin of the drug, its substitutes (*abdîl*) etc. This work certainly deserves further study.

Among the numerous works on medicine written in the East and containing also chapters on pharmacology only the most important can be mentioned here. The *Firdaws al-Ilkâm* of All b. Rabban al-Tabarî, written in 235/850 (ed. M. Z. Siddiqi, Berlin 1928), quotes the translations of Ḥunayn and his disciples and is of special interest as aiming to introduce also Indian medicine (*cf. A. Siggel, in Abh. der Akad. der Wiss. und Lit.*, Berlin 1950). The large medical encyclopaedia (*al-Hawi*) of Abû Bakr al-Râzî (250/864–925) describes and names of drugs. The corresponding chapter in the immense *al-Kânûn il-Tibb* of Ibn Sinâ (Bûlûk 1294) treats of eight hundred remedies. The 10th book of *Dakhîhâ-ya Khârîmgihsî* (not yet printed), a medical encyclopaedia written by Zayn al-Dîn Isamî al-Dîjurdjânî in the 6th/12th century, contains a special treatise on the names of drugs and their operation.

In very many cases the descriptions of Dioscorides, Abû Ḥanîfa al-Dinawari, etc., were certainly inadequate for the recognition of the plant. Thus, in the
absence of technical terminology — a want shared by Muslim as well as ancient science — it was a most valuable device to depict the plants in figures.

In ancient time this method was introduced by the "zhizotomist" Crateusus (1st century B.C.), and a part of the synonyms and figures of his herbal passed into the recension of Dioscorides represented by the Juliana Anicia codex of A.D. 512 (in which later hands introduced also Arabic synonyms). It was the gift of an illustrated Dioscorides by the Byzantine Emperor to Abd al-Rahman III in Cordova in the year 948 that inspired a new and most fruitful study of the text in Spain. (For illustrated MSS of Dioscorides see divyuskurdis.) By Ibn Abi Ujaylif (ii, 216-9) we are told that his teacher Râshîd al-Din al-Manșur b. al-Sûrî (d. 639/1241) prepared a herbal illustrated with figures depicted from living plants.

For the botanical chapter of Ibn Fadîl Allah, see B. Farès, Un Herbar arabë illustré du XIV siècle, Archéologie Orientale in Memoriam E. Herzfeld, 1952, 84 ff.

The Muslim inhabitants of the Iberian Peninsula were the inheritors of a country famous in antiquity for its wealth of minerals and plants useful for preparing remedies. At first, pharmacological knowledge in Spain was, however, an import from the Orient, and Western students went to Bagdad for medical studies. A strong impulse to pharmacological studies in Spain was given by the revised text of Dioscorides introduced by A. al-Bustani, Tangier 1939.

In a vast encyclopaedia, al-Djumîdî li-Muwaradî al-Adwîya wa'l-oghîdîya (bad edition of the Arabic text, Bûlak 1921); French transl. by L. Leclerc, Notices et Extraits de la Bibliothèque Nationale, xxii, xxv, xxvi, xxx, 1877-93, Ibn al-Baytâr (d. 646/1248) put together all information available to him, quoting about 150 previous authors from Dioscorides to his own teacher, Abu'l-Abbâs al-Nabâtî, whose Rûhâ, or "Botanical Journey," he often quotes. Most of these works Ibn al-Baytâr certainly knew from secondary sources, al-Ghafîkî above all. In 2324 articles the Djamît treats of about 1400 different drugs and plants, 400 of which were not different drugs and plants, 400 of which were not.

To these works, written in the West, containing descriptions of the drugs and directions for their use, may be added also a number of others, containing lists of synonyms written in order to explain the meaning of the different names given to simples and drugs. Such are e.g. the Sharh Asmâ’ al-Ukhâr of the famous Jewish theologian, philosopher and physician Mîsâ b. Maymûn (Maimonides, A.D. 1135-1204), ed. M. Meyerhof, Cairo 1940, and the anonymous Tuhfat al-Ukhâr, ed. H. P. J. Renaud and G. S. Colin, Rabat 1934, treating especially of the names current in Morocco and written probably in the 18th century.

Bibliography: M. Meyerhof, in the introduction to Maimonides, Sharh Asmâ’ al-Ukhâr; for a list of drugs, M. Steinschneider, Heilmitelnamen der Araber, WZKM, x1 (2043 items). (B. Lewin)

AF'â means not only the viper, as it is commonly assumed, but also other similar kinds of snakes (Nâdeke, in Wiedemann, 272). The descriptions, however, which are given in Arabic zoological works (spotted or speckled, broad head, slender neck, short tail, sometimes furnished with two horns, etc.) fit well with specific kinds of vipers (echis carinatus, echis coloratus, aspis cerastes cerastes). Most sources state that af’d denotes the female, whereas the male is called af‘awân. The first term, however, is always employed in a generic sense. Corresponding forms in Hebrew and Ethiopian suggest that the word belongs to the oldest stock of the Semitic languages.

The af’d is often mentioned in Arabic literature, from ancient poetry, proverbs and hadith down to those later works in which zoology and zoological items are treated systematically. In ancient poetry it is represented as the emblem of the mortal enemy, of one who seeks revenge for murder. Its noxiousness is illustrated by the proverb: "He who has been stung by an af’d is afraid to take hold of a rope". Rich information is offered by al-Dîhîgî. The af’d had a market value since theriac was prepared from it. Certain people made a living from this trade importing the af’d chiefly from Siđjîstân. In al-Dîhîgî’s time thirty af’d sold for two dinârs. With certain Bedouins the af’d was sold as food, and this habit was satirically alluded to by some poets.

A good deal of information on the af’d is fabulous: e.g., that it lives to an age of a thousand years, that it becomes blind and recovers its sight after sixty years, that it becomes blind and recovers its sight after sixty years, that it is represented as the emblem of the mortal enemy, of one who seeks revenge for murder. Its noxiousness is illustrated by the proverb: "He who has been stung by an af’d is afraid to take hold of a rope". Rich information is offered by al-Dîhîgî. The af’d had a market value since theriac was prepared from it. Certain people made a living from this trade importing the af’d chiefly from Siđjîstân. In al-Dîhîgî’s time thirty af’d sold for two dinârs. With certain Bedouins the af’d was sold as food, and this habit was satirically alluded to by some poets.

A good deal of information on the af’d is fabulous: e.g., that it lives to an age of a thousand years, that it becomes blind and recovers its sight after sixty years, that it is represented as the emblem of the mortal enemy, of one who seeks revenge for murder. Its noxiousness is illustrated by the proverb: "He who has been stung by an af’d is afraid to take hold of a rope". Rich information is offered by al-Dîhîgî. The af’d had a market value since theriac was prepared from it. Certain people made a living from this trade importing the af’d chiefly from Siđjîstân. In al-Dîhîgî’s time thirty af’d sold for two dinârs. With certain Bedouins the af’d was sold as food, and this habit was satirically alluded to by some poets.

Bibliography: Abû Hayyân al-Tawhîdî, Imdâd, 1, 160, 174, 192; Damirâ, s.v. (transl. Jayakar, i, 56-8); Dîhîgî, Hayawân, index; Ibn al-Athîr, Nikâyâ, i, 44; Ibn al-Baytâr, Dîjâmît,

(L. Kopp)

AFĀMIYA, or FĀMIYA, the Seleucid city of Apamea on the right bank of the Orontes (ʿAshī), at its northward bend 25 m. N.W. of Hamāt. During the Syrian campaign of the Sānid Khusraw I (540) it was captured and laid waste. After the Arab conquest of Syria it was colonized by tribesmen of ʿUdhrā and Bahrā. It regained importance as a fortified outpost of Aleppo only in the Ḥamdānid period and during the early Crusades. After the disintegration of the Sālidik power in Syria, AFĀMIYA was occupied by the Arab Khāl al-Mulāʿ in the Fatimid interest in 489/1096. On his murder by Asmāʿī it was captured by Tancred in 500/1106, and became the seat of a Latin archbishopric. It was recaptured by Nūr al-Dīn Māh|mūd on 18 Rabīʿ I, 544/26 July, 1149, after his victory at Inab, but its fortifications were destroyed in the great earthquake of 552/1157. The ruins of the old city still exist, flanked on the west by the later citadel, now named Kāʾl al-Muḥalk (for al-Madik, i.e. the shallows or ford).


**AFĀR** [[see Danakil]]

AL-AFDAL B. SALĀḤ AL-DĪN, in full AL-MALIK AL-AFDAL ABU ʿL-ḤASAN AḤŪN NŪR AL-DĪN, the eldest son of Salādīn (Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, [q.v.]), b. 565/1169-70, d. at Sumaysāt 622/1225. On Salādīn's death he was recognized as ruler of Damascus and head of the Ayuʾbdī family, but owing to his incapacity and self-indulgence he lost successively Damascus, Egypt, and all his Syrian fiefs, and ended as a dependent of the Sālidik sultan of Rūm. See AYYUBIDS.


AL-AFDAL, Rāṣūlid ruler [[see Rasūlids]]

AL-AFDAL B. BADR AL-DJAMALĪ, ABU ʿL-KĀSIM ṢĀHANSHAH, Fatimid vizier, commonly known in history by his vizierial title. His birth is placed about 485/1090, and it is known from an inscription of 482/1090 that he was associated with his father in the vizierate. On the death of Badr, the aged caliph al-Mustanṣir was forced by the army to accept AL-AFDAL as his chief minister, and himself died a few months later.

The accession of the caliph al-Mustanṣir assumed a capital importance by its indirect repercussions. While al-Mustanṣir was still alive, but of great age, the problem of his successor had been debated, and an Ismaʾīlī missionary from Persia, Ḥasan b. al-Ṣabbāh, had concluded in favour of Nīzār, one of the caliph's sons. AL-AFDAL, being the vizier in office, raised to the throne a younger son of al-Mustanṣir, Ahmad, who was given the title of ʿl-Mustanṣir. The dispossessed heir, Nīzār, who had fled to Alexandria to raise an army, was seized and immured in a dungeon. Some persons, however, believed that he succeeded in escaping, and he was recognized as Imām by Ḥasan b. al-Ṣabbāh, who founded the formidable sect of the Assassins. The coinage of the latter bore for some time the name of Nīzār, and their partisans in Egypt were called Nīzārīs. AL-AFDAL had not foreseen these consequences, and his attitude had been dictated by considerations of personal ambition, which induced him to place on the throne a young man who would be submissive to his will.

Badr Al-Djarmālī, who had saved Egypt from disaster, had set up a dictatorial regime, and AL-AFDAL now followed in his footsteps, confining the caliph al-Mustanṣir, who was about twenty years of age on his accession, to his palace. AL-Mustanṣir resigned for less than eight years (490/1097-498/1104), and some historians have suggested that he may have been poisoned by Nīzārīs. AL-AFDAL then placed on the throne a son of al-Mustanṣir, a child five years old, who was given the title of al-ʾĀmir bi-ʿĀkām Allāh, and the all-powerful minister went on to govern without interference. But as the caliph grew up he became restive under his vizier's tutelage, and succeeded in hiring the services of assassins who rid him of AL-AFDAL in 515/1121. The latter had held the office of chief minister for twenty-seven years, marked by an internal tranquillity which is the more impressive by contrast with the unprecedented disorders of the following years.

AL-AFDAL's dictatorial power justifies the laying at his door of the responsibility for the Egyptian negligence in face of the invasion of Palestine by the Crusaders. The Fatimid government may be partially exonerated if its unpopularity outside the borders of Egypt is taken into account. It has certain actions to its credit: some fortresses were restored (we have epigraphic evidence at least for the port of Sidon in 491/1098); in the previous year the Fatimid army had regained Tyre from a disloyal governor; finally, Jerusalem was forcibly captured in 491/1098 from the Artukid officers who had established themselves in it. The Egyptians were not unaware that Jerusalem was the essential aim of the Crusaders, and it cannot be believed that they captured it in order to hand it over to the Franks. Ambassadors from Egypt had in fact appeared in 490/1097 in the Crusaders' camp before Antioch, and the latter in turn sent envoys to Cairo, possibly to negotiate an agreement. As a matter of fact, northern Syria was occupied by princes of Sunni obedience; the Fatimids had no desire to interfere with them, and the Sālidikids would have viewed their intervention with bad grace. In the absence of precise documents we are reduced to putting forward these hypotheses.

Nevertheless, the inaction, or at least the lack of vigour, of the Egyptian troops cannot be ignored. They did not move to the defence of Jerusalem. Its fall was deeply felt, and AL-AFDAL led an army corps to a position north of Ascalon; there, however, he
held them immobile, while he waited for reinforcements which were expected to arrive by sea and for the concentration of his bedouin contingents from Palestine. The Franks took the opportunity to massacre the Egyptian army; al-Afdal fled to the protection of Ascalon and hastily returned to Cairo. The year 494/1101 witnessed the Frankish occupation of Palestine, whose population sought refuge in Egypt. The vizier continued, in the following and later years, to show a certain activity against the Crusaders, but in fact the expeditions generally went beyond the outskirts of Ascalon and never gained more than booty and prisoners. The main ports of Syria were at the time in the hands of overlords, who sported Sunni or Shi'a colours according to the interest of the moment. One of the more important raids, led by a son of al-Afdal, succeeded in taking Ramla. In 497/1105 'Akki (Acre) fell, surrendered by its Fatimid commandant because of lack of support. The stubborn resistance of the autonomous prince of Tripoli induced al-Afdal to send a naval squadron, which arrived too late. In 512/1118 the Frankish threat redoubled when the town of Farama was burnt down—an episode which became famous because of the accidental death of Baldwin I, king of Jerusalem, who led the expedition. During this lamentable period the Muslim princes were full of mutual suspicion, but al-Afdal had solicited, and obtained, the cooperation of the Búids of Damascus.

Clearly, a very bad impression is made by the luxury which surrounded the caliph al-Amir and his vizier; ceremonies and feasts seemed to multiply in direct ratio with the number of cities that fell into the hands of the Franks. Whatever responsibility rests on the government of Egypt for this indifference cannot be placed on the caliph, still a mere child, but on his all-powerful minister, who was given over to frivolous heedlessness. There is in particular a striking contrast between the kind of edifices built by Badr—of which only the wall and the monumental gates of Cairo need be mentioned here—and those erected by his son al-Afdal. The latter was concerned with his own wellbeing, and multiplied pleasure-pavilions in Fustat and Cairo. On his death, the caliph al-Amir appropriated the minister's property; it required no less than two months to transfer the precious objects, jewels and silks. On the credit side, however, the historians record al-Afdal's financial readjustments, which notably increased the revenues of the State.

For al-Afdal's son, surnamed Kutayfát, see the following article. The vizier did not propose to outlaw it, and even showed it a certain consideration; in the college of kadís appointed by him there sat an Ismá'íl in addition to a Hañafí, a Shí'í and an Imamí. The Ismá'íl elements evidently did not relish the idea of being relegated to the status of a disestablished religious sect. Kutayfát was killed while riding outside the city, and 'Abd al-Madíd was brought out of his prison (16 Muḥarram 526/8 Dec. 1131). The event was commemorated annually, right to the end of the Fatimid dynasty (Ma'rizí, Khašš, i, 357, 490). 'Abd al-Madíd first ruled as regent, but after a brief interval was proclaimed caliph under the title of al-Hāfíz il-Din Alláh.
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**AL-AFGHÁN** (see ALIAMAL IL-DUN AL-AFGHÁN).

(i) The people; (ii) The Pashto language; (iii) Pashto literature.

(i) The people.

Racially, there is a considerable difference between the various Afghan tribes. According to B. S. Guha, *Census of India*, 1931, i, iii A, p. xi, the Patháns of Bágáwar are closely related to the Kaláshes of Cítral, probably because they are to a large extent áfghánized Dárds. On the other hand the broad-headed Patháns of Bálústán resemble their Bálúsh neighbours. In the plains of Pégáwar and the Dérágáts there is some admixture of Indian blood, and among some tribes we find traces of Turko-Mongolian influence. But in general it may be said that the Afghaní belong to the Irano-Afghaní branch of the dolichocephalic Mediter-
renean race. According to Coon, *Race of Europe*, 419, the skull index is 72-75, and the average height 170 cm. (Frontier Patháns), and 163 cm. (Afghaní of Afghanístan). The nose is prominent, frequently convex, of the so-called "Semitic" type. Similar noses are found also among Bálúshes, Káshmiris, etc. The Afghaní are usually brunes, but at the same time show a persistent minority of blondism, which in this case reflects Nordic admixture. They are heavy- bearded" (Coon, 420).

A distinction is sometimes made between Afghaní and Patháns, the former name being applied to the Durrání and allied tribes. But the difference is probably only one of nomenclature, the Persian designation Afghaní (of unknown etymology) being naturally applied chiefly to the western tribes,
while Paθān, the indianized form of the native name is used about the eastern ones.

The native name, employed by all tribes, is Pašhtūn, or Pashtūn (north-eastern dialect Pašhtūn), pl. Pašhtūnān. Lassen and others after him, compared Pashtūn to the Πάκτυς of Herodotus, and the name of the Afrīds has been identified with that of the 'Αραχνητα. This latter identification is possible, if by no means certain. The first one, however, must be rejected, for phonetic and other reasons. (The ending -un goes back to -ana, and the ancient sound-group which has resulted in Pashto gh (gh is a later dialect form), could scarcely have been rendered by Greek κτ.) More probable is the connection first suggested by Marquart, with Ptolomy's Παρανυμπη, a tribe inhabiting the Paropamisus. Paštū can go back to ancient rs (see Morgensterns, "Pashto", "Pathan", etc., A0, 1940, 138 ff.), and the probable ancient form was *Parswe-anā, derived from *parsu, cf. Assyrian-Babylonian Parsu(a) Persian. This does not imply any specially close relationship between the two Iranian tribes in question. (Cf. also Pusht, Pulkht, the name of the supposed seat of the Afghān tribe in the Waziri country.—Pashto (Pakhto) the native name of the Afghān language, probably goes back to a fem. adjective *Parsəwəd (sc. language).

The Afghāns are called Kāḏ by the Omurs of Logaš, and the Wazirs Kesi (pl.) by the Omurs of Kāgūrān. The origin of this word is unknown, but it is connected with Kāš, the name of an Afghān tribe near Quitta (Masson, Travels, i, 330) and with the Pashto name of the Sulaymān Mountains: (dā) Kase Ġhar.

The word Pashto is used also as a synonym of Paṣhunaiči, etc., the special social code of the Afghāns, the main pillars of which are: nanandais, right of asylum, badal, revenge by retaliation, vendetta, mēmastāy, hospitality. The causes of feuds leading to badal are said to be "women, gold and land" (zan, sar, sāmin). Among most tribes the organization is democratic, the hereditary khrān having restricted power. More important matters are settled in consultation with the chiefs of the sub-tribes and clans, and the tribal or village council (dīrga) plays an important rôle. But the semidependence of many tribes has become constantly more curtailed as well in Afghanistan as in India (Pakistan). Afghān or non-Afghān clients (kamsāyas) are attached to, and living under the protection of most tribes.—The ancient custom of periodic redistribution of land (wēd) is now dying out in most places.—Even while politically disunited, and fighting amongst themselves, the Afghān tribes had a feeling of some kind of unity, based upon their sharing language, customs and traditions. On the other hand, each tribe is split up into sub-tribes, septs and clans. The names of such sections are often formed with the word khd, or with the suffix -ay, but in some cases -ay denotes a whole tribe.

The Afghāns are first referred to (in the form Avaqagān) by the Indian astronomer Varāha Mīhira (early 6th cent.) in his Brhatsamhitā. A little later is the probable reference to them in the Life of Hiuen-Tsang, which mentions a tribe A-p'o-kien (*Avagon?) located in the northern part of the Sulaymān Mountains (see A. Foucher, La vieelle route de l'Inde de Bactres à Taxila, ii, Paris 1947, 235, 252 note 17). The earliest Muslim work mentioning them is the Hudud al-Shām (372/982), followed by al-Uṭbi's Ta'rīkh-i Yāmīnī, and al-

Biruni. The name Paθān does not occur till the 16th century, but the change of gh to ḍh shows that it must have been borrowed into Indo-Aryan at a considerably earlier date.—According to al-

Uṭbi, Cairo 1286, ii, 84, Mahmūd of Ghazni attacked Tukhāristān with an army consisting of Indians, Khulādji, Afghāns and Ghaznawīs, but on another occasion he attacked and punished the Afghāns, and this is corroborated by Bayhaḏ who wrote shortly afterwards. Al-Biruni mentions the various tribes of Afghāns as living in the western frontiers of India (India, transl. Sachau, i, 1, 208, cf. 190). This points to the Sulaymān Mountains as the earliest known home of the Afghāns. It is uncertain how far they extended towards the West, but no Afghān settlement west of Ghazni is mentioned by early authors. There is no evidence for assuming that the inhabitants of Ghūr were originally Pashto-speaking (cf. Dames, in E1). If we are to believe the Pīya Khatāni (see below, iii), the legendary Amir Karōr, grandson of Shanasb, (8th century) was a Paštō poet, but this for various reasons is very improbable. The origin and early history of the westernmost Afghān tribe, the Durrānīs (Abdālīs) [g.v.], is quite obscure.—Regarding the Ghaltays (g.v.) it seems possible that their name is based upon a popular etymology ("Thief's Son")—Thus the tribal name Khlādji, Khaladji, located by al-Īstakhri on the middle course of the Hilmand and by the Hudud in the region of Ghazni [see Khaladī]. But the Ghaltays themselves may have been partly, perhaps predominantly, of Afghān origin. At any rate the Afghāns do not appear to have acquired any political significance during the Ghaznawī period. Some early references which follow were noted by M. Longworth Dames (E1) and have been supplemented by P. Hardy. In 431/1039-40 Musāfīr sent his son Izadhār into the hill country near Ghazna to subdue the rebel Afghāns (Garḍīzī, ed. M. Nazīm, 109). In 512/1118-9 an army composed of Arabs, adjam, Afghāns and Khaladji was assembled by Arslān Shaḥ. In 547/1152-3, Alīf says, Bahārām Shāh assembled an army of Afghāns and Khaladji. With the rise of Gūrī power, the same state of things continued in 588/1192 according to Firīqshā, Bombay 1831, 100 f., the army assembled by Muʿizz al-Dīn Muhammad b. Sām consisted of Turks, Tadjiks and Afghāns, and his Indian opponent Pithoray (Prithvī Rādī) assembled a force of Rājpūt and Afghān horsemen. Thus in this great war between Muslims and Hindus Afghāns are represented as fighting on both sides, which probably indicates that they were not yet completely converted to Islam, although the manufactured legends represent them as having been converted from the days of Khūlid. It is not clear whence Firīqshā obtained his statement. It does not appear in the account of this war given by Minhādī Sirāḏī in the Tabakht-i Nāṣīr. This author does not mention the Afghāns throughout his account of the Ghaznawī and Gūrī kings. His first and only mention of them is in his own time in the year 658/1260 in the reign of Nāṣīr al-Dīn Maḥbūb of Dīhil. He there says (transl. Raverty, 852) that Ulugh Khān employed 3000 brave Afghāns in subduing the hill-tribes of Mēwāt in Rājpūtāna. According to Dujawīnī, i, 142, Khaladji, Ghaznawīs and Afghāns formed part of the Mongol army which sacked Marv in 619. During the next two centuries we find occasional mention of Afghāns in Indian history. For instance Barānī says in the Ta'rīkh-i Firāshtānī, 57, that Balban in 664/1265 established small forts in the neighbourhood of Gopālpur and entrusted
them to Afghans; three other towns, particularly afflicted by robbers, were also given the protection of forts entrusted to Afghans. According to the same author (p. 482) in the reign of Muhammad b. Tughlak there was a rebellion at Multan of a body of Afghans headed by Multan Mall (this name means in the Multani dialect “the champion of Multan” and is probably not the proper name of an Afghan). Sirhind, Ta’rikh-i Mubarakshahi, Calcutta 1931, 106, says that this revolt was in 744/1343. Again Maḥḥ Afghan was one of the foreign amirs who rebelled at Dōgīrī. In 778/1376-7 the sief of Bihār was given to Malik Bīr Afghan (Ta’rikh-i Mubarakshahi, 133). Tīmūr found them still hill robbers and in the Mafṣūdāt-i Tīmūrī, the Zhaj-nāma and the Malāʾ al-Sa’dayn it is related that he ravaged the country of the Awhānī (or Aghānī) who inhabited the Sulaymān Mountains. Thus except as occasional soldiers of fortune they remained a fierce race of mountain robbers until the rise to power in India of one of these adventurers made them famous. This leader was Dāwlat Khaṇ Lōdī of the Lōdī clan of Ghalzays; he rose to be one of the most important persons in the empire. Bahlūl Lōdī occupied the throne of Delhi in 855/1450 [see 1450]. The dynasty was overthrown by Bābur in 932/1525, but for a short time (944-63/1537-55) Shahr Shah Sūr reinstalled the Afghans in power [see Shāh] and a large number of Ghalzays and other Pathāns settled in India. At a later date Awrangzīb made grants of land to Pathāns of various tribes in Rohilkhand (p.v.; see also Rāmpūr) (Bareilly division, etc.), so called from Pashto rōhīlī (Rohilla), “hillman”, “Pathāṅ”. At the court of the Nawāb of Rāmpūr some Pathān traditions were still alive at the time of Darmesteter’s visit in 1886. But gradually the Afghān settlers in India were assimilated, except in the extreme North-West.

The immigration into India was part of the great expansion of Afghan tribes during the late Middle Ages. This expansion was on such a scale that it is difficult to believe with Dames (EP) that the Afghans were still at a period as late as that of the Ghūrid dynasty only an unimportant hill-tribe inhabiting a restricted area.—The Lohanīs were expelled from the Ghazni mountains by the Sulaymān Khaṇ Ghalzays, who also pressed the Bitāns eastward through the Gōmal Pass in the 15th cent. The main outlines of the tribal traditions of the Afghan tribes are mentioned by Abu ’l-Faḍl, Akbar-ndma; slightly different versions are given in Sulaymān Mākī’s Tadhkrīt al-Awliya (allegedly of the 15th century) and in the Pura Khaṣṣāna (cf. these below, iii). Our main source for the tribal traditions is Niẓāmat Allāh’s Maḥkān-i Afghānī (completed A.D. 1613). The genealogies given there and copied in later works such as the Ḥayāl-i Afghānī, cannot be relied upon as historical sources, but are valuable as a testimony to the traditions current among the Afghāns in the 17th century. According to this tradition the common ancestor of the majority of the Afghan tribes was Kays ʿAbd al-Raḥḥīd who was converted to Islam by Khaṇīl and descended from Afghān, a grandson of King Tālīt or Sārūl (Ṣaul). Kays had three sons: Sarbān, Bāṭan (Bīṭan) and Ghurghush. Sarban had two sons: Shahrbūn and Kharshbūn. The further ramifications may be tabulated as follows:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Tribe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharkbhūn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(from a Kūkā woman)</td>
<td>Lohanī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ancestor of the tribes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sbārān, Djalwānī, Haripāl, Bābār, Uṣturānī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tārīn (&quot;Black&quot;)</td>
<td>Spīn (&quot;White&quot;)</td>
<td>Awdāl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tārīn tribe</td>
<td>Spīn Tārīn tribe</td>
<td>Abdāl (Durrānī) tribe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kharshbūn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Tribe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghōrī (or Ghura)</td>
<td>Khakhay (or Khashay)</td>
<td>Muḥammadzād-żāsūrīya tribe of Kasār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khaṇīl, Dādūzāy, Čarmānī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
Most of the remaining tribes are said to be descended from Karrān (or Karlān), of doubtful ancestry.

According to some traditions also the Bangash (Bangāsh) and Wazirfs are descended from Kakhay; according to other, the Wazirfs and the Dawr tribes are not attached to any of these genealogies.

Certain clans claim to be sayyids by descent; such are to be found among the Sherāns, Kākār, Karraiān, Dāway, Tarīn, Miyyāna and Bītanān. The same descent is claimed by the tribes of Gandāpur and Ustārānā; these were originally subdivisions of the Sherāns.

In the Makhzan-i Afghānī all these tribes are expressly acknowledged as Afghāns, with the exception of the Bangash, Wazirfs and those Karraiān which belong to the Kakhay division (Afrīdl, etc.). The last seem to have remained unknown to him.

It is of interest to note that all the Pashto dialects which change the long vowels (a > α, etc., see below ii) belong to the Karraiān group or to the Wazirfs.

The extreme complexity of the tribal system may be exemplified by the ramifications of the Yūsufzays. One of their five sub-tribes, the Akōzayz, are divided into Rānizayz and other sections. One of the five Rānizayz clans is in its turn divided into Ghaiby Khel and three other clans. And one of the two Ghaiby clans are the Nūr Muhammad Khelz, divided into Gharīb Kh. and Dwār Kh.—It may also be noted that the name Tōrmān, one of the ancestors of the Khātsaks, is probably identical with that of Toramānā, a Hūnā king of India, and also a member of the Shāhī dynasty. This does not imply any historical connection between the legendary Afghān and these princes, but only a survival of the name in local traditions.

Geographical distribution of the Afghān tribes. Durrāns [q.v.] in the lower river valleys from Sabzawār and Zamān-dawār to south-east of Kandahār and Čāman. Among the sections are the Pōpolzayzs (including the royal clan, the Sadōzayzs) and the Bārakzayzs.—Next to the Durrāns, the Ghālzayzs [q.v.] are the most powerful tribe, and were for a long time their rivals. They occupy the country between Kālāt-i Ghilzay and Djalālābād. The Hōtaks were formerly the leading clan. The most important section is now the Sulaymān Khel from whom are recruited the Pōwindas, nomads moving in autumn down through the Gōmal and Tōčī passes to the banks of the Indus, and returning in spring to Afghānistān. The Kharotis are related to the Ghālzayzs.—Kākār and Tarīns inhabit the Pishin and 2ōb districts in Balūclstān. The Panis of Sibi are their neighbours.—North-west of 2ōb, around the Takht-i Sulaymān, we find the Sherāns. —The Wazirfs [q.v.] (divided into Darwēsh Khel and Mahsūd) live in the mountains between the Gōmal and the Kurram on both sides of the frontier. In the foothills to the East we find the Bītanāns and Lōhāns, and in the plains south of the lower Kurram the Marwats. The Tōčī valley is inhabited by the Dawrīz and Banūfs.—The Khātsaks occupy the plains of Kōhāt and extend right up to Attock. In the upper Kurram valley live the Bangash, the Shīrā Turfs and other tribes, and on the Afghan side of the frontier the Dīdılı̇s, with their neighbours the Mangals and Khostwāls.—North of the Bangash are the Orakzayz (with some Shīrā clans), and in Tirah, the Khaybar and Kōhāt pass the Afrīdls [q.v.], with Shinwārs to the north of them, on both sides of the frontier.—The Mahmān [q.v.] occupy a large tract of land north of the Kābul river in...
Afghanistán and in the Pesháwar district. Related to them are the Khálís in Pesháwar. — East of the Mahmands are the Yúsufzays (q.v.) and allied tribes (Mándán), etc., in Pesháwar and in the mountains to the North (Bunér, Swátt, Dír, etc.), where they are pushing back and assimilating the Dardic population. — The so-called Swáttis are a mixed lot, driven by the Yúsufzays across the Indus into the Hazrár district. — In the Kunar valley and in other places in N.E. Afghanistan we find the Sáfís. — In recent times many Pashto speaking Afghans have settled, or have been settled, in various places north of the Hindú-kush and in the Harát region.

Bibliography: see the works of Muhammad Háyát, Belléw, Raverty, quoted in the Bibliography to Afghánistán, section ii; the work of Elphístone, quoted in that to Afghánistán, section i; H. A. Rose, A Glossary of Tribes and Casts of the Punjab and the N.W. Frontier Province, Lahore 1911-9, especially s.v. Páthán; H. C. Willy, From the Black Mountain to Wástírán, London 1912 (on the Páthán frontier tribes).

(ii) The Pashto Language.

Pashto is spoken in south-eastern Afghanistan from north of Djalálábáb to Kándáhár, and from there westwards to Sábszawár. (The Kábúl area is mainly Persian-speaking, and so is Ghánz.) Pashto is also spoken by settlers in northern and western Afghanistan. In Pakistan Pashto is used by the majority of the inhabitants of the N.W. Frontier Province from Dír and Swátt southwards, in some localities in the Pándíáb, and in Bálústán as far south as Quetta, probably in all by over 4 million people.

Pashto is in its origin and structure an Iranian language, although it has borrowed freely from Indo-Aryan. It shares all the common Iranian sound-changes. It sides with the other Eastern Iranian languages e.g. in having fricatives corresponding to W.Ir. initial b, d, g, and in the sonorization of intervocalic -gh-. In its origin it is probably a "Saka" dialect, introduced from the North, but it has been examined, containing the manuscripts are made available for philological investigation. Even if the authenticity of the Kházína cannot be finally settled until the manuscripts are made available for philological investigation. Even if the authenticity of the Kházína is admitted, however, Muhammad Hótak's dating of the oldest poems may be doubted. According to Raverty, Sháhíb Mllí in 1417 wrote a history of the Yúsufzays, but nothing more is known about this work (cf. Yúsufzay). A manuscript exists, and has been examined, containing the Kháyr al-Báyan of the arch-heretic Búyáyd Anár (d. 1585). From the early 17th century we possess the theological and historical works—rich in invectives—of the south-western group (the so-called "soft" dialects) from the north-eastern ("hard") group (Bángásh, Órákzay, Afrúdí, Yúsufzay, Mahmand, etc.). The so-called "dialecets" preserve ɬ, ž with the original quality of back ɣ, ʃ, while the "hard" ones they merge with respectively ɣ and ʃ. Thus: Pákhto = Pashto and Pákhto, ffrí bead ffrí or frí (in the other sections of this article ɬ has been rendered by ɣ in tribal names and in the word Pákhto, etc.). Some Chalzay dialects occupy an intermediate position. The exact date of the change is uncertain, but it is probably later than the great northward migration of tribes.—Dialects also vary a good deal in their treatment of ɬ, ż, ɣ, ɬ (partly owing to the influence of an Indian sub- or adstratum), and palatalization, assimilation, dissimilation and metathesis act differently according to dialect (e.g. nmar, rmar, mar, etc. sun, wasána, nimánd, mannáz, coonb, pása, páfo foot). — Cutting across the line dividing "soft" from "hard" Pákhto runs an isogloss enring a number of dialects (from Afrúdí to Wázírí) changing ō > ŏ; ŏ > ŏ and in some dialects further to ā and ā > ŏ (e.g. Wázírí mór father, ñór father; ír daughter).—The Wápetí dialect of north-eastern Balústán (Harnái-Sháhrír region) occupies a rather independent position and must have split off from the bulk of Pákhto earlier than any other dialect. It has retained ŏ before ɬ, e.g. in yrír bear, and it shows a different development of -t (piýár father, etc.).

Important morphological features of Pashto are e.g.: 1. Distinction between two genders, masc. and fem. 2. A great variety of declensions and traces of case-inflection. 3. No distinction between 3rd sing. and plur. 4. So-called passive construction of the preterite of transitive verbs (s tā wakhram I strike you, but s tā wakhšam you struck me).

(iii) The Pashto Literature.

Until recently no Pashto literary work older than the 17th century had been published. But in the Almanác de Kábúl, 1940-1 (Da Kábúl Sálimána) Abd al-Háy Hábíl published fragments of the "Akh-kirát-i Awísád" by Sulaymán Mákh, containing poems said to go back to the 11th century. In 1944 he published in Kábúl the Píta Kházína by Muhammad Hótak, which professed to be written in Kándáhár (finished 1729), and to be an anthology of Pashto poets from the 8th century down to the time of the compiler. But these works raise a number of grave linguistic and historical problems, and the question of their authenticity cannot be finally settled until the manuscripts are made available for philological investigation. Even if the authenticity of the Kházína is admitted, however, Muhammad Hótak's dating of the oldest poems may be doubted. According to Raverty, Sháhíb Mllí in 1417 wrote a history of the Yúsufzays, but nothing more is known about this work (cf. Yúsufzay). A manuscript exists, and has been examined, containing the Kháyr al-Báyan of the arch-heretic Búyáyd Anár (d. 1585). From the early 17th century we possess the theological and historical works—rich in invectives—of his orthodox opponent Aklándár Darwésa (see Rawsháníyá) (Mahkán-i Afgání and Mahkán-i Islám). The 17th and 18th centuries are rich in poets,
but most of them are imitators of Persian models. The most remarkable according to European standards, the most popular were Abd al-Rahman and Abd al-Sider. His spontaneousness, force of expression and independence of mind lend a special charm to his best poems. Several of his descendants were also poets, and his grandson Afjal Khan wrote the 'Abd al-Rahman and 'Abd al-Sider. Abd al-

Kalid-i-Afghdnt, patriot, warrior and prolific writer, was also poets, and his grandson Afjal Khan, the founder of the Durrani dynasty, was a poet. There are also numerous translations from the Persian and versified versions of Persian and Afghan legends, e.g., Adam Khan and Durrandal. Of considerable interest are the folk-songs, ballads, etc., collected and published by Darmesteter. Recently the Afghan Academy (Pašto Tölama) in Kābul has published a volume of folk-songs, chiefly so-called landais or mizrāds, lyrical distichs in a peculiar metre, and some of them of great beauty. There is a considerable output of modern poetry in Afghanistān, and the Pašto Academy publishes also other literary works.


AL-AFGHĀN [see Djamāl al-Dīn al-Afgān].

AFGHANISTĀN.

(i) Geography; (ii) Ethnography; (iii) Languages; (iv) Religion; (v) History.

(i) Geography.

The country now known as Afghanistān has borne that name only since the middle of the 18th century, when the supremacy of the Afghan race became as- sured: previously various districts bore distinct ap-pellations, but the country was not a definite political unit, and its component parts were not bound together by any identity of race or language. The earlier meaning of the word was simply "the land of the Afghāns", a limited territory which did not include many parts of the present state but did comprise large districts now either independent or within the bound-

ary of Pakistan. As at present constituted, under the rule of the Bārakzay kings (formerly amirs), Afghanistān consists of a territory of irregular shape lying between 29° 30' and 38° 30' N. and between 61° and 75° E. or, if the long strip of Wajhān is omitted, 71° 30' E. Geological formation. This country forms the north-eastern portion of the great Iranian plateau (cf. Irān), which is bounded to the north by the Central Asian depression, and to the east by the plains of Sind and the North-West Frontier Province of Pakistan, while to the south and west it slopes away into the depressed tract which occupies the central portion of the plateau, and on the south-east is connected with the mountain system of Balūchistān. The northern barrier of the highlands is the mountain range extending westwards from the Pāmir, with its outlying ridge, the Band-i Turkistān, beyond which the plain of sand and loess extends to the Oxus. On the east there is a sudden drop into the Indus valley. It will be seen therefore that, with the exception of the loess plain of Turkistān, the whole country belongs to the plateau, which is itself a late geological formation of the tertiary period, mainly sandstones and limestones. The north-eastern part of the plateau formerly formed part of a great ocean connecting the Caspian depression with the plains of Pakistan. The process of upheaval which has raised it still continues, and Holdich considers that the extra-

ordinarily deep river gorges are due to the fact that the erosive action of the rivers is too slow to keep pace with the upward movement.

Orography. The most prominent feature of the mountain system is the northern range running east and west above alluded to as forming the northern boundary of the plateau. It divides the Turkistān districts on the north (the ancient Bactria) from the provinces of Kābul, Harāt and Kandahār (the ancient Ariana and Arachosia) on the south. This main range is known by various names such as Hindū-kūsh [q.v.] on the E. where it branches from the Pāmir, Kūh-i Bābā further west, and Kūh-i Saffād and Sīyāh Bukur near Harāt; the latter is generally known as Paropamisus, although the true Paropamisus (or Paropamisus of Ptolemy) included the Hindū-kūsh. The greater part of the country south of this range is occupied by a number of subsidiary chains or long spurs which run from east to west or more generally from north-east to south-west. These ranges and the intervening valleys form the greater part of the Harāt and Kandahār provinces, while the tangled mass of mountains lying to the south of the eastern Hindū-kūsh comprises the valleys of the Kābul and Kurām rivers and forms the provinces of Kābul and Nūristān. The highest elevation in the northern range is the Shāh Fulād peak (16,870 ft./5158 metres) in the Kūh-i Bābā, and the long spur running to the south-west contains several peaks of about 11,000 ft./3353 m. The ridges dividing the Hilmānd, Tarnāk, Arghandāb and Arghān are outliers of this system, and it may be traced further south-east into Balūchistān. The Sulaymān [q.v.] range (highest peak the Taqht-i Sulaymān, 11,200 ft./3145 m.), which drops finally into the Indus valley and is the eastern edge of the plateau, is beyond the political limits of Afghanistān. The mountains further
north on this eastern flank of the plateau between the Kuram and Gumal rivers are a more irregular mass with peaks over 11,000 ft. (3353 m.), while further north still between the valleys of the Kābul and the Kuram is the Safīd Kūh, the highest range in Afgānīstān after the Hindū-kūsh and Kūh-i Bābā (highest peak Sīkārām, 15,600 ft./4543 m.).

Rīver system. Northward from the Hindū-kūsh the level of the country falls rapidly towards the Oxus valley, while southward the valleys fall more gradually towards the Sīstān depression containing the Hilmān Hāmūn (H. Lake) and its extension the Gūd-i Zirāh, into which flow, with the exception of those belonging to the Indus system, all the rivers south of the Hindū-kūsh. Thus the rivers fall naturally into three groups, which may be called the Indus group, the Hilmān group and the Oxus group.

The Indus group comprises the Kābul [q.v.] river and its affluents, of which the most important are the Tagāo and Kunār flowing from the Hindū-kūsh on the north and the Lūghār flowing from the Gul Kūh on the south. South of this the Kuram rising in the Paywar, and its tributary the Točī, called in its lower course the Gambīla, which joins it in Pakistan territory below the mountains. Still further south separates the Wārizmān mountains from the Taḵht-i Sulaymān is the Gūlīm formed by the junction of the Kundar and Zūb. These rivers though of small volume drain extensive tracts and mark important military and trade routes through the mountains between India and the plateau. Other small streams such as the Wānu, Lūnī, Kāhā and Nārī further south serve a similar purpose. It may be noted that many of these streams flow not along the natural valleys formed by the mountain range but transversely across the sandstone and limestone ridges of the Sulaymān Mountains, through which they cut deep precipitous gorges.

The second or Hilmān group consists of the Hilmān and its tributaries, and of the other rivers running towards the south-west into the Sīstān depression. The Hilmān [q.v.] or Hirmand (the Ḥaṭūmanat of the Avesta, the Etymandrus of classical writers) is the principal of these. It rises near Kābul and flows through narrow mountain valleys into the more open country of Zāmīn-dāwar, where it is joined on the left bank by the Arghāndāb (Harahwaiī, Arachotis). The latter in its turn is formed by the junction of the Upper Arghāndāb, the Tarnak, and the Arghāsan (or Arghaṣṭān), which drain a series of nearly parallel north-easterly and south-westerly valleys. Another member of the same system is the stream flowing southward from Ghazna which never joins the Hilmān system but is absorbed by the Aūštābī Salt Lake. Other rivers west of the Hilmān with the same general south-westerly flow, which also discharge into the Hilmān, are the Khaṣṣ Rūd, the Farāb Rūd, and the Harāb Rūd.

The Hāmūn [q.v.], a basin sometimes of small extent, expands enormously to the south in seasons of high flood, when the hill fort of Kūh-i Khādīja becomes an island. It then discharges itself through a channel called the Shīraḥgha into a still lower depression known as the Gūd-i Zirāh. Part of the Hāmūn is in Afgānīstān territory and part in Persia, according to modern demarcations which have divided Sīstān. The Hāmūn is only 1560 ft. above sea-level, and the Gūd-i Zirāh is still lower. The Hāmūn on the average overflows once in ten years into the Gūd-i Zirāh. Its water is only slightly brackish, and can be drunk, a circumstance due no doubt to its occasional overflow. The level of Sīstān does not appear to have risen since ancient times in spite of the enormous volumes of silt discharged by the rivers which have no other outlet. The cause for this is probably the prevalence of violent north-west winds through a great part of the year, which remove the light surface soil.

The third or Oxus group comprises the Oxus [see Aμάν Daryā] and its southern tributaries, as well as the Murghāb [q.v.] and Harī Rūd which also flow northward into the plain but never reach the Oxus. All of these rise on the northern flank of the great mountain barrier, with the exception of the Harāb Rūd [q.v.], which rises on the south of the Kūh-i Bābā and flows westwards through a narrow valley between the Kūh-i Safīd and Kūh-i Siyāh into the Harāt plain where it turns to the north and after passing through a depression in the mountains loses itself in the plains of Russian Turkistān beyond Dhu'ul-Fīkār.

General formation. The mountain ranges generally become less lofty towards the south and west and the difficulties of communication that exist further north disappear. Hence the easy route for trade or military expeditions from Harāt to Kandahār has in all ages been circuitous via Sabzawār, Farāb and Girīškh, while from Kandahār to Kābul and Ghazna the direct line of the Tarnak valley is followed. From Harāt where the Paropamisus drops to an insignificant elevation the Turkistān province is easily accessible, and the same country can also be reached from Kābul directly by difficult passes, the Khaʿwāk, Bāmiyān and others, through the Hindū-kūsh.

Thus the three towns Harāt, Kandahār and Kābul are marked out by natural position as the most important points in the country. Each of them lies in a fertile valley and is self-supporting, and each of them commands important routes to the others as well as to India, Persia and Central Asia. If therefore Afgānīstān is to be an independent whole the possession of these three points is essential to its rulers. There can be no stability if they are in separate hands. In this political sense Ghazna and Dialālabbād must be classed with Kābul, the old capitals Bust and Girīškh with Kandahār, and Sabzawār with Harāt. Sīstān lying on the easy route from Harāt to Kandahār has always been a debatable land.

Kābul is in every way the strongest position, and has generally in consequence been more independent than other districts. Harāt on the contrary is much exposed to attack from the west and north, and when Harāt has been conquered by a foreign invader Kandahār is immediately threatened. As long as Harāt is held Kandahār is safe from an attack on the western side and it has also a strong position towards the Indian side, though not so strong as that of Kābul.

The district of Sīstān adjoining the Hāmūn is fertile and suited for irrigation. Occupying a commanding position on the route leading eastward to Kandahār and westward to Harāt, it is of great importance to the rulers of Afgānīstān, and its present division between that country and Persia is unfortunate.

Climate. The whole country is liable to great extremes of temperature ranging from the intense summer heat of Sīstān, the Garmsīr district and the Oxus valley to the great winter cold of the high exposed regions, where violent snowstorms are
not uncommon. Instances of armies suffering from such cold are well known in history. The march of the emperor Bābur from the neighbourhood of Harāt through the Hazāra mountains to Kābul is a case in point, and the Hindū-kush (lit. Hindu-slayer) is popularly supposed to derive its name from the death of the Indian troops of the emperor Shāh Djiāhān. More recent instances are the sufferings of 'Abd al-Rahmān’s army in 1865 and of the British Boundary Commission in Bādghīs in 1885. The daily range of temperature is everywhere very great, the difference between maximum and minimum varying from 17 to 30 degrees of Fahrenheit. In the spring and autumn the upland valleys have a temperate and pleasant climate, which is very favourable to the growth of fruit, especially grapes, melons, peaches, plums, apricots, walnuts and pistachio-nuts. Modern travellers have found the neighbourhood of Kābul to be not unworthy of the praises lavished on it by the emperor Bābur.

In the more lofty part of the Hindū-kush inhabited by the Kāfīr tribes a truly Alpine climate is found resembling that of parts of the Himalayas.

The vegetation generally speaking is that of the Persian plateau, and is quite distinct from that of the Indian plains. In the plains few trees are found except those cultivated in gardens, fruit trees, planes and poplars, while on the higher mountains many varieties of pines and evergreen oaks are found with wild vines, ivy and roses. On the lower and dryer ranges the wild pistachio (Pistacia khitnik), wild olive (Olea eurpaeus), juniper (J. excelsa) and the reedan (Tecoma undulata) are the most characteristic trees. The angūsa or king (Ferula assafoetida) is very abundant in many parts. Wild flowers also abound in the spring, especially the iris, tulip and poppy.

Political divisions. The divisions of the country follow its physical formation.

Kābul. The province of Kābul contains the fertile high-lying valleys round the upper waters of the Kābul, Lōghar and Taga rivers and Ghazāna, also the lower part of the Kābul valley near Dīlālābād [q.v.]. Ghazāna [q.v.] was the most important town in this tract formerly, but Kābul [q.v.] has taken its place during the past four hundred years. Kābul was recognized as the centre of government under Mughal emperors, and was adopted by the Durrānī kings as their capital taking the place of Ghāzni [q.v.]. Kābul was the most important town in this tract formerly, but Kābul [q.v.] has taken its place during the past four hundred years. Kābul was recognized as the centre of government under Mughal emperors, and was adopted by the Durrānī kings as their capital taking the place of Ghāzni [q.v.].

Kandahār. Kandahār includes the old province of Zamīn-dawar, and comprises the lower valleys of the Helmand, Tarnak, Arghandāb and Arghāšān, the principal home of the Durrānīs. The modern town of Kandahār [q.v.] on the Arghandāb has been the capital of the province since the 14th century, and has taken the place of older towns such as Girishk [q.v.] and Bust [q.v.].

Sīstān. Sīstān [see Sīstān] is the hot and fertile irrigated district lying around the Hámmūn. A large part of it, however, belongs to Persia. It contains no large town.

Harāt. The Harāt province includes the fertile valley of the Hari Rūd and the open country lying between the Hazāra Mountains and the Persian border; also a considerable part of these mountains which are inhabited by the Hazāra [q.v.] and Čahār Aymāk [q.v.] tribes. The town of Harāt [q.v.], one of the most famous in eastern history, is its capital; although fallen from its ancient glory it is still and must remain a place of importance and will no doubt develop greatly with peace and improved communications. Sabzawār [q.v.] is also a thriving town in the south of the province.

Hazārāstān [q.v.]. The country of the Hazāra and Čahār Aymāk tribes in the mountainous mass bounded to the north by the Kūh-i Bābā, to the west by the open country of Harāt, to the east and the south by the Helmand valley. It is the country of the Hazāra tribes. The hills of Hazāra (lit. Hindū-kush) lying north of the Kabul valley and west of the Kunar are inhabited by the Kāfīrs. It was known as Kāfīristān [q.v.], but after its conquest by 'Abd al-Rahmān Khān in 1887 its name was changed to Nūrīstān.


(M. LONGWORTH DAMES *)
(ii) ETHNOGRAPHY.

The population of Afghanistan is divided into the following main groups: (1) Afghans; (2) Tadjiks and other Iranians; (3) Turkic-Mongolians; (4) Hindū-kūsh Indo-Aryans (including Kafirs). According to an estimate made in 1947 the population amounts to twelve millions, of which 53% are said to be Afghans, 36% Tadjiks, 6% Uzbeks, 3% Hazaras and 2% others. But the figures are by no means certain. No "pure races" are to be found, each linguistic community being composed of several anthropological types, and interchange and secondary adoption of Persian and Pāṭho having to a great extent blurred whatever clear distinctions may have existed at some earlier date. Apart from the theoretical difficulties in defining race, the meagreness of anthropological data, dealing with clearly defined local groups, warns us to be cautious in our statements.

1) For the Afghans, see the separate article AFGHĀN.

2) Tadjik is the general name [cf. TADJIK] of the Persian-speaking population of Afghanistan, often also called Fārsḵwān, or, in the East and South, Dīghāns and Dīhvāns. They are villagers, and also the inhabitants of most towns speak Persian. The Tadjiks have no tribal organization, except in some remote regions. In the villages they are peaceful tenants. In Harāt and Sāstān they are a direct continuation of the Persians of Persia, while in Northern Afghanistan (from Maymana to Badakhshan) they are in contact with the Tadjiks of the Soviet Union. In South-eastern Afghanistan they occupy some of the most fertile agricultural districts around Ghazna and in the Kābul region (Kūh-i Dāman, Pāndāshīr, etc.). Anthropologically they are very mixed, but the hill-Tadjiks of Badakhshan, and of Northern Afghanistan in general, are of the Alpine type. South of the Hindū-kūsh many Tadjiks probably belong to the Irao-Afghan race. Some of the hill-Tadjiks of Badakhshan still retain their ancient Persian languages. The same is the case with the Parādās north of Kābul and the Ormurs in the Lōgār valley. — The Kūtibāsh are descended from Persian Turks settled in Kābul and Harāt by Nādir Shāh.

3) Turkish and Mongolian tribes. In the plains of Northern Afghanistan Turkish tribes form an important, or even dominant part of the population. The majority are Uzbeks [q.v.], settled in villages and towns, and estimated by Jarring at about 500,000. West of them, between Andkhūy and Bālā Murghāb we find Turkmen [q.v.], nomads, chiefly Ersārs (estimated at up to 200,000). In Ḍān Pāmir there are about 30,000 Kūrgiz [q.v.] nomads. Also some other Turkish tribes are represented in Afghanistan. — The Turks settled in the Kūstān and Kūh-i Dāman north of Kābul have now all probably given up their national language. The central massif, from Ghazna to Harāt, and from north of Bāmiyān to the middle Himaland, is occupied by tribes of Mongol or mixed Turko-Mongol origin and type, extending also into Persia. The eastern part of this territory is the home of the Hazāras [q.v.] (or Bārbarīs). They are divided into a number of tribes, Day-Kuadi, Day-Zengi, Dārghūf, etc. The Hazāras are settled in villages, their formerly very powerful chiefs living in baronial castles. They are Shiā, and up to the time of the Amir ʿAbd al-Rahmān they retained semi-independence. Their orthodox neighbours accused them of practising the infamous "lamp-extinguishing" ceremonies, and of laxity in sexual behaviour in general. When finally subdued by the Afghan Amir, many of them sought refuge in Quetta and other places outside Afghanistan. A large number of Hazāras work as labourers in Kābul and other cities. They have decidedly mongoloid features, but are usually distinguishable from the more flat-faced Uzbeks. Further west, on both sides of the Hari Rūd, we find the half-nomadic Sunnī Ċāhār Āmyak [q.v.] ("Four Tribes"), a term apparently used somewhat loosely, but usually including Taymans (south of the Hari Rūd), Frūzkūhs (north of this river), Dījamshīdīs (Kūshk), Taymūrs (west of Harāt, in Persia) and Hazāris (Kalûs-i Naw), probably not to be confounded with the eastern Hazāras. —

The Hazāras are often assumed to be descended from Čīngiz Khān’s soldiers, but more probably Mongol and to some extent also Turkish elements have gradually occupied the territories laid waste by him and his successors (see Bacon, op. cit.).

4) Indo-Aryans and Kafirs. Among the Indo-Aryan "Dārdic" tribes of Afghanistan the most important are the Pāṣaḥs (locally also called Dīgāns) in the Kūstān of Kābul, Lahmān and the lower Kunar Valley. They are the remnants of the ancient Hindu and Buddhist population of Kāpāśa and Nagarāhāra. There are also some smaller communities of Indo-Aryan origin in the Kunar region. — Nūristān (formerly Kāfīrland) is inhabited by a number of tribes, linguistically distinguished from the true Indo-Aryans [cf. KĀFĪRISTĀN]. They were finally conquered by ʿAbd al-Rahmān in 1896, and converted to Islām. Some of the Dārdic tribes also remained pagans till comparatively recent times. The Kafirs are now called Ṣūrīasts or Dījamshīds, i.e. "Recruits (of Islam)". Their ancient religion was a polytheism of an Indian type, with pantheons varying from tribe to tribe. They had also preserved many ancient social customs. There is no evidence of their being of Greek origin as sometimes asserted. Their neighbours divided them into Siyāh-pūsh "black-clad" (Katis and Kāns) and Safd-pūsh "white-clad" (Wāyahs, Āfghūns and Prāsūns or Parūns). Anthropologically the Kafirs contain Oriental, Dinaric and Nordic elements, beside a short, dolichocephalic type with connections in the West Himalayas. Among some of the tribes the ratio of blondism is rather high.

There are some Dīs [q.v.] "gipsies" in Afghanistan, and a few Ghūļārs [q.v.] in the Kunar valley. Hindus are settled as traders and money-lenders in Kābul and other towns, and as horticulturists in the Kūh-i Dāman north of Kābul.

Languages, Babur mentions eleven languages spoken in the Kabul region, and the actual number for the whole of the country is considerably higher. The majority of the inhabitants speak either Pashto or Persian, both of them Iranian.

For Pashto see Afghanistan.

Other Iranian Languages. Most of the Persian dialects [cf. also Kuran, section on language] spoken in Afghanistan are of the eastern type, retaining the distinction between madżābul 1, 2, and ma-rāf 1, 2, in the northern, and of the western, and the dialect of the Hazaras presents traits of its own. Babur just crosses the frontier into the southern deserts. In the Lōgar Valley, south of Kabul, Ormuri is dying out, but it is still spoken in Kānīsārām in Wardhān. Another ancient local Iranian language is Parāfī, which is found in a few villages north of Kabul. North of the Hindū-kūsh, in the mountains of Badakhshān, the so-called Pāmir or Qalača [q.v.] languages have survived, but they are probably remaining and being gradually replaced by Tadjik Persian. They include: Mundgī spoken in Mundgī (with an offshoot called Yidgha in Citrāl), the very archaic Wakhā in Wakhān (overflowing into Gilgit and Citrāl), Sanglī, Zēbākī and Isjākshīmī at the bend of the Oxus and in the upper Wardōdī valley; Shugnī and Rōshānī in the Oxus Valley, north of Isjākshīm.

Indo-Aryan and Kafirī. Apart from Lahndā spoken by Hindus, we find a number of Indo-Aryan languages and dialects on the fringes of Nūristān in North-Eastern Afghanistan. They belong to the so-called Dardic branch of Indo-Aryan. The most important is Pāshā which has several widely diverging dialects, and is rich in popular poetry. In the Kunār Valley, close to the frontier of Citrāl, Gāwar-Bātī is spoken.—The Kāfīr languages (Kātī, Wāgīrī, Aghkūn and Prasut) occupy a somewhat separate position and must have split off from Indo-Aryan in pre-Vedic times. But they have now been heavily overlaid with purely Indo-Aryan elements.

Non-Indo-Iranian Languages. Turkish dialects are spoken by Uzbeks, Turkmen and Kirghiz in Northern Afghanistan. Most Hazaras have now given up their ancient language, and the same is probably the case with the Čahār Aymāks. But (acc. to a private communication) F. Mackenzie was still able in 1951 to collect lists of words, containing many of Mongolian origin, among the Hazaras of Blāsūd and the “Moghols” north of Maywāna.—Some nomads west of Mazār-i Sharif are said to be still speaking Arabic, as is also the case with some Arabs in Tadjikistan [see ʻArab].

Bibliography: General: Linguistic Survey of India, Vol. x (Eranian); viii/ii (Dardic Languages); G. Morgenstierne, Report on a Linguistic Mission to Afghanistan, Oslo 1936; idem, Rep. on a Linguistic Mission to N.W. India, Oslo 1932; Persian: D. L. R. Lorimer, Phonology of Bakhšāsh, Badakhshān, etc., London 1922; G. Morgenstierne, Persian Texts from Afghanistan, AO, vi, Ormuri and Parāfī: G. A. Grierson, The Ormuri or Bargasī Language, Calcutta 1918; idem, Ormuri (LSI, x); G. Morgenstierne, Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages, i, Oslo 1939 (Parachi and Ormuri); idem, Supplementary Notes on Ormuri, Norsk Tidskrift for Sprogvidenskap, v, Pāmir Dialects: W. Geiger, Pāmir-Dialekte (Grundr. d. Iran. Philol., i, with bibliography); G. A. Grierson, Linguistic Survey of India, Vol. x (with bibliographies); G. Morgenstierne, Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages, ii, Oslo 1938; idem, Notes on Shugnī, NTs, i; R. Gauthiot, Quelques observations sur le mindīnān (MSL, 1915); W. Lenz, Materialien zur Kenntnis der Schamian und Kizildar nach F. Mackenzie, London 1933; H. Sköld, Materialien zu den iranischen Famnursprachen, Lund 1936; I. I. Zarūbīn, Kharakteristike mundzhanskogo yazika, Leningrad 1932; Klimčíský, Vahkanské teksty, Moskow–Leningrad 1936. Dardic and Kafir Languages: G. A. Grierson, Linguistic Survey of India, Vol. viii, ii (with bibliographies of older works); G. Morgenstierne, Parāfī Texts (Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages, iii/2, Oslo 1944); idem, The Language of the Ashkun Kafirs (NTS, ii); idem, The Language of the Prasun Kafirs (NTS, xv); idem, Notes on Gāwar Bātī, Oslo 1950, and other publications. Turkish and Mongol: G. Jarring, Uzbek Texts from Afghan Turkestan, Lund 1938; Ramstedt, Mogholica, JSFO, 23; Leech, Vocabulario of the Moghal Asiakhs (Vocabularies of Some Languages, etc., Bombay 1838).

Religion. Since the conversion of the Kafirs practically the entire population of Afghanistan are Muslims, and the great majority are Sunnis. Shiʼite are the Hazaras, Kizilbash, the Yakānūs of Sīstān and Harāt, a few Pathan frontier tribes (Tūrfs, and some sections of Orakzays and Banggah, beside the Savyds of Tirāh), and some Kūhīstānis and Badakhshis (especially the Qalačas). Of these inhabitants of Badakhshān (with Shugnī, Wakhān, etc.) and many Pathals of Laghmān and adjacent valleys are Kizilbash, the so-called Badakhshis calling themselves Mullās and the Pathals being known under the name of 'All-Ihāhs (cf. Ivanow, Guide to Ism. Lit., p. 9). Among the Shiʻī Pathāns there may still be secret adherents of the great heretic Bāyazīd Anṣārī (cf. Rawshānīyya).

Orthodox Islam is now very firmly established in Afghanistan, and the Islamic law (šari'a) is recognized. Hindus and Shiʻīs are tolerated, but Ahmāds are not allowed to enter the country, and Christian missions are prohibited. Local saints and their tombs are worshipped. Among the Pathān tribes of the Frontier the muallīs have often played an important role in local politics and in preaching the dīkā (holy war). (G. Morgenstierne)

History. Pre-Islamic. The territories now known as Afghanistan were occupied by Iranian tribes during the Aryan migrations in the second and first millennia B.C., incorporated in the Achaemenid empire by Cyrus, and after the conquests of Alexander (cf. e.g. W. W. Tarn, Alexander the Great, Cambridge 1918) disputed between the Greco-Bactrians and the Parthians (cf. W. W. Tarn, The Greeks in Bactria and India, Cambridge 1952). In the first century B.C. there was a fresh influx of Iranian tribesmen under the leadership of the Kushan tribe of the Yuezhi. The Kushan empire, which attained its zenith under Kujula Kadphises in the 1st century A.D. and Kanishka in the 2nd (cf. Cambridge History of India, iii, 1935; R. Ghirshman, Bélagram. Recherches archéologiques et historiques sur les Kouchans, Cairo 1946), eventually fell to the Sasanids under Shāhpūr II, probably before the middle of the 4th century. Shortly after 350 the Yuezhi tribes which had remained in Kāshgāria, pressed from the East by Turko-Mongol elements, appeared in Bactria, supported by a confederation of tribes known as Chionites (see R. Ghirshman, Les Chionites-Hepthalites, Cairo 1948, 69 ff.). Shāhpūr, though at
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A war with Rome, marched against the invaders, but was obliged to come to terms with them and to establish them in Bactria and its peripheral regions, in return for their aid against the Romans. Kidara, the king of the Yueh-Chi or "Lesser Kushans", soon extended his conquests to the south of the Hindu-kush and annexed the Faropamisad and Gandhara. It is in the period of this expansion that the establishment of a tribe of Chionites, the Zabuls, in the region of Ghazni is to be placed. When, later on, Kidara's efforts to assert his independence led to a deep conflict with Shahrūr, the Chionites sided with the latter. Kidara lost his kingdom, and probably his life; and Bactria passed into the hands of the Chionites known as Hephthalites from the name of their ruling dynasty. About 400 the lands both to the north and to the south of the Hindu-kush were held by the Chionites-Hephthalites, divided into two branches by the mountain-chain, but whose southern branch, the Zabuls, recognized the supremacy of the northern branch—both, however, remaining vassals of the Sāsānids. This vassal status was preserved so long as the Persian dynasty remained strong, but already by the beginning of the 5th century the Hephthalites, exploiting the difficulties experienced by Persia in the struggle against Rome and in defending the passages of the Caspian Sea against the barbarians, attempted to throw it off, only to be resubjected by Bahram Gōr, just as their pressure towards India was halted by the Gupta kings.

The middle of the 5th century was a turning-point in the relations between Persia and the Hephthalites. During the reign of Pērōz, the Hephthalites won, in 484, a victory which transformed them almost from the vassals into the masters of Iran, to whom the Sāsānids paid tribute for more than half a century. It was only c. 560, when a new people, the Western Turks, had appeared on the chessboard of Central Asia, that a coalition between them and Khosraw I put an end to the central power of the Hephthalites. (For the relations with the Sāsānids, cf. A. Christensen, L'Iran sous les Sassamides, 1944.)

The kingdom of Zābul, or of the southern Chionites, followed its own course. At the end of the 5th century a new dynasty reigned to the south of the Hindu-kush. Its two kings, Toramana and Mihirācula (c. 515-544), made extensive conquests in India; the latter, devoted to a religion with a solar divinity, Mihira, left a memory of cruel persecutions which were pursued until he was crushed by an Indian national coalition. The disappearance of the kingdom of the southern Chionites preceded by a few years the destruction of Hephthalite supremacy in the northern lands.

After the destruction of these two kingdoms, their territories remained in the hands of a number of minor princes, some of whom became vassals of the Sāsānids, others of the Turks. The political condition of Eastern Afghanistan about the middle of the 7th century is portrayed in the account of the travels of the Chinese pilgrim Huien-Tsang, where the Afghan people are mentioned for the first time in a historical source under the form of the country of A-p'o-ki, located in the northern part of the Sulaymān mountains (see A. Foucher, La vieille route de l'Inde de Bactres à Taxila, i, Paris 1947, 235, 254 n. 17). Shortly after the passage of Huien-Tsang, the Chinese T'ang dynasty crushed the Western Turks and extended its suzerainty to the west of the Pāmr. For a whole century (659-751) sixteen kingdoms north and south of the Hindu-kush recognized the authority, more nominal than real, of the Chinese emperor. The Arab invaders who rapidly overran Iran, were checked in this part of Afghanistan by the tenacious resistance of the last kinglets, seconded by the civil wars and dissensions between the conquering tribes, and it was only at the end of the 9th century that Islam finally triumphed south of the Hindu-kush. Nevertheless, the Hephthalite element did not disappear without leaving its traces in the ethnic composition of modern Afghanistan, and there still exists in Badakhshān an important group bearing the name of Haytal. See, for a fuller account of the Chionites-Hephthalites the articles Haytal, Zabulistan, Zūn. For the background of the early history, cf. also W. M. McGovern, The Early Empires of Central Asia, 1939. (R. Ghirshman)

(2) ISLAMIC—TO THE RISE OF THE AFGHAN NATIONAL STATE.

To the Mongol period. The territories that form modern Afghanistan belonged in the first thousand years of Islamic history to different provinces, and although these neighbouring provinces, often shared common vicissitudes, they did not at any time form a separate entity. Nor did the Afghāns form a state of their own until the days of Mir Wazīr, more especially Ahmad Shāh Durrānī. The little that is known of the earlier history of the Afghāns has been summarized in the article Afghān; here a short sketch will be given of the history of the country. (For further details see the articles on the various provinces, e.g. Khurasan, Sidjistan, Zabulistan, Zāmīn-Dawar, Turkestān, Kābul-istān, and on the various dynasties that ruled these lands, as well as the articles on the most important towns, e.g. Balkh, Ghazna, Harat, Kābul, etc.)

At the time of the Islamic conquest the provinces belonging to the Sāsānīd empire were quickly overrun. One wave of the invasion passed through Sidjistan, but the attempts made during the first three centuries to conquer Kābul from this base produced no lasting results until the rise of the Šaffarid [q.v.] dynasty. The province of Kābul resisted Islamization much longer than the other eastern Islamic provinces, and it was only under the Ghaznavids that this was fully achieved. In the middle of the 9th/10th century Alp-takīn [q.v.] seized Ghazna from its former ruler Lawik, conquered Zābulīstān and built up an independent principality, which was inherited by his son Ishāk, then by a slave of his, Balka-takīn, then by another slave, Subuk-takīn, the founder of the Ghaznavid [q.v.] dynasty. The dynasty had its seat in Ghazna, and it was from that town that the greatest Ghaznavid ruler, Māmūd [q.v.], set out on his expeditions to Persia in the west and India in the east. Yet, while it is about this time that the name Afghan first appears in the historians, the Ghaznavid dynasty was in no sense a national Afghan one. The armies were probably composed mainly of Turks. When Māmūd marched to Balkh against the Kara-khanīd ruler, his army comprised, according to al-ʿUtbi, Indians, Khalaǰī [q.v.], Afghāns and "Ghaznavīs", the last term no doubt meaning Iranians ("Tādīk" [q.v.]) of the province of Ghazna. In 414/1023 Māmūd attacked the Afghāns of Sulaymān Kūh and sacked their country.

By the end of his life Māmūd ruled over an extensive territory comprising in the west Khurasan, part of Dībāl and Tabaristan and in the east the whole of the Pandjab; to the north his influence
extended beyond the Oxus while the core was formed by the whole of what is now Afghanistan. The personality of the great conqueror made a deep impression, and he became in a way a national hero in the land which formed the centre of his empire. For the further history of the dynasty, see Ghaznawids. Bāhrām Shāh (512-52/1118-57) had to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Sāḥīhābids; therefor, after the chieftains of Ghūr became increasingly stronger, and after long struggles drove out the Ghaznawids. The Ghurids (q.v.) dynasty was probably of "Tadzik" origin. The fortunes of this dynasty were checked by invasions of Afghanistan by the Ghuzz and the Khāzīrīm-shāhs, so that the Ghurids lost their power in their native land, but succeeded in building up an empire in India, which was inherited by their Turkish slaves. Dīālāl al-Dīn Manukūrīnī, the last scion of the house of the Khāzīrīm-shāhs, after strong resistance, had to vacate Afghanistan before the Mongols of Cingiz Khan.

Mongols, Karts. Harāt and Sitān were conquered by Cingiz Khan's son Tulūy, Ghazna by Uguday. Uguday also entered the Ghūr country and, making it the centre of his operations, conquered the mountains of Fīrūz Kūh and Ghardjistan as well as the plains of Garm-sīr and Sitān. The last Ghūrīm kings were subdued and the Ghurid dynasty was completely destroyed. Tulak and other mountain fortresses offered resistance but to no effect. A leader of the resistance in Ghūr was the awār Muhammad of Ghardjistan, descendant in the male line of the Ghūrīm kings. He was killed in 620/1223 in the fortress of Aghγar. The founders of the Kart dynasty were his descendants. The greater part of Afghanistan was incorporated into the Mongol empire. In the east, however, a Turkish chieftain, Sayf al-Dīn Ḥasan Karlūgh, who had perhaps been allied to Dīālāl al-Dīn Manukūrīnī, managed for some time to get possession of Bāmīyān, Ghazna and Ghūr. He must have exercised his rule in 622/1225, in which year he issued coins in the name of the caliph al-Zahir. In 636/1238 he submitted to Uguday, and was placed under the control of a Mongol qādī (intendant). Nevertheless, he was expelled through the Kuram valley to India. In Sind he and his son Nāṣīr al-Dīn reigned for a further twenty years. Ghazna and the Kuram served as a base for the further incursions of the Mongols into India. We do not hear of Afghans in these movements, perhaps they had not yet reached as far north as the Kuram valley. After Uguday's death the Mongol empire was divided and Afghanistan fell to the lot of the Ilkhāns of Persia. Under their sovereignty a Tadzik dynasty, named Karts (q.v.) came into power and ruled for nearly two hundred years over the greater part of the country. It was Timūr who put an end to the dynasty of the Kartīs, who reigned as last rullers of the Tadzik element in Ghūr and Harāt to establish in their country an independent state. From this time until the rise of the Afghan 13th century no native dynasty held rule in Afghanistan.

Timūr, Timūrīs. In the course of Timūr's invasion Sitān suffered terrible destruction; Kūbāl and Kandahār (which now began to be of importance) were quickly subdued and the whole country formed part of Timūr's empire. In 800/1397 Timūr turned to the east and left his grandson Ptir Muhammād as governor of Kūbāl, Ghazna and Kandahār, while his son Shāhrukhīf received in fief the kingdom of Kūrāshān, with Harāt as its capital. Ptir Muhammād attacked the Afghāns of Sulaymān Kūh and then advanced into India. On the news that he was resisted in Multān, Timūr himself advanced from Andarāb over the Hindū-kuhrī turned aside from Laghūm to attack the Sīyāh-pūghī and the Kator-Kāfirs. After this expedition, he attacked the rebellious Afghāns and then passed over the Indus. Both on his outward march and on his return he passed Banī; he therefore probably followed the road of Točī, which leads through the country of the Ghalejā and the Waziris. We do not hear of Afghans serving in his army, though it comprised Tadziks.

When Timūr died (807/1405), Ptir Muhammād reigned in Kūbāl; it was, however, Khālīf who took possession of the throne of the empire. (For fuller details concerning the history of the descendants of Timūr cf. Timūrīs.) The war that ensued ended with the murder of Ptir Muhammād. Shortly afterwards, Khālīf was deprived of the throne and Shāhrukhīf became the supreme ruler. His reign, which lasted for about forty years, was a period of peace and the country was able to recover from the devastations of the last years. He was followed by Ulūgh Beg, 'Abd al-Latif, 'Abd Allah, Bābūr Mirzā, all of whom reigned for a short time only. In 861/1456 Abū Sa'id ascended the throne, but the possession of Kūrāshān and Afghanistan was contested by Husayn Baykara. The last of the family came to an end in 1465, but Abū Sa'id died two years later, and his successor, Sultan Ahmad, did not possess Kūrāshān at all. Husayn Baykara ruled uncontested, from his capital Harāt, over Kūrāshān, Sitān, Ghūr and Zamin-dāwar. Under the long reign of Shāhrukhīf and Husayn Baykara, Harāt reached the zenith of its fame as a centre of poetry, learning and art. During the latter years of Husayn Baykara, his capital was menaced from the north by the growing might of Shāyβānī and his Uzbeks, while other parts of Afghanistan showed a tendency to dissolve into separate principalities, though not under indigenous rulers. Bābūr (q.v.) established himself in Kūbāl and assumed the title of pādshāh. Until then Kūbāl had been governed by more or less independent members of the Timūrī house; Mūkīm, the son of Arghūn, had just taken possession of it when Bābūr appeared before the city and occupied it (910/1505). Kūbāl remained under Bābūr and his successors, the emperors of India [see MUGHAL] for more than two hundred years, until the invasion of Nādir Shāh.

Bābūr, Arghūn, Uzbeks, Shāh Ismā'īl. More dangerous for the kingdom of Kūbāl was the rise of the dynasty of Arghūn (q.v.). Its founder, Dhu 'l-Nūn Beg Arghūn, a descendant of the Ilkhāns, governor of Ghūr and Sitān, received also, after defeating the tribes of Hazāra and Nikūdār, the regions of Zābulistān and Garm-sīr. Taking Kandahār as his capital, he made himself independent, and with the help of his son, Shāh Beg, extended his rule southward to the Bolan pass and Siwastān. In 904/1498-9 he even invaded Harāt, recruiting his army from the population of Ghūr, Zamin-dāwar and Kandahār—probably Tadziks and Afghāns. His son Mūkīm, as mentioned above, occupied Kūbāl, though only for a short time. Shāyβānī's invasion, however, proved the undoing of Dhu 'l-Nūn Beg; in the first battle against the Uzbeks he was killed and in 913/1507 Shāyβānī took Harāt and Siwastān.

Dhu 'l-Nūn's sons Shāh Beg and Mūkīm were now between Bābūr and Shāyβānī. Bābūr with some right claimed to be heir to Timūr's empire and advanced against Kandahār, while the Arghūn princes allied themselves with his old enemy Shāyβānī. Bābūr defeated them and took Kandahār.
He left there as governor his son Nāṣīr Mīrzā, who was immediately attacked by Shaybānī. Bābur himself had been on his way to Ḥarāt to concert measures of defence against the Uzbeks with Sultān Ḥusayn when he heard of the latter's death. He joined the Sultan's sons in their campaign on the Murghāb, and then after visiting Ḥarāt returned in winter by the mountain road to Kābul, a journey during which he and his troops underwent great hardships. He returned to Kābul in 912/913 just in time to suppress a dangerous plot amongst his own relations. Then followed his expedition to Kandahar in the summer, and he was back in Kābul by Dīnjādār 1 913/Sept. 1507, arranging an Indian expedition, and had already started when he was recalled by the news that Ḥarāt had fallen and that the Afgānīs had been restored by Shaybānī. When the news reached him he was actually engaged in war with the Afgān tribes of Dījadalāk and Nangrāhār, tribes recently established in the Kābul valley. He had great difficulty in holding even Kābul, where his authority was threatened by rebellion and mutiny. Shaybānī was now possessor of Khurāsān and overlord of Ḥarāt, but his power began to decline. His armies suffered severely during an expedition into the mountains of Ghūr, and another warrior king, Shāh Ismā'īl, founder of the Sāfawī kingdom of Persia, threatened him from the west. In 916/1510 Ismā'īl invaded Khurāsān and Shaybānī was defeated and slain near Marw. Ḥarāt passed into Ismā'īl's possession and the Shi'ite doctrines were enforced there by a severe persecution. Bābur now allied himself with Ismā'īl and recovered for a time possession of his hereditary dominions in Central Asia, leaving the kingdom of Kābul to his brother Nāṣīr Mīrzā. The alliance with the Sāfawī king was unpopular, however, and the Uzbeks rallied. In the end Šāh Būr, after a severe defeat at Ghāzdāwūn near Bukhārā (918/1512) from which he barely escaped with his life, had to fall back upon Kābul, which he found in great disorder, and he had to suppress outbreaks among his own Mughal troops and among the Afgān tribes. The Yūsūsfāys had moved down from the mountains into the Peshāwar valley, and expelled their predecessors the Dīladāks from the mountains of Bādījar and Swāt. Bābur put them down severely and took Bādījar with great slaughter. He also had to put down risings among the Ḥārātarās. He then turned his attention to Kandahar where Shāh Bēg Aṛghūn was still established. He had tried in vain to make terms with Shāh Ismā'īl, had been imprisoned at Ḥarāt, but escaped, and had since been endeavouring to establish a kingdom for himself in Sīnd, which he invaded with the assistance of some Bālūţ tribes in 917/1511. Bābur made two attempts to take Kandahār before he finally succeeded in 918/1522. Shāh Bēg then removed his headquarters to Şāh (Quetta) in summer and Sībl in winter, and pursued his schemes in Sīnd, while the whole Kandahār province remained in Bābur's possession. Bābur now felt himself strong enough to embark on the series of enterprises which ended in the overthrow of the kingdom of the Lōdī Afgāns in India. He always preferred Kābul to the plains of India, and was buried at Ghāzāna where his tomb is marked by a column.

Between the Mughal and Sāfawī empires. Afgānistān entered upon a more settled period under the influence of the two great empires of India and Persia between which it was divided. Ḥarāt and Sīltān remained with Persia though still for a time troubled by Uzbek raids. Kābul remained part of the Mughal empire while Kandahār belonged sometimes to one and sometimes to the other. The power of the Mughal emperors was gradually restricted to the south of the Hindū-kūsh. North of it Sulaymān Mīrzā, established by Bābur as governor of Badakhsān, founded something like an independent dynasty, and the rest of the country remained under the Shaybānīs. Ismā'īl died in 930/1524, and Bābur in 937/1530. Bābur's son Humayūn succeeded him and his brothers Kamran, Hindal, and ʻAskari held various governments. Kābul and Kandahār were united with the Pāñjab under Kamran. On the Persian side Ţahmāsp the successor of Ismā'īl had made his brother Sām Mīrzā governor of Ḥarāt. The Sāfawīs regarded Kandahār as an appanage of the kingdom of Khurāsān now in their possession, and considered its occupation by the Mughal emperors to be a usurpation. In 941/1535 Sām Mīrzā made a sudden attack on it, but it resisted him successfully, and after eight months Kamran arrived and raised the siege. During Sām's absence the Uzbeks under Ţubayd Allāh invaded Khurāsān, and the unfortunate town of Ḥarāt was again taken and sacked. Ţahmāsp recovered it, deposed Šāh Bēg and himself annexed Kandahār which he took; but it was recovered by Kamran. Meanwhile Humayūn lost his throne in India through the rising of the Sīr Afrāns under Shīr Shāh, and in 950/1543 he made his way from Sīnd through the desert south of Kandahār to Sīltān and Persia, where he was treated hospitably by Ţahmāsp. In 952/1545 with the assistance of a Persian army he last retook Kandahār which was held against him by his brother ʻAskari on behalf of Kamran, and took it after a prolonged resistance. In accordance with his engagement with Ţahmāsp he made the town over to the Persians, but this excited great discontent among his own followers, and Humayūn at last retook Kandahār from the Persians, and treated the province as part of his own dominions, greatly to the anger of Ţahmāsp. Shortly afterwards Humayūn took Kābul and with it obtained possession of his young son Akbar now three years old. During the next few years the war between the brothers went on with varying fortunes. Kamran twice regained possession of Kābul but could not hold it long; on one occasion he is said to have exposed the young prince Akbar on the battles. Ţahmāsp then spent some time among the Mahmār and Khaḷl tribes of Afgāns, whom he incited to plunder the Kābul valley. At last in 961/1553, he surrendered to Humayūn and was deprived of his sight. Humayūn now held the kingdom of Kābul and Kandahār and found himself strong enough to attempt the reconquest of India. This resulted in his victory over the Sīr kings, but soon afterwards, in 963/1556, he died from the effect of an accident. While the young king Akbar was occupied in completing the reconquest of India Ţahmāsp took the opportunity (965/1558) of seizing Kandahār, and it remained under Persian rule until the prince Muṣaffar Ḥusayn surrendered it to Akbar thirty-eight years later in 1003/1621. Shāh ʻAbbās recovered it, but it was lost again by his successor Shāh Saft I, in whose time the governor ʻAli Mardān Khān surrendered it to Shāh Dzhahān (1047/1637). Gīrīṣḵ was also taken after a siege, and Zamin-dawar occupied. In 1058/1648 the young Persian king ʻAbbās II, then only sixteen years of age, led an army to Kandahār and took it, and it never again formed part of the dominions of the Mughal
empire. Shāh Djahān’s armies in vain attempted the reconquest. The rival princes Awrangzib and Dārā-shikōh both conducted expeditions against it, but were equally unsuccessful, and after the failure of the last (1062/1652) no further attempts were made.

With the exception of the vicissitudes of Kandahār, there is little to record in the history of Afghanistan during the time it was divided between the Mughal and Šafawī empires. The Afghan tribes were steadily increasing in numbers and influence, and it was probably in this period that the Abdālīs and Ghazālys spread from their mountains over the more fertile lands of Kandahār and Zamīn-dāwar and the Tarnak and Ārghandāb valleys. The decline in the position and influence of the Tadjik races which had borne the brunt of the Mongolian invasions, and the occupation of their mountain fortresses of Ghūr by a semi-Mongolian population (cf. Nāzārā), gave the Afghān race the opportunity of rising into prominence. In their eastern mountains they had been but little affected by invaders, eager chiefly to press on through the passes to the plunder of India, and the same need of an outlet for their increasing population which led them to spread into the plains of India on the east also led the pastoral tribes to spread westwards. The mountain tribes continued to maintain practical independence at all times. The Mughal government of Kābul ruled nominally, but its actual power was confined to the open valleys. In 1545/1546 for instance Akbar’s army met with a disastrous defeat at the hands of the Yūsufzays of Swāt and Bādγāwār, and the general Rāḍār Blbbl was slain. Rāḍār Mān Singh afterwards defeated the mountaineers but they were never really conquered; they often raided the plains and sometimes took sides in dynastic quarrels, as when the Yūsufzays took up the cause of the pretended prince Shudjā against Awrangzib. When Shāh ʿAlām I before his accession was governor of Kābul under Awrangzib in 1114/1702 one of his commanders Purdīl Kān himself an Afghān, was killed with all his troops when trying to pass from Khost to Kābul, and he had to bribe the tribes to keep open the road between Kābul and Peshawar.

Abybāls, Ghazālys, Nādir Shāh. In the Kandahār province the frequent changes of government between India and Persia fomented dissensions and intrigue, and enabled the powerful tribes to play off one against the other. The Abdālīs [q.v.] near Kandahār succeeded in this manner in obtaining concessions from Shāh ʿAbdāl the Great. Sadō was recognized as chief, and his descendants the Sadāzays became the ruling family. Nevertheless their misconduct led to part of the tribe being removed to the Harāt province. This removal led to the extension of the influence of the Ghazāly [q.v.] tribe near Kandahār, and their power continued to increase until the accession of the Emperor Shāh ʿAlām I, when the Ghazālys of the Kandahār province began to intrigue with him against the Persian government. The plot was discovered and Gurgīn Kān, a Georgian chief, was sent to Kandahār at the head of an army, and arrested Mr Wāys the Ghazāly chief. During his imprisonment, however, Mr Wāys succeeded in gaining the confidence of Shāh Husayn the Persian king, and was allowed to return to his tribe. Shortly afterwards he treacherously murdered Gurgīn Kān whom he had invited to a banquet, seized upon Kandahār and defeated all attempts to subdue him. He died soon after, and his brother ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, who showed an inclination to submit to Persia, was murdered by Māḥmūd, son of Mr Wāys, who established himself as ruler. (For further details of their conquest of Persia see Ghazāly.)

At the same period the section of the Abdālī tribe in the Harāt province became practically masters of that province, defeated a strong army sent against them under Šafi Kuli Kān, and held their own till the time of Nādir Shāh, even taking Farāh from the Ghazālys after the latter had conquered Persia. While the Ghazāly Māḥmūd fought in Persia, the Abdālīs spread over Kūrūsān and laid siege to Māḥhad. The Ghazāly dynasty was in no way fitted to reign over a country like Persia, and had not sufficient force behind them to oppose any truly national movement. Even the support of the Kandahār province was lost when Aṣhāf succeeded his cousin Māḥmūd, whose brother was able to retain Kandahār. The Abdālīs too remained independent in Harāt. Thus when Nādir [q.v.] put himself at the head of a national movement Aṣhāf’s government collapsed rapidly, and few of the Ghazālys survived to reach their native country. Aṣhāf was killed while wandering in Balzōlīstān in 1142/1729. Nādir now turned his arms against the Abdālīs under Malik Māḥmūd Kān who held Māḥhad (1142/1728). He thoroughly defeated them and took many prisoners. Nevertheless he perceived their value as fighting men and secured their support by restoring them to their old home near Kandahār, from which he removed the Ghazālys when he had the opportunity. He banished them to the Harāt province, but very few, if any, seem to have really settled there, and there are none there at the present day. When Nādir Shāh had made himself king of Persia he laid siege to Kandahār which resisted him for a year, but at last fell (1150/1738). The Ghazāly power was thoroughly broken, but towards the Afghān tribes in general and especially the Abdālīs he pursued a policy of conciliation, and enlisted large numbers in his army. Many Ghazālys took refuge in the Kābul province of the Indian empire, and Nādir Shāh, asserting that his remonstrances had received no reply, advanced on Kābul which fell at once (1151/1738). Thus it was finally severed from the Mughal empire. The last known date of any coin of the emperor Muhammad Shāh struck there is 1138/1725. Nādir Shāh apparently did not use the Kābul mint, but struck coins at Kandahār in 1150/1737, the year of his conquest, and others struck at Nādirābād (which he built during the siege outside Kandahār) no doubt refer to the period of the siege. The whole of Afghanistan was now in his hands and afforded him the necessary base for his invasion of India in 1152/1739. As a result of his victory over Muhammad Shāh the whole Mughal territory west of the Indus including Peshawar and the DēRotāt with the suzerainty over the Kalhūzā or Abybāl rulers of Sind was ceded to him as well as the province of Kābul. On his return from India (1152/1739) he first crossed the Indus at Attock and attacked the Yūsufzays who had been giving trouble, and then went to Kābul. Thence he descended via the Kūrām valley and the Bangāsh country, and went through the DēRoṭāt to Sind, returning by the Bolān to Kandahār and thence to Harāt. During the remainder of his life he relied to a great extent on his Afghān troops and but little on the Persians, from whom he was alienated by his Sunnī creed. The Abdālīs were especially favoured and their young chief Ahmad Kān rose to a high position in his army. Tradition says that Nādir himself prophesied that Ahmad would be king after him. When Nādir Shāh was assassinated by Persians
and Kızıl Bash, Ahmad Shâh who was near by with a strong body of Abdâlîs seized on a treasure convoy and made his way to Kandahâr, where he made himself king. (M. LONGWORTH DAMES *)

(3) THE AFGHÂN NATIONAL STATE. (A) THE SADO-ZAY DYNASTY.

Ahmad Shâh made himself king in Kandahâr and obtained possession of all the eastern portion of Nâdîr’s empire up to the Indus. Harât soon followed, and in the general break up of the Persian monarchy Ahmad Shâh acted as the protector of Shâhrukh, grandson of Nâdir Shâh, who was blinded by his enemies, and maintained a principality for him in Khurâsân. This province in reality formed part of the dominions of Ahmad Shâh and his son Timûr Shâh, both of whom occasionally struck coins at Mashhad, but Shâhrukh continued to rule in name until he was seized and killed by Ağhâ Muhammad Kâdjar after Timûr Shâh’s death. Harât was however treated as an integral part of the Durrânî monarchy, and the ancient kingdom of Khurâsân has remained divided between Persia and Afghanistan.

Ahmad Shâh made Kandahâr his capital and gave it the name of Ahmadshâhî which appears on his coins and those of his successors. He took the title of Durr-i Durrânî, and his tribe, the Abdâls, have since been known as Durrânîs [see]. His family had long been looked up to, and this fact, combined with his tact and energy, enabled him to hold his own. The tribes were treated mildly, and he relied upon foreign war rather than taxation to provide him with a revenue. The Durrânîs were proud of him and followed him willingly, but they were not an easy race to govern, and his son Timûr Shâh on this account moved his capital to Kâbul where the population is mainly Tûdîlî. In his Indian conquests Ahmad Shâh not only rivalled but excelled Nâdir Shâh, and extended his dominions far beyond the Indus. He added the provinces of Kâshmir, of Lahore and Multân, that is the greater part of Pandîjâb and the suzerainty over the Dâ’udpotos or Bahâwâlpur to his dominions. He invaded India several times, and occupied Dâhiy more than once. His defeat of the Mahrattas at Pânpât in 1174/1761 was a turning point in Indian history, but he did not add any provinces beyond the Pandîjâb to his own dominions. His wars with the Sikhs were perpetual and led to the eventual loss of the province. The Khân of Kâlât too, the Brahdî Nâsîr Khân who had become feudatory to Nâdir Shâh declared his independence in 1172/1758. Ahmad Shâh besieged Kâlât without success, and on being called away to India accepted a purely nominal submission. Nâsîr Khân, however, supported Ahmad Shâh in his wars in Khurâsân, and contributed greatly to his victory over Karîm Khân Zand in 1182/1766. On this occasion the blind Ağhâ prince took the side of Karîm Khân and suffered him in Mashhad which Ahmad Shâh reduced by blockade.

For further details about Ahmad Shâh see AḤMAD SHĀH DURRĀNĪ; he died at Murghâb in the hills near Kandahâr in 1187/1773, leaving his successor a very extensive but insecure empire.

Timûr Shâh had held important posts under his father, such as the Niţâmshîp of Lahore and Multân, which is marked by a distinct series of coins. At the time of Ahmad Shâh’s death he was at Harât, and only obtained possession of Kandahâr after seizing and executing his brother Sulaymân, who had been set up as his rival. He soon moved his capital to Kâbul, and reigned uneventfully for twenty years, during which the monarchy declined steadily in strength and stability, although externally it remained unimpaired. The authority of the central government over the outlying provinces was precarious. The Sikhs grew in power and took Multân in 1196/1781, but Timûr Shâh retook it the same year. In Sind the feudatory Kâlbârâs were overthrown and replaced by Balîc amîrs of the Tâlbûr tribe (commonly called Tâlpurs), who waged successful war against Timûr Shâh’s generals from 1197/1782 to 1201/1786, and remained independent, although they accepted a nominal suzerainty. The Mangît amîr of Bûhirâr Ma’âsîm, who had been encroaching on the Turkistân province, especially Marw, also made a nominal submission when attacked by Timûr Shâh, but retained all his conquests. In Kâshmir also there was a revolt which was suppressed. Internally the power of the Bârâkzây clan of the Durrânîs became gradually greater. Timûr Shâh died in 1207/1793 and was succeeded by his son Zamân Shâh, who, though reigned till he was dethroned by his brother Maḥmûd Shâh in 1215/1800. Short as his reign was he was able to concentrate in it crimes and follies enough to wreck the Durrânî monarchy. Although weakened at home by the rivalry of his brothers Maḥmûd and Shûdja’-al-Mulk, threatened in Khurâsân by the Kâdjar, and in the north by Shâh Murâd Mangît, supported by the Khân of Kâlât and the amîrs of Sind, yet he could not refrain from wasting his strength in foolish attempts to rival Ahmad Shâh’s conquests in India, and to pose as the champion of Islam against Sikhs and Mahrattas. This brought him into collision with the English now rapidly becoming the ruling power in North India. His first invasion (1209/1795) was cut short at Hasan Abdal by the news that Ağhâ Muḥammad Kâdjar had captured Mashhad and murdered the blind old Shâhrukh. Having been appeased by an embassy from the Persian king he began a second invasion of India, which was interrupted by the rebellion of Maḥmûd at Harât. After defeating this rising he invaded the Pandîjâb, and this time reached Lahore and received the nominal submission of the Sikhs, now headed by Randîj Singh, but the Kâdjar encroachments in Khurâsân again called him back. Maḥmûd meanwhile led a wandering life intriguing with discontented persons in Harât and Kandahâr. Among these was the powerful leader of the Bârâkzây clan, Payinda Khân, known by the title of Sârîrâz Khân, who was jealous of the authority wielded by the viceroy Wafîdâr Khân. The conspiracy was detected and Payinda Khân was executed. His son Fath Khân fled to Maḥmûd in Khurâsân and induced him to throw himself on the sympathy of the Durrânî tribe with whom Zamân Shâh was unpopular (Zamân Shâh’s mother was a Yûsûfzay while Maḥmûd’s was a Popalzây Durrânî). This advice was justified by the result. Maḥmûd obtained possession of Kandahâr while the infatuated Zamân Shâh was preparing for another invasion of India. Maḥmûd advanced on Kâbul and Zamân Shâh fled, but was soon captured and blinded (1215/1800). Simultaneously with Maḥmûd’s accession at Kâbul Shûdja’-al-Mulk proclaimed himself king at Pêshâwar. He was assisted by a Ghâzâlî rising against Maḥmûd and in 1218/1803 he took Kâbul, imprisoned Maḥmûd and released the blind Zamân Shâh, his own whole brother. For a time Kandahâr was held by Maḥmûd’s son Kâmîrân supported by Fath Khân, but the latter made terms for himself and submitted, but discontented with his position almost immediately set up a rival king Kâysâr Shâh son of Zamân Shâh.
The next few years were occupied by constant intrigues. Path Khan changed rapidly from one pretender to another, sometimes supporting Mahmud and Kâmrân, sometimes Kayser, while Shudjâ³ al-Mulk dissipated his strength in expeditions to Sind and Kashmîr. Finally Fath Khan, who was now supporting Mahmûd, defeated Shudjâ³ al-Mulk at Nimla (1224/1809). He fled into India and Mahmûd’s second reign began. He was however absolutely dependent on Fath Khan, whose power became very great. His brother Dûst Muhammad held high office, another brother Muhammad A’sam became governor of Kashmîr, and another Khânûndîl governor of Kandahâr. Harât which had become independent under another prince was reconquered by Fath Khan and Dûst Muhammad in 1232/1816. Soon afterwards Dûst Muhammad incurred the enmity of Kâmrân, who had become governor, by entering his harem and insulting his sister. He fled to Kashmîr and Kâmrân took his vengeance on Fath Khan, whom he blinded and afterwards killed with the consent of Mahmûd. Although perfidious and unscrupulous Fath Khan was greatly admired by the Afghans, and his brother Dûst Muhammad had no difficulty in raising a large force and defeating Mahmûd in 1235/1818 near Kâbul. Mahmûd lost Kâbul which he never recovered. He held Harût till his death in 1243/1829 and Kâmrân continued to rule there till he was murdered in 1258/1842.

(M. Longworth Dames *)

(b) THE BâRKAZAY (OR MUHAMMADZAY) DYNASTY.

The Muhammaddazy, a small subdivision of the Durrânî Bârkazay of Kandahâr, derive their name from Muhammads, a contemporary of Malik Sadozây, chief of the Abdâf class, with whom he lived amongst his small tribe at Arghasân, SE of Kandahâr, about 1000/1591. His descendants held the title of chief among the Bârkazay tribes of Kandahâr, and came into prominence with Hâjdi Dûmân Khan b. Hâjdi Yûsuf b. Yâro b. Muhammads, who served under Shâh Shâh and died in 1186/1770–1. His son Fâyinda Khân rendered important service to Timûr Shâh in the suppression of rebellions, but in consequence of his intrigues with Muhammads against Shâh Zamân was executed in Kandahâr in 1214/ 1800. He left a number of sons, the eldest of whom, Fath Khân, was installed as vizier, with the title of Shâh Dûst, on Muhammads’ occupation of Kâbul (1215/1800). With the increasing power of the Muhammaddazy their ambitions clashed with the ruling Sadozây family and plunged Afghanistan into strife and bloodshed until finally, after the execution of Fath Khân in 1234/1818–9, his brother Dûst Muhammads drove Muhammads out of Kâbul.

The Bârkazay chiefs, who by now held most of the country, ruled at first in the name of various puppet kings of the Sadozây family, such as Ayyûb and Sultan ‘Ali (who took the name of Sultan Muhammads on his coins). It was not until 1254/1838 that Dûst Muhammads formally assumed the style of amir of Kâbul; but neither he nor any of his successors before Habib Allâh took the title of shâh or king. During the early years of his rule the outer provinces of the empire were rapidly lost. The Sikhs took Multân in 1233/1818, Kashmîr in 1235/1819, Dûrâ Gâzî Khân in the same year, and Dûrâ Ismâyîl Khân in 1242/1824. Peshawar long resisted them under Dûst Muhammads’ brother, Sardâr Sultan Muhammads, but it too fell in 1250/ 1834. The amirs of Sind threw off the last sign of Afghan rule by taking Shikâr-pûr, and to the north of the Hindû-kush Balâk was lost also. Dûst Muhammads therefore became the ruler of a compact Afghan kingdom; the loss of the outlying provinces, which had always been a source of weakness to the Sadozây kings, tended to consolidate his power. Although without scruples of any sort in attaining his ends, yet he had the reputation of a just man and was popular among the Afghans. But his progress was checked by the inevitable rivalries of his brothers. While he made Kâbul his capital, Kâhûndîl Khân held Kandahâr and defeated an attempt by Shudjâ³ al-Mulk Sadozây to recover it in 1250/1834. Harût was taken by the Persians after the murder of Kâmrân by his vizier Yâr Muhammads Khân (1258/ 1842), and was only recovered by Dûst Muhammads in 1280/1863, just before his death. Shudjâ³ al-Mulk, after his failure at Kandahâr, endeavoured to obtain British assistance, and political events led to his ultimately obtaining it. Attempts by Alexander Burnes to negotiate a treaty with Dûst Muhammads had broken down, and the growth of Russian influence led the Indian government to favour Shudjâ³ al-Mulk’s claims. The Persians had at this time (1253/1837) laid siege to Harât. It was believed that their operations were directed by Russians and an English officer conducted the defence. This brought matters to a climax. An Anglo-Indian army advanced through Sind and the Bolân Pass on Kandahâr (end of 1254/Feb. 1839) and after taking the city marched on Kâbul. Dûst Muhammads fled to Bukhârâ and Shudjâ³ al-Mulk was placed on the throne of Kâbul (1 Dûjumâdâ II 1255/17 Aug. 1839). Dûst Muhammads, after some unsuccessful operations in the north, surrendered to the British in the following year and was sent to Calcutta.

Shudjâ³ al-Mulk’s reign was a troubled one. Kâbul was abandoned by the British-Indian army in 1841, and on its retreat the army was almost annihilated at the Khurâd Kâbul pass. These operations were conducted by Muhammads Akbar Khân, son of Dûst Muhammads. The British continued to hold Djalâlabad and Kandahâr, and recouped Kâbul in the autumn of 1256/1842. Shortly before this, Shudjâ³ al-Mulk had been murdered, and his son Fath Djang was recognized as king by the Popalzays but opposed by the Bârkazays. The British soon afterwards left Afghanistan, and Fath Djang, knowing that he could not hold his own, went with them, accompanied by the blind old Zamân Shâh, who was still living. Dûst Muhammads was sent back to Afghanistan, as he was the only man who could establish a firm government. His sons and brothers were reestablished in their governments, but rifts continued from time to time to breach the solidarity of the clan, and even Akbar Khân, now vizier, was on bad terms with his father till he died in 1266/1849–50. Dûst Muhammads maintained friendly relations with Britain except at the time of the Sikh war of 1849, when the Afghan contingent covered itself with ridicule by its rapid flight after the battle of Gudrât. During the mutiny of the Indian army in 1857, Dûst Muhammads gave them no support. He occupied himself in strengthening his own country, and from 1267 to 1272/1850–55 he reconquered Balâk, Khûlm, Kunduz and Bâdakhshân. In 1280/1863 he succeeded in driving the Persians from Harât, and he died there immediately afterwards, having been a good ruler on the whole in spite of obvious faults. [See also Dûst Muhammads Khân.]

Shîr ‘Ali, his fifth son, who had been nominated by him as his successor, became almost at once
involved in civil war with his own elder brothers Muhammad A'zam and Muhammad Afdal, and with 'Abd al-Rahman, the able and determined son of the latter. (For an account of these wars see 'Abd al-Rahman Khan). Shīr 'All was defeated in 1283/1866 and lost first Kābul and then Kandahār. Afdal and A'zam reigned in succession until 1283/1868, but never held possession of Ḥarāt, whence Muhammad Ya'qūb, Shīr 'All's son, advanced in the latter year and recovered Kandahār and Kābul for his father. Shīr 'All now held the whole of Afghanistan, and was recognized by the Indian government, and met the viceroy Lord Mayo at Āmbālā in 1286/1869. He was not, however, satisfied with his treatment, as he could obtain no definite promise of support against other powers. At this period he imprisoned his enterprising son Muhammad Ya'qūb and refuted the viceroy's attempt to intercede for him. He agreed to an arbitration by British officers as to the Sīstān border, regarding which there was a dispute with Persia. According to this arbitration (1290/1873) a considerable part of the most fertile lands was awarded to Persia, and this was another cause of resentment. Finally he began to negotiate with Russia and refused to receive a British embassy. These causes led to the war of 1878-80. The British army took Kābul, and Shir A1I fled to Mazar-i Sharif, where he died in 1296/1879. [See also Shir A1I]. His army, organized on the European model, was defeated by Lord Roberts at the Paywār pass. Muhammad Ya'qūb, released from prison and proclaimed 'Amīr on his father's flight (Rabī‘ I 1296/ Feb.-March 1879), met the advancing British forces at Gandamak, and there concluded a treaty (4 Dūmādār 1296/26 May) by which he ceded to British India certain territories near the Bolān pass and the Kurām valley, and agreed to receive a mission at Kābul. A few months later a rising in Kābul resulted in the massacre of the members of the mission headed by Sir Louis Cāvagnari. This led to a fresh outbreak of war. Roberts took Kābul a second time, but was besieged there by a tribal army headed by Muhammad Dāmān and Mūshk-i 'Alam. After its defeat Ya'qūb Khan was deposed and removed to India, and the government was offered to 'Abd al-Raḥmān, a separate state being constituted at Kandāhār. Part of the army at Kandahār under Stewart marched to Kābul, as a preliminary to evacuating the country, and in passing through the Ghālzāy country was attacked at Aḥmad Khyāl by a large force of men of that tribe, who were only defeated after a most desperate conflict. Scarcely had 'Abd al-Raḥmān been proclaimed when Ayyūb, a son of Shīr 'All, who had been collecting an army at Ḥarāt, marched on Kandahār, defeated a small Anglo-Indian force at Maywand, and laid siege to Kandahār. Roberts marched rapidly from Kābul and defeated Ayyūb. After this the British army withdrew and the whole country including Kandahār was made over to 'Abd al-Raḥmān (1297/1880). In spite of internal difficulties and external problems [see 'Abd al-Raḥmān Khan], he preserved the independence and integrity of the country, and on his death (15 Dūmādār II 1319/1 Oct. 1901) transmitted an undisputed authority to his son Shīr A1I. His son Muhammad 'Alī, then aged 19, was at once proclaimed as successor by the brothers of Nādir Shāh, the eldest of whom, Sardār Muhammad Hāshim Khan, exercised a virtual regency until 1946. Several tribal risings in the course of which king Nadir Shāh was assassinated (20 Rādīj 1352/8 Nov. 1933) in the palace of Dilkushā. His son Muhammad 'Alī, then aged 19, was at once proclaimed as successor by the brothers of Nādir Shāh, the eldest of whom, Sardār Muhammad Hāshim Khan, exercised a virtual regency until 1946. Several tribal risings in the following years were sternly suppressed, and an active programme of military, educational and economic development was pursued. In 1934 Afghanistan entered the League of Nations, and in 1937 signed with Turkey, 'Irāk and Iran the pact of Sa'ādābād; a trade agreement was negotiated with the USSR in 1936. During the second World
War it again maintained a strict neutrality. The remaining frontier disputes were settled in 1947—that in the north by agreement with the USSR, and that with Iran over the Helmand river by American arbitration. Since the constitution of Pakistan in the same year, however, the problem of the unsubdued tribes of the former “North-West Frontier” (see the articles AFGHANISTAN and MAHMAND), which for a century bedevilled relations between Afghanistan and British India, continues equally to obstruct those between the two Muslim States.


(1) L. Longworth Dames—H. R. Gibb)

‘AFLAJ or AL-DIN AL-TILIMSANI (see AL-TILM-SANI)

AFLADI (AFLADI AL-DAWASIR), a district in southern Najid, almost the great cuesta of Tuwayq, roughly bounded by Wadi Birk (N), the plain of al-Bayadh (E), Wadi al-Makan (S), and the sands of al-Daby (W). The most populous oasis and present capital is Layla (46° 44' 35" E, 22° 16' 45" N). The district contains a remarkable group of spring-fed pools called ‘Uydn al-Sayh and the extensive remains of a system of channels which once irrigated a more prosperous land. The pools, the largest of which is nearly a kilometre long, are the most noteworthy features of this kind in the Arabian Peninsula. The district, in older times also known as al-Falaijd, takes its name from falaj (pl. aflaj), the term still used in ‘Uman for an underground aqueduct with surface apertures to facilitate cleaning of the channel, though strangely enough this type of aqueduct, which may be of Persian origin, is now called saddi (pron. sadji, pl. sawadjji) in al-Aflaiid. The poorly kept aqueducts of Samhan, Barbir, al-Wadjdajj, and three smaller ones, all of which water the oasis of al-Sayh, are still flowing.

The northernmost village of al-Aflajid is Usayliia. Layla comprises the settlements of Qashiba, the present seat of the amir, al-Mubarrar, the former seat, and al-Diufaydiriyia. Farther south are the oases of al-Ammar (not to be confused with Al ‘Ammar, a section of the Dawasir), al-Sayh, which is the most extensively cultivated of all, al-Kharfa, and al-Rawda. The pools lie south-west of al-Sayh. South of the pools are the tiny oases of Suwaydan, al-Rukaykyiya, al-Ghawta, and Marwan. The southernmost oases are al-Badda in Wadi Hachradj, which descends from al-Haddar, and al-Shubta in the upper reaches of al-Makan. In the highlands of Tuwayq are al-Sittara (al-‘Idara in al-Hamdan), Hurada, and al-Ghayl, all ancient places. Along the western escarpment of Tuwayq are al-Hamar (al-‘Amar) (N) and al-Haddar (S).

At the dawn of Islam the dominant tribe in al-Aflajid was Dja [q.v.], whose ancestor was a brother of Kushayr and al-Hashir, sons of Ka'b, a descendant of ‘Amir b. Sa‘a‘a of the Northern Arabs. In 630-1 Dja‘da embraced Islam and sent an envoy to Medina, where the Prophet confirmed the tribe’s position in the district (Caetani, Annali, ii, 1, 297). In 126/743-4 Dja‘da and their allies of Banu ‘Amir on the First Day of al-Falajid killed a governor of Banu Hanifa who had been set over them. Banu Hanifa, after defeating Banu ‘Amir on the Second Day of al-Falajid, had their power broken on the Day of al-Nishah in 176 (Caetani, Chronographia, v. 1601).

Three centuries after the Prophet, Dja‘da remained the foremost tribe of al-Aflajid, followed in importance by Kushayr and al-Hasir (al-Hamdan, i. 549). Dja‘da’s chief centre was Sukkan al-Falajid, a city with iron gates and walls 30 cubits thick enclosing an area said to contain 260 wells of sweet water. Also within the territory of Dja‘da was al-Kar al-‘Adi, reputed to date back to the time of ‘Amza and ‘Iraqid—perhaps the same as the ruins now known as Kuşyayrat. ‘Ad just south of al-Sayh. Kushayr occupied the city of al-Haysamiyya with walls broad enough for four horses to run abreast along the summit. Among the towns belonging to al-Hasir was al-Haddar, but many members of this tribe had already moved to the Yemen.

In 443/1051 Naisir-i Khusrav found al-Aflajid in a state of virtual ruin as the result of internal dissensions so severe that men wore their shields and swords even while praying. During this medieval age the tribe of Dja‘maya, said to be a branch of ‘Anza, became the leading power. ‘Al Salabb and ‘Al Khalfa, the present ruling houses of al-Kuwayt, who eventually supplanted Dja‘maya in control of the whole district.

In 1199/1785 the people of al-Aflajid, following the lead of their kinsmen in Wadi al-Dawasir, adhered to the Wahhabi cause and have since remained staunch in its support, though the district has played only a minor role in modern history. In 1348/1920 ‘Abd al-Alir al-Saad bordered the rebellious leaders of the Hazazina of al-Para at Layla and executed them. The district is now under an amir responsible to the central government of Saudi Arabia in al-Riyadh. In addition to the Dawasir, small numbers of Subay, the Suhul, and the Fu‘ul live in al-Aflajid. Remnants of Dja‘maya are found at al-Haddar. Aflajid form an important part of the population of al-Sayh. Negro blood is often seen in the towns, and there are many folk of Banu Khadlr (q.v.), mainly tillers of the soil (hadda, pl. havadda).

The dates of al-Aflajid are famous. Both al-Hamdan and Philby mention the sfire variety (called by al-Hamdan sayyid al-tumur, though the present inhabitants regard the siri as the sayyid),
and Nāṣīr reckoned the dates of al-Aflādī better than those of al-Bagār.


**AL-FALĀTŪN Arabic** for Plato, the Greek philosopher, who became, together with Aristotle, the standard philosopher in late Greek philosophy. (i) Works and doctrine; (ii) Lives; (iii) Sayings. (i) Plato is known to Arab authors according to the different ways in which his genuine works or those erroneously attributed to him were read and studied in the Greek sections of the Roman Empire during the centuries preceding the Arab conquest of Hellenized lands in the Eastern Mediterranean. Most Arab thinkers did not consider Plato the main representative of Greek thought as St. Augustine e.g. had done (Civ. Dei, viii, 4, 12) but subordinated him to Aristotle; they were however like e.g. Porphyry, Ammonius and Simplicius aware of an identity of purpose and a basic agreement between the two great philosophers.

Just as commentaries on Aristotle written outside the Neoplatonic schools survived in Arabic translations and, partly, in Arabic translations only (as in the case of certain writings of Alexander of Aphrodisias and Themistius, etc.), interpretations of Plato, untinged by Neoplatonism, found their way to the Arabic philosophers and were studied by them. Part of Galen's *Dīllūnīs (q.v.)* Παντοκράτωρ διάλογων συνόψεως in eight books, lost in the Greek original but still partly accessible to Ḥunayn b. Iṣḥāḳ (Mā Tūrgīmūn min Kūṭub Dīllūnīs (Bergsträsser), no. 124) and his school, has been traced and recently published, viz. the summary of the whole of the *Timaeus*, with many verbal quotations, a fragment of his paraphrase of the *Republic*, a fragment of his summary of the *Laws* and a reference to his summary of the *Parmenides* (P. Kraus and R. Walzer, *Plato Arabus*, i, 1951). Fragments of his medical commentary on the *Timaeus* (Ḥunayn, no. 122) have been recovered from Arabic medical writers (H. O. Schröder and P. Kahle, Corpus Medicorum Graecorum, *Supplementum*, i, 1934). Many quotations from Plato and references to him reached the Islamic world through translations of other works by Galen. As had happened in the case of Aristotle, late Greek philosophers tried to arrange Plato's dialogues in systematic order. An otherwise unknown work of this type, completely free from Neoplatonic influence and still fully aware of the political aspects of Plato's thought, was used and partly reproduced by al-Fārābī (F. Rosenthal and R. Walzer, *Plato Arabus*, ii, 1943). The author of the Greek treatise, who had even regarded this systematic ordering of the dialogues as a chronological arrangement by date of composition, is unknown. A commentary on the *Republic* of similar provenience was widely used by al-Fārābī; it constitutes the main part of Ibn Rūghād's commentary which is available in a Hebrew translation and a 16th century Latin one (edition in preparation by E. J. Rosenthal). A summary of Plato's *Laws*, of a similar type, was used by al-Fārābī in his compendium of the work (F. Gabrieli, *Plato Arabus*, iii, 1951). Al-Rāzī commented on Plutarch's commentary on the *Timaeus* (S. Pines, *Atomenlehre*, 90) and Yāḥyā b. ‘Adī copied Plutarch's book *μεταφυσικά* (Bibliography, 246). But, in general, Arabic philosophers look at Plato through the eyes of his Neoplatonic interpreters, Plotinus (cf. *AL-SHAYKH AL-YŪNĀN*), Porphyry (Furfuriyūs (q.v.)), Proclus (Burūlus (q.v.)) and others. In the preface to his translation of a fragment of Proclus' commentary on the *Timaeus* (89E–90C: E. Pfaff, Corpus Medicorum Graecorum, *Supplementum*, iii, p. xiii, 1941) Ḥunayn b. Iṣḥāḳ (cf. also Mā Tūrgīmūn, no. 45) says: "Galen is the standard interpreter of Hippocrates, and the man who is best entitled to explain the meaning of Plato's words is Proclus the most famous of scholars". An instructive example of this Proclean interpretation of Plato is to be found in Miskawayh's *al-Fawās al-Asghar*, in the section on the immortality of the soul (F. Rosenthal, 399 ff.), based probably on Proclus' work *On the immortality of the soul according to Plato* in three books, which was known to the Arabs (Fīhrīst, 252). A tradition of this kind is followed by al-Kindī, in whom the Platonic element is strong (cf. Rasā'il (Abū Rida), nos. 10–13) not only in psychology but also in his extremely orthodox neoplatonic metaphysics of the One and in his ethics. The Plato to whom al-Fārābī (with the exception of his theory of the ideal state), Ibn Sīnā, Ibn Bīḍār and Ibn Rūghād refer is, whether explicitly or implicitly, always the Plato of Plutinus and his followers. Yāḥyā b. ‘Adī had Olympiodorus' (6th century A.D.) commentary on the *Sophist* (lost in the Greek original) in his library (Fīhrīst, 256) in the translation of Iṣḥāḳ b. Ḥunayn. We find an interesting account of Plato's metaphysics, cosmology and psychology, derived from an unknown but valuable neoplatonic source, in al-Shahrastānī, 283 ff. (German transl. by Th. Haarbrücker, ii, 177).

On the whole, since Neoplatonism claims to be a reinterpretation of Plato, influential Neoplatonic writings deserve to be mentioned here as well, the *Theology of Aristotle*, in which Aristotle is supposed to have become a Platonist in his old age, the *Liber de causis* based on Proclus' *Elements of Theology*, the new Plotinian text discovered by P. Kraus (cf. Bibliography) and the Arabic Plotinus source discussed by F. Rosenthal (cf. *ARISTOTELES* and *AL-SHAYKH AL-YŪNĀN*).

A new development starts with al-Suhrawardī al-Maktūl (q.v.) and the Ḥirākhīs (q.v.), who, criticizing al-Fārābī and Ibn Sīnā, emphasize the mystical aspects of Platonism or rather Neoplatonism, and make Plato the mystic the chief authority in philosophy. The Şūfis now become the true followers of Plato (cf. e.g. al-Suhrawardī, *Opera Metaphysica et Mystica* (Corbin), i, p. viii, xxxix ff.). An anonymous book *On the Platonic Ideas* (ed. 'A. Badawi,
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 Cairo 1947), written probably in the 14th century
(Corbin, op. cit., a, n. 79), depends on al-Suhrawardi's
strange interpretation of the Platonic ideas.

Another special tradition of Platonism is repre-
sented by Muhammad b. Zakariyya' al-Razi [g.v.]
who also claims to follow Plato as his main author.
His Platonising ethics (cf. al-Tibb al-Ruhand) may
be connected with his study of Galen, and his
rejection of the eternity of the world with the
interpretation of the Timaeus put forward by Plato.
Galen, but his five eternal principles
are of Neopythagorean provenience, although he
considered them to be Platonic. His theory of the
atomic structure of matter may go back to Plato's
lecture On the Good, it is certainly found in a
neopy-
thagorean version of Plato's metaphysics (Sixtus
Empiricus, Adversus Physicos, ii, 249 ff.).

The Arabic bibliographers list the titles of all
the dialogues to be found in the Greek Corpus Platonicum,
but give little information about Arabic translations.
They mention a commentary on the Republic
(translated by Hunayn b. Ishah); translations of the
Timaeus by Yahyâ b. al-Bdtik, Hunayn b. Ishah and Yahyâ b. 'Adî. (Hunayn wrote also a
commentary which that ought to be read before Plato's
works.) Ibn al-Nadîm also mentions a copy of the
Cratylus in Yahyâ b. 'Adî's handwriting. Proclus' comment-
ary on the Phaedo (lost in the Greek
original) was translated from the Syriac by Ibn Zur'a.

No manuscripts of these or other Arabic transla-
tions of a Platonic dialogue have so far been traced.
A verbal quotation from the Republic (apart from
the more or less verbal references in Ibn Rushd's
paraphrase and references to its contents in works
of other philosophers) occurs e.g. in the Rashd
Ikhwdn al-Saf', Cairo 1347, iv, 134 (the story about
Al-Kindî wrote a treatise on the Platonic number
(Rep., viii; Fihrist, 256). Quotations from the
Timaeus occur frequently, but it is difficult to
decide whether they are taken from Plato or from
some intermediary. For the quotations from the
Laws to be found in al-Bubrûn's India cf. F.
Rosenthal, 359 f. and F. Gabrieli, Plato Arabus, iii, p. xii,
n. 2. There are numerous quotations from the
Phaedo in the same work. The closing section on
Socrates' death is to be found e.g. in Ibn al-Kifês' a, 100-6 and Ibn Abi Usaybi'a, i, 45. A Persian
version of the dialogue exists in Brusa (Bell., 1952, 114).
The Akbâdî-speech from the Banquet has been
translated by F. Rosenthal in Istanbul, Köprüli 1608,
fol. 216. Persistent research will no doubt trace more
quotations of Platonic dialogues in Arabic philo-
sophical and non-philosophical writings.

Among the pseudopigrapha of a philosophical
kind can be mentioned: the neopythagorean
interpretation of Plato's Eskortation of young men, probably
of Greek origin (F. Rosenthal, Orientalia, x, 383-95),
a letter by Plato addressed to Phormvy (!) about
the banishment of grief, depending on a treatise on
consolation by al-Kindî (Magh., 1922, 884-9, see
H. Ritter-R. Walzer, Memorie Ac. dei Lincei, 1940,
388 n. 2) and Plato's will addressed to Aristotle.
But the Arabs are acquainted not only with the
different interpretations of Plato's thought which
are familiar to the student of Greek philosophy but
also with a Plato who had been associated with the
superstitions which had become an integral part of
the teaching of most of the neoplatonic schools:
magic, astrology and alchemy (Olympiodorus
and other late Neoplatonists had dabbed in alchemy
and made Plato their patron). The Arabs went a
step further and made Plato the author of alchemical
works. Djâbir quotes a Musahhahâd 'Afâlân in
which Plato initiates his disciple Timaeus in the
secrets of alchemy; but the passages of the Timaeus
referred to by Djâbir have nothing to do with the
original dialogue of Plato (P. Kraus, Jabir et la
science grecque, 48 ff.). Another work of a similar
character, a philosophical alchemical book attributed
to Plato is the Rasâbî 'Afâlân known to the West
as Liber Quaurtorum and preserved in two Arabic MSS.
It contains a dialogue between Ahmad b. al-Husayn
djâbir Buqhtâr and the well known Harranian
mathematician and astronomer Thabit b. Kurra
(P. Kraus, op. cit., 31, 339). Another alchemical
treatise, the Liber Platonis de XIII clavisibus, is
supposed to have been translated from the Arabic
into Latin in A.D. 1301 (L. Thurnhike, A History
of Magic, iii, 57). Cf. also Kraus, op. cit., 31, n. 9.

Among the magical treatises ascribed to Plato the
Al-Nawâmîs, which deals with artificial generation,
appears to be worth mentioning (P. Kraus, op. cit.,
or, n. 12) as well as al-Sirr al-Khafi (Ibid., 52).

The Arabic "Lives of Plato" do not add
anything substantial to the material to be found in
the Greek tradition as represented by Diogenes
Laertius, book iii, Olympiodorus, and the Prote-
gomena to the Platonico philologico (cf. H. Breitenbach, F.
Buddenhagen, A. Debrunner, F. von der Miehl,
Diogenes Laertius III, 1907; J. Kirchner, Prosopographia
Attica, no. 11835). There is, however, no direct connection
between them and any of the Greek texts known.
Partial of the Arab tradition can be traced back to
an introductory work by Theo of Smyrna (2nd
century A.D.), referred to by the Fihrist, 245,
and quoted at length by Ibn al-Kifês, 17-9 (cf.
J. Lippert, Studien auf dem Gebiete der griechisch-
arabischen Übersetzungsliteratur, i, Braunschweig
1898, 39 ff.). The Fihrist refers also to (Ps.-) Plutarch,
see H. Diels, Doxographi Graeci, 287, Al-'Amîr, a
philosopher of the 4th/10th century (quoted in the
Abbreviation of Abî Sulaymân al-Manîjî's Studi
al-Eikma, introduction), probably following some
lost Greek tradition, made Plato one of the five
pillars of wisdom, the others being Empedocles,
Pythagoras, Socrates and Aristotle (Ab Andréullls,
Fûthaghûrûs, Sukrât, Aristotulls [qq.v.]); these
philosophers derived their wisdom from the Prophets.
According to him Plato retired in old age into
solitude and prayer. He also gives an account of
Plato's solution of the Delian problem (cf. Plutarch,
De gen. Socr., 7, p. 579; idem De Ei ap. Delphos, 6,
p. 386; Tannery, La Gnomèria grecque, 110;
Alaxwîl, Untâhâr al-Bildâl (Wüstenfeld), 45; Lutfi al-
Maktûl, Ta'dîl al-Ma'âbûk (S. Yalikaya, A. Adnan,
H. Corbin), Paris 1940). On him depends Sûfîd al-
Andalus, Tâbahdî al-U'mam, 25; Sûfîd life was used,
as a minor source, by Ibn al-Kifês, passim.

The life in Mubâshshîr b. Fâtîk's Muhâjr
al-Eikm (MS Brit. Mus. Add. 25893, fol. 44 ff.; on
this work cf. F. Rosenthal, in Orientalia, 1937,
21 ff.) was copied by Ibn Abi Ushbi'a, i, 50 ff.
He made both Plato's parents descendants of
Asclepius, probably misinterpreting the epigram
to be found in Diog. Laertius, iii, 45 (cf. E. J. and
L. Edelstein, Asclepius, Baltimore 1945, i,
o. 322, ii, 127). Alone among the Arab biographers
he mentions Plato's supposed stay in Egypt. For the

Ibn al-Kifât based his long and detailed life
(17-27) on the Fihrist, on Theo of Smyrna (cf. above)
and on an unidentified Greek source (19 line 16-25
There are Greek parallels to almost everything mentioned. Stories similar to the discussions reported to have taken place at Dionysius' court (21) are to be found in Olympiodorus' Life and in Plutarch's Dio. There are a very few confusions, such as the story of Socrates' stay in Sicily and the introduction of Plato's two female disciples as his wives and the inclusion of Proclus among his pupils. The section 257-264 is taken from al-Farabî (cf. the anonymous Froll. Phil. Plat., cap. 7-16); 264-274 reproduces Sâ`id al-Anslawi, q. Plato's prayer in neoplatonic language (274-5) is worth mentioning (cf. also MS Oxford, Hunt. 162, fol. 202r).

Al-Shahrazûri's account of Plato's life in his Nuzhat al-Amrûshî (in MS) is based on Mubâshshîr.

In later centuries Plato's tomb could be visited at Konya (F. W. Hasluck, Christianity and Islam under the Sultans, Oxford 1929, 363 and passim).

(iii) The main source for the various compilations of sayings of Plato is Hunayn b. Ishaq's Na`wdat al-Falâsîsa wa l-Hukami` (cf. the Hebrew transl., ed. by A. Löwenthal, Frankfurt 1896, and translated by him into German, Berlin 1896; and K. Merké, Sinnsprüche der Philosophen, Leipzig 1921). Another primary source is Ibn Hindû, al-Kalâm al-Kânûnîyâ, fi l-Hikm al-Yûnûnîyya, Cairo 1918. The life in the Abbreviation of Abû Sulaymân's Sîrîn al-Hikma contains only sayings. Ibn Abi Usaybî, i, 517-518, reproduces the section on sayings to be found in Mubâshshîr. Sayings attributed to Plato occur very often in Arabic literature.
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(S. M. Stern)

**AFRASIYAB**

Afrasiyab founder of a line of governors of Basra (Al Afrasiyab). He was an officer of unknown racial origin, who purchased the government of Basra from the local pasha about 1021/1612. Afrasiyab was succeeded by his son 'Ali in 1034/1624-5, during an attack on Basra by Persian forces, which failed in face of 'Ali's resistance. A second Persian attempt in 1039/1629 was equally unsuccessful. During the Turco-Persian struggle for Baghdad, 'Ali Pašâ took neither part and continued to govern his province independently. The succession of his son Husayn (c. 1062/1652) led to internal conflicts, of which advantage was taken by Murtadâ Paša of Baghdad to evict Husayn in 1064/1654 and replace him by 'Ali's brother Ahmad. Murtadâ's subsequent execution of Ahmad led to a rising of the local population and tribesmen and the restoration of Husayn Paša. His attempts to extend his power over al-Hasâ' were followed by a full-scale expedition against him led by İbrahim (Tawîl), pasha of Baghdad, in 1076/1665. After a prolonged siege of Kurna, Husayn abdicated in favour of his son Afrasiyab, but continued to govern as regent until a second expedition from Baghdad under Kara Muṣṭafa (Firûrî) Paša drove him out and restored the imperial government in 1078/1668.

**Bibliography:** Murtadâ Nazmi-zade, Gulshan-i Khâlât, Istanbul 1730; Fath Allâh al-Ka'bfî, Zâd al-Musâfiir, Baghdad 1924; Mub. Aghâ Khâdji-zade, Ta'rîkh al-Sîlîkhâr, vol. i, Baghdad

(H. A. R. Gibb)

AFRASIYABIDS, also called (by Rabino) the Kiyas of Culab or Culab (after one of the eight bukhah of Amul, and (by Sachau), the Kiyas Djialawi, minor dynasty of Mazandaran. The eponym of the clan, Afrasiyab b. Kiyas Hasan, was a sipahsalar in the service of his brother-in-law, Fakhr al-Dawla Hasen Bawand [see BAWAND]. Kiyas Afrasiyab conspired with his sister, who had a daughter from a previous marriage, accused the Bawand of taking this girl as his mistress, and obtained from the wali of Amul a fatwa authorizing the death of the culprit. At the same time, the Bawand put to death his minister, Kiyas Djialal al-Din Ahmad b. Djialal, a member of the powerful family of the Kiyas-yi Djalali. This filled the nobles with anger and consternation and obliged the Bawand to seek the friendship of the Kiyas of Culab, old rivals of the Kiyas-yi Djalali. The reconciliation of the two families gave the Kiyas Afrasiyab liberty of action, and finally the Bawand was assassinated in a bath, on 27 Muharram 750/17 April 1349, by 'All and Muhammad, sons of Afrasiyab (or by the latter alone, according to Justi). With the death of Fakhr al-Dawla, the dynasty of the Bawand, which had ruled for 750 years (45-750/665-1349) came to an end, and Kiyas Afrasiyab took over the power in Amul (and Sari; J.A., 1943-5, 237). Seeing that most of the officers of his former master refused to submit to him, he tried to make use of religion and became the disciple of the darwishes Kavam al-Din Marashli, called Mir-i Buzurg, hoping that the veneration of the population of Amul for him would restrain them from rebellion. After ten years of rule, however, Kiyas Afrasiyab was defeated and killed, together with his three sons, by the same darwishes in the battle of Djialalchmarparin, in 760/1359.

Mir-i Buzurg established himself as governor of Amul and thus founded the dynasty of the Marashli (q.v.) sayyids (760-989/1359-1581). In the same year, a member of Afrasiyab's clan, Kiyas Fakhr al-Din Djialati, murdered 'Abd Allah, son of Mir-i Buzurg, and was himself executed with his four sons; Kiyas Gushatsa (Wishatsa) also, another brother-in-law of the last Bawand, was killed with his seven children.

The Kiyas of Culab re-emerge only with Iskandar-i Shaykhli, eighth son of Kiyas Afrasiyab, who took refuge at Harat, led an adventurous life and eventually entered the service of Timur. In 795/1392-3 Timur invaded Mazandaran, took the fortress of Mihana-Sar near Amul, sacked Amul and Sari, deported the Marashli sayyids and appointed Iskandar as governor. Having returned with the invader, Iskandar enjoyed little popularity, all the less that he ordered the mausoleum of Mir-i Buzurg at Sari to be demolished. In 802/1400-1 Iskandar accompanied Timur on his expedition to Irak, Afghanistan, and Syria, then, having obtained permission to return to Amul, he rebelled. In 805/1403-4 Timur marched into Mazandaran in pursuit of Iskandar, who fled into the forest with his wife and two small children, and fearing that he might be betrayed by their cries he killed them together with their mother. Finally he was killed at Shirud Dui-Hazir, and the officers of Timur sent his head to his son Husayn Kiyas who was holding out in the fortress of Firuz Kuh and now hastened to surrender it. Another son, 'Ali Kiyas, had fallen into the hands of Timur's troops. Timur pardoned the two brothers and Husayn Kiyas continued to rule over Firuz Kuh. His son, Luhrasp b. Husayn b. Iskandar ruled over Talakan in 880/1479-80. In his turn, amir Husayn (Hasan; J. B. Tavernier, Les Six Voyages, Paris 1676 etc., Eng. trans. London 1678; S. H. Longrigge, Four Centuries of Modern 'Iraq, Oxford 1925, 99-117; Abbas al-Azawi, Ta'rkh al-'Irab bayna Itiballayn, vol. v, Baghdad 1953, 21-101.
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established in Tirah long before the advent of those Pashto-speaking Afghan invaders who gradually pushed their way into the belt of hills and alluvial plains to the west of the Indus between the 13th and 16th centuries.

Their position athwart the Khyber Pass connecting India with Afghanistan made it extremely difficult for the Mughal emperors of Hindustan to maintain safe communications with their outlying province of Kabul. In the reign of Akbar, incited by the preaching of Bāyāzīd, the founder of the Rawshāh-nīyya [q.v.], sect of heretics, and of his son Djiālāl al-Dīn, they attacked Mughal troops and caravans passing through the Khyber. They were forced into submission by Akbar’s forces in 1587 and in the following year agreed, in return for allowances, to keep the pass open for traffic. They were however only temporarily subdued and expeditions had to be undertaken against them in the reigns of Djiālānīr and Awrangīb. Djiālānīr deported many Afridis to Hindustan and Deccan, where their descendants are still to be found. After the establishment of the Afghan kingdom by Ahmad Shāh Durrānī the Afridis were nominally subject to him and are mentioned in the register of his army; according to it the tribe counted 19,000 fighting men.

The first skirmish of British troops with the Afridis dates back to the invasion of Afghanistan during the first Afghan War of 1839-42. From the annexation of the Pandjāb in 1849 to the formation of the North-West Frontier Province in 1901 no less than eight expeditions were required against these unruly clans. The first was against the Kohāt Pass Afridis in 1850. In 1853, troops were sent against the Djiāwākī Afridis, a clan of the Adam Khel Afridis. Punitive measures were necessary against the Akā Khēl Afridis in 1855. Expeditions were necessary against the Djiāwākī Afridis in 1877 and 1878, and against the Zakka Khēls in 1878 and 1879. The Zakka Khēls of the Khyber and the adjacent Bāzār valley of Tirah have been the most contumacious of all the Afridi clans. Inhabiting lands stretching from the slopes of the Safīd Kūh to the border of Peshāwar they have been able to force their neighbours to pay exorbitant tolls for the privilege of passing through their territories. The first agreement with the Zakka Khēls was during the Indian Mutiny of 1857 (Aitchison, xi, 92-6). This was observed until the Second Afghan War, 1878-80, when the peace of the Khyber and the whole frontier zone was abnormally disturbed. Zakka Khēl attacks on the Khyber lines of communication forced the British, in 1878 and 1879, to enter their country, destroy their crops, and raze their forts and villages to the ground. On 17 Feb. 1881, the Khyber Afridis, together with the Loargi Shinwarīs of Landī Kotal, accepted responsibility for the safety of the Khyber; and in return for the recognition of their independence, agreed to have no dealings with other foreign powers. At the same time arrangements were made for the protection of the Khyber by a force of Djiārīdīs (tribal levies), to be paid by the Government of India (Aitchison, xi, 97-9). The Afridis were the last to join in the general frontier conflagration of 1897 and were only forced to come to terms after extremely severe fighting in the Tirah campaign of 1897-8. At the end of this campaign the previous system of allowances which had proved so successful for seventeen years, 1881-97, were once more adopted. At the same time the Khyber Rifles were reorganized under British officers supported by a movable column at Peshāwar. This agreement, under which the British became responsible for the Khyber Rifles and for the safety of the pass, regulated British relations with the Afridis until the year 1908 (Parliamentary Papers, 1908, lixxiv, Cd. 4210, pp. 14-5).

Towards the end of 1904 large numbers of Afridis visited Kābul. This was followed by small marauding incursions into British territory, in which the Zakka Khēls, assisted by other Afridi clans, by Orāka-yays, and even by bands of Afghan outlaws, such as the Hazārnāo gang, were the chief offenders. From 1905 to 1908 bands of well-armed Afridis ravaged the British borders. An attack by a gang of about eighty men upon Peshāwar city, on the night of 28 January 1908, exhausted the patience of the Government of India, and in that year, the Zakka Khēls were speedily coerced by troops under the command of Major-General Sir James Willcocks. The entry of Turkey into the First World War, in November 1914, created considerable excitement on the frontier. One of the great dangers on the frontier has always been the possible attitude of the Afridi clans whose lead in the war the other tribes are usually prepared to follow. Fortunately for the peace of the Peshāwar borders and possibly of the whole frontier, the mission of the so-called Turkish generals to Tirah failed because of a shortage of funds. The danger of an Afridi rising was averted when, on 1 February 1915, the Government of India decided to double their allowances.

Quickly following the wake of the 1914-18 war came the Third Afghan War of 1919 which was the signal for risings along the entire frontier, and for the collapse of Lord Curzon’s militia scheme. By 1921 the Afridi clans had made full submission. The Khyber Rifles were disbanded and their place taken by Kāpūsādas, tribal levies paid by the Government of India but providing their own arms and ammunition. But there was a great danger of a recrudescence of Afridi raiding because of the intrigues of the Akā Khēl mulla, Sayyid Akbar, who denounced all tribesmen who had accepted British terms. His activities were checked when, in April 1921, the Afridi tribal digirī accepted new allowances in compensation for the increased tribal responsibility involved in the construction of the Khyber railway (Secret Border Report, 1921-2, p. 1). In February 1922 the Zakka Khēls agreed to pay a substantial fine for their past misdeeds. In the following year the peace of the Afridi country was rudely disturbed by the exploits of the Kohāt gang. Members of this gang were forced to seek refuge in Afghan territory where their immunity from punishment led to a diplomatic protest on the part of the Viceroy. The opening of the Khyber Railway from Djamrud to Landī Khāna did not make for peace. The construction of this line had been a source of profit to the tribesmen but its completion reduced their allowances. From 1927 to its settlement in March 1930 Tirah became the scene of a religious struggle between its Sunni and Shiīte clans. In the spring of 1930 the Afridis came under the influence of Indian National Congress agitators with the result that Afridi lashkars (tribal forces) entered the Peshāwar district and attacked the city of Peshāwar in June and August of that year. By the end of August all raiding gangs had been expelled from the district. Since 1947 the Government of Pakistan has been responsible for the control of the Afridi clans. As recently as December 1952 the Afghan government has been accused of granting asylum to Afridi outlaws who had been organizing depredations into Pakistan.

Bibliography: C.U. Aitchison, Treaties, Engagements and Sanads, 1909, xi; C. C. Davies, The
Problem of the North-West Frontier, Cambridge 1932; idem, British Relations with the Afridis of the Khyber and Tirah, Army Quarterly, 1932; Frontier and Overseas Expeditions from India, i, and Supplement A, 1908; H. D. Hutchinson, The Campaign in Tirah, London 1898; Th. Holdich, The Indian Borderland, London 1901, chs. xv-xvi; North-West Frontier Province Administration Reports (published annually); W. H. Paget and A. H. Mason, Record of Expeditions against the N.W.F. Tribes since the Annexation of the Punjab, 1888; Parliamentary Papers, 1908, LXXIV, Cd. 5001; R. Warburton, Eighteen years in the Khyber (1879-98), 1901. (C. COLLIN DAVIES)

AFRIDI [see PARIDON].

A'FRIN important right tributary of the Orontes (al-‘Aṣfī [q.v.]), which it reaches after joining with the Nahr Yāghrah (Murād Paša) in the Lake of Antioch and the Nahr al-Aswād (Kāra-šāh), in the ‘Amm. Its wide middle valley, between the Djalal Simān and the Kur-dag, was known in the Middle Ages as the district of the Diğmā. The importance of the valley was due to the crossing of the road, which used it to connect Antioch with the districts of the upper Euphrates, with the roads which led from Cilicia and Asia Minor towards Aleppo and inner Syria. One of these roads, after passing the Amusa or the col of Baggāt (q.v.) and following the shore of the Lake of Antioch, crossed the ‘Afrin at the ford near modern Bellane (the “Ford of the Baleine”) of the Crusaders. In the first centuries of Islam it was guarded on the south side by the small fortresses of Tīzan, Artāh, ‘Imm and since the time of the Crusades by that of Hārīm (q.v.), which lay nearer to the Orontes. The other, more northern roads issued, after passing the Kur-dag, at the gap of ‘Aṣāz and passed the ‘Afrin either at the bridge of Kībār (now ‘Afrīn) or further up below the old capital of the region, Küriş (Cyrrhus). The new capitals were ‘Azāz, outside the real basin of the ‘Afrīn, and ‘Āyandān—of which important ruins are still preserved near one of the ‘Afrīn’s sources. Thus the valley of the ‘Afrīn served in the classical period of Islam as the main longitudinal line of communication in the western part of the military district of the ‘Awṣām (q.v.). It was temporarily captured from Islam by the Byzantines in the 4th-10th centuries, and by the Crusaders in the first half of the 12th century. At present it lies athwart the political and ethnical boundary between Turkey and Syria.


AFRIT [see ‘IRRĀT].

AFSANTIN, AFSINTIN or, more rarely, ISFINTIN (from Greek ἄφιντος) mostly denotes the common wormwood (Artemisia Absinthium L.) but also other similar kinds of plants. In medical writings it is often called khashāth ṭumī. The cognate form isfīn (absinth-wine) already occurs in ancient Arabic poetry (Nōdeke, in Lōw, 386).

A good deal of the information which Arab authors offer on the afsantin goes back to classical sources. Its different kinds were generally classified according to their origin: Persian, Nabataean, Syrian, Egyptian, Khurāsānī etc. That from Tyre and Tarsus was considered the best. The yellow flower in particular was put to diverse medicinal uses. Not only tonic and vermifugal but also laxative, diuretic and other properties were attributed to the plant. It was also recommended as an antitoxin. Externally it was used in plasters, oils etc. Its juice mixed with the ink was said to preserve the paper. In addition to many other applications it was also employed against the loss of hair (dā‘ al-tha‘lab).

Bibliography: ‘All al-Ṭabarī, Firdaws al-Hikma (Siddiqi), 418-9; Dā‘ūd al-Anṭākī, Taddikira, Cairo 1935, i, 49-50; Ghāfīk (Meyerhof-Sobhy), no. 27; Ibn al-‘Awwām, Fīlākha (transl. Clément-Mullet), ii/b, 265; Ibn al-Bayṭār, Diğmā, Būlāk 1921, iii, 127-8; Kalkashandi, ‘Abd al-‘Aṣfī, ii, 406-6; Kazwīnī, (Wustenfeld), i, 259; I. Lōw, Aram. Pflanzennamen, index, s. v.: idem, Die Flora der Juden, i, 631-4; Maimōnides, Ḥarāk Asmā’ al-Ukhbār (Meyerhof), no. 295; M. Stein- Schneider, in WZKM, 1898, 220; Tuḥfat al-Ḥabbāb (Renaud-Colin), no. 309. (L. KOPF)

AFSAN, AFSANTIN, or more rarely, ISFINTIN (from Greek ἄφιντος) mostly denotes the common wormwood (Artemisia Absinthium L.) but also other similar kinds of plants. In medical writings it is often called khashāth ṭumī. The cognate form isfīn (absinth-wine) already occurs in ancient Arabic poetry (Nōdeke, in Lōw, 386).

A good deal of the information which Arab authors offer on the afsantin goes back to classical sources. Its different kinds were generally classified according to their origin: Persian, Nabataean, Syrian, Egyptian, Khurāsānī etc. That from Tyre and Tarsus was considered the best. The yellow flower in particular was put to diverse medicinal uses. Not only tonic and vermifugal but also laxative, diuretic and other properties were attributed to the plant. It was also recommended as an antitoxin. Externally it was used in plasters, oils etc. Its juice mixed with the ink was said to preserve the paper. In addition to many other applications it was also employed against the loss of hair (dā‘ al-tha‘lab).

Bibliography: ‘All al-Ṭabarī, Firdaws al-Hikma (Siddiqi), 418-9; Dā‘ūd al-Anṭākī, Taddikira, Cairo 1935, i, 49-50; Ghāfīk (Meyerhof-Sobhy), no. 27; Ibn al-‘Awwām, Fīlākha (transl. Clément-Mullet), ii/b, 265; Ibn al-Bayṭār, Diğmā, Būlāk 1921, iii, 127-8; Kalkashandi, ‘Abd al-‘Aṣfī, ii, 406-6; Kazwīnī, (Wustenfeld), i, 259; I. Lōw, Aram. Pflanzennamen, index, s. v.: idem, Die Flora der Juden, i, 631-4; Maimōnides, Ḥarāk Asmā’ al-Ukhbār (Meyerhof), no. 295; M. Stein-Schneider, in WZKM, 1898, 220; Tuḥfat al-Ḥabbāb (Renaud-Colin), no. 309. (L. KOPF)
AFSHAR

Ya'qūb b. Arslān al-Afshār; "Husam al-Dīn ShuhH" in Hamd Allah Mustawfl, Ta'rikh-i Guzida, i, 547—whence to be due—merely to a textual error). §humla, to iktd* (tiyul) of the Afshar. Afshar chieftains are mentioned during the rule of the Afl Koyunlu (e.g. Mansūr Beg Awshār, 877/1472-3, Hasan Rūmū, Afsan al-Tawārīkh, in MS, chapter on the Afl Koyunlu; Dawwānī, 'Ard-nāma, MTM, v, 298, Engl. transl. in BSOS, 1940-2, 156, 174, Mansūr Beg, district of Shīrāz, 904/1498-9, 906/1502-1, idem, ed. Seddon, Baroda 1931, 21 ff. 69; Fīrūz Beg, Shīrāz, 904/1498-9, ibidem, 24). The Afshar played a part in the establishment of the Safawid dynasty (cf. kīlīq bāsh, ismā'īlī). High dignitaries of Afšār origin are often mentioned in the Safawid chronicles (e.g. Afsan al-Tawariikh, 236, 332, 339, 345, 438; Iskandar Munghi, Ta'rikh-i 'Alam-ār-yi Abbās, i, 155, 185, 190, 251, 309 ff., 400, ii, 765; Tahkhir al-Mulāk (Mirmosky), 16).

Under the Safawids we find Afšār clans in various districts, and their chieftains occupied provincial governorships. Afšār khāns ruled in the district of Kūh Gūlī; the tribesmen of this region belonged mainly to the Gūndūzli and Arafshu clans (see Ta'rikh-i 'Alam-ār-yi Abbās, 199, 340-4, 358 and 1ūr). After the revolt of 1005/1596-7 their rule came to an end, most of the clans that escaped punishment were scattered and only small remnants survived by the beginning of the 17th century.

The Gūndūzli and Arafshu played an important role in the Khūrāstān. In the beginning of the 17th century we find in Dīzfūl and Shūshṭar Afšār governors like Mahdī Kūlī Sūltān and Haydar Sūltān. When the governor Mahdī Kūlī rebelled in 946/1539-40, the Afšār, Alwādšt (Gūndūzli) and Urmīya, while a smaller portion were settled in Shūshṭar and Dīzfūl, Afšār governors ruled for two and a half centuries, from the time of 'Abbās I till about 1250/1834-5, in Kāzārūn [q.v.]. We find governors belonging to various Afšār clans also in other regions: Inālu in Yazd, Kīrmānšāh, Mosul and Rūmīyā, Alpū, Kūse Aḩmadlu and Kīrīkh in Kūrūsān (Abbārd, Farāh, Isfīzār).

In the vicinity of Urmīya, Afšārs were settled in the time of 'Abbās I (the tradition in the text translated by Nikitine, that they came there with Timūr in 802/1400, has no foundation). Kāsim Kūshān, a distinguished general of 'Abbās I, chieftain of the Inālu, settled with his tribe, shortly after 1032/1622-3, in the regions of Urmīya, Sāmn Kūšān and Sīstān. (Ta'rikh-i 'Alam-ār-yi Abbās, 762). His son, Kābul 'All Kūshān, was governor in 1027/1617-8, and was followed by other Afšār governors; Kūshādād Beg Kāsimlu (the Kāsimlu clan probably derived its name from Kāsim Kūshān) took the title of begārān Beg in 1119/1707. (For further details see B. Nikitine, Les Afsar d'Urmuyeh, J.A, 1929, 71 ff. and Urmuyeh; cf. also Sām Kūšān.)

In general, the Afšārs played an important role in the wars of the Safawīs against the Ottomans and the Uzbeks, though, as we have seen above, 'Abbās I, according to his policy in general, tried to break the particularist tendencies of the clans. During the reign of Nādir Shāh, who himself came of the Kūšān branch of the Abīward district, Afšār amīrs were prominent. Some Afšār chieftains played important roles during the troubled period after Nādir's death. Afšār contingents were an important element in the Kādrār army and were used in the suppression of revolts as well as against external enemies.

According to Joannin (quoted in Langles, Voyages du Chevalier Chardin en Perse, Paris 1811, x, 243) the Afšārs counted at the beginning of the 19th century 80,000 souls (repeated by Ritter, Asien, vili, 400-5; etc.—this may, however, refer to the total of tents. [Detailed statistics according to localities are also given there.] For the same period, cf. also P. A. Jaubert, Voyages en Arménie et en Perse, 225; Zayn al-'Abidīn Shīrwānī, Bustān al-Siyāsā, 106 (the numbers seem exaggerated). For more modern times see Māfic Rūshā, Diwārīyā-yi Muṣalāsā-i Irān, Teherān 1301-2, ii, 86 (Inālu in Fārs, as part of the lūd-i khamsa); 106 ff., 112, 265 (Inālu and Afšār in the vicinity of Ardabil, Mīshkīn, Zarand, and especially Sāwā and Kāzwīn [cf. also gīmīn khamsa and gīmīn sāwā]; 90 (clan called Afšār as part of the Akādīrī in Kūh Gūlī—cf. also Fārs-nāma-yi Nāsīrī, ii, 270); 92 (Gūndūzli near Shūshṭar and Dīzfūl, completely assimilated); 92, 253 (Afšār in Kūrsan); cf. also 75 and 371 (their name in geographical and administrative nomenclature); Mēhmed Ḫāsan Bābūr, Astarābādī, Bakū 1301, 73 (Afšār in the Republic of Astarābād; for an earlier time, cf. Ewīlīyā Cēlēbi, Siyāhāt-nāma, ii, 259, 859, iv, 284, 337); G. Jarring, On the distribution of Turk tribes in Afghanistan, Lund 1939, 61 (some Afšār settled in Andūkū); by Shībah I, others by Nādir Shāh).—Just as Afšār elements were (as noted above) attached to other tribes, so also we find Afšār clans, which, to judge by their names, must have originally belonged to other tribes: the Shāmānu and Dīlārī in Urmīya (mentioned by Nikitine) who were probably detached from the great tribes of the same name; the same is true of the Tekelī and Innīlū (O. Mann, Das Mu'mūn et-Tairīkh-i ba'd Nāsīrī, 31).

Afšārs figure among the Turkmen who lived during the Mamlūk period in Syria, especially round Aleppo (cf. e.g. al-Kalkashandī, Subh al-Aṣkā; Ibn Taghrībirdī (Popper), vi, 225, 364, 386, 557). They seem to have played a role in the establishment of the principality of the Rāmān-oghlu (g.v.); see C. Cahen, in Byzanzion, 1939, 133). In the Ottoman period various branches of the Afšār are mentioned (Rādāb-oghlu near Kāl'at Ḡūrār; Ḥaddīl Khāli, Dīkhān-nāma, 593; in documents: Radjour Abu-Ṣawārī, A. Refik, Anadoluad Türk aşireleri, Istanbul 1930, 145, 165-7, 186, 209, 239; Kārā Awshār, Kārā Gūndūzlu Awshārī, Bahrīl Awshārī, ibid., 106, 102). These tribes, who were also known under the
collective name of Yeni II, spent the winter in Syria and the summer in Anatolia, near Zamanti. The government made continuous efforts to settle them in the regions of the Çukur Owa, Marash (cf. Besna Khani, Marash, H. M. Barlow, Istanbul 1340, 70 ff.), Icel and Kayseri in Anatolia, and near al-Ra'kka in Syria (Ali Riza Yalman, Cemüpti Türkmen Oymaklari, Adana 1939, ii, 105 ff.).

**Bibliography:** IA, s.v. Asşar (by M. F. Köprülü); Aḥmad ʿAbd Tabrizi, in Ayanda, iv and v, and part ii, viii, Teheran 1926-8; idem, Taʾrīkh-i Pumşad Sāla-yi Šâsištân, Teheran 1312; F. W. Hasluck, Christianity and Islam under the Sultans, index; V. Minorsky, Apalludinallu, Rocznik Orientalistyczny, 1951-2, 1 ff. (M. Fuad Köprülü)


**AFŞUS** (Afsos), poetical name of Mīr Shīr Ṭāli, the son of Sayyid ʿAlī Muẓaffar Khaṇ, and descendant of the Prophet through ʿĪmām Djaʾfar al-Sādik. His ancestors dwelt at Khānāf in Persia. One of them, Sayyid Badr al-Dīn, the brother of Sayyid ʿĀlīm al-Dīn Ḥāḏīqī Khaṇ, came to India and settled at Naurābād Agra. Sayyid Ghiyāḥ Muṣṭafā, the grandfather of Afsūs, came to Delhi during the reign of Muḥammad Shah (1719-48), and was an associate of Nawwāb Šamsān al-Dawlah Khaṇ. Afsūs was born at Delhi and received a liberal education. On the assassination of the Nawwāb (1747), when Afsūs was 11 years of age, his father took him to Patna; later on, after 1760, they removed to Lucknow, where Afsūs settled, supported by Nawwāb Šāhīn the son of Iḥāṣān Khaṇ, and became an associate of Mīrzā Djaḥān-baqhṭ (Djahān-dār Šāh), the eldest son of the emperor Šāh ʿAlām.

After living some years at Lucknow, he was brought to the notice of the Resident, Colonel W. Scott, at whose recommendation he went to Calcutta in 1215/1800-1, and was appointed Head Munṣiq in the Hindustani department of the College at Fort William.

Afsūs wrote a Hindustani Diwān during his residence at Lucknow. He also made there a translation of the Gulistān of Saʿdī, which was completed in 1226/1810, under the title of Bāṭh-i Urdū. The introduction to this translation contains an autobiographical sketch, which is the principal source of our information regarding his life. Whilst at Calcutta, he edited the Kulliyāt of Sawāda, and revised the Hindustani translations of Persian works, which had been prepared by munṣiqs of the College. He also made a translation of the first part of the Ḥadiṣat al-Tamārīk or a Persian history of Hindustan written by Mīrzā Ṣudjān Rāʾe of Pātiala in 1207/1695-96. This work, undertaken at the instance of J. H. Morington, was completed in 1220/1805 under the title Aḏāḥ-i Mahfīl, and was first printed at Calcutta in 1808. John Shakespear translated the first ten chapters of this work into English and included them in his Munṣiq-i Hindī, Dublin 1847. A complete English translation was made by M. J. Court and published at Allahabād, 1871 (and ed. Calcutta 1882). According to Garcin de Tassy and Sprenger (Urdu Catalogue, 158), Afsūs died in 1809.

**Bibliography:** Garcin de Tassy, Histoire de la Littérature Hindouie et Hindoustani, Paris 1868, i, 348; Encyclopaedia of Islam, ii, 16.
and of the whole region between the rivers of Douro (Douro) and Mondego, marked one of the decisive stages of the Reconquista.

At the death of al-Mu'azzafar, who only survived for a short time this grave amputation of his dominions, he was succeeded by his son Yahyä al-Manšūr, who was challenged by his brother 'Umar, governor of Evora (Yābūrā) and soon disappeared from the scene. 'Umar, who took the lākāb of al-Muta-wakkil, was exposed, like all the mulāk al-lāwâdih of his epoch, to the increasing demands of the Christian king Alfonso VI, who in 471/1079 took from him the fortress of Coria (Kūriyā). He seems to have been the first, even before the capture of Toledo by Alfonso VI, to solicit the intervention of the Almoravids in Spain, but eventually, like all his neighbours, he was unable to resist the growing aggressiveness of the Christian king, and had to comply with his demands for tribute. His attempt in 472/1080 to add the kingdom of Toledo to his dominions, following on the offer made to him by the inhabitants of Toledo themselves, failed in spite of the fact that he stayed for ten months in the Dhu 'l-Nūnīd capital. He was present at the battle of al-Zallākā [q.v.], which took place within his own territory on 12 Rādpā 479/23 Oct. 1086, and had a hand in the intrigues which finally decided the Almoravids to dethrone all the mulāk al-lāwâdih of al-Andalus and annex their possessions. Feeling himself menaced, 'Umar al-Mutawakkil turned towards Alfonso VI and solicited his help, in return for the cession of Santarem (Shantarān), Lisbon (al-'Ushbūna) and Cintra (Shintara). But all this was in vain, and Badajoz was taken at the end of 497/1095 by the Almoravid general Sir b. Abl Bakr, with the connivance of the inhabitants, who had had enough of the fiscal exactions of their king. Al-Mutawakkil and two of his sons, al-Fadil and Sa'd, were taken prisoner and sent to Seville, but even before their arrival there they were executed. Another son of al-Mutawakkil, al-Manšūr, escaped, fortified himself for some time in the castle of Montanchez, in the modern province of Cáceres, and finally, together with his followers, migrated into the dominions of Alfonso VI and was converted to Christianity.


(E. LEVI-PROVENÇAL)
**Bibliography:** The *diwân* of al-Afwah al-Awdî was published in *al-Tard* in 1937; L. Cheikh, *Sha'arî al-Nasrâniyya*, 70-4; it was introduced into Spain by al-Kâlî, who had received it from Ibn Durayd (*BAH*, ix, 396). Verses and biographical notes are to be found in *Dîbâj*, *Hayawan*; index; *idem*, *Bayân* (*Sandbûl*, i, 177; Ibn Kutayba, *Sârî*, 110-1; *idem*, *Uyun al-Akhâr*, iii, 113; *Kâlî*, *Amâlî*, i, 125; *Afhân*!, xi, 41-2; Barbir de Meynard, *Swans* 15 (offprint from *J.*, *Soles*); Brochelmann, *S.* i, 57; Nallino, *Solihi*, vi, 29 (French transl. 48). (Cf. *Pellat*).

**AFYUN**.

*Opium*, from Greek ὀπίσμον, diminutive of ὄμοσ, "vegetable juice". Opium is the dried resinous juice of the unripe capsules of the oppy (*Papaver somniferum L.*, in Arabic *khâkhâbîd*), the preparation of which is already described by classical authors, e.g. by Dioscorides, iv, 64. (For opium in Antiquity see Fauluy-Wissowa, s.v. Mohn.) In Islamic times it was used officially and as a narcotic (also by *darwîshes*). The poppy had long been cultivated in Upper Egypt: according to Kûhîn al-ʿAtţâr, 128, in his time (7th/13th century) the best opium was prepared in Aabû Tâdî, S. of Assûût. The cultivation of the poppy and the preparation of opium flourished in Egypt until the beginning of the 19th century. (Cf. Lane, *Modern Egyptians*!, i, 118, ii, 35). The cultivation of the poppy in Asia Minor does not seem to go back to the Byzantine period. It apparently spread after the Crusades, and under Turkish rule the plant was acclimatized especially in the neighbourhood of Kara Hisâr, which received the nickname of *Afyûn Kara Hisâr* [*q.v.*]. This town was the centre for the cultivation and the export of the opium as late as the 19th century. (Cf. O. Blau, *Entwus über das Opium*, *ZDMG*, 1869, 280). In Persia, as well as in Turkey, opium is often called *tirâg*, "antidote". When ʿAbbâs II tried to enforce the prohibition of wine, the consumption of opium grew to such dimensions that he was forced to soften the prohibition and take measures, instead, against the trade in opium (1621; P. della Valle, *ii*, 108). Yârûd and Iṣfâhân used to export opium to India and Turkey. (See Chardin, *Les six voyages*, 1735, iii, 14-5, 282 ff.; Houtsma, *Chronogr.* 1116, ii, 67; E. Polak, *Perien*, Leipziger, 1865, ii, 248-55; and the vivid description of opium-eating by E. G. Browne, *The Poppy in China*, 5; E. Bretschneider, in A. de Candolle, *Origine of Cultivated Plants*, 400; Yule and Burnes, *Hobson-Jobson*, 641; Giles, *Glossary of Reference*, 200, who derive the Arabic name of opium from the obopic).—For the adulteration of opium by dishonest merchants (by admixture of various resins, or sandarac, etc., see E. Wiedemann, in *SBPMs Eri*, xi, 1914, 176-206).


**AFYUN KARA HISAR** (modern spelling: *AFYON KARAHISAR*), more correctly *AFYON KARA HIŞAR*, "Opium Black-castle", at present also simply *AFYON*, formerly *KARA HISAR-ı Şâbîh* (in Neshîr, ed. Ankara, 64 = ed. Berlin, 21 = Leuindavius, *Hist. Myst.*, 644, 1931, col. 140: Şâbihiy Kara Hisârı[!] *Principia Maurocraticarum*, *Sulbarcarcas in Baron* Zâlêi (1758), *Commentariorum del Viaggio in Persia*, Venice 1558, 14b), town in western Anatolia, 38°50' N, 30°30' E, about 1007 m. above sea level, on the stream Akârçay, which flows into the Eber Gölü, and then into the Akshêhir Gölü, at the foot of an isolated and steep trachyte cone which rises from the plain to a height of 200 m. above the town surrounding it. *Kara Hisâr-ı Şâbîh* was the capital of a *sandâq* of the eyalet Anadolu (Hâджî Khaîîfî, *Die Flora der Asie Mineure*, 641, since 1281/1864 of a *sandâq* of the eyalet Khudâwendiğâr (Brusa); in modern Turkey *Afyûn Kara Hisâr* is capital of the eyalet of the same name, comprising the kadâd (*ilî*), Afyûn Kara Hisâr, Bolwadin, Dînâr Emirêdâgh (*Ašiziyê*, Şandîkli and Shuhût. In 1943 the town had 29,030 (1950: 29,826), the kadâd 136,667, the *milâyêt* Khudâwendiğâr (Brusa); in modern Turkey *Afyûn Kara Hisâr* is capital of the *milâyêt* (*il*), called the kadâd (*ilê*). Afyûn Kara Hisâr, Bolwadin, Dînâr Emirêdâgh (*Ašiziyê*, Şandîkli and Shuhût. In 1943 the town had 29,030 (1950: 29,826), the kadâd 136,667, the *milâyêt* Khudâwendiğâr (Brusa); in modern Turkey *Afyûn Kara Hisâr* is capital of the *milâyêt* (*il*), called *Aphion*.

Kara Hisâr-ı Şâbîh is identified with the Byzantine fortress of Akroûnos, Akroûnos, near which in 740 A.D. the emperor Leo III defeated the Arabs, and the legendary hero Sayyid Bâtîl and his armies met their death (Theophanes, *Chronogr.*. de Boor), i, 390, 411; and where the emperor Alexius I Comnenus negotiated in 1116 with the Saltûk prince Malikshâgh (Anna Commena, *Alexiens* (B. Leib, Paris 1555, i, 118, ii, 35). The name *Afyûn Kara Hisâr*, formerly only in popular, but at present also in official use (Tavernier, *Les six voyages*, 120 has: Aphion Carassar; Ch. Texier, *Asie Mineure*, Paris 1834: *Aphionum*) comes from the rich production of opium in the district, already mentioned by Belon, *Les six voyages*, 1735, iii, 14-5, 282 ff.; Houtsma, *Chronogr.* 1116, ii, 67; E. Polak, *Perien*, Leipziger, 1865, ii, 248-55; and the vivid description of opium-eating by E. G. Browne, *A Year amongst the Persians*, *ZDMG*, 1869, 280). According to B. Laufer, in *Toung Pao*, 1916, 462 (cf. also O. Franke, *Geschichte d. Chines. Reiches*, ii, 551, iii, 428) the knowledge of preparing opium came to the Chinese from (medieval) India and not from the Muslims (contrary to the assertions of scholars such as J. Edkins, *The Poppy in China*, 5; E. Bretschneider, in A. de Candolle, *Origine of Cultivated Plants*, 400; Yule and Burnes, *Hobson-Jobson*, 641; Giles, *Glossary of Reference*, 200, who derive the Chinese names of opium from the obopic).—For the adulteration of opium by dishonest merchants (by admixture of various resins, or sandarac, etc., see E. Wiedemann, in *SBPMs Eri*, xi, 1914, 176-206).

another, p. 36 and 37, that Karasari was in the possession of Ibn al-Sayib—by which no doubt the descendant of the Sāhib is meant—under the suzerainty of the Germiyans; cf. also Ahmed Tewhīd, in TOEM, 1st series, ii, 563 ff. After this Kara Hisār shared in the vicissitudes of the principality of Germiyan [q.v.], which soon became a dependency of the Ottomans and under. Bāyazīd I actually belonged for a time to the Ottomans, from 7Q2/1390 until its restoration under Timūr, 805/1402. Khādīr Pasha (d. 790/1389), son of Sulaymān-šāh of Germiyan, and other members of this princely family, are mentioned as heads (célebi) of the Mewlewī colonies in Kara Hisār (see Şāhlīb Dede, Tebūkhi-yi Şū-war-yi Mewlewīyye, MS Vienna, no. 1257, fol. 54r, 90r = ‘Ali Enwer, Sevātšāh-yi Edeb, Istanbul 1390, 48 f., 102). During Timūr’s invasion of Asia Minor after the battle of Ankara (1401), Kara Hisār also suffered from the raiding parties of the conqueror (Şaraf al-Dīn ‘Ali Yazdī, Zafar-nāma, Calcutta 1887-8, ii, 446, 457, 484, 492 = Histoire de Timur-Bec, transl. Pétis de la Croix, Delft 1723, iv, 21, 31, 60, 68; Dukas, Hist., Bonn, 77).

In 832/1428-9 the principality of the Germiyan-oghlu definitely fell into the hands of the Ottomans, and Kara Hisār with its territory became a ṣancād (sandjab) of the eyālet Andolū (cf. Dhīlān-nāma, 643). As a fortress near the Karamān frontier, it was, as long as Karamān remained independent, of military importance. At the beginning of the war with Uzun Ḥasan (878/1472-3) the prince Muḥṣafāt retired to Kara Hisār and used it as a base for his expeditions against the Karamān-oghlu, the allies of the Persians (‘Ashīkhpāsha-zāde, Ta’īlīhī (Giese), 169; Sa’d al-Dīn, Ta’īlīhī, i, 534; Caterino Zeno, loc. cit), and in 853/1449-50 it served as a base for the operations of Hersek-zade Ahmed Pasha against the Egyptians who had invaded Karamān (Sa’d al-Dīn, ii, 65). Kara Hisār is often mentioned in connection with the revolts and struggles of contending pashas in the 17th century (1011/1602, revolt of Dehlī, 1041/1631, revolt of Baba ʿOmār, 1069/1658, revolt of Abāzā Ḥasan Pasha). In 1833 the town was temporarily occupied by Ibrahim Pasha, son of Muḥṣafāt ‘Ali Pasha. In the Greek-Turkish war in 1921-2 it was occupied by the Greeks twice (28 March-7 April 1921 and 13 July 1921-27 August 1922). The war caused great damage to the town, which was, however, restored by reconstruction on a large scale under the republic.

The greater part of the scanty antiquities from the classical period seems to have been removed to the town from the ruined sites of the vicinity, notably Seydiller (Prymmessus), İse Şera Hisaş (Docimium) and Çifet Kaşabası (Symmada). The town’s land-mark, the steep trachyte cone with the late Byzantine fortifications restored by the Germiyan-oghlu (described by Ewliya Celebi, Seyyāh-nāme, ix, 29-34) bore as late as at Niebuhr’s time (1766) the name Bek Bara Kāfe’si (“the fortress which gives refuge to the Beg”). It was never properly inhabited, and is now derelict, but was used occasionally for the internment of political prisoners (‘Ashīkhpāsha-zāde, Ta’īlīhī, ed. Istanbul, 243 f., not in ed. Giese), and as late as 1802 for the imprisonment of the French prisoners of war from Egypt. The other monuments from the epoch of the Sāhibs and the Germiyan-oghlu, such as the Şāhlīb Türbesi, the Ulu Djànīn of Khohī Beg and the mausoleum et Sultan Djwānāl, as well as the Ottoman monuments, such as the mosque of Ahmed Gedik Pasha with its annexes (the medrese at present used as a museum; Ekrem Hakki Ayverdi, Fāṭih devari mimarisi, Istanbul 1928, 25-58), still await detailed examination.—In addition to the inscription on the Altıgöz köprüsü, mentioned above, other inscriptions from the town are published in RCEA, nos. 4132, 4329, 4540 and 4667.


**AGADIR**

AGADIR, one of the names of a fortified enclosure among the Berbers, whose chambers are allotted to the various families of the tribe for storage of grain, and where the tribe takes refuge in times of danger. The following are the areas where this ancient Berber institution survives: Diabal Naftûsa (under the name of gasr = ṣābus, or temiṭel); Southern Tunisia (ghurfa); and in Morocco the Rīf and more especially the Great, Middle and Anti-Atlas and the Sirwa (agadir among the Şāhibs and amongst the Berbers of the Middle Atlas). The word agadir probably goes back to Phoenician gadar = Hebrew ḥadar “wall” (in fact the word has in the Sōs the meaning of “strong wall”).


**AGADIR-IGHIR.** Moroccan town situated at the junction of the Moroccan High Atlas with the plain of Sūs, on the Atlantic coast. The town stands at the northern end of a large bay, at the foot of a hill some 800-900 feet high which is surmounted by a fort. The population numbers 30,111, of whom 1,518 are Jews and 6,062 Europeans (1932 census).

It is not clear whether a settlement existed there before the arrival of the Portuguese, although a letter from the inhabitants of Massa to Emmanuel I of Portugal, dated 6 July, 1510 (Sources indéédées de l’Histoire du Maroc, Portugal, i, 243) speaks of an agadir al-arba’āt at that site. This suggests that an agadir existed there near which a working market was held every Wednesday. At all events, it was of no great importance. Leo Africanus mentions the

**AGA [see AĞHA].**
same settlement under the name Gartguessem ("Cape Ksima" named after a Berber tribe living round about the town).

In the second half of 1505, a Portuguese nobleman João Lopes de Sequeira, built a wooden castle there, perhaps to protect a fishing fleet, perhaps also, with the approval of his sovereign, to thwart the Spaniards in the Canary Islands who had designs on the southern coast of Morocco. The castle was situated near a spring, at the foot of the hill commanding the roadstead. This site still bears the name of Funti, although its official designation seems from the first to have been Santa Cruz del Cabo de Aguar, by reason of its relative proximity to Cape Ghir. This castle was purchased by the King of Portugal on 25 January 1513.

The establishment of the Portuguese at Santa Cruz caused a strong reaction among the Berber tribes of the Sūs. The members of the Darḍūlya order, which had established itself in the Sūs 50 years previously, were able to exploit this antipathy for the purpose of a holy war, and some of them promoted the rise of the Sa'dīds (Banū Sa'dī), a family of guwarafīya coming from the Dar'[a] (Dra'a). The chief of this family, Muḥammad, later entitled al-Kā'īm bi-Amr Allāh, was proclaimed war leader about the year 1510.

From that date the Portuguese fortress was subjected to an intermittent, but nevertheless irksome, military and economic blockade, and to attacks which grew in severity as the power of the Sa'dīds increased. In September 1540, the Sa'dīd king of the Sūs, Muḥammad al-Šaykhk, son of al-Kā'īm, captured the hill which dominated Santa Cruz and concentrated there a strong force of artillery. The siege began on 16 February 1541 and ended, on 12 March, with the surrender of the garrison. A very detailed and lively account of these events can be found in the Chronique de Santa Cruz, the work of one of the besieged who, after 5 years' captivity at Tarāḍānt and elsewhere, wrote this account of his adventures.

For many years Santa Cruz-Agadir was left deserted until the Sa'dīd al-Ǧhalīl bi-lbāb (1555-74) built a fort on the top of Agadir hill to protect the anchorage from the Christian fleets. From then onwards Agadir was one of the points at which European traders regularly landed, principally to take on cargoes of sugar (see especially Sources inédites de l'Histoire du Maroc, 1ère série, France, iii, 361). Agadir retained its role of trading port up to the founding of the Muslim town of Mogador (Agadir) in 1773. Since that date, Agadir harbour has been little used.

The settlement achieved momentary renown in 1911 when the German gunboat "Panther" cast anchor in the roads to assert German claims there at a time when General Möničer's column had just occupied Fez (1 July 1912). After the signing of the Protectorate agreement, Agadir was occupied by French troops in 1913. Its population was then less than 1,000.

Since then, the town has developed greatly. It has become the chief town of one of the administrative regions of Morocco which comprises nearly 700,000 inhabitants. It owes its growth chiefly to the development of its agriculture and fisheries, and to the exploitation of its mineral wealth. The port of Agadir, constructed since 1914, has recently been enlarged.

Bibliography: Leo Africanus, Description de L'Afrique, (Schefer), i, 176 (Guarguessem); Chro-
father" and "uncle", and in Cuwash "elder sister". Among the Mongols it appears already to have been used as an honorific, the princesses of the imperial family being designated by it (cf. Quatremère, Histoire des Mongols, xxxix-xl).

In Ottoman Turkish agha (usually pronounced ä'ä or even ä) means "chief", "master" and sometimes "landowner". It is also used for the head servant of a household and occurs in combination with many words, e.g. çarşîîi aghasi ("market inspector"), şahîîi aghasi ("inkeeper"), köy aghasi ("village headman") and aghäey ("elder brother"—cf. above—"or "senior"). As a title, up to the reform period and in some cases even later, it was given to many persons of varying importance employed in the government service, for the most part in offices of a military, or at least a non-secretarial, character, being contrasted particularly with efendi [q.v.]. The most notable aghas of this kind were the Yeniseri Aghast (see YENISERI) and most of the principal officers of the standing as opposed to the feudal army, and the Öncesi or Rikhâ Aghalar (also most officers of both the "Inside" and "Outside" Services of the sultan's household. But the kâhya (ked-kudud) of the Grand Vizier was also entitled aghä, though his duties were entirely administrative and secretarial—whence, in his case, the word efendi was usually added to his title and he was called Agha Efendims; and so were the eunuchs of the palace service headed by the Bâb-ul-Sefadet Aghast or Kapî Aghast (white) and the Dâr-ul-Sefadet Aghast or Klâr Aghast (black), and the eunuchs attendant on the Wâlide Sultan and princesses of the imperial blood. Hence eunuchs employed by officials and the well-to-do in general came usually to be known as harem or Kâddim aghalar, till the word agha alone might sometimes mean "eunuch".

After the abolition of the Janissaries in 1826 and the formation by Mahmûd II of the 'Asâhir-i Memûsr, it became the custom to entitle agha illiterate officers up to the rank of hâ'im-mahâm, literate officers of corresponding rank being addressed as efendi; and this usage was maintained among the people up to the end of the Ottoman regime. Until the establishment of the Constitution there existed a military rank intermediate between the people up to the end of the Ottoman regime.

In consequence of intrigues at the court under the reign of Muhammad Shah, Hasan 'Ali Shah revolted in 1836 in Kirmân, but was defeated and fled in 1840 to Sind, where he rendered valuable services to Sir Ch. Napier in the Sind campaign. After an unsuccessful attempt to establish himself in Persia from the Bunpore district, he went to live in Bombay, but was removed to Calcutta at the instance of the Persian government. In 1848 he returned to Bombay, which has remained, except for a brief period at Bangalore, the headquarters of the movement headed by him and his successors. Internal troubles among the Khojis [q.v.] concerning the leadership of the Imâm, led to lawsuits, culminating in the famous judgment of Sir Joseph Arnow in 1866 in favour of the Agha Khan. It was this case, during which a great deal of information about the sect was elicited, which called the attention of western scholarship to the continued existence of the Nizâri Ismâ'îlîs; cf. M. H. B. Freer, The Khojas, the Disciples of the Old Man of the Mountain, Macmillan's Magazine, 1876, 431 ff.; St. Guyard, in JA, 1877, 337 ff.). Hasan 'Ali Shah (d. 1881) was succeeded by his son 'Ali Shah (d. 1885), and the latter by his son, the present Agha Khan, H. H. Sir Sultan Muhammad Shah (b. 2 Nov. 1877), the spiritual head of the Nizâri Ismâ'îlîs in India (including the Khojis), Persia, Central Asia, Syria and East Africa. Under his guidance, the organization of the Nizâri community has been greatly developed. The Agha Khan has also occupied a prominent position in public life. His heir (wali 'a'âd) is 'Ali Khan (b. 1910).

Bibliography: J. N. Hollister, The Shî'a of India, London 1953, 364 ff. The memoirs of the present Agha Khan were published under the title of World Enough and Time, London 1954. (H. A. R. Gibb)

A GHÂ MUHAMMAD SHAH, founder of the Kâdîr [q.v.] dynasty of Persia, who was born in 1555/1742, was the elder son of Muhammad Hasan Khan, hereditary chief of the powerful Kâdîr tribe. When a child he was castrated by order of 'Adî Shah, Nâdir Shah's nephew, an act which warped his character in later life. On his father's murder in 1758, he became chief of the Kâdîrs. He spent his youth at Khurshâd's court at Shâh-âb; on Khurshâd's death in 1779 he fled to Ashtâbâb and engaged in a long struggle with his descendants. By 1785 he had made himself master of the north and centre of the kingdom, and in that year he made Teherân his capital because of its central position and its proximity to the Kâdîr territories. In 1794 he captured the gallant Lûf 'Ali Khan, the last of Karim Khan's descendants, and put him to death after inflicting fearful tortures. In the following year he re-established Persian authority over Georgia. He was crowned Shah in 1796. He subsequently added Khorasan to his dominions, deposing Shâhrukh, Nâdir Shah's blind grandson; by means of torture, he forced Shâhrukh to disclose where he had hidden his grandfather's jewels, So dreadful were the unfortunate prince's sufferings that he died. Nemesis soon overtook Aghâ Muhammad, for he was assassinated in 1797. He showed great skill as a statesman and also as a military leader, but his reputation was sullied by his revengefulness, his revolting cruelty and his insatiable avarice.

Bibliography: 'Abd al-Razzaq b. Nadif Kull, Ma'tûhî-i Sulûqîyya, Tabriz 1826 (English translation by Sir Harford Jones Frere), The Dynasty of the Kojars, London 1833); Ridâ

(C. Huart-L. Lockhart)

AGHAČ, meaning in Ottoman Turkish "a tree", "wood", in Eastern Turkish (in which the forms yľghâ, yľghât are the more frequent) means also "the male member" and "parasang"; cf. al-Kâşghârî, Divân Luktî al-Turk, Istanbul 1933, iii, 6, and Brockelmann, Mittelorientliche Wortschatz, Budapest-Leipzig 1928, 87. Al-Kâşghârî shows only the forms yľghâ and yľghât, but W. Radloff, Versuch eines Wörterbuchs der Turk-Dialekte, 1893, 1, 150, shows also aghâd and other forms of the word such as aghâts, aghâs and yaghat, as signifying not only "title" and "wood" but also "a measure of distance". The measure thus referred to by al-Kâşghârî as a "parasang" is said (cf. Pavet de Courteille, Dictionnaire Turc-Oriental, Paris 1870, 554-5) to be three times the distance at which a man standing between two others can make himself heard by them. An aghâd in this sense is equal, according to a verse of Mîr 'Alî Shîr Naw'âkî, to 12,000 double cubits (kârt); according to Pietro della Valle, Voyages, iii, 141, to a Spanish league, or four Italian miles; according to Flandin and Costa, or four Italian miles; according to Flandin and Costa, as well as more serious distortions. In Latin translations from Arabic we find various representations of different accurateness, e.g. in the Turba Philosophorum: Agadimôn, Adimon, Agmon.

The Graeco-Egyptian god Agathodaemon (see Ganschinietz, in Pauly-Wissowa, iii. Suppl.-Bd., ii, 280; Ibn Kutayba, Shîr, 389; Aghânî, xviii, 164-7; Baghdâtî, Khâzâma, i, 322-4; Ibn Hadîjar, Isbâ, no. 225; Ibn al-Kiflî, 2, Agathodaemon was the teacher of Asclepius. Jâdîb and Asma'î, Asbâh, in ZDMG, 1911, 466-7; Dîbîr, Hayawânt, ii, 280; Ibn Kutayba, Shîr, 389; Aghânî, xviii, 164-7; Baghdâtî, Khâzâma, i, 322-4; Ibn Hadîjar, Isbâ, no. 225; Amidi, Mu'talif, 22; Ibn Durayd, Ishbâk, 208; O. Rescher, Abrîs, i, 114; Brockelmann, S I, 90; Nallino, Scrilli vi, 96-7) (Fr. trans. 149-51).

(Ch. Pellat)

AGHALABIDS or BANU 'AL-AGHALAB, a Muslim dynasty which throughout the 3rd/9th century held Ifrikîya in the name of the 'Abbásids and reigned at al-Kayrawân.

(i) General Survey; (ii) Religious Life; (iii) Chronological Survey.

(i) General Survey.

In 184/800 the founder of this dynasty, Ibrâhîm b. al-Aghlab, who, as governor of the Zâb, had displayed skill and energy in restoring law and order in his province, was invested with personal power by the caliph Hârûn al-Rashîd on terms advantageous to the latter. His vassal relinquished the subvention of autonomy, especially in the matter of the succession. "He bequeathed his dominions to a son or a brother as he pleased" (al-Nuwârî), making his choice without interference from Baghdad, and this practice was followed by each of the amirs who succeeded him.

Our knowledge of these Arab rulers of Ifrikîya is considerable, and it is possible to discern their
characters with reasonable clarity. In these high officials of the caliphs who had become independent princes, one finds the merits and defects of their masters. Although the majority were devoted to pleasure and addicted to drink, which at times incited them to outbursts of violence and bloodshed, there were among them men of culture who had a sense of greatness, shrewd statesmen, at once stern and humane, and leaders anxious to promote public works and to devote the revenues accruing to them to the welfare of the state. Under them, ifrīkiya experienced a genuine renaissance, and many magnificent foundations still testify to their beneficent rule.

They needed energy and political skill to overcome the difficulties which confronted them. Ibrahim b. al-Aghlab (184-97/800-12) had to extinguish the last outbursts of Berber revolt. On the borders of Aghlabid territory, Kharidjism was in control of Southern Ifrikiya, of the Awrās and nearly all of Central Maghrib, the Zāb forming the western boundary of the kingdom. The adherence of the Kutāma of Lesser Kabylia to Shi‘ism was to cause the downfall of the dynasty. The gravest crises, however, were centred round the very heart of the Aghlabid kingdom. Tunis and even al-Kayrawān were centres of opposition; and the most troublesome elements were the Arabs of the ġundūn, who ought to have been the strongest supporters of Aghlabid power. In the towns in which they were garrisoned, they treated the indigenous population with contumely, and proved exacting and contentious in their dealings with the rulers of the country. Ibrahim I had to suppress two Arab revolts: that of Hamdis b. ʿAbd-al-Rahmān al-Kindī (186/802) and that of Ibrahim II, as ascetics, they criticised the morals of the amirs.

The Aghlabids were enthusiastic builders. Under Ziyādat Allāh's successor, Abu ʿUṣūl al-Aghlab (223-6/837-40), the small mosque named after Abū Fateṭā was built at Sūsā, which acquired other new foundations about the same time. Abu ʿUṣūl ʿAbd Allah and Ibrahim II, who constituted an imposing coloured guard. The Aghlabids carried out many of these in order to restore prosperity to regions possessing only a poor water supply, notably to the south

b. Ibrahim (197-201/812-7) promulgated a financial reform which was contrary to Islamic tradition, namely, the levy on crops of a fixed sum in cash instead of the tithe in kind. This measure aroused strong protests, and the death of the amīr soon afterwards was regarded as a divine punishment. On the whole, the Aghlabid rulers treated the religious classes with respect and tried to conciliate them, but they rarely induced them to relax their uncompromising attitude. Apart from various architectural creations and public works which will be described later, which may be considered to owe their origin to this religious policy, the conquest of Byzantine Sicily can also be attributed to the same cause.

Although this conquest, the supreme military achievement of the Aghlabid amīrs, was undertaken by Ziyādat Allāh immediately after the revolt of Mansūr al-Tunbuḏī, and was doubtless inspired by the desire to divert the energies of the Arabs to an external theatre of operations, the expedition of 211/827 assumed the guise of a holy war. The army was entrusted to the learned jurist Asad b. al-Furat ʿq.v., and Sūsā ʿq.v., where the fighters for the Faith and their followers embarked, already had the character of a tābiʿa port, as the town had been furnished with a ribāʿi system previously.

This ribāʿi still exists. An inscription at the foot of the signal tower bears the name of Ziyādat Allāh and the date 206/821. The rebuilding of the Great Mosque at al-Kayrawān ʿq.v. is attributed to the same amīr. This splendid building, founded by ʿUkba b. Nādir about 670, twice remodelled or rebuilt in the course of the 8th century, was in fact the work of the Aghlabids. In addition to Ziyādat Allāh, two other amīrs, Abū Ibrahim and Ibrahim II, carried out work there and enlarged the prayer-hall. The Aghlabids were enthusiastic builders. Under Ziyādat Allāh's successor, Abū ʿUṣūl al-Aghlab (223-6/837-40), the small mosque named after Abū Fatýāta was built at Sūsā, which acquired other new foundations about the same time. Abu ʿUṣūl ʿAbd Allah and Ibrahim II, who constituted an imposing coloured guard. The Aghlabids carried out many of these in order to restore prosperity to regions possessing only a poor water supply, notably to the south

The hostility of the Kayrawāns and the policy of the Aghlabids towards them constitute another aspect of the internal history of the dynasty. This hostility was fostered mainly by the religious classes, scholars and devotees who enjoyed the confidence and regard of the people. These doctors of religion, exponents of hadith, jurists and theologians who, for the most part, were of eastern origin, lived close to the people and guided public opinion. As professing ascetics, they criticised the morals of the amīrs; as champions of orthodoxy, they protested against their illegal decisions and their abuse of power. The second of the Aghlabids, Abu ʿUṣūl ʿAbd Allāh
of the “Tunisian chain”. A recent work by M. Solignac, based on an examination of the constructional methods employed and the nature of the materials used, and a comparison with those used at the neighbouring reservoirs at al-Kayrawân, leaves no doubt on this point.

For their public works, their defence installations, and, in general, for their buildings, the amirs evidently relied on a labour force recruited locally. The superintendence of the workshops was entrusted to non-Muslim freedmen, their names recorded on the buildings themselves. On their coins are mentioned officials of the same origin who controlled the Mint.

Although the inherited traditions of Christian Africa had a considerable influence on the construction and ornamentation of buildings (the Roman mosaic style of paving being still employed), Aghlabid architecture draws also on Oriental sources. The influence of Syria, Egypt and Mesopotamia is apparent, and a new and specifically Muslim art emerges which finds its most striking expression in the Great Mosque at al-Kayrawân.

The dynasty enjoyed its last years of prosperity in the reign of Abu l-I š hâk Ibrâhim II, who succeeded Abu 'Abd-Allâh Muhammad called Abu 'l-Ghârânîk ("Father of the Cranes"), a frivolous and extravagant prince. Ibrâhim II, in whose strange character were blended in exaggerated form the merits and defects of his line, was by turns a just sovereign, concerned for the welfare of his people, and a sadistic tyrant, whose cruelty spared no member of his family. On the command of the 'Abbâsîd Caliph al-Mu'taḍid, who had received complaints about him, he abdicated in 289/902 in favour of his son Abu 'l-‘Abbas 'Abd Allâh, and devoted himself to a most edifying life of penitence. Being unable to perform the pilgrimage by the overland route, he travelled to Sicily, made himself master of Taormina, and then went on to Calabria, where he died before Cosenza (19 Dhu 'l-Ka‘da 289/29 Oct. 902).

During the reign of Ibrâhim II there appeared in Hîriyâ the Shi‘îte missionary Abu 'Abd Allâh (q.v., who was to bring about the precession of the dynasty and secure the triumph of the Fâtimid al-Mahdî 'Ubây al-Laâh. Supported by the Kutâma Berbers, whom he had converted to Shi‘ism, Abu 'Abd Allâh set out to conquer the Aghlabid kingdom. The posts on the western frontier, some of which had been imprudently denuded of their Arab garrisons, victims of Ibrahim’s severity, were incapable of checking these fanatical mountaineers. The amir Abu Mudar Ziyâdat Allâh III perceived the danger, but his measures lacked any rational plan and were insufficient to delay the catastrophe. He restored the walls of al-Kayrawân and sent against the Kutâma several forces which were defeated. Then, announcing a great victory, he made preparations for flight. He left Rakkâ, the royal city which Ibrâhim II had founded 4½ m. south of al-Kayrawân, and, taking with him what treasures he could, set out for Egypt. From there he went to Râkkâ, but later returned to Egypt, and died at Jerusalem.


(ii) Religious Life.

Al-Kayrawân under the Aghlabids was a great centre of Islamic religious life, scholarship and literature, both in its own right and as a half-way house between the Islamic East and West. Whilst they did not elaborate a common local interpretation of religious law of their own, the scholars of al-Kayrawân followed one or the other of the Eastern schools of thought, sometimes adopting an eclectic attitude. This eclecticism is attested not only by the Asâdiyya of Ibn an-Furfâ but by other works as well. ‘Irâkian and Medinese doctrines were equally well represented in al-Kayrawân of the Aghlabids, but the teaching of al-Shâfi‘î never took root there. In particular, al-Kayrawân under the Aghlabids became the most important centre of the Mâlikî school, superseding Medina and Cairo as such. Some of the most prominent scholars in religious law of the period, whose works have to a greater or lesser extent survived, are: Asad b. an-Furfâ (q.v.), d. 251, Saḥân (q.v.), d. 240, author of the Mudawwana, the great digest of Mâlikî doctrine, Yûsuf b. Yaḥyâ (d. 288), Abu Zakariyya Yaḥyâ b. ‘Umar al-Kinânî (d. 289), ‘Isa b. Miskín (d. 295), and Abu Ḥūmân Sa’d b. Muhammad b. al-Hâdîd (d. 302). Manuscripts dating from the time of the Aghlabids, of the works of these and of other scholars, are still preserved in the library of the Great Mosque of al-Kayrawân.

In the field of dogmatic theology, too, al-Kayrawân under the Aghlabids was the meeting-place of many opinions and the stage of lively discussions, occasionally, too, of violence and persecution, between the orthodox, the Dâ‘ârîyya, the Murji‘îa, the Mu’tazîla, and last but not least the Išâ‘îyya (see these artt.). Asad b. al-Furfâ, for instance, assaulted Suleyman al-Farrâ who denied that the believers would see God, and when Saḥân became ḫâdî, he had slowly beaten to death his predecessor ‘Abd Allâh b. Abî ‘l-Dja‘awîd, who was of the opinion that the Kur‘ân was created. Concerning this last proposition, the religious policy of the Aghlabids followed that of the Caliphs of Bagdad. Shortly after the mi‘âna (q.v.) in the East, the upholders of the orthodox doctrine had to undergo a similar, though milder, tribulation under the pretender Aḥmad b. al-Aghlab; Saḥân himself had been in danger on that occasion, but escaped serious trouble. In the same way as in the East, an orthodox reaction soon asserted itself, but Mu’tazîlite doctrines were not eradicated, and a profession Mu’tazîlite, such as Ibrâhim b. Aswâd al-Shâdînî, was appointed Ḫâdî of al-Kayrawân at the end of the reign of Ibrâhim b. Aḥmad, shortly before the end of the dynasty. Religious life proper is represented by a great number of pious persons and saints who were often
in opposition to, but still in contact with the religious scholars. Both groups were very influential under the Aghlabids, and both showed a spirit of independence and held a critical attitude towards the government. Occasionally, the kâdis were at the same time governors and military commanders. Several collections of biographies, the oldest of which are very near to the period in question, give a vivid picture of the religious and intellectual life in al-Kayrawân (and in the other cities of Ifriqiya) under the Aghlabids.


(iii) Chronological Survey.

The dynasty consists of the following eleven princes:

1. Ībrâhîm I b. al-Aghlab b. Sâlim b. ‘Īkhâl al-Tamâmî (12 Dhul-Qa‘dah 184/79 July 800—21 Shawwâl 1965/850), the founder of the dynasty. His father al-Aghlab, a former associate of Ābû Muslim, was one of the commanders in the Khurasanian corps sent to Isrâ‘îliyya by al-Mânsûr; in 148/763 he had succeeded Muhammad b. al-Ashâ‘îh as governor, and was killed in 150/767 during the revolt of al-Ḥasan b. Ḥarb. In 179/795 Ībrâhîm was appointed governor of the Zâb, and in return for his assistance in putting down a revolt against the governor Ibn Mu‘âtîl was granted the province as a hereditary fief by Ḥârûn al-Rashîd. Energetic and wise, prudent and shrewd, a brave fighter as well as skilful diplomat, Ībrâhîm gave Isrâ‘îliyya an excellent administration. He was a man of wide culture, being, it is said, a good fâkîh as well as a fine orator and poet. At the time of his death, his son Ābû Allâh, who had been sent in 1866/1011 to suppress a rising of the Khârijjite Huwwârâ in Tripolitania, was besieged in Tripoli by the Rustamîd Ābû al-Wâhâbî of Tâbât, and made peace with the latter by ceding the entire hinterland of Tripoli.


2. Ābû ‘l-‘Abbâs ‘Ābû Allâh I b. Ībrâhîm (Safar 197/Oct.-Nov. 812—6 Dhū l-Hijjâja 202/25 June 817) had a reputation for beauty and illiteracy; he was blamed more especially for having imposed non-kurâ’ânic, and particularly heavy, taxes.

3. Ābû Muḥammad Ziyyâdât Allâh I b. Ībrâhîm (201/817—14 Radjab 223/10 June 838) was one of the greatest princes of the dynasty. Apart from the revolt of al-Tunbûshî, the outstanding event of his reign was the conquest of Sicily, from 217/837 onwards, under the command of the kâdî of al-Kayrawân, Asâd b. al-Furîdî (q.v.). Two and a half years later he granted an amnesty to the former rebels, and Isrâ‘îliyya entered on a period of general peace. To him is due also the restoration of the mosque of al-Kayrawân and other public works.

4. Ābû ‘l-‘Ikâl al-Aghlab b. Ibrâhîm (223/838—Rabî‘ II 226/Feb. 841) was a brilliant and cultured prince, who devoted his attention to the administration of Isrâ‘îliyya and gave a further impetus to the dîwâh in Sicily.

5. Ābû ‘l-‘Abbâs Muḥammad I b. al-Aghlab (226/841-2 Muḥarram 242/10 May 856). Six years after his accession he was ousted by his brother Āḥmad, whom, however, he managed to defeat a year later and banished to the East, where he died. His reign was marked by two rebellions: those of Sâlim b. Ḥâlbûn in 233/847-8 and of ‘Āmîr b. Sâlim al-Tuḏûbî in 235/850. Muḥammad was a warm supporter of the Mâlikîs and especially of the kâdî of Sânîn (q.v.).

6. Ābû Ībrâhîm Āḥmad b. Muḥammad (242/856—13 Dhū l-Ka‘da 243/28 Dec. 863) was a nephew of the preceding. He had a peaceful reign, marked especially by public works.


8. Ābû ‘l-Ghârânîl Muḥammad II b. Āḥmad (250/863—6 Dîjumâdâ I 261/16 Jan. 873), son of Ābû Ībrâhîm, was noted for his great passion for hunting. His reign was marked by the conquest of Malta (255/868).

9. Ābû Isâhî Ībrâhîm I b. Āḥmad (261/873—17 Dhū l-Ka‘da 288/18 Oct. 902) was raised to the throne by popular acclamation in place of his nephew Ābû ‘l-‘Ikâl. In 264/878 he built himself a new residence, Raḵkâda (q.v.), which he later abandoned for Tunis. The main events of his reign are the capture of Syracuse (264/878), the defeat of an invasion of Isrâ‘îliyya by Ābîbâs, son of Āḥmad b. Tâlûn, by the Îdâhidât of Dîjabil Nâfûs (266-7/879-80), the suppression of a revolt of the Berbers of the Zâb (268/881-2), and of another rising in the north of Isrâ‘îliyya (280/893). His son Ābû Allâh, appointed governor of Sicily in 287/900, captured Palermo and Reggio, and was recalled on Ībrâhîm’s abdication (see above).

10. Ābû ‘l-‘Abbâs 3 Ābî Allâh II b. Ībrâhîm (289/902—29 Ṣa‘îbân 290/23 July 903). He endeavoured to check the Shi‘îte menace, but was assailed at the instigation of his son Ziyyâdât Allâh.

11. Ābû Mudâr Ziyyâdât Allâh III b. 3 Ābî Allâh (290/903—295/909). Ascending the throne after the murder of his father and other members of his family, he was completely lacking in courage. Nevertheless, he proclaimed the dîwâh in 291/904, but, driven to despair by the fall of Laribus (18 March 909; see Ābû 3 Ābî Allâh al-mu‘īn), he incessantly fled from the country.

ĀGHMÂT, a small town in Southern Morocco, about 25 m. south of Marrákkush, on a small watercourse Wâdî Ūrîkâ or Wâdî Āghmât, at the edge of the Great Atlas range (the Djabal Daran of the Middle Ages). From the 5th/6th century the name of this place, according to the statement of the geographer Ābû ‘Ubayd al-Bakfr, applied to two distinct settlements ½ m. apart, namely Āghmât an-Waylân (the spelling given by al-Baydâq, Doc. inédits d’hist. almohade) or Āghmât of the Aylân (a Berber tribe: arabîc Haylânâ) and Āghmât Īrîkâ, or Āghmât of the Īrîkâ (Warikâ). To-day the latter is a small country town named simply Īrîkâ. Al-Bakfr and al-Idrîsî describe Āghmât as a flourishing town surrounded by well-irrigated gardens and inhabited by a considerable and highly industrious population. It is a fact that before the foundation of Marrákkush, at the beginning of the
Almoravid expansion beyond the Great Atlas range, this town was the chief urban centre in southern Morocco and even, if one accepts the tesquency of certain biographical notices in the Andalusian dictionaries, an extremely active cultural centre. In the 25 years prior to the accession of Yusuf b. Tashfun [q.v.], many scholars and jurists flocked to Āgmāt from Cordova and even from al-Kayrawān, the latter having been forced into exile in large numbers by the disturbances which had just devastated Irfikīya. At that time Āgmāt was the capital of a small Berber state, in the hands of a chief of the Maghrāwa [q.v.], Laḫkūṭ b. Yusuf, who married the celebrated Zaynab al-Nafzawīyya, the daughter of one of the emirates from Irfikīya. The latter afterwards became successively the wife of the Lamtūna chief Abū Bakr b. ʿUmar [see al-Murābīṭūn], and of his lieutenant and successor Yusuf b. Tashfun. This intelligent and cultured prince who, according to certain chroniclers, was also something of a magician, speedily assembled at Āgmāt a literary entourage and introduced the rough Lamtūna chieftains from the Sahara and their wives also to a more cultured mode of existence. Once it had been founded and become the capital of the Almoravids, Marrākūsh attracted many members of this select circle from Āgmāt, and this mania of its decline which, however, seems to have been summoned only much later. The Almoravids chose Āgmāt as an enforced place of residence for two of the rulers whom they had deposed in Spain, namely the Zirid ruler of Granada ʿAbd Allāh b. Bulūgūn, and the famous al-Muṭamīd of Seville. Later, Āgmāt was the last stage on the journey of the Mahdī Ibn Tūmart on his return from the East, prior to his “rising”, in both a religious and a political sense, in the Great Atlas Mountains. By the time of Leo Africanus the old Berber capital was in a state of complete decline.


(Formerly Aleghkird or Alashgird), Patmos (formerly Antāb), Tutik. The name is spelled Aghrī DAGH sometimes also EGHR! DAGH, mountain (extinct volcano) with a double peak on the eastern frontier of the Turkish Republic, 39°45′ N 44°20 E, the highest point in the plateau of the region of the Aras (Araxes) and Wan (high plateau of Ararat), in Armenian Masis or Marsik, in Persian Kūh-i Nūh; by Europeans it is called Ararat, as it was identified with the mountain of this name (Hebrew Arārat, originally the name of the country of Urartu, later understood as the name of a mountain), on which Noah’s ark is said to have alighted. (Originally Ararat was identified with Diabal Dīdī [q.v.], near Diyarbakr ibn ʿUmar in Mesopotamia.)

The mountain rises, almost without any intermediate ridges, over the flat plain of the Araxes, which is just over 800 m. high and extends to the east and north of the mountain. To the south and the west there extends an undulating high plateau from 1800 to over 3000 m. high, from which rise other extinct volcanoes, and ridges from which to NW and W form the transition to the system of the Eastern Taurus. The Ararat group covers an area of over 1000 square kms. and has a circumference of over 100 kms. It culminates in two summits, Great Ararat (5172 m.) in the NW and Little Ararat (3906 m.) in the SE; these are connected by a narrow, smooth-rounded saddle (2687 m.) 13-14 kms. long, called, after a spring c. 8 km. below, Serdar Bulak. A pass leads over this ridge. In absolute height Ararat surpasses all the mountains of Europe, and with its relative height of over 4300 m. also many famous giants of the other continents. Seen from the north, the mountain, towering over the whole landscape, offers a majestic sight.

Great Ararat (Diabal al-Huwawīrī) has the form of a slightly rounded cone. From its summit, which forms an almost circular plateau with a circumference of 13-14 kms. long, called, after a spring c. 8 km. below, Serdar Bulak. A pass leads over this ridge. In absolute height Ararat surpasses all the mountains of Europe, and with its relative height of over 4300 m. also many famous giants of the other continents. Seen from the north, the mountain, towering over the whole landscape, offers a majestic sight.

The district is afflicted by frequent earthquakes. The most terrible earthquake of recent centuries was that of 20 June 1840; this caused an enormous landslide, which destroyed a flourishing settlement, the ancient Argurī (old Armenian Akor; cf. Hübschmann, in Indogerm. Forsch., 234, 236, 295), with all its inhabitants (c. 1600), the small monastery of St. James. Lesser Ararat (Diabal al-Huwawīrī) has the form of a beautiful regular cone.

The district is afflicted by frequent earthquakes. The most terrible earthquake of recent centuries was that of 20 June 1840; this caused an enormous landslide, which destroyed a flourishing settlement, the ancient Argurī (old Armenian Akor; cf. Hübschmann, in Indogerm. Forsch., 234, 236, 295), with all its inhabitants (c. 1600), the small monastery of St. James. Lesser Ararat (Diabal al-Huwawīrī) has the form of a beautiful regular cone.

The whole of the Ararat district, owing to the porosity of the cinder- and slag-stone, suffers from a considerable scarcity of water; in spite of the abundant cover of snow, there are only two springs of importance on the slope of Great Ararat (the Sardar Bulak, 2290 m.); and the famous well of St. James, which emerges since 1840 at a different spot), none on Little Ararat. The latter does not
reach the region of eternal snow. It is only in the districts at the eastern and northern feet of the mountain, in the plain of the Aras, that the water oozes out and forms in parts marshy patches.

The dearth of water results in scanty vegetation. Apart from some birches, Ararat, like all the neighbouring mountains, is completely bare of forests; in this extreme form, however, this is caused by human agency. A poor fauna corresponds to the scanty flora. Since the destruction of the human settlements in the valley of St. James the district of Surmalu, Kulp and Igdir in the Eastern slope of Little Ararat (cf. MSOS, 1934, ii, 116); thus at present the whole territory of the Central-Caucasus and Bashan, which was ceded by Persia to Russia. Thus the northern slopes together with the summit of Great Ararat fell to Russia, while Little Ararat formed the gigantic boundary stone between the three empires of Turkey, Persia and Russia. By the treaty of Moscow, 16 March 1921, between Soviet Russia and Turkey the plain of the Aras was ceded to Turkey; and in the Turco-Persian agreement (cf. MSOS, i, 138 ff.) of 23 Jan. 1932 (which came into force on 3 Nov. 1932) Persia also ceded to Turkey a small territory, comprising the eastern slope of Little Ararat (cf. MSOS, 1934, ii, 116); thus at present the whole territory of the immense mountain belongs to Turkey. (Cf. G. Jäschke, Die Nordostgrenze der Türken und Nachbarvölker, Vol. I, 1835, 394 ff.).


(M. Streck-F. Taeschner)

AGRA, town, headquarters of a division and district of the name in the state of Uttar Pradesh, is situated on the banks of the river Yamuna, 27° 59' N, 77° 59' E. Pop. (1951) 375,665, of whom 15.6% are Muslims. The city was for a long time the seat of residence of the Mughal emperors, and is renowned especially for its remarkable monuments of Mughal architecture.

History. Little is known about the early history of Agra, but there is no doubt it was founded long before the Muslim invasions of India. The first reference to the city, and to an ancient fortress in it, is contained in a hāsida written in praise of the Ghaznavid prince Mahmūd b. Ibrāhīm by the poet Mās'ud b. Sa'd b. Salmān (d. 515/1121 or 526/1131), wherein the conquest of the fortress (presumably during the reign of Sulfān Mas'ud III, 493-508/1099-1113) is mentioned. The town was ruled by Rādgātānī, or his successors, who, upon making their submission to the Sultanate of Delhi, were allowed to keep their control over it, under the overall command of the governor of Bībīya province. It remained unnoticed until Sultan Sikandar Lōdī (894-923/1490-1517) rebuilt the city in 911/1505 and made it the seat of his government. The place quickly gained in importance and attracted scholars and learned men from many parts of the Muslim world. Commanding routes to Gwalior and Māluwā in the south, Rādgātānī, the west, Delhi and the Pāndjāb in the north-west, and the plain of the Ganges in the east, it soon became a strategic and trading centre. It continued to be the capital of Ibrāhīm Lōdī (923-32/1517-26) and, on his defeat in 932/1526, it became the capital of Bābār. In addition to building his palace of Cārbāgh, Bābār laid out a number of gardens in the city and constructed many mosques. His nobles followed his example, and a considerable portion of the old city was levelled down. The city remained Humāyūn’s and Shīr Shāh’s capital, but neither Humāyūn, nor Shīr Shāh or his successors were able to spend much time there. It again became the seat of government in the third year of Akbar’s reign (965/1558), when he took up residence in the citadel formerly known as Badal Gadh, and his nobles built their houses on both banks of the river. In 972/1565 the construction of the fort on the site of Badal Gadh was undertaken, but before it could be completed, the building of Pathpūr Sīkīr [q.v.] was commenced. From 982/1574 to 994/1586 Akbar lived mostly in the new city, and latter, till 1006/1605, his headquarters were generally at Lahore. In the latter year he returned to Agra. On his death in 1014/1605, Dzhāhāngīr ascended the throne in that city and lived there almost continuously from 1016/1607 to 1021/1613. He spent another year at Agra in 1027/1618, but later, until his death in 1037/1628, he spent most of his time in Kashmir and Lahore. Like his father, Shāh Dzhāhān also ascended the throne at Āgra, but had to leave for the Deccan in the following year. From 1041/1623 to 1042/1623 he again resided in the city, but after that, except for brief visits, he did not stay there for long. Thereafter, he lived mostly at Delhi, where he built...
the new city of Shahdijahanabad. (The name of Agra was also changed to Akbarabad, but the latter name was never widely used.) In 1067/1657 he fell seriously ill and was brought to Agra by his eldest son, Dara Shikuh. In the war of succession that broke out, Agra was victorious and ascended the throne in 1068/1658. Shah Djahân was imprisoned in the Fort, where he died in 1076/1666. On hearing the news, Agra was returned to Agra and held Court there for some time. Later, he again stayed in Agra from 1079/1669 to 1081/1671. However, Agra's use as a place of residence was first, Delhi, and then, in the Deccan. Though, in the 17th century, the court did not remain at Agra for long, the place was nevertheless regarded as one of the capital cities of the Empire. Most of the European travellers who visited India considered it to be one of the largest cities they had seen, comparable in size to Paris, London and Constantinople. It was a centre of trade and commerce and was well known for its textile industry, gold inlay work, stone and marble work and crystal. However the population as well as the trade diminished considerably when the court was away.

The successors of Agra lived mostly in Delhi, though Agra continued to be important politically. During the second half of the 16th century, it suffered much from the depredations of the Dâts (q.v.), the Maharrats and the Rohlilâhs. Though nominal Mughal sovereignty over the town continued till it was annexed by the British in 1803, except for the years 1774 to 1785 when Nadjaf Khan (d. 1782) and his successors were its governors, Agra was under the occupation of the Dâts (1761-1770, and 1773-74) and the Maharrats (1758-61, 1769-73, and 1785-1803).

Monuments. The Fort. The present fort of Agra was built by Akbar on the site of the Lodî fortress of Badal Garh on the right bank of the Yamunâ. It was constructed in about eight years (1565-73) under the superintendence of Muhammad Kâsîm Khan Mir-i Bahir at a cost of 35 lacs of rupees. It is in the shape of an irregular semi-circle with its base along the river. The fort is surrounded by a double wall, loop-holed for musketry, the distance between the walls being 40 ft. The outer wall, just under 70 ft. high and faced with red sand-stone, is about 1/4 miles in circuit and represents the first conception of dressed stone on such a large scale. The principal gateway, the Delhi Gate, is one of the most impressive portals in India. Within the fort, according to Abu'l Faḍl, Akbar built “upward of 500 edifices of red stone in the fine styles of Bengâl and Gudîrât”. Most of these buildings were demolished by Shah Djahân to make room for his marble structures, among those that still stand Akbari and Bangâlî Maâball are the earliest. Akbar's buildings are characterised by carved stone brackets which support the stone beams, wide eaves and flat ceilings, the arch being used sparingly. Similar in design is the Djahângîrî Maâball, a double-storied construction, 261 ft. by 288 ft., supposed to have been built by Akbar for Prince Salim (later Djahângîr) but very probably built by Djahângîr himself for the Râjpût princesses of the haram, though Cunningham thinks it was built by Ibrâmî Lodî. After the accession of Shah Djahân architectural style underwent a radical change. With the discovery of marble quarries, red sand-stone was practically eliminated and large-scale use of marble made carved line and flowing rhythm of style possible. Instead of the beam and brackets, foliated or cusped arches became common and marble arcades of engraved arches distinguished the buildings of Shah Djahân. Among the most important of his buildings in the Fort are the Kâhî Mâball and its adjoining north and south pavilions; the Shâh Mâball a bath whose walls and ceilings are spangled over with tiny mirrors of irregular shape set in stucco relief; the Mûhammadan Bûrdî built for the Empress Mumtâz Mâball (in which building Shah Djahân breathed his last); the Dîwân-i Khâs (or private assembly chamber); the Dîwân-i Âm (or public audience chamber) having a court 500 ft. by 73 ft., and a pillared hall 201 ft. by 67 ft. with an alnove of inlaid marble being the throne gallery (built of red sand-stone plastered with white marble stucco which is artistically gilded); the Motî Masjîd (or Pearl Mosque) a magnificent structure of white marble standing on a plinth of red sandstone.

Not far from the fort stands the Dîwânî Masjîd, built by Djahânh Ahrd Bégam, the eldest daughter of Shah Djahân, in 1058/1648, a red sand-stone building having three domes and five gracefully proportioned arches, the central archway being a semi-domed double portal.

The tomb of Akbar at Sîkandara, constructed in Djahângîr's reign on a site selected by Akbar himself, stands in the middle of a well-laid garden about five miles from Agra. Very probably some idea of the design was settled by Akbar, but the building lacks that correctness which is characteristic of the construction undertaken by that monarch. The building is 340 ft. square, consisting of five terraces diminishing as they ascend. The lowest storey is arcaded and in the centre of each side is inserted a large portico with a deeply recessed archway. The next three storeys consist of super-imposed tiers of pillared arcades and kiosks built mainly of red sand-stone. The topmost storey is of white marble and is screened with perforated lattices. Each corner of this storey is surmounted by a slender kiosk.

The tomb of Djahângîr's minister, Mirzâ Shîyâh Bég, entitled lîtimâd al-Dawla (d. 1622), constructed by his daughter, the Empress Nûr Djahân and completed in 1628, stands in the middle of a well-laid garden on the left bank of the river. The mausoleum consists of a square lower storey 69 ft. wide with a gracefully proportioned octagonal turret, like a dwarfed minaret, thrown out from each corner; while the second storey rises in the form of a traceried pavilion covered by a canopy shaped vaulted roof sending out broad stepping eaves, surmounted by two golden pinnacles. It is the first large building in India built entirely of marble and is remarkable for the richness of its decoration and profuse pietra dura work.

Tâdî Mâball. The most famous building at Agra is the Tadî Mâball, the beautiful mausoleum erected by Shah Djahân for his dearly loved wife, Arjdumand Bânû Bégam, entitled Mumtâz Mâball, popularly known to her contemporaries as Tâdî Mâball. She was the daughter of Asaf Khan, son of lîtimâd al-Dawla, and was married to Shah Djahân in 1612 at the age of nineteen. She bore him fourteen children and died in June 1631 at Burhânâpîr after giving birth to a daughter. Work on the mausoleum was started almost immediately after her death and was completed in about twelve years at a cost of five million rupees, though some later writers have put the figure at 30 million rupees. According to the contemporary European traveller,
Tavernier, the structure, together with its subsidiary buildings, was completed in about twenty-two years during which period twenty thousand workmen were continuously employed on it. The best architects and craftsmen, each a specialist in his own field, available in the Empire as well as in the neighbouring countries were engaged for the work, which was carried on under the general supervision of Makramat Khan and Mir Abd-al-Karim. The tradition that the architect of the Tādī Mahāl was a Venetian, Geronimo Veroneo, based on a statement made by Father Manrique, finds no corroboration either in the Mughal chronicles or in the writings of the other contemporary European travellers like Tavernier, Berneri, and Thevenot, who regarded the building as a purely oriental work. Its close resemblance with the tomb of Humayun at Delhi, and an analysis of its architectural as well as decorative features, suggest that it was undoubtedly the culminating point in the evolution of the Indo-Muslim style of architecture, though no other building in India is quite as exquisite, elegant or beautiful.

The tomb, built of white marble from Djodhpūr, stands on a raised platform, 18 feet high and 313 feet square, faced with foliated arches. At each corner of this platform there is a beautifully proportioned cylindrical minaret, 133 feet high with three galleries and finished with an open domed fair throw out broad eaves. In the centre of the platform stands the mausoleum, a square of 186 feet, with angles canted to the extent of 33 feet 9 ins., the façade rising 92 feet 3 ins. from the platform. In each face of the building is a high arched recessed porch. On either side of each porch, and at the canted angles, there are arched recesses of uniform size arranged in two stories. These recesses and the porches are vaulted. Above each of the canted angles stands a domed pillared kiosk, while the centre is occupied by a beautiful bulbous dome, rising from a high circular drum, and surmounted by a gilt pinnacle finished with a crescent. The central dome, 58 ft. in diameter and rising 94 feet above the roof or 192 feet from the platform, is one of the finest in the world. Beneath the dome is the central chamber, octagonal within, buttressed at each angle by small octagonal rooms of two storeys, with the great domes of two storeys, with the great porches in each pair. In the middle of the central chamber is the cenotaph of Mumtaz Mahall, and beside it that of her husband. Immediately beneath these, in the crypt, are the two graves. The cenotaphs are enclosed by a remarkable screen of trellis-work of white marble. The porches are framed in ornamental inscriptions from the Kurān, and the beauty of the whole is enhanced by copious and graceful ornamentation in piëstra dura. All the spandrels, angles, and important architectural details are inlaid with semi-precious stones combined in wreaths, scrolls, and frets, as exquisite in design as beautiful in colour. The tomb is surrounded by a formal garden of great beauty, with long lily-ponds, also of marble, containing a row of fountains, leading from the principal entrance to the mausoleum. The river, which bounds the garden on the north, provides marvellous reflections of the building.

the region to vassal status. The problem of the origins of these peoples is still not solved [see BERBERS], and the local traditions and the theories formulated by writers at different periods about the populating of the Ahaggar must be treated with reserve. It is clear however that the country has been inhabited from remote antiquity, as witness the traces of work rupestre au Hoggar, Art during the course of the 19th century. After the massacre of the Flatters mission (1880) and the Foureaux-Lamy expedition (1898), the aménokal [q.v.] Mūṣa ag Amāṣtan surrendered to Commandant Laperrière in 1904, and Ahaggar was placed under the control of France. It forms part of the Oasis Territory and its chief centre, Tamanrasset, comprises less than 1,000 inhabitants.

The population of the Ahaggar does not exceed 5,000. The noble tribes of the Kal Ghała, Taytok and Tégéh Mollat, with their subdivisions and subject tribes constitute the Ahaggar confederacy, the aménokal being chosen from amongst the Kal Ghała.

The Touareg of the Ahaggar live in tents. Society is divided into three classes: the noble and suzerain tribes (Ihaggar or Imhuaghā), the subject tribes (Amghid, pl. Imghad) and slaves (akli, pl. ikla). The Ihaggar, especially warriors, levied tribute from the Imghad in exchange for their protection. They were the suzerains, and they themselves lived by warfare and pillage. By putting an end to their warlike activities, the occupation of the country by France had some what curtailed the resources of the Ihaggar, who nevertheless retain their prestige and continue to be supported by the Imghad.

For their writing (timnahā), language (tamahākk), the subject of a masterly study by P. de Foucauld, and literature, see BERBERS.

Bibliography: Duveyrier, Les Touaregs du Nord, Paris 1864; Benhazera, Six mois chez les Touaregs de l’Ahaggar, Algiers 1908; E. F. Gautier, La conquête du Sahara, Paris 1910; idem, Le Sahara, Paris 1918; Ch. de Foucauld, Dictionnaire de noms propres, Paris 1940, 97-101; idem, Dictionnaire touareg-français, Paris 1952, II, 533-39; the monograph of H. Lhote, Les Touaregs du Hoggar, Paris 1944, which has a detailed bibliography, is an essential work. (Ch. PELLAT)

"AHD, injunction, command; hence: obligation, engagement; hence: agreement, covenant, treaty. The term (as well as the 1st and the 3rd forms of the corresponding verb) occurs frequently in the Kurān. It is used there over the whole range of its meanings, of Allāh's covenant with men and His commands, of the religious engagement into which the believers have entered, of political agreements and undertakings of believers and unbelievers towards the Prophet and amongst each other, and of ordinary civil agreements and contracts (xvii, 34; xxiii, 8; lxx, 32); occasionally, the agreement is personified: it "will be asked" to give evidence (xvii, 34; xxiii, 15). From the idea of God's covenant derive the Christian Arabic terms al-'ahd al-ṣaḥīḥ and al-'ahd al-ṣaḥīd for the Old and the New Testament respectively. The basic concrete concept is "joining together", whereas the synonym 'ahd derives from the concrete idea of "binding". In later usage, the latter term is commonly used in commercial engagements and contracts, whereas 'ahd is generally restricted to political enactments and treaties, in particular to the appointment of a successor, a wali al-'ahd [q.v.], by a ruler, and to treaties of alliance with non-Muslims outside the Islamic state, who are therefore called aḥl al-ṣaḥīd; this last term is occasionally extended, on one side to the musta'āmin [see AḤMĀN], and, on the other to the dhimmis [see DHIHMA]; both aḥmān and dhihmān are, indeed, a political 'ahd with religious sanction.

Bibliography: Lane, Lexicon, s.v.; Durri-dināni, Ta'riftil, 1915; W. Heffening, Freiendrecht, index s.v.; A. Jeffery, in MW, 1950, 120 f.; E. Tyan, Institutions du droit public musulman, i, Paris 1953, 270 ff. (J. SCHACHT)

AL-AHDAL (plur. Mahādilā, < Mahdall for am-Ahdahl?); on etym. cf. al-Muhibbi, I, 67, Wüstfeld, 6), a family of sayyids living mostly in SW Arabia, descended from the sixth 'Aīl dīmān Dhaf'ar al-Ṣaḏīk. Their ancestor, 'Abd b. 'Umar b. Mūḥ. al-Ahdal, called Ḥūb b. Yaman, and his son Abū Bakr (d. 700/1300) were famous šūfīs, living in the little town of Murūwa'(TA) or Marāwī' (al-Muhībbī) N (sibiyā) of Bayt al-Fakht Ibn ʿUdāyīl, where their graves are visited by pilgrims. To this clan belong the following šūfī scholars:


2. Ḥusayn b. ʿAbīl-Dīlīk b. Ḥusayn (grandson of 1) (b. 850/1445 in Abyāt Ḥusayn, d. 903/1497 in 'Adūn) abridged, according to his pupil Abū Majhrīm, his grandfather's Taʾrīkh (i.e. Tuhfāt al-Zaman). A mosque was built in 'Adūn in his memory in 1847. Cf. Brockelmann, S II, 251 (incorrect), Nūr, 27-30, Daʾūd iii, 144.

3. Tāhir b. Ḥusayn b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, Ḥūmāl al-Dīn (b. 914/1508 in Murūwa', d. 998/1590 in 'Adūn), a jurist and traditionist, abridged a work of his ancestor Ḥusayn (no. 1) called Muṣālāb Ḥūr b. Ẓahr Duʿāʾī al-Wālī Aḥī Harba (Nūr, 447 ff., cf. Daʾūd iii, 146). His son

Mūḥ. b. Tāhir wrote Bughyat al-Tālid bi-Maʿrījat Ašīlād ʿĀli b. Aḥī Tālíb (Wüst, 7; Brockelmann, S II, 239 is incorrect).

5. ʿĀṭīm b. ʿAbd al-Muḥ. Mūṣa b. ʿAbīl-Kāsīm b. Mūḥ. (d. 1013/1604 in the seaport Makhbāh (Mukha), where he had lived for 32 years), famous šūfī and scholar, "the Ibn 'Arabī of his time", according to his disciple ʿAbd al-Kādīr al-Šaḏarī (Nūr, 161-473), who published their correspondence in the work al-Darr al-Bāsim min Raʾūḍ al-Sayyid ʿĀṭīm. His improvised poems were collected into a diwān. Cf. Brockelmann, II, 407, S II, 565; al-Muhībbī, i, 496-500, Wüst, 114, Serjeant, Materials, ii, 585 f.


7. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Sulaymān (d. 1250/1835) is mentioned with eight titles in Brockelmann, S III, 131. Another work, al-ʿNafaʿ al-ʿAmāl (Igīs, Bani l-Shawālānī, cited by Serjeant, Materials, ii, 587,
For two more members of this family, with the nisba al-Musawi, Muh. al-Kazim in the 9/15th century, the other in recent time, see Brockelmann, S II, 239, 865. A collection of traditions on South Arabia, Nafs al-Durr al-Maknun min Fad'il al-Yaman al-Maymun, was published ca. 1350/1931 in Cairo by Muḥ. b. 'All al-Ahdali al-Ḫusayni al-Azhari.


Aḥdāth, literally "young men", a kind of urban militia which plays a considerable role in the cities of Syria and Upper Mesopotamia from the 4th/10th to the 6th/12th centuries, and is particularly well known at Aleppo and Damascus. Officially, its role is that of a police, charged with public order, fire-fighting, etc., and also, in time of need, with military defence in reinforcement of the regular troops. For these services the aḥdāth receive stipends allocated from the product of certain urban taxes. The only distinction between them and any ordinary police is the local nonprofessional nature of their recruitment, but it is precisely this which gives them an effective function, much more useful, in this case has generally been aḥdāth but the term was responsible for public order, aḥdāth and logically also, have the same fīyaḍ. This ra's forces the authorities to recognize him as ra's al-balad, a kind of mayor, whose influence counterbalances, and sometimes exceeds, that of the kādī, also a local notable. Out of this there may thus emerge finally veritable urban dynasties, such as (parallel to the Banū 'Ammār of Tripoli, arising out of the bādis of that city) the Banū Nisān of Ḍāmīd, hereditary chiefs of Ḍāmīd in the 6th/12th century under the nominal suzerainty of the Īnlād Turkman princes. The portrait of the cities of Syria and the Ḍāmīzra furnished to us by these facts is evidently at some remove from the common view which presents them as lacking any kind of municipal structure. The aḥdāth were, of course, most active at times and places in which a professional police (šurtā [q.v.]) could not be maintained, and for this reason neither Baghdād nor Cairo offer us a comparable picture. Their final decadence begins with the establishment by the Sālṭāhids or their successors of military commandants (šibātā [q.v.]) at the head of each city, supported by garrisons drawn from the regular army. About the same period the term aḥdāth is applied also to armed bands of the Bāṭinīyya or "Assassins" in Syria.

The term is found in earlier centuries in Irāk, especially in Basra and Kūfah in the 2nd/8th century, but also in Baghdād and elsewhere. The officer in charge of the aḥdāth was responsible for public order, but the term aḥdāth in this case has generally been taken (following the opinion of Dozy, s.v.) in the other sense, equally justified by etymology, of blameworthy "innovations" of such a nature as to disturb public order and whose authors should be seized and punished. In usual use, the term certainly has in given contexts the sense of "crime", but equally certainly in other contexts the sense of groups of "young men", vaguely specified. In the light of the materials described above, Dozy's view must be regarded as open to question; but up to the present time no text has come to notice which allows of a definite decision.

The further question arises of the relations between the Syrian and Mesopotamian aḥdāth and the fīyaḍ (see Fāṭa) and ṣaydarūn (see Ṣayyār) whose existence is documented in Irāk and the Iranian regions throughout the Middle Ages, and who also were especially active from the 4th/10th to 6th/12th centuries. These certainly played the role of "active wing" of the popular oppositions to the official authorities, parallel to, but more vigorously pressed than, that of the aḥdāth; the Iranian cities, moreover, all had apparently a ra', who seems sometimes to have been the ra's of the fīyaḍ in his city. Etymologically also, aḥdāth and fīyaḍ have the same meaning. Nevertheless, though there is often convergence in fact, the two institutions differ in their origin, and these differences persisted. Fīyaḍ and ṣaydarūn were essentially private groups, recruited from the depressed classes and more violent in action, and it was only by gradual stages that they sometimes succeeded in drawing certain bourgeois or aristocratic elements in their train, or in replacing the military police. They often formed organized bodies with initiatory rites, within which there developed the peculiar ideology of the fīshwāna [q.v.]. No parallel to this has yet been found among the aḥdāth. It may not be accidental that the boundaries between cities with fīyaḍ and those with aḥdāth corresponds very closely to the ancient Byzantine-Sasanid frontier, a fact which suggests that the aḥdāth may possibly be related to the ancient "factions" of the Later Roman empire. The whole question can, however, only be investigated in the framework of the general social study of the Islamic cities, on which little work has yet been done.


(CL. CAHEN)
AHl, Turkish poet, whose real name seems to have been Belhi Hasan (“Hasan with the mole”). His father Sidi Khodia was a merchant in Trstenik (not far from Nicopoli). After the latter's death Ahl went to Istanbul and chose for himself the career of a scholar, but for a long time advanced no further than the rank of candidate (mulāsim), because he declined the position of mūderīs in Bayazid Pasha’s madress in Brusa. Finally he obtained the less important position of mūderīs in Kara Feyya (Berrhoea), where he died in 923/1517. He left two unfinished poetical works, of which the titles are: Shırin ve Persus (imitating Sheykh’s Khawass u-Shırin), and Hzun u-Dīl (Istanbul 1277). The latter work is an allegorical poem written in prose interspersed with verses, and is an imitation of Fattahi’s (muldzim), and is therefore synonymous with the jurds, the positive law as opposed to legal theory or jurisprudence [see tafsir]; but as it also means judicial decisions, the term is more specifically used of the application of legal rules to concrete cases.

Bibliography: Sehi, 108; Latifi (Chabert), 105; Āshg Celebi and Khnall-zade, s.v.; Gibb, ii, 286 ff.; Hammer-Purgstall, Gesch. d. Osman. Dichtkunst, i, 209; Yemi Memsıma, 1918, no. 54; Istanbul Kitaplkları Türkçe Yasma divanlar katalogu, no. 33.

AŁ-AHAKh, the title of Sūra xlvi of the Kur’ān, and a geographical term the meaning and application of which have been generally misunderstood. The Sūra derives its title from verse 21, which speaks of Ād as warning his people in al-Ahkāf. The word ahhāf is usually interpreted in dictionaries, books of tafsir, and translations of the Kur’ān as meaning curved sand dunes. Medieval Arab geographers considered al-Ahkāf to be the name of a sand desert in Southern Arabia, said to lie between Hadrāmawt and Qumān, i.e., in the eastern part of al-Ramla or al-Rub’ (q.v.). Modern Western geographers, on the other hand, have inclined towards the identification of al-Ahkāf with the whole of al-Ramla or just its western half. C. Landberg (Hadrāmaut, 146-160) showed that al-Ahkāf as a regional name is used in Southern Arabia as roughly synonymous with Hadrāmawt in the broadest sense and is not applied to the sands farther north. The southern beduoin tribes define Banū al-Ahkāf as the mountainous area running behind the coast from Zufar west to Aden, the central valley of which is Wādī Hadrāmawt; to them the word ahhāf means simply mountains and is not associated either with dunes or, as suggested by Landberg, with caves (khuft). A statement made to ‘All b. Abī Tālib by a man of Hadrāmawt, as recounted by Ibn al-Halbī and repeated by al-Bakrī and Yākṣī (s.v.), indicates that even in ancient times ahhāf may have been used in Southern Arabia in this connection rather than as a name for dunes in the Great Desert.

(A. Khambiz)

AHH.Kām, pl. of āhkm, decision, judgment. [See also HAKAM.] In the Kur’ān, the word occurs only in the singular, and is used (as is the corresponding verb) of Allah, the Prophets, and other men. Used of Allah, it denotes both individual ordinances and the whole of His dispensation (iii, 79; xliv, 16; li, 10). In the ultimate sense, final jurisdiction belongs to Allah alone [see AL-MUKAKIMA], but He has given authority to make decisions to His Prophets. The jurisdiction of Muḥammad, in particular, is opposed to that of paganism (v, 50). So āhkm comes to mean the authority, imperium, of the Islamic government and, on the other hand, the judgment of a kādī on a concrete case.

From āhkm in the sense of a judicial decision derive the meanings of a logical judgment concerning a thing, of a status to be predicated of a thing or of a person, and of a rule in religious law, in grammar, and in other sciences. In all these meanings, the term is freely used in the plural. In particular, one speaks of ahhām al-ḥammās, the “five qualifications” (obligatory, recommended, indifferent, reprehensible, forbidden), by one or the other of which every act of man is qualified in religious law [see šar’ā]. In a broader sense, ahhām means the sum of the rules pertaining to any given subject (cf. the titles of books such as ahhām al-aqāf “On Wa’f”, ahhām al-sulām-iyya “On Government”, also ahhām al-āhāf “On the Next World”; ahhām al-nudīm “astrology”, etc.). In the field of religious law, ahhām is therefore synonymous with the jurds, the positive law as opposed to legal theory or jurisprudence [see tafsir]; but as it also means judicial decisions, the term is more specifically used of the application of legal rules to concrete cases.

Bibliography: Lane, Lexicon, s.v. āhkm; Djurdjuri, Ta’rifat, 97; A. Sprenger, Dictionary of the Technical Terms, s.v. āhkm; J. Horovitz, Koranische Untersuchungen, 72 f.; A. Jeffery, in MW, 1952, 121 f.; R. Bell, Introduction to the Qur’ān, 153; L. Gardet, La Cité musulmane, index, s.v. ahhâm and āhmām. (J. Schacht)

AHL (A.), originally meaning “those who occupy with one the same tent (Hebrew šādāl)”, thus “family, inmates”. Therefore ahl al-Bayt means literally “the household of the Prophet”. When the ahl (pl. aḥāl) of a town or a country is spoken of it denotes its inhabitants, sometimes, as in Medina (according to Burton), specially those who were born there and own houses. But this word is often connected with other concepts, and in these combinations it may come to mean “those who occupy with one the same tent”, “sharers in a thing, belonging to it”, or “owner of the same”, etc. Some of the compounds with ahl most in use follow here.

AHL AL-AHWA (A.; sing. āwâd, “predilection, inclination of the soul”; comp. Kur’ān vi, 51) is a term applied by the orthodox theologians to those followers of Islam, whose religious tenets in certain details deviate from the general ordinances of the Sunnite confession (cf. ZDMG, 1898, 159). As examples there are mentioned: Djabariyya, Kadariyya, Rawāfīd, Khawāriji, anthropomorphists, Muṣṭilla. From the above definition it may be inferred that in the sense of Muslim theology it is not proper to designate these tendencies as sects.

(A. Khambiz)

AHL AL-BAYT, ĀL-BAYT, “the people of the House”, ĀL-NABI, “the family of the Prophet”, all mean the same; the term Āl Yāsīn also occurs. The origin of the phrase is to be found in the strong clan sense of the pre-Islamic Arabs, among whom the term al-bayt was applied to or adopted by the ruling family of a tribe (by derivation from an ancient right of guardianship of the symbol of the tribal deity, according to H. Lammens, Le Culte des Diydles, in L’Arabie occidentale avant l’Hégire, Beirut 1928, 136 ff., 154 ff.), and survived into later centuries in the plural form al-bayta for the noble tribal families [see AHL AL-BUYUTA and Aį]. In early Islamic times the term bayt was applied to themselves by a number of families, e.g. by ʿAbd Allah b. ʿUmar to the house of Ummayyah (Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam, Strad ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAṭś, Cairo 1927, 19), and by ʿUmar II to the Umayyad house (innamā li-ʿl-bayt: ibid. 24). In the Kur’ān the phrase ahp “l-bayt” occurs twice: once in xi, 73, applied to the house of Ibrāhīm; the
second passage, xxxiii, 33 ("God desires only to remove filthiness from you (masc. pl.), ahl 'l-bayt", and with cleansing to cleanse you"), serves as the proof-text for its application to the house of Muhammad (but see R. Paret, in Orientalische Studien Enno Lüthmann ... übersieht, Leiden 1935, 127-20).

The precise interpretation of the term in xxxiii, 33, gave rise to differences of opinion. In one tradition, according to which Salmān al-Fārisī [q.v.] is included among the ahl al-bayt (Ibn Ḥāšām, Sīra (Cairo), iii, 244; Ibn Saʻda, i, 59), it is opposed to muhādīrūn and ansār. Among the Shī‘a (and generally in circles friendly to ʻAlli) it was applied to Muhammad, ʻAlī, Fāṭima, al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn (cf. already al-Kumayt, Ḥāşimīyyāt (Horovitz), 38 l. 30; cf. 92, 1. 67) by interpreting the verse through the well-known "tradition of the mantle" (ḥadīth al-kisā‘, ḥadīth al-ʻabā‘), which was accepted also in Sunni circles (see ahl al-kisā‘). In keeping with an explanation of the Kūrānic phrase as referring to the Prophet's wives and dependents, attributed to Ibn ʻAbbās and ʻIkrīma, Umm Salama is, in some versions of this tradition, recognized by the Prophet as belonging to the ahl al-bayt. It is given a still wider application in a version of the so-called ḥadīth al-thāqālayn, where the term is applied to those to whom (including their maṣūli‘) a share in the ṣādah is given. In this verse the Prophet extended it to include all the Banū Ḥāṣim and al-Shī‘a, extended it to the Banū Muttalib also, and of al-ʻAbbās. In this tradition, therefore, the ahl al-bayt includes the Ṭalibids and Ṭabāsids, historically the most important families of the Banū Ḥāṣim; and in order to strengthen their claim to inclusion in the verse of purification, the Ṭabāsids also had their counterpart in the ḥadīth al-ʻabā‘ and ʻAbbās extended it to include all the Banū Ḥāṣim and al-Shī‘a extended it to the Banū Muṣṭafī also, while others make it include the whole community.

The current orthodox view is based on a harmonizing opinion, according to which the term ahl al-bayt includes the ahl al-ʻabā‘, i.e. the Prophet, ʻAlī, Fāṭima, al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, together with the wives of the Prophet.

The Shī‘a limit the family (which they call by preference ʻitrā) to the ahl al-kisā‘ and their descendants, making devotion to them an essential, or even the main, part of religion. In one version of the "Farewell Sermon" Muhammad is represented as saying that God has given two safeguards to the community that it will not go astray; "God has given a still wider application in a version of the hadith al-kisā‘, hadith al-ʻabd‘, which was accepted also in Sunnī circles [see ahl al-kisā‘]. In keeping with an explanation of the Kurānic phrase as referring to the Prophet's wives and dependents, attributed to Ibn ʻAbbās and ʻIkrīma, Umm Salama is, in some versions of this tradition, recognized by the Prophet as belonging to the ahl al-bayt. It is given a still wider application in a version of the so-called hadith al-thāqālayn, where the term is applied to those to whom (including their maṣūli‘) a share in the ṣādah is given. In this verse the Prophet extended it to include all the Banū Ḥāṣim and al-Shī‘a, extended it to the Banū Muttalib also, and of al-ʻAbbās. In this tradition, therefore, the ahl al-bayt includes the Ṭalibids and Ṭabāsids, historically the most important families of the Banū Ḥāṣim; and in order to strengthen their claim to inclusion in the verse of purification, the Ṭabāsids also had their counterpart in the hadith al-ʻabā‘ and ʻAbbās extended it to include all the Banū Ḥāṣim and al-Shī‘a extended it to the Banū Muṣṭafī also, while others make it include the whole community.

The current orthodox view is based on a harmonizing opinion, according to which the term ahl al-bayt includes the ahl al-ʻabā‘, i.e. the Prophet, ʻAlī, Fāṭima, al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, together with the wives of the Prophet.

The Shī‘a limit the family (which they call by preference ʻitrā) to the ahl al-kisā‘ and their descendants, making devotion to them an essential, or even the main, part of religion. In one version of the "Farewell Sermon" Muhammad is represented as saying that God has given two safeguards to the world: His Book and the Prophet's sunna; in another version, this is replaced by: His Book and the Prophet's ʻitrā. The official creed of the Shī‘a does not go beyond this, but popular belief ascribes cosmological importance to the family as in traditions like: "The stars are a pledge to the world that it will not be deserted, and my family are a pledge to the community that it will not go astray"; "God would not have created heaven, earth, paradise, Adam, Eve, the angels, nor anything else but for them (the family)". They have the same saving function as Noah's ark. The heads of the family are the Imāms [q.v.], infallible and sinless. The extreme Mānṣūriyya called the family heavy and the Shī‘a earth (al-ʻAsh’ārī, Māḥālād), 9.

The ideas of the Shī‘a found their way into later collections of hadith, although the Sunna declares that love for the family is of no avail without obedience to the sunna. Al-Mālikī legal thesaurus (cf. ʻAbbās b. ʻAbd Allāh, ibn Maṣūli‘, An Nāfi‘, the book on sunna) also speaks of finding fault with one of the family, for no heresy, no default in the performance of religious duties, and no sin deprives him of his sons' share."

The form al is used more especially in the invocation: "O God, bless (salī ‘alā) Muhammad and his family!" (cf. I. Goldziher, in ZDMG, i, 114-7). The definition of those comprehended in this expression has produced controversies similar to those about the ahl al-bayt. Ibn Khālawayh enumerated twenty-five classes in his K. al-ʻĀl (G. Flügel, Die grammatischen Schulen d. Araber, 231; citation in Bahrānī, Manār al-Hadd, Bombay 1320, 200). See also al-ʻUtsi, List of Shī‘a Books, no. 294.


AHL AL-BUYUTAT (al.), originally denoted those that belong to Persian families of the highest nobility (Nöldcke, Gesch. d. Perser u. Araber zur Zeit der Sassaniden, 72); then, the nobles in general. Other meanings are given by Dozy, Supplément, i, 131.

AHL AL-DĀR (al.) = "the people of the house", in the Almohad hierarchy the 6th order (see al-Muwāhidūn).

AHL AL-DHIMMA (al.), the Jews and Christians, between whom and the Muslims there is according to Muslim law a certain legal relation [see dhimma].

AHL AL-FARD [see mālikī]

AHL AL-HADITH, also ʻAṣbāb al-Hadīth, the partisans of traditions [see hadith]. Traditionalism in Islam manifested itself first in the re-emergence of the old Arabian concept of sunna [q.v.], the normative custom of the community, which was in due course identified with the sunna of the Prophet. This normative custom found its expression in the "living tradition" of the ancient schools of religious law, which came into being at the very beginning of the second century of Islam. In opposition to the ancient schools and their extensive use of human reasoning and personal opinion [see ʻAṣbāb al-ra‘ī and ra‘ī], the ahl al-hadīth, who appeared on the stage a little later, claimed that formal traditions from the Prophet, even though they were transmitted only by isolated individuals [see ʻAbbās b. al-Wāḥih], superseded the "living tradition". The traditionalists themselves were responsible for putting into circulation many traditions which purported to go back to the Prophet, and they specialised in collecting, perfecting, transmitting and studying them; long journeys were made in search of traditions. Though hardly any of this material, as far as religious law is concerned, can be regarded as authentic by the standards of historical research, the Muslims, from the 3rd/9th century onwards, have accepted its essential parts as genuine.

The movement of the traditionists was the most
important event in the history of Islamic religious law in the second century of Islam. The ancient schools were those which issued traditions on the authority of the Companions of the Prophet. They have thus earned the name of *ghayar mukallid*, which appellation, though disowned by them, nevertheless admirably defines their position in relation to other sects. They reject also the common notion that the *idijihad* or legal conclusions of the founders of these schools are of final authority; and rather contend that every believer is free to follow his own interpretations of the *Kur'an* and the traditions, provided he has sufficient learning to enable him to give a valid interpretation. Consequently, they do not regard the *idijim* or consensus of the preceding generations of Muslims as binding on them. As a result of their characteristic attitude, they have found themselves in conflict chiefly with the *Hanafis* or followers (*mukallids*) of Abū Ḥanīfa, who constitute the majority of Sunni Muslims in India and Pakistan. Their controversy has, however, been confined in actual practice to certain minor points of ritual (such as *raj* al-ya'dayn, *ādmin bi-l-jahr*) and belief, there being a substantial agreement on really important theological and doctrinal questions.

The Ahl-i Ḥadīth try to go back to first principles and to restore the original simplicity and purity of faith and practice. Emphasis is, accordingly, laid in doctrinal questions. There is free to follow his own interpretations of the *Kur'an* and the traditions, provided he has sufficient learning to enable him to give a valid interpretation. Consequently, they do not regard the *idijim* or consensus of the preceding generations of Muslims as binding on them. As a result of their characteristic attitude, they have found themselves in conflict chiefly with the *Hanafis* or followers (*mukallids*) of Abū Ḥanīfa, who constitute the majority of Sunni Muslims in India and Pakistan. Their controversy has, however, been confined in actual practice to certain minor points of ritual (such as *raj* al-ya'dayn, *ādmin bi-l-jahr*) and belief, there being a substantial agreement on really important theological and doctrinal questions.

The Ahl-i Ḥadīth try to go back to first principles and to restore the original simplicity and purity of faith and practice. Emphasis is, accordingly, laid in doctrinal questions. There is free to follow his own interpretations of the *Kur'an* and the traditions, provided he has sufficient learning to enable him to give a valid interpretation. Consequently, they do not regard the *idijim* or consensus of the preceding generations of Muslims as binding on them. As a result of their characteristic attitude, they have found themselves in conflict chiefly with the *Hanafis* or followers (*mukallids*) of Abū Ḥanīfa, who constitute the majority of Sunni Muslims in India and Pakistan. Their controversy has, however, been confined in actual practice to certain minor points of ritual (such as *raj* al-ya'dayn, *ādmin bi-l-jahr*) and belief, there being a substantial agreement on really important theological and doctrinal questions.

The Ahl-i Ḥadīth try to go back to first principles and to restore the original simplicity and purity of faith and practice. Emphasis is, accordingly, laid in doctrinal questions. There is free to follow his own interpretations of the *Kur'an* and the traditions, provided he has sufficient learning to enable him to give a valid interpretation. Consequently, they do not regard the *idijim* or consensus of the preceding generations of Muslims as binding on them. As a result of their characteristic attitude, they have found themselves in conflict chiefly with the *Hanafis* or followers (*mukallids*) of Abū Ḥanīfa, who constitute the majority of Sunni Muslims in India and Pakistan. Their controversy has, however, been confined in actual practice to certain minor points of ritual (such as *raj* al-ya'dayn, *ādmin bi-l-jahr*) and belief, there being a substantial agreement on really important theological and doctrinal questions.

The Ahl-i Ḥadīth try to go back to first principles and to restore the original simplicity and purity of faith and practice. Emphasis is, accordingly, laid in doctrinal questions. There is free to follow his own interpretations of the *Kur'an* and the traditions, provided he has sufficient learning to enable him to give a valid interpretation. Consequently, they do not regard the *idijim* or consensus of the preceding generations of Muslims as binding on them. As a result of their characteristic attitude, they have found themselves in conflict chiefly with the *Hanafis* or followers (*mukallids*) of Abū Ḥanīfa, who constitute the majority of Sunni Muslims in India and Pakistan. Their controversy has, however, been confined in actual practice to certain minor points of ritual (such as *raj* al-ya'dayn, *ādmin bi-l-jahr*) and belief, there being a substantial agreement on really important theological and doctrinal questions.

The Ahl-i Ḥadīth try to go back to first principles and to restore the original simplicity and purity of faith and practice. Emphasis is, accordingly, laid in doctrinal questions. There is free to follow his own interpretations of the *Kur'an* and the traditions, provided he has sufficient learning to enable him to give a valid interpretation. Consequently, they do not regard the *idijim* or consensus of the preceding generations of Muslims as binding on them. As a result of their characteristic attitude, they have found themselves in conflict chiefly with the *Hanafis* or followers (*mukallids*) of Abū Ḥanīfa, who constitute the majority of Sunni Muslims in India and Pakistan. Their controversy has, however, been confined in actual practice to certain minor points of ritual (such as *raj* al-ya'dayn, *ādmin bi-l-jahr*) and belief, there being a substantial agreement on really important theological and doctrinal questions.

The Ahl-i Ḥadīth try to go back to first principles and to restore the original simplicity and purity of faith and practice. Emphasis is, accordingly, laid in doctrinal questions. There is free to follow his own interpretations of the *Kur'an* and the traditions, provided he has sufficient learning to enable him to give a valid interpretation. Consequently, they do not regard the *idijim* or consensus of the preceding generations of Muslims as binding on them. As a result of their characteristic attitude, they have found themselves in conflict chiefly with the *Hanafis* or followers (*mukallids*) of Abū Ḥanīfa, who constitute the majority of Sunni Muslims in India and Pakistan. Their controversy has, however, been confined in actual practice to certain minor points of ritual (such as *raj* al-ya'dayn, *ādmin bi-l-jahr*) and belief, there being a substantial agreement on really important theological and doctrinal questions.
religious life of the Muslims by ridding it of its innovations, superstitions and unnatural accretions, (2) their active promotion of the study of Hadith literature, the importance of which had already been recognized by Shāykh Ṣā‘īd al-Ḥāḍīth Mubaddījī of Delhi [q.v.], and (3) their polemics against the Ārya-Samājīst Hindus, the Christian missionaries and their active promotion of the study of Hadith innovations, superstitions and unnatural accretions, Abd al-Hakk Muhaddith of Ahl-i Ḥakīka.

Abd al-Hakk Muhaddith of religious life of the Muslims by ridding it of its innovations, superstitions and unnatural accretions, is also used by the Ahl-i Ḥakīka. In the strict sense, fiṣūrub, 1909, 40), and because it has an affinity with furūsī, prevalent mainly in western Persia. Ahl-i Ḥakīka, because it is used, for example, by the IJurufls would seem to be a rather imprecise name for this sect, because its neighbours is an unsuitable title, because Ahl-i Ḥakīka is not the dominant figure in the religion described in the present Textes persans relatifs a la secte des Aḥl-i Ḥakīkī, and further because the term Aḥl-i Ḥakīka, and because the term Aḥl-i Ḥakīka has not yet been established. (v. infra), but there are branches which are not included in this list, cf. the Sayyid Djalālī (Minorsky, Notes, 48 [35]) and the Tāmārī (a highly abnormal group) (Minorsky, Estudes, I). The account by Gobineau, the Firkān and the text published by W. Ivanow reveal a religious system more philosophical than the naive legends of the Sarangīm (in the Ātāsh-begi version). Since, at the moment, however, this branch is better known to us, the following account will be based primarily on the Ātāsh-begi documents, to be supplemented later by material from the Firkān, the author of which was a Khamūshī (?).

The Dogmas. The central point in the dogmas of the Ahl-i Ḥakīk is the belief in the successive manifestations of the Divinity, the number of these being seven. The manifestations of God are compared to garments put on by the Divinity: “to become incarnate” means “to come to dwell in a garment” (libīb, ḥāmam, dön < Turk. *dom).

On each occasion the Divinity appears with a following of Four (or Five) Angels (yārān-i ĭrāmalak) with whom he forms a close group.

The table of theophanies according to the MS. of the Sarangīm is given below.

In pre-eternity (azal) the Divinity was enclosed in a Pearl (durr). He made his first external appearance in the person of Khwāndaqār, the Creator of the world. The second avatar was in the person of ‘All. From the beginning of the third epoch the list becomes quite original and typically Ahl-i Ḥakīk. The first four epochs correspond to the stages of religious knowledge: shāri’a, farīka, ma’rīfa and ḥabība. According to all branches of the sect, the representative of the last and the highest stage is Sultān Suhkār. On the other hand, several differences of opinion regarding the successors of Sultān Suhkār are recorded.

Just as the divine essence reappears in each of the seven “garments”, the angels (cf. the vertical columns in the table) are avatars of one another. For this reason their names are interchangeable and Salmān is often spoken of in the epoch of Sultān Suhkār or Benyāmīn in the epoch of Khwāndaqār. The angels are emanations of the Divinity: the first of them was produced by Khwāndaqār from his armpit, the second from his mouth, the third from his breath, the fourth and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Khwāndaqār</td>
<td>Ḥādīth al-Ṭabīb</td>
<td>Isrā’īl</td>
<td>‘Arrā’īl</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Murtaḍā ‘All</td>
<td>Ṣā‘īd al-Ḥāḍīth</td>
<td>Ḥadrat-i Muḥammad</td>
<td>Nusayr</td>
<td>Fātimā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Shāh Khosḥīn</td>
<td>Bābā Buzurg</td>
<td>Kākā Redā (Riḍā)</td>
<td>Bahā Ṭahir</td>
<td>Māmā Dīrālā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sultān Šohkār</td>
<td>Benyāmīn</td>
<td>Dāwūd</td>
<td>Muṣṭafā Dowdān</td>
<td>Khāṭūn Dīyāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Kirmāz (Shāh Ways Kuli)</td>
<td>Kāmārīdīn</td>
<td>Yārālī</td>
<td>Shāh Sawār</td>
<td>Razbār</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
fifth from his perspiration and his light respectively (cf. the Sarandism). According to another version, Benyâmn was created from the perspiration, which is characteristic of modesty; Dâwûd — from the breath (anger); Mûsî — from the moustache (pity); Razbâr — from the pulse (fear). The angels play the part of ministers to the Divinity: Benyâmn is the deputy (waqîl) and the pîr; Dâwûd is the overseer (nâsîr) and judge (?); Pir Mûsî is the wazir who records good and evil; Muṣâṣâfâl Dowdân (= Nuṣait) is the Angel of Death.

The angels are usually said to be four in number (in some lists and in certain periods this number is reduced to three) but in fact a fifth angel is especially charged with the supervision of worship. This angel's symbolic name is Razbâr, Razbâr or Ramzâbâr ("entrusted with mysteries") and her feminine character is indisputable; but the sex in Razbâr is not emphasized. One of the informants even alleges that Razbâr is a hermaphrodite (khu'ntûhâ). Razbâr is the informative name of Khu'ntûn Dâyira, mother of Sultan Şohâk, and the compiler of the list quoted above is wrong in relegating her to the fifth epoch.

Metempsychosis and Eschatology. The belief in the reincarnation of the theophanies finds its parallel in the general belief in metempsychosis. "Men! Do not fear the punishment of death! The death of man is like the dive which the duck makes!"

Human beings must pass through the cycle of 1,001 incarnations, in the course of which they receive the reward of their actions (Notes, p. 131 [251]). According to the Firkân (i, 32, 35, 57, 68), however, the possibilities of purification are essentially limited by the very nature of beings; of whom some, created out of yellow clay (zard-gil), are good, and the others, created out of black earth (siyâh kâhû), are evil. "The more (the former) go through the world of garments and the more they suffer, the more they approach God and the more their luminous state increases". While the "Dark ones" shall never see the Sun. As a complement to these beliefs, the Ahl-i Ḥâkk eagerly await the advent of the Lord of Time which announce the "Five (sic!) Angels" stand round the infant. A Muscat nut (gâna-us-hawad) is broken by the celebrant as a substitute for the head. It is then worn as an amulet, with a piece of silver called hauvisa bearing the Sh'â'a form of the profession of faith (hauvisa from the Sh'â'a town of Hauzîn in Khuzistân; cf. Notes, p. 227 [107], and W. Caskel, Ein Mahdi des 15. Jahrhunderts, in Islamica, 1931, 48-93, and the art. Nûsq'a'sma'). Links recalling blood relationship are established between him whose head is commended and the line of the zahâkh to whom the head has been commended. This spiritual relationship carries with it the prohibition of marriage between the individual dedicated and the family of the pîr.

5. With the object of attaining moral perfection special unions (nuclei) are formed between a man (or several men) and a woman who are called brother and sister (shârî-i šîrâr). The union is said to be formed in anticipation of the Day of Resurrection: Notes, p. 230 [110]; cf. the akh wa-빅히 al-âkhira among the Yazidis [q.v.].

6. Fasting is rigorously observed but lasts only for three days, as among the Yazidis [q.v.]. It takes place in winter and is followed by a feast. Among the divisions of the sect, only the Ātâgh-begî do not observe the fast "for the days of the (final) advent are near" and instead of fasting they say one ought to feast.

For the other rites and customs see the Notes by Minorsky (Bibl.).

Firkân al-Âkhbâr. The author of this treatise was Hâđîdji Nî'mat Allâh of Dâyîbûn-âbâd near Dînawar (1871-1920) who belonged to the Kâmûshi division and who believed the time had come to reveal the Real Truth (ḥâkîkat). His son Nûr-Allâh (b. 1313/1895) wrote the biography of his father and an introduction to the Firkân under the title of Kâhî al-Âkhbâh. While confirming much that was already known, the Firkân represents a tradition different from that of the Ātâgh-begî in as much as it makes no mention of "seven" epochs and reserves a special position for Khâwandâgâr and Sultan Şohâk while the number of manifestations of less importance is increased (Bâbâ Nâsîh, etc.).

The Firkân consists of 4 parts. The first deals with the fundamental principles of the baḥîkat established in pre-eternity by the Divinity who in the stage of "yâ-ya zahâkh" became externalised in the garment of Khâwandâgâh. The law required concealed till the coming of Sultan Ishâk (Şohâk). Then the daftardârs recorded these doctrines but each in his own way and according to the sources which were accessible to him. As a result the Ahl-i Ḥâkk community has no [single?] sacred book and
its divisions are distinguished by different views. The Ahl-i Ḥakk required a ḥubb-i kull which would be unique. So after 1524/1526 Nīmat Allāh, by God’s command, abandoned the world and became the “messenger of the Lord of the Hour”, i.e. of Pir Benyāmīn (explained as bin yā + amin “faithful son of Yā”). Then comes the explanation of metempsychosis (gardish-i dān bi-dān = “going from one garment to another”).

The creatures of the world are divided into two distinct categories according to their original element (sardārî or ḥakk-i ayī). To the first belong the Saved and Luminous beings whose respective sardārs are Benyāmīn and Sayyid Muhammad (in his avatar of Buzurg-sawār). To the other category belong beings of Fire and Darkness whose respective sardārs are Iblīs and Khannās, with whom are associated the first three caliphs, Muʿawīya, ‘Alī, etc. The intermixture of the two categories of beings produces combinations which may be recognised even externally.

The second part of the treatise is mainly concerned with the correspondence of the avatars through the ages. Thus the manifestations of Benyāmīn are Noah, Jesus and provisionally (mihmān Rustam of the Persian epic; those of Razbār: Bīlīs, the queen of Sabaʾ, Mary, etc.; those of Sayid Muhammad: Zoroaster, the prophet Muhammad, etc. Next we are given the history of Sultān Ishāk (Ṣohāk) and of his successors.

The third part relates the personal experiences of Nīmat Allāh and the commandments which he received from God during his journey “to the beyond” (ṣafar-i ʿubd), notably his mission to unite the khānadāms, to give absolution from sins (as khlīvānat pāk namiddān) and to intercede (ghīrād) with the Lord of Time.

The fourth part is the full description of the rites and customs (amr wa-nahy), with the Guran text of the formulae recited on each occasion.

Distribution. The principal centres of the Ahl-i Ḥakk are in the west of Persia, in Luristan, Kurdistān (land of the Guran east of Zohāb, town of Kerend) and in Adharbaydjan (tribes of Māzandarān and the provinces in Transcaucasia especially Karabagh). Little colonies of Ahl-i Ḥakk are found almost everywhere in Persia (at Hamadhan, Teheran, at Māzandarān, Fārs and even in Khurāsān, to which, according to tradition, one of the brothers of Khān ʿAtaš had gone). In ʿIrāq there are Ahl-i Ḥakk among the Kurd and Turkoman tribes of the region of Karbūl, of Sulaymāniyya and probably at Mosul.

Very little is known of the connection between the Ahl-i Ḥakk and the sects popularly known under the name of ʿAll Ilahi or by contemptuous terms like čirāg-sūndārīn (“extinguishers of lights”), khūrās-kushān (“slaughterers of cocks”) etc. (see ʿertašt, khlīl-bahš, sārī, shabbāk). In any case, it is a striking fact that the direct influence of Ahl-i Ḥakk preachers of the district of Zohāb could be traced among the ʿAlawī (Khlīl-bahš; cf. Trowbridge, The Alevi, Harvard Theol. Review, 1909, 340–55, repr. in MW, 1921, 253–66).

Religious History. The Ahl-i Ḥakk possess a wealth of legends arranged according to the manifestations of the Divinity. The collections of these legends are known as Sarāndājm. The epoch of Khwāndqār is interesting only for its cosmographic myths. The traditions relating to the epoch of ʿAll (which does not in any way form the central point) are inspired by the extreme Shiʿa. The epoch of Khoshūn is placed in a typically Lur (q.v.) environment, the geographical nomenclature showing an excellent knowledge of the localities of Luristān. One of the angels of Khoshūn is Bābā Tāḥir (q.v.) whose quatrains in dialect are quoted. The fourth epoch is placed in the land of the Gūrân close to the river Sirwān. The sayings attributed to Sultān Ṣohāk are in Gūrân, which is the sacred language of the Ahl-i Ḥakk (cf. Firdōs, i, 3; see Minorsky, The Guran, BSO, 1943, 77–103). The greatest sanctuaries of the sect: Bābā-ʿAqādār and Perdiwar, are situated in the same region. In the later epochs the scene is transferred to Adharbaydjan and the hādāms relating to these epochs are in Adhar Türkish. From these facts it may be concluded that the stages of propagation and development of the religion have been: Luristān — land of the Gūrân — Adharbaydjan.

Exact dates are naturally difficult to obtain and we shall endeavour to proceed from the known to the unknown. Khān ʿAtaš, born at Aḏājang (north of Māzāṅgā) and buried in the village of Aḏājang-beg in the district of Ḥaṣhta-rūd, northeast of Mount Sahand, is said to have lived at the beginning of the 18th century (Notes, p. 41 [27]). This line was continued by his direct descendants of whom the seventh was called Sayyid ʿAbd al-ʿAṣīm Mirzā (Agā-ḥālshāq) and lived at Garabān (also called Dūrū) on the Gāmāṣāb to the south of Bīšābān, where O. Mann visited him in 1917, and was succeeded by his son Muhammad Ḥasan Mirzā. The popularity of the Turkish poems of Shāh Ismāʿīl ʿṢafawi is significant; the hālam, known as Kūb-nāma, calls Shāh Ismāʿīl the “pir of Turkistān” (= Adharbaydjan where Turkish is spoken). The spread of Ahl-i Ḥakk doctrines among the Turkoman tribes seems in any case to go back to an earlier period, that of the Kara Köyunlu rulers. The remnants of these Turkomans who live in a district in the centre of Mākū are Ahl-i Ḥakk. Similarly in Transcaucasia the Kara Köyunlu in the region of Gandja live in the close neighbourhood of the Gūrān (< Gūrân). Shāh Ibrāhīm, whom many of the Ahl-i Ḥakk regard as the successor of Sultān Ṣohāk, and who lived in Bagdād and whose acolyte angel was Kushū-oghī (author of Turkish songs), is perhaps responsible for the dissemination of Ahl-i Ḥakk teaching among the Turkomans north of the Tigris.

Tradition places immediately before Shāh Ibrāhīm the famous Sultān Ṣohāk who (outwardly) was the son of Shaykh ʿIsā and Khatūn Dāyira (Dāyārāk, daughter of ʿAbbās Beg Dālād, chief of the tribe of Dījavī Murūd. His real name is said to have been Sayyid ʿAbd al-Ṣayyid. Barzīndāja, north of Sulaymāniyya, is said to have been his birthplace. He is said to have had seven sons from his wife Khatūn Bāšīr, who are named ḫastān. His tomb is at Perdiwar (in Awramān-i luḥūn, see senne), on the right bank of the Sirwān.

The Kāhāl chiefs of Taʿbīk claim to be his direct descendants (see al-Azāwi, al-Khākāyya, Shaykh Mahmūd, who after the World War proclaimed himself “King of Kurdistān” [cf. the article konu], claimed to be descended from the brother of Sultān Ṣohāk in the twelfth generation. At Kūrk Minorsky found a MS containing a genealogy of that family.

The only definite indication of Bābā Khoshūn’s date would be his association with the poet ʿAbbā Tāḥir (11th century) but here tradition is on very uncertain ground.

The Elements of the System. The religion of the Ahl-i Ḥakk is typically syncrétist. At its foundations we find Shiʿa extremism. It should be
noted that the Ahl-i Ḥakḵ always speak of the 12 imams and as a result ought not (at least directly) to be connected with Ismaʿīlism. According to the
Fīrḵān, the “religion of Truth” simply re-establishes the contents of the 10 ġūz̄ which were suppressed in the received text of the Kurān, but in fact the Ahl-i Ḥakḵ deviate from the orthodox Shīʿa to the extent of forming a separate religious system. The religion of the Ahl-i Ḥakḵ has in common with those of the Druzes and the Naṣʿyīrīs the worship of ‘All, but ‘Ašr is completely overshadowed by the Šāh ʿAlī." 

The other obvious element in the formation of the Ahl-i Ḥakḵ is the rites of the Sūfī darwīshes: election of the pīr, agapes with ġūdrī and distribution of food, brotherly unions.

From the social point of view, the religion of the Ahl-i Ḥakḵ is professed particularly by the lower classes, nomads, villagers, inhabitants of the poorer quarters, darwīshes etc. From this probably comes the hope that on the day of the last judgment “the sultāns” will be punished (Notes, p. 44 [31]). On the other hand, the eminently popular character of the religion is apparent in the exuberance of the miraculous and folklore element in the traditions of the Ahl-i Ḥakḵ. Amid the country people in the remote provinces which have at all times been outside the control of central governments, it is natural to expect a development from olden times.

The Divinity enclosed in the Pearl is a Manichæan idea (personal communication by Th. Nöldeke), like the belief in the purification of the "Luminous" in the course of their transmigrations. The belief in metempsychosis cannot be directly Indian for it was already in existence in Ismaʿīlism. The division of beings into two distinct categories is perhaps a later development of Zoroastrian ideas. The sacrifice of the cock has been several times connected with the corresponding Jewish rite (cf. I. Schefelowitz, Das stellvertretende Huhnopfer, Giessen 1914), while the Biblical names (Dāwūd, Mūṣil) may have come through the intermediary of the Kurān. The alleged Christian influence ought not to be exaggerated: if the Ahl-i Ḥakḵ in their conversations with the Christians talk of Jesus and Mary, it should be remembered that, apart from these possibly being simply reminiscences of the Kurān, the Ahl-i Ḥakḵ regard them merely as avatars of their own pantheon. For the agapes it is not necessary to go farther back than the known darwīsh practices (e.g. the Bektaghi). The elasticity of the system of metempsychosis is responsible for the appearance of unexpected names in the myths.

W. Ivanow has called attention to the name of Malak Ţāʿūs (cf. vazarūs) in a fragment containing traditions, found at Shīrāz.
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another ruler [see BAY'А]. They must be Muslims, male, of age, free, 'adl [q.v.], and capable of judging who is best qualified to hold the office. No fixed number of "electors" is required; according to the prevailing opinion, even the appointment made by one "elector" in the presence of two qualified witnesses is valid. This is the theory; in fact, all through the history of Islam, the ahl al-hall wa'l-akd have consisted of the persons who wielded political power in the capital, acting in association with the notables and prominent religious scholars. The thought of modernists and reformers occasionally identifies them with the whole of the community, or nation, with parliament, or with the body of religious scholars. 


AHL AL-KAHF [see ASHÅB AL-KAHF].

AHL AL-KIBLA (А.) = "the people of the kibla" [q.v.], appellation of the Muslims.

AHL AL-KISÅ', the people of the cloak. According to a tradition Muhammad went out one morning—at the time of the visit of the Nadjran delegation in 10/631 [cf. MURÅBah]—wearing a figured black cloak; first Fätimä, then 'Ali and then al-Hasan and al-Husayn came and he took them under his cloak, hugging them and quoting from Kür'än, xxxiii, 32: "God only desireth to put away filthiness from you as his household, and with cleansing to cleanse you". The Sunnis explains filthiness as unbelief but the Shi'a explains it as intercourse with the impure world, a parallel to the Jewish saying: "I hide them with my cloak". Another version says that Muhammad threw his cloak over his uncle 'Abbås and his sons saying: "Hide them from hell fire as I hide them with my cloak".


AHL AL-KITÅB, "possessors of the Scripture" (or "people of the Book"). This term, in the Kur'än and the resultant Muslim terminology, denotes the Jews and the Christians, repositories of the earlier revealed books, al-Taurâd [q.v.] = the Torah, al-Zabår [q.v.] = the Psalms, and al-InÅhål [q.v.] = the Gospel. The use of this term was later extended to the Sabéans (al-Såbå'å [q.v.])—both the genuine Sabéans, mentioned in the Kur'än alongside the Jews and the Christians (= Mandeans), and the spurious Sabéans (star-worshippers of Harârn)—to the Zoroasterians (Ma'dås [q.v.]), and, in India, even to idolaters.

This article deals only with the doctrinal position of the Kur'än, the šâdîhå and the controversialists concerning the Jews and the Christians. For their legal status as protected persons (ahl al-dhimma) on the fringe of the Muslim community, see DHIMMA and DlYAN.

In the Kur'än, the term does not occur before the end of the Meccan period. A possibly slightly earlier expression is ahl al-dhåhir, "possessors of edification", witnesses of previous revelations (xv, 43 (45), xxii, 9), but dhåhir also denotes generally the Pentateuch and the Psalms. The Kur'än emphasises the community of faith between the possessors of the earlier scriptures and the adherents of the new revelation. It occasionally pays tribute to their religious and moral virtues and calls on the Prophet to interrogate them. More often, however, as a result of his dissatisfaction with the conduct of Muhammad at the intransigence of the Jews of Medina and of the Christians with regard to his mission, he puts the emphasis on their failure to comprehend the message which they possess but do not put into practice, just as they fail to comprehend the new teaching which fulfils that message, on their exclusiveness, and on their impotent jealousy; they are therefore not to be treated as allies, but to be fought with: xxxiv, 45-7 (44-6); xlii, 14 (13); x, 93-5; ii, 105 (99), 109 (103), 111 (105), 135 (129); xviii, i, 4, 6; iii, 19 (17), 23 (22), 64-5 (57-8), 69-73 (62-7), 75-6 (68-9), 77 (71), 98-100 (93-5), 110 (106), 113 (109), 199 (198); lviii, 29; lv, 152 (152), 173 (169); lix, 11; ix, 29; v, 7 (5), 15 (18), 19 (22), 57-9 (62-4), 65 (70), 68 (72). The Kur'änic texts which mention the adherents of these two religions by their proper names (lbarå Isåri'âl [q.v.] and Yahåd [q.v.] for the Israelites of biblical history and the contemporary Jews of Medina respectively, Na'sårå [q.v.] for the Christians) adopt similar viewpoints and determine the entire future attitude of Islam towards these two groups. The children of Israel are God's chosen people, recipients of his bounty, admitted to his covenant, beneficiaries under his law, to whom Paradise is assured. The Kur'än recognises several episodes of their history: the bondage in Egypt, the crossing of the Red Sea, their wanderings in the wilderness, their sojourn before the Mount, their division into twelve tribes, their entry into the Promised Land and into the Holy City and the City by the Sea. But they distinguish themselves by their rebellious spirit and unbelief; they worship the golden calf; they demand to see God and they clamour for idols. Instead of believing in the prophets, they persecute them. They violate the Sabbath and infringe the Law; they are uncircumcised in heart. Though guardians of the Scriptures, they alter them, conceal them and pervert their meaning; they are signalized by their opposition to all further revelations, and they are themselves divided into factions. Curse be the Lord, metamorphosed into apes, punished in this world where they are doomed to humiliation, they are moreover consigned to Hell. They can only be saved by righteousness; they have on the other hand given rise to a just community.

This picture is coloured, like all Muhammad's conceptions of religious history, by his experiences and disappointments, which are expressed still more clearly in his pronouncements concerning the contemporary Jews and Christians.

At first the Kur'än admits that Jews, Christians and Sabéans can, like Muslims, achieve salvation through the performance of the rites of their respective religions, but this standpoint is not maintained. At Medina, the Kur'än admonishes the Jews (recalling especially the divine protection vouchsafed to their ancestors) and summons them to Islam. Although certain Jews are praised and granted forgiveness, the tension, and finally the breach and conflict between the Jews and Muhammad, are reflected by the condemnation of their doctrines, by maledictions, and the ban on association between them and believers. Their sins fall into the moral as well as the religious category. Their attitude resembles that of their ancestors: eager to enjoy life, they fear death; ungrateful for God's blessings, they are careless too of the welfare of their doctors of religion; they practise usury, war among themselves, and
rush into iniquity and corruption. They preserve and study their Law, but do not hesitate to transgress it, taking advantage of its multiplicity and to conceal the truth. The prohibitions concerning food have been imposed on them as a punishment. Their enmity towards the Christians is not forgotten. Even their monotheism is questioned; they believe in the Djiht and Tashht and deify 'Uzayr [q.v.]. They Ally themselves with the polytheists. Their attitude towards the Kur'anic revelation, the advent of which has caused disunity amongst them, is compounded of hostility and unbelief. They are the worst enemies of Islam; they bandy words with the Prophet, are jealous of the believers, and are conspicuous for their mockery, their machinations, and their treachery. Assured of obloquy in this world, they are destined to Gehenna. [See also YAHUD.]

As regards the Christians, God has made a convenient with them, and their salvation through their faith is admitted in several passages. Muhammad at one time credited them with a leaning towards Islam, and they are declared to be superior to the Jews, to whom they are opposed. But the condemnation of their doctrines is no less outspoken. Their exclusive claim to salvation and to the true religion is severely criticised; it would be a grave error to adopt their religion. The divinity of Jesus ('Isa [q.v.]), the reality of His Passion, the Trinity, and the monasticism are all rejected. They are threatened with Hell; affiliation with them is forbidden, and recourse to imprecation (mustahala [q.v.]) is proposed to them. The dissension between the Christian sects is not forgotten. [See also NADJRAN, NASARA.]

The attitude of Islam towards the Jews and Christians, as reflected in the hadith, is one of mistrust. It stresses the importance of differentiating at all costs, as regards religious and social conduct, between the believers and these two religious groups, which are rather superficially understood. Moreover there is noticeable in Muslim tradition a clear tendency to stress the originality of those Muslim institutions which invite comparison with similar (mainly Jewish) institutions. Finally, the hadith sometimes puts into a poletical context the condemnation of various abuse prevalent among the Muslims, as well as certain positions taken up in many internal controversies within the Muslim community. The principles and processes employed betray more than once their Jewish origin. The basic rule is: "do not act as do the people of the Book" (ahl al-kitab), which corresponds to the Talmudic ban on following the practices of the Gentiles (habkhot ha-goy). By virtue of this principle, the hadith condemns numerous practices of little consequence in themselves. But to Jewish rorism it opposes a certain degree of Muslim laxity, especially in sexual matters. It claims as purely Muslim (if it does not date back to "Israelite" antiquity or to pre-Islamic Arabia) an institution like the fast of Yom Kippur and is moreover virtually supplanted by Ramadan [q.v.], which again is found to have its origin in Jewish and Christian institutions. Developing and aggravating the grievances uttered in the Kur'an, Muslim tradition willingly underlines above all the enmity of the Jews, but also that of the Christians, ranging from certain episodes in the Prophet's life to eschatological disputes. Although Muslim tradition rarely gives evidence of direct acquaintance with large portions of the Judaeo-Christian Scriptures (information of this type stemmed from intercourse with the ahl al-kitab or was supplied by converts), this does not prevent it from accusing the inheritors of those Scriptures of suppressing certain portions which had fallen into desuetude (capital punishment for adultery in Deuteronomy) or which foretold the mission of Muhammad, and also of interpreting passages falsely and even of materially altering their sense. Discussion with the ahl al-kitab is regarded with dislike, and consultation of their religious documents is deprecated as much by reason of the probable fraudulency of their own texts, as from the fact of the spiritualism of the Kur'anic revelation, which abrogates all that is antiquated in previous revelations and renders the remainder superfluous by superseding it. In contrast, the edifying stories connected with the antiquity of the ahl al-kitab (fryadith [q.v.]) are tolerated.

The anti-Jewish and anti-Christian polemics of Islam display a remarkable consistency in their major themes from the writings of the controversyists of the 3rd/9th-4th/10th centuries down to contemporary apologetics. Unlike the hadith, they make use of a scriptural, theological, historical and sometimes liturgical knowledge which is ample if not always exact.

As regards their use of the two Testaments, Muslim polemics continually waver between two opinions: (a) the Judaic-Christian Scriptures in their existing form are authentic documents which only require a suitable exegesis; (b) they are not to be trusted, either because their actual meaning has been falsified [see TAHRIF], or because their recension and transmission do not afford the necessary guarantee of sincerity and authenticity, so that they cannot be accepted as the Torah and Gospel as actually revealed to Moses and Jesus. The first view prevailed in the 9th-10th centuries (whatever one thinks of the authenticity of "The Book of Religion and Empire", attributed to 'Ali b. Rabbân al-Tabari, which includes a huge mass of scriptural arguments), whereas Ibn Hazm wrote the most penetrating literary, historical, theological and moral criticism of the Judaeo-Christian Scriptures. This method has been followed down to the modern polemic writers, who in addition utilise the rationalist bible-criticism of the 19th century in their attacks on Judaism and Christianity.

In the anti-Jewish polemics the chief theological problem is the abrogation (nasâgh [q.v.]) of previous divine revelations, which does not imply baddâ [q.v.](alteration of God's purpose). The principal charge levelled at Judaism, in most of the traditional compositions, is that of the anthropomorphic conception of the Deity.

The anti-Christian polemics are much richer in historical and theological argument. The message of Jesus has been altered by Paul, and the historical position of the Christian community has been falsified by Constantine. The christological controversies between the Melkites, the Nestorians and the Jacobites afforded ample material to the Muslim polemic writers. The Trinity, taken to mean tritheism, is irreconcilable with divine unity; the incarnation is a blasphemous offence against divine transcendence. Jesus may have had the prerogative of theophaetic speech, but nothing more than a moral union can be involved (al-Ghazzalî). Muhammad is the Paraclete foretold by the Gospel [see AHMAN], and in addition several messianic and eschatological prophecies of the Old Testament are similarly fulfilled in his person. Historically and sociologically, the astonishing success of Muslim arms and the superiority
of Muslim civilization are proofs of the truth and superiority of Islam. In al-Djahiz, there is a "socio-
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AHMAD I, fourteenth Ottoman sultan. Eldest son of Mehmed (Muhammad) III, born at Manisa 22 Dijumada II, 998/18 April 1590, succeeded his father 18 Radjab 1012/22 Jan. 1603. The chroniclers have noted that on his accession, contrary to established custom, he did not put to death his brother Murads, and the latter later succeeded him. One of the first acts of the sovereign was the confinement in the old Seray of his grandmother Şafiya Sultan (the Venetian Baffa), the prime mover in the Ottoman administration under Murad III and Mehmed (Muhammad) III. Ahmad sent an army under the command of Cihâle-zâde Sinân Pasha [q.v.] against the Persian troops of Shah 'Abbâs I, who had just gained possession of Erivan and Kar and had been repulsed in front of Akalska. Sinân Pasha, however, was defeated at Salmâs (9 Sept. 1605) and shortly afterwards died of chagrin in Diyarbekir, while Şah 'Abbâs profited by his victory to recover Gandja and Shîrwan. In Hungary the Grand-Vizier Lâlâ Mehmed Pasha [see MÜMÂM PASHA], after experiencing setbacks before Pest and Esterhögen (Esterghem, Gran), captured Vác (Vác, Waitzen). In a second campaign, in which he was supported by the ruler of Transylvania, Stephan Bocskay, he was able to isolate and storm the fortress of Esterhögen (4 Nov. 1605), while Tiryâkî Hasan Pasha entered Wesprim (Veszprém) and Palota. Bocskay was invested with the principalities of Transylvania and Hungary. Soon afterwards the Grand-Vizier died, and his post was held successively by Darvish Pasha and Murad Pasha, in which he succeeded Kuyudju ("the well-sinker"), who signed the treaty of Zsitvatorok (11 Nov. 1606) with the Austrians, whereby the Ottomans were left in possession of the territory which they had conquered and received in a single, definitive payment an indemnity of 200,000 hârâ əlmâr, but contracted to accord the Austrian sovereign the title of "Emperor" and not merely "King", a step which would give him equality of status with the Sultan. Conferences were held at Neuhäusel in 1608 to settle the final details of the treaty, and at Vienna in July 1615 and March 1616 to extend its validity. Internal difficulties had forced the Ottomans to sign it; revolts, caused by repeated military levies and by the exactions of certain governors, had broken out in various parts of the empire. Kuyudju Murad Pasha was despatched against the rebels, and triumphed over Mustâ Ali Pasha at Lâranda, over Djamshid at Adana, and notably over Djanbûlîd-oglu 'All Pasha in the plain of Orûdî, near Beylân (24 Dec. 1607). In the west, he attacked Kalender-oglu Mehmed (Muhammad) Pasha, who held the districts of Brusa and Manisa, and defeated him at Alâçayrî (5 Aug. 1608). In Syria, the Turkish forces launched themselves against the Druse amir Fâkhr al-Dîn b. Ma'n [q.v.], but could not win a decisive victory. The Grand-Vizier, at the age of 90, then set out for Tabriz, but shortly after opening peace negotiations with the Şah of Iran,
he died. His successor Naṣīb Paşa [q.v.] concluded in 1611 a peace treaty which fixed the demarcation of the frontier on the basis of the settlement made during the reign of Selim II, but hostilities were resumed four years later. At sea, the Grand-Admiral Khalil Paşa [q.v.] achieved important successes against the Florentine and Maltese fleets. In 1609, six Maltese galleons were captured in Cypriot waters, including the "red galleon" of Commander Fursinet (battle of Kara Djiakhmet); in 1610, the Turks suffered a setback at Lepanto, and the Maltese Corsairs were checked at Cos; in 1612 a Florentine squadron raided the Cilician coast, near the port of Aqghâlim, and in 1614 Khalil Paşa inflicted some losses at Malta. In the Black Sea, the Cossacks, who had sacked Sinope, were overtaken and defeated at the mouth of the Don by Shâhshâfî Ibrahim Paşa; another Cossack attack in Moldavia was checked by Iskender Paşa, and peace was signed at Bussa, on the Dniester, on 27 Sept. 1617. Under Ahmad I, the capitulations with France, England and Venice were renewed (1604), and similar capitulations were concluded for the first time with the Netherlands (1612). The use of tobacco became widespread in Turkey during his reign. Ahmad I devoted himself to the promulgation of a hâkim-nâme designed to establish an authoritative code of the administrative and commercial regulations of the empire, hitherto not co-ordinated. He constructed (1609-1616) in the At Meydânâ at Istanbul the magnificent mosque which bears his name. He died 23 Dhu'-Ka'da 1026/22 Nov. 1617 after a two months' illness. Of a violent and changeable nature, and easily swayed, Ahmad I was not always capable of appreciating the services of his most able ministers; a pious man, he established numerous religious foundations, and even furnished and took a close interest in the Ka'ba with ornaments. He was passionately fond of hunting and divârîd, and took a close interest in poetry.
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AHMAD II, twenty-first Ottoman sultan, son of Mehmed IV (Muhammad IV, [q.v.]). Born in 1084/1673, he succeeded his brother Mustafâ II [q.v.] on 10 Rabî‘ II 1115/21 August 1703, when the latter abdicated in consequence of a rising of the Janissaries. The leaders of this rising were soon got rid of by the new sultan on his immediate re-establishment of Istanbul as the habitual residence of the court; and for the next few years large numbers of persons known to have, or suspected of having, been implicated in it continued to be dismissed, banished, or executed, to the detriment of governmental efficiency. Ahmad's resolve to break the power of the soldiery was also shown by his dismissal from the palace service of 700 bostandîlis and their replacement by dewshîrme conscripts (this being the last application of the dewshîrme), as well as by his later drastic reduction of the Janissary establishment. Nevertheless during the first half of his twenty-seven years' reign in particular he lived in a morbid dread of "revolutionaries" (fitnedêler); for three years he was unable, though making four changes in the Grand Vizierate, to find a capable minister; and it was only with the appointment in Muhammâr 1118/May 1706 of Corlulu 'Alî Paşa [q.v.] that the government regained some stability. During this period, and indeed for the following eight or nine years, his actions were largely influenced by a palace camarilla, headed by the Wâlide Sultân, the Kizlar Ağası, and the sultan's favourite, later to be known as Şehidî Şûhâbîlî Dûmâd 'Alî Paşa [q.v.]. The sultan and the camarilla were always uneasy at the appointment to the Grand-Vizierate of "outsiders"—i.e. persons not of the palace service, such as Köprüllû Nu'mân Paşa (see below), and took fright at any initiative they might display.

No event of much note occurred during the reign until 1709, when, after being defeated by Tsar Peter the Great at Poltava, King Charles XII of Sweden, nicknamed in Turkish demir baş, "Iron Head", sought refuge at Bender on the Dniester in Ottoman territory. The Porte had so far made no attempt at profiting either by the preoccupation of Austria and the western powers with the War of the Spanish Succession to recover any of the territory lost to the sultan in 1699 by the Treaty of Carlowitz, or by the preoccupation of Russia with the "Great Northern War" to nullify the concessions to the Tsar's Black-Sea ambitions agreed to in the Russo-Ottoman treaty of 1700. Charles, however, in order to retrieve his fortunes, soon began urging the
sultan to take up arms against Peter, an action to which the Porte was also incited by successive ambassadors of Louis XIV and the Venetian representative at Istanbul, with the result that in June 1710 Corlulu ʿAli, who had but recently renewed the Russian treaty, was dismissed, and that though his successor, Köprüülü [q.v.] Nuʾmān Paşa, proving too independent for the taste of the camarilla, fell in turn two months later, his replacement in September by the plant intriguer Bâltâdî Mehemet Paşa [see MUHAMMAD PASHA], who had shown his incapacity when in office earlier, was followed on 20 Nov. by a a declaration of war, the main Ottoman grievances being the Tsar's construction of warships at Azov, his erection of a number of fortresses along the Ottoman frontiers, his interference with the Tatars subject to the Khan of the Crimea, and his incitement of the sultan's Orthodox subjects to disaffection.

The opposed armies met only in July 1711, after Peter had been enabled to overrun most of Moldavia owing to the treachery of the Hospodar Demetrius Cantemir [q.v.]. But by then he had run gravely short of food supplies and was surprised by the main Ottoman army when marching south along the Pruth with the intention of seizing Ibrāʾīl; was forced to retreat; and was eventually surrounded and obliged to sue for peace. A treaty was signed forthwith by which Peter agreed to retrocede Azov and raze the other objectionable fortresses, to interfere no further either with the Tatars or in the affairs of Poland, no longer to maintain an ambassador at Istanbul, and to cease intriguing with the sultan's Orthodox subjects. Since, however, the Grand Vizier could have forced the Tsar to almost any concession, he fell under suspicion of having been bribed into the acceptance of such lenient terms and was dismissed three months later, largely as the result of further intrigues on the part of Charles, whose hopes had been disappointed by the treaty. Charles continued indeed for most of the next three years to incite the Porte to a renewal of hostilities, a task made easier by Peter's failure to observe his undertakings. Largely as a result of the king's efforts war on Russia was again actually declared no less than three times (in Dec. 1711, Nov. 1712 and April 1713), though it was always averted by Russian concessions. A final agreement with Peter was reached only in June 1713, with the signature at Adrianople of a treaty, to remain in force for twenty-five years, whereby the terms of the Treaty of the Pruth were confirmed and peace with Russia was in the event established for a long period. Charles, persisting in a refusal to quit Ottoman territory unless provided with money and troops with which to recover his losses in Poland, was at length, in the spring of 1714, removed forcibly from Bender to Demotika and then to Demirtaş by ʿAli, who was mortally wounded on the field. Eugène followed up this victory with the reduction of Temesvár and the occupation of the Banat and Little Wallachia in the autumn; and in the summer of 1717 laid siege to Belgrade, where on 16 August he completely routed a superior Ottoman relieving force. The Belgrade garrison surrendered three days later, after which, though the Austrians failed in an attempt to overrun Bosnia, there was no fighting of importance. The Porte soon made proposals for an armistice; and peace was finally signed, on 21 July 1718, at Passarowitz (Passarófás, Pozarevac), whereby Belgrade and the region about it, the Banat, and little Wallachia were ceded by the Porte to Austria, while the Morea, the Cretan ports and Tenos, as well as the south-eastern districts of the Hercegovina were ceded to the Porte by Venice, which for its part received Corfu and the strongholds the Venetians had captured in Albania and Dalmatia. A commercial treaty further secured to Austrian and Venetian traders certain advantages they had not till then enjoyed.

The Grand Vizier responsible for this treaty was another favourite of Ahmad's: Nūshehrîlî ʿIbrāhîm Paşa [q.v.], who by marrying the sultan's thirteen-year-old daughter, Fâṭīme Sultan, formerly the nominal wife of ʿAli, had also become a dāmâd; and for the remaining twelve years of the reign, which with this entered upon its second phase, he entirely dominated the court. Ahmad was of a pleasure- and art-loving nature, and with ʿIbrâhîm, who shared his tastes, was able, as he had not been able with the warlike Silâhdar, to indulge them and set new fashions for Ottoman society. The general abandonment of the deşâkûrs during the 17th century had led, with the occupation of the chief governmental posts by free-born Muslims, to a growth of interest among the powerful in the arts and learning, side by side with a decline in military and administrative efficiency. Moreover the Greek community of the Phanar quarter had at the same time acquired both a stronger influence than before in metropolitan society and some familiarity with contemporary western thought. In consequence the twelve years ensuing on the peace of Passarowitz witnessed a remarkable change of taste in poetry, music and architecture and a new inclination to profit by European example. During this short
period—known as İkle demari, “the Age of Tulips”, the cultivation of which became for some years a “craze”, and the secular spirit of which is exemplified by the poet Nadım [q.v.] in the verse “Let us laugh and play and enjoy the world!”—pavilions and gardens were more often built than mosques and mausoleums, and they were built to designs imported from the west. An ambassador accredited to Louis XV received specific instructions to study French institutions and report on those adaptable to Ottoman use; and in 1724 his son assisted İbrahim Muteferrika [q.v.] to establish the first printing press in Istanbul. A French officer of Engineers was invited by the Porte to prepare plans for the reform of the army on western lines, while a French convert to Islam organized a fire service (the qofak of the İslahumbagi); and though the reform of the army came to nothing, the organization of the Admiralty was overhauled and the building of three-decker men-o’war was undertaken for the first time. Some of the İslahum further founded a society for the translation of books (from Arabic and Persian); the export of rare manuscripts was prohibited for educational reasons; and no less than five libraries were founded at the capital, including the sultan’s own Enderun-i Hümâyûn Kiitiib-khanesi, of which Nadım was made curator. China factories at Küçükâya and İzmid were revived and a new one founded at Tektür Saraylı at Istanbul; extensive repairs to the Byzantine walls were carried out from 1722 to 1724; and a barrage was built to provide water for the capital from springs at Belgrade. The most notable extant architectural monuments of the period are the mosque built by İbrahim III for his mother at Üsküdar and his çeşme outside the Bâb-ı Hümâyûn of the Topkapı Saraylı, for which he composed the chronogram himself.

It was İbrahim Paşa’s policy to avoid war. Nevertheless the Tulip Age saw the temporary extension of Ottoman rule over large tracts of western Persia. The decline of the Şafawids and the Afghân invasion of their dominions, culminating in the capture of Isfahan in 1135/1722, had plunged the country into a state of anarchy tempting to both Russia and the Porte. In 1135/1723 Ottoman forces occupied Tiflis, and on Russia’s seizing Darband and Bâkû in the same year, in 1724, after a period of tension during which a fresh war between Ahmad and the Tsar came near to breaking out, another Russo-Ottoman treaty was concluded, providing for a partition that should leave Peter in possession of Darband, Bâkû and Gilân and the sultan in that of Georgia, Eriwân, Şirwân, Aqharbaydjan and all Persian territory west of the line Ardabil-Hamadân. Ottoman forces in fact took over all this vast region, the Porte forming it into ten provinces all of new syilâs. But when in April 1725 the Afshar Ahşaf proclaimed himself şâh, he demanded the relinquishment of these conquests; and on the Porte’s refusal eventually, in November 1726, defeated İbrahim Paşa [q.v.] commanding the Ottoman forces in Persia. However, a year later Ahşaf was obliged to make peace; and the sultan’s sovereignty over the conquered provinces was recognized. From then until 1730, accordingly, these regions formed part of the Ottoman Empire. But in 1729 Ahşaf was overthrown by the future Nâdir Şâh, who in the following year also defeated the Ottomans and obliged them to relinquish all their gains.

The result was a revolt of the people at Istanbul, to suppress which İbrahim and the sultan hesitated until it was too late. The Muslims of the capital, though they had at first disapproved the Persian conquests, were now indignant at their loss. But İbrahim Paşa was anxious to avoid further fighting and prepared for it only under pressure from public opinion; moreover he was already unpopular for the nepotism he practised to secure his own position and for the fiscal policy he had pursued; the new luxurious and “Frankish” manners of the court were disliked by the conservative and resented by the poor; and the project of army reform had alarmed the Janissaries. The leader of the revolt was a Janissary “affiliate”, an Albanian, formerly a levêné and hence [cf. Bahriyya] called Patrona Khâlî, who acted under the influence of two disaffected İlâsmâ and with the approval of many Janissary officers. It began on 28 Sept. 1730; and in a few hours a partially armed crowd of thousands had gathered in the At Meydân. Ahmad and İbrahim were in camp at Üsküdar; but on learning of the outbreak in the evening, they returned to the palace at night. For the next two days fruitless attempts were made to parley with the rebels, who demanded the delivery up to them of the Grand Vizier, the Şâhâr al-Islâm, the Kapudan Paşa, the Kâhya Bey and others, till, during the night of 30 Sept., the sultan, finding no support in any of his troops, decided to sacrifice his favourite, whose corpse, together with those of the Kapudan and the Kâhya, was brought out to them in the morning. Ahmad himself agreed to abdicate on condition that his own life and the lives of his sons should be spared, and was accordingly succeeded on 1 Oct./18 Rabî‘ I 1143/1730 by his nephew Mâmûd I [q.v.]. He died, in the retirement that was henceforth his lot, in 1149/1736.

Ahmad III was handsome of person and an accomplished calligraphist, letter-writer and poet. Though normally of a mild disposition, he was ruthless in the treatment of those whom he feared or who had incurred his displeasure. He had no taste for war, partly because of the expense it entailed; for he was exceedingly fond of money and applied himself to the accumulation of treasure. His love of amusement and display ran counter to this propensity. But Dâmid İbrahim Paşa contrived to minister to both his avarice and his extravagance by increasing the revenues and curtailing other expenditure in ways that contributed to his unpopularity. Ahmad was greatly attached to his harem, to which he gave much of his attention, but he did not allow its members to influence public affairs as some of his predecessors had done. He had no less than thirty-one children; and his reign was consequently distinguished by frequent festivities to celebrate the circumcision of his sons and the marriage of his daughters, which lent it a special air of gaiety.

Minor events of the reign were a revolt of the Muntafîk [q.v.] Arabs in the neighbourhood of al- Başra in 1117/1705; the suppression of another Arab revolt in the same region in 1727–8; the affirmation of Ottoman sovereignty over certain areas of the Caucasus bordering on the Black Sea early in the reign; the conquest of Oran (Wahrân) from Spain by Algerian forces in 1708; recurrent troubles in the Armenian millet occasioned by Jesuit propaganda (particularly in 1706–7 and 1727–8); and two insurrections in Egypt (in 1712–3 and 1727–8). Successive kânas of the Crimea played a considerable part in the events of the period, more especially in the war with Russia, the kânah Dewlet Girîyâ [q.v.] in particular strongly supporting Charles XII in his anti-Russian schemes. During the war with Austria
the Porte accepted an offer of assistance from Francis Rakoczy, the Prince of Transylvania, after the final failure of his attempts to secure the independence of Hungary, but he reached Istanbul too late to be made use of. Finally the treachery of Cantemir and his fellow-Bosporus of Wallachia during the campaign of the Pruth resulted in the appointment from 1716 onwards of Phanariote Greeks to the governorship of the Principalities.
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(H. Bowen)

Ahmad III — Ahmad b. Abī Khālid al-ʿAlwāl, secretory to al-ʿAmmūn, was of Syrian origin and the son of a secretary of Abū ʿUbayd Allāh. He took advantage of his former connections with the Barmakids to enter the service of al-Fadl b. Sahl. Indeed the Barmakids were already under an obligation to his father, and he himself had managed to be of service to the disgraced Yahyā. Apparently even before the capture of Baghdaḍ he went to Khurāsān and, as the result of a letter of recommendation which Yahyā had given to him before his death, he was placed in charge of several diwāns at Mawr. After the return of the caliph to Irāq, profiting by the support of Thumāmā b. Aḥrās, he assisted al-Ḥasan b. Sahl in the direction of the administration, and later replaced him. A man of doubtful integrity, easily corrupted, notorious for his greed and his harshness towards his subordinates, he was, nevertheless, up to his death in 211/826-7, the right-hand man of al-ʿAmmūn. It is not possible, however, to state definitely whether he acquired the rank of waṣir. Doubtless his ability was the reason why the Caliph, who was fully aware of his faults, still retained him in his service.

He played an important part in the political intrigues which secured in 205/821 the nomination of Tāhir b. ʿAl-Ḥusayn, then governor of Baghdaḍ, to the governorship of Khurāsān in place of ʿAbd al-
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‘Abbad. When fahir asserted his independence in 207/822, al-Ma’mun ordered his secretary to proceed at once to Khurāsān and to bring back the governor whose loyalty he had guaranteed. Ajmān with much difficulty secured a respite of 24 hours, and, before his departure, the news of the death of Tāhir is said to have reached the city. Everything points to the fact that, as some chroniclers aver, Ajmān was privy to this sudden death. He secured the appointment of Tāhir’s son Talḥa as governor, but al-Ma’mun sent Ajmān himself to Khurāsān to assist, or rather to keep watch on Talḥa. The secretary, furnished with military powers, penetrated on this occasion as far as Transoxania, and conquered Uṣūrān. Ajmān also used his influence to obtain a pardon for al-Ma’mun’s uncle, Ibrāhīm b. al-Mahdī, who had laid claim to the throne and who had for several years succeeded in eluding the caliph’s police.
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AHMAD B. ABI TĀHIR ṬAYFŪR [see Ibn ABI TĀHIR]}

AHMAD B. HĀBIT (rather than Ḥābit, if the position in the alphabetical order given to him by al-‘Askālānī is taken into consideration), a theologian ranked among the Muʿtaṣilis; he was the pupil of al-Naẓẓām [q.v.], and the teacher, in particular, of al-Fadl al-Hadathl. Nothing is known about his life, and only his “innovations” are partly known to us. His doctrine, evolved before 232/846-7, seems to differ from Muʿtazilite teaching on the following two fundamental dogmas, which are borrowed from systems alien to Islam but which, in the eyes of Ibn Ḥābit, found justification in the Kurʾān. (1) On the basis of Kurʾān (xxix, 22-23), ii, 210 (206), and v, 110, he affirms the divinity of Jesus, from which heterodoxies infer three, four, or five creators, God and the Messiah. (2) He professes the doctrine of kurūr, or the reincarnation of souls, sprung from the Universal Spirit, in forms which will be more beautiful or more ugly according to the merits they have acquired in their previous incarnation. This theory involves the existence of five stages: a place of damnation (Hell); a place of testing (this world); two places of relative reward; and, finally, Paradise, where the souls were created. According to Kurʾān vii, 34 (33); x, 49 (50); xvi, 61 (63), souls which have “filled to the brim the cup” of good or evil will eventually go to Paradise or Hell. Ibn Ḥābit, who accepts reincarnation in animals, is obliged to reconcile its corollary, the doctrine of the taklīf of animals, of their individual responsibility, which can be justified only if they have had prophets to teach them; verses vi, 38; xvi, 68 (70) and xxxv, 24 (22), enable him to put forward this opinion. The heterodoxers, of course, have passed a severe judgement on this theologian, to whom they deny the name of Muslim.


AHMAD B. HANBAL, “the imām of Baghdād”, celebrated theologian, jurist and traditionalist (164-241/780-855), and one of the most vigorous personalities of Islam, which he has profoundly influenced both in its historical development and its modern revival. Founder of one of the four major Sunnī schools, the Ḥanbalī, he was, through his disciple Ibn Taymiyya [q.v.], the distant progenitor of Wahhābism, and has inspired also in a certain degree the conservative reform movement of the Salafīyya.

life. Ahmad b. Hanbal was an Arab, belonging to the Banū Ṣayyābān, of Rabī‘a, who had played an active role in the conquest of al-Ṭrāk and Khurāsān. His family, first resident in Basra, moved to Marw with Ahmad’s grandfather, Hanbal b. Hūlāl, governor of Sāraqūs under the Umayyads and one of the early ‘Abbasid propagandists. Ahmad was born in Rabī‘a ii 164/Dec. 780, a few months after his father Muhammad b. Hanbal, who was serving in the army of Khurāsān, had removed to Baghdād, where he died three years later. Ahmad inherited, however, a small family estate which allowed him a modest but independent livelihood. After studying in Baghdād lexicography, juridical and tradi-

Bibliography: Fisal, iv, 293 ff., v, 424; Shahrastānī, Milal (Cureton) 42 ff.; Baghdadī, Statio, 197 ff.; Baghdadī, Futūh, 164-241/780-855, and one of the most vigorous personalities of Islam, which he has profoundly influenced both in its historical development and its modern revival. Founder of one of the four major Sunnī schools, the Ḥanbalī, he was, through his disciple Ibn Taymiyya [q.v.], the distant progenitor of Wahhābism, and has inspired also in a certain degree the conservative reform movement of the Salafīyya.

tion, he devoted himself from 179/795 to the study of tradition, in pursuit of which he made a series of journeys in al-Ṭrāk, Hijaz, and Syria. His visits to Iran, Khurāsān, and even to the distant Maghrib must be dismissed as legendary. Already in 183 he had visited Kūf. He stayed more frequently in Basra; after a first visit in 186, he returned there in 190, 194 and 200. He was more often still at Mecca, where he made the Pilgrimage on five occasions: in 187, 191, 196, 197 (followed by a pious retreat (mudājāwara) at Medina), and 198, followed by a second mudājāwara into the year 199, after which he visited the traditionist ‘Abd al-Razzāk at Sān’ā. (Manābīb, 22-3; Tārdjama, 13-24).

His studies of ḥīḏ and Ḫāḏrī were made under a great many teachers, whose names have been preserved (Manābīb, 33-6; Tārdjama, 13-24). At Baghdād he attended the courses of the kāfī Abū Yūsuf [q.v.] d. 182/798, by whom he was not profoundly influenced, and studied regularly under Hughaym b. Baḡṣīr, a disciple of Ibrāhīm al-Naḥḍī, from 179 to 183 (Manābīb, 52; Bidāya, x, 183-4). His principal teacher thereafter was Sufyān b. ‘Uyayn (d. 198/813-4), the greatest authority of the school of the Ḥijāz. Others of his more important teachers were ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Mahdī of Ba顼 (d. 198/813-4) and Wāḥīd b. al-Djarrāḥ (d. 197/812-3) of Kūf. But, as Ibn Taymiyya noted (Minhādī al-Sunna, iv, 143), his juristic formation is due, above all, to the school of Ḫāḏrī and of the Ḥijāz. He cannot therefore be regarded, as is sometimes done, simply as a disciple of al-‘Askālānī, whose juridical work he knew, at least partially, but whom he seems to have met only once, at Baghdād in 195 (Bidāya, x, 251-5, 326-7).

The policy adopted by the caliph al-Maʾmūn, towards the end of his reign, under the influence of Bishr al-Marīṣī, of giving official support to the doctrine of the Muʿṭazila [q.v.], inaugurated for Ibn Ḥanbal a period of persecution, which was to gain for him a resounding reputation [see AL-MAʾMŪN, AL-MINHA]. Ibn Ḥanbal vigorously refused to accept the dogma of the creation of the Kurʾān, contrary to orthodoxy. Al-Maʾmūn, then at Tarsus, on hearing of this, ordered that Ibn Ḥanbal should be sent to him, together with another objector, Muhammad b. Nūh. They were put in chains and sent off, but shortly after leaving Raḵja they
received the news of the caliph's death. They were then sent back to Baghdad; Ibn Nuh died on the journey, and Ibn Ḥanbal, on arrival in the capital, was imprisoned first at the Yāsiriyā, then in a house of the Dār ʿUmrā, and finally in the common prison of the Darb al-Mawsīl (Mandābīb, 308-317; Tārdāmā, 40-56; Bidāyā, x, 272-280).

The new caliph, al-Ḥūṣain, beamingly inclined to abandon the inquisition, was, it is said, persuaded by the Muʿtaṣīlīs to keep Ahmad b. Abī Duʾād of the danger to the authority of the State of surrendering a position now officially taken up. Ibn Ḥanbal was therefore summoned to appear before the caliph in Rāmāḍān 219. Still stoutly refusing to acknowledge the creation of the Kūrān, he was severely beaten but permitted to return to his home after an imprisonment of some two years in all. During the whole of al-Ḥūṣain’s reign he lived in retirement and disbanded from giving lectures on Tradition. On the accession of al-Wāḥībī (227/842), he attempted to resume his courses of lectures, but almost at once preferred to discontinue them, though not officially forbidden to give them, lest he should be exposed by further reprisals by the Muʿtaṣīlīs. He continued therefore to remain in retirement, sometimes even (it is said) in hiding, in order to escape from his enemies (Manākbīb, 349).

With the reinstatement of Sunnism by al-Mutawakkil on his accession in 232/847, Ibn Ḥanbal was able to resume his teaching activity. He does not, however, appear among the traditionists appointed by the caliph in 234 to oppose the Dājmīyya and the Muʿtaṣīlīs (Manākbīb, 356). The disappearance of the leading figures of the era of persecution opened the way to an association between the caliph and the independent-minded theologian. Abī Ḥūṣain, Abī Duʾād was removed from office in 237/853, and his successor Ibn Ḥṣam is even said, in certain traditions, to have been recommended to the caliph by Ibn Ḥanbal (Bidāyā, x, 315-6, 319-29). After a first unsuccessful approach to the court, the date and circumstances of which remain obscure (Manākbīb, 359-62), Ibn Ḥanbal was invited in 237 to Sāmārā by al-Mutawakkil. It appears that the caliph wished him to give lessons in ḫadīth to the young prince al-Ḥāfīz, and it may also be supposed that he had some idea of utilizing the famous theologian for his policy of restoration of the sunna. This journey to Sāmārā gave Ibn Ḥanbal the occasion for making contact with the personalities of the court, without danger of compromise. The extant narratives show him welcomed on his arrival by the ḫādīḥī Waṣīf, installed in the luxurious palace of Ṯākhl, loaded with gifts, presented to al-Ḥāfīz, but eventually exempted, on his own request, from any special charge on account of his age and health. After a short stay, he returned to Baghdad without seeing the caliph (Manākbīb, 372-8; Tārdāmā, 58-75; Bidāyā, x, 316, 337-40).

Abūd al-Ḥādīth died in Rabīʿ 1 241/July 855, at the age of 75, after a short illness, and was buried in the Martyrs’ cemetery (Maḥābir al-Ṣahādāʾ) near the Ḥar gate. The traditions which surround the account of his funeral, although partly legendary in character, convey the impression of a genuine popular emotion, and his tomb was the scene of demonstrations of such ardent devotion that the cemetery had to be guarded by the civil authorities (Manākbīb, 409-18; Tārdāmā, 75-82; Bidāyā, x, 340-3). His tomb became one of the most frequented places of pilgrimage in Baghdād. In 574/1178-9 the caliph al-Ḥustadī furnished it with an inscription glorifying the celebrated traditionist as the most faithful defender of the Sunna (Bidāyā, xii, 300). It was washed away by a flood on the Tigris in the 8th/14th century (Le Strange, 166).

By each of his two legitimate wives Ibn Ḥanbal had one son, Sāliḥ and ʿAbd Allāh, besides six children by a concubine, who are not otherwise known (Mandābīb, 295-306). Sāliḥ (born in Baghdād 203/818-9, died as ḫāṣīf of Isfahān 206/879-80) is said to have transmitted a large part of Ahmad’s fiqh (Tabādālī, i, 173-6). ʿAbd Allāh (b. 213/828) was chiefly interested in ḥadīth, and through him the major part of Ahmad’s literary work was transmitted. He died in Baghdād in 290/903 and was buried in the Kūraysh cemetery, and to his tomb was transferred the venera/ion enjoyed by that of his father when the latter was swept away (Tabādālī, i, 180-6). Both sons, who were closely associated with the intellectual life of their father, were amongst the chief architects of that collective structure which constitutes the Ḥanbali madhhīb.

2. Works. The most celebrated of Ibn Ḥanbal’s works is his collection of traditions, the Musnad (1st ed., Cairo 1311; new edition by Ahmad Shākir in publ. since 1368/1948). Although Ahmad himself gave an exceptional importance to this work, it was his son ʿAbd Allāh who collected and classified the enormous accumulation of material, and himself made some additions. His Baghdād disciple Abū Bakr al-Ḵaṭṭār (d. 368/978-9) transmitted this recension with some further additions. In this vast collection the traditions are classified not according to subjects, as in the Ṣaḥīḥ of al-Bukhārī and Muslim, but under the names of the first guarantor; it thus consists of a number of partcularly juxtaposed, and include those of Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUṯmān, ʿAll and the principal Companions, and ends with the musnads of the Anṣār, the Meccans, the Medinians, the people of Kūfa and Baṣra, and the Syrians.

This order, though evidence of an effort of intellectual probity, made it difficult to use by those who did not know it by heart. It was therefore sometimes reshaped. In his K. al-Dawāt, al-Mutawakkil classified in alphabetical order the Companions, the traditions contained in Ibn Ḥanbal’s Musnad, in the “Six Books”, al-Ṭabarānī’s Muḥdjam and the Musnads of al-Bazzār and Abū Yaḥyā al-Mawsīl (Ṣaḥāḥī, vi, 231). Ibn Ṣaḥibūn (d. 837/1433-4; Ṣaḥāḥī, vii, 222-3) follows, in his K. al-Duʾā, the order of the chapters of al-Bukhārī, and has the great merit of having inserted among the hadīths which he quotes extracts from numerous Ḥanbalī works, especially of Ibn Ḥudāma, Ibn Ṣaḥibūn, and Ibn al-Kayyīm. This voluminous compilation, preserved in the Ṣaḥīrīyya in Damascus, has served as a mine for numerous editions of Ḥanbalī texts in the last fifty years.

Within the framework of Tradition, Ahmad b. Ḥanbal is to be regarded as an “independent muḥtahīd” (mustakhill), who as Ibn Ṣaḥibūn has remarked (Mināḥīd, iv, 143), was able, from amongst the mass of traditions and opinions received from many teachers, to form his own doctrine (iṣbāḥa il-najīsā). In no sense can he be regarded, in the manner of al-Ṭabarī, as merely a traditionist, and nothing of a juristic consult (ṣalāḥ) concerned with normative rules. As already pointed out by Ibn ʿAṭīlī, “certain positions adopted (iṣbīḥa ydrā) by Ibn Ḥanbal are supported by him on traditions with such consummate skill as few have equalled, and certain of his decisions bear witness to a juridical subtlety without parallel” (Manākbīb, 64-6). “Fol-
followers of tradition" (asbāb al-hadīth) must not be too systematically contrasted with "followers of opinion" (asbāb al-ra'y), since it is hardly possible to acquire an understanding of hadīth and to resolve their contradictions and divergences, or to deduce from them the consequences which may derive from them, without using a minimum of personal judgment.

The two fundamental treatises for the study of Ibn Hanbal's dogmatic position are the short Radd 'ala'i'Dhimmiyuwa wa't-Zandikā and the K. al-Sunna (both printed together, Cairo n.d.), a longer version of the K. al-Sanā' (d. 251/866-7). In the former of these, he expounds and refutes the doctrines of Dhimmī and Sīwān (q.v.), whose ideas, widely circulated in Kūrāsān, were adopted by certain disciples of Abū Ḥanīfa and of 'Amr b. ʿUbayd. In the K. al-Sunna he re-examines some of the theological questions already raised in the Radd and unequivocally defines his own position on all the principal points of his creed (cf. also Tabākāt, i, 243-36). Of his other surviving doctrinal works, the K. al-Salāt (Cairo 1323 and 1347), on the importance of the communal prayer and rules for its correct observance, was transmitted by Mūḥānna b. Yābūyā al-Shāmī, one of his early disciples, and extracted from the biblio-bibliographical repertory of the kādī Abu ʿI-Husayn (Tabākāt, i, 345-80). Two unpublished MSS should be noted: the Musnad min Mads'il Ahmad b. Hanbal (B.M.; cf. Brock., S I, 311), possibly be a fragment of the Musnad, (see Tabakdt, i, 345-80). Two unpublished collections, and in addition the Tabakāt of Ibn Abī Ya'la contains the replies given by Ibn Ḥanbal to numerous visitors.

These dispersed materials were assembled in the K. al-Ḍāmīs (li-ʿUlām al-Imām Ahmad), by a disciple of Abū Bakr al-Marwāzī, the traditionist Abū Bakr al-Khallāl (d. 311/923-4), who taught at Baghdad in the mosque of al-Mahdī (Tab., i, 11-15; Taʾrikh Baghadād, v. 112-5). Al-Khallāl's role has been quite appreciated by Ibn Tāmīyya, who says (K. al-Imān, 158) that his K. al-Sunna is the fullest and best source for a knowledge of Ibn Ḥanbal's dogmatic views (wsūl diniyya), and of his fīl-ʿIlm the most valuable repository for the study of law (wsūl fiḥlīyya); these are doubt subdivisions, or a rehandling, of K. al-Ḍāmīs. According to Ibn Kāyīm al-Djawziyya (Ṭāhir al-Manṣūkhet b. ʿAbd Allah and of Ibn Tribal, Cairo, i, 31), the K. al-Ḍāmīs consisted of twenty volumes. To our present knowledge, the work is lost, except for the fragment referred to above; but as it has entered deeply into the output of Ibn Tāmīyya and Ibn Kāyīm, the study of these two writers may partially compensate for its loss in assisting an evaluation of Ibn Ḥanbal's thought.

Ibn Ḥanbal's work was completed by his disciple ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Ḍiyāfī (d. 363/973-4), better known as Ghalūm al-Khallāl, who did not always accept his master's interpretations of Ibn Ḥanbal's thought, and whose Zād al-Musāfīr, though less important than the Ḍāmīs, presents a body of supplementary materials often consulted. The divergences which this Corpus has allowed to remain in the exposition of Ibn Ḥanbal's thought explain why the Ḥanbalis distinguish between the text (nass) of the founder of the school, the teachings ascribed to him (risaḍāyāl), the indications (tanbihāt) suggested by him, and what are simply points of view (awāḍīkh) of his disciples.

Ibn al-Djawzi (Manṣūkhet, 191) cites a Taṣīr based upon 120,000 hadīth, and other works now lost. See also Brockelmann, I, 193; S I, 309-10.

3. Doctrine. Ḥanbalism has sometimes suffered from a slightly fanaticized turbulence among certain of its followers, or an extravagant literalism adopted by others through ignorance or as a challenge. It has been exposed throughout its history to numerous and powerful opponents in the various schools whose principles it opposed, who, when they did not deliberately disregard it, have united to attack it or to muffle it with insidious suspicions. Western orientalism has taken little interest in it, and has been less severe. It has become the received opinion to see in Ibn Ḥanbal's doctrine a ferociously anthropomorphist theodicy, a traditionalism so sectarian as to be no longer viable, a spirit of individual variations, any systematic codification, such as to impose it in the terms of the thought of any particular representative or to conceal it by fixation, was to change its inner character.
ments that the governing objectives of his teaching are to be sought.

The Attributes of God. For Ibn Hanbal, God is the God of the Kur'ān: to believe in God is to believe in the description which God has given of Himself in His Book. Not only, therefore, must the attributes of God, such as hearing, sight, speech, omnipotence, will, wisdom, etc., be affirmed as realities (ḥākīm), but also all the terms called "ambiguous" (mumālikā) which speak of God’s hand, throne, omnipresence, and vision by the Believers on the day of resurrection. In conformity with tradition, also, it must be affirmed that God descends to the lowest heaven in the last third of every night to hearken to the prayers of his worshippers, and at the same time, with the literal text of the Kur'ān (cf. sūra cxii), that God, the Unique, the Absolute, is not comparable to anything in the world of His creatures (K. al-Sunna, 37; Manābīb, 153). Ibn Hanbal therefore vigorously rejects the negative theology (taʿtiil) of the Dījahmiyya and their allegorizing exegesis (taʿwil) of the Kur'ān and of tradition, and no less emphatically rejects the anthropomorphism (tasbīḥ) of the Mughabbīla, amongst whom he includes, in the scope of his polemics, the Dījahmiyya as unconscious anthropomorphists. In the fideism of Ibn Hanbal, one must believe in all that God without seeking to know the "mode" of the theologoumena (bild kayf), and leave to God the understanding of his own mystery, renouncing the vain and dangerous subtleties of dogmatic theology (kalām) (K. al-Sunna, 37; Manābīb, 155-6). So simple, and at the same time so strong, was this position from the Kur'ānic angle, that al-Ṭashīzī, on abandoning Muʿtazilism, seeks, either for tactical reasons or in sincere acceptance, to place himself under the patronage of Ibn Hanbal before making certain concessions to his former creed, concessions successively enlarged by his disciples, on the problem of the attributes, the Kur'ān, and the legitimacy of dogmatic theology.

The Kur'ān. The Kur'ān is the uncreated Word of God (kalām Allah shayr maṣḥūḥ). To affirm simply that the Kur'ān is the Word of God, without further specification, is to refuse to take up a position, and to fall into the heresy of the wāḥshiyya, the "Abstentionists", which, because of the doubt which it inspires, is a graver sin than the more open heresy of the Dījahmiyya (K. al-Sunna, 37-8). By Kur'ān is to be understood, not just an abstract idea, but the Kur'ān with its letters, words, expressions, ideas— the Kur'ān in all its living reality, whose nature in itself eludes our understanding.

The Pronunciation of the Kur'ān. It is difficult to define Ibn Ḥanbal's position on this question. Some traditions assert that he regarded its pronunciation as uncreated (lafz biʿl-Kur'ān shayr maṣḥūḥ). In K. al-Sunna (38) he goes no further than to say: "Whoso asserts that our words, when we recite the Kur'ān, and that our reciting of the Kur'ān are created, seeing that the Kur'ān is the Word of God, is a Dījahmi". While formally condemning the lāfzīyya, who held the pronunciation of the Kur'ān to be created, he gives no more positive formulation of his own doctrine, to the embarrassment of the later Ḥanballahs. Ibn Taymiyya regards this question as the first on which a real division existed among the Ancients (cf. H. Laoust, Essai sur . . . Ibn Taymiyya, 178) and states that Ibn Ḥanbal avoided taking up a position. He himself gives, in al-Wāṣīṭiyya, the cautious formula which appears to him to be in conformity with the spirit of Ḥanbalism: "When men recite the Kur'ān or write it on leaves, the Kur'ān remains always and in reality the Word of God. A word cannot in fact be really attributed except to the one who first formulated it, and not to anyone who transmits or carries it."

Methodology. Ibn Ḥanbal, unlike al-Ṭashīzī, wrote no treatise on ethico-juridic methodology (wusul al-ṭīb), and the well-known later works of his school, composed with elaborate technique and in an atmosphere of discussion with other schools, cannot be accepted as rigorously expressing his thought. His own doctrine, as it may be elucidated from the Masāʿīl, is more rudimentary than the later elaborations, but has the merit of setting out the first principles of the methodology of the school.

Kur'ān and Sunna. This doctrine claims to rest above all on the Kur'ān, literally understood, without any allegorical exegesis, and on the Sunna, i.e. the total of traditions which can be regarded as deriving from the Prophet. From his own statement (Musnad, i, 567), Ibn Ḥanbal aimed to collect in his Musnad the hadīths generally received (maẓḥār) in his time. In this work, therefore, there are found, to use his own terminology, hadīths whose authenticity is properly established and which may be regarded as perfectly sound (ṣaḥīḥ), and hadīths which benefit only from a presumption of authenticity and for whose rejection (daʿī) there is no positive reason, or, to use the classification established by al-Tirmidhī, sound hadīths and "good" (ḥasan) hadīths. It was only much later, when the criticism of Tradition had reached, with Ibn al-Djawzī, the climax of formalist rigour, that Ibn Ḥanbal was reproached with admitting apocryphal (maṣhūr) hadīths—an accusation contested by many traditionists, as, for example, Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Ḥadījī al-ʿAskālānī. The opinion which has come to prevail is that in the Musnad there are found, along with "sound" traditions, "good" or "rare" (zāhir) traditions, none of which, however, are strictly speaking unacceptable.

The Fatāwā of the Companions and Ijtīmaʿ. Kur'ān and Sunna find their continuation in a third source, derived and complementary: the consultā (fattāwā) of the Companions. The reasons which, for Ibn Ḥanbal, sustain the legitimacy of this new source of doctrine, are clear: the Companions knew, understood, and put into practice the Kur'ān and the Sunna much better than later generations, and all of them are worthy of respect. The Prophet also, in his wāṣīyya, had recommended the Muslims to follow, together with his own Sunna, that of the "rightly-guided" (rasīḥīdān) caliphs who should succeed him, and to avoid all innovation (bidʿa). Where the Companions disagree, it is easy to determine the juster view by reference to the Kur'ān and the Sunna, or by taking into account their order of pre-eminence (Manābīb, 161).

In hierarchical order (lafzī), Ibn Ḥanbal puts Abū Bakr first, then ʿUmar, then the six ʿasḥāb al-ṣārād appointed by ʿUmar “all of whom were worthy of the caliphate and merit the title of imām”: ʿUthmān, ʿAll, Zubayr, Talḥa, ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿAwī, and Saʿd b. Abī Waqās; then the fighters at Badr, the Muḥājirs and the Anṣār (K. al-Sunna, 38; Manābīb, 159-61). This doctrine of Sunnī reconciliation acknowledges the eminent position of ʿAll and the legitimacy of his caliphate, but also rehabilitates his enemies, and in the first place Muḥājiya, whose historical role in the consolidation of Islam has always been indulgently evaluated in the Ḥanballah school, and whose decisions are not necessarily to be discarded.
The decisions of the most authorized representatives of the later generations (tābi‘un) also deserve to be taken into consideration as evidence of plausible interpretations. The consensus of the Community, in such a doctrine, expresses a general concentration around a truth founded on Qur'ān and Sunna; it does not constitute in itself, properly speaking, an independent source of law. A community may well fall into error collectively, if not guided by the light of revelation transmitted by the Tradition (cf. Essai, 239-42).

Function of the muftī. The first duty laid upon the jurist consists to follow faithfully the spiritual legacy transmitted by the Elders, by avoiding any spirit of creation or innovation. Ibn Ḥanbal therefore condemns ra‘y, the gratuitous expression of personal opinion (Abū Dā‘ūd, Masā‘il, 275-7), but without requiring as a rule of conduct an absolute and impossible passivity in face of the texts. He does not reject analogical reasoning (biyās), but does not fully appreciate its value as an instrument of juridical systematization and discovery, as Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn ʻAbī al-Dabbāh were to do later, under intellectualizing influences.

Ibn Ḥanbal made an extensive use of idīṣīṭḥāb, a method of reasoning which consists in maintaining a given juridical status so long as no new circumstance arises to authorize its modification, and of dharāḍī, another method of reasoning to the effect that, when a command or prohibition has been decreed by God, everything that is indispensable to the execution of that order or leads to infringement of that prohibition must also, as a consequence, be commanded or prohibited.—The notion of maṣlaḥa, or recognized common interest, which allows the limitation or extension of a juridical status, is also in conformity with his doctrine, although he did not himself extend and regulate its use as Ibn Taymiyya and his disciple al-ʻĀmilī were to do.

To repeat a comparison of Ibn ʻAbī al-Dabbāh’s, which seems to us to characterize very successfully the double care for tradition and for realism shown by Ibn Ḥanbal: the muftī, like the physician who must adapt his treatment to the state of his patient, must make a constant personal effort (idīṣīṭḥāb) to draw from the sources of the law the moral prescriptions which should be applied to a given case. Thus, if the great Ḥanbalis have never called for the reopening of idīṣīṭḥāb, it is because they have held that its continual use was indispensable to the understanding and application of legal doctrine.

The Caliphate and the Arabs. Ibn Ḥanbal’s political views, directed essentially against the Khaṭābirites and the Shi‘ites (rubā‘iyyah) affirm first and foremost the legitimacy of the Kura-yūhite caliphate: “No person has any claim to contest this right with them, or to rebel against them, or to recognize any others until the Day of Resurrection” (K. al-Sunna, 35).

In the quarrel of races (gharībīyya) which was raging in his time, he defended the Arabs, but without proclaiming their superiority: “We must give the Arabs credit for their rights, their merits, and their former services. We must love them, by reason of the very love which we bear for the Apostle of God. To insult the Arabs is hypocrisy; to hate them is hypocrisy” (ibid., 38)—hypocrisy because, behind the insults or the hatred, there was concealed a more secret aim, to destroy Islam by reviving the ancient empires or reinstating other forms of culture.

On the precedents furnished by Abū Bakr and ʻUmar, Ḥanbal founded the legality of a caliph’s designation of his successor, but any such designation, to become effective, should be followed by a contract (mushāya’ah) in which the imām and the authorized representatives of public opinion swear to mutual fidelity in respect for the Word of God (cf. Essai, 287). His view of the functions of the imām follows the general lines of the legal expositions, but leaves to the imām, within the framework of the prescriptions of the Qur’ān and the Sunna, a wide freedom of action to take, for the common good (maṣlaḥa), all the measures which he considers necessary to improve the material and moral conditions of the community. In this lies the germ of that important concept of “juridical policy” (ṣiyāsah ḥarī‘yya), which was methodically taken up by Ibn ʻĀmilī, Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn ʻAbī al-Dabbāh.

The members of the community owe obedience to the imām and may not refuse it to him by disputing his moral quality. “The dīshk should be pursued alongside all imāms, whether good men or evildoers; the injustice of the tyrant or the justice of the just matters little. The Friday prayer, the Pilgrimage, the two Feasts should be made with those who possess authority, even if they are not good, just or pious. The legal alms, the tithe, the land taxes, the fay’, are due to the amirs, whether they put them to right use or not” (K. al-Sunna, 35). If the ruler seeks to impose a disobedience to God (muṣy’ya), he must be met on this point with a refusal to obey, but without calling for armed revolt, which cannot be justified so long as the imām has the prayer regularly observed. But every member of the community has also the duty, according to his knowledge and his means, of commanding to the good and prohibiting the evil. By their apostolate, therefore, the doctors of the law, while remaining within the limits of loyalty, may revive the Sunna, keep public opinion vigilant, and impose on the prince respect for the prescriptions of religion.

The Spirit of Community. Ibn Ḥanbal’s policy is one of communal concentration and confessional solidarity; to the fitna, disunity, which weakens the community, he opposes the concept of djīhd, group unity and cohesion. He goes so far as to adopt, on the problem of excommunication (ba‘hīr), an attitude of tolerance which links up with the laxism of the Murdžii’a. One may not exclude from the community, he states, any Muslim guilty of a grave sin except on the authority of a ḥadith which must be interpreted with a restrictive literalism (K. al-Sunna, 35-6). He cites only three sins which involve excommunication: non-observance of prayer, consumption of fermented liquors, and spreading of heresies contrary to the dogmas of Islam, among which he mentions none but the ʻIkhmīyya and the ʻAbīwādīyya. As to excommunication properly speaking, he replaces it by a systematic refusal to associate with the heretical within the bosom of the community. “I do not like (he wrote) that prayer should be made behind innovators, nor that the prayer for the dead should be said over them” (K. al-Sunna, 35-6).

Ethics. Ibn Ḥanbal’s doctrine is entirely dominated by ethical preoccupations. The end of action is to serve God (ibādah). In opposition to the ʻIkhmīyya and the Murdžii’a, he asserted that faith (al-imān) “is word, act, intention, and attachment to the Sunna” (K. al-Sunna, 34). It may therefore vary in intensity, “increase or diminish”, and it implies so total an engagement of the being that no man may possibly call himself a Believer without making his affirmation in a conditional form (istīṣṣuṣḥād), by
adding "if God wills". Faith is, therefore, not a simple body of rites, but implies a whole system of strong moral convictions: an absolute sincerity brought to the service of God (ikhlās); renunciation of the world, with refinement of feeling and a spirit of poverty (suhd, fiṣr); a moral courage which lies in "relinquishing what one desires for what one fears" (futuwa); fear of God; a scrupulous mind, which leads one to avoid dubious things (ḥabībād) between the two well-marked limits of the licit and the illicit (cf. Mandābīh, 194-260). Ibn Ḥanbal's belief has, therefore, nothing of a pedantic juristic literalism.

Religious practices and Customs. This is not the place in which to analyse in detail the juridico-moral prescriptions which constitute the applied doctrine of Ibn Ḥanbal (furu') in the two domains which come within this discipline: that of religious practices (ṣibādāt) and that of usages and customs (ṣādāt, mu'tamālāt). The methodical exposition of them contained in al-Muḥbūsar of al-Khārkhāt does no more than reproduce single opinions of Ibn Ḥanbal and presents a restrictive codification of his thought. The same is to be said of the 'Umda of Ibn Kuḍāma, precious as it may be for a knowledge of Ḥanbalism in the 7th/13th century. (See Laoust, Précis de droit d'Ibn Qudama, Damascus 1950.)

But there is one very important rule which Ibn Taymiyya has brought out and which seems to us characteristic of primitive Ḥanbalism: nothing is to be regarded as imposing social obligations but the religious practices which God has explicitly prescribed; inversely, nothing can be lawfully forbidden but the practices which have been prohibited by God in the Kurān and the Sunna. This is the dual principle which Ibn Taymiyya resums in the formula: lawfh fī 'l-ṣibādāt wa-ṣāfīw fī 'l-mu'tamālāt, i.e. the most rigorous strictness in regard to religious obligations and a wide tolerance in all matters of usage (cf. Essai, 444). A wide liberty should therefore be left to both parties in drawing up the conditions of a contract, especially in regard to transactions, in which no stipulations can be nullified except those contrary to the formal interdiction in the Kurān and the Sunna of speculation (maysir) and usury (ribā). In the Kitāb al-Sunna (38), Ibn Ḥanbal, reacting against al-Muhāsibī, regards the free pursuit of an honest profit as an obligation of conscience and of usages which have been prohibited by God in the Kurān and the Sunna. This is the dual principle of the Ḥanbalis by which Ibn Ḥanbal and the Muhāsibīs are visited by pilgrims. His grandsons, Yaḥyā al-Wāṣilī al-Yamānī, Tarīkh al-Yaman, Cairo 1346, 338-43. (L. Massignon)

AHMAD B. İSĀ B. M. B. ʿALĪ B. AL-ʿARĪF B. DĀʾIR AR-ṢĀDIK (the great-grandson of 'Aṭī), called al-Muhādīrī "the Emigrant", saint and legendary ancestor of the Ḥadrami sayyids. He left Babṣr in 317/930 accompanied by Muhammad b. Sulaymān (alleged ancestor of the Banū Ahḍāl [q.v.]) and Sālim b. Abū Ṭālib (ancestor of Banū Kuḍām) who was forced to submit to Ṣaʿūdī Arabia by a protectorate agreement, negotiated by the Sanūsī leader Ahmad Sharīf [see İsrāʾīls].

The İsrāʾīliya order is at present strongly represented in former Italian Somaliland (Merca), in Djibuti, among the Banū Ṭāmir (Kaṭhmiyya) in Eritrea, and among the Gallas (where their missionary, Nūr Ḥusayn, enjoys great veneration). The İsrāʾīliya order maintains fraternal relations with the other congregations derived from the Khādirīya, particularly the Mirḥāniyya of the Sudan.


AHMAD B. İSĀ B. M. B. ʿALĪ B. AL-ʿARĪF B. DĀʾIR AR-ṢĀDIK, Moroccan sharif and mystic, a disciple of Abū al-ʿAzīz al-Dubbāh, the founder of the Khādirīyya order, himself founded a religious congregation, the İsrāʾīliya, in ʿAsīr, where in 1823, he initiated the founder of the Sanūsīyya [q.v.]. He died in Saʿūdī Arabia by a protectorate agreement, negotiated by the Sanūsī leader Ahmad Sharīf [see İsrāʾīls].

Ahmad b. İsā, ʿĀmīd al-Dīn, ancestor of the Ḥadrami family al-ʿAmdūl, see v. d. Berg, Hadramauw, 41, 85.
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By his bravery he gained the favour of the caliph al-Musta'īn, who, on his abdication in 251/866, chose to go into exile under the guard of Ahmad. The latter had no hand in the subsequent murder of al-Musta'īn, probably because his cooperation had not been invited. In 254/868 the caliph al-Mu'tazz gave Egypt as apanage to the Turkish general Bakkāb, who had married Tūlūn's widow. Ahmad was appointed as lieutenant of his father-in-law, and entered Fustat on 23 Ramaḍān 254/15 Sept. 868.

For the next four years Ahmad was engaged in seeking to obtain control of the administration from Ibn al-Mudabbir, the powerful and skilful intendant of finance, whose intolerable exactions, cunning and greed had earned the hatred of the Egyptians. The struggle was fought out mainly through the medium of their agents and relations at Sāmarrā', and ended with the removal of Ibn al-Mudabbir. After the murder of Bakkāb Egypt was given as apanage to Yārdūkh, who had married one of his daughters to Ibn Tūlūn; he confirmed Ahmad in his post as vice-governor, and invested him also with authority over Alexandria, Būrkā, and the frontier districts, which had hitherto lain outside his government. The revolt of Amādīr, governor of Palestine, gave Ahmad the opportunity to obtain the caliph's authorization to purchase a large number of slaves in order to subjugate the rebel. Although the task was subsequently confided to another, this intact army constituted the foundation of Ibn Tūlūn's power. For the first time, Egypt possessed a large military force which was independent of the caliphate. By liberal gifts, Ahmad gained the favour of the ʿAbbāsīd courtiers, and succeeded in obtaining the annulment of an order of recall issued by the caliph. It was at this time that Ibn Tūlūn, and not to Ibn al-Mudabbir's successor, that the caliph addressed his requests for the Egyptian contributions to the treasury. In order that he might have the personal use of them by keeping their sum a secret from his brother al-Muwaṭṭāl, he placed the financial administration of Egypt and the Syrian Marches under Ahmad. In 258/872, the caliph's son Djafer (later entitled al-Muwaffak) succeeded Yārdūkh as apanagist of Egypt; al-Muṭtamid had recognized his brother al-Muwaṭṭāl as heir to the throne after his own son and had divided the empire between the two heirs-presump-tive, al-Muwaṭṭāl receiving the eastern provinces as his apanage, and al-Muwaṭṭāl the western; a regent, the Turk Mūsā b. Būghā was appointed as coadjutor of the latter. In fact, al-Muwaṭṭāl exercised the supreme power. But while the caliphate was threatened in the east by attacks making a stand against Ibn Tūlūn, was threatened above all by the disorders in the administration and by the internal conflicts between the caliph and himself on the one hand, and the captains of the Turkish regiments on the other.

Such was the state of the caliphate at the moment selected by Ibn Tūlūn for his essay at independence, after gaining the financial control of his territories. On account of the long and costly campaigns against the Zindj which engaged the forces of al-Muwaṭṭāl, he, himself, the only man capable of making a stand against Ibn Tūlūn, was threatened above all by the disorders in the administration and by the internal conflicts between the caliph and himself on the one hand, and the captains of the Turkish regiments on the other.

Such was the state of the caliphate at the moment selected by Ibn Tūlūn for his essay at independence, after gaining the financial control of his territories. On account of the long and costly campaigns against the Zindj which engaged the forces of al-Muwaṭṭāl, he, himself, the only man capable of making a stand against Ibn Tūlūn, was threatened above all by the disorders in the administration and by the internal conflicts between the caliph and himself on the one hand, and the captains of the Turkish regiments on the other.
by Ibn Tulun’s forces led to the abandonment of the attempt. Ahmad was now encouraged to occupy Syria (655-1258), under the pretext of engaging in the holy war and of defending the frontiers in Asia Minor against the Byzantines. But he had to return to Egypt shortly after to deal with a revolt by his son ʿAbbās, whom he had appointed as his lieutenant in Egypt.

After the Syrian campaign, Ibn Tulun began to add his own name to those of the caliph and of Dīnār on his gold coinage. (It should be noted that Ibn Tulun always recognized the caliph and Muʿtamid himself, perhaps just because he was powerless.) In 357/968 Ahmad invited the caliph to take refuge with him, aiming by this means to concentrate the whole sovereign authority in Egypt and to gain the merit of being the saviour of the caliph, now a shadow. But the latter’s flight was intercepted, and al-Muwaffak nominated Ishak b. Kandjādī as governor of Egypt and Syria. Ahmad retaliated by proclaiming through an assembly of jurists which met at Damascus the forfeiture of al-Muwaffak’s succession to the throne. Al-Muwaffak thereupon compelled the caliph to have Ahmad cursed in the mosques, while Ahmad had the same measure applied to al-Muwaffak in the mosques of Egypt and Syria. But al-Muwaffak, though finally victorious in his war with the Zindj, sought to have the sultan who recognized him as the saviour of the state were no longer drained off to the metropolis; they were thus in spite of the heavy charges which were still laid upon their produce. He put an end to the exactions of the officers of the fiscal administration for their personal profit. The prosperity of Egypt under Ibn Tulun was due principally to the fact that the greater part of the revenues of the state were not longer drained off to the metropolis; they were thus employed to stimulate commerce and industry and to found, to the north of Fustāṭ, a new quarter, called al-Κaṭa‘, which was the seat of government under the Tulūnids and in which the great mosque built by Ibn Tulun was situated.

AHMAD AMIN, EGYPTIAN SCHOLAR AND WRITER, B. IN CAIRO 2 MUBARAM 1304/1 OCT. 1886, D. 30 RAMAṍḌĀN 1373/30 MAY 1954. After studying in al-Azhar and the School of the Gnostic Leaders he served as a magistrate in the Native Courts, and in 1926 was appointed to the staff of the Egyptian University (U. of Cairo), where from 1936-1946 he was professor of Arabic Literature. In 1947 he became Director of the Cultural Section of the Arab League. Ahmad Amin was one of the founders and most active members of the Lajmat al-la‘īl wa-l-talā‘ama wa-l-masāk (see U. Rizzitano, in OM, 1940, 31-3), for which he edited and produced (in collaboration) a number of classical Arabic texts and general works on literary history. As a scholar, his most important production was a book of Islamic civilization to the end of the 4th/10th century (three parts: Faḍr al-Ilm, 1st ed., Cairo 1928; Duhā’īl Ilm, 1st ed., Cairo 1933-6; Zuhar al-Ilm, Cairo 1945-53), notable as the first comprehensive attempt to introduce critical method into modern Muslim Arab historiography. From 1933 he collaborated in the weekly literary journal al-Risāla, and from 1939 edited a similar journal al-Ṭhabāṭa; his essays on literary, social and other topics in these journals were later collected and issued in book form (Faḍr al-Khāṣir, 8 vols., Cairo 1957 ff.). Of his many other works special mention should be made of his dictionary of Egyptian folklore (Khmus al-ʿĀdhāt wa-l-Tāḥādīd wa-l-Misyrīyya, Cairo 1953), and his autobiography Hayyāl (Cairo 1950).


AHMAD B. YŪSUF B. AL-ḴĀṢĪM B. ṢUBAYH, AND DIYĀR, SECRETARY TO AL-MAʾMūN. He belonged to a movement of secretaries and poets originating from the neighbourhood of al-Kūfa. His father, Yūsuf, was secretary to ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAll, then to Yaḥyā b. Dāwūd, and finally to Yaḥyā the Barmakid. It appears that Ahmad held a secretarial post in Irāk at the end of the caliphate of al-Maʾmūn. He was presented to al-Maʾmūn by his friend Ahmad b. Abl Ḥālid, and soon attracted notice by his eloquence. He became an intimate of al-Maʾmūn, and at a date impossible to determine accurately, was placed in charge of the dīnān al-sīr, (rather than the dīnān al-raṣūl), which was entrusted to ʿAmr b. Masʿūd. As private secretary to the caliph he occupied a position of such importance that some historians have styled him ‘vizier’, a title, however, which he does not appear to have held. He came into conflict with the future caliph al-Muṭaṣīm, and died, it seems, in Ramaḍān 213/Nov.-Dec. 828. Various letters, terse remarks, aphorisms and verses by which he achieved fame as a ‘secretary-poet’ are attributed to him.


AHMAD B. ZAYNĪ DAILĀN (See DAILĀN).
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to recognise the authority of the court of Marrakush and, two years later, the governor Maḥmūd Ṣārūn arrested him. He retained his freedom, and accused him of fomenting a revolt at Tinb ukūt against the new rulers. Taken in chains to Morocco with several of his compatriots, Ahmad Bābā was not long in regaining his liberty, but he was required to reside in Marrakush (1004/1596). He began to give instruction in ḥikb and ḥaddīth, and formulated legal opinions (jūṭāw). His renown soon spread throughout the Maghrib. At the death of Ahmad al-Mansūr in 1016/1607, his successor Mawlāy Zaydān allowed Ahmad and the other Sudanese exiles to return to Tinbukūt. It was no doubt at this time that he went on pilgrimage to Mecca, and returned to his native town where he died on 6 Ṣaḥābān 1036/22 April 1627.

Ahmad Bābā was the author of some 50 works on Mālikite law, grammar and other subjects. But his chief work is his supplement to the biographical dictionary of the faḥīs of the school of Mālik b. Anas, composed in the second half of the 14th century by Ibn Farḥūn [q.v.] and entitled al-Dībuydī al-Mudhahbān fi Maʿrifat Ayyān al-Majhīb, Ahmad Bābā gave his supplement the name of Nayl al-Ibīyīdī bi-Taṭrīs al-Dībuydī. He completed it at Marrakush in 1005/1596, and later issued an abridged version dealing only with those Mālikite faḥīs not represented in Ibn Farḥūn, called Kiṣyāyat al-Muḥāzadī li-Maʿrifat mā layya fi l-Dībuydī. The Nayl was lithographed at Fas in 1317 and printed at Cairo in 1329, in the margins of the Dībuydī.

Ahmad Bābā’s dictionary is one of the main sources for a bibliographical survey of the Maghrib up to the 16th century, and contains, apart from the Mālikite doctors, a certain amount of information on the great Moroccan saints (awliyā’). The extensive library which he built up in the Sudan has still not been entirely dispersed, and it was one of his own copies of which particular use was made in the publication of the materials relating to Spain in al-Rawd al-Miḥarrīb of Ibn ʿAbd al-Munīm al-Ḥimyārī (Lévi-Provençal, La Péninsule ibérique au Moyen Âge, Leiden, 1958 p. xii-xiii).

Bibliography: Lévi-Provençal, Chorfa, 250-5; idem, Arabica Occidentalia, iv, in Arabica, ii (1955), 89-96; Muhībīb, Khuldsat al-Āthār, i, 170 ff.; al-Īrānī, Nuhūt al-Ḥādīb, Fez, 81 ff.; idem, Sayāwī mun intāshar, Fez, 52 ff.; Kādirī, Nuzhat al-Mufāsālīn, Fez 1310, i, 151 ff.; Ahmad Nāṣirī, Iskāḥān, Cairo 1312, ii, 63; Saʿdī, Taʾwīh al-Sādān (Houdas, i, 35-6, 244; transl. 57-9, 379); M. Ben Chenab, Ijdāna, § 94; idem, in EID, i, 191 (with a complete list of the works of Ahmad Bābā); Brockelmann, II, 618, S II, 715-6. (E. Lévi Provençal)

AHMAD AL-BADAWĪ (in modern Egyptian Arabic al-Bedawi), with the kunya Abu ʿl-Fātīyān, is the most popular saint of the Muslims in Egypt and has been so for about 700 years. By the people he is often called simply Saʿyāwī; in a song in his honour (ed. Littmann) he has the title of sīkhī al-Marībī because of his name al-Badawi, and this name was given to him because he wore a veil like the bedouin of the Maghrib. As a Sūfī he was called al-buḥ, the pole.

Ahmad was probably born in Fez in 596/1199-1200, and he seems to have been the youngest of seven or eight children. His mother was called Fatima, his father ʿAll (al-Badri); the occupation of his father is not mentioned. His genealogy was traced up to ʿAll b. Aḥb Tālib. In his early youth Ahmad went with his family on a pilgrimage to Mecca where they arrived after four years' travelling. This is placed in the years 603-7/1206-11. In Mecca his father died. Ahmad is said to have distinguished himself in Mecca as a daring horseman, and he received there, according to tradition, the surnames al-ʿAṭṭābī, "the intrepid horseman", al-Ḥaḍībānī, "the furious, raging one". His name Abu ʿl-ʿAbbās may be a miswriting for Abu ʿl-Fātīyan; and the latter would have much the same meaning as al-ʿAṭṭābī. Other names that were given him later are al-Ṣāmnīt, "the silent" and Abū Farrāḍī, "liberator", namely of prisoners. About 627/1230 he allowed to have undergone an inner transformation. He read the Kurān according to all the seven readings and studied some Shāfi’ite law. He gave himself up to devotion and declined the offer of a marriage. He retired from men, became taciturn, made himself understood by signs. According to some authorities Ahmad was summoned in 633/1236 by three consecutive visions to visit ʿIrāk, and he went there in company with his eldest brother Ḥasan. They visited the tombs of the two great "poles" Ahmad al-Rūfīfī and ʿAbd al-Ḵādīr al-Dīlānī and of many other saints. In ʿIrāk he is said to have subdued the indomitable Fāṭima bint Ṣarrī, who had never yet surrendered to any man, and to have refused her offer to marry him. This incident has been turned into a highly romantic story in popular Arabic literature; it may go back to ancient Egyptian mythology. In 634/1236-7 Ahmad had another vision which told him to go to Ṭanṭā in Egypt. His brother Ḥasan returned from ʿIrāk to Mecca. In Ṭanṭā Ahmad entered on the last and most important period in his life. His mode of life is described as follows: He climbed in Ṭanṭā to the roof of a private house, stood there motionless and gazed up into the sun so that his eyes went red and sore and looked like fiery cinders. Sometimes he would maintain a prolonged silence, at other times he would indulge in continuous screaming. He went without food or drink for about forty days. (The forty days fast is also known from Christian saints. The standing on the roof is reminiscent of Symeon Stylites; and the followers and disciples of Ahmad: Shāṭḥiya or Aṣḥāb al-SAṯār, "the roof men", of the Christian "pillar saints", the followers of Symeon.) Those saints who were still worshipped at the time of Ahmad's arrival in Ṭanṭā (such as Ḥasan al-Iḫmānī, Sālim al-Maghribī and Wāḏīh al-Ḵamarī), found themselves eclipsed. His contemporary, the Mamlūk sultan al-Ẓāhir Baybars, is said to have worshipped him and to have kissed his feet. A boy called ʿAbd al-ʿĀl came to him when he was searching for a cure for his sore eyes, and this boy became afterwards his friend and his khalīfa (successor); the saint is therefore called Abū ʿAbd al-ʿĀl in popular literature. Ahmad died on 2 Rabī I 675/24 August 1276.

Ahmad al-Badawi is the author of (i) a prayer (ḥaḍīb); (ii) a collection of prayers (ṣalāḥāt), commented by ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Muṣṭafā al-ʿAydūrī under the title of Fath al-Rahmān; and (iii) a spiritual testament (waṣāyāt), containing admonitions of a rather general character.

Ahmad al-Badawi is a representative of the lower type of the dervishes, and his intellectual qualities seem to have been of small importance. After his death ʿAbd al-ʿĀl (d. 733/1332-3) became his khalīfa and built a mosque over his tomb. The veneration of Ahmad and the pilgrimage to Ṭanṭā were often disapproved by more highly educated scholars and other opponents of the sūfis. These
opponents were partly men who were averse to all sufism, partly politicians who objected to the sufis as people would not forsake their old customs. The rulers of the people. We hear twice of the murder of opponents were partly men who were averse to all sufism, partly politicians who objected to the sufis as people would not forsake their old customs. The rulers of the people. We hear twice of the murder of opponents were partly men who were averse to all sufism, partly politicians who objected to the sufis as people would not forsake their old customs. The rulers of the people. We hear twice of the murder of opponents were partly men who were averse to all sufism, partly politicians who objected to the sufis as people would not forsake their old customs. The rulers of the people. We hear twice of the murder of opponents were partly men who were averse to all sufism, partly politicians who objected to the sufis as people would not forsake their old customs. The rulers of the people. We hear twice of the murder of opponents were partly men who were averse to all sufism, partly politicians who objected to the sufis as people would not forsake their old customs. The rulers of the people. We hear twice of the murder of
in Algeria and to put an end to the illicit arms traffic, took care that the Porte should not interfere in Tunisian affairs. In 1846, Ahmad went to France and was warmly welcomed in Paris. As a reward for his stubborn resistance, he succeeded in obtaining from the Porte in a khātāt-i sherif which recognized him individually as an independant sovereign.

Ten miles from Tunis, on the banks of the Sebīla Sefjūmi, Ahmad built the Muhāmmadiyya palace, a huge mass of enormous buildings which were still incomplete at the end of his reign and which soon fell into ruins.

This extravagances, and the prodigality of the Bey’s favourites, the Geneoese Raffo, the minister of foreign affairs, and above all the Greek Muṣṭafā Khāznādār, minister of finance from 1837 to 1873, exhausted the Treasury. The farming of the tax on tobacco and increased taxation generally caused revolts in 1840 at Tunis and in the region of Kābis, and in 1842 at La Goulette. They were suppressed, but the Bey was unable to impose his will on the mountain tribes. Beneath an outwardly brilliant display, a love of ostentation coupled with chaotic administration set Tunisia on the road to decadence.

It must nevertheless be recognized that Ahmad, sincere in his desire to confer on his country western institutions, introduced some beneficial reforms. In 1837, he prohibited the sale of negroes, and emancipated his household slaves. In 1846 he formally abolished slavery throughout the Regency. He abrogated the laws discriminating against Jews. Finally, he promoted the development of education. The abbé Bourgade, in charge of the chapel of Saint Louis of Carthage, the construction of which a nursery school was attached, as well as a small printing press. The abbé later opened other schools and dispensaries. Various archaeological excavations were begun. French influence became dominant in Tunisia, as a result both of their educational activities and of the flourishing trade conducted by the merchants of Marseilles.

**Bibliography:**
- (G. Yver-M. Emerit)

**AHMAD BIDJĀN** [see BIDJAN AHMAD].

**SAYYID AHMAD BRĪLWI,** a militant religious reformer of Muslim India, was the son of Muhammād Irfān and the 36th direct descendant of Ḥasan, the son of All. He was born on 6 Safar 1201/28 Nov. 1786 at Bareilly (Brēlī), where he received his early education. He then went to Lucknow and after a few months’ stay there, he proceeded about 1235/ 1819 to Delhi, where he became a disciple and constant companion in his chequered career were Mawlawī Muḥammad Ismā’īl, the nephew of Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, Mawlawī ʿAbd al-Ḥāyy, the son-in-law of Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, and Mawlawī Muḥammad Yūsuf al-Phulhat, a descendant of Shāh Aḥl Allāh, the elder brother of Shāh Wali Allāh.

In 1236/1821, Sayyid Ahmad set out on a pilgrimage to Mecca, staying a few months at Calcutta on the way. On his return to India in 1239/1824, he began to make active preparations for a religious war. It is clear from his letters that the ultimate object of his reformist movement was to overthrow the rule of the British and the Sikhs and restore Muslim dominion in India. His first aim was to oust the Sikhs from the Pandjāb. Having enlisted the sympathy and promised aid of his co-religionists at Kābul and Kandahār, he started on his expedition in 1241/1826 with an army of enthusiastic followers, and reached Peshāwar via Ragāpātāna, Sind, Baluchistān and Afghanistan. He attacked and repulsed the Sikh army at Akora Khattak (20 Nov. 1826); but lost the battle of Saydo through the desertion of Yār Muḥammad Khān Durrānī and his brothers. Although he succeeded in occupying Peshāwar in 1830, he was discouraged by the treachery of the Durrānīs and other local khans, and decided to proceed to Kāshmir. On the way, however, he was encountered by the Sikhs in 1246/1831 at Bālākot where he was killed along with Shāh Muḥammad Iṣmā’īl and his army was dispersed. Nevertheless, the remnants of his army continued their struggle in the North-West Frontier Province for the cause for which their leader had laid down his life.

His numerous disciples continued his reformist movement in India, and were responsible for the production of a vast religious literature. In order to reach the masses, they adopted the Urdu language as their medium and were incidentally instrumental in promoting the growth of a simple, direct and vigorous style. His adherents preferred to engage themselves in commercial pursuits rather than seek service under the British government.

A few short epistles and pamphlets on religious topics are credited to Sayyid Ahmad. He is also said to have inspired the composition of Sīrāl Mustakīm, a work written in Persian by his two foremost disciples, Shāh Muḥammad Iṣmā’īl and Mawlawī ʿAbd al-Ḥāyy. Several collections of his letters (in Persian) also exist in manuscript.

**Bibliography:** Sayyid Ahmad Khān, *Āthr al-Ṣanādīd* (in Urdu, Delhi 1847); *Waṣāṣul Ahmād* also known as *Taʾwīls Kāhir*, consisting of reports made by a number of the close associates of Sayyid Ahmad, recorded in Urdu at Tonk, covering about 2,000 large folios, still in manu-
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(Sh. Inayatullah)

AHMAD DJĂLÂ’IR [see DJÂLâ’IR].

AHMAD-I DJÂM, “Ahmad of Djâm”, also Ahmâd-i Djâm, PERSIAN ʿSUFI in the Saljuq period, contemporary of al-Ghazâlî, Adîr b. Mūṣâfîr, Ayn al-ʿUqâd al-Hamâdînî, and Saṅârî, in full ʿSNÂRÂH AL-DIN ABû NÂRJ AHMâD B. L-HÂSAN B. AHMâD B. MUḤ. AL-NAṽâR AL-DJÂMÎ. He is also known by the nickname of ʿZaďâ al-Pîl, “Elephant-colossus”. He claimed descent from the Prophet's colossus”. He claimed descent from the Prophet's

This may well be the case here. The above-mentioned al-Kûsâwî is later said to have claimed to wear the same robe. Ahmad wrote the following works, all in Persian: Uns al-Ṭâbîn, Sirāḍî al-Sâʿîrîn (professedly written in 513/1120), Fūṭîh al-Kulûb (= Fūṭîh al-Râhî?), Râwâjî al-Muḥâbibîn, Bâhâr al-ʿUkâbî, Kûnnâ al-Ḥiḥmâ, Miṣrâf al-Nâdîrî—written in 523/1128. Of these only the first and last-named works have so far been recovered, although Mîrzâ Mâṣûm ʿAli Shâh (1901) had still read the second. The biographers' information on the dates of the first six writings (Ivanov, in JRAS, 1917, 303 f., 349-52) must be false in part, since all these works are listed in Miṣrâf al-Nâdîrî, and must be earlier than 522/1128, unless the list is an interpolation or the works mentioned were subsequently revised. There has been preserved further a Risâla-yi Samarkandîyya (also called Suwâl u-Djâsâbî), in reply to a question. Two or three other works listed by the biographers, together with the Fūṭîh al-Râhî, are said to have perished in Djâm in consequence of the Mongol invasion. Only the library (in Dihlî) of Firûzshâh, of the Tughlakid dynasty (752-90/1351-88), still possessed all Ahmad's works. The Miṣrâf al-Nâdîrî (MS Rûdî Fâṣâha 3009), mentioned in the I A, s.v. Camî, is probably not a work by Ahmâd.

On his conversion Ahmâd, as himself states, possessed no theological training, and what he later learned and published on this subject was professedly acquired by revelation. This is to be taken cum grano salis. Even his early dicta betray some theological knowledge and still more his writings, where he positively requires it. His views, or at least his formulations, are, however, not exempt from contradictions and inconsequences. His theology is firmly grounded on Kurâʿ and Sunna, and on the şarîʿa in the şûfî sense, and in it he shows himself a pronounced Sunni; he allows, for example, the masâḥ al-ḥâshiyya. Right action includes, however, also ḫududiya; unlawful conduct accompanied by ḫududiya is, according to him, better than lawful conduct without ḫududiya. His doctrine of the tarîba recognizes the purification of the soul through the stations ammârâ, lauwâstina, mulhâmsa, up to muṣâfîna, and aims to clarify the relation of the last stage to the heart (ḥub); Ahmâd defines the “soul at rest” (muṣâfîna) as the sheath in which the heart is fixed (gûlîʿ-e ḥub). The aim of mystical endeavours is according to him—to pick out only one of many expressions—to find the “spirit” (rûḥ, djân), the “real being” (ḥabîbat-i tu), to which only two ways lead: remembrance of God (ḥâdîr Allâḥ) and waiting (intîsâr) until God in His grace discloses this being to one. An assumption of God's qualities in concrete, as certain şûfîs have taught, is regarded by Ahmâd, in agreement with al-Sarrâjî, al-Kâlabâdhî, and al-Kûsâwî, as impossible, since this implies indwelling (buṭîl), and only effects (aṭhâr) of God's qualities, not these themselves, can inform the creature (incommensurability of the eternal and the temporal). True belief in lauhâd consists in Ahmâd's view of referring all action and event back to the one original cause, God (muḥaddârî—ṭâhir—ḥâdîr—aṭhâr). For the rest, conditions in mystical love are much the same as in ordinary love; no person can really become one with another. The representation which one may take on oneself from the Beloved is rapidly dissipated,
and one immediately returns to daily life. Should it reappear, so in reverse one loses again one's con-

Ahmad expresses the dignity and the spiritual power of şii life in poetic tones. He cites the case of Fuḍayl b. Ḥyāḍ who, when converted from highway robbery, returned their possessions to those whom he had robbed and when he had nothing more left, still brought gold from beneath his robe for a Jew, the earth having been turned into gold. One who is converted, he says in the same treatise (Miftāḥ al-Najḍ, which was written on the occasion of the conversion of one of his sons), him does the water praise over which he journeys; him do the stars praise and for him they pray. The ṣidq, ʿabdāl, ṣāḥid, is the sun, from whom all men derive their light. The şii should distil a dew of blessing around him, as musk and aloes distil their scent. True poverty (fakr) is, according to Ahmad, the elixir which has the faculty of colouring everything which comes into contact with it.

The picture of Ahmad's spiritual personality acquired from his prose writings and sayings is in contradiction with the Diwan which goes under his name, and which would make him out to be an ecstatic pantheist intoxicated with self-deification. As already remarked by Ivanow (JRAS, 1917, 295), and expressed in a private letter by H. Ritter, there is room for suspicion that the Diwan is at least partly a falsification, but the question still awaits fuller investigation. It is preserved in several MSS, not all of which are complete (list in Meier, Bibl., and has been lithographed (Cawnpore 1898, Lucknow 1923). Taḥkhalīṣ Ahmad and Ahmadī. A book of 'Poems' is also mentioned, however, by his biographers.

Bibliography: Biographies: (1) Raḍā al-Dīn ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm-ī Tāʿābādī, a contemporary of the skayḥ; it is not preserved, but was used by: (2) Saʿdīd al-Dīn Muhammad b. Mūsā al-Ghaznawī, also a contemporary and a disciple of the šaykh, Maḥmūd skayḥ al-ʿīlām . . . Ahmad b. ʿAbī l-ʿIṣārān al-Nāμākī thumm al-Dżāwī, composed ca. 600/1204, MS Nāfīdī Pasha, Istanbul, 399, 388-132v. It is almost worthless for Ahmad's real biography and thought, being full of miracu-

lous legends appealing to the primitive masses; al-Ghaznawi must have interpreted in a concrete sense certain poetical utterances of his master. It is, however, interesting for the typical forms of the şii legend and for certain historical circum-
stances, as well as geographical names, of eastern Persia. (3) Ahmad b. ʿTārakhistānī, a contem-

porary of the skayḥ, whose work is apparently not preserved, but was used, together with that of al-Ghaznawi, by: (4) Abū ʿI-l-Makārim b. ʿAlī al-ʿIṣārān džāwī, Khāṣṣāt al-Maḥbūbāt . . . Abū ʿAlī ʿIṣārān al-Nāμākī thumm al-Dżāwī, composed in 840/1436-7 and dedicated to Shahrukh, MS of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (Ivanow, Cat., i, no. 245), and two incomplete MSS in Russia, one of which was published by Ivanow, in JRAS, 1917, 291-365. (5) ʿAlī of “Būzdžan” (probably = Būzdžān), of 929/1523, probably depending of Abū ʿI-l-Makārim, was used by Khunakoff.—The articles in Diwān's Nāfīdī al-ʿUns (Calcutta 1859, 405-7) on Abū ʿI-l-Dżāwī and Abū ʿAbd al-ʿIṣārān džāwī, as well as certain other notices, are drawn from al-Ghaznawi.—See also Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (Defrémery-Sanguinetii), iii, 75 ff.; Mūsā Maḥbūb ʿAlī Shāh, Taʿrīkh al-Hādżah, Lith. Teheran 1316, 261.

Studies: N. de Khunakoff, Mémoire sur la partie méridionale de l'Asie centrale, Paris 1801, 116-9; Ch. Rieu, Cat. of the Persian MSS in the Br. Mus., ii, 351; H. Ethe, in G. lr. Ph., ii, 284; F. Ivanow, A Biography of Shaykh Ahmad-i ʿIsmāʿil, JRAS, 1917, 291-365; idem, Concise Descr. Cat. of the Persian MSS in the Coll. of the As. Soc. of Bengal, index; E. Diez, Chuvashische Baudenkämmer, i, Berlin 1918, 78-82; F. Meier, Zur Biographie Ahmad-i ʿIsmāʿils und zur Quellenkunde von ʿIsmāʿil's Nāfīdīh-ʿīn, ZDMG, 1943, 47-67. Further references in these studies.

AHMAD DJEWDET PASJA eminent Ottoman writer and statesman, born on 28 Dżumādā i, 1237/22 March 1822, at Lofča (Lovloc) in northern Bulgaria, of which his father, Hādżi ʿIsā Ḥaşiba, was a member of the administrative council, and where his earliest known ancestor, a native of Kiğaš in Crimea, (Kiğaš Külise), had settled after taking part in the campaign of the Pruth in 1711. Ahmed early displayed unusual aptitude and diligence, and in 1839, on reaching the age of seventeen, was sent to continue his education in a medrese at Istanbul. There, as well as following the traditional medrese courses, he not only studied modern mathematics, but devoted his spare time to learning Persian with the poet Sulejman Fehim and himself took to composing verse in the traditional style. It was from Fehim that he received the maḥfīlah Djewdet that he thenceforth added to his name.

After obtaining the igāzī that permitted him to enter the judicial profession, he received his first paid but nominal appointment at ûbdî in 1260/1844-5. When Muştafa Reshīd Pasha, on becoming Grand Vizier in 1846, applied to the office of the skayḥ al-ʿīlām for an open-minded ʿIsmāʿil to provide him with the knowledge of the šairā necessary for the proper drafting of the new kāmāns and nisām-nāmes he had it in mind to promulgate, it was Djewdet who was chosen. From this time to Reshīd Pasha's death thirteen years later Djewdet remained closely attached to him, even living in his house and becom-

ing his children's tutor. During this period he also became acquainted with ʿAlī and Fuʾād Pasjas, and under Reshīd's influence was persuaded to undertake political and administrative duties. In August 1850 he received his first appointment proper as Director of the recently founded ʿDīr al-Muʿallīmin, with membership, as its chief secretary, of the Medjīs-i Muʿārif.

During his directorship of the ʿDīr al-Muʿallīmin, which seems, however, to have come to an end in the following year, Djewdet achieved reforms in the admission, maintenance and examination of the students attending it; and as secretary of the Medjīs-i Muʿārif he wrote the report that led to the foundation in July 1852 of the Endijmen-i Dīnāşh, to which, after accompanying Fuʾād Pasha on a state visit to Egypt in March 1852, he devoted his attention, beginning his best known work, the Taʾrīkh-i Wāḥeṣ-i Dmvot-i ʿAlīyeh, of which he completed the first three volumes during the Crimean War, under its auspices. On his presenting these to ʿAbd al-Medjdī he received promotion to Sulejman Mānīyeh rank; in February 1855 he was appointed waṣaʿ-āmiṣ; in 1856 he was appointed molla of Galata; and in 1857 he attained Mecca rank in the judicial hierarchy. Meanwhile, during the war, he was made a member of a commission set up to compose a work on the prescriptions of the šairā regarding commercial transactions, which was dissolved, however, after publishing only a Kitāb al-Buyūṭ. In 1857 he was appointed to the Council
AHMAD DJEWDET PASHA

of the tanzimat, taking a lead in the composition of a new criminal bānān-nāme, and, as a president of the Arādi-yi Seniyye Komisyonu, participated in that of a bānān-nāme on tapu.

After the death of Rüşd Pasha in 1858 it was suggested to Djewdet by Āli and Fu'tād Pāças that he should abandon the learned profession in favour of the government service by accepting the wakāliq of Vidin. It was not for another eight years, however, that he took this step, although in the interval he was twice charged with important administrative missions as an “Extraordinary Commissioner”, the first in the autumn of 1861 to Iļışkodra, and the second (in company with a general commanding a division) in the summer of 1865 to Kozan in the Taurus region, to pacify those areas by the introduction of needed reforms. So successful was he in the first that he was sent in March 1863 as müfettis, with the judicial rank of hādi-asker of Anatolia, to Bosnia, where he was again markedly successful during the ensuing eighteen months in restoring order. During this period he was also made a member, first, of a commission appointed to reform the official newspaper Taksir-i Wakālā'ī, and secondly of the Medjlis-i Wāld. His abandonment of the learned profession took place in Jan. 1866, when he ceased to be vâkâ's-münet. His “learned” rank was then replaced by that of vizier, and he was appointed governor of the wilāyet of Aleppo, as reconstituted under the Ordinance of wilāyet. In Febr. 1868, however, he was recalled to the capital to become president of the Diwān-i Āhām-i ʿĀlīyye, one of the two bodies that then replaced the Medjlis-i Wāld, the other being the Shurā-yi Derbelt. It was chiefly owing to Djewdet’s efforts in this post that the Niğāmī courts were instituted; that this Diwān was in due course divided into a Court of Appeal (Temyis) and a Court of Cassation (Istīmād); and that the presidency was converted into a ministry. It was also during this his first term as a Minister of Justice that on the one hand Djewdet instituted law courses at the Ministry for the better instruction of judges and the improvement of judicial procedure, and, on the other, a beginning was made with the composition of a legal code (Medjelle [q.v.]) based on Hanafī fiqh, under the auspices of a society for the purpose. In securing approval for such a code (that is one based on Islamic prescriptions) Djewdet had the support of Fu'tād and Şeriwān and of Rüşd Pasha in opposition to Āli Pasha, who favoured rather the adoption of the French Code Civil.

Djewdet Pasha (as he now was) remained Minister of Justice up to the end of April 1870, by which time four volumes of the Medjelle had been published. Just as the fifth was completed, however, he was dismissed, and though appointed wālī of Brusa, was almost immediately relieved of that post also. He remained unemployed until August of the following year, when he was recalled to the presidency of the Medjelle society and of the tanzimet department of the Şurā-yi Derbelt. In the interval, as well as the fifth volume of the Medjelle, a sixth, in which Djewdet had had no hand, had been published. It was largely the deficiencies of this volume, which he at once superseded by a new version, that led to his recall; and from this date until the publication of the final volumes in 1877 he continued to supervise the composition of the code, though also otherwise employed in a variety of important offices, sometimes in the provinces. One of the chief of these was his assignment in April 1873 as Minister of Education, in which capacity he achieved a reform of the primary schools for boys (şeb-i mêhellerî); drew up curricula for the Rüşhüdiyye, and the still to be created İdâdiyye, schools—measures that necessitated the composition of new manuals of instruction, three of which he wrote himself; and reorganized the Dar al-Mu'allimin to meet the demands of these three educational grades. On 2 Nov. 1874, however, after the appointment as Grand Vizier of Hūseyen ʿAwnî Pasha, who was apparently already meditating the deposition of Sultan ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz, Djewdet was made wālī of Yanya (Jannina) in order to remove him, as a likely opponent of the move, from the capital; and it was not until June of the next year, after Hūseyen ʿAwnî’s fall, that he was restored to his former post. In Nov. 1875 he became for the second time Minister of Justice, and as such secured the transference to his Ministry of the commercial courts, which had till then depended on the Ministry of Commerce. But he incurred the displeasure of Mâmmûd Nîdîm Pasha, during the latter’s second Grand Vizierate, by opposing his grant of customs concessions to foreign capitalists; and after first being sent on a tour of inspection through Rumelia in March 1876, he was dismissed from the Ministry of Justice and was on the point of proceeding to Syria as wâlî, when on the fall of Mâmmûd Nîdîm he was for a third time made Minister of Education.

Djewdet played no part in the deposition of ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz, which occurred at the end of May, and in November, after the accession of ʿAbd al-Ḥamîd II, he returned to the Ministry of Justice. It was now that he and Midhat Pasha became permanently estranged, owing to what Midhat regarded as Djewdet’s reactionary attitude to the constitution, in the discussions upon which the latter began by taking part. Yet throughout his Grand Vizierate Midhat maintained Djewdet in office; and it was only on Midhat’s disgrace and replacement by Sâkîzîzd Edhem Pasha that Djewdet left it for newly created Ministry of the Interior. In this he remained near the end of the war of 1877 with Russia, after the involvement of the Porte in which he disapproved, when after a short term as Minister of the Imperial Ewâlî, he was for a second time appointed wâlî of Syria.

He remained in Syria nine months, during which, having special knowledge of the area, he suppressed another revolt at Kozan. In December of the same year he was replaced by Midhat and recalled to the capital to preside over yet another ministry, that of Commerce. On the dismissal of the Grand Vizier Khayr al-Dîn Pasha in Oct. 1879 Djewdet acted for ten days as President of the Council of Ministers, and on the appointment of Kûlûk Saʿîd Pasha he was for a fourth time made Minister of Justice. This was, so far, his longest term in that position, lasting three years. It was during that which Midhat was put on trial. Djewdet appears already to have denounced him as treacherously pro-Christian, and went out of his way, as ex-officio head of the body appointed to arrest Midhat and bring him to the capital, himself to travel for the purpose to Smyrna.

His fourth tenure of the Ministry of Justice came to an end in Nov. 1882, on the appointment of Aşmed Wefîk Pasha as Grand Vizier; and it was only in June 1886 that he was given office again, for the last time, in the same post. He held it on this occasion for four years, during which he also became one of the three members of the special conclaves.
convened by 'Abd al-Hamid for the discussion of political problems, and presided over a commission set up to compose a firman embodying various modifications in the regulations for the government of Crete, introduced after the suppression of the rebellion of 1828. In May 1890 he resigned, owing to differences with the Grand Vizier Kâmil Paşa; and thereafter played no further part in public affairs. During the last thirteen years of his life, nine of which were spent in retirement, he devoted most of his attention to literary work of various kinds, including the last volumes of the Ta'rikh. He died on 25 May 1895 after a short illness at his yâllı at Bebek.

Djewdet Pasha, both in his conduct and in his works, exhibited a curious mixture of the progressive and the conservative. While he consistently advocated the greater enlightenment of Ottoman society and fiercely condemned any manifestation of ignorance, bigotry and self-seeking in the ruling class and the erroneous beliefs prevalent among the people, his outlook was fundamentally shaped by his early medrese education. Whereas in the writings of his earlier years he criticizes the shortcomings of his contemporaries in a hopeful tone, those of his declining age exhibit a disillusionment with the lanzimât, about which his language is often bitter. It would appear that this change of attitude was due at least in part to his quarrel with Midhat, who antagonized him in particular by mocking Djewdet's imperfect command of French and consequent mispronunciation of European thought. Thenceforth he would seem to have been more or less forced by events, and above all by the unhandsome part he played in connection with Midhat's trial, into a reactionary attitude, which harmonized all too well with the prevailing spirit of the Hamidian regime.

Of Djewdet Pasha's numerous works the most important are historical. Apart from his Kisaâ-i Enbiyâ va-Tawârettî Khulefâ, an educational compilation in 12 vols. (starting with Adam and ending with the sultan Murâd II), he composed towards the end of his life, and Kifîm va-Kawdî Kârib ta'rikhesi (largely based on the Gulbûn-ı Khânân of Hallim Giray), three deserve particular mention. These are (i) his Ta'rikh, commonly called Ta'rikh-i Djewdet, also in 12 vols., covering the period between 1774 and 1826 (from the Treaty of Küçük Kaynardja to the abolition of the Janissaries). Thirty years elapsed between his beginning and finishing it, during which his outlook altered with the great contemporary changes that took place in Ottoman life. This is exemplified in particular by his adoption from vol. 6 onwards of a simpler, less traditional style. In most of the various editions brought out since the composition of the work progressed, while making corrections and additions, he followed his original plan. But in the final edition (telif-i gjedî), completed between 1853 and 1851-2, the whole was more radically altered, so that it, for instance, the original vol. 1 figures wholly as an introduction. (ii) The Ta'rîkh-i Usâyen, a collection of memoranda made by him on contemporary events as wâka-nâwi and for the most part handed over by him to his successor Lutfî. Only four of those so handed over have survived. They have been published in OTEM, nos. 44-7 and in the Yeni Medjmûa, ii, 454. The memoranda he retained are preserved in manuscript in the Sehir ve İnkâlîp Muzeesi at Istanbul, but the form of his daughter Fatma 'Aliyye Khanîm's Djewdet Paşa ve-Zamanî. (iii) His Mat'âlardî, a long series of observations submitted to 'Abd al-Hamid at the sultan's request on the events of the period 1839 to 1876, in 5 parts, the 2nd, 3rd and 4th of which have been published in OTEM, nos. 78-80, 82, 85, 87-9, 91-3. Part 5 appears to be lost. Part 5 deals with the fate of 'Abd al-Âzîz.

Djewdet's purely literary works date from his medrese days and are of little interest. Most of the poems that he collected at 'Abd al-Hamid's request into a Divânî were composed at this early period. Of more consequence were his Turkish grammars: the Kawûdî-î 'Hâfîîniyye (the first version of which he wrote in collaboration with Fu'âd Paşa in 1850); an introduction to the same work for primary schoolboys called Medhkûl-î Kawûdî; and a much simplified version of the first called Kawûdî-î Turîkîye (1292/1875). Other works are the Belâgâtî-î 'Hâfîîniyye, a manual on eloquence composed for his students at the Law School; the Ta'rikh-î Edavî (1897-1870-1), in which the question of calendar reform was first raised; and his completion of Pîr-zâde Mehmed Sâ'b's Turkish translation of the Mukadvisa of Ibn Khaldûn, by which Djewdet's own historical writing was much influenced. The publication from 1862-3 of the collection of hânûns called Dûstûr was also due to Djewdet's initiative; and, as has been indicated above, he took the lead in the composition of the Medjlîlî-î Âhâmî-î 'Hâfîîniyye.

Bibliography: IA, s.v. Cevdet Paşa (by Ali Olmezolu); Ebûlîlûla Mardin, Medenî Hukuk Cephesinden Ahmet Cevdet Paşa, İstanbul Univer- sitesi Hukuk Fakûltesi Memcmaüsi, 1947; Mahmut Cevat, Maarif Ümmiyye Nesaretî Ta'rikhesi Teşkilâtî ve İcra- tiç, i, 47, 52, 128, 136-9, 149, 163-72; Osman Ergin, Türkiye Maarif Tarîhi, 316, 317, 319, 370-1, 390-1; Ibnülmuhâmed Kemal İnan, Son Asîr Türk Şairleri, 236-40; idem. Osmanlı Dervîne San Sadrasamlar, 345, 355, 387; I. H. Uzunçarşılı, Midhat ve Rüştü Pasalarının Ta'rikhei- denin darî Vestekler, index; M. Z. Pâkâlîn, Son Sadrasamlar ve Başvekiller, i, ii, index; Divriği Zaydân, Ta'rikhim Müzahîhir al-Sharîk, ii, 190 f. (H. Bowen)

AHMAD FâRîS AL-SHIDYÂK [see FâRîS AL- SHIDYÂK]

AHMAD GHLÂM KHÂLÎL [see GHLÂM KHÂLÎL]

AHMAD GRÎN b. İRâHÎM, leader of the Muslim conquest of Abyssinia, whence he was called sâhib al-fath and al- qâdî. The Amharans nicknamed him Grîn 'the left-handed'. According to tradition he was of Somali origin. Born (c. 1506) in the Hābat district of the state of Adal he attached himself to al-Djâdî Abûn, leader of the militant party opposed to the pacific policy of the Walashma rulers towards Abyssinia. On Abûn's death Ahmad became leader of the opposition, defeated and killed Sultan Abî Bakr b. Muhammad, and assumed the title of imâm. His refusal to pay tribute to the Negus Lebna Dengel precipitated the war. After defeating the governor of Bâli he welded his Somali and 'Afar troops into a powerful striking force, won a decisive victory over the Abyssinians at Shemberâ Kurî (1529) and within two years had gained control of Shoa. Six more years of remarkable campaigns sufficed for him to conquer most of Abyssinia. But he was unable to consolidate his successes. The centrifugal forces working within his army of nomads and the setback given by the early successes of the Portuguese campaign which had arrived in 1542 after Lebna Dengel's death, led him to send to the Paşa of Zâbdî for disciplined musketeers.
With their aid he defeated the Portuguese, but then sent away his mercenaries. The new Emperor Galawdewos, joining up with the Portuguese remnant, took the offensive and won a decisive victory at Zantera in 1540/1543, when Ahmad's death in battle brought about the complete collapse of the nomad invasion.


J. S. Trimmingham

Ahmad Hijmet (1870-1927), Turkish novelist and journalist, was surnamed Müfti-Zade, his ancestors having long served as Müftis in the Peloponnesian. Born in Istanbul on 3 June 1870, he began his career as a writer while still a pupil at the Galatasaray lycée. He entered the Foreign service after leaving school (1889) and held several consular and vice-consular appointments, until 1896, when he was transferred to the Foreign Office. He crowned a distinguished career by becoming director-general of the Consular department (1926). At the same time he had been teaching literature at his old school and, from 1910 onward, at the Dâr al-Funun. For a time he acted at Ankara as head of the cultural section of the Türk Ocakları.

He wrote for İhdam and Therwet-i Funun, but did not conform to the prevailing literary fashion: his style and themes were Turkish and he was a pioneer of the language reform movement. A volume of his stories was published under the title of Khârisîyân av-Geîslân (Istanbul 1317/1899-1900); German translations of three of these, by Fr. Schrader, were published as Türkische Frauen in vol. vii of Jacob's Türkische Bibliothek, Berlin 1907. Some of his later writings appeared as a volume entitled Câhlâyânur, Istanbul 1922. His subtle humour is best exhibited in his monologues, a genre which he introduced into Turkish literature. He died at Istanbul on 20 May 1927.

Bibliography: Schrader’s introduction to his translation (see above); Türk Yurdu, 1927, no. 30; IA, s.v. (by A. H. Tamphar); F. Tevetoglu, Büyûk Türkü Müftüoğlu Ahmed Hijmet, Ankara 1951, critically reviewed by H. Dizdaroglu in Türk Dili, 1952, 429-31.

F. Giese-G. L. Lewis

Ahmad Ihsan, Turkish author and translator, was born in Erzurum on 24 Dhul-Hijjah 1285/7 April 1869. Passing out of the school of administration (Mülkiye) at the age of 17, he was appointed interpreter to the Commander-in-Chief of the artillery, but soon abandoned this post, despite strong family opposition, to become a journalist. At the age of 18 he founded a shortlived fortnightly, Umurân, and at the same time embarked on his career as a translator of French novels, including many of the works of Jules Verne and Alphonse Daudet. While working as a translator on the staff of Therwet, a Constantinople evening newspaper, he conceived the idea of publishing a weekly illustrated magazine. He persuaded his Greek employer to let him bring out a scientific supplement to the paper, under the title of Therwet-i Fünûn. This new review for the most part fought shy of politics. Realizing the potentialities of an illustrated magazine as a propaganda weapon, the authorities at first gave it every assistance, including financial subsidies, but this support was soon transferred to another illustrated paper, Baba Tahir’s Mûsawwar Ma’tûmât. Therwet-i Fünûn continued to devote itself to making known and imitating the intellectual life of the west, especially of France. Almost all the young literary men of the time wrote for it: Ekrem Bey, Khalil Dîvâz (Ziya), Ahmad Râsim and Nabi-zade Na‘im were among the regular contributors and in 1896 Tewfik Fikret was given full editorial control. But in 1901 he quarrelled with Ihsan and resigned; their estrangement lasted till 1907. In 1901 a worse disaster befell: the sultan’s anger was roused against the paper because of a translation by Huseyin Dîhâh of a French article, some sentences in which touched on the French Revolution and were held to be seditious. Therwet-i Fünûn was closed down for some weeks but then reappeared, thanks to the influence of Mehmed 4Arif, a member of the Palace staff who had been at school with Ihsan. But all the writers who had worked for the paper severed their connection with it, and although Ihsan continued to publish it the old enthusiasm was gone.

Ihsan’s original literary production was not outstanding. An account of his travels in Europe was published in 1894, and under the title of Mülûbat Hâltralar, Istanbul 1930-1.

Late in life he became a member of the Grand National Assembly and died in 1942.


K. Süßheim-G. L. Lewis

Ahmad Khân, educational reformer and founder of Islamic modernism in India (1817-98). Ahmad Khân (often called after his two titles of honour Sir Sayyid) sprang from an ancient Muslim family of high nobility. His forefathers came from Persia and Afghanistan, settled down in India about the reign of Shah Jahan (1628-66), and became closely connected with the Mughal Court. He was born on 6 Dhul-Hijjah 1232/17 Oct. 1817 at Delhi. His mother, a sensible woman, gave him a good education, but the schooling he had was no more than that taught in a maktab. On the death of his father Mir Muttaki in 1838, the emoluments from fictitious posts at the Court stopped, and Ahmad Khân had to seek his livelihood. He entered the service of the East India Company and had to content himself with a minor clerical appointment in the court of justice at Delhi. Soon, however, his industry and sense of duty were rewarded with promotion to the rank of munsif (sub-judge).

To his first literary products belong half a dozen religious treatises, mainly in defence of Sunni belief. More important are the historical and archeological studies he published in this period. The best known of them is the work on the old buildings and monuments in Delhi and its environs Âbdâr al-Sânâdîd (1847). Its translation into French by Garçin de Tassy in 1861 won him fame. Three years later on he was elected an honorary Fellow of the Royal Asiatic Society of London.

A second decisive change of his life and outlook was effected by the Indian Revolution, known as
the Mutiny (1857). The unhappy outcome of it, especially for the Indian Muslims, decided him to work for the future of his compatriots; in the first place by earnest attempts at reconciliation between the British and the Indian Muslims, who, rather than the Hindus, were considered to have been the actual rebels. Ahmad Khan, who himself had proved his loyalty to his government by saving the European colony in Bijnawr through personal intercession, wrote two treatises to calm the resulting passions, viz. ʿAbd Bāqī Bahārāwī Hind, 1858, and Loyal Muhammadans of India, 1860-1. He put the blame on both sides, and in his opinion the Mutiny was caused by the Indian people's misunderstanding of English rule as well as by the government's ignorance of the conditions of the ruled.

Keeping aloof from political agitation he sought the uplift of his nation with spiritual means derived from 19th century European mode of life. On a visit to England (1869-70), he had been much impressed by the standard of civilization of the ordinary Englishman. Back in India he started a periodical Tahdhib al-Ākhlah with the object of educating the public by removing prejudices. His next and still more admirable achievement was the establishment of a Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College at Aligarh (q.v.) 1878, modelled after Oxford and Cambridge (later to become a university). Thirdly he instituted The Muhammadan Educational Conference (1886), which held annual meetings in various cities and afforded opportunities for exchange of thought and propagation of reforming ideas.

Ahmad Khan perceived that in the process of westernization religious ideas needed to be reconsidered. In a speech at Lucknow: "To-day we are, as before (i.e. when Islam came into close contact with the Greek world of ideas), in need of a modern ʿilm al-kalām, by which we should either refute the doctrines of the modern sciences or undermine their foundations, or show that they are in conformity with the articles of Islamic faith". The last way of approach, however, gained so much the upperhand in his own re-interpretation of Islam that it was felt to injure the specific character of religion, in spite of his sincere intentions to counter secularism. The axiom of his theology was the adage: "The Work of God (Nature and its fixed laws) is identical with the Word of God (Kūrān)".

A violent reaction was provoked in the camp of the ʿulamāʿ, who heaped abuse on him as a Nizārī (Urduized form of Naturist), and fiercely attacked his demythologizing of the Kūrān and his teaching about the ḍuʿāʾ (the effect of it would be merely psychological, i.e. of setting the mind at rest, and not "real!", in the sense of exerting any influence on the divine decrees), but in the end his tenacity and disinterested work for the welfare of his people overpowered the opposition. About the eighties he became the acknowledged leader of his community. This found expression, when in 1887 he advised the Muslims not to join the National Congress and the Muslim League, to whom he promised pay and rewards; he took the honorific laḥab of al-Mansūr, "the victorious."

The new sovereign acceded to the throne under the most favorable auspices. From all sides, felicitation poured in, from the Grand Turk, the pāša of Algiers, even from Spain and France. Nevertheless he had to overcome many difficulties at home; these he faced with skill and energy, reinforced by the considerable sums which he realized by the ransom of the prisoners of Wādī ʿl-Makhzūn. With this money he engaged, in the customary manner of Islamic rulers, a reliable bodyguard commanded by morisco officers and organized in the Turkish fashion, and built fortifications in Tāzā, Fez and the kasbah of Marrākūsh. At the same time, he Turkicised to a certain degree his court and administration (māḥāz [q.v.]), as well as his military cadres, under the command of bāys and pagāsā. He also had to repress various troubles stirred up by the Arab tribes and to overcome the opposition of some members of his family who rose against him. But in general, Ahmad's reign, which lasted for a quarter of a century, was peaceful and allowed Morocco, at last, to enjoy for a time a relative tranquillity.

It was in foreign affairs that Ahmad al-Mansūr showed real diplomatic talent. We have ample materials at our disposal for estimating his abilities in the incomparable collection of documents made by H. de Castries in his Sources inédites de l'Histoire du Maroc. First of all, the sultan had to give some
pleads to the Porte, without completely yielding to its demands; then he had to negotiate with Philip II of Spain, and he did this in such a way that Spain achieved no positive results. On the contrary, the practically-minded sultan encouraged the development of smuggling, or even piracy. In 1585 a "Barbary Company" was founded by British merchants in order to monopolize the external trade of Morocco. After the destruction of the Armada in 1588, Ahmad al-Mansur gave up the friendship with Spain and entered into relations with Queen Elizabeth.

To Ahmad's credit stands also the conquest of the Sūdān, which, though it was ephemeral, gained for this ruler, greedy for riches, a considerable booty in gold and procured him his second surname of al-Dhahabi, "the golden". It was prepared by reconnoitring and the conquest of the oases of Touat (Touat) and Tigzagrin in 990/1581, and was decided upon by the advice of al-Mansur's Morisco general staff. It is related in detail by all the historians of the Saʿdīid dynasty and by three Sudanese chronicles. The expedition, commanded by the pasha Djawdhar, left Marrakesh in the autumn of 999/1590 and reached, not without difficulties, the Niger three months later. The Sudanese aṣḥīa of Gaṭ, Iṣbāk, after a battle near that town, had to seek for peace and shortly afterwards the Moroccan troops entered Timbuktū (q.v.). After the pasha Djawdhar had been replaced in his command by another morisco officer, Maḥmūd Zarḫūn, the conquest of the whole country was continued, while the most important fakhs of Timbuktū, amongst them Ahmad Bābā (q.v.), were deported to Marrakesh. Thereafter, for some years, there was an incessant afflux of gold and captives to the Saʿdīid capital.

Ahmad al-Mansūr, who hardly left Marrakesh during the whole of his reign, wanted to build there a residence worthy of himself: the palace called al-Kaṣr al-Badhī, the construction of which was begun soon after his accession and lasted for about twenty years. This sumptuous mansion was later mutilated by the sultan Mawlay Ismail. At the same time, the Moroccan ruler made a point of assembling a literary court, in which shone various writers, especially the secretary of the chancery, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Fīṭrī (q.v.), author of a panegyrical chronicle, Māhdbī al-Sūṭī (q.v.).

The last years of Ahmad's reign were troubled by the intrigues of his sons to obtain the succession, and by an epidemic of cholera which began, from 1007/1598 onwards, to decimate the population of the capital. Deserting Marrakesh to escape the scourge, the sultan went to the north of the country and, after his arrival at Fez he died there on 12 Rabiʿ I 102/20 August 1603. His body was transferred to Marrakesh and buried in the sumptuous mausoleum which he had built for himself and his family and which still exists.


(A. Lévi-Provençal)

AHMAD MIDHAT, Ottoman Turkish writer, was born in Istanbul in 1260/1844, the son of a poor draper called Sulaymān Aghā and a Circassian mother. He lost his father in early childhood, and was for a while apprenticed to a shopkeeper. When he was 10 old the family moved to Vidin, where his half-brother Ḥāfīz Aghā was the mūḍir of a kadī. Ḥāfīz, however, fell into disgrace, and in 1859 Ahmad returned to Istanbul, where he began his schooling. In 1277/1861 Ḥāfīz Aghā, having won the favour of Midhāt Paşa, was reinstated and given an appointment in Nish, to which he brought the family. Ahmad entered the Rüşdiyye school there, and graduated in 1280/1863. In 1281/1864, when Midhāt Paşa took over the newly constituted wīlāyet of Tuna, the family followed him to its capital, Rusçuk, where Ahmad was apprenticed as a clerk in the provincial chancery (wīlāyet mutasaddīb ḥālem). While working, he continued his studies privately, and also studied French and western knowledge under the guidance of a Christian colleague. He won the favour of Midhāt Paşa, who gave him his own name, and, after appointing him to various offices, made him, at the age of 24 or 25, editor-in-chief of the wīlāyet newspaper Tuna. In 1285/1868, when Midhāt Paşa became wāli of Baghdad, Ahmad Midhat followed him there, taking charge of the government printing-press and newspaper (Zawra). During his stay in Baghdad he continued his private studies, and began to write school-books and stories. In 1288/1871 his brother Ḥāfīz, who had meanwhile become mutasaddī of Baṣra, died, and Ahmad returned with the whole family to Istanbul. Abandoning the state service, he devoted himself entirely to writing and printing. For several years he contributed articles to various papers, and also ran a printing-press where he himself printed and published his numerous books. His journalistic activities brought him into an apparently fortuitous association with the Young Ottomans, and in 1289/1872 he was arrested and summarily exiled to Rhodes, together with Abūʾ-Disa Tewfīq. There he wrote a number of books, some of which were published in Istanbul under a pseudonym. In 1293/1876, after the deposition of Sultan ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, he was pardoned, and returned to Istanbul, where he resumed his activities as a writer and printer. His cautious attitude during the following months won him the good will of Sultan ʿAbd al-Hamīd, and in 1294/1877, after publishing the Uṣūl-i ʿInkbī (an historical justification of ʿAbd al-Hamīd's accession), he was promoted to the direction of the official gazette and printing-press. This led to a permanent breach with the Young Ottomans. During the reign of ʿAbd al-Hamīd he held various state offices, and from 1295/1878 onwards edited the Tergûmān-i Ḥāfīz, a periodical of some importance in the intellectual history of that time. In the summer of 1888 he went as official Ottoman representative to the International Congress of Orientalists in Stockholm, and spent some 3½ months in Europe. (This trip is described in his Aurupada bir Dizelân, Istanbul 1307/1889.)

In 1908, after the Young Turk revolution, he was retired from his official positions under the age-limit, and was subjected to vigorous attacks. He attempted to resume the literary work which he had long since sacrificed to his official career, but abandoned the attempt in the face of hostile opinion and altered tastes. For a few years he held teaching posts at the University, the Female Teachers' Training College, and the School for Preachers. He died in Muharram 1331/Dec. 1912-Jan. 1913.

Besides playing an important role in the development of Turkish journalism in the 19th century,
Ahmed Midhat also wrote an enormous number of books, estimated at about 150. These fall into two main groups, fiction and popularised knowledge. His novels and short stories, many of them first published as serials in periodicals, were widely read among the generation of Turks that grew up under the tanzimat, and played no small part in developing new tastes and interests among a public still entirely unacquainted with western literary forms and aspirations. His novels were in every sense popular, simple in both style and sentiment, intended to entertain and sometimes also to instruct a reader of unsophisticated and unliterary tastes. Some are romances of adventure, others deal with his own and the immediately preceding periods, and at times manage to achieve a certain liveliness and realism. Ahmed Midhat was much influenced by the French popular novelists, and also translated a number of their works. Apart from fiction he wrote or adapted a considerable number of popular and semi-popular works on history, philosophy, religion, ethics, science, and other subjects, the purpose of which was to bring modern European knowledge to his compatriots in a simple and attractive form. The most important of his historical works are Usul-i İnjihat (2 vols., 1294/1877-8), already cited, and Zewadi al-İlahb (1300/1883). He also wrote a universal history in 3 volumes (1303-5/1880-2), and a series of separate histories of European countries (Kâmi, 14 vols, 1292-1303/1871-81).

Bibliography: IA, s.v. (by Sabri Esat Siya-vgil), on which much of the foregoing is based. Further Turkish publications are cited there. A contemporary judgment on the work by M. Hartmann, Une Yesiktiche Briefe aus der Türkei, Leipzig 1910, 70, 208; J. Östrup, Erindringer, Copenhagen 1937, 47-44.

AHMAD B. KHALID B. HAMMAD AL-NAŞIRI AL-SALAWI, Abü'Abbâs Shâhâb al-Dîn, Moroccan historian, born at Salé (Salâ) 22 Dhul-Hijja 1293/12 April 1835, died in the same town 16 Djamâ- dá 1 1315/13 Oct. 1897. The genealogy of this writer descends in a direct line from the founder of the Moroccan brotherhood of the Nâşiriyya, Ahmad b. Nâşir, who was buried at his zâwiya at Tâmgrot in the valley of Wâdi Dar'a (Darâ). He pursued his studies at Salé, and, without neglecting his religious and juridical studies, delved deeply into Arabic prose literature. At the age of about 40, Ahmad al-Nâşir entered the judicial branch of the Sharîf administration as a notary or as a steward of State lands. Intermittently, he held relatively important posts. He lived first at Dâr al-Bayâd (Casablanca), from 1292-3/1875-6, and had two periods of residence at Marrâkush, where he was employed in the Steward's department of the royal household. Later, he lived for a time at al-Dîdâtâ (Mazagan), as a customs official. He then stayed successively at Tangier and Fes, and, at the end of his life, returned to his native town, where he devoted himself to teaching. At his death, he was buried in the cemetery at Salé situated outside the gate known as Bâb Ma'allâka. In short, al-Nâşir was a minor official under the Sharîfs, and at the same time a man of letters and a historian. Apart from his historical writing, which gained him a name even outside Morocco, he left several works which without doubt would have sufficed to draw attention to him and to assure him an honourable place among contemporary Maghribi men of letters. These are, in addition to six short works (Chorfa, p. 353 n. 1); i) a commentary on the Shâmak-şâkhîyya, a poem by Ibn al-Wannân, which he called Zahr al-Âdân min Ithâbik Ibn al-Wannân (lithographed at Fâs in 1314/1896); ii) a survey of the schisms and heresies of Islam, entitled Ta'žîm al-Minna bi-Nusrat al-Sumna (Ms. Rabat; cf. Catalogue, i, 23); iii) a monograph on the alleged sharîfi house of the Nâşiriyya, to which he himself belonged, entitled Ta'âl al-Mushtari fi'l-Nasa'î al-Dîsîrî (lithographed at Fâs; French summary by M. Bodin, La Zoïa de Tamagrt, Archives Berberes, 1918). This work, which the author completed in 1300/1881, is an excellent history of the zâwiya of Tâmgrot, containing a great deal of interesting information which compensates for the lengthy arguments by which the author seeks to demonstrate the authenticity of the family's genealogy.

The major work of Ahmad al-Nâşirî is the Kûdâb al-Istikâşâ il-Âdâbâr Duwal al-Maghrib al-Âzîz. Its publication was an unprecedented event in Moroccan historiography. The author produced, not a chronicle of limited scope, but a general history of his country, printed, moreover, in the Orient. Hailed, ever since its appearance, by the orientalists of Europe, this work speedily attracted the attention of the North African historians, who frequently had recourse to it in the course of their studies—the more so when a French translation, in the Archives Marocaines, rendered the last part of the work, containing the history of the ‘Alid dynasty, available even to non-Arabists. It was quickly realised that this chronicle was akin to other productions of western Arab historiography; it was no more than a compilation, the main virtue of which was to have combined in a connected narrative the fragments of political history scattered throughout the chronicles and the biographical anthologies previously produced in the country. But it must be recognized that al-Nâşirî was the first of his countrymen to deal exhaustively with a subject which his predecessors had treated only in part. This, however, was not his original aim. Elsewhere (Chorfa, 357-60) it has been explained that the starting-point for the compilation of the Kûdâb al-Istikâşâ was a work of considerable length on the Marinid dynasty of Morocco, composed mainly with the aid of the historical works of Ibn Abî Zarî and Ibn Khaldûn, and entitled Kâfi al-Arin fi Luyâh Bani Marîn. His successive transfers from one capital of Morocco to another enabled him to extend his knowledge of the sources for the history of other Moroccan dynasties, and he conceived the idea of writing a full history of Morocco. He completed his work on 15 Djamâdâ II 1298/15 May 1881, and dedicated it to the reigning prince Sultan Mâwlây al-Hasan, but received no reward for his action. On the death of this ruler, the author decided to have his history printed at Cairo, after bringing it down to the accession of Sultan Mâwlây ‘Abd al-Azîz, and the Istikâşâ duly appeared at Cairo in four volumes in 1312/1894.

For an analysis of the Arabic historical sources of al-Nâşirî, and for a list of the works from which he adapted or quoted verbatim numerous passages, the work previously cited should be consulted. It is
AHMAD AL-NASIRI — AHMAD PASHA BONNEVAL

sufficient to say here that, apart from documenting his work from the Arabic sources, he was the first Moroccan chronicler to call on European sources which, however, only became known to him by chance. These were the history of Mazagan under Portuguese domination, entitled Memorias para historia de praza de Mazago, by Luis Maria do Conto de Albuquerque de Cunha, Lisbon 1684, and Description historia de Marruecos y breve resena de sus dinastias, by Manuel P. Castellanos, Santiago 1878; Orihuela 1884; Tangier 1898.

In the presentation of his history, al-Nasiri follows the usual method of his fellow-countrymen but he does occasionally demonstrate a critical sense. On the whole, however, he gives the impression of being a historian by accident, but a man of letters by vocation. Sometimes he gives indication of considerable intellectual independence and breadth of outlook. His style is lucid and polished, and he rarely resorts to the artificial use of metaphor and rhymed prose. He gives the impression of being the modern Moroccan historian who has perhaps handled his language with the greatest ease and elegance. Vol. iv of the Arabic edition of the Istiḥṣāṣ has been translated by E. Fumey, with the title of Chronique de la dynastie alaouite au Maroc, in Archives Marocaines, Vols. ix and x, Paris 1906-7. The remainder has been translated in the same journal, Vols. xxx ff., Paris, 1923-35, by A. Graulle, G. S. Colin, I. Hamet and the sons of the historian himself.


AHMAD PASHA, Ottoman governor of Baghdad, son of Hasān Pasha (q.v.), also governor of Baghdad. In 1715 he was appointed governor of Shahrizur and Kirkūk, and subsequently of Baṣra; in 1719 he was made vizier. After the death of his father (at the beginning of 1724) he was appointed governor of Baghdad and charged with the continuation of the expedition undertaken by the former against the Persians. In the spring of 1724 he took Hamadān, and although he was defeated (owing to the desertion of the Kurdish chieftains) by Ashraf, the Ghulayr ruler of Persia, he achieved in 1727 favourable terms, acquiring for the Ottoman empire Kirmānshāh, Hamadān, Tabriz, Rawan, Nakhībewān and Tīfīl. After losing these conquests to the Šālaḏwī Taḥmāš, Ahmad Pasha undertook another campaign and captured Kirmānshāh and Ardalān, and in 1732, after winning the battle of Kurījāk, reached Ḥamadān. By the treaty of 1732, some of the conquered territories were kept by the Ottomans, others returned to Persia. Hostilities, however, were soon resumed and Ahmad Pasha had to defend Baghdad itself from Nādir Shāh. In 1733 he was made governor of Baṣra in addition to Baghdad. The following year he was transferred first to the governorship of Aleppo, then to that of Rakkā. After the death of Köprülü-zade ʿAbd Allāh Pasha, he, though retaining the governorship of Rakkā, was made commander-in-chief in the east and succeeded in reaching an armistice with Nādir Shāh.

He was appointed governor of Baghdad for the second time, and was engaged, in addition to the Persian affairs, in subduing rebellious tribes. He died in 1747, on his return from an expedition against the Bakhūn ruler Salīm, and was buried at the side of his father near the tomb of Abu Hanīfa. He had governed Baghdad first for a period of eleven, and on the second occasion for twelve years.

Bibliography: Rāghīb, Taḥrīḥ, iv, 57; Celebi-zade ʿĀsim (continuation of the former), Istanbul 1878, passim; Sāmī, Shāhīk, Tāriḵ Shāhīk, Taḥrīḥ, Istanbul 1198, passim; ʿĪṣā, Taḥrīḥ, Istanbul 1199, passim; Kāṭib Celebi, Tabwīn al-Tawārīḵ, Istanbul 1146, 153 ff.; Naẓrī-zāde Murtaḍā, Gūṭh-i Khudāf (MS of M. Cavid Baysun; the passage on Ahmad Pasha not in printed ed.); Daqībat al-Wustārā (continuation of former), Baghdad 1246, index; Niebuhr, Voyage en Arabie, ii, 254-6; Sīdīl-i ʿOṯmānī, i, 250, ii, 149; Hammer-Purgstall, index; C. Huart, Histoire de Bagdad, 145-6; S. H. Longrigg, Four Centuries of Modern Iraq, 75, 127 f., 131-62, 165 f., 346.

AHMAD PASHA KARA, Ottoman grand vizier under Sulaymān I. He was of Albanian origin, was educated in the palace and rose to the post of Kapid-i bashi, mir-i ʿālem (in 927/1521) to the grand-vizierate.—According to the historian himself.

On the whole, however, he gives the impression of having the wish to reappoint Rustam Pasha, governor of Egypt, the sultan's main motive seems to have been his intrigue against ʿAlī Pasha, governor of Egypt, the sultan's main motive seems to have been his wish to reappoint Rustam Pasha, his son-in-law, to the grand-vizierate.—According to Hādīkāt al-Dīwānī, i, 143; Sīdīl-i ʿOṯmānī, i, 259, Ahmad Pasha married Fāṭima ʿUṯman, daughter of Selim I. He began to build a mosque near Top Kapl, which was, however, finished only after his death.

Bibliography: Dielāl-zāde Muṣṭafā, Tabābāl al-Masālīk, MS; Dielāl-zāde Śāhī, Sūleymānāme, MS; Rūstempaşha, Taʿwārīḵ-i ʿAlī ʿOṯmānī, MS; Luṭfī Pasha, Taḥrīḥ, Istanbul 1341, 323-453; ʿĀlī, Kunh al-ʿAkbār, MS; University Kütüph. no. 2290/32, fol. 317; Pecewil, Taḥrīḥ, i, 24, 247-343; Solak-zāde, Taḥrīḥ, Istanbul 1297, 504-34; Mūneddiqim-baši, Şabāḥī al-ʿAkbār, Istanbul 1285, iii, 497-506; Kāṭib Celebi, Taḵwīm al-Taʿwārīḵ, Istanbul 1146, 121, 176, 236; ʿOṯmān-zāde Ahmad Ṭāʿīb, Hādīkāt al-Wustārā, Istanbul 1271, 31; Ayyawānārāy, ʿUṯmān, Hādīkāt al-Dīwānī, Istanbul 1261, i, 141-3; Sīdīl-i ʿOṯmānī, i, 198-9, 259; Hammer-Purgstall, passim; Busbeq, Litterae Turcicae, i, 129; M. Cavid Baysun 1878; Orihuela 1884; Tangier 1898.

AHMAD PASHA BONNEVAL. Claude-Alexandre Comte de Bonneval was born in 1675 into a noble family of the Limousin. During serving with
great distinction in the French army at the beginning of the War of the Spanish Succession, in 1704, regarding himself as insulted, he changed sides and soon won a European reputation as a general in the Austrian service under Eugene of Savoy in a succession of campaigns against his own countrymen, the Pope, and finally the sultan, being wounded at Peterwardein in 1716 and participating in the siege of Belgrade in the following year. He later, however, fell out with Eugene and, after being imprisoned for a year, in 1727 fled to Venice, whence, after offering his services in vain to various powers inimical to Austria, he resolved to place them at the disposal of Ahmed III. In 1729 he accordingly travelled by way of Ragusa to Bosnia Sarayli, where, to avoid being extradited to Austria, he turned Muslim, taking the name Ahmed; and after the accession of Mahmud I was first given a daily allowance while resident at Gümüldüje in Thrace, and then, in Sept. 1731, summoned by the grand vizier Topal 'Ogmen Pasha, who aimed at training the Ottoman army on European lines, to reform the oğlak of the khumbaradžis. Although on 'Ogmen Pasha's fall in the following April, Bonneval was at first neglected by his successor Hekim-oghlu 'Ali Pasha, in 1733 the latter sought his advice on the course to be followed by the Porte in relation to the problem of the Polish succession, and in Jan. 1735 appointed him Khumbaradži Bašçi with the rank of a pasha of two fugals (mîrdrîån). After the dismissal of 'Ali Pasha in July of the same year, however, Bonneval was excluded from the counsels of the Porte until 1737, when he was again called on by Muhîsin-zade 'Abd Allâh Pasha to advise on the conduct of the war against Austria. But although he eventually accompanied the grand vizier Yeğen Mehmed Pasha to the front, a plan he had put forward for the fomentation of a revolt in Hungary was a failure, and on his return to Istanbul in 1738 he fell from favour and in the following year was deprived of his command and exiled to Kastamonu. Moreover, although he was restored in less than a year, he never regained his former influence, and up to his death in 1747, by which time he was casting about for means to return to France, he was employed only in the continued management of the khumbaradžis and in furnishing the Porte with comments (some of which have been preserved in Turkish translation) on European political developments. He was buried in the cemetery of the Mewleül-khane in Galata, and succeeded in his command by his adoptive son, also a French convert, who went by the name of Sîleymân Agha.

**Bibliography:** Mehmed 'Arif, Khumbaradži Bašçi Ahmed Pasha Bonneval, OTEM, nos. 18-20; Prince de Ligne, Mémoire sur le comte de Bonneval, Paris 1817; A. Vandal, Le Pacha Bonneval, Paris 1884; idem, Une Ambassade Francaise en Orient, Paris 1887, index; IA, s.v. (M. Cavid Baysun).

**AHMAD PASHA,** called **BURSALI,** Ottoman poet of the second half of the 15th century, the most important after Seyyidl and before Nedjatl. He was the son of the bâetti 'âsher Well al-Din b. Ilîyas (who claimed descent from Hüsâny) and was most probably born in Adrianople (according to some authorities in Brusa). He was appointed müdderris at the madrasa of Murad II in Brusa and in 855/1451 succeeded Molla Khedim in the latter's place. After the accession of Muhammad II he became bâetti 'âsher, and tutor of the new ruler, obtaining the rank of vizier. He accompanied the sultan during the conquest of Constantinople. Though his wit made him a great favourite of the sultan, he fell into disgrace (allegedly because of a love affair with a favorite of the sultan, but possibly merely in consequence of the sultan's well known capriciousness) and was held in custody, but was pardoned and appointed as mučelâvî of the Orkhan and Murâd mosques in Brusa, afterwards even as sanâdjak beyî of Sultan Ömmü, Tire and Ankara, and after the accession of Bâyâzid II, as sanâdjak beyî of Brusa. He took part in the suite of Sinân Pasha, beylerbeyî of Anatolia, in the battle of Aghacayiri against the Mamluks (8 Ramadan 893/17 August 1488; cf. Sa'd al-Din and Hammer Purgstall). He died in 902/1496-7 in Brusa; the ruins of his turbe could be seen not long ago in that town.

Among his poems there are many composed for Mümmâdad II, Bâyâzid II and Sultan Ömmü; he also composed a dirge on the death of Mümmâdad II's son, Mustaфа. He was closely connected with various scholars of his time, and while governor of Brusa, he drew into his entourage poets such as Harîrî, Resmü, Mîrî, Çâkhsîdîrî Şeykhîlî and Shehdi. Ahmed Pasha was influenced by Turkish poets such as Ahmedî, Nîâyî, Melliî and especially Şeykhîlî and 'Atâli (cf. Yeni Meşgîma, 1918). Like the other poets of his age, he was also under the influence of Persian poetry (his models were especially Salmân Sâwâdî, Hâféz, Kamîl Khudîândî and Kâtîbl); on the other hand, the very widespread opinion (which we find for the first time in the Źëdzhûr of Hasan Celebi) that he began his poetical career by making nasîres on some poems of 'Ali Shîr Nawâ'î is quite erroneous (cf. M. Fuad Köprûlî, in Türk Yurdu, 1927, no. 27; idem, Türk dili ve edebiyati hakkında araştırmalar, Istanbul 1936, 264 ff.). Ahmed Pasha was acknowledged as the greatest poet of his day and was imitated by many poets of the late 15th and early 16th century; and his influence can be felt even after his poetry lost its preponderant position owing to the new trends initiated by Nâşîtâ and especially by Bâktî. Apart from his divân, which was compiled by order of Bâyâzid II, and the numerous manuscripts of which are rather different from each other, Ahmed Pasha's poems (some of them written in Arabic and Persian) are to be found also in the great nasîre collections of the 15th and 16th centuries.

**Bibliography:** The Źëdzhûr of Sehîl, 20, Lâfiî, 76, 'Ashîk Celebi and Kinnâl-zade, s.v.; al-Shakîhî al-Nu'manîyya, Turkish transl., 217; 'Allî, Kunh al-'Abhîr, v, 290 f.; Sa'd al-Din, Tâdî al-Tanârîkh, ii, 517; Reîhîl, Güldeste, 259; Hammer-Purgstall, index; idem, Gesch. d. osm. Dichtkunst, ii, 41 ff.; Mu'allîm Nâdiî, 'Oğmânîîl Şâ'îrleri, i, 209-17; Fâlik Reshid, Ta'rîkh-i Edebiyyatî-i Öthmânîyye, Istanbul 1913, 137-50; Gibb, ii, 40-58; Sadettin Nîzîhî Ergûn, Türk şâ'îrleri, Istanbul 1936, i, 305-20; M. Fuad Köprûlî, Bursali Ahmed Pasha, Istanbul 1920, nos. 36, 45, 56; idem in IA, s.v.; Istanbul Kitaplıklari Türkçe Yusağı Divanlar Katalogu, no. 13.

(HALIL İNALÇIK)
himself by capturing Koyun Hisar (1461). In 1469-72 he subdued the mountainous part of Karaman-ili and its coastal area, taking 'Ala'iyya in 1471, Silifke, Mokan, Gorigos and Lulye (Lulun) in 1472. In 1472 a dangerous attack of the Ak Koyulu forces, which, led by the Karamanid prince Piri Ahmed, had advanced as far as Hamsili-ili, was repelled by Gedik Ahmed, who subsequently reconquered Karaman-ili. According to Neshri, 211, he played an important part in the victory over Uzun Hasan [q.v.] in 878/1473. Later we find him in Icliili fighting successfully against the Karamanid princes who had retaken it with the help of a Christian fleet. During this campaign Ahmed captured Minan, Silifke, massacred or banished the local chieftains in Tashili (1473-4). Having been the second vizier up to this time, he became the first after the execution of the Grand Vizier Mahmud in 1474 (Kemal Pasha-zade). He was sent by Mehmed II against the Genoese in the Crimea, where he took Kaffa (June 1475), Soldaya and Tana, and besieged Mangup (which was to be captured later by Ya'qub Beg (December 1475)). Ahmed also signed an agreement with the new khan Mengli Giray whom he had saved from prison in Kaffa, by which Mengli Giray accepted the sultan's protection. Ahmed's self-confidence roused the sultan's displeasure and when he dared to disagree with the sultan on the subject of an expedition to Scutari in Albania, he was imprisoned in Rumeli Hisar (1477). In 1478 he was released and made Kapudan of the fleet. In 1479 he seized Santa Maria from Leonardo Tocco (who fled to Apulia), and setting sail from Valona, he captured Otranto on 21 August 1480. When in the next spring he gathered in Valona a new army to make further conquests from Otranto, he was persuaded to uphold the new sultan, Bajezyd II, against his brother Djem Sultan, and he played a decisive part in securing the throne for Bajezyd. But as he could not, or would not, capture Djem in his flight to Mamlik territory, the suspicious sultan put him into prison. This, however, led to a tumult among the kapti-bulu, so that he had to be rehabilitated. After the failure of Djem's second attempt to seize the throne, Bajezyd felt himself strong enough to put Ahmed to death (6 Shawwal 887/18 Nov. 1482), though this caused a new tumult among the kapti-bulu.—A district in Istanbul is called after Gedik Ahmed because of his pious foundations there and the mosque of Gedik Ahmed in Afyon is a fine example of old Ottoman architecture.

Bibliography: Neshri, Diihan-numa (Teaehner); Kemal Pasha-zade (MS Fath 4205); Urun, Tasvir-i Ali 'Othman (Babinger); D. da Lezze (G. M. Angiolello), 'History of Turcosca, Buckeeao, 1910; Hammer-Purgstall, index; S. Fisher, 'The Foreign Relations of Turkey', Urbana 1948; Fr. Babinger, 'Mehem der Eroberer, Munich 1953; IA, s.v. (by M. H. Yinan). (Halil Inalcik) AHMAD PASCHA KHA'RIN, Ottoman Vizier. Georgian in origin, Ahmed entered Selim I's palace as ic-oglan; later, as bayik emir-i dokhr he took part in the campaign against the Mamliks in 1516-7 and became beşlerbeg of Rüm-ili in 1519. In the campaign of Suleyman I against Belgrade Ahmed's plan of operations was accepted. Accordingly he took Bogürdelen (Sabac) (2 Shaw 927/8 July 1521) and invaded Syria. As a reward for his services in the siege of Belgrade the sultan appointed him vizier of the dieçin (autumn of 1521). In the campaign against Rhodes he, as commander-in-chief, was responsible for the successful operations during the landing and the siege. Subsequently he negotiated with the knights of St. John the terms of surrender of the castle (2 Shawar 929/21 Dec. 1522). Ahmed Pasha was instrumental in causing the fall of the Grand Vizier Piri Mehmed Pasha [q.v.], and expected to be promoted from the third viziership to the first, as the second vizier was in Egypt. But, contrary to custom, the grand vizierate was given to the kha'ss oda-beg Ibrahim [q.v.]. Deeply disappointed Ahmed asked the sultan for the governorship of Egypt (19 August 1523). There he reconciled the discontented Mamlik as well as the bedouin chieftains who were in a state of great agitation after the death of Khayr Beg, Suleymán, still under Ibrahim's influence, appointed Kara Mesi governor of Egypt and charged him with Ahmed's execution. On discovering this, Ahmed decided to declare his independence with the title of Sultan (January 1524). He massacred and dispersed the Janissaries in the castle of Cairo and established relations with the Christian powers against the Ottomans. Suleymán sent an army to Egypt under the vizier Ayas Pasha, while Ahmed's troops were secretly encouraged to turn against him. One of his officers, Kadi Mehmed Beg, made an attempt on his life in a public bath. Though wounded, Ahmed succeeded in escaping to the Banû Bakr Bedouins, who, however, finally delivered him to be beheaded.

Bibliography: Djelal-zade Mustafa, Tabakht al-Mamlûk we-Dere'azat al-Maslîk (MS Fâth 4423); Süheyl, Ta'wil-i Misr al-Dîdât, Istanbul 11457; Perdiin Beg, Mumi, Istanbul 1274, 507-40; Pečewi, l. 71-9; Marino Sanuto, I Diari, vols. XXXV-XXVIII, Venice 1879-1903; Hammer-Purgstall, index; J. W. F. Stripling, The Ottoman Turks and the Arabs, Urbana 1942. (Halil Inalcik) AHMAD RAF'IK (he assumed the family name of Arîkai), Turkish historian. He was born in Beshiktash, Istanbul, in 1880, and educated in the Kuleli military lyceum and the military school (Harbiye Mektebi), became an officer, but for most of the time was engaged in teaching geography and French. In 1910 he was appointed to the General Staff, as editor of the 'Ashkeri Meclis'ı, in which he himself published articles on military subjects. After becoming a member of the Ta'wil Endjunên, he retired and devoted himself entirely to his studies. From 1917 to 1933 he was professor of history in the University of Istanbul. He died on 10 Oct. 1937. He wrote a very large number of historical books, partly of a scholarly, partly of a more popular character, and published many documents concerning Ottoman history from the archives. Among his best known books are those on life in old Istanbul (Herc X unc.—or respectively XI unc., XII unc., XIII unc.—Aş'îrda Istanbul Hayatlı), and the series of monographs: Gömleğ 'Aş'îrda Türk Hayatlı. Numerous articles by him were published in TOEM, Yeni Meclis'ı, Hayatî, Edebiyat Fakültesi, Türkîyat Mecmuası.

Bibliography: Reşad Ekrem Koç, Ahmed Rafik, Istanbul 1918; Ismail Habib, Edebiyat Turki, Istanbul 1942, 384; O. Spies, Die türkische Prosaliteratur der Gegenwart, Berlin 1943, 83-7 (with full list of his works). (A. Tietze) AHMAD RASIM, Turkish writer, b. 1864 in Sargiuzel or Sarligz, a quarter of Fâthî, Istanbul, d. 21 Sept. 1932 in the island of Heybeliada and buried there. In early life he lost his father Bahâ al-Din, who belonged to the family of Mentegh-oglu from Cyprus, and was brought up by his mother.
From 1292/1875 to 1300/1882-3 he attended the school Dar iil-Shafaka in Istanbul, where he was attracted to art and literature and decided to become a writer; and to this profession (or, as he himself calls it, "the Sublime Porte Road", Bâb-i 'Ali Diâdêssî) he remained faithful throughout all later political changes. Like many other writers he began as a journalist, and almost all the more important Turkish papers received contributions from his pen. He afterwards collected his numerous articles and sketches, for example in the two volumes of Mahâllât ve-Mûşâhabâtî (1325) and the four volumes entitled 'Omrî Edâbi (1315-19). The latter is not an account of his life but reflects his spiritual development and the feelings and emotions reflected in his publications of different years.

Ahmad Räsim's output became in time very extensive; in all, he is said to have produced about 140 works of larger or smaller size. Nevertheless he was not a polygraph in the depreciatory sense of the word; before dealing with a subject he always studied it thoroughly and then wrote on it seriously, or sometimes in the lightly humorous fashion of which he was a master, or again in a pleasing conversational way, but always with artistic feeling and in his particular style, which was new and independent of existing schools and coteries. He had a great success with his public; he himself created a school of writers, and his influence has been strongly felt in Turkish literature.

His literary work in the fields of the novel, short story and tale, includes his early novels Meyî-i Dîl (1890) and Teğribî-i Hayâtî (1892) (short analysis of both in P. Horn, Gesch. der Türkischen Moderne, 46 f.), the patriotic novel Maşhîkî-i Hayâtî (1901), the stories Teğribîsî 'Asâkî (1311) and Mehteb Arkaşağîm (1311), a little later Nâhâm (1315) and another patriotic novel *Aşker-oghlu (1315) and the more lyrical *Kıdâbe-yi Gham (1315) and *Andâlî (in verse).

At the same time he had from the first a preference for history and sought to arouse an interest in it among his fellow-countrymen by presenting his carefully prepared compilations in popular form. After earlier works on the history of Rome, of civilisation, etc., he devoted himself to the history of Turkey, and produced a work on Turkish history from Selim II to Murâd V, entitled İstibdadât-i Hayâtî (1911-21) and a general survey, *Ötlümânî Ta'lih-i (1936-30). A valuable supplement to these is formed by his "City Letters", Şehir Mehtablarî (1328-29), which contain an unsurpassed description of old Istanbul life in all its variety, written in a vivid and stimulating manner. In Menâkıb-i İslâm (1325) the Muslim festivals, mosques, and other religious matters are dealt with. To the history of literature belongs his book on *Şınâ (e.g.), which was intended as an introduction to the history of the Turkish Moderns (Matbâ'âtî Ta'lihine Mehtâgal. Ihl büyük Muhtar-rîlerden Şınâ, 1927). Matbâ'âtî Khâfirînardan (1924) contains his personal recollections of Turkish writers, and *Fâlakâ (1927) of his own schooldays and the old system of education in general.

Ahmad Räsim was also a prolific writer of school books on grammar, rhetoric, history, etc., and composed also a work on model letters (İlahîî *Khasîne-yi Mehtebî 1887, 5th ed. 1938). In addition he translated many western works, and a large collection from his early period is called "Selections from Western Literature" (Edebiyât-i *Ghârbiyeyden bir Nebâî, 1887). He was a talented composer as well, and left 65 songs now preserved in the Dâr ül-Shafaka library.

For this great literary activity Ahmad Räsim required a measure of freedom which did not exist under 'Abd al-Hâmid II, and such as he could hardly have enjoyed at all as a state official. He was, however, twice a member of a commission of the Conseil de l'Instruction Publique (Endijîmen-i Teşîî bî ve-Mu'dâyanâ); but only for a short time. He showed his interest in religious matters in 1924, when after the abolition of the caliphate he wrote an article in Wabîtî on 4 March 1924 on the relics (amâna, müba'âlâtî) of the Prophet, cloak (şâkmârî), banner (lîwâ), praying-carpet (sadîfîsâda), etc., which also appeared in Cairo and Damascus in Arabic. He proposed to make these relics accessible to the public in a museum (cf. C. A. Nullino, in OM, 1924, 220 f.). From 1927 he was a deputy for Istanbul along with men like 'Abd al-Ḥâki Hâmid and Khâlîl Edhem (cf. OM, 1927, 416; 1931, 227 and Mehmed Zeki, Encyclopédie biographique de Turquie, i, 1928, 23 and ii, 1929, 88), but suffered from ill-health in his last years.
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AHMAD RASIM, Ottoman statesman and historian. Ahmad b. Ibrâhîm, known as Resmi, came from Rethymno (Turk. Resmi; hence his name) and was of Greek descent (cf. Hammer-Purgstall, viii, 1939, 1358-62). He was born in 1765 and in 1767 he was sent to Europe, this time as ambassador to the Prussian court in Berlin. He also wrote a very full account of this mission, which early attracted attention, in the West also, for its views on Prussian policy, its description of Berlin and its inhabitants and all sort of observations on related topics. After filling a number of important offices he died on the 2 Shawâdî (1197) in Istanbul. Where he was educated, married a daughter of the Re's Efendi Ta'âlîqî Mustâfâ and entered the service of the Porte. He held a number of offices in various towns (cf. *Sidîgî-i *Öltümânî, ii, 380 f.). In Safar 1177/Oct. 1773 he went as Ottoman envoy to Vienna and on his return made a written report of his impressions and experiences. His book on *Şinnâ (e.g.), which was intended as an introduction to the history of the Turkish Moderns (Matba'âtî Ta'âlîqine *Mehtâgal. *Ilk büyük *Muktar-rîlerden *Şinnâ, 1927). Matba'âtî Khâfirînardan (1924) contains his personal recollections of Turkish writers, and *Fâlakâ (1927) of his own schooldays and the old system of education in general.

Ahmad Räsim was a prolific writer of school books on grammar, rhetoric, history, etc., and composed also a work on model letters (İlahîî *Khasîne-yi Mehtebî 1887, 5th ed. 1938). In addition he translated many western works, and a large collection from his early period is called "Selections from Western Literature" (Edebiyât-i *Ghârbiyeyden bir Nebâî, 1887). He was
Kaynardje (1769-74) a treatise entitled Khuldset ul-I’tibdr, in which as a participant in the campaign and eye-witness, he gave his impressions of this important period in the history of Turkey. Of especial value are his biographical collections, particularly his Khaufs ul-Rüeså? (composed in 1157/1744) with the biographies of 64 re’s ul-kullâb (re’s efendiler) and his Hamilet ul-Küberå?, in which he gives the lives of the chief eunuchs of the imperial harem (hizâlar askalar). Of a similar nature is his continuation (written in 1172/1760) of the Wefayât of Mehmed Emin b. Hâdijî Mehmed called Alay-beyl-zâde, in which he gives in twelve lists the deaths of famous men and women (cf. the accurate list of contents in Hammer-Purgstall, ix, 187 f.). He also wrote several other works on geology and proverbs.

Bibliography: Siqâlii-i Othmâni, ii, 380 ff.; Brusali Mehmed Tâhir, ‘Othmâni mû’dûsîleri, iii, 58 f. (with list of works); Babinger, 309-12 (add to the list of the MSS of his sefer-name’s: Berlin, Or. 4° 1502, fol. 27v-46v (incomplete), Paris, Suppl. Turc 510 (?); Paris, collection of Cl. Huart and the MSS described in Istanbul Kitâbîklâri Tarih-Cografya Yazmalari Kataloglari, i, no. 483; add also the Polish trans. Podroz Resmi Ahmd al-Mulk Ghazi ‘1-Dîn Khan caused him to be assassinated by KizilbashI conspirators at Kudan in 1751. He was crowned at Kandahar where coins were struck in his name. Like the Persian conqueror who served as his model, he organized a special force dependent on himself, known as the Ghulâm Šâhûs, a heterogeneous body recruited from Tâdîks, Kizilbash, and Yûsufzays; but he naturally relied chiefly on his immediate followers the Durrâns. With Kandahâr as his base he easily extended his control over Ghaznî, Kâbul, and Peshâwâr. His aims were to consolidate his power in Afghanistan and to increase his prestige and provide employment for his turbulent followers by means of foreign wars in which course he was favoured by the anarchical conditions prevailing in India. Regarding himself as heir to Nâdir Šâh’s eastern dominions, he laid claim to the provinces which Nâdir had wrested from the Mughul emperor. In accordance with this policy, but with no intention of founding an empire in India, he invaded India nine times between 1747 and 1799. He set out from Peshâwâr on his first Indian expedition in December 1747. By January 1748 Lahore and Sarhind had been captured. Eventually Mughal forces were sent from Delhi to resist his advance. Lacking artillery and greatly outnumbered he was defeated at Manûpur, in March 1748, by Mu’nîn al-Mulk, the son of the waiz Kamar al-Dîn, who had been killed in a preliminary skirmish. Ahmd Šâh retreated to Afghanistan and Mu’nîn al-Mulk was appointed governor of the Pandîjkât. Before Mu’nîn al-Mulk could consolidate his position, Ahmd Šâh, in December 1749, again crossed the Indus. Receiving no reinforcements from Delhi Mu’nîn al-Mulk was forced to come to terms. In accordance with instructions from Delhi, Ahmd Šâh was promised the revenues of the Čahâr Makäll (Gudrâät, Awrangbâd, Siâlkoit, and Pasûr) which had been granted by the Mughul emperor Muhammâd Šâh to Nâdir Šâh in 1739. While he had been absent in the Panjâb, Nûr Muhammâd Alîzay, a former Afghan general of Nâdir Šâh, had conspired to dethrone him. On his return to Kandahâr the conspiracy was suppressed and Nûr Muhammâd executed. He next turned his attention to his western frontier. By 1165/1751 Harât, Maqâhid, and Nîshâpur had been captured. Mirzâ Šâhrûkh, the grandson of Nâdir Šâh, was forced to surrender several districts bordering on Harât and to acknowledge Afghan suzerainty on his coins. In the same year Ahmd
Shah came into conflict with the rising Kadjar power but was repulsed at Astarabad beyond which he was unable to advance. He was more successful across the Hindú Kush where he annexed Balkh and Badakhshán after which the Oxus roughly formed his northern frontier.

The non-payment of the revenues of the Čahár Makhñál was the reason for his third Indian expedition of 1752-3. Lahore was besieged for four months and the surrounding country devastated. Mu'in al-Mulk, without reinforcements, was defeated in March 1752, but was reinstated by Ahmad Sháh to whom the emperor formally ceded the two súbas of Lahore and Multán. During this expedition Kashmír was annexed to the Durrání empire. By April 1753 Ahmad Sháh was once more back in Afghanistan. Mu'in al-Mulk found the Pandjáb a troublesome charge and his death in November 1753 only served to intensify the anarchy. All power was for a time in the hands of his widow Mughalání Bégásm whose profligacy led to constant rebellions. The Mughal wástr 'Imád al-Mulk took advantage of this anarchy to recover the Pandjáb for the empire and entrusted its administration to Adína Beg. Ahmad Sháh immediately set out to recover his lost provinces. Lahore was reached towards the end of December 1756, and, after an unopposed march, Delhi was entered on 28 January 1757. The city was plundered and the defenceless inhabitants massacred. A similar fate befell the inhabitants of Mathúra, Brindában, and Ágra. Towards the end of March 1757, an outbreak of cholera amongst his troops forced Ahmad Sháh to leave India. Before leaving he married Hadrát Bégám, daughter of the late emperor Muhammad Sháh, while his son Túmír was married to Zuhra Bégám, daughter of the puppet emperor 'Aliamgír II. The territory of Sarhind was annexed to his empire. Nagáb al-Daulá, the Rohillá leader who had supported him, was left in charge of Delhi and Túmír remained as viceroy of the Pandjáb. He had no sooner left India than the Sikhs, together with Adína Beg, rose in revolt against Túmír. Early in 1758 Adína Beg invited the Marathás to expel the Afghans from the Pandjáb. This was accomplished by the Marathás who actually crossed the Indus and held Pesháwar for a few months. (The evidence which corroborates Grant Duff's History of the Mahrattás, 1921, 507, is to be found in the Persian manuscript agháráts (news-letters) in the archives of the Bharat Íthasa Sambhodhí Mandal and in the Chandráchuda Daśtar, i, 1920, ii, 1934. See also H. R. Gupta's Studies in Later Mughal History of the Panjáb, 1944, 175-6.)

These events brought Ahmad Sháh to India a fourth time (1759-61). Before setting out he marched against Náṣir Kán, the Brahíí chief of Kalát in Balúcistán who had declared his independence. Despite Ahmad Sháh's failure to capture Kalát, Náṣir Kán agreed to acknowledge his suzerainty and to furnish contingents for his army. The Marathás rapidly evacuated the Pandjáb before the Afghan advance and fell back on Delhi. Sádáshív Bhíí, the brother of the Marathá peshwá, was entrusted with the formidable task of ousting the Afgháns from northern India. The Marathás had not only to face a coalition of the northern Muslim chiefs who had joined forces with Ahmad Sháh but they had to fight without the assistance of the Rájdúps and other Hindu powers whom their ex- tortionate demands for chaukh and sardeshmukhi had estranged. The Marathás occupied Delhi (22 July 1760) but it was of little use as a base since food, fodder, and money were unprocurable. The situation, so far as supplies were concerned, was temporarily relieved by the capture of Kunjípúra (17 October 1760). But this advance proved disastrous as the Afghan army crossed the Jémmn to cut off Marathá communications with Delhi. The Bhíí now decided to entrench his forces at Panipat. Deprived of all supplies by more mobile forces he was compelled to leave his entrenchments and attack the Afgháns. Although the Marathás fought desperately they failed to withstand the fierce Afghan onslaught under Ahmad Sháh's expert generalship and were routed with enormous losses at Panipat on 14 January 1761. Ahmad Sháh made no attempt to consolidate his position and in March of the same year was once more on his way back to Afghanistan.

The Afghan victory at Panipat had far-reaching consequences. It enabled the Nísháám to recover from his defeat at Údgir (1760), and probably saved the state of Hyderábád from extinction. It also contributed to the rise of an independent Muslim power in Mysore under Haydár 'Allí. It is usual to regard Panipat as a temporary set-back from which the Marathás rapidly recovered. This view ignores the real importance of the victory which granted the English the respite needed for the consolidation of their power in Bengal.

After Panipat the main factor in the history of northern India was the growing strength of the Sikhs whose attacks on Ahmad Sháh's lines of communication gradually led to a cessation of the Afghan menace. It was against the Pandjáb Sikhs that his sixth expedition (1762) was directed. They were defeated with enormous slaughter near Grúddjárwal in a battle known to Sikhs as the Ghallghára. Ahmad Sháh remained in the Pandjáb for nine months during which Kashmír whose Afghan governor had revoked was re-annexed to his empire. But the Sikhs were by no means crushed. Their attacks on Afghan garrisons necessitated three more expeditions between 1764 and 1769. Ahmad Sháh had also to contend with serious revolts nearer home. The Aymák near Harát rebelled in 1763 and, in 1765, serious disturbances broke out in Khurásán. At Ahmad Sháh's death, in 1184/1773, his empire roughly extended from the Oxus to India and from Tibet to Khurásán. It embraced Kashmír, Pesháwar, Multán, Sind, Balúcistán, Persian Khurásán, Harát, Kandáráh, Kábul, and Balkh. Even in his lifetime it was apparent that he would be unable to maintain distant conquests like the Pandjáb. Balúcistán was practically independent, and Khurásán was obviously destined to become a Kádjar possession. Under his successors the Durrání empire rapidly disintegrated.

Bibliography: Abd al-Karím 'Alawi, Ta'ríhk-i Ahmad, Lucknow 1206 (Urdu transl.: Wa'háli-i Durrání, Cawnpur 1929; Mirzá Muhammad 'All, Ta'ríh-i Sultáni, Bombay 1928; O. Mann, Quellenstudien zur Geschichte des Ahmad Sáh Durrání, ZDMG, 1898; Storey, i, 395 (on the historians of Ahmad Sháh); H. Elliot and J. Dowson, History of India, viii. London 1877; M. Elphínstone, Caubul, ii. App. A., London 1839; H. R. Gupta, Studies in Later Mughal History of the Panjáb, Lahore 1944; C. J. Rodgers, Coins of Ahmad Sháh Durrání, J. As. Bengál, 1885; J. Sarkar, Fall of the Mughal Empire, Calcutta 1934; idem., translation of Núr al-Dín's Ta'ríh-i Náṣirí al-Daulá, IC, 1933; idem., translation of Káshírjáí Shiv Ráo Pandit's account of Panipat, Indian Historical Quarterly (1934); Selections from the
The period from 1878-84 witnessed the amir of many. In 1874 he assumed the title of amir shaded for Letters (Maktilbdt), several sufl orders, he avoided their extravagances, Laduniyya; Mukdshafdt Ghaybiyya; Risala fi Ithbdt al-Mabdd* wa'l-Ma^dd, where his tomb is an object of veneration to this day. Shaykh Ahmad wrote a number of tracts on religious topics, viz., al-Mabda\* waw-Ma'add (Delhi 1312); Risala Tahliyya, published as an appendix to the Lucknow edition of his Maktubbd; Ma\*rim Ladauniyya; Mwagghafat Shaybqibyya; Risala li l\*baddi al-Nubuwwa; Adadh al-Muradi; Shahr-i Rau\*sa\*yi K\*hadja Baki bi'illah, etc. But he is chiefly remembered for Letters (Maktubbd), which he wrote (in Persian) to his disciples and other persons and in which he explained a large number of points, ranging over a wide area of Islamic faith and practice. These letters have exercised a great influence in favour of orthodoxy and, in their collected form, constitute one of the most important classics of religious literature produced in Muslim India. It was in recognition of his services to the cause of orthodox Islam that Mulla 'Abd al-Hakim al-Siyalkot\* [q.v.] gave him the title (lakab) of Mudjaddid-i Alf-i Thanl, i.e., the Renovator of Islam who appeared at the beginning of the second millennium of the Islamic era. Even in his life time, his influence spread as far as Afghanistan and Central Asia. After his death, it deepened still further, when his descendants and disciples, now called Mudjaddidis, were dispursed, as a result of the unfavourable conditions produced by the rule of the Sikhs in the Panjdb. Although Shaykh Ahmad was connected with several s\*f orders, he avoided their extravagances, especially their pantheistic tendencies; and in fact he tried to bridge the gulf between the monotheistic and pantheistic groups of s\*fs by putting forth the theory of wahdat al-\*shud\* in place of wahdat al-wuj\*d (pantheism). This theory is regarded as his special contribution in the field of religious thought.

**Bibliography:** The Maktubbd, about 530 in number, have been repeatedly lithographed in India (Lucknow 1913; Delhi 1888, 1920; Amritsar 1351-4); Urdu translation by K\*ddi \*lim al-Din, Lahore 1913; Tasaw\*k-i D\*shangiri, Aligarh 1864, 272-3; 308; 'Abd al-K\*dr Badayuni, Munthhabat al-Tawvur-kh, Calcutta 1868; Muhammad H\*shim Kashm\*i, Zubdat al-Muk\*mam, composed in 1037, lithographed at Cawnpore, 126-282; Badr al-Din Sirhind\*i, Hadadh al-Kuds composed in 1057, still in MS, Urdu translation by Ahmad Husayn Kh\*n, Lahore 1922; Muhammad Amin Nakshband\*i, Mahmud\*i Ahmadiyya, composed in 1668.

AHMAD TĀʾIB (see ʿUṭmān-zābī).  

AHMAD TAKUḌĀR (see ʿUṯmāns).  

AHMAD WAḤĪF PĀSHA, (AHMAD WAḤĪF PĀSHA), O Tuṭşīm e șaṭrī nāma and leading Turkish Turkologist, born 23 Shawwāl 1238/6 July 1823, died at Istanbul 22 Sha'ban 1308/2 April 1891. He came of a family of interpreters, grandson of Bulgar-zāde Yahyā Nādi, a dragoman of the Porte converted to Islam, of rūmī origin according to the historian Ṣanāʾī-zāde ʿĀṭā ʿAlāʾ ʿAbdī, of Jewish origin according to A. D. Mordtmann. Ahmad Waḥīf accompanied his father Rūḥ al-Dīn Mehmed ʿAbdī, the Turkish chargé d'affaires in Paris, studied for three years at the Lycée Saint-Louis, and returned at the age of 14 to Turkey where he already had a varied career lay before him (for details see Sīqīlī-i ʿUṭmānī, i, 308). After initial employment on the interpreting staff, his most important posts were as follows: ambassador in Paris (1860); inspector of the Western Anatolian provinces; legendary president of the first and ephemeral Ottoman Parliament of 1876, with the rank of ṯawīr and title of pāşah; twice Grand Vizier (for periods of 25 days and one day respectively); governor-general of Brusa. As a diplomat, he successfully defended Turkish interests at the time of the Russian occupation of the Danubian principalities and the French occupation of the Lebanon. He edited the first Imperial Year Book (1295/1876), and the newspaper *Taṣwīr-i Eḥkār* (in collaboration with Shiḥāṣī). He was responsible for the restoration of the Yeshīl ʿDīmāʾi mosque at Brusa (by the French ceramist Parvīlī) and for effecting the transfer of the Burgaz Owa estates in the Izmir region, which were granted to Lamartine by ʿAbd al-Maḍīd (1849). It was he who was responsible for the celebrated incident in the Paris theatre concerning the production of Voltaire's *Mahomet*.  

A strong personality, he was an energetic, honest and conscientious man, frank to the point of rudeness; at the same time he was whimsical and an eccentric, and possessed a dry wit. Extremely studious, and with long periods of leisure at his disposal as a result of being debarred from office by the enmity of ʿĀli Ṭāḥṣārī, he immersed himself in the library of his famous villa in Rumelihī Ḥiṣār, and there produced works to which, however, he scorned to subscribe his name. Turkish studies were his special province. He was self-taught, but acquainted with Western studies which, paradoxically, he underestimated; as one of the first "Turkicists", he made an impressive contribution to the Turkish purist movement. His *Lehjī-yi ʿOlmānī* (1st edition 1293/1876; 2nd edition 1306/1920), the first Turkish dictionary in Turkish worthy of the name, a concise work of which the fullest use has not yet been made, formed a basis for the work of Shams al-Dīn Sāmī Bey Frasheri and many others (see the preface to the *Supplement* of Barbier de Meynard, i, p. v). His translation, or rather adaptation, of sixteen comedies of Molière (2nd edition in Latin script, 1933) is a masterpiece. (He produced them on the stage at Brusa.) He also translated *Telmaze*, *Gil Blas de Santillane* and the *Micromégas* of Voltaire. In Eastern Turkish, he published Abu 'l-Qāṭār and, in collaboration with Belin, the *Mabkūb el-Kulūb* of Mir ʿAll ʿṢir Nawāt (1828/1872). A collection of proverbs (Aṭālar Sōsū) figures among his other works. For his historical works, see Babinger (see below) and Enver Koray, *Türkiye tarih yazınları* bibliography, Ankara 1932.  

Ahmed Wefīk was buried in the Kayalār ("Rocks") cemetery at Rumelihī Ḥiṣār, allegedly by order of ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd II, but once again there are probably no grounds for this assertion. Ahmed Wefīk's grandfather, who owned estates in the neighbourhood, was buried in the same cemetery. The Sultan's displeasure may be explained by the fact that Ahmed Wefīk had sold land to the American institution Robert College.  
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AHMAD WAŞİF (see ʿWAṢĪF).  

AHMAD YASSAWI, Turkish sūfī ʿṣāḥīḥ of Central Asia. His life story is shrouded in legend like those of many popular saints. Son of a certain Shaykh İbrahim, he was born at Sayrām (İsfīqāb) in Türkistan during the second half of the 11th century. He lost his father at the age of the family settled at Yasl. There, he began his education (it is said as a disciple of Arslan Baba),
AHMAD YASAWI — AHMADI

Later moving to Bukhara where he became a disciple of the great Shaykh Yusuf Hamadhanī, and eventually succeeded him in 555/1160. He returned to and remained in Yasl until his death in 562/1166.

Ahmad Yasawi's tomb became a place of pilgrimage for kings and princes and was especially venerated by the Turks of Central Asia and the Volga region. A sumptuous mausoleum was erected in Yasl (later known as Turkistan) by Timūr [see Yasl] and the court of Yasawi has never decreased.

Among the Turkish nomads Yasawi's doctrine was adapted to local trends and was strongly influenced by pre-Islamic Turkish creeds and rituals. The 'skīyāt's first hālīta was Arslan Baba's son, Mansūr Ata (d. 594/1197) great-grandfather of Zengī Ata [q.v.]; the second, Sa'd Ata (d. 615/1218), the third Ḥakīm Ata [q.v.]. (d. 582/1188). His other successors also bore the title of atā. Yasawism established itself in Eastern Turkistan, later spread to Mā warā al-Nahr, Khārākim, as far as Buğkāp, Khūrasān and Persia, and penetrated into Anatolia with the migration of Yasawi skīyāhs, among whom Hādīqī Bektāsh and Sālī Saltuk [q.q.v.] are outstanding.

We know that Ahmad Yasawi wrote vernacular Turkish verse in the old syllabic metre in order to popularize and spread his mystic doctrine. But the poems to be found in the extant collection called Dīvān-i Ḥikmet attributed to him (ḥikmet = "religious poem"), can hardly be genuine. The original work of Ahmad Yasawi has not come down to us and the oldest MSS belong to the 17th century. But we can safely assert that these poems reproduce the true spirit and style of Ahmad Yasawi, since we know that the verses of many a mystic leader were often faithfully imitated, for centuries, by later disciples (cf. Yūnus Emre and his followers). The poems in the Dīvān-i Ḥikmet are of a didactic character and express, in popular language, Islamic and mystic precepts. They gave rise to a new genre in Turkish literature: mystic folk literature which, in the following centuries, flourished side by side with secular folk literature and classical literature.


Ardā AHMAD YUKNAKI (the nisba may possibly refer to the village of Yūghnak, south of Tashkent), early Turkish poet of the 12th century, author of the didactic poem in quatrains, ‘Ayašt al-Ḥakā’īh, dedicated to a certain Dād Sipāhsālār Beg. Its subject matter is related to that of Yusuf Khuwājadīh's [q.v.] Kuwatli̇ghū Būlīg; its language is also akin to, though not identical with, that of the Kuwatli̇ghū Būlīg. The content is, however, more Islamic in character, and more Arabic and Persian words are used. It was edited by Nejīb ‘Āsim, under the title Ḥibāt al-Ḥakā’īh, Istanbul 1334. Critical edition by R. Rahmati Arat, Istanbul 1951.

AHO MDI — AHMANDIS

elegy on the death of Sulayman (814/1411) the poet did not neglect to add a prayer for the new sultan. Mbmed, to whom he subsequently dedicated some of his poems. He died at Amasia in 815/1413.

His main works are the following. (1) Iskender-nâme, on the life and deeds of Alexander the Great, the subject matter of which is borrowed from Firdawsi and Nizâmi, but is expanded by many didactic digressions. The language is singularly pure Turkish and the metre is the native parmasb-hipâ. The poem ends with a trivial sketch of Islamic history, the last part of which, however, is a highly important versified history of the Ottomans, the first we have, on which later historians frequently drew. (The story is brought down to different dates in different versions.) (2) Diri Madâne-eh Khursâdî, a mathnâwâi on the theme of the love of a Chinese prince for a Byzantine princess, based on Salâmân Sâwâdlî’s poem of the same title. (3) Tarwîth al-Arnâwî, a didactic mathnâwâi on medicine and preservation of health, apparently written for the edification of Salûyâmân Celubi. (4) A diwân.


AHMANDIS (see SIKKÂ).

AHMANDIS, a dynasty of princes of Mârâgha. Distinction must be made between the eponym Ahmadî and his successors. Ahmadî b. İbrahim b. Wâhsûdân al-Rawwâdî al-Kurdi was a descendant of the local branch of the originally Arab family of Rawwâd (of Azd) established in Tabrîz (see RAWWADIS). In the course of the time the family became Kurdicized, and even the name Ahmadî is apparently formed with an Iranian (Kurdish) diminutive suffix -î. Ahmadî took part in the anti-Crusade of 505/1111. During the siege of Tell Bağûr, Jôcêyn made an arrangement with him and he withdrew from the town (Kâmâl al-Dîn, Ta’rîkh Halab, RHC, iii, 599). Shortly afterwards he left Syria altogether in the hope of winning the succession to the Şhâhî Arman [9.e.] Sûkmân (d. 506/1112). As Sûkmân had subjugated Tabrîz, Ahmadî was probably interested in recapturing the basic fief of his ancestors. According to Sihti b. al-Dawwâlî (RHC, iii, 556), Ahmadî could muster 5,000 horses and the horse revenue amounted to 400,000 dinars yearly. In 510 (or 508) he was assassinated in Bağdâd by the Ismâ’llîs, to whom he had caused much harm (RHC, ibid.; Ibn al-Ahîr, s.a. 510).

The study of his successors is complicated by the variants of their names and titles used in different sources. Ahmadî was apparently succeeded by one of his slaves, bearing the Turkish name Âk Sûnkûr (al-Abâmî) who is often mentioned in the struggles between the sons of Sultan Muhammad (d. 511/1118). In 514 Mas’ûd b. Muhammad appointed his former âtâbek Kasm al-Dawla al-Bursûqûl to Mârâgha, but Sultan Mûhâmûd b. Muhammad restored Âk Sûnkûr (who had come to Bağdâd) to Mârâgha. After the death in 515/1122 of Kûntûghî, âtâbek to Malik Tughrîl b. Muhammad, Âk Sûnkûr was anxious to succeed him; Tughrîl ordered him to raise 10,000 horse and went with him to conquer Ardablî. During the unsuccessful siege of this town, Mârâgha was occupied by Dîvûsh-beg, sent by Sultan Mûhâmûd. Under 516/1128 the Georgian chronicle (Brosset, i, 368) mentions the defeat of the âtâbek of Armân Ağhûndul (Âk Sûnkûr), whom Tughrîl had directed to carry out a raid in Shîrwan. In 522 he was employed to frustrate the intrigues of the Mazyadid Dubays. Under 524 we hear of Âk Sûnkûr, âtâbek to Dâ’dû b. Mûhâmûd, supporting the candidature of this prince. In 526 Tughrîl defeated his nephew Dâ’dû and occupied Mârâgha and Tabrîz (al-Bundârî, 161). Âk Sûnkûr fled to Bağdâd and then helped Dâ’dû’s other uncle Mas’ûd to recoup Ardashâryân. He also captured Hamadân but in 527/1133 was killed by Ismâ’llîs instigated by Tughrîl (ibid., 159).

Âk Sûnkûr’s son and successor is usually called Âk Sûnkûr (Ibn al-Ahîr, xi, 166, 177; Ta’rîkh-i Gurûda, 472), but is called also Ârsûn b. Âk Sûnkûr (Akûbûr al-Dawla al-Salûdijîyya), and referred to by ‘Imâm al-Dîn as ‘Usrât al-Dîn Khasb-bek (al-Bundârî, 231, and even, p. 243, as ‘Usrât al-Dîn Arslân-Âhà 7). At this time the authority in Ardashâryân was divided between Eldûz, âtâbek to Arslân b. Tughrîl, and Âk Sûnkûr II, who was associated chiefly with the family of Mûhâmûd b. Sultan Mûhâmûd. An enemy of Âk Sûnkûr, Khasîb-bek Arslân b. Belînî-erî, besieged Mârâgha in 541/1146 (al-Bundârî, 217). In 547/1152 Sultan Mûhâmûd executed Ibn Belînî-erî, but in point of fact this execution alerted the two lords (âtâbek of Ardashâryân, Eldûz and Âk Sûnkûr), who proclaimed another candidate (Sulaymân). When Mûhâmûd was restored he appointed Âk Sûnkûr as âtâbek to his son Dâ’dû. This led to a rift with Eldûz. With the help of the Şhâhî Arman, Âk Sûnkûr defeated Pahlûwân b. Eldûz on the Safîd Rûd. In 556/1161 he supported Inandj of Rayy, who was hostile to Eldûz, but this amir was defeated by Eldûz in 557, and Âk Sûnkûr subsequently accompanied Eldûz on his expedition to Georgia (557/1162). In 563, however, Âk Sûnkûr obtained from Bağdâd the recognition of his charge, Malik Dâ’dû, and this led to a new clash with Pahlûwân (Ibn al-Ahîr, xi, 218). Soon afterwards, Âk Sûnkûr fades out of the picture. According to Ta’rîkh Gurûda, 472, his brother Kutlûq revolted in Mârâgha, apparently with the encouragement of the amir Inandj of Rayy (d. 564/1168-9; see Ibn al-Ahîr, xi, 230). Pahlûwân suppressed the revolt and left Mârâgha to Âk Sûnkûr’s brothers ‘Âlî al-Dîn and Rûnû al-Dîn.

Under 570 Ibn al-Ahîr (xi, 280) mentions in Mârâgha Falâk al-Dîn, son of Âk Sûnkûr (II), who must have cherished some designs on Tabrîz, but after a clash with Pahlûwân had to desist from this claim, although the hereditary rift between the two families persisted. In 602/1205-6 the lord of Mârâgha ‘Âlî al-Dîn made a pact with the lord of Irâbî Gîbûrî to depose the incapable Eldûzûd Abû Bakr, but the latter, with the help of the former slave of the family Ay-doghmisji, expelled ‘Âlî al-Dawla from Mârâgha, giving him Umiya and Uguhîn in compensation. In 604 ‘Âlî al-Dawla (whom Ibn al-Ahîr, xii, 157, 182, this time calls ‘Kâr âl Sûnkûr) died, and a courageous servant of his took charge of his minor son who died in 605. The servant remained in the castle of Rûyîn-dîz, while Abû
Bakr occupied the remaining territories of Maragha. It seems certain that 'Ali al-Dawla was the patron to whom Nizām dedicated his Haft Āyāk (completed in 593? and whom the poet calls 'Ali al-Dīn Krb (Korp.-"young")-Arsālān (see Rieu, Cat. Pers. MSS, ii, 567, and Suppl., 1985, 154). Nizām refers to his two sons Nuṣrat al-Dīn Muḥammad and ʿAhmad (one of whom may be the son who according to Ibn al-Athir died in 605).

After this we find the line continued by women. When in 618/1224 the Mongols took Maragha the mistress of the town survived in the fortress of Rūyān-dīz. In 624/1224 Nūr al-Mulk, wasir of the Kharaqām-šāh Djalāl al-Dīn, besieged Rūyān-dīz, whose mistress was a granddaughter of 'Ali al-Dīn Khraba (Nasawī, 129; possibly *Korp-apā-i*). She was married to the de facto son of the Eidsugūd ʿUzbek (called Khamush, "silent"), but probably was separated from him because Khamush had joined Djalāl al-Dīn and later went over to the Ismāʿīlīs (Nasawī, 129-30). The princess was ready to wed Nūr al-Mulk when Djalāl al-Dīn himself arrived on the spot, married her, and appointed his own governor to Rūyān-dīz (ibid., 157). Khamush had a numerous family and it is not clear whether his son "ʿūzbek Nuṣrat al-Dīn" was born to him of the Ahmādī princes. According to Dhuwaylī, Nuṣrat al-Dīn was hiding in Rūm, but towards 644/1246 he obtained an al tamgha from Ghiyūk Khān for the governorship of Tabrīz and Aḥgbarjavān.

(V. Minorsky)

**AHMADIYYA** is the name (i) of an organized religious community, standing in continuity with its eponym, Mīrzā Ghulām ʿAhmad of Kādīyān; and (ii) of a small organization or movement derived from (i).

Ghulām ʿAhmad was born into the leading family of the small town of Kādīyān, Gurdaspur district, Pandjāb, India, about 1835/1839. The title Mīrzā relates to the family's having come in with the conquering Mughals, in this case under Bābūr. The boy received a good traditional education, in Arabic and Persian, and was from childhood studious and reflective. Rather than follow his father as kālim, or this father's wishes by going on in British government service or practising law, he soon gave himself up (on his landlord income) to quietude in his native place. Along with meditation and religious study he developed apparently a propensity for hearing voices. At the age of about forty he began to publish (1880) a considerable work Barāhīn-i Ahmādīyya, which was well received. On 4 March 1889 he announced that he had received from God a revelation authorizing him to accept bayāt; and a small group was forthcoming of formal disciples, who were devoted and in some cases remarkably able men. Opposition from the Muslim community began two years later when he announced that he was the Masīḥ and the Mahdī. From that date (1881) until his death (24 Rabi’ II 1326/26 May 1908) there was continuous increase both in opposition to him and in his own claims; also in his following. Controversy raged; chiefly with Muslims, though also with Hindus and Christians. He claimed to receive revelations (both śāhīm and wahi are used), including foreknowledge; to perform miracles (including both raising the dead to life, and vice-versa: he boasted of bringing about, through prayer, the death of rivals); and to be an Avadār of Kṛṣṇa (1904) as well as Jesus returned to earth and the Mahdī; also the burūs ("re-appearance") of Muḥammad. Whether he claimed to be a nabī, and if so what he meant by it, is disputed between the two groups into which his followers later divided (see below). His teachings, over his last twenty years, are multifarious: sometimes curious (as, e.g., that Jesus died and is buried in Srinagar) or well-informed, sometimes inconsistent, often polemical and crude, sometimes remarkably spiritual. One discerns in them, in addition to peripheral Hindu concepts and a reaction against Christian influences, but more especially in the pattern of his life and the positive response evoked, a late Indian sūfī version of Islam activated by modern-Western infiltrations.

When he died, his followers thereby ceased to be a body of disciples; they became instead a community of believers, and, rather than disintegrating, elected a khilīfa (Mawlāw Nūr al-Dīn) and proceeded to exist as an independent community. The validity of this, or at least of its form, was doubted by some; and when this first khilīfa died (1914), most of the executive and westernized minority seceded, to set up at Lahore a society propagating the new teachings (as they saw them), while the majority remained at Kādīyān rather as a community embodying those teachings (and propagating itself). There was a political difference also: the sellectionists (dissociating themselves less from the wider Muslim community) were beginning to feel and to participate in the nascent anti-imperialism of Indian Islam (Kānprū mosque incident, 1913), while the major group explicitly clung to the traditional loyalty of the founder and his family. They chose the founder's twenty-five-year old son as Khilīfat al-Masīḥ II. The forty years of his khilīfat have been the story of the gradual forging of the virtually new movement that exists to-day. Similarly in the case of the Lahore party, which had as leader a young lawyer and religious intellectual, it has been rather the gradual working out of a virtually new system of ideas.

Both groups were—and are—dynamic, and have developed much, each in its own way. They have travelled far, from their common starting point, and also from each other. They will, accordingly, be separately described.

(i) The community. Name: Urdu, DJAMA-AT-I AHMADIYYA; English, AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT IN ISLAM. An Ahmādī is also commonly referred to as Ḵādiyānī (which since 1947 has become less appropriate; see below), and sometimes—usually to his own annoyance—as Mīrzāʾī. Membership is by birth within the movement, or by joining, on formal profession of faith and acceptance of duties. According to their own figures, there are some half-million members; about half of these being in Pakistan, the rest somewhat evenly divided between India and the remainder of the world (chiefly West Africa; but there are Ahmādī congregations from Indonesia to the Arab world, with small bands of converts also in Britain, the continent of Europe, and the United States). Members pay monthly dues (from each a minimum of 1/4% of his income is required; with various further contributions expected and often given). The movement accordingly handles considerable sums; and its organization is strong and centralized. The community also operates and enforces (on traditional "Islamic" lines) its own internal judiciary (*kadd*) so far as feasible. New headquarters of the community are at Rabwah, Pakistan. There is a central Advisory Council (Majūdi-i Muḥāwarat), largely elected; and a strong central secretariat. However, all power is finally vested in the head of the movement, who for the last
Ahmadiyya

Forty years has been, as already indicated, the founder's son, Hazrat Mirza Bashir al-Din Ahmad (b. 1906/1889). So largely have direction and control been in his hands that the movement in its present form may be said to be in significant degree his creation.

The above organization binds the community together; and strikingly vigorous, well-planned missionary activity throughout the world continues to expand it. These externals, however, are manifestly informed by a spiritual quality, a faith and religious life. Four, overlapping, aspects of this may be noted: the memory of the founder, reverence for the present head, doctrine, and the intensity of corporate life. The teachings are those of the founder, as interpreted (expanded, modified) by the present head. At the present stage of development they are most effectively presented in his Ahmadiyyat or the True Islam (1924; 3rd ed., Washington 1951; also available in other languages), and in his vast Kur'ān commentary, now in process (Tafsir-i Kābir, in Urdu). In the formula currently signed on joining the movement, a statement addressed to the head, these sentences figure: "I bear witness that God alone is to be worshipped. He is One having no partner. /I will try my best to act upon all the Laws of Islam. /I will obey you in everything good that you tell me. /I consider the Holy Prophet Muhammad to be the Seal of the Prophets, and also believe in all the claims of the Prophet Ahmad of Qadian (peace be on them) ..." (from the English version used in the Washington, D. C., mosque). The core of Ahmadi belief is that their community embodies the only true form of Islam (the one true religion, sent by God), it having been launched in this revitalized and newly revealed form by Ahmad, who was sent by God for the purpose, and it is being further divinely guided through its present head. Other Muslims, by rejecting this heaven-sent re-formation, are pronounced kāfir. Of the veneration in which the present head is held by his followers a compelling illustration is the reasoned tribute by one who is to-day a world figure: Zafrullah Khan, The Head of the Ahmadiyya Movement in Islam (offprint, Chicago, n.d. [c. 1945]).

The activities of the community, apart from their zealous and efficient propaganda, include such internal matters as the establishing and running of schools and colleges (the former centre, Kādiyān, appears to have been much the most literate town in India, with almost total feminine literacy). They produce great quantities of literature (see below); have their own exclusive mosques; and sustain a telling esprit de corps.

Ahmadi relations with Hindus and Sikhs have been chiefly attempted proselytism, with very limited success; with Christians there was also at first a spirited polemic on both sides, not without acerbity, though the situation appears gradually to have improved. It is with other Muslims that the Ahmadiyya have had primarily to deal: from them has come the overwhelming body of their converts, and also their opposition, often bitter and at times violent. The ambiguities of their situation became particularly vexed with the establishment in 1947 of Pakistan, into which both geographically and ideologically they almost, but not quite, fit. They transferred their headquarters perforce from Kādiyān (in India, because of the controversial Radcliffe award) to a site, previously barren, in Pakistan, which they named Rabwah (cf. Kur'ān, ii, 265) and where they are now constructing a town (about 90 miles south-west of Lahore). The political issue was less easily settled: whether they, who called other Muslims kāfir, should be fully admitted into the Muslims' new state, was a question that flared up in 1953 and brought riots, bloodshed, and the fall of governments.

The Bibliography is enormous. The most important source is the movement's own voluminous publications. A few of the founder's more than 75 books (in Arabic, Persian, Urdu) have been republished by the present community in several languages (perhaps most important today: The Teachings of Islam, various editions); the first bālija wrote some half-dozen, and the present head is the author of over thirty works (two most important noted above; add: Introduction to the Study of the Holy Quran, London 1949; Economic Structure of Islamic Society, Qadian 1946). Other members have written about the community, and its leaders; also lives of Muhammad, etc. (e.g. Sufi M. R. Bengalas, Life of Muhammad), and translations of the Kur'ān in several languages. Moreover, the community has produced and produces large numbers of periodicals—daily, weekly, and monthly—from India, West Pakistan, East Pakistan, Ceylon, Indonesia, Lagos, Israel, Zurich, London, Chicago, Washington, and elsewhere. Sunni Muslim and Christian missionary writing on the movement has often, though not always, been polemical; the former often important and revealing (e.g. Muhammad Ibqal, Islam and Ahmadism, Lahore, 1936), the latter often informative (e.g. H. A. Walter, The Ahmadiya Movement, Calcutta and London 1918; numerous other studies; articles in MW every few years). Almost all books on Indian Islam (e.g. M. Titus, Indian Islam, 1930, 226 ff.; W. C. Smith, Modern Islam in India, 1946, 298 ff.) or Modern Islam mention the community. Objective descriptive studies, of an academic sort, do not seem to have appeared in significant or comprehensive form since L. Bouvat, in JA, 1928, 159-81.

(ii) The Ahmadiyya An'umman Islām (headquarters in Lahore). This group accepts Ghulām Ahmad as muddādd, not as prophet, and affirms that he never claimed to be a prophet. It has always been incomparably smaller than (i); but comparatively zealous in its activities. It has differed, for instance, in trying more to win converts to Islam than to itself. It has been active in a systematic and effective fashion, chiefly in three overlapping fields: publishing, organized foreign missionary work, and leadership in intellectual modernism (liberalism) in Islam, especially of English-reading Islam. It has produced and circulated throughout the world (chiefly in English and Urdu, but also in a half-dozen and more other European and well over a dozen Asian languages) translations of the Kur'ān, lives of Muhammed; impressive expositions of Islam, many monographs and essays, and innumerable pamphlets. Its foreign mission stations, in London, Berlin, Indonesia, have been influential; especially the first (the Woking Mission, an independent entity from 1930, but from 1947 again semi-officially related to the Lahore movement). The leader of the movement from its inception until his death in 1951, prolific author of much of its literature, and chief creator of its distinctive intellectual contribution was Maulānā Muhammad 'Ali. Also to be mentioned is the equally prolific but shorter-lived idām of the Woking mosque, Khādja Kamāl al-Dīn (1870-1932).

Bibliography: The movement's own publications are again the main source: see the writings.
Ahmadnagar is the capital of the district to that name in India (Presidency of Bombay) on the river Siva. In 1901 the town numbered 42,000 inhabitants, the district (6586 square miles = 17,058 square kilometres) 837,695 inhabitants. The town in 1901 the festival of the breaking of the fast; a contribution from slaves for the provisioning of the army; the *wugar* (fulbe: *wurru*), a 10% customs duty. Every spring military expeditions were organized. Each village had to provide a fixed quota of men for these military operations, a third of this quota being mobilized each year by roster. The troops, free men, received subsistence for the maintenance of their families during their absence. There were five high-ranking military officers, each responsible for the defence of a particular sector. There existed a right of appeal from the regional *kadis* to the *kadis* at Hamdallahi, and from the latter to Ahmadu himself, aided by a "marabout tribunal" in an advisory capacity.

Ahmadu I died in 1844 and his son Ahmadu (Hamadu) II succeeded him, despite the native customary law of succession. In 1846 he reimposed, in a modified form, the sovereignty of Mäsa over Timbuktü, which had rebelled at the death of his father. Ahmadu II was similarly succeeded in 1852 by his son, Ahmadu III. He died, by diplomacy or by force, to check the expansion of the great Tokolor conqueror, al-Hadidj Umar Tal, but the latter took Hamdallahi in June 1862. Ahmadu III fled towards Timbuktü, but was captured and put to death at Umar's orders. His uncle Ba Lobbo continued the fight against Umar and his successors. The Mäsa State had been a centre of strict Islam, inimical to infidels, as the European travellers René Caillé and Heinrich Barth had discovered.


Ahmar, Banu 'L', genealogical name of the nasrid dynasty (see MAŠRIDS).

Al-Ahnaf b. Kays, the usual cognomen of a Tamimite noble of Busra named Abu Bakr Şaghër (sometimes, but erroneously, called al-Dahhák). B. Kays b. Mu'awiya al-Tammi al-Sadî, of the family of Murra b. 'Ubayd; through his mother, he was descended from the Bahlite clan Awād b. Ma'n. He was born before Islam and, probably at an early age, lost his father, killed by the Banu Mäzin. His biographers state that he was deformed from birth and that he had under himself a huge and abnormal stammer. His cognomen (al-ahnaf) derives from the fact that his feet were misshapen, but he also had other abnormalities (see the description of his physical appearance in al-Djahiz, al-Bayan, i, 56).
At the advent of Islam, the Tamimites did not respond immediately to the Prophet's overtures, and it was the Ahnafite (al-Ahnaf b. Kays) who was instrumental in procuring their conversion. He then presented himself to Umar, and was among the first inhabitants of Basra, where he soon emerged as spokesman and leader of the Tamimites who, during the 1st/7th century formed the intellectual, religious and political élite of the city. Under the command of Abu Mūsā al-Aswāfī, he took part, notably in 23/644 and 29/649-50, in the capture of Kūmm, Kāghān and Isfahān. He was later one of the best generals of 'Abd Allāh b. 'Amīr [q.v.], under whose orders he conquered Kūhistān, Harāt, Marw, Marw al-Rūdgh, Balkh and other districts (near Marw al-Rūdgh, his memory was perpetuated by the Қaṣr al-Ahnāf and the Rustāk al-Ahnāf). He even led his troops as far as the plains of Tukharistan, thus preventing the last king of Persia from organising further resistance against the Muslims. For a time governor of a district of Kūhsrān, he afterwards returned to Basra where his position as head of the Tamimites enabled him to play an important political role. Although a neutral at the battle of the Camel (36/656) between the partisans of 'Ali and those of ʿĀlī and 'Iqṣāḥ, he fought on the side of 'Ali the following year at the battle of Siffin. From then on he appears to have devoted himself to local political affairs, but the Umayyads considered his influence to be such that they consulted him on general political problems, and it was in this way that he came to give his opinion on the question of Muʿāwiya's successor. At Basra there was latent hostility between the Rabi'a faction, represented by the Bakrī and the Mudar faction, represented by the Tamlīm. At Basra where his position as head of the Tamimites had been kept alive by the Tamlīm who considered him one of their greatest leaders. He was something of a poet, but above all he left a reputation for sagacity, which is conveyed by a large number of aphorisms and maxims, some of which have become proverbial; his ʿilm is compared to that of Muʿaṣira, and is also proverbial; hence the saying: ʿalm min al-Ahnāf (al-Dībiḥī, al-Hayyānī), ii, 92; al-Maqrīzī, i, 293-300, 53-57; ʿAbd Allāh b. Ziyad, Sarfy al-ʿUyun, i, 274; Aḥbānī, index; Goldzinner, Muh. St., ii, 96, 205; Ch. Pellat, Milleu bāšris, index. (Ch. Pellat)

AL-AḤSĀʾ [see AL-ḤASA and ḤUḤŪF].

AL-AḤSĀʾ, Shāykh Ahmad b. Zayn al-Dīn b. Ibrāhīm, founder of the theological school (later, after his excommunication by the Shiʿī mujtahids, more properly speaking "sect") which, from his designation, took the name of Shāykh [q.v.]. He was born in al-Āhsāʾ (Arabia) in 1166/1753. His biographers record his great piety from his years of infancy. At the age of twenty, already learned in the religious sciences, he went on pilgrimage to the Shiʿī sanctuaries in al-ʿIrāq, where he had his first successes in obtaining from the mujtahids "licences" to teach the religious sciences. After establishing himself with his family in Bahrayn, and later in Basra, he made several journeys in al-ʿIrāq and, from 1221/1806 onwards, also in Persia, where he made the pilgrimage to Mashhad and, on his return, settled at Yazd as a teacher, enjoying the greatest veneration. Even the šāh (Fath ʿAll Shah Kāgār) summoned him to Teherān, and loaded him with honours. This, together with his great popularity, roused the jealousy of the divines of Yazd, and several reports began to circulate on the unorthodoxy of Shāykh Ahmad's teachings; more particularly challenged were his eschatological doctrines, in which, according to the "orthodox" Shiʿī theologians, he had denied the resurrection of the body and interpreted it as a purely spiritual resurrection (see sāyyādī). After a final pilgrimage to Karbalāʾ, he settled in 1229/1814 in Kirmānsāh, whence he made several journeys (into al-ʿIrāq and, in 1232/1817-18, to Mecca). His definitive rupture with the mujtahids took place at Kazmān about 1235-40/1824, after his return from another pilgrimage to Mashhad, in consequence of a discussion with the fiery Hājjī Mullā Tākī Barakānī, uncle of the famous Bābī poetess Tāhirā (or Kurrat al-ʿĀyn, see bāllī). The hostility of the mullās towards him steadily increased, and he was even accused of professing theories which never entered his head (e.g., the divinity of ʿAll, the doctrine of tawfīq, according to which God had entrusted the care of the worldly creation to the imāms, etc.). After many wanderings, interspersed with teaching and the composition of his numerous works, he died in the course of a pilgrimage to Mecca, at the age of 75 years, near Medina, in 1241/1826, and was buried there. His theological works (including minor treatises) number about a hundred. For his doctrines see art. sāyyātī. The school founded by him was guided by his successor Sayyid Kāẓim Rāshī [q.v.], and out of it there developed at a later date the Bābī [q.v.] movement. Bibliography: A. L. M. Nicolas, Chakh Ahmad Lāḥiṣānī, Paris 1910 (Essai sur le Chékhisme, i); Brockelmann, S ii, 844-5. For further bibliography see sāyyātī. (A. Bausani)
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[18x-95]Encyclopaedia of Islam
[19x81]as a poet. He excelled chiefly in love poetry,
[19x81]fakhr,
[19x174]five years, although the Ansar, whose mouth-piece
[19x140]political aims by a satire against the Muhallabids.
[19x208]in the pillory, and exiled to the island of Dahlak
[19x200]in the Red Sea
[19x200],
[19x47]Umar b. Abl
[19x47]Rabl
[19x47]a; this is shown in his preference for the old
[19x183]language uses it freely, perhaps influenced by the
[19x140]relations with Yazld; he died after an illness in
[19x132]Nothing more is known of al-Afowas after his
[19x123]is influenced by the dialect of Medina (cf. K.
[19x225]On the instigation of the governing circles and by
[19x267]al-Husayn) in his poems, his conflict with the
[19x276]his mentioning of noble ladies (e.g. Sukayna bint
[19x285]political and moral offences, such as his love-affairs,
[21x420]with al-Walid, -whose guest he was on various
[21x437]were the main representatives.
[21x505]Ardii, and al-Afcwa§ Umar b. Abl Rabl'a, al-
[21x522]of Medina, which was dominated by worldly pleasures.
[21x531]rations exercised an influence also on the social life
[21x539]exile. Affluence and the exclusion of political aspi-
[21x548]however, not allowed to take part in government
[21x565]addition, subsidized by the caliphs. They were,
[21x582]it
[21x599]refined society of Medina. The noble-born inhabitants
[21x607]born about 35/655; he spent his life mainly in the
[21x615]Df the Banu Pubay
c[21x615]C
[21x624]AsiM B. THABIT, Arabic poet,
[21x624]ABD ALLAH B. c
[21x624]c
[21x624]c
[27x-64]gesch.,
[27x-73]Lett, ar.,
[27x-73]Abriss der ar. Lit.,
[27x-56]Zahra.
[27x-47]TA
[27x-47]Mu'diam; LA
[27x-47]idem,
[27x106]The judgements about al-Ahwas's character are
[27x-82]Gaudefroy-Demombynes,
[27x-39]tfamdsa;
[27x-39]tfamdsa;
[27x-39]Yafcut,
[27x-21]313.
[27x-4]s.v. al-Atiwas; Ibn Kutayba,
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[211x-165]quoted by al-Ghazall attest
[211x-157]Kdmus al-Mufrit
[211x-157]but a marginal gloss in the
[211x-157](2nd
[212x-183]language uses it freely, perhaps influenced by the
[212x-200]"Ottoman family law", (/. O.
[212x-191](Ma&atta),
[212x-191]Ottoman civil code
[212x-191]for example hukuk-i
[212x-174]the meaning "family". The modern neo-classic
[212x-140]C
[212x-140]YL, this word is not found in the Rur'an except
[212x-148](ix, 28) as a variant reading for
[212x-148]'ayla
[212x-37]for its foundations the remains of the great dam.
[212x22]ning of the present century it had about 2000
[212x-12]zistan in 1926. The town has also benefited greatly
[212x-123]close of the 3rd/19th century. A recovery was sub-
[212x-132]serious Zandj rebellion caused a decline towards the
[212x164]
[212x191]of Huzl, i.e., KhazI or Khud|I, in Syriac Huzayg,
[213x149]Abbasid Caliphates. It was the centre of
[213x149]c
[213x149]and
[213x174]O$£toi of the classical writers; hence also Khuzistan
[213x208]renamed the town Sufc al-Ahwaz, meaning "the
[213x216](Khuzistan) and took Hormuzd Ardashir, they
[213x250]Gesch. d.
[213x250]Susiana in place of Susa. (Cf. Th. Noldeke,
[213x259]greatly and became capital of the province of
[213x267]Under him and his successors the town prospered
[213x301](Cf. Pauly-Wissowa, s. vv. Aginis and Tareiana.)
[213x309](Cf. Nearchus anchored his fleet just below this bridge
[213x284]I, who renamed it Hormuzd Ardashir and began the
[213x233]1889, 410.)
[213x242]13, 19; Perser und Araber zur zeit d. Sasaniden,
[213x242]ZDMG,
[213x259]construction of the great dam across the rapids.
[213x276]Pasargadae crossed the river by a bridge of boats.
[213x309]after his memorable voyage up the Persian Gulf.
[213x326]Tareiana was rebuilt by the Sásánian king Ardâshir
[213x233]1889, 410.)
[213x326]I, who renamed it Hormuzd Ardashir and began the
[213x242]13, 19; Perser und Araber zur zeit d. Sasaniden,
[213x259]greatly and became capital of the province of
[213x267]Under him and his successors the town prospered
[213x309](Cf. Nearchus anchored his fleet just below this bridge
[213x233]1889, 410.)
[213x242]13, 19; Perser und Araber zur zeit d. Sasaniden,
[213x259]greatly and became capital of the province of
[213x267]Under him and his successors the town prospered
[213x309](Cf. Nearchus anchored his fleet just below this bridge
[213x233]1889, 410.)
[213x242]13, 19; Perser und Araber zur zeit d. Sasaniden,
[213x259]greatly and became capital of the province of
[213x267]Under him and his successors the town prospered
[213x309](Cf. Nearchus anchored his fleet just below this bridge
[213x233]1889, 410.)
[213x242]13, 19; Perser und Araber zur zeit d. Sasaniden,
[213x259]greatly and became capital of the province of
[213x267]Under him and his successors the town prospered
[213x309](Cf. Nearchus anchored his fleet just below this bridge
[213x233]1889, 410.)
[213x242]13, 19; Perser und Araber zur zeit d. Sasaniden,
[213x259]greatly and became capital of the province of
[213x267]Under him and his successors the town prospered
[213x309](Cf. Nearchus anchored his fleet just below this bridge
[213x233]1889, 410.)
[213x242]13, 19; Perser und Araber zur zeit d. Sasaniden,
[213x259]greatly and became capital of the province of
[213x267]Under him and his successors the town prospered

Sociological theories. The collective work of the Arab genealogists is based implicitly on the assumption that the tribe is a family on a larger scale. Robertson Smith has made a just appreciation of this over-simplified conception, which is ostensibly based on common sense, and, more recently, Bich Frères (L’Honneur chez les Arabes, Paris 1932, 49-50) has recognized "that it appears impossible to study the social morphology of the ancient Arabs". This picture corresponds to that given by the nomads regarding their social structure. But does it correspond to reality? The existence of ancestor-worship and of the cult of the dead among the Semites, disputed by Renan, has been proved by A. Goldziher as regards biblical antiquity, and by I. Goldziher as regards the Arab world. The cult of the dead concerns the family because the natural ministers of such a cult are recruited from within the family, and because it implies a posterity for its own perpetuation. It is not impossible even that this cult may have played some part in the formation of the family, and especially in establishing it as a religious unit, endowed with social functions. Earliest-recognizable traces of the cult of the dead, to which Islam has been opposed since its inception, persist even to the present day, with unmistakable signs of propitiatory rites. The need, still felt to be imperative, for descent in the male line could be a final relic of this cult. On the other hand, to liken saint-worship and the veneration of holy places to ancestor-worship is to invite disagreement. The interconnection between divine and human genealogies has been amply demonstrated by Dhorne (La Religion des Hébreux nomades, Brussels 1937, Ch. xviii). It confirms the identification of legal relationships involving protection or alliance, with kinship, an idea which still exists among the nomads, and which is typical of the patriarchal system.

The basic social unit among the Semites was the clan (Hebrew mishkahba, Arabic hujjat [q.v.]). The totemistic theory of an exogamous organization between maternal clans has been brilliantly developed by Robertson Smith (Kinship and Marriage in early Arabia, Cambridge 1889). In his review of this work, Nöldeke (ZDMG, 1886, 148-89) disputes the importance of the naming of clans after animals "which occurs, relatively speaking, much rarer than the expect of the author would imply". But, in addition to the linguistic arguments based on the words indicating the clan by allusion to a uterine relationship, and on two parallel series of names of kinship, agnate and cognate, all the facts so far advanced hardly seem to provide a better explanation. Marriage customs of a matriarchal character seem to have persisted relatively late in the Peninsula. The lack of a prohibition of incest in the paternal line is also adduced as evidence by R. Smith (ibid., 163), but Wellhausen (Die Ehe bei den Arabern, Nachr. von d. königl. Ges. d. Wiss. u. d. Georg-August Univ. zu Göttingen, 1893, 431-82) is of the opinion (441) that this has not been sufficiently proved. Even if one admits the existence of a totemistic period during remote antiquity, the patriarchal régime is firmly established from the dawn of the historical era, and the notable survivals of earlier practices pose a difficult problem. According to Gertrude H. Stern (Marriage in Early Islam, London 1939), certain marriage alliances of a political nature, contracted by the Prophet with the tribes, were of a different character from the others, and the women continued to reside amongst their own clan (appendix A, 151-7). In fact it is possible to find, up to the contemporary epoch, evidence of this type attested in Assyrian legislation. It is, however, indisputable that the family regime has become patriarchal.

The family in Islam. Islam did not create the practices of the social milieu in which it appeared, and to begin with it concerned itself only with improving the moral standards governing these practices. In the second period, at Medina, the Prophet, now head of the State, is led to dispense justice and to create, in progressive stages, a system of rules, called into being by judgements in individual cases, with the force of statutory law. The work by G. H. Stern quoted above shows that he followed a plan of reform, by unifying the chaotic practices of pagan Arabia. This unification could not have been completed, as is clear from monographs on present day customs. Elements borrowed from conquered peoples have been incorporated in the original Arabic background. But if the lack of unity displays itself in a marked discrepancy between fact and theory, the overall picture nevertheless reflects the type of patriarchal family which has maintained its position with remarkable stability throughout the Near East, and which is already depicted in the ancient Hittite, Babylonian, Assyrian and Sumerian systems of law. In its most primitive forms, the authority of the head of the family is entirely unrestricted; it becomes weaker among the settled populations of the great cities. This patriarchal authority is the origin of the laws on divorce, polymony etc. The veil (hidjâb [q.v.]), which goes back to remote antiquity, is not strictly relevant to the subject of family institutions, although it is in keeping with their patriarchal character. In short, the Muslim family recalls in certain respects though with some notable points of difference that portrayed in European literature in the heyday of the Middle Ages. See also MARIM, MARRA, MUKHÂNA, TALIK.

Bibliography: In addition to the works mentioned above, the following works on Semitic antiquity should be consulted: Robertson Smith, Lectures on the Religion of the Semites, London 1889 (re-ed. S. A. Cook, 1927); I. Goldziher, Le Culte des ancêtres et le culte des morts chez les Arabes, in RHR, 1884, 332-59; A. Lods, La croyance à la vie future ... et spécial Le Culte des morts dans l'antiquité hébraïque, Paris 1906; for the modern period, see H. A. R. Gibb, Modern Trends in Islam, Chicago 1947 (French trans. Paris 1949); R. Paret, Zur Frauenfrage in der arabisch-islamischen Welt, Stuttgart 1934; Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, London 1895; Kâzım Daghestâni,Ėtude sociologique sur la famille musulmane contemporaine en Syrie, Paris n. d.; for a full bibliography, see J. Lecerf, Note sur la famille dans le monde arabe et islamique, Arabica, 1956/1. (J. Lecerf)
of the ʿAlīn-nāma, translated by Ibn al-Muqaffāʿ, are preserved in the Uyun al-Akhbār of Ibn Kutayba, and the most important of these, relating to military tactics, archery and polo, have been studied by Inostranzev. It is possible that, co-existent with the large official ʿAlīn-nāma, there were lesser works of a specialized nature dealing with each branch of court education. This belief arises from other titles quoted in the Fihrist, namely, ʿAlīn al-Rāmy and ʿAlīn al-Darb bi-ʾl-Ṣaḥādiyya, although these could be considered merely as portions or extracts from the larger work. The Sāsānīd ʿAlīn-nāma is also mentioned by al-Masʿūdī (Tanbih, 104-6); (pseudo)-Dībih, in the Kitāb al-Tādīfi fi ʿAbdāb al-Mulāk, which has very full materials concerning the manners and etiquette of the Sāsānīds, also refers to, but does not quote directly, an ʿAlīn al-Furūʿ. The title of ʿAlīn was used later in other works on Persian Islamic history and institutions, such as the ʿAlīn-i Akbari, being that part of the Akbar-nāma of Abuʾl Fadl ʿAllāmānī (q.v.) (16th century) which is devoted to the institutions of Akbar’s court.


(A. F. Gabrieli)

AIR (AYR), also called ASHEN, mountainous district of the Sahara, falling between lat. 25°-31° N., and long. 7°-9° E. It comprises three distinct regions: 1) the northern Air, consisting wholly of plateau and plain; 2) the central Air, which is a homogeneous unit, has a rugged landscape, with peaks rising to 5,000 ft.; 3) the southern Air, consisting of rocky plateaux sloping towards the Sudan. The rainfall, more abundant in the Air than in the rest of the Sahara (rainy season from June to August) feeds underground basins which support a fairly rich vegetation (gum trees); agriculture is, however, on a small scale, and the country owes its important place in the economic life of the Sahara primarily to its position on caravan routes (azalay). It possesses strata of slate, and hot springs; primitive handicrafts are still carried on.

The population of the Air is composed of two main elements: negroid (Hausa) and Berber—the Kel Air who form one of the seven principal Tuareg groups; they comprise the Kel Geres and the Kel Ui (Ewey), the latter having intermarried to a considerable extent with the Hausa. According to the censuses of 1933-8, the Kel Air number 27,765. They are a semi-settled people, and live in villages or in groups; they comprise the Kel Geres and the Kel Ui who, in the Air, had just supplanted the Kel Geres. Agades is now the chief town of a region (Niger Territory) of which the Air is a part. The whole population is Muslim (the Kel Geres since the 9th/15th century), and religious activity is relatively keen, owing to the presence of religious brotherhoods with considerable numbers of adherents.

Aisha Bint Abi Bakr — Aisha Al-Mannubiyya

(Kur’an, xxiv, 11 ff.) implying her innocence and rebuking those who had gossiped. 'Abd Allah b. Umar was publicly humiliated.

A number of stories about A'isha have been preserved from the later years of Muhammad’s life. They depict Muhammad as having genuine affection for A'isha, and A'isha as being devoted to him. They do not, however, justify the view (cf. H. Lammens, Le Triomphe de Abou Bakr etc., MFOB, iv) that she engaged in political intrigue and influenced Muhammad’s decisions. Nevertheless, there seems to have been two factions among Muhammad’s wives, one led by A'isha and Hafsa, the daughter of 'Umar, which supported the policy of their fathers, and another led by Umm Salama of the Meccan clan of Makhzum; but their rivalry probably had little political effect. When Muhammad realized that death was near, he asked his wives to agree that he should go to A'isha’s chamber and remain there. She nursed him for the few days of his illness, and his grave was made in the floor of her chamber. Abū Bakr and 'Umar were also buried there.

As Muhammad’s power increased, his wives had a more comfortable life and a higher status in the community, including the title “mothers of the believers” (cf. Kur’an, xxxxi, 6); but they were forbidden to remarry (ibid. v, 53). A'isha was thus left a childless widow about the age of 18. For two years her father was caliph, and then for ten 'Umar, with whom she was on good terms, but she does not seem to have played any part in public affairs. As opposition grew against 'Uthman, the third caliph, however, A'isha came to have a leading part in it, though she was not in agreement either with the group of insurgents responsible for 'Uthman’s assassination nor with the party of 'Ali. She openly declared her opposition to the killing of 'Uthman, but left Medina for Mecca to take part in the pilgrimage. Many motives have been alleged for this flight by A'isha at a critical juncture. Perhaps the chief one was to help in organizing in Mecca a party of like-minded Persons.

'Uthman was assassinated in Dhu 'Al-Hijja 35/ June 656. About four months later A'isha met Medina for Bagr along with about 250 men of Kuraysh, professing to be taking vengeance for 'Uthman. Shortly before this she had been joined by Taḥa and al-Zubayr. The three were now leaders of a movement in opposition to 'Ali. They obtained control of Bagr, and with many of the Muslims of that city marched to the outskirts to meet 'Ali who had meantime left Medina for Kūfa, and was advancing against them. The battle (in Djamād II 35/December 656) came to be known as the Battle of the Camel, since the fiercest struggle was round the camel bearing A'isha’s litter. 'Ali was victorious, and the opposing army was scattered. A'isha herself was treated with respect, but Taḥa and al-Zubayr lost their lives.

After this failure A'isha lived quietly in Medina for over twenty years. She took no further active part in politics, but became reconciled to 'Ali and did not oppose Mu'awiya. Her approval and disapproval, however, still seem to have counted for something. She died in Ramadān 58/July 678. In later times she was depicted as a model of piety, but it is difficult to know what is the basis of fact for this view.

It is said that 1210 traditions were related on her authority, but barely 300 of these were retained by al-Bukhārī and Muslim. She is said to have had a codex of the Kur’an, and a few readings are given on her authority (cf. A. Jeffery, Materials for the History of the Qur'an, Leiden 1937, 231 ff.). She was noted for her knowledge of poetry and ability to quote it, and also for her eloquence; and she was versed in Arab history and other subjects.

Bibliography: Ibn Hisham, index; Balāghur, Ansāb, v; Ṭabarī, index; Ibn al-Aqīr, index; idem, Usd al-Qābīa, v, 501-4; Ibn Sa'd, vii, 59-56; Ibn Ḥājar, Ḥāfiz, iv, 691 ff.; Mas'ūdī, Munāfiq, iv; Nawawī (Wüstenfeld), 848 ff.; Ibn Hanbal, Musnad, vi, 29-282; F. Bubel, Das Leben Mohammeds, passim; in Abbott, Aisha the Beloved of Mohammed, Chicago, 1942.

(W. Montgomery Watt)

Aisha Bint Talha, one of the most famous of Arab women. Daughter of a Companion of the Prophet, Taḥa b. 'Ubayd Allāh al-Taymi [q.v.], who had already won great renown, grand-daughter of Abū Bakr through her mother Umm Kūlhām, and niece of A'isha, the Prophet’s favourite wife, she combined nobility of birth with an imperious spirit and a rare beauty, which she was anxious should not go unnoticed. By nature a coquette, she courted the praises of the ghassal poets ('Umar b. Rabī'a, i, 80; Kūthayyir 'Azza, Ibn Kūtayba, Shīr, 322; 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr, Ahdanī, x, 60), and knew how to use to the best advantage the emotions which she inspired. She even occasionally disposed of the Governor of Mecca, Al-Hārīr b. Khālid al-Majzūmī, who had agreed to postpone the hour of prayer in order to allow her to complete her jawāl (Ahdanī, iii, 100, 103, 113; see Dāhib, Bigkal, ed. Pellat, in course of preparation) § 20, and Ahdanī, x, 60, for an anecdote concerning the brilliant retinue which she had obtained from the caliph for the purposes of her pilgrimage). She is reckoned as one of the mutawwidad, i.e. women who have had several husbands; she married successively her cousin 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr, Muṣ'ab b. al-Zubayr, and after the latter’s death, 'Umar b. 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ma'mar al-Taymi. The date of her death is not known.

Bibliography: Ibn Kūtayba, Ma'ārī, Cairo 1355/1934, 102-103; Ibn Sa’d Tabākhi, viii, 344; Balāghur, Ansāb, xi, 10, 202; Ibn Kuthayr, Musnad, 322; Abd al-Rahman b. Abi Rabi', Musnad, 1, 103, 113; Kuthayr, al-Zubayr, and after the latter’s death, Byr; Ibn al-Athir, index; Ibn al-Adhr, index; Ibn Iltuf, 103, 113; see Dāhib, Bigkal, (ed. Pellat, in course of preparation) § 20, and Ahdanī, x, 60, for an anecdote concerning the brilliant retinue which she had obtained from the caliph for the purposes of her pilgrimage). She is reckoned as one of the mutawwidad, i.e. women who have had several husbands; she married successively her cousin 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr, Muṣ'ab b. al-Zubayr, and after the latter’s death, 'Umar b. 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ma'mar al-Taymi. The date of her death is not known.

Bibliography: Ibn Kūtayba, Ma'ārī, Cairo 1355/1934, 102-103; Ibn Sa'd Tabākhi, viii, 344; Balāghur, Ansāb, xi, 10, 202; Ibn Kuthayr, Musnad, 322; Abd al-Rahman b. Abi Rabi', Musnad, 1, 103, 113; Kuthayr, al-Zubayr, and after the latter’s death, Byr; Ibn al-Athir, index; Ibn al-Adhr, index; Ibn Iltuf, 103, 113; see Dāhib, Bigkal, (ed. Pellat, in course of preparation) § 20, and Ahdanī, x, 60, for an anecdote concerning the brilliant retinue which she had obtained from the caliph for the purposes of her pilgrimage). She is reckoned as one of the mutawwidad, i.e. women who have had several husbands; she married successively her cousin 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr, Muṣ'ab b. al-Zubayr, and after the latter’s death, 'Umar b. 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ma'mar al-Taymi. The date of her death is not known.

Aisha Bint Yusuf [see Al-BA'QUN].

Aisha Al-Mannubiyya, Tunisian saint of the 7th/13th century whose name was A'isha bint Imrān b. al-Hādij Sulaymān. The niṣaḥ by which she became known derives from her native village of Mannūba (La Manouba), situated 5 m. W. of Tunis. She is also commonly known, especially at Tunis, by the reverential title of al-Sayyida. The contemporary historians of the Ḥafṣid dynasty, under which she lived, maintain complete silence about her, but we possess a small anthology of her mandīth written in a style strongly influenced by the colloquial, by an anonymous semiliterate author; the latter appears to have made use of another anthology, composed during the saint’s lifetime or soon after her death by an imām of the mosque at Mannūba. While still young, A'isha gave evidence of her future vocation by a number of karāmd. When she reached a marriageable age, her mystical ideal caused her to refuse the counsel of her parents who wished her to marry and to flee to Tunis, where she took refuge in a kaysariyya (a kind of caravanserai) situated outside the old Bāb al-Fallāk (S.E. of the
A'ISHA AL-MANNUBIYYA — AK HIŞAR

1. Ak Hisar. 

2. Ak Hisar in the Marmara district, now called Panul-ova, in the ḫadd of Geyve, wilāyêt of İzmir (Koja-eli), situated on the left bank of the Şakarya river, and a station on the Anatolian railway. It was captured by the Ottomans in 708/1308-9. The fortress, now deserted, commands a vast plain. The remains of many ancient columns and other buildings in the town and its neighbourhood bear witness to its earlier prosperity, but its ancient name is unknown. In 1935 it had 1,668 inhabitants, and its nābiye 9,324.

3. Ak Hisar was formerly also the name of a small locality in western Sarajevo, at the outlet of the Prusekota in the Semeskilitza; its modern name is Polyni (i.e. Lower) Wakuf. It was conquered by Muşafa Paşa in 907/1501-2 (J. von Hammer, Rumûlût und Bosnîa, 166; Ch. Per- turur, La Bosnie, Paris 1822, 222. (K. SUSSHEIM*)

-town, later known as Bab al-Gurdjani). There she passed her life, enjoying, especially among the lower classes, a great reputation for saintliness, although certain doctors of law showed hostility towards her. Oral tradition relates that she received mystical teaching from the celebrated sūfī Abu'l-Hasan al-Šâhdîlî, who was at Tunis during her lifetime, but neither the manâkıš of the saint herself, nor those of the disciples of Abu'l Hasan, make any reference to this. She died at an advanced age, 21 Rağbiy 655/20 April 1255, or 16 Shawwâl 653/19 Nov. 1255. She was buried in the cemetery which, in her time, was known as Mâkbarat al-Šaráf, and at the beginning of this century, a fervent devotee believed he had discovered her tomb. He erected there a wooden mausoleum which soon became a place of pilgrimage for the women of Tunis. However, the locality where A'isha lived continues to attract believers, especially women, and to-day bears the name of al-Mannubiyya. Around the old hâsâsîyya has grown up in the course of centuries a small group of buildings comprising an oratory, rooms for visitors, private dwelling-houses, and even a few shops. The visit (mi'âd) to the sanctuary is performed by women on Thursdays, by men on Saturdays. The house in the village of al-Mannîba where the saint was born has similarly been made the object of special veneration. During the reign of the Huşaynî Bey Muhammed al-Šâdîl (1859-82), it was in 1343 a Venetian possession and in 1395 passed into the hands of Castoria. It is still famous as the residence of Scanderbeg (Iškender Beg [q.v.]), and withstood vigorous sieges in 1450, 1466, and 1468, before it was finally taken by Muhammed II in 883/1475 July 1478. Later on it was the centre of the Bektâşî [q.v.] order of darwishes in Albania. One of the graves of Şarî Şâltî Dede [q.v.] is shown to the public, and the number of graves of Bektâşî saints around the town is considerable. Special reverence is paid to the tombs of Hâdîdî Hamza Baba and Baba 'All (with a tekke). The citadel was demolished in 1248/1832 by order of Raşîd Paşa. In the Albanian state the town became the centre of a sub-prefecture, and had in 1938 4,500 inhabitants, mostly Muslims.

Bibliography: Ippen, Shahari, 71 f.; Wissenschaftliche Mitteilungen aus Bosnien, vii, 60; A. Degrand, Souvenirs de la Haute-Albanie, Paris 1901, 215 ff.; F. W. Hasluck, in Annual of the British School at Athens, 1915, 121 f.; F. Babinger, in MSOS, 1930, 149; idem, Mehmed der Eroberer, index, s.v. Krueje. — For the date of the capture of the city see especially the contemporary chronicler Benedetto Dei (in Della decima e delle altre grazze, della moneta, e della mercature de' Ficorenzi, ii, Lisbon-Lucca 1765, 270 ff.).

(K. SUSSHEIM-F. BABINGER)

AK HIŞAR, nisba of several authors originating from one of the places called Ak Hisar. To Ak Hisar in Aydınl belong:

(a) Ilyâs b. 'Isa, commonly called İbn 'Isâ n. MAĞDUB, d. 720/1321, author of a Turkish book of prophecies (Kâşi-i Rumâsî Kûnû) which, composed in 965/1557-8 when the Ottomans had reached the summit of their power, foretold the continuation of their empire until the end of the world and, from the numerical value of the letters of proper names, predicted the fate of the nation until the year 2035 A.H. (Cf. Fertsch, Cat. Berlin, No. 45, 9; Krafft, Cat. Vienna Acad., No. 301; Flügel, Cat. Vienna, 1915. 121 f.) A few other works of his in prose and in verse are mentioned by Hâdîdî Khalifa (Flügel), iii, 480, iv, 155, 412, 440 and by Mehmed Tahir (see bibliography). He died in 967/1559-60.

Bibliography: Bursali Mehmed Tahir, Ufhamîlî Mu'aallifleri, 1, 18.
a. AK HİŞARİ — AK KIRMÂN

(b) MUHAMMAD B. BADR AL-DÎN, Muhyi '1-DIn i
al-Munshi3, also called al-$arukhani, al-Ruml, or al-
Mufassir. He was at that suggestion of Sâdi wrote
his commentary on HâfiZ. His main work is a
popular commentary on the Kur'ân under the title
Naslî al-TanSî (or TanSî al-Naslî), begun in Aku
Hîşar in 981/1574 and completed in 999/1590. The
author dedicated it to Sultan Murâd III. He became
Şayyâh al-Dârâm in Medina in 981/1574, was later
in Damascus, where in 989/1580-90 he wrote an
Arabic commentary on the Burda of al-Bâşîr
(Ahlwardt, Cat. Berlin, No. 2708), and died in
Mecca towards the end of the year 1000/1592 (sic,
according to the oldest sources).

Bibliography: Brockelmann, II, 439, S II,
651; 'Atâî, 'Hâdâ'îk al-Tabâ'î, 321; Na'îmâ,
Ta'ârîh, 40; Hüdâdî Khalîfa (Flügel), ii, 380,
iv, 358, vi, 399; Muhibbi, Khuldsat al-Athar, iii,
490; Mehmed Tâhir, ii, 20.

(c) Nasîhî, called Nâwâili, became in 990/1582
 tutor to the future Sultan Muhâmmad III, when
the young prince was governor of Mağfînîa. For him
he wrote a Farâh-nâme on the duties of a ruler
(Rieu, Cat. Br. Mus., 121); this work claims to be
the Turkish version of the Kûdâb al-Ri'yâsâ mu'l-
Siyâsây, allegedly written by Aristotle for Alexander
the Great (Hüdâdî Khalîfa, Flügel), iv, 417, v, 86).
He also translated the Ahhâdîk-i MuhiSini. To Nâwâili
is further attributed one of the Turkish translations
of al-Ghazzâlî's Kimyâ' al-Sâ'dda, but this is
perhaps a confusion with the work of Muhâmmed
b. Muş'târî al-Wânî (d. 1000/1591). Nasîhî died in
1003/1594-5.

Bibliography: 'Atâî, 390; Mehmed Tâhir, ii, 43-
7. To Ak Hîşar in Bosnia belong:

(d) Hasan, called Kâîî. He was born in 951/1544
and died in 1025/1616, having been kâîî in his
native town for more than twenty years. His tomb
became a place of pilgrimage. He took part in the
campaign of Egrî (Erlau) in Hungary in 1004/1595,
and during the campaign composed in Arabic a
treatise on good government and on the necessity
of reforms in the Ottoman administration, entitled
Uşûl al-Şîkamât fi Nîşâm al-Âlam. In the following
year 1005/1597 he translated it himself into Turkish,
at the request of high officials. He further wrote
a popular compendium of theology, directed against
the Şûfls and other innovators, called Raawdât al-
Dhannâât fi Uşûl al-I'blâhâdi (completed in 1014/1605),
which he himself wrote a commentary called Akhâr al-Raawdâ (completed in 1015/1606),
a commentary on the 'akida of al-Ţâhâwî entitled
Nûr al-Ţâbîn fi Uşûl al-Dîn, and a commentary on
the Mukhtasar al-Kuduru.

Bibliography: Brockelmann, II, 443, S II,
659; Babinger, 144; 'Atâî, 304; Hüdâdî Khalîfa
(Flügel), index, s.v.; Ewliyâ' Celebi, Siyâsây-nâme,
v, 443 ff.; Mehmed Tâhir, i, 277. For printed
editions and French, German, and Hungarian
translations of the treatise on government, see
Babinger, loc. cit.

(e) Hüdâdî NASÎM-ÔGHUL Ahmad b. Hasan
described in 1186/1772-3, whilst prisoner in Germany,
the campaign and the subsequent events in Bosnia
of 1148-1153/1735-44 (cf. Babinger, 276, n. 1).

AÇ KÎRMÂN (Kîrmân), "White City" (or
"White Emporium"), in Romanian Cetatea Albă,
in Russian Belgorod, town on the western bank of
the Dniester estuary. In antiquity it was called
Tyrs. According to Constantine Porphyrogenetus
(ed. and transl. Moravcsik-Jenkins, 168, 62), the
fortress was called "the White Castle". The anonymity
"Toparcha Gallicus" (in B. Hase's ed. of Le
Diaconus, 496 ff.), however, calls it Maurokeraston,
"Black Fortress". Subject to the Mongols after 1241,
the town was frequently visited by Genoese traders,
who called it Mauroakraustro (Malvastra, Mon-
castrum), but also Album Castrum. Abu 'l-Fîdâ',
following Ibn Sa'id, calls it Akî Kirmân; 'Âli (Kûnî
al-Ashârî, vi, 218) referring to Abu 'l-Fîdâ', writes :
"Akî Kirmân is known at present as Akî Kirmân.
In the 14th century Maurocastro-Moncastrum was a
Genoese fortress, under the administration of the
Oﬃcium Gazarie (Kharazia), which comprised the
Genoese colonies on the northern shores of the
Black Sea. The Genoese fortress was restored by the
Moldavians and the Turks, and still exists. Towards
the end of the 14th century the town was occupied
by the ruler of the newly established state of Mo-
lavia (in Turkish Boghdan [q.v.]), and remained
under Moldavian domination until 1454. The fortress
was attacked by an Ottoman fleet in 1420, and
another attack was made in 1454. In 1455 the
Voivoda Petru III recognized Ottoman sovereignty
over Moldavia; the sultan Muhâmmed II, by a
firman dated 5 Radjab 860/9 June 1456, gave the
merchants of Cetatea Albâ permission to frequent
Adrianople, Brusa and Istanbul.

The town was captured by Bâyezid II on 4 August
1484; the sultan directed the operations in person.
(Çf. Feth-nâmé-i Kara Boghdân, MS Cairo, adab
turkî, 131, 103 f.; I. Ursu, Şefan cel Mare, Bucarest
1925, 202-4 f.; I. Bogdan, Cronice inédite atingătoare
de istoria Românilor, Bucarest 1893, 43, 58). Most
of the inhabitants of the town were deported to
Istanbul and Anatolia, and Akî Kirmân became a
sandjak under the jurisdiction of the beylerbeyi
of Rumelia. It was included in the eyâlet of 6tsû
(q.v.), when this was created in 1593. According
to 'Ayn-i 'All, 6nasûn-i Â-i 6shâmu (Istanbul 1280,
12), the sandjak contained 914 fîmovâri. The custom
duties of the port were regulated at the same
period. The town is described by Ewliyâ' Celebi
(v, 108 f.) who visited it in May 1658. He mentions
the fortress (read darân instead of 6trân) on the
sandjak's road built by Bâyezid II, Mengli Girây K等着,
Selmî I, a Fâisz Dîmâ'i, a medrese built by Selim I, and a ham-
mâm built by Bâyezid II. He also mentions (vii, 501)
the sanctuary of Mayak Baba Sultan near the ford of
the Dniester. Muhâmmed Elendi Akî Kirmân, a well-
known Turkish philosopher, was a native of the
town (cf. Bursall Mehmed Tâhir, '6shâmu 6dîlîsîfere
i, 214). In addition to the original inhabitants,
Akî Kirmât and its district was inhabited by
Turks and Crimean and Nogay Tatars; the Tatars
were settled there after the attempt of the Voivoda
Arman of Moldavia to capture the fortress in 1595.
In 1502 the last chief of the Golden Horde, Şayyâh
Ahamd, fled to Akî Kirmân, in order to rally his
forces. Selim I made Akî Kirmân the base for his
operations against his father Bâyezid II (1 April
1511). The brothers Mehmed Girây and Şâhîn
Girây of Crimea in 1610 made the town their basis
for raiding the Ukraine; they were, however, ousted
by their brother the Kânî Dînabeî Girây (cf.
I. H. ÜrunçarSlî, Osmani Tarhi, iii, 176). Between
1618 and 1636, Kântemir, Pasha of Silistria,
controlled the region between the Danube and the
Dniester and defeated the kalgays Girây of Crimea
in the plain of Akî Kirmân" (Hüdâdî Khalîfa, Feßbaka,
i, 187); Murâd IV, however, had his head cut off
(UruncarSîlî, 180). Ewliya' Celebi (vii, 497) describes
the battle between the Tatars of Mehmed Girây Kân
and those of Adil Giray, under the walls of Ak Kirman.

In 1683, the Cossack chief Kunicki advanced as far as Ak Kirman, but was pushed back by the serdar Bosnak Şarl Süleyman Paşa (Findikllî Mehmed Ağa, Şükâdar Ta'rikhî, İstanbul 1928, i, 397, ii, 127, 185). The Russian general Igelstöm captured the town in 1770, but it was returned to the Porte by the treaty of Küçük Kaynardja (art. 16). The fortress was repaired in 1760 (Topkapı Arşivi, E 70, 416; for other repairs from 1645 onwards, see ibid. E 5860, 6237). In 1789 Potemkin occupied the town again (Diewdew, Ta'rikhî, iv, 332), but it was returned to Turkey in the peace of Yassi (1792), after which the fortress was strengthened.

In 1806 the town was captured by the Russian colonel Förster and Prince Kantakuzino; the Tatars left the district and passed to the eastern bank of the Dnieper. In the peace of Bucarest (1812), Ak Kirman was transferred to Russia. It was there that the short-lived Convention of Ak Kirman between Russia and Turkey, concerning the Rumanian principalities and Serbia, was signed in 1826. Subsequently the town shared the vicissitudes of Bessarabia.

Bibliography: N. Iorga, Studii istorice asupra Chisîei şi Celulii-Albe, Bucarest 1899; G. I. Briant et al., Recherches sur Vîtina et Cetalea-Albâ, Bucarest 1935; idem, Contributions à l'historie de Cetalea-Abî (Ahkerman) aux XIIe et XIVe siècles, Acad. Roumaine, Bull. Sect. Hist., xxii, Bucarest 1927, 25 ff.; B. Spuler, Gesch. d. gold. Horde, 408 (commercial relations with Kârimizm and China in the Genoese period); Feridun Bey, Münürêddî-i Selâmî, i, 312, 319; Hasan Esirl, Miünşeût-i Seldîn, 397, ii, 127, 185). The Russian general Igelstöm captured the town in 1770, but it was returned to Turkey in the peace of Yassi (1792), after which the fortress was strengthened.

In 1683, the Cossack chief Kunicki advanced as far as Ak Kirman, but was pushed back by the serdar Bosnak Şarl Süleyman Paşa (Findikllî Mehmed Ağa, Şükâdar Ta'rikhî, İstanbul 1928, i, 397, ii, 127, 185). The Russian general Igelstöm captured the town in 1770, but it was returned to the Porte by the treaty of Küçük Kaynardja (art. 16). The fortress was repaired in 1760 (Topkapı Arşivi, E 70, 416; for other repairs from 1645 onwards, see ibid. E 5860, 6237). In 1789 Potemkin occupied the town again (Diewdew, Ta'rikhî, iv, 332), but it was returned to Turkey in the peace of Yassi (1792), after which the fortress was strengthened.

In 1806 the town was captured by the Russian colonel Förster and Prince Kantakuzino; the Tatars left the district and passed to the eastern bank of the Dnieper. In the peace of Bucarest (1812), Ak Kirman was transferred to Russia. It was there that the short-lived Convention of Ak Kirman between Russia and Turkey, concerning the Rumanian principalities and Serbia, was signed in 1826. Subsequently the town shared the vicissitudes of Bessarabia.

At the end of the 15th century, the Turkish emirs of the Erzurum region, the Doğere, the Bayat, the Doger, the Cepni, etc., who had apparently arrived with the Sâljuqs, but under the Mongols, led an inconspicuous existence. Among these clans must be particularly distinguished the Bayundur clan, to which belonged the rulers, who, with their immediate followers, must have taken the leadership and organised the federation. The early period of these Turkmen (both Ak and Kara Koyunlu) is reflected in the Turkish epic poem Dedê Korîbet (Rossi, Vatican 1932, 46-9). The Bayundur family ("the amirs of Âmîd") are first mentioned by the Byzantine chroniclers in 1340. They were, however, the chief among the Ak Koyunlu who were attacked twice by the Ottomans, during the latter's invasion of Persia in 920/1514 and in 922/1516, but finally died in the same year near Urfa. The following is the genealogical tree of the Bayundur rulers:

1. Kara Uthmân b. Kulu b. Tur 'All
2. 'Ali
3. Hamza
4. Djiâhîngir
5. Uzun Hasan
6. Khall
7. Ya'qûb
8. Baysunur
9. Rustam
10. Alwand
11. Muhammad
12. Yusuf
13. Murâd
The chronology is as follows. Kara Uthman was killed in 839/1435 at the age of eighty. Of his sons who disputed his succession 'All died in 840/1438 and Hamza in 848/1444. Dihângir ruled in the west 848-74/1444-69. Uzun Hasan, b. 828/1424, ruled from 857/1453, overthrew the Kara Koyunlu in 872/1467 and died in 882/1478. Ya'qub ruled 883-74/1478-90; Baysunqur 867-74/1462-8; Rustam 897-902/1492-7; Ahmad Gâwe 902-3/1397. After Ahmad Gâwe's death the struggle went on (903-7/1497-1502) between Muhammad, Alwand and Murad. Alwand, defeated by Shah Isma'il in 907/1502, retreated to Diyar Bakr and died in 910/1504. Murad, defeated by Shah Isma'il in 908/1503, fled to Baghdâd, where he ruled for four and a half years, and then went to Dîyâr Bakr and Turkey. He died at the age of 25 and with him the dynasty came to an end.

Bibliography: The special history of the beginnings down to Uzun Hasan is in the Ta'rikh-i Divânikbrrisiyé (being prepared for publication in Ankara by F. Sûmer); for the reign of Sultan Ya'qub 'Álam-ârâ (first appearance in a dream, an attempt to attach himself to Zayn al-Ámmârî, to be a forgery of Feridun. Afd Shams al-Din had seven, according to others twelve, sons, the most of the inhabitants was transferred by Muhammad II to Istanbul after its conquest and a quarter in the capital received the name of Ak Sarây after them. The town is an agricultural centre and has in ruins, was built under the Saljûks and restored by the Karamân-oghlu Ibdrîhîm Beg, the Nâzîshâhi Dîjmâni (modern, but with a minaret from the 14th century) and various hamâmns; on the Erval Tepe near the town there is a turbe in briquets from the 13th century.

Bibliography: Fr. Sarre, Reise in Kleinasiens, 93 ff.; Ch. Texier, Asie Mineure, 509, 566; Ainsworth, Travels and researches in Asia Minor, i, 197; E. Réclus, Nouv. géogr. mun., ix, 571; Hamilton, Researches, ii, 22; Gülâmî-i Male'îîî, i, 521, 524; All Djêwâd, Memâlik-i 'Othmdnîyênin Ta'rikh we-Dîjâbrîlysâ Lughât, 21; W. Ramsay, Asia Minor, 284; Ewilîyâ Celebi, ii, 191.

AK SARAÎ, palace near Gurgândî (Urgench), still mentioned in the "Shaybânîade" (ed. Vânbéry, 392). For the palace of the same name erected for Timûr in Şahr-i Sab, see KASH.

AK SHAMS AL-DIN, properly MUHAMMAD SHAMS AL-MILLA WA'-L-DIN, sâiînt of the Bayrâmîyya [q.v.] and discoverer of the tomb of Abû Ayyûb al-Anşârî near Constantiopolis. He was the son of a certain Hamza, who acquired fame in Syria as a worker of miracles and later died in the district of Kâwâk (near Amasîa). Ak Shams al-Din was born in 792/1389-90 in Syria (Damascus) and came with his parents to Kâwâk in 792/1389-90. After the early death of his father (when Shams al-Din was seven years old) he engaged in theological studies; Badr al-Din b. Kâdî Samawâîn is reputed to have been among his teachers. Later he obtained a post of Kur'ân teacher (müderrisî) in 'Othmanîddîlî. Not satisfied with the rational outlook of orthodox Islam, he sought a spiritual leader, undertaking for this purpose long journeys, extending to Persia and Transoxania. He gave up, following an exhortation in a dream, an attempt to attach himself to Zayn al-Din al-Ákhâfî, and about 830/1426-7 he turned, after some initial hesitations, to Hâçâtî Bayronî (q.v.), who shortly afterwards appointed him to his succession (khiyât). The scenes of his later activities as Shaykh of the order and nature-healer were Szeghâzâr (west of Ankara), where he built a small mosque and a min, the district of Ískîbî (near 'Othmânîddîlî) and Göyûmek (near Brusa). The dates of his seven pilgrimages to Mecca are not known. Between 851/1447-8 and 855/1451-2 he was called to Adrianople, to treat Sâhîyânî Celebi, Âdî 'Ashar of sultan Murât II. He took part in the conquest of Constantiopolis as a preacher in the army; according to a later legend he discovered the tomb of Abû Ayyûb al-Anşârî (q.v.) and worked other miracles of fîrâsa. He healed a daughter of Mehmed II and in general gained the favour of the sultan. After the conquest Ak Shams al-Din returned to Göyûmek, where he died at the end of Rabîî I 865/1459.

The story of his interpretation of a dream of the sultan before the battle of Togrûl against Uzun Hasan (1 August 1473) cannot refer to him and seems to be a forgery of Ferîdûn. Ak Shams al-Din had seven, according to others twelve, sons, the most
important of whom was the poet Hamdl [q.v.]. He
also wrote several medical and sufi works, which
have not yet been published. In the history of the
Bayrāmiyya, Ak Shams al-Dīn seems to have played
a fatal part, because a quarrel between him and
some of his companions caused the great secession
of the Malāmatiyya, which could not fail to hamper
considerably the development of the whole order.

Bibliography:
  Tāshkōpurū-zāde, al-Shāhād el-Nu'māniyya (transl. O. Rescher, 145 ff.; Emrī
  Rūmīn, mendehāl-i Ak Shams al-Dīn, Istanbul
  1305; also used, on the basis of a MS, by Üner);
  Giibb, ii, 138 ff.; Bursall Mehmed Tāhir, 'Oth-
  mānīl Muṣīṭəllīrī, i, 12 ff.; A. S. Üner, İlim ve
  sanat bākl命ndan Fatih devri notlari, i, Istanbul
  1947, 127 ff. ("Hakl menahibine göre Ak-semsetdən
  ve irbnī hağinda"; on his miracles, sayings,
  etc.); H. J. Kissing, Aq 'Sems el-Dīn, Ein türkischer
  Heiliger aus der Endzeit von bysyan, bysanschische
  Zeitschrift, 1957, 322 ff. (with detailed justification
  of statements differing from views of earlier
  authorities).

Aς SHEHR, in modern Turkish orthography
Akşehir, "White Town":
(i) Town in inner Anatolia situated at the
foot of the Sultān Dagh. In antiquity it was known
as Philemelon (see Pauly-Wissowa, s.v.). In old
sources the name of the town occurs as Akgär,
Ağkähr or Akşehirh. It was under Sāfīlāk
and Karaman-oglu dominion and was annexed by
Bāyezyd I. In the 16th-17th centuries it is mentioned
by the travelers Ghazzl, Makī and Ewliya Ĉelebi.
The town, capital once of a sandjak, now of a
besīr, is derived from the name of a river (also
sandīq, ...)

Bibliography: V. Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie,
i, 803, 818; Ch. Huart, Konia, Paris 1897, 109-17;
Idem, Epigraphie Arabe d'Asie Mineure, Revue
Sémiltique, 1894, 28-34; Fr. Sarre, Reise in Klein-
asiien, 21 f.; Ch. Texier, Asie Mineure, 455;
Ainsworth, Travels and Researches in Asia Minor,
i, 63; Hamilton, Researches, ii, 185; All Djewdj,
Me'mālik-i Othmāniyyenin Ta'rikh we-Diogrāfiyya
Lughāti, 21; Ewliya Ĉelebi, ii, 15 ff.

(Ch. Huart-F. Taeschner)

(ii) Aκ ŞEHM (also Akgär or Akgähr; Piz-
zigani, 1367, writes Azaĉar), town in north-east
Anatolia, on the Kélkit İrmak between Koylu
Ḫişar and Sushehri; it is often mentioned by early
authors, and occurs as late as in Ṭābi Tābi's
Dhīḥan-nūmā, 627. It is probably identical with
the modern village of Güzeller or Ezibider. The
name was preserved, even longer than for the
town, for the plain (Aκ Şehrī Owasi), which is
regularly mentioned in the itineraries of the Ot-
tonan armies on their campaigns against Persia
and Georgia.

Bibliography: F. Taeschner, Das anatolische
Wegenteil, ii, 2 (with further references).

Aκ ŞU (Τ.), "white water", (i) technical term
for the original bed of a river (also aβ daryā),
from which a canal (kara şu or karı daryā) is derived;
(ii) name of several rivers in Turkish-speaking
countries; they are sometimes better known under
other names. The following are some of the rivers
that bear in Turkish the name of Aκ Şu: (i) one of
the source rivers of the Amu Darya [q.v.], also called
Murgāb [q.v.] or the "River of Kulâb"; (ii) the
"southem" Bug (in Ukrainian: Boh) in the Ukraine
(so regularly in the Ottoman historians), which,
coming from the T'ien-shan, flows in a S. E. direction
wards the Tarim (Yarkand Daryā) and reaches it
somewhat above its junction with the Khotan Daryā
near Sil. The town of Aκ Şu (see next article) receives
its name from this stream.

(β. Spuler)

Aκ ŞU, town in Eastern Turkistan (Sin-kiang),
about 6 km. to the north of the river of Aκ Şu (see
preceding article), approximately opposite to its
junction with the Tawshkand Daryā; 1006 m. above
the sea; 45° 14'; 7° N, 86° E; on the Bokhara car-
route, between Ma'salbā and Kuča. A little
upstream from the modern town lies another settle-
ment called Aκ Şu, and N. E. of both is the "Old
Town", which possibly both correspond to older
settlements with Chinese names of their own (see
below). Aκ Şu is first mentioned with its Turkish
name in the 8th/9th century only; the usual iden-
tification (current since Dequignes) with Auzakia
in Potlemy is therefore more than doubtful. Its iden-
tification with various Chinese toponyms is not yet
finally settled. W. Barthold had identified it (mainly
on the basis of its present Chinese name, see below)
with the Wôn-su of the Han period and the B.nčūl
(B.čūl ?) of the Budād al-Aleśm (ed. Minorsky, 98)
and Gardzi (in Barthold's Otčüt o povestkte v
Srednyyu Asiju, St. Petersburg 1897, 91); later,
however, he gave up this view. P. Peliot identified
Aκ Şu with the Ku-mo of the Han period (Pa-lu-kia
in Hsüan-tsang, Po-huan in the T'ang period;
al-Idrisī's "Bakhuwan"). Chinese merchants in Aκ Şu
are mentioned already about 1400 (Niżam-Shāmī,
Zafar-nāma), but even in 1475 its importance was
small in comparison with other towns of Eastern
Turkistan (W. Barthold, 22 Vorlesungen, Berlin 1935,
220; according to Ḍayār Mīrzā Ta'ībī-r Rağašī,
however, it was about 1547 one of the capitals of
the country. In modern times the importance of the
town (which did not reach, however, that of Yār-
kan, Kāshāhr and Turfan) lay in its role as a
commercial centre and a junction of roads between
China, Siberia, Eastern and Western Turkistan,
Kashmir, Ladakh and India. It had also a military
importance. It is said that at one time the town had
6000 houses, six caravansaries, five madderas, and
a wall with four gates. As the town was almost
completely destroyed by an earthquake in 1716, no
old buildings have been preserved. By the travellers
of the 19th century (A. N. Kuropatkin, 1876-7;
N. M. Prseval'skiy, 1885-6; Carey, 1885-6; F. E.
Youngusband, 1886; Sven Hedin, 1895) it is
described as having about 15,000 inhabitants and
being about 2 km. in circumference. The livelihood
of the inhabitants was based on metalwork, cotton
materials of very good quality (bazz), saddles,
brides, jewellery and the breeding of camels, horses
and cattle. Between 1867 and 1877 Aş Şu belonged to Ya'qub Beg [q.v.] of Kashghar, since 1877 to Ya'qub Beg [q.v., Küt, Kara Shahr and Üzdürfän]. In the 20th century it shared the changing fortunes of Eastern Turkistan. The number of the inhabitants (presumably mostly Sunni Eastern Turks) is at present given as between 20,000 and 40,000, who occupy themselves also with carpet weaving.


**AŞ SUNKUR,** “White Falcon”, the name of many Turkish officers, of whom the following are the most important:

1. **AŞ SUNKUR B. ʿABD ALLĀH ʿĀSĪ A-L-DANLA,** known as al-Hâdis, mamûlik of Malik-shâh [q.v.], who appointed him to the government of Aleppo in 480/1087. He at first supported the efforts of the Saldjûk prince Tutush [q.v.] to establish himself in Syria, but after Malik-shâh’s death he, with the other governors in northern Syria and the Djaza‘r, declared for Barkiyaruk, and was defeated and executed by Tutush near Aleppo in Diumâdâi, 487/1094. He was the father of Zankî [q.v.], afterwards atâbeg of Mosul, and is highly praised for his justice and good government.

**Bibliography:** Ibn al-Ḳalânisî (Amedroz; tr. Le Tourneau, introduction. (CL. CAHEN))

2. **AŞ SUNKUR B. ʿABD ALLĀH ʿĀSĪ A-L-DANLA** [see A-L-DUN].

**AŞ SUNKUR B. ʿABD ALLĀH ʿĀSĪ A-L-DANLA,** originally a mamûlik of Bursuk [q.v.], and one of the principal officers of the Saldjûk sultans Muhammad and Mahmûd. He became prominent firstly through his activities as military governor (ṣir’â) of al-Trâk, and later, at the end of his life, as governor of Mosul, where office he held simultaneously with the former. Appointed ʿâshâ in 498/1105. His main task was to oppose the Mazyadite Arabs of Dubays [q.v.], who were infesting the environs of Baghâd. In his first government of Mosul (507/1113) his chief duty was the organization of the Holy War in the name of the sultan against the Franks in Syria, combining with this an effort to restore the Saldjûk authority in Diyar Bakr and up to the Mediterranean. After several setbacks, due essentially to the suspicions aroused by these ambitions, and which led to his spending the years 509/1112-1113 in partial disgrace at his fief of al-Rahba on the Euphrates, he finally succeeded, after saving Aleppo from an attack by the Crusaders supported by Dubays, in taking over the government of the entire province (518/1125), by agreement with the leading citizens of Aleppo. He thus realized that union of a part of the Djaza‘r with northern Syria which had served as the basis of Ḥamdânî power, and was to support that of Zankî [q.v.]. His life was cut short by the Batinîs of Alamût, one of whose allies he had opposed in al-Trâk, in 519/1126, before he could display his abilities, and it fell to Zankî to realize, with greater solidity, the task thus begun. But already al-Bursukî had combined, as Zankî was also to do, Saldjûkist legitimism, represented by his dignity as atâbek of a prince, with an almost complete déictic autonomy at Mosul, and had effected that reinforcement of Muslim north Syria by the forces of the Djaza‘r which was to permit the former to break the Frankish encirclement and explains its readiness, despite its particularism, to accept his authority.


**AL-ʾÂKABA,** a mountain-road, or a place difficult of ascent on a hill or acclivity. There are many places of this name: the best-known is that between Minâ and Mecca. Here, according to traditional accounts, Muhammad had secret meetings with men from Medina at the pilgrimages of the years 621 and 622 A. D. In 621, at “the first ʾÂkaba”, twelve were present, and they gave to Muhammad an undertaking known as ‘the pledge of the women’ (bayʿat al-nisâ‘); at “the second ʾÂkaba” seventy-three men and two women promised to defend the woman-kind, if necessary, by arms, in what is known as ‘the pledge of war’ (bayʿat al-barb). Some Western writers have held that there was only one meeting at al-ʾÂkaba, since only one is mentioned by al-Ṭabîr (i, 1224 f.), and since the wording of “the pledge of the women” in the extant sources is based on Kurʾân, ix, 12, which is admittedly later (cf. F. Buhl, *Muhammed*, Leipzig 1930, 186). It is likely, however, that the delicate negotiations involved would require more than one meeting. (For the stone-throwing that takes place at al-ʾÂkaba as part of the pilgrimage, see al-ʿÂmira and ʿÂmira.)


(W. MONTGOMERY WATT)

**AL-ʾÂKABA,** the sole seaport of the Ḥashimite Kingdom of Jordan, lying on the eastern side of the head of the Gulf of ʾÂkaba at the foot of the Diabat Umm Ṣuṣayla.

Al-ʾÂkaba is the successor of Ayla [q.v.], from which it developed as the town grew further to the southeast. The name al-ʾÂkaba is a shortened form of ʾÂkabat Ayla, “the Pass of Ayla”, which refers to the pass through the Diabat Umm Ṣuṣayla traversed by the route from al-ʾÂkaba northeast to Maʿān through the Wâdi Ighm and the Wâdi HīsÎm. This pass, which was improved also to the Tullûn Khumârâwâyû (884-95), ultimately gave its name to the town itself. The term ʾÂkabat Ayla appears as early as the time of al-ʾIdrîsî (d. 1166), but the town was still generally known as Ayla. Ibn Bat’tîtö
At the very end of the Mamlûk period (920/1514-5) al-‘Akkâba, by the beginning of the 20th century, was reduced to a village of some fifty mud-and-stone huts, the inhabitants of which lived from the produce of their gardens and from the fruit of date palms, the latter of which they divided equally with the Huwaytâb bedouin, to whom the palms still belong.

The opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 and the fall of the Mamlûk to the Sa’udi Arabian of World War I, al-‘Akkâba of its only remaining importance as a pilgrimage station. When Musil visited the town in 1896 it was a seat of a Turkish garrison guarding the frontier with British occupied Egyptian Sinai. (It belonged to the province of the Hijaz and was the seat of a muqâbil subordinated to the wa‘îf in Djidda.)

During the sea bombardment by British and French warships which preceded the capture of al-‘Akkâba by Anglo-Arab forces on 6 July 1917, the town was severely damaged. Following the end of World War I, al-‘Akkâba was part of the Hijaz, but with the fall of the Hijaz to the Sa’udi Arabian forces in Oct. 1925 the town, along with the Ma‘ân district, was annexed to Transjordan. Little change to protect pilgrims from the attacks of predatory forces in Oct. 1925 the town, along with the Ma‘ân district, was annexed to Transjordan. Little change in the event of the fall of Egypt to axis armies when new construction was undertaken by the British forces to prepare the port as a supply port in the event of the fall of Egypt to axis armies. In 1942-5 (see T. Baqir, in Iraq, Suppl. 1944, 1945; 1946, 72 ff.) the high tower (the ruins of the ancient ziggurat) drew the attention of the Arabs, and is referred to in connection with the Arab conquest as al-mansâra (al-Baladhuri, Futûh, 250; cf. also al-Tabari, ii, 917, iii, 943). It was said to be the tomb of the “Kayânî” dynasty (Ibn al-Fakîh, in Yâkût), or to have been built by Kay Kâfûs (Hamad Allâh, Nukha, 39) or the Kayânî, son of either Tamûrta (Yâkût, al-Kâfûsî) or of Fâris b. Tâmûrta (Ibn al-Fakîh, 196) or of Sâm (Abû Hâmîd). According to a legend (already found in Hamad Allâh) the stone into which Namûrî threw Abraham [see irrahâmî] was at ‘Akkârkût; for this reason it was sometimes called Tell Namûrûb. Tubb Nuwsîs mentions ‘Akkârkût in a verse (Dârân, Cairo 1958, 100) and al-Mâhdî (258) quotes from al-Kalbî a Persian tradition naming it among the seven towns of al-‘Irâq noted for intelligence (cf. Ibn al-Fâkîh, 210). There was also a village, a prominent family being the descendants of Sa’d b. Zayd al-Khâzîrî (Ibn Sa’d, ii/2, 93; al-Samânî, Yâkût). The European travellers of the 16th century and later who mention ‘Akkârkût (see Ritter, Erdhume, xi, 847-52; Tuch, De Nino urbe, Leipzig 1845, 4) usually call it the “Tower of Babel”.

Bibliography: E. Lévi-Provençal, Chorfa, 200-13 (with bibliography, 200 n. 1); idem, Extraits des historiens arabes du Maroc, Paris 1948, 8-9 and 126-7; Brockelmann, S II, 884-5.

(E. Lévi-Provençal)

‘AKÂNÇUS [see ‘AKÂNS].

AKÂNSAH (see ‘AKÂNSH). A name for the pass of Baghras or Baylân [see BAGHRAS].

‘AKÂD [see ‘AKÂD].

‘AKÂL (see ‘IMÂMA). A MOROCCAN historian and man of letters originating from the Berber tribe of Idrîs (Knûsîs), which inhabited Sûs in southern Morocco, where he was born in 1211/1797. He studied at Fez under several teachers of repartee and then obtained a post at the Sharîfian court as secretary. Promoted to the rank of vizier in 1238/1822, he was entrusted by the Sultan Mawly Sulâmîn (Mîlây Sîlmân) with several official missions, but lost his post on the latter’s death (1238/1822). He retired to Marrâkûsh, where he devoted his time to the composition of poetical and historical works and became one of the most prominent representatives of the Tîjdîânîyya tarîba. He died, at an advanced age and afflicted with blindness, on 29 Muhammân 1294/14 Feb. 1877, in the same town. His tomb, situated outside the Bab al-Rabb, is still visited by initiates of the Order.

The major work of Akânsûs is a general history of Islam up to his own era, in which pride of place is given to the history of his own country and, even more specifically, to that of the ‘Alid dynasty (‘Alawiyya) of Morocco, from its origins up to 1282/1865. This voluminous work, a limited number of copies of which were lithographed at Fez (1336/1852), is entitled al-Dîyâ’ al-‘Arâmram al-Khumâsî fi Daw’al Aasîd Mawla’dnâ ‘Ašî al-Siqî[jîmâsî. Its chief merit lies in the fact that it constitutes the first chronicle of the reigns of the sultans ‘Abî al-Râhîm b. ‘Abî al-Râhîmân b. ‘Abî al-Râhîmân, and was subsequently used extensively by Ahmad b. Khâlîd al-Nâfi’î [q.v.] in his al-Isîrîsî. For the earlier period, the Dîyâ’ plagiariizes most frequently the chronicles of al-Ifrânî [q.v.] and al-Zayyânsî [q.v.].

Bibliography: E. Lévi-Provençal, Chorfa, 200-13 (with bibliography, 200 n. 1); idem, Extraits des historiens arabes du Maroc, Paris 1948, 8-9 and 126-7; Brockelmann, S II, 884-5.

(E. Lévi-Provençal)

‘AKÂRÎB (see ‘AKÂRÎB).

‘ÂKÂRKÛF group of ruins 30 kms. west of Baghdât; its identification by H. Rawlinson with the town of Dur Kurigalzu, founded by the Kassites in the 14th century B.C., has been confirmed by the excavations of 1942-5 (see T. Baqir, in Iraq, Suppl. 1944, 1945; 1946, 73 ff.). The high tower (the ruins of the ancient zkhrurat) drew the attention of the Arabs, and is referred to in connection with the Arab conquest as al-mansâra (al-Baladhuri, Futûh, 250; cf. also al-Tabari, ii, 917, iii, 943). It was said to be the tomb of the “Kayânî” dynasty (Ibn al-Fakîh, in Yâkût), or to have been built by Kay Kâfûs (Hamad Allâh, Nukha, 39) or the Kayânî, son of either Tamûrta (Yâkût, al-Kâfûsî) or of Fâris b. Tâmûrta (Ibn al-Fakîh, 196) or of Sâm (Abû Hâmîd). According to a legend (already found in Hamad Allâh) the stone into which Namûrî threw Abraham [see irrahâmî] was at ‘Akkârkût; for this reason it was sometimes called Tell Namûrûb. Tubb Nuwsîs mentions ‘Akkârkût in a verse (Dârân, Cairo 1958, 100) and al-Mâhdî (258) quotes from al-Kalbî a Persian tradition naming it among the seven towns of al-‘Irâq noted for intelligence (cf. Ibn al-Fakîh, 210). There was also a village, a prominent family being the descendants of Sa’d b. Zayd al-Khâzîrî (Ibn Sa’d, ii/2, 93; al-Samânî, Yâkût). The European travellers of the 16th century and later who mention ‘Akkârkût (see Ritter, Erdhume, xi, 847-52; Tuch, De Nino urbe, Leipzig 1845, 4) usually call it the “Tower of Babel”.


(S. M. Sterm)

AL-‘AKÂKWÂK, “thick-set”, sobriquet of the poet Ali b. ‘Abdallâh. Born at Baghdât in 156/776, of a family of Khurasânîs (a)shâ, al-‘Akâkwâk seems to have spent most of his life in ‘Irâq, where he was the panegyrist of Abû Dulâl al-Qâ’îl [q.v.]. Hûmâyâd
b. 'Abd al-Hamíd al-Tusi, and the vizier al-Hassan b. Sahl [q.v.]. The exaggerated and almost sacrilegious eulogies addressed to the two first-named excited, it is said, the hostility of the Caliph al-Ma’mún, who had the poet’s tongue torn out. Al-Akawwak died as a result of this mutilation in 213/828. His al-dīwān, a work of considerable proportions (see Fihrist, 16416), has not come down to us, and his poetry is known to us only through the quotations of anthologists; the long poem quoted by al-Thālibī, Yatim al-Dahr, Damascus edition, iii, is ascribed to him, but this is questionable. Al-Dihāzī had a great admiration of his rivals was a usurping Hindu minister named river Tungabhadra, the Hindu empire of Vidjaya-in Sind while his father Humayun, who had been once only in his Kīthāl-Bayān wazīl-Tābīyān. On the other hand, contemporaries of al-Dihāzī such as Ibn Kutayba and Abu’l-Farāq al-Isfahānī consider al-Akawwak to be a poet of exceptional merit.

Bibliography: Ibn Kutayba, Shīr, 550-3; Aghāmī, xviii, 100-14; Ibn ’Abd Rabbih, al-Jahādī, (’Uryān), i, 238, 243; al-Khāṭīb al-Baghdādī, Tārīkh Baghdād, xii, 359; Ibn Khālidīn, Cairo, 1310, i, 348, ed. Cairo 1948, no. 434: Brockelmann, S. i, 120. (R. Blache-Re)

AKBAR, ABDU’L-FATH DZALILL AL-DIN MUHAMMAD (1556-1605), the greatest of the Mughal emperors of India, was born at Unmokr in Sind while his father Humayūn, who had been ousted by the Afghan usurper Shīr Shāh Sūr, was escaping to Persia. A grandson of Bābur, he was both a Timūrid Turk and a Caṭhātāy Mongol. His mother, Ḥamīda Banū, was a Persian. After thirteen years of exile Humayūn, because of the decline of Sūr power, decided to attempt the reconquest of Hindūstān. Little however had been accomplished before his death on 24 Jan. 1556. In fact there was no Mughal empire before Akbar, only an attempt to create one. In his early struggles Akbar owed much to his able guardian and regent Bayram Khān [q.v.]. In addition to the Sūr claimants the most dangerous of his rivals was a usurping Hindu minister named Hēmū who had assumed the title of Rāgha Vikrama-dītya. Hēmū’s forces were routed at Pānīpat on 5 Nov. 1556. The following year saw the surrender of Sikandar Shāh Sūr. In 1560 Bayram Khān fell from power, after which Akbar remained for about four years under the pernicious influence of the ladies of the harem and of a faction controlled by his foster relatives, the ala ḍawla of contemporary Muslim historians. His personal rule therefore dates from 1564.

His annexations. In 1564 his kingdom comprised the Pandžāb and Multān; the basin of the Ganges and Djinna between Pānīpat and Allāhābād; the country between the Gumti and the foothills of the Himalayas; Gawlōr in Central India and Adīmīr in Nadīputana. The country around Kābul was held by his half brother Muḥammad Ḥakīm. Kandahār belonged to Persia. Outside his dominions were the Muslim states of Gudjrāt and Khāndāsh; the five Deccani sultanes of Bājrā, Bīdār, Aḥmādnaγar, Bīlgāpūr and Goloconda; and, to the south of the river Tungabhadrā, the Hindu empire of Viḍjaya-nagar. Kāhīnī, Nadīputana, and Gondwana were under independent chiefs and rādīs. Bīhār and Bengal acknowledged an Afghan ruler, Sulaymān Karānān. The Portuguese were firmly established at strategic points along the coast.

Between 1562 and 1576 he added to his dominions Malwā (1562), the Gond kingdom of Garha-Katanga in Gondwana (1564), Chīтор (1568), Rantambhōr (1569), Kalandjar in Bundelkhand (1586), and Gugjār (1573). The annexation of Bāṇglā in 1576 made him master of the whole of northern India with the exception of lower Sind. Subsequent additions to his empire were Kālmār (1586), Sind (1591), part of Orissa (1592), Bālōṣistān and Makrān (1594), and Kandāshā (1595). As a result of his Deccan campaigns Benār, Khāndesh, and part of Aḥmādnaγar were annexed between 1595 and 1601. At his death, in 1605, his empire comprised the following fifteen sūhrs (provinces): Bālōṣistān (including Kāhīnī), Lahore, Multān (including Sind), Delhi, Oudh, Agra, Adīmīr, Aḥmādnaγar, Malwā, Allāhābād, Bīhār, Bengal, Khāndesh, Benār and Aḥmādnaγar (not fully subdued).

Administrative policy. Akbar was not merely a conqueror. He was in addition endowed with a genius for administration to which the structure of both his central and provincial government bears testimony. The ideas of Akbar can be traced back to his immediate predecessors the Sūr Afghāns and the sultans of Delhi. The chief lesson he learned from the past was the danger of the unlimited wazīrat. In 1564, therefore, the central government was reorganized by entrusting the financial functions of the wakīl-mulāb to the ṣādir or wazir. From this time onwards the power of the wakīl was eclipsed by that of the ṣādir and the importance of the office was further lessened by keeping it vacant for long periods. Other important officers of the central government under Akbar were the mir bakhshī, the mir sāmān, and the ṣadār al-ṣādir. It is extremely difficult to define the functions of the mir bakhshī, who has been referred to as the Paymaster-General or as the Adjutant-General, but the more fitting modern equivalent would be Quartermaster-General. Under Akbar the mir bakhshī as administrative head of the military department was responsible for all transport arrangements during campaigns and could be placed in command of an army in the field. In accordance with Akbar’s policy of separation of powers it was only on active service that the mir bakhshī actually paid the troops. Normally this was the work of the ṣādir. The mir sāmān was in charge of the būyūlī department and was responsible for the organization of the hār-khānas, the factories, workshops, and stores maintained by the emperor. The ṣadār al-ṣādir, the chief spokesman of the ‘ulāma’, was the Chief Kāḏī and head of the judiciary. In the early part of Akbar’s reign this official had extraordinary powers. His reading of the būyūlī in the name of a new sovereign legalized the accession. He also exercised the right of patronage recommending deserving cases to the king for maddās-i ma’āṣī grants. It is incorrect to assert that in 1581 Akbar abolished this office. It is true that six provincial ṣadārs were appointed but the office of ṣadār al-ṣādir continued, though shorn of its former extraordinary powers. All important officers, whether civil or military, were graded as amīrs or mānsābādārs on a military basis. They were divided into 33 classes and their rank and precedence were regulated by nominal commands of horse, ranging from 50 to 5000. Under Akbar there was evidently some connection between an officer’s rank and the number of troops he entertained, but the exact meaning of the terms ḍāḥī and suwār is controversial.

The provincial government was administered by a hierarchy of officials corresponding to those at the centre. The sūhrās (provinces) were divided into sarkārs (districts) which were further subdivided
into parganas or mahalls, the lowest fiscal unit in the empire. Distance and the backwardness of communications necessitated elaborate precautions to prevent fraud and rebellion. The provincial governor was a bureaucratic head and was not allowed to develop into a feudal baron. Not only was the governor's tenure of office short but important provincial officials like the divān and the fāngūdar (executive head of a sarkār) were appointed by the central government. There was also an elaborate system of espionage carried out by the wāda's naubās (reporter) and other officials.

Akbar's revenue policy was the outcome of three experiments. In each case a different set of assessment rules was adopted but in all three the assessment was based on the area sown and varied with different crops. The first two experiments failed and it was not until the 24th regnal year (1579-80) that a stable system was introduced. This was known as the dāh sāla system because the assessment was based on the average of the previous ten years. An attempt was made to deal directly with the peasants who had to pay one-third of their gross produce to the state. It was enforced only in the six central provinces which formed the original nucleus of his empire.

His religious policy was chiefly dictated by political and dynastic considerations. His policy of sulh-i kull (universal toleration), his abolition of the dīdiya and of the tax formerly levied on Hindu pilgrims were aimed at securing the loyalty of his Hindu subjects, who formed the bulk of the population. It was also inextricably bound up with his conception of sovereignty and was an assertion of the supremacy of the state politically, economically, and financially. With this object he curbed the powers of the 'alamās' by the so-called Infallibility Decree of 1579 by which he was recognized as the chief authority in the realm on religious matters. Although illiterate he was genuinely interested in the study of Comparative Religion and built an ibhādāt-khāna (House of Worship) where learned men of all religions assembled for the purpose strange words, whether Persian or vernacular. From the sociological point of view, the main interest of his poetry lies in the fact that it may be regarded as a running commentary on the social foibles of his contemporaries and the political and religious trends of his times. His criticism is not, however, the result of deep or sustained sociological thought, but is the impulsive reaction of a conservative mind to that Westernization of Indian life, which as a matter of fact had been in progress for a long time past. The shafts of his wit and ridicule simply touch the surface of things, and as the phases of life criticised by him pass away in a changing society, a considerable part of his poetry is likely to lose its topical interest for the coming generations.

His poetical compositions have been collected in four volumes and frequently published under the title of Kulīyyāt-i Akbar. The first volume was published in 1909, the fourth in 1948. His letters, too, have been published in several collections. Shortly before his death, he composed Gāngī-ñāma, in which he set down the political views of the various parties, which took part in the anti-British movement led by M. K. Gandhi. It was edited by M. Na'īm al-Rāhman, Allahabad 1948.


(Sh. Inayatullah)
Aspre or asper, from the Greek aspron. The term was already in use under the Seljukids of Irak during the 12th century (see al-Rawanid, ‘Ikhd al-Sudur, 300, where a gift of 1,000 akbes is recorded); and since, when applied to the first Ottoman coin to be struck, under Orhah in 727/1327, it was qualified by the epithet “Othmami”, it would appear to have continued in use either for some other coin or as signifying “money” in a more general sense. In later Ottoman times it certainly came to bear this wider sense, as in such phrases as telded akbes, ‘aadad akbes, and to have been generally used by all the northern Turkish-speaking peoples in both senses (cf. Radloff, Wörterbuch, s.v.). During the 14th and 15th centuries the Ottoman coin was usually called simply “Othmami”, but from the reign of Selim I onwards, this usage being abandoned, it came to be known simply as the akce.

The earliest Ottoman akce was modelled on the dirhem of the Seljukids of Rüm; and although in one issue or another of the sultans down to Murad II there appear most of the elements that were later to make up the final formulae of the akce’s inscriptions, it was not until the reign of Mehemed II that these were all regularly, though not always identically, combined.

The akce of Orhah was weighed 6 kiras, or one-quarter of a mithkdl, measured 18 mm. in diameter; and down to the reign of Murad II, though the akce was somewhat reduced in size, its standard of purity and even its weight were pretty well kept up. Under Mehemed II, Bayazid II, and Selim I, however, its standard was reduced by 5% and its weight to 5/6 kiras; and although under Suleymân I and Selim II this decree was retarded, it continued, till, under Mahmoud III and his successors down to Othmam II, though retaining the same standard and more or less the same diameter, it was reduced by fits and starts to a weight of no more than 3½ kiras, becoming thinner and thinner. Moreover, under Murad IV, Ibrahim, and Mehemed IV, its silver content was reduced first to 70% and then to 50%, though its weight and size remained roughly the same. The effect of these various debasements on its value was that, whereas 40 akbes went to the first Ottoman gold piece, of Mehemed II, by the reign of Mustafâ II, when a currency reform resulted in the first coining of the Ottoman kurush, the rate of the gold piece (whose own weight and standard had been pretty well maintained) had risen to as much as 300 akbes.

As a conventional unit, used chiefly for accountancy purposes, and in the landtax period it was abandoned, except in connection with the akce, even for that.
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**AKD.** The akd, in Muslim law, is properly the legal act, whether it relates to a contract or to a simple unilateral declaration, such as a will. More especially, however, the term akd denotes the legal act which involves a bi-lateral declaration, namely the offer (i’dâb) and the acceptance (i’had). Thus the latter is a legal act binding on itself, and, as such, is one and indivisible. In the absence of an act of acceptance, the offer is not binding. It is necessary to distinguish clearly between the akd and offer, and, simple promises (i’dâa) and also allowances (i’hadâl), which are not binding.

The akd is not merely a simple expression of agreement. Every akd requires a sigha, or form, by which the wishes of each of the parties are expressed. These wishes must in principle be expressed verbally, unless a mute is involved. Writing cannot be used unless the parties are not in the presence of each other. But there is no question of an inflexible formalism. The sigha is not confined to a stereotyped form. Any mode of expression (sûra) is valid, provided it gives the required meaning. It is necessary to realise that akd can in no way validly express the will to contract. Verba de praesenti only bind the contracting party if the will to contract is established independently. There is no necessity to try to establish this intention (niyya) if the verba are in the past tense.

The akd should therefore reflect a mutual understanding which has already been reached. It is concluded in order to secure for this agreement its legal effects. Thus the effect of a contract of sale is the immediate transfer of the ownership of the object of sale to the vendee. This conveyance cannot be deferred. In the definition of the akd, there is no question of obligations being incurred by one party or the other by virtue of the contract. The akd, in Muslim law, is not so much an act giving rise to obligations as a legal act creating a new legal situation or modifying an existing one. The vendor is naturally obliged to deliver the object of sale, just as the purchaser is obliged to pay the price. These obligations, however, are not considered to be effects (hukm) of the contract, but are properly considered to be contractual rights (i’had al-i’dâb).

If the obligations of the two contracting parties are discharged as soon as mutual agreement is reached, then this does not constitute an akd, but only a mu’âldtl, a mutual delivery of the object of sale and of the sale price. This delivery is certainly valid for res vires. It is also valid, according to some legal doctrines, for articles of value, if there has been an effective fulfilment of the contract by at least one party. But, in principle, the akd postulates a sigha which necessarily creates, in law, a new situation.

It should also be noticed that, in certain contracts, the material delivery of the object of sale is regarded as a condition of the fulfillment of the akd. This position obtains as regards loan of fungible and not fungible things, pledge and gift which, in Muslim law, are equivalent to "real" contracts.

The akd must comply with a condition of unity in time and space. The akd constitutes an indivisible whole. The negotium (safa) is one and indivisible, in the sense that the offer cannot be accepted in part, even when it involves two distinct things. Similarly, the offer cannot be accepted by one of its recipients to the exclusion of the other. Finally, the contract is rendered null and void if one of the objects of the contract proves to be an asset extra commercium. This conception of the contract as an indivisible unit gives great rigidity to the structure of the akd. Thus the akd cannot comprehend more than one.
negotium. On the other hand, the *akd must be concluded at one and the same sitting (the contractual meeting or madjlis al-*akd). In short, the contracting parties must assemble in one and the same place. The contractual act thus takes place under the symbol of the three unities (see Ch. Chehata, *Théorie générale*, no. 110).

From this it follows that any clause added to the contract will be declared inoperative unless it is implied by the nature of the contract itself, so that it can be smoothly integrated into its structure. Such clauses are termed essentialia and naturalia. All other clauses (accidentalia) will be considered invalid. Thus the inalienability clause added to a contract of sale will be deemed null and void.

Does this mean that contracts in Muslim law are all formulated contracts, and that the parties cannot, by mutual agreement, conclude contracts which have not been anticipated by the Law (ghar)? The answer usually given is that Muslims are bound by their stipulations (ghurūt) [q.v.]. But at the same time every type of contract is considered on its merits and pronounced legal or otherwise on the basis of the Qur'ānic texts, the hadith and the idāma. It must moreover be realised that the conditions governing the formation of contracts are tantamount to prescriptions of an authoritative nature, and that the various regulations laid down by jurists concerning contracts entail the sanction of nullity, which considerably limits the area of contractual freedom. On the other hand it should not be forgotten that the Muslim social order, in matters concerning contracts, is based on two main principles; the struggle against usury and any suspicion of usury (riḥā and ghubāt al-riḥā), and the exclusion of all risk (gharar) from transactions.

The *akd*, once drawn up in accordance with the requisite conditions, cannot in principle be vitiated by some fault in the agreement, unless there is a question of constraint (ikrāḥ). Constraint is usually the subject for a separate chapter in works on *īkh.* The party which has suffered constraint can revoke its contractual obligations. In the case of fraud, on the other hand, the contract can be challenged only if the fraudulent actions have inflicted on the deceived party excessive loss (ghānī fāhib). Errors, such as a fault in the agreement, pass almost unnoticed. The party which is deceived as to the quality of the article can only withdraw from its contractual obligations if the quality has been made the subject of a special stipulation in the contract. The contract will then have to be cancelled, not on account of the error, but on the basis of the resolutory clause.

An *akd* which does not satisfy the required conditions is in principle ineffectual, and is termed null and void (bāṭil) [q.v.]. Hanafite doctrine distinguishes, however, between the invalid contract and the irregular (fāṣād) contract. The contract will be considered null and void only if one of the conditions (ruḥān) regulating the conclusion of the contract happens to be unfulfilled. In all other cases, the contract will simply be irregular. The irregular contract, however, is, like an invalid contract, an act devoid of legal consequences. The advantage of the distinction between these two categories appears only when the protection of a third party is involved. Thus a person acquiring property by virtue of a fāṣād contract can validly alienate it in favour of a third party, if he has previously taken possession of it. The alienation in this case arises from a non dominus, but it is considered valid, because the third party, which has acquired the property from its owner, could be ignorant of the irregularity (fasād) attaching to that owner's title. This measure of protection is at the basis of the theory of *lās* contracts in Hanafi Muslim law. (See Ch. Chehata, in *Travaux de la Semaine du Droit Musulman*, Paris 1953, 36 ff.)

It should, however, be noted that certain contracts are neither valid nor invalid, but belong to a third category. The *akd* is then said to be ma`ūsul, as, for example, in the case of a contract concluded, without the audtorias of his guardian, by a minor who is not without powers of discrimination. Unless gratuitous transactions are involved, transactions concluded by minors who are not without powers of discrimination are not null and void. They are simply non-effective (cf. Art. 108 of the German civil code). The ratification (idāda) of the guardian gives them full and absolute effect. Similarly a contract agreed to by a non-dominus is considered simply to be non-effective, prior to the ratification of the verus dominus. In the meantime, the contract has no legal effects whatever. It is in a state of suspense (ma`ūsul) between the parties and equally as regards any third party.

If an *akd* is to have effect on other than on the contracting parties, representation is required. In Hanafi Muslim law the agent (ma`ūs) does not, in principle, represent his client. In order that the *akd* may produce its effect directly on the client, the agent must act in the name of his client (alierno nomine). But he then assumes the role of a messenger a spokesman pure and simple (rasūl). If he acts in his own name (proprio nomine), which is the usual function of an agent, the *akd* will still produce its effect in regard to the client, but the obligations arising from the contract will not be binding on the client; they will be binding on the agent alone. Thus the legal representative of a person acquiring property will find himself bound to pay its price himself, while the property will go directly to his client. The distinction, already noticed, between the effects of the contract (ahkām) and rights arising from the contract (bukhāl al-*akd*) is clearly illustrated here. (See Chefik Chehata, *La représentation dans les actes juridiques en droit musulman handîfî, d'après les textes de Shaybānî*, to appear in the Proceedings of the Congress of Comparative Law, Paris 1954.)

The effective *akd* is in principle binding (lāsīm). There are, however, several exceptions to this rule; for instance agency, gratuitous loan, pledge, partnership, suretyship, security and gift are considered, among others, to be contracts which are essentially revocable. In all these contracts one of the parties is free, depending on the circumstances, to withdraw from its contractual obligations by a simple unilateral declaration. (In the case of gift, however, a judicial decree is necessary.) Moreover, contracts of lease can always be rescinded if one of the parties lodges a plea (nabir) on any grounds whatever. Finally, a special clause can be inserted in general in any contract, to confer on one party, or on both parties equally, the right to withdraw (jus paenitendi, called in Muslim law khīyār al-shalī). In conclusion it may be mentioned that mutual agreement between the parties can always put an end to a contract. This is termed shikā (mutus dissensus), and is discussed at length in works on *īkh.* But the *akd* cannot in principle be cancelled on the grounds of non-fulfilment. Thus the vendor, in default of a special clause, cannot demand the rescission of the sale in a case where the purchaser has not paid the agreed price. (See also *shurūt.*)

Doctrinal sources, i.e. those for Hanafite law, which is specially discussed in the article: Muḥammad b. al-Jāṣān al-Shaybānī, al-As, Kitāb al-bayyūd wal-sālam, ed. by Shafīk Shihātī, Cairo 1948; Fārākhshī, al-Mākṣūr, vol. iii, 1928/1946; Kāsānī, Badā‘i‘ al-San‘ā‘ fi Tartīb al-Ṣaḥrā’iyya, 7 vols., Cairo 1938/1940.

But as the sister can after all only lay claim to half the grandfather’s part, the right proportion between these two parts has again to be re-established. Together they inherit $\frac{1}{8} = \frac{1}{16}$, but the grandfather receives $\frac{1}{2}$ and the sister $\frac{1}{3}$.

About the meaning of the name akhāriyya the Muslim scholars hold different opinions. Some say that the question itself is akdar (i.e. troubled, obscure), or that the otherwise generally accepted principles are “troubled, disturbed” in this case; others believe Akdar to be the name of a man, to whom ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān submitted this question.

interest since the discovery of the greater part of
the Muktabis of Ibn Hayyan. It is an ill-proportioned
and relatively late work, probably contemporary
with the reconquest of Valencia. In it are found
lengthy passages from earlier chronicles, notably
from that of Ibn b. Ahmad al-Razi. The fact that
this text does not refer to the sources which it
transcribes or transposes has deceived Dozy (preface
to his edition of the al-Bayag al-Mukhrib of Ibn
Iqbar, Leiden 1848-51, 10-12) and Ribera (intro-
duction to his translation of the Itfadah of Ibn al-
Khiyya, Madrid 1926, XII, 11) into believing
it to be an original work. The extremely debatable
study and problematical conclusions reached by
by the non-Arabist Spanish historian Cl. Sanchez
Albornoz, in his work El “Afhur maymaa”, questiones
historiographicae que suscita, Buenos Aires 1944,
need only be mentioned here.


AL-AKHDAR, “the green”, a vulgar form cur-
cently used in North Africa for the personal name
al-Khir (q.v.). Various sants, especially at Con-
tantine, are known by this name.

AL-ALKHAIR, Abu Zayd ʿAbd al-Rahman b.
Suyydi Muhammad al-Saghib, Algerian au-
thor of the 10th/16th century. He wrote (1) al-Sulaim al-
Murawna (composed in 942/1534), a short verifi-
cation of al-Saghib’s (q.v.) works; this little work soon became extremely popular and
acquired numerous commentaries (one by the author himself)
and glosses; it has often been lithographed or
printed, in Fas, Bulaq (editio princeps of 1241
in Majmua al-Majmua al-Mutafun), Cairo and Luck-
now; French transl. by J. D. Luciani, Le Soullam,
Algiers 1921. Very popular, too, is his (2)
commentaries by other writers, it has often been
rently used in North Africa for the personal name
on logic; this
Also printed or lithographed are (3)
al-Durr al-
Durra al-Maghrib, two words is accidental, though it was willingly
offered in the form of address
in the same form and with
Middle Turkish (Kashgharian): in al-Kashghar,
Diar n Lughat al-Turk (akl, “al-djawadd”, i, 84 —
vi, 1.4). The word occurs in the same form and with
“generosity”) in

Bibliography: Sirafi, A’jbdr al-Nahwiyin
(Krenkow), 52; Zubaydi, Tababdi, Cairo 1954;
Suyuti, Muzhir, ii, 248, 249; Ibn Taghribri, 1, 485;
Brockelmann, S I, 165.

and Tha‘lab; he gained distinction by introducing
the grammatical studies of Baghdad into Egypt,
where Ahmad al-Nahhas was his pupil; a grammatical
work which he wrote was studied and annotated
in Spain (see BAH, iv, 313-4). He died in 125/1073.

Bibliography: Brockelmann, S I, 165. On
the subject of these grammarians, see also Flügel,
Die grammatischen Schulan der Araber, 61 ff.

(C. Brockelmann-Ch. Pellat)

AKHI, designation of the leaders of asso-
ciations of young men organized as guilds
in Anatolia in the 13th-14th centuries, who
adopted the ideals of the futuwa (q.v.) and were
recruited mainly among the craftsmen. Ibn Battuta
(ii, 260) connects the name with the Arabic word
for “my brother”; if this explanation is based on
anything more than an identity of sound, it would
offer an instance of a “title in forms of address”
similar to A. sayyid, T. Ṣanʿun, bagum, etc. It
is more likely, however, that the homonymy of
the two words is accidental, though it was willingly
adopted by the Akhs; occasionally also it is borrowed
in the Persian translation biradar (cf. Taeschner-
Schumacher, Nāṣirī, 38). In reality it is a Turkish
word (cf. J. Deny in JA, 1920, 182 f.; H. H. Schaeder,
in OLZ, 1928, 1049, n. 1), which is already found in
Uyghur in the form akl “generous” (A. von Gabain,
Alltürkischen Grammatik, glossary, s.v.; Turfanische,
vii, 24). The word occurs in the same form and with
the same meaning (cf. also akl, “generosity”) in
Middle Turkish (Kashgharian): in al-Kashghar,
Düzin Lughat al-Turk (abl, “al-djamat”), i, 84 —

Encyclopaedia of Islam
facs. ed. 57; a£J/J£, iii, 129 — facs. ed. 520; C. Brockelmann, *MitteUurkischer Wörterbuch*, s.v.), and in the didactic poem *‘Attebet al-‘Hašab* by Edib Ahmed b. Mahmūd Yūnekht, ix (ed. R. Ramet, Istanbul 1951, 58-61, index, s.v.; under the title *Hībet al-‘Hašab*, ed. Nejīb ‘Asīm, Istanbul 1334, 52-5; cf. J. Deny in *RMM*, 1925, 219, no. 11) *aḥī er*, “the generous one”, and *aḥī bāk*, “the generous”; the opposite is *bākīl* and *bākīlīh*, or *bukhul*, also *ḥasīs* and *ḥasīsīh*). In the latter work the form *aḥīs* occurs also as a variant reading for *aḥī*; and this is the form which is exclusively used in Rūm-Turkish. It is found several times in the oldest Rūm-Turkish literature, as a vocative (“oh generous one, oh noble one, oh hero”) constituting the rhymeword at the end of a line; for instance in the *Kitāb-i Dede Korkut* (ed. E. Rossi, fol. 65°, three times; ed. Kiiäsi Rifʿat, 16; ed. Gökkyay, 9), in two poems of Yūnus Emre (ed. Burhan Ümid, ii, 344, 361; ed. Abdülbaki Gölpinarlı, 117), and also elsewhere (e.g. Enveri, Mürkrimin Khalili, 43). The word passed from the general to the particular meaning, i.e. possessor of *fuṭuwwa* (*P. fuṭuwwa*) or *fuṭuwwat*, by acquiring the full implications of the Persian word *gūwānmār*, which the latter in turn had received as a translation of Arabic *fata*, *al-fata* (cf. H. H. Schaeder, loc. cit.).

*Aḥī*, as a term qualifying its bearer as possessing *fuṭuwwat* (*aḥīb fuṭuwwat* or *fuṭuwwat-dār*), always precedes the name and occurs occasionally with reference to persons even earlier than the 7th/13th century. So for instance it is applied to the sūfī *gāyāh* Aḥī Faradj Zandjanl (d. 1 Radjab 457/836), and the teacher of the poet Niẓāmī (b. 533/1142) is also said to have borne that designation. It is, however, only in the 7th/13th, and more especially the 8th/14th century, that the name occurs frequently, in the whole of the Middle East, but predominantly in Anatolia; it gradually disappears again in the course of the 9th/15th century.

In the more particular sense, Akhism is the specific form assumed by the *fuṭuwwa* organization in late- and post-Salṭūn Anatolia. It is well attested here by a literature of its own (the Persian *Fuṭuwwat-nāme* of Niẓāmī, written in 1204, were members of *aḥī* organization; in prose, by Yabāy b. Khalīl al-Burghazī, probably from the 8th/14th century; the important chapter on *fuṭuwwat* in Gūlscheh’s old-Ottoman version of *‘Attar’s Manṭik al-Tayr*, studied by F. Taeschner in *S.P.A.W.*, 1932, 744-60) as well as by allusions in various authors (the most impressive being Ibn Battūtā’s vivid account, ii, 254-354, especially 330 ff., the chapter on *al-‘akhkhya al-fiyān*, and by inscriptions and documents. (A list of the references, to which many additions could now be made, in *Islamica*, 1929, 29-47; *‘Aḥīkasha-zāde* (Giese), 201, 213 (= Istanbul ed. 205), names the *aḥīs*, together with the *ghayyāh*, *abdālān* and *bādījān*, as the four groups of “travelers” (*muśfīlīrīn wa-sayyādārin*) in Rūm (Anatolia) (for comments on this statement see P. Wittek, in *Bysantion*, 1936, 310). The wording of the sentence seems to imply that these groups came to Anatolia from abroad. They can perhaps be connected with the *flood of daruwalas* and related figures from the east (*Khurāsān* and *Turkistan*), who are known from other sources as well to have come to Anatolia in the Mongol period (second half of the 13th century). Some early mentions of *aḥīs* in Iranian territory in pre-Mongol times would bear this out. The earliest mentions of *aḥīs* in Anatolia (especially in Aflākī, *Manākīš al-‘Arifīn*, cf. Cl. Cahen, see below) also go back to relations with Iran. On the other hand, in considering the forms of organization, the connection with the courtly *fuṭuwwa* at the caliph’s court in Baghdād ought not to be passed over; this is made likely by the relations, repeatedly attested, between the caliph al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh (575-622/1180-1225), the reformer of the *fuṭuwwa* [q.v.], and the Sājdālīl sultan of Rūm.

During the disintegration of the state of the Rūm Salṭūns and the division of Anatolia into a number of Turkish principalities (second half of the 13th century), the *aḥīs*, who according to the contemporary or slightly later authors (such as Ibn Bīlī, Aḵṣarāyī, the Paris Anonymous and Aflākī) were leaders of bands (*rūmsd*, showed a remarkable activity, reminiscent of the activity of the *‘ayyārān* [q.v.] in Baghdād and the *aḥādīs* [q.v.] in Syria a century before. In the first half of the 14th century, the *aḥīs* appear in the account of Ibn Battūtā, to whom the *aḥī* extended hospitality in every town during his journey through Anatolia, ca. 1333, as an important element of cohesion in the motley conglomeration of states in Anatolia at that period. In towns where no prince resided, they exercised a sort of government and had the rank of *amīr* (Aḵ Sarāy, Ibn Baṭṭūta, ii, 286; Kayasıyye, ii, 288 f.); sometimes they exercised judicial authority (Konya, Ibn Baṭṭūta, ii, 281). Their position seems to have been especially strong in Anḵara, at the time when the authority of the Mongol governor residing in Siwās did not reach so far. Sharaf al-Dīn, the richest and most powerful of these *aḥīs* of Anḵara, calls himself in his tomb inscription of 751/1350: *aḥī muṣṣām* (*Mushārak Ghālib, Anḵara, ii, 15 f., no. 20; Islamica, 1929, 44, no. 3b). According to Neghīr (Taeschner), 52 (= ed. Anḵara, 190-2), it was from their hands that Murād I accepted the town in 762/1360-1, We find *aḥīs* also in the entourage of the first Ottoman rulers; some of these *aḥīs* took part in the conquest of Brusa (for details see *Islamica*, 1929, 30). Basing himself on this fact, Fr. Giese (ZS, 1924, 255, 258) considered the *aḥī* as the troops with whose help the Ottomans founded their power, and surmised that they themselves were members of *aḥī* organizations. This is, however, little likely, in view of the urban character of Akhism and the fact that its associations were composed of craftsmen. P. Wittek has shown with much probability that the role attributed by Giese to the *aḥī* belongs in reality to the *aḥīs*, fighters for the faith, who constituted a military counterpart to the *aḥī* (first in *ZDMG*, 1925, 288 f., and then frequently). On the other hand it results from a *wakfiyya* of Murād I, of 767/1366, and an inscription in *Hādīdī Bektash*, of 796/1396, that Murād, probably for political reasons, joined the still powerful *aḥī* organization (see Fr. Taeschner, *War Murād I Grossmeister oder Mitglied des Achibundes*, Oriens, 1953, 23-31). This was followed, however, by the decline, rather than the advancement, of Akhism, as it seems that the Ottoman sultans, when they had no further need of the *aḥī*, dropped their relations with them.

The *aḥī*’s own literature does not allude to any activity in public life. Here the *aḥī* organization appears as a half-religious, *daruwalas*-like society. It comprised three grades: *yigisi* (“young man”), translation of A. *fudā*, designated the ordinary unmarried member of the organization; *aḥī* (president of a corporation of *fityan* and owner of a *sikāya*, meeting-house, of which there were sometimes more than one...
in a town); and shaykh. The latter grade seems to have played practically no active role; probably it refers to the leader of a darugh settlement, to which the members of the corporation felt themselves attached. Such attachments seem to have varied with the individual corporations; there are known to have been relations between akhs and the Mewlewis, Bektaşıs, Khadwetis, and probably yet other orders. The ordinary members were always again divided into two classes: they were either bawalis, "word-members", when they made a general profession only ("by way of speech"), or saylis, "word members", who probably were the active members. The symbol was, according to Ibn Battûta, ii, 264, a knife (şikkîm); they covered their heads with a white woolen headgear (kalanswâs), from the end of which there hung down a piece of cloth one ell long and two fingers in breadth (the resemblance to the head-covering of the later Janissaries, the kele, is noteworthy). According to Ibn Battûta, the members of an akhî corporation met every evening in the house of their leader, the akhî, bringing him their daily earnings, which served to cover the expenses of the club premises and the communal meal, to which also guests, especially passing travellers, would be invited. The lodging and entertaining of travellers was considered by the akhîs as one of their main function. According to Ibn Battûta, they also played a political role by fighting tyrants and murdering their adherents; this statement may be an echo of the frequently attested activities of the akhs in earlier times, which found expression in revolts and similar demonstra tions.

As regards other customs and their code of honour, the akhis accepted the general rules of futuwwa ([q.v.], T. Anjuman, 1905). As in the futuwwa, so also among the akhsîs, the initiation of novices (terbiye) into the association by their girding, the cutting of their hair, the passing round of a cup of salted water and putting on the trousers, was of central importance. Their religious-political position, however, was not fixed: some elements in the custom and theory of the akhsîs, as for instance the intense cult of Allah, showing a Shî'î colouring also, yet they no doubt considered themselves to be Sunnis and like all Turks considered themselves to be Sunnis and like all Turks, fell in Sinob under suspicion of being a Râfî'dî, i.e. Shî'te, because of a minute difference in the ritual of prayer and had to clear himself by eating roasted hare ([i.e. 3522]).

In the 15th century information about Akhism becomes more and more rare and finally ceases. Sometimes the word akhî occurs, but merely as a proper name. A mollâ Akhaywân is named by Mehemed II; a family called Akhî-zâde, whose members occupied high judicial posts, survived into the 17th century. Also place-names in which the word akhî occurs in various combinations are not uncommon in Anatolia and Rumelia. But it seems that Akhism disappeared in the course of the 15th century. Its tradition survived only in some elements of the Turkish guilds ([q.v.], in which organization (which according to Sayyid Mehemed b. Sayyid 'Ali b. Dîn's Great Futuwwet-nâmé (composed in 1524) had nine grades) the akhî, also called khâlisî, occupied the seventh grade. The akhî tradition was especially cultivated in the guild of the tanners, who had as their patron Akhî Ewran ([q.v.], a semi-mythical figure, who, if he is historical at all, must have lived in the first half of the 14th century. The president of the tanners' guild bore the title of Akhî Baba ([q.v.]). Moreover, among the tanners the Futuwwet-nâmé of Yahyâ b. Khalîl al-Burghâzî continued to be read, revised and copied.


Akhî Baba, in popular parlance Akhî Baba or Eht Baba, title of the shaykh of the tekye of Akhî Ewrân ([q.v.]) in Kırîehir. Sometimes also his delegates to the Turkish guilds ([q.v.]). Sometimes also his delegates to the Turkish guilds ([q.v.]), more correctly Akhî Baba wekhî. The main task of the Akhî Baba, or of his delegate or local representative, was to carry out the initiation of apprentices to these guilds by the ceremony of the girding (husbâk or peştemâl hümâlma); this carried with it some fees. The Akhî Babas succeeded little by little in extending their ascendancy over other guilds and conducting the girding ceremony in them also. Thus they brought under their control almost the whole Turkish guild organization, both in Anatolia and the European provinces (but not, however, in the provinces with Arab population), acquiring for themselves a position of considerable power, and for the tekye of Kırîehir great riches. Only a few guilds managed to escape their control; among these were the guilds of Ankara, which had formerly been the stronghold of akhîs. His influence even reached as far as the Crimea, where also the tanners' guild had precedence in all celebrations of the guilds (E. Bulatov, in Oterki Rossii, ed. V. Passek, Moscow 1840, iii, 139-54; V. Gordlewskiy, Organisationsya
The Akhi Babas claimed to be descendants of Akhi Ewran. The local representatives of the Akhi Baba were elected by the members of the respective guilds, but did not necessarily belong to them, and any persons who were in any way notable could be chosen. They had, however, to receive a licence (fikādet-nāme) from the Akhi Baba of Kirsehir and a diploma (berdi), confirming the appointment, from the government. The Akhi Baba of the tanners was at the same time the head of the whole guild organisation in his town. He could, however, be deposed.

With the decline of the Turkish guilds, following on the penetration of Western economic systems, the journeys of the Akhi Babas of Kirsehir, as well as the sending of delegates by him, fell into disuse. A delegate of the Akhi Baba came to Bosnia for the last time in 1886-7 (Hamdija Kreševljaković, Esnaft i Obrit u Bosni i Hercegovini, Sarajevo, 1931, 101-47). In the provinces which remained part of the Ottoman Empire, this practice ceased only at the time of the abolition of the old guilds in 1908. 

Bibliography: see Āli and Āli Ewran, also Fr. Taeschner, Die Zunftwesen in der Türkei, Leipziger Vierteljahrschrift für Südosteuropa, 1941, 172-88; idem, Das bosnische Zunftwesen zur Türkenseit (1463-1878), Byzantinische Zeitschrift, 1951, 551-9.

(A. Fr. Taeschner)

AKHI EWRAN, semilegendary Turkish saint, patron of the Turkish tanners' guilds. His tomb sanctuary in Kirsehir (built in the 9th/10th century, with inscriptions of 854/1450 and 886/1481; in the last in the name of Āli al-Dawla b. Süleyman Beg, probably of the family of the Dhu 'l-Kadhr, and thus brother-in-law of Sultan Mehmed II), connected with a tekke, was a frequented place of pilgrimage. Tashköprü-zade (on margin of Ibn Khallikan, 25; Turkish transl. of Mehdji, 33; German transl. by O. Rescher, 6) mentions him amongst the qaybed-i şeyh of the period of Orkhan. His name first occurs in a Turkish mathnawi, Teramād-i Ākhī Ewrān tába tharāk, by Gūlşehri, which was composed probably after the author's Manṭik al-Tayr (finished in 717/1317)—from which it has many borrowings—and not long after the saint's death. He is next mentioned in the Wilāyāt-i nāme of Hādżdīl Bektāsh, written in the time of Murad II (E. Gross, Das Wilāyat-i name des Hādżdīl Bektāsh, Leipzig 1927, 82-93). While in Gūlşehri's mathnawi Ākhī Ewrān's figure is given only a slight touch of the miraculous (it is noteworthy that there is as yet no mention there of his relation with the tanners' craft), in the Wilāyāt-i nāme it is already fully elaborated with legendary features (there is also mention of relations with the tanners); it is worth noting that here Ākhī Ewrān is presented not as a disciple, but as a friend of Hādżdīl Bektāsh. According to 'All Emdī (OTEČ, 1135, 467 f., note) and M. Djedwed (Dhawī 'āli Fasī al-'Akhīyya al-Fiṣyān), Istanbul 1351/1932, 279-82) there exists a document of endowment (muḥāżirah) by Ākhī Ewrān dating from 706/1306-7 (in a copy published by C. H. Tarim, Kırşehir Tarhi, Kırşehir 1938, it even bears the date of 676/1278), where the full name of the saint is given as Āli Shāhīyāy Nāsīr (Tarīm: Naṣīr al-Dīn Piri-i Pīrak Ākhī Ewrān. The document can, however, easily be recognized as a forgery, as Shaykh Hāmid Well (d. 815/1413), teacher of Hādżdīl Bayrām Well (d. 833/1428-9) is named in it; it was probably fabricated in the first half of the 15th century, in order to give legal sanction to the possessions of Ākhī Ewrān's sanctuary in Kirsehir. The importance of the sanctuary as a place of pilgrimage is attested by Sīdi 'Ali Reis (Mīrād-u-门-Mnābak, Istanbul 1313, 16; Engl. transl. by A. Vambery, The Travels and Adventures of the Turkish Admiral Sidi Ali Reis, London 1899, 105; published by H. B. Kunter, Kitabelerimiz, Vakıflar Dergisi, Istanbul 1351/1932, 279-82) there exists a document of endowment (muḥāżirah) by Āli Kırşehir, and only the sanctuary of Kirsehir retained its position.

In addition to the aforementioned writings, legends of Ākhī Ewrān are occasionally found in authors such as 'Āli Kırşehir, and the saint is given as al-Shaykh Nasrī (Tarīm: Nasrī), who visited it in 964/1556 on his return from India. Also other Anatolian cities besides Kirsehir boasted of the possession of the grave, or at least of a memorial of the saint, for instance Trapezunt (a makām on the Bö Tepe), Konya (in the quarter of Şırçağl), Nigde and Brusa. All these were, however, more or less forgotten, and only the sanctuary of Kirsehir retained its position.

AKHÍ EWRÁN — AKHLÁK

1942, 431 ff. (the inscriptions in the sepulchral sanctuary: 434 f. nos. 8-14); W. Ruben, Khrischir’im akhlaki in dem persischen turkischen him charcoal, in: A. Ewran, Türklesi, Bel., 1947, 616-38 (German résumé in Bel., 1948, 195-9; description of the sepulchral sanctuary and legends about Akhí Ewrán); Fr. Taeschner, G. Scherer’s Memoir auf Ewran, den Heiligen von Khrischir und Patron der türkischen Künste, Wiesbaden 1953. (Fr. Taeschner)

AKHKİLJUK, “little aḫḫ”, an amir of unknown name in Tabriz, in the 8th/14th century, follower of the Čobanid Malik Aghraf, who was defeated and executed by Džani Beg, hân of the Golden Horde. When after Džani Beg’s death his son, Berdi Beg, who had been left by his father as governor in the conquered city, left Tabriz in order to secure his father’s throne for himself (758/1357), Akhkiljuk succeeded in obtaining possession not only of Tabriz, but of the whole of Čagharcaydan, and in defending them for some time from the Djalîurd sultan of Baghdâd, Uways, son of the “Great Hasan” (Hasan-i Buzurg). When, however, Uways captured Tabriz in 760/1359, he ordered the execution of Akhkiljuk, who had taken part in a conspiracy against him. During his short rule Akhkiljuk corresponded with the Mamlûk Empire of Egypt (he was addressed by the Mamlûk chancery simply by the title of “aḫḫ”; al-Kalâshandî, Sukh, 381, cf. W. Björkman, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Staatskanslei im islamischen Ägypten, 128). His fame spread as far as Anatolia, where a chapter was devoted to him by the old Ottoman poet Ahmedî in his famous Iskender-nâme.

Bibliography: Mirkhân, Rawdat al-Šarîf, Bombay 1266, v. 169; Kîndâmîr, Ḥâbbî al-Siyar, Teheran 1371, iii, 81; Ḥâfîz-iAbrû, transl. Bayani, Paris 1936, 154; V. Minorsky in EP, IV, artt. TABRIZ and UWAYS; B. Spuler, Die Mongolen in Iran, 137; Fr. Taeschner, Der Achidschuk von Tebriz, in Festschrift Jan Rybka, Prague 1936. (Fr. Taeschner)

AKHIR-I ČARRAMBA [see SAFAZ].

AKHRA, fem. of aḫîr, "the last", is a term used already in the Kurân for the condition to come according to the commentators properly al-dâr al-aḫhrâr, "the last abode", as opposed to (al-dâr or al-bâyâl) al-dunyâ, "the nearer or nearest abode or life", i.e. the present world. A synonym is mu’âdâ. The same antithesis is expressed by the terms dâr al-bâbâb, "the abode of everlasting existence", and dâr al-fanâ, "the abode of transitoriness", and by the roots ʾdîl and ʾdî. Aḫira also denotes the condition of bliss or misery in the hereafter, again as opposed to dunyâ, the lot of man in the present world, and in particular its pleasures. From these meanings derive more technically theological and philosophical definitions, such as the state of resurrection whether corporeal or incorporeal or, if resurrection of the body is denied, a spiritual state. See also DUNYÂ.

Bibliography: Lane, Lexicon, s.v.; A. Sprenger (ed.), Dictionary of the Technical Terms, s.v.; Ghazzâlî, Ikhb’Ullâm al-Dîn, khâb 40 and passim; Fakhri al-Dîn al-Râzî, Muṣâṣal, rubk 3, kîmâ, 2. (A. S. Tritton)

AKHESHA, the Persian and Turkish name of a town, in Georgian ĂGHAL TŞHÎ, “New Fortress”, situated on the Pshów river (left tributary of the upper Kuber), centre of the Georgian province Samtskhe (later Sa-atabago) which is mentioned among the conquests of ʿAbd b. Maslama (under Muṣâwiya), al-Balâdḫurî, 203.

Under the Mongols the local rulers (of the Djalîr-ee family) became autonomous and received the title of atabago. The name Karšûrû found in Persian and Turkish sources refers to these rulers of whom several bore the name of Kuarkuare (see Brosset, Histoire de la Géorgie, ii). In 1579 Āḵal Tšihe was occupied by the Ottomans who succeeded in implanting in this region Islam and Ottoman customs. In 1625 the Turkish pašas took over the administration. Āḵal Tšihe became a considerable strategic point and one of the chief Caucasian slave-markets, cf. Ḥâḥîdîj Khallîfâ, Diţîn-numâ, 408 f. In 1829 the town was incorporated by the Russians. After the revolution it forms part of the Georgian S. S. Republic. (V. Minorsky)

AKHLÁK (plural of khulûk, “innate disposition”), ethics.

(i) Survey of ethics in Islam; (ii) Philosophical ethics.

(i) SURVEY OF ETHICS IN ISLAM.

1. Islamic ethics took shape only gradually and the tradition of the different elements of which it is composed was not finally established before the 5th/11th century. Unlike the Greek world, in which popular ethics were refined and reshaped by philosophical reasoning without any breach between, and with, and with no perceptible influence of any foreign doctrine, so that eventually philosophy came to express the moral values by which the lives of the educated classes were governed, in Islam ethics appear in their mature state as an interesting and, on the whole, successful amalgamation of a pre-Islamic Arabian tradition and Kurdîc teaching with non-Arabic elements, mainly of Persian and Greek origins, embedded in or integrated with a general-Islamic structure. The praise of, and value attached to, good character (husn al-khulûk) is common enough among traditionalists, mystics, philosophers, and those writers who aim at giving practical advice to rulers and “civil servants”. But their ideas of moral perfection are drawn from widely different sources, although all of them, in various ways, try to conform to the basic standards of Islam (which are in themselves not static); hence the process of assimilation and eventual integration of these different and sometimes conflicting trends extended over a considerable time.

2. It would be erroneous to assume that the different kinds of morality which found literary expression in successive periods from the age of the pre-Islamic poets to the 5th/11th century present a cumulative process, in the sense that each new type as it emerged replaced or suppressed the earlier types. On the contrary, they co-existed for a long time, in varying strength. The tribal sunna of the pre-Islamic Arabs, based on usage and custom, described by I. Goldzìher (Muhammedanische Studien), i and others (e.g. B. Fares, L’honneur chez les Arabes) around Islam, Paris 1932), by no means died out with the advent of Islam; and since pre-Islamic literature eventually became part of the accepted Arabic humanities, the values expressed in it were never entirely forgotten: a high sense of personal honour [see ‘IRÁ], courage [see HAMASA], loyalty to one’s fellowtribesmen [see ŠAMS], hospitality [see DAVÉ], endurance [see SABR], self-control [see HILM], and a secular spirit which could never be completely gelded by the prevailing religious morality (cf. also MURUWWA). The preaching of Muhammad obviously produced a radical change in moral values as well, based on the sanctions of the new religion, and fear
of God and of the Last Judgment: kindness and equity, compassion and mercy, generosity, self-restraint, sincerity, moral fellowship of the Believers are among the new virtues to replace tribal morality, and to become the pillars of an ethical society or, at least, the programme for such a society.

The religious ethic of the Kur'ān was subsequently expanded and pointed in immense detail by the traditionists in the form of ḥadīths (q.v.), expressly based upon and expounding the sunna, or model behaviour, of the Prophet, but frequently supplementing this source by traditions of the Companions and by adaptation of materials from the cultural traditions of the older religions. The importance of the Ḥadīth in forming and maintaining the common ethical ideas of the Muslim Community in all ages and all regions has been incalculable; but in addition it was largely responsible for the ethical framework of the developing Islamic Law (see ŞA'r), and for laying the foundations which made possible the process of integration described above. It may be said broadly that the whole corpus of Ḥadīth constitutes a handbook of Islamic ethics, inasmuch as in the general Muslim view the correct performance of religious duties and the right understanding of religious doctrine are inseparable elements of the moral life. Within this comprehensive structure, however, certain forms of conduct were more particularly designated by the term ḏabā (q.v.), which in this early religious context had a definitely ethical connotation (see, e.g. Wensinck's Handbook, s.v. Adab). It is tempting to surmise (though it might be difficult to prove) that it was the capture of this term for the very differently motivated ethic of Persian origin expounded by the 2nd/8th century writers (see § 4 below) which led to the substitution of the term ḥākīd, which appears in various traditions extolling "good ḥākīd" (see Wensinck, Handbook, 11a and B. Farès, Makārim al-ḥāqāq, Rend. Linc., 1937, 417 = Ḥabīd Ṭarībiyya, Cairo 1939, 21 ff.). The tradition of the Prophet used as a proof-text by later writers on Islamic ethics: "I have been sent to fulfill the virtues which go with nobility of character (makārim al-ḥāqāq)", does not occur in the canonical books of tradition (cf. B. Farès, loc. cit.). Under this title several collections of ethical ḥadīths were made from the 3rd/9th century onwards, e.g. by Ibn Abī l-Dunyā (Broek., I, 160), al-Khārašīf (Broek., I, 250), and al-Ṭabarṣī (Broek., I, 213; S I, 709), the last-named being the classical Ḡībīte book on the subject (cf. also B. Farès, 412-2).

3. The refinement and development of moral thought on the basis of the Ḥadīth was carried further by both of the religious movements which began to develop within Sunnī Islam in the 3rd/9th century. In theological circles, on the one hand, the conflict with the antideterminist trend of the Muṭaṣ질īs (q.v.), and the consequent emphasis laid by the Muṭaṣ질īs theologians on moral decision and individual responsibility, produced an elaborate discussion and analysis of these topics (see KADAR); and it was through both the Muṭaṣ질īs movement, which in its turn was connected with Greek thought and Christian-Hellenistic apologetic works, and the orthodox reaction to it (see KALAM) that the reception of Greek philosophical ethics was prepared and made possible. On the other hand, the anti-intellectual and ascetic mystical movement of Şīṣīsī (see TĀRĪKH) produced a somewhat divergent type of Islamic ethics, which was gradually to become more and more influential and eventually almost dominated in the Islamic world. For the ŞīṣI preachers, poverty, self-humiliation, and complete surrender of personality became the highest values in life. It may be sufficient here to mention one eminent early Şīṣī writer, al-Muḥāṣṣībī (d. 213/832), who had a decisive influence on al-Ghazzālī when he made ṣīṣīsī a definite part of Islamic ethics in his fundamental Revisification of the Religious Sciences (see M. Smith, An early Mystick of Baghdad, London 1935, and J.R.A.S., 1936, 65).

4. The introduction of Persian moral thought into the Islamic tradition preceded the acquaintance with Greek ethics. Its main representative is Ibn al-Muṣafīfī (q.v.), and--apart from Kalīla wa-Dīmna, a work which deserves to be mentioned in this context--its main content is to be found in the two ḏabā works ascribed to him, the ḏabā al-Ḵābīr (Fr. translation by C. F. Destree, Brussels 1902, from the Dutch of G. van Vloten; German trans. by O. Rescher, MSOS, 1917) and the ḏabā al-Saghīr (German trans. by O. Rescher, 1915), whose authenticity has been doubted but not disproved by G. Richter (-Isl., 1930, 278) and F. Gabrieli (RSO, 1932, 219 ff.). These works (cf. also ARDAQ, BUZURQMAH) are not based on any philosophical principle, but rather remind the reader of Greek rhetorics, giving the rulers, "civil servants" and persons who wish to advance in life advice how to be successful. The Islamic allusions contained in this literature are at first scanty and formal, but in the connection of this tradition with religion is steadily emphasized; Islam is regarded accordingly in the character of a state religion, linked to the sovereign power as religion had been linked with political power in the old Persian state (cf. A. Christensen, L'Iran sous les Sassanides, Copenhagen 1944, ch. iii): "religion and government are sisters". The advice, conveyed in a pleasing and effective style, is based on opportunistic considerations and the recognition of force, which the intelligent man (al-ṣākil) will know how to deal with properly. In the course of a century or so, however, this originally foreign ḏabā tradition was more or less adapted to Islamic standards, and was finally received into the accepted body of the "Ṭarīqāt al-Ṭabā'ī" of Ibn Ḥākām al-Būzī (Ibn Kuṭayb[a (d. 276/889-90). This work, which may be said to have been the first comprehensive manual of Islamic ethics, brought together and to a remarkable degree integrated the Kur'ānic, Ḥadīth, pre-Islamic and Persian contributions, and by excluding the irreconcilable elements of the two latter, practically defined and standardized the component elements of the orthodox morality in its pre-philosophical and pre-Ṣūfistic stage. Related types of literature are the "Mirrors of Princes" (see MALIK) and popular wisdom in apothegmatic form (see ḤIJKMA).

5. Philosophical ethics, derived from the Greeks, was introduced at first by the limited circles who devoted themselves to the study of philosophy. The details of its development amongst the Muslim šāsīfīs are studied in the next section. As is pointed out in §§ 8-10 of that section, philosophical ethics exercised an influence on ḏabā literature and what is of even greater importance, philosophical ethics in the form given to it by Miskawayh was fully excepted by such an influential theologian as al-Ghazzālī and in this way was integrated with religious tradition. Miskawayh's doctrine became known also through another channel, viz. the Persian works of authors such as al-Tūst and al-Dawāwīn. On the other hand, the purely ṣīṣīsī morality gained through the great Persian poets an
immense influence in the eastern Islamic world, including Turkey—an influence which was paralleled and reinforced in all countries by the powerful social position occupied by the Sufi orders and the extension of their lay membership to all classes.

6. During the last century, the strong revulsion from Sufism in orthodox Muslim circles has had a parallel effect on Muslim ethical thought, which in reaction from the extreme passivity of the Sufi ethic has tended to swing towards an activist ethic, rather guardedly expressed by such leaders as Djamal al-Din al-Afghani and Muhammad 'Abduh, and in more outspokenly "Mu'tazilite" terms by others. Outside theological circles, the same trend, reinforced by the influence of Western philosophies, together with internal social and political developments, has stimulated more evolutionary types of ethical theory, notably those of the Turkish sociologist Ziya Gokalp and of the Indian poet Muhammad Ikh\'al, all of which, however, are most properly to be regarded as representing transitional phases in modern Muslim thought.

(R. Walzer and H. A. R. Gibb)

(ii) Philosophical Ethics.

1. In the classification of the various branches of philosophy, al-Akh\'al is considered, together with politics (al-Sul al-madawi, see MAD\'AN) and economics (tadbir al-manzil [q.v.]), as a part of practical philosophy. Galen's work Fi 'l-Akh\'al is described in Hunayn's treatise on the Syriac and Arabic Galen-translations in the following terms: "Galen dealt in it with different 'f\'by, their causes, signs and treatment" (ed. Bergstrasser, no. 119; cf. Seneca, Epist. xcv, 65). Al-Ghazawi uses almost the same words when he says (al-Munkidh, 99) that al-Akh\'al as a branch of philosophy consists in "defining the characteristics and moral constitutions of the soul and the method of moderating and controlling them". The same definition still occurs in Ibn Sadr al-Din al-Shirwani (d. 1036/1626-7), quoted by Fadlji Khallata, s.v. al-Akh\'al: "It is the science of virtues and the way how to acquire them, of vices, and the way how to guard against them. Its subject is: the innate dispositions (al-Akh\'al), the acquired virtues, and the rational soul as far as it is affected by them". Al-Akh\'al as a philosophical doctrine of ethics appealed at first only to the limited circles of persons interested in Greek philosophy. But since its representatives insist that philosophical ethics are not meant to contradict Islam but either to supplement or confirm it, these ideas could eventually be integrated with the religious tradition and retain some influence even in later centuries.

2. Greek moral philosophy was conveyed to the Arabs in several different ways which eventually converged. Standard works of the classical days of Greece read in the late philosophical schools, like Plato's Republic, Timaeus, Laws, were known in the original and in commentaries and summaries (cf. AFLATON). Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics, divided into eleven books, were known in Is\'hak b. Hunayn's translation. Books viii-xi of the Arabic text, corresponding to vii-x of the usual division, have been traced in a Moroccan manuscript (cf. A. J. Arberry, in BSOAS, 1955, 1 ff.). The same manuscript contains a summary of the Nicomachean Ethics and of Niclaus of Damascus's (1st century B.C.) Porphyry's commentary (cf. Fibrist, and J. Bidez, Vie de Porphyre, Gand-Leipzig 1913, 56*-58*) was translated into Arabic and most probably extensively used by Miskawayh in chapters 3-5 of his Tahdib.

al-Akh\'al (see § 7 below). The late Greek summary of the Nicomachean Ethics ("Summary of the Alexandrians"): extracts in MS Taym\'ur Pasha, akh\'al, 290, no. 16; this work was translated into Latin by Herman the German in 1243 or 1244 (cf. Aristoteles Latinus, ii, Cambridge 1955, 1308). Al-F\'ar\'abi wrote a commentary on the introduction of the Nicomachean Ethics which is referred to by Spanish authors of the 12th century (cf. M. Steinschneider, Al-Far\'abi, St. Petersburg 1860, 60). Ibn Rushd's Middle Commentary (written in A.D. 1177) is preserved in a Latin translation by the same Herman in 1240 (cf. Aristoteles Latinus, ii, 1308) and in a Hebrew translation of 1321 by Samuel b. Judah of Marseilles (M. Steinschneider, Die hebr. Übersetzungen, 217).

Among Greek works less known in the Western tradition but widely read in the Arab world are three treatises by Galen. (1) Hepl X, Fi 'l-Akh\'al, lost in the Greek original and preserved only in Arabic guise. (Arabic Epitome published by P. Kraus in Bull. of the Fac. of Arts of the Univ. of Egypt, vi/1, 1939; cf. R. Walzer, in Classical Quarterly, 1949, 82 ff.; idem, in Harvard Theological Review, 1954, 243 ff.; S. M. Stern, in Classical Quarterly, 1956). (2) How may a discover his own vices (cf. Corpus Med. Graec., v, 4, 111). Hunayn, no. 152). (3) Good men profit by their enemies (lost in the Greek original; Hunayn, no. 121). Both of these two latter treatises were used by al-Ranz (see § 5 below), all three by Miskawayh (§ 7 below). A treatise by Themistius is quoted under a wrong name by Miskawayh (see below); another one attributed to him survives in Arabic (ed. L. Cheikho, M\'ah\'af, 1920, 889-9, tr. M. Bouyenne, Arch de Philosophie, 1924, 14 ff.). There were, no doubt, some other late Greek books from which middle-platonic Greek thought, only slightly touched by neoplatonic ideas, was handed down to the Arabs. Among other pre-neoplatonic treatises studied by Arabic writers on moral philosophy are the Pinas of Cebes ("Kabis the Platonist"), reproduced in Miskawayh's Tahdib al-Mutanab (ed. Badawi, 1940, 186 ff.). Al-Kindi (cf. Fihrist, nos. 190-1, 195-6, cf. also F. Rosenthal, al-Sarakhi, ii, A, 10-2, 16-7) were apparently appreciated by subsequent Islamic writers. His treatise On freedom from Grief (ed. H. Ritter-R. Walzer, Studi su Al Kindi ii, Rome 1938; M. Pohlenz, in Zeitschr. f. Geschichte der Philosophie, 1938, 404 ff.) was translated into Arabic and extensively quoted by Miskawayh (ed. M. Pressner, Heidelberg 1928); the Golden Verses ascribed to Pythagoras (see PYTHAGORAS) and a pseudo-platonic Exhortation concerning the education of young men, two "pythagorean" documents by which Miskawayh was impressed (cf. F. Rosenthal, in Orientalia, 1941, 104 ff., 383 ff.).

3. Al-Kindi's ethical treatises (Fihrist, nos. 190-1, 195-6, cf. also F. Rosenthal, al-Sarakhi, ii, A, 10-2, 16-7) were apparently appreciated by subsequent Greek writers. His treatise On freedom from Grief (ed. H. Ritter-R. Walzer, Studi su Al Kindi ii, Rome 1938; M. Pohlenz, in Zeitschr. f. Geschichte der Philosophie, 1938, 404 ff.) was translated into Arabic and extensively quoted by Miskawayh (ed. M. Pressner, Heidelberg 1928); the Golden Verses ascribed to Pythagoras and a pseudo-platonic Exhortation concerning the education of young men, two "pythagorean" documents by which Miskawayh was impressed (cf. F. Rosenthal, in Orientalia, 1941, 104 ff., 383 ff.).
different in detail, be compared to the Stoic arrangement of the virtues and vices, or, e.g., to the pseudo-Aristotelian De virtutibus et vitiis (transl. in the 11th century by Ibn al-Tayyib (Brock., S 1, 884). The Aristotelian definition of virtue as the mean between two extremes is combined with the platonising view (cf. Porphyry, Ἀσκοπαῖ, ch. xxxii, 2 and I. Goldziher, Maḏdat al-Nafs, 20). Although the evidence available in the few extant works of al-Kindi is obviously slight, it seems probable that Miskawayh based himself in the first chapter of Taḥdhib al-Akhlaq on al-Kindi’s treatment of the virtues and vices. There is on the whole nothing ultra-neoplatonic in al-Kindi’s platonising popular philosophy, in which platonic, peripatetic and stoic elements are blended in a way not uncommon in hellenistic and later popular Greek moral treatises.

4. The Christian Kuṣṭb. Lūkā’s treatise About the causes of the differences which exist between men with regard to their characters, ways of life, desires and considered moral choice (ed. P. Shath, in BIE, 1941) is based on the Platonic tripartition of the soul and on the whole on ideas to be found in Galen.

5. Al-Kindi’s treatise On Spiritual Medicine appears to be lost but al-Rāzī’s brilliant treatment of the same subject is printed in a critical edition of the Arabic text Opera Philosophica, ed. Kraus, 15-96, Eng. tr. by A. J. Arberry, The Spiritual Physick of Rhazes, London 1950). As was to be expected in this Muslim “Platonist”, it is written in an uncompromisingly platonistic vein, and the Aristotelian elements found in al-Kindi and Miskawayh are missing. It should be studied together with his autobiographical description of the philosophical way of life (Opera, 98-111; French transl. by P. Kraus in Orientalia, 1935, 300 ff.; English tr. by Arberry in Asiatic Review, 1949). Al-Rāzī’s version of Greek moral philosophy did not, however, influence the main trend of philosophical ethics in Islam.

6. The treatise Fi Taḥdib al-Akhlaq of the Jacobite philosopher Yaḥyā b. ʿAdī represents another variant of late Greek thought. There are no specifically Christian ideas in it: Aristotelian influence is, as in al-Rāzī, non-existent. It is based on the platonic tripartition of the soul, but the 21 virtues and corresponding vices are neither specifically referred to the three souls nor subordinated to the four cardinal virtues and their contraries (which are listed among them). This scheme probably depends ultimately on some lost pre-neoplatonic Greek original. His concluding chapter on the perfect man who bases his life on the requirements of his intellectual soul and has trained himself to love every human being combines stoic and neoplatonic language, and is not very different from the thought of al-Fārābī [q.v.]

7. The most influential work on philosophical ethics is Taḥdib al-Akhlaq of Miskawayh (d. 431/1040) (analysis of its contents in de Boer, 507, and Donaldson, 127-133; Eng. tr. by A. J. M. Craig in course of publication). Miskawayh firmly rejects the pre-Islamic Arabic poets as educators, but is not unsympathetic to the Persian tradition of ethics. In many striking passages he insists on the agreement of Greek moral philosophy with the basic tenets of Islam. He tries, however, to reconcile revealed and philosophical truth on the basis of rational thought, and for this reason his views are not acceptable to a primarily religious thinker, except with a certain shift of emphasis. The few Greek writers mentioned by name and quoted, sometimes at considerable length, are all of the later centuries of the Roman Empire: Galen (see § 4 above), Bryson (on the right upbringing of children; ibid.), Porphyry as a commentator on Aristotle’s Ethics, and Themistius, wrongly quoted under the name of Socrates (cf. F. Rosenthal, in IC, 1940, 403). References to Plato and Aristotle occur within the context of these late works. Although al-Kindi is only twice mentioned by name, Miskawayh is probably in al-Kindi’s debt to a much greater extent (see § 3 above). In chapters 3-5 he follows rather closely a neoplatonic commentator on certain sections of the Nicomachean Ethics, which recalls the known teaching of ethics in the later Peripatos and the extant commentaries on the Ethics without being identical with any of them. But at the same time he stresses the platonic elements to be found in the Ethics to make out Aristotle to be a more decided platonist than he was. Miskawayh’s own contribution to this inherited interpretation, if any, was (apart from demonstrating the compatibility of Greek philosophy with Islam) to emphasise the neoplatonic aspects of this moral philosophy still further (cf. R. Walzer, Some aspects of Miskawāh’s Taḥdib al-Akhlaq, Mélanges Levi della Vida, Rome 1956).

8. The influence of philosophical ethics on adab literature has been noted by de Boer, who singles out as an instructive example Adab al-Dunyā wa l-Dīn by al-Māwardi (d. 450/1058). In this work the presentation of the traditional ethical materials is refreshed and “modernized” by the inclusion of materials from the later centuries, including both philosophical and ascetic ideas; these are combined with the older materials somewhat unsystematically, but in a direction not dissimilar from that taken later by al-Ghazzālī. (German transl. by O. Rescher, 1932-3.)

9. A much more far-reaching and fundamental synthesis was carried through by al-Ghazzālī (d. 505/1111), who on the one hand discarded the merely formal and superficial elements of the adab tradition, and on the other firmly based his exposition on the penetrating spiritual analysis developed by the šīff teachers (see sect. i, § 3 above). At the same time, he evidently regarded Miskawayh’s treatise as “reasonable in itself and supported by proof”, and agreed that its contents “did not contradict the Book and the Sunna”. Hence the philosophical ideas of Greek origin which Miskawayh discusses and explains became part of the generally-accepted educational theory to be found in the Ḥikāyāt ʿUlm al-Dīn, in which the section on self-discipline (2nd book of the 3rd quarter) is based on Miskawayh’s Taḥdib al-Akhlaq. Miskawayh’s influence is also unmistakably traceable in other works of al-Ghazzālī, and his ethical theory was in this way eventually integrated with the religious tradition. (Cf. A. J. Wensinck, La Pensée de Ghaṣālī, Paris 1946, esp. chap. ii; M. Pissner, op. cit.; H. Ritter, Al Ghaṣālī, Das Eltzer der Gliickeisgkeit, Jena 1925; and see al-Ghaṣālī.)

9. How successful the Ghazzālīan synthesis was in influencing later ethical literature and thought is a question which still awaits investigation. The literary evidence suggests prima facie that its influence, if anything, was indirect, and that the diverse trends of ethical thought continued to exist side by side. The influence of Miskawayh’s work was perpetuated chiefly in Persian literature; the Shīfite Avcennian, Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Tūṣī, follows Miskawayh closely, as he himself avows, in the section on ethics of his Ākhlaq-i Nāṣirī (completed 633/1233) (cf. Plessner, loc. cit.). Two centuries
later, al-Dawwani (d. 907/1501), the author of the Akhīdīk-i Dialali (Eng. trans., with valuable notes, by W. F. Donaldson, Studies in Muslim Ethics, London 1839; short analysis by Donaldson, 184), selected his basic material from Tūsī's work, but he also refers to al-Ghazālī as an additional Islamic authority. (For Persian akhlāk literature cf. H. Ethé, in Gr. J. Ph., ii, 346 ff.)

Bibliography: (i) and (ii): No comprehensive history of Islamic ethics has yet been written. D. M. Donaldson, Studies in Muslim Ethics, London 1953, is of unequal value. There is a brief but suggestive survey by T. J. de Boer in Hastings' Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, vol. v, 1912, s.v. Ethics and Morality (Moslem). Scattered materials are to be found in a number of works; in addition to those mentioned in the article, different aspects are dealt with in the following: G. Richter, Studien zur Geschichte der älteren arabischen Fürstenstiefel, Leipzig 1932; D. B. Macdonald, The Religious Attitude and Life in Islam, Chicago 1909; C. E. von Grünbaum, Mediaeval Islam, Chicago 1946, etc.; L. Gardet, La Cité Musulmane, Paris 1954. (R. Walser)

AKHLAT or KHALAT, town and fortress at the N.W. corner of Lake Van.

(ii) After the battle of Köse Dağ (642/1244) Akhlat was captured by the Mongols (642/1244; see Tomaseck, in SBWA, 133, no. iv, 32 ff.; Abu 'l-Fida'ī (Reiske-Adler), iv, 472), who, however, confirmed the native princes in their possessions (confirmation of a Georgian princess in her possessions in Akhlat; Cricic of Gandía, 440, cf. B. Spuler, Die Mongolen in Iran, 330, n. 1). The definitive occupation by the Mongols of Akhlat and the neighbouring lands of Upper Mesopotamia and the Armenian highlands followed only after their capture of bagdad (656/1258), in conjunction with Hulagu's advance into Syria in 658/1259-60 (Spuler, op. cit., 55). Thereafter Akhlat belonged to the kingdom of the Ilkhanids and their successor states (Dālā'īrids, Aχ Kayyūnlu), and was also a minor-city of the Ilkhanids. In 644/1246 the city was largely destroyed by a severe earthquake.

In one version of the legend of the foundation of the Ottoman empire Akhlat is mentioned as the starting-point of the Oghuz tribe to which Ertogrul, the alleged father of 'Oghmān, belonged; he is said to have moved westwards from Akhlat under pressure from the Mongols. Neshri, however, denies the identity of this Ertogrul with 'Oghmān's father (Ta'wilād, ed. Taeschner, 21-2; the statement is confirmed by Ewliya Celebi (iv, 140) tombs of the ancestors of the Ottomans were shown in Akhlat. The city appears to have come into Ottoman possession only under Selim I; in 955/1548, however, it was captured by Şah Tahmāsp and levelled to the ground. Sulaymān I, under whom it was finally incorporated in the Ottoman empire, built on the lake shore a citadel (completed in 963/1554-5 according to Ewliya Celebi), in the vicinity of which a smaller new town arose. During the Ottoman period, Akhlat remained under the rule of local Kurdish chieftains, and was brought under direct Ottoman administration only under Mahmūd II in 1847. At the end of the 19th century, according to Cuniet, the kadā (capital) of Akhlat had 23,659 inhabitants (16,635 Muslims, 6609 Gregorian Armenians, 210 Orthodox Greeks, 250 Yazidis). It is now the capital of a kadā (ile) in the wilāyet (ii) of Bitlis in the Turkish Republic; population of the town (1945), 3,124, of the kadā, 13,702.

The mediaeval town (Eski Akhlat), on the slope of the mountain, is in ruins and uninhabited; the new town, with a large Ottoman şahe (in 1568) lies to the E. of it on the lake shore. The latter contains the mosque of the 16th century (İskender Pasha Djamī, with inscriptions from 972/1564 and minaret from 978/1570, and Kâdum Mahmud Djamī, dating from 1006/
AKHLĀT — AKHSĪKATH

1597). Between the medieval and the modern towns there is a famous cemetery with richly ornamented tombstones from the 13th-15th centuries (among them a "ram" stone from 1401) and many funeral buildings (tūbres or kunihs) from the Salqūkids, Mongol and Turkmen periods. The most noteworthy among them are: Ulu Kunih (undated); Shādī Aghā Kūndeli (1273; now disappeared); Iki Tūbre (of Būghtāy Aghā, d. 1281, and his son Hasan Timūr, d. 1279); Bāyīdfur Mesdijl (882/1473) and Tūbre (890/1489; of specially interest, one built by Bāba Dīnān); Shāykh Nāginād Al-Dīn Tūrbesi (1222); Hasan Pādīshāh Tūrbesi (1275); and Erzen Khāṭūn Tūrbesi (1396-7).

Bibliography: In the works mentioned under (i), Hādījī Khāllīf, Dīkhān-nūmā, 413 f.; Ewīliyā Čelebi, iv, 134-42; Sāmīl, Kūmās Al-ʿĀlīm, i, 46a; Récits, Now. geogr. univ., ix, 376; V. Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie, ii, 564-6. (F. Taeschner)

AKHMIM, town in Upper Egypt on the east bank of the Nile about 312 m. from Cairo. Its name reflects the Coptic name, Šinmin, the Greek Khlemnis, and it is placed on Panopolis in Byzantine texts. It was the chief town of a pagarchy (hora), and later, from the time of the reforms of the Fatimid caliph al-Mustanṣir, of a province. In the 12th/13th century the town lost its position of chief city and was incorporated in the governorship of Būghtāy Aghā, d. 1281, and his son Hasan Dīnān. It was the chief town of a pagarchy (kura), and remained, with the remainder of his works, which embraces every category of classical poetry: ḥaṣāl, elegy, thenody, satire, descriptive verse, personal glorification. He even composed some muwāṣṣāt, and wrote some notable baccic songs which led to his being dubbed the "Abū Nuwās of the 19th century". His dīwān, although incomplete, was compiled through the efforts of the nephew of ʿAbd al-Dādī, Ahmad ʿIssāt Pāšā al-Ākhmī, who published in Constantinople in 1304/1886, under the title: al-ʿIrād al-Anfās fi Ṣāḥīr al-ʿAlhār. Bibliography: Dż. Zaydān, Tarā gid Magābīr al-Shārkh, 3rd ed., 1922, ii, 257-60; L. Cheikh, Le littérature arabe au XIXe siècle, 2nd ed., 1924-6, ii, 9-11; M. M. al-Ṣabīr, Nahdāt al-ʿIrād al-Adabīyya fiʿl-Karn al-Tāsus ʿAshār, Baghdaḏ 1365/1946, 114-29; H. Pīrs, La litt. ar. et l'Islam par les lettres, 28; Brockelmann, S II, 72; and references quoted. (Ch. Fellat)

AKHSĪKATH (see SALĀT). AKHSĪKATH or AKHSHIKATH (Sogdian, "city of the prince"), in the 4th/10th century capital of Farghāňa and residence of the amir and his lieutenants (ʿumūdí), on the north bank of the Sir Darya (Jaxartes), near the mouth of the Kasan (c), with the old citadel, Iski Akhsi, were considered only one of Akhshī's important sisters. The delightful description given by Ibn al-ʿArabī, Ahmad ʿIssāt Pāšā al-Ākhmī, in the 4th/ioth century capital of Farghāňa; according to Ibn Hawkāl (Kramers), 512, it was a large town (1 sq. mile) with many canals and a citadel where stood the Friday Mosque, the governor's palace, and the prison. The city was then enclosed by a wall with five gates, outside of which stretched extensive suburbs and gardens. There was a market-place both in the city and the suburb, and there were rich pasturages in the vicinity (al-Iṣṭakhrī, 333; al-Makhđīs, 271; al-Kazwīnī, ii, 156; Ḥūdād al-ʿĀlam, 72, 116).

The town was apparently destroyed during the wars of the Khārizmshāh Muhammad II, in the beginning of the 13th century, and the succeeding Mongol invasions (Sharaf al-Dīn ʿAll Yazdī, Šafarīmān, Calcutta 1885-8, i, 441, ii, 633; here also the form Akhsīkant). The capital was transferred to Andījān, but for some time Akhsī, as the town was called at the time of Bābur (see transl. of Beveridge, index), still remained the second town of Farghāňa. As late as the 11th/17th century Namānān, as the present capital, was considered only one of Akhsī's less important sisters (lāwādī); cf. Bahr al-Asrār, in H. Eth., India Office Cat., no. 575, fol. 108v. The ruins, near the villages of Akhsī and Shāhand (1000 steps from west to east, 600 steps from north to south, about 150 feet above the level of the Sir Darya), with the old capital, Iski Akhsi, were explored in 1885 by N. ʿI. Veselovskiy (cf. Sredneasiaštški Fvesnīk, Tashkent, July 1890).

Bibliography: Schwarz, Iran, iii, 269 (incidental reference, Farghāňa is not dealt with in the book); Le Strange, 477 f.; 489; K. Miller, Mappeae arabices, Stuttgart 1926-31, iv, 75-82, 86*-91*.

(B. Spuler)
AL-AKHTAL, "the loquacious", the sobriquet of the Arab poet GHIYATH B. GHAWTH B. AL-§ALT, who died probably before 92/710. He belonged to the great tribe of the Taghibi (q.v.) of northern Syria, which remained entirely Christian, of the Monophysite persuasion. By his mother Layla he was connected to another Christian tribe, that of Iyad. He was born either at Hirra (see Aghdni, vii, 170), or near Rusafa (Sergeopolis); his date of birth is uncertain, but may have been about 20640. He remained a Christian all his life, and was unmoved by the efforts of prominent members of the Umayyad dynasty to convert him to Islam. Although a Monophysite, he maintained good relations with the Melkite family of the Sarghun. In his poetry, certain features prove his zeal for his faith and even indicate a certain ostentation in asserting it (see Dinas, passim). His moral standards, however, do not seem to have differed markedly from those of the society in which he lived. He repudiated his wife and married a divorced woman. He seems to have been a heavy drinker, passing his time in taverns in the company of singing-girls of easy virtue.

All his life al-Akhtal followed the fortunes of the reigning dynasty. During the reign of Mu‘awiya, he became enroiled in political affairs. He was the close companion of Yazid I, whom he lauded in his panegyrics, and of other men of rank such as Ziyad and al-^Hajjaj. Under 'Abd al-Malik, he actually became official poet to the Caliph (see Aghdni, xii, 172-6). He remained in the service of the successors of 'Abd al-Malik, and in his poetry attacked all opponents of the dynasty (see Dinas, 58, 73, 93, 204, 277 etc.). Lammens has clearly shown the historical interest of such compositions.

The poet's whole career was dominated by verbal warfare with his contemporary, the poet Djair. In his diatribes he was supported by the poet al-Farazdakh who, although a Tamimite like Djair, was in antagonism with his fellow-tribesman. It is almost impossible to dissociate here the accounts of these three men. It is clear that in this sphere al-Akhtal and Djair perpetuated the pre-Islamic tradition and simply expressed the sentiments of their particular group. In this respect, the poems of al-Akhtal show how the old bedouin themes break between Djarir and al-Farazdak, the poet Abu Ubayda, al-Asma‘i, and Hammad the Reciter (collated in Aghdni, viii, 284 ff., 291, 305). Al-Akhtal does not seem to have left any place in Arabic literature in the eyes of later generations (cf. for example the rather cautious judgement of Taha Husayn in Hadid al-Arba‘a, ii, 77 ff.)

Up to the present time al-Akhtal has, in the West, been the subject only of biographical studies.


(A. Blachère)

AKHTARI is the takehallus of Muslih al-Dln Mustafa b. Shams al-Dln al-Karabashri (d. 968/1561). He wrote an Arabic-Turkish Dictionary (1524-1545), known by the name of Akhtari Kahir (there are also concise recensions, and printed at Constantinople (1242, 1256, 1292). Cf. Flügel, Die arab. pers. u. türk. Hss. zu Wien, i, 119-120.

AKHUND (Aghdn, A^h^n), title given to scholars. In Eastern Turkistan it is used after the name as "Mister", in Western Turkistan it is given to 'ulama' of high rank, in the district of Kazan to the chief muzim of a place. In Persian it is current since Timurid times in the sense of "schoolmaster, tutor". The word probably comes from Persian kh^and (k^h^w^nd, khund), from khudawand (q.v.).

AKHUND-ZADA, Mirza Fatim‘al (1812-78) was the first writer of original plays in a Turkish idiom. The son of a trader who hailed from Persian A^harbajdan, he was born in 1811 (according to Caferoglu) or 1812 (according to the Soviet Encyclopaedia, 1950) in Sheki, the present-day Nukha. Thanks to the assistance of a friend he was able to avail himself of a good literary and philosophical education, which brought him into closer touch with liberal ideas than the actual calling which he intended to follow, that of an
Islamic theologian. After instruction from a divine in Gandja (Karabagh) Akhund-zada finished his training at the newly-opened Russian intermediate school for Muslims at Şêkî. It is possible that Akhund-zada was in his early days brought into touch with modern trends in Islam owing to contacts with the reformers Djamal al-Din Aşqâni and Malkum Kân. Influence of this nature, however, as reported by Köçeri on the basis of communications from Akhund-zada’s family, can scarcely be proved. In his youth Akhund-zada wrote six comedies and a historical narrative in Ağırchi Turkish, the titles being as under: (1) Hisbâyet-i Molla İbrahim Khalil-i Kimiyâgîıer ("Story of M. I. Kh. the alchemist"); 1850; (2) Hisbâyet-i Monsieur Jourdan Hekim-i Nerbâdi wa-Mosta’ull Şah Dîdâqger-i Meğhûr ("Story of M. Jourdan and Mosta’ull Şah, the well-known magician"); 1850; (3) SERgûcîstî-ii Wezîr-i Kân-i Serab ("Adventures of the Vezir of the Khan of S."); 1850; (4) Hisbâyet-i Khârî ("Story of the bear that caught the robber"); 1852; (5) SERgûcîstî-ii Merî-dî Kerâsi ("Adventures of the miser"); 1852-3; (6) Hisbâyet-i Wukandî-yê Murâda’s (Story of the attorneys in the lawsuit’’); 1853; and the historical-satirical narrative, Aðanâmîgî Kewâkhd ("The betrayed stars"); 1857. In the plays and in the narrative the author gave play to his progressive ideas in opposition to feudalism, the practice of highway robbery, the prevalent corruption of justice and the superstition then rife in the Caucasus. Now and again he preaches loyalty to the Russian authorities in order to facilitate the transition of the Transcaucasian Muslims (the term Ağırchi Turks was not yet in use in the 15th century) to modern civilization.

Several of the plays were published in Russian translation in the official Government journal Kavbus, and performed in Russian at Tiflis and St. Petersburg. The first performances in the original language were given by pupils of Ağırçarbaydjin state schools at the end of the 1870’s. A complete Ağırçar Turkish edition of the plays and the narrative appeared in Tiflis in 1879: a second was brought out in 1938 by the Ministry of Culture of the Az.S.S.R. to mark the 125th anniversary of the writer. (In the 1920’s, frequent separate editions for school use had already appeared.) The plays were translated into Persian by Muhammad Dîja’far Munshî; no. 1 was transl. into French by Barbier de Meynard, JA, 1886; no. 2 into German (after the Persian) by A. Wahrmund, Vienna 1889, and into French (after the Turkish original) by L. Bouvat, Paris 1906; no. 3 into English (after the Persian) by W. H. O. Haggard and G. le Strange, The Vauri of Lankurîan; no. 4 into French by Barbier de Meynard, Recueil de textes et de traductions, Paris 1889; no. 5 into French by L. Bouvat, JA, 1904; no. 6 into French (after the Persian) by Aliilère, in Deux comédies turques, Paris 1888; the narrative was edited and transl. by L. Bouvat, JA, 1903. Besides his activity as a dramatist, which earned him the name of the “Caucasian Gogol” or the “oriental Molière”, Akhund-zada wrote treatises on political science against absolutism and theology, and also two memoranda on an alphabetical system of his own invention, designed to render the Islamic tongues, especially the Turkish idiom, more tractable and thus more capable of progress.


(Selected and translated by H. W. BRANDS)
inextricably mingled, but the topic has not been fully investigated. The exclusiveness of the Khawāridjīs was opposed by the inclusiveness of the Murdżīlīs, who refused to treat Muslims who had committed grave sins as unbelievers (and could therefore remain loyal to caliphs of whom they disapproved). As these sects had many subdivisions with differing views, there was a great variety of doctrine by the middle of the 2nd/8th century. In the second half of that century elaborate intellectual arguments about doctrine appeared, inspired partly by Greek and Christian thought. This may be regarded as the beginning of kādām or theology [q.v.]. It influenced the formulation of dogma to the extent that some philosophical terms were introduced into the theologians' creeds, e.g. when they said that God is neither substance nor accident (gāshahr, 'arad), or when al-Sanūsī prefaced his creed by distinguishing between the necessary, the impossible, and the possible. The opposition to this intellectualizing tendency, which probably always existed, found its chief exponent in Ibn Taymiyya. The statements of their position by Şāfīs often contain, besides their specifically mystical teaching, a section dealing with their attitude on matters of dogma.

3. The main Dogmas of Islam. No creedal statement has been accepted even by all Sunní Muslims as the standard account of Islamic dogma. The following brief account has been compiled from various creeds (chiefly those of al-Baghdādī, al-Ghazālī and Naḍîm al-Dīn al-Nasāfī), though not in their precise words. Short comments have been added. For fuller details see the articles referred to below.

(a) God (see Allāh) is one; there is no god except Him; He has no partner nor wife; He neither begets nor is begotten. This article of faith belongs to Muhammad's Meccan period, though it was given no emphasis in the earliest passages of the Qur'ān. It soon became necessary, however, to insist that Muhammad's doctrine was incompatible with the vague monotheism apparently current in Mecca, which, while acknowledging God as supreme, tolerated lesser deities. Hence in the later Meccan sūrah strict monotheism was vigorously proclaimed, and gīrhr (q.v.), the giving of partners to God, i.e. polytheism, became a serious sin. When the Muslims came into closer contact with Christians, they regarded the current interpretations of the doctrine of the Trinity as an infringement of this article of faith. This is the point chosen for emphasis in the first clause of the shahīda.

(b) God exists; His existence is rationally proved from the originated character of the world. When the Muslims had to defend their religion against materialists and other unbelievers, some of them offered rational proofs of the existence of God. These were given at length in the theological treatises, and came to influence the creedal statements (cf. al-Baghdādī, Naḍîm al-Dīn al-Nasāfī). Some schools (cf. al-Sanūsī) treated existence (madījja) as one of God's attributes. This implied a distinction between essence and existence which was opposed by the early Ash'arīyya and Ibn Taymiyya.

(c) God is eternal; His existence has neither beginning nor end. This calls for no comment except on the difficulty of translation. Arabic has no single word for "eternal". Kādīm (properly "old" or "ancient") and asālī mean "being from eternity" or "having no beginning", while bākī and abādī mean "being to eternity" or "having no end" [cf. abād, kīdam]. Consequently the renderings in European languages sometimes puzzle the uninitiated, e.g. "priority" and "continuance" for the hypostatized attributes shī'ām and bākī. Perhaps "pre-eternity" and "post-eternity" might be suggested.

(d) God is different from created things. He does not resemble any of them, and none of them resembles Him. He is not a body nor a substance nor the accident of a substance. He is not bounded nor limited in any way; He does not have a position in space; He may not be said to be in any direction. He sits on the throne (fārīgh), but only in the sense in which He Himself intended. He is above the throne and the heavens, but at the same time is "nearer to man than his jugular vein" (Qur'ān, 1, 16/15). He is not subject to movement or change or suffering. The otherness (mudjālāt) of God is presupposed in Islamic thinking from the Qur'ān onward, but only gradually became an explicit article of faith; al-Sanūsī makes mudjālāt one of the negative attributes of God. At an earlier period the main body of Muslims came to regard the Muḥʃabbīha (those who made God resemble man) as unorthodox [cf. tašāri]. This was chiefly with regard to the interpretation of the anthropomorphic expressions in the Qur'ān, such as God's sitting on the throne and having hands and a face. At the other extreme from the Muḥʃabbīha were those, like the Muṭtaṣilīs, who interpreted the terms metaphorically. The central position was that of those who said the terms were to be taken neither literally nor metaphorically but bi-lā īsāfī ("without how"), i.e. without specifying their manner or modality, or, as it was sometimes expressed, "in the sense in which God intended them" when He used them in the Qur'ān. It was emphasized that God was not corporeal and not material, and those who held that view were sometimes called Muḥjjāsima. From the 5th/11th century onwards the followers of al-Ash'ārī and other orthodox theologians, but not the Ḥanābīla, largely abandoned bi-lā īsāfī and accepted metaphorical interpretations of anthropomorphic terms.

(e) God will be seen by the faithful in the world to come. This article occasioned great difficulty because of God's incorporeality. The Muṭṭaṣilīs and others denied the possibility of any vision of God. Dirār suggested that a sixth sense would be created. Eventually, however, it was generally agreed to accept the doctrine bi-lā īsāfī, and to avoid any inferences from it which involved corporeality.

(f) God is eternally powerful (or omnipotent), knowing (or omniscient), living, willing, hearing, seeing, speaking. He is so by the attributes of power, knowledge, life, will, hearing, sight and speech. These attributes are eternal; they are not God, yet not other than God. His power extends to everything, and no inadequacy or weakness characterizes Him. He knows everything, even what is concealed and secret, even the creeping of a black ant on a rugged rock on a pitch-black night. These seven attributes (siḍā [q.v.]) received special attention from the theologians from the 3rd/9th century onwards. The discussion probably arose out of the question whether the Qur'ān was created or uncreated (see below). If the Qur'ān was uncreated, it was an eternal entity existing in relative independence of God's essence, even though it was His speech. For the Ḥaṭīmīyya and Muṭṭaṣilīs this view was unsatisfactory, and they asserted that God does not possess attributes of power, knowledge, speech, etc. which are distinct from His essence. In their view it is by His essence that He knows. Opponents called this
la'til, ‘stripping’ (sc. God of His attributes), and the upholders of it Mu'attila. Those who held that God knows by an attribute of knowledge, neither identical with His essence nor distinct from it, are sometimes known as Şıfâtiyya, and include the Aş'ârîyya and other orthodox theologians. The points at issue were discussed with much subtlety, and in al-Sanûsî and al-Faḍîlî a further distinction is drawn between God's power and His 'being powerful' (kaum âkîrôm, etc.; the first group re-known as şifât al-ma'sûnî and the second as şifât al-ma'na'îyya (perhaps to be rendered “attributes which are hypositized concepts or aspects” and “attributes connected with hypositized concepts”). It was doubtless because of their importance in popular religion that hearing and seeing were retained among the seven.

(c) The Kur'ân [q.v.] is the eternal and uncreated speech of God. This eternal speech is repeated by men's tongues, written in their copies of the Kur'ân and remembered in their hearts, yet it is distinct from its material embodiments.—The doctrine of the uncreated character of the Kur'ân was doubtless advanced in order to justify its position as the chief foundation of law and doctrine. The opponents, who included the Dîhâmiyya, the Mu'tazila, and the central government of the caliphate from about 217/832 to 234/849 [cf. Mînâ], were sympathetic politically to certain groups of the Shî'a; and the Shî'a tended to set the imamate above the written scripture. (It is still the view of the Shî'a that the Kur'ân is created.) The Maturidiyya and other followers of Abî Hanîfa rejected the Aş'ârîyya's view that the eternal speech of God can be heard.

(b) God's will is supreme and always effective; “what He wills exists, and what He does not will does not exist”. Thus He wills all things, good and evil, though He does not command or approve of all. There is no obligation of any sort upon Him, e.g. to do what is best for men, or to reward them for good works, or to command them to do only what they are able to perform. Actions are good or bad because He commands or forbids them, and not in themselves; He could, if He so willed, change what is good and bad.—The sovereignty of God's will in the world was thought to be impaired by the Mu'tazila's assertion of man's free will, and was vigorously re-asserted by the orthodox. The Mu'tazila also held that God was bound by our (sc. human and rational) conceptions of good and bad. Al-Aş'ârî and some of his followers opposed this, maintaining that good and bad are known only by revelation. They further asserted that God may punish one who obeys Him, that He may change a faithful man into an infidel (and that therefore when one says “I am a believer” one ought to add “if God will” [cf. iṣâfatînâ]), and that God may impose on men duties that are beyond their powers. The Maturidiyya took a contrary view on these and similar problems, though affirming the sovereignty of God's will against the Mu'tazila. The later and more intellectualist theologians emphasize the supremacy of God's will at the time of events, but in the earlier and more popular creeds, the stress is on God’s determination of events beforehand [cf. kadâr]; and thus al-Aş'ârî himself includes in his creed the doctrine that whether a man dies or is killed his death takes place at his appointed term (aḍgâl [q.v.]).

(j) God's acts are created by God, but are nevertheless properly attributed to man. They proceed from a power (kudra, istîlâs) in the man, but this power is created by God; God does so at the moment of the act, not before it.—The leading orthodox theologians all try to find a middle way between absolute determinism (djabr) and absolute free will (kadâr). The argument of the Mu'tazila, that God's justice (ṣadî) presupposed that men could properly be punished or rewarded for their acts, forced orthodoxy to deny that men were mere automatons. The Aş'ârîyya (and others before them—cf. JRAAS, 1943, 234-47) used the vague word kub [q.v.] or istîlâs, “acquiring”, to describe the relation of man to his act. They held that, though the act proceeded from a power in the man, this power was created by God at the moment of the act for this specific purpose and no other. The Mu'tazila on the other hand held that the power was created before the act and was power to do either the act or its opposite. (j) God is also characterized by active attributes (şifâtîsîyya), such as creating and giving sustenance. —Some, especially the Aş'ârîyya, held that God cannot be called creator, sustainer, etc. until He has created or given sustenance; as this implies the existence of originated beings, these attributes cannot be eternal. On the other hand, some, like the Maturidiyya, held that God is eternally creator, etc.

(k) Only those names (or attributes) are applicable to God which are to be found in the Kur'ân and sound traditions, or are sanctioned by ijtîhâd.—The Mu'tazila argued that names might be applied to God by inference. It is commonly held that there are 99 names [cf. al-asma' al-husna], but in fact more are found.

(l) The questioning by Munkar and Nakîr, and the punishment of the tomb, are realities; so also are the signs of the end, such as the slaying of the Dâjîdjal by 'Isâ.—Between death and the resurrection on the Last Day men will be questioned in the graves by two angels, Munkar and Nakîr, and rewarded or punished. Various signs of the coming of the Last Day are also mentioned. These are popular beliefs, based on Tradition and not on the Kur'ân, but they have been incorporated into the creeds [cf. 'adl mâl al-kâtib]. Among the Shî'a special emphasis is laid on the Return (rug'â), i.e. of the Mahdi and of a limited number of very good and very bad people; this is for the punishment of the latter and the glorification of the household of Muhammad (cf. D. M. Donaldson, The Shi'ite Religion, London 1933, 236 f.). This return to earth before the Last Day, though a preliminary judgement", is to be distinguished from God's final judgement.

(m) God will judge all men on the Last Day [cf. kiyâma]. The balance (mi'zân), the bridge (ṣirât) and the pool (hawd) are realities.—The central fact of judgement is prominent in the Kur'ân, and the balance on which men's deeds are weighed is hinted at (cf. Wensinck, Muslim Creed, 157 ff.). The pool or basin of Mu'âammad, from which he quenches for ever the thirst of his followers, and the knife-edge bridge over the pit of Hell, from which the wicked fall down, come from popular conceptions. The various ideas were reconciled with one another only by the later systematizers.

(n) Certain persons, and notably Mu'âammad, will be permitted by God to intercede for others on the Last Day [cf. muara's]. Mu'âammad will intercede for sinners of his community.—This was denied by the Mu'tazila on Kur'ânic grounds, but ultimately gained general acceptance.

(o) Paradise and Hell already exist, and will continue to exist eternally [cf. jannâ, dâhānâm]. Grave sinners of the Muslim community will be
punished in Hell, but not eternally. No monotheist will remain eternally in Hell. —The Djahmiyya and other sects held that Paradise and Hell would not be created until the Last Day and would cease to exist after a time, but the majority rejected this view. There are some divergences about the precise late of Muslims who are sinners, but it is generally agreed that by intercession of otherwise they will eventually be released from Hell, if they enter it all.

(p) Prayers for the dead and alms offered on behalf of them are advantageous to them.

(q) God has sent to mankind messengers (rasul) and prophets (nabiyyā'). The prophets are above saints and angels. Muḥammad is the seal of the prophets and the most excellent of them. —The Fīḥk Akbar ascribed to Al-Shāfi‘ī says there are 120,000 prophets and 373 messengers.

(r) Prophets are preserved (ma‘ṣūm) from all sin by God.—This was the view of the Māturidīyya and the other followers of Abū Ḥanīfa, but the Ash‘āriyya admitted that they might commit light sins.

(s) The best men of after the prophets are Abū Bakr, then 'Umar, then 'Uṯmān, then 'A‘lī. This assertion of the acceptance of the first four caliphs in order is made in opposition to the Shi‘ā who hold that 'A‘lī was best.

(t) No Companion of Muḥammad is mentioned except for good. —This was to bury the quarrels about rights and wrongs of 'Uṯmān, of 'Ṭalḥa and al-Zubayr, etc. It was directed mainly against the Shi‘ā.

(u) Unbelief (kufr), or the status of being an unbeliever, does not necessarily follow the commission of sin by a believer. —This was directed against the Khawārij, who excommunicated anyone guilty of sin.

(v) Faith is knowing in the heart, confessing with the tongue and performing works. It increases and decreases [cf. IMĀN].—Many others, however, notably the Ash‘āriyya, said that works were not a part of faith, and that faith did not increase and decrease.

(w) Faith and unbelief are due to God's guidance and abandonment (ḥikmat) respectively.

(x) (Some later creeds also contain articles about the nature of knowledge and true report, and other philosophical matters.)
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ALA’AKI, the name of a number of valleys, mines, and other places in Arabia and elsewhere. When applied to valleys, ‘Akik is used in the sense of a bed cut out by a stream; when applied to mines, it may refer either to stones such as the cornelian (‘akib) or more generally to any mineral cut away from its source. The name is much used by the Arab poets, who do not always make clear which of the many ‘Akiks they have in mind.

The best known of the ‘Akiks is the valley passing just west of Medina, from which it is separated by Harrat al-Wabra. It continues northwards to join Wadi al-‘Hamd (q.v.), the classical Iṣām, which empties into the Red Sea south of al-Wadīh. The mountain ‘Aṣyir south of Medina rises above the right bank of al-‘Aṣik, which draws much of its water from the neighbouring lava beds. After heavy rains the valley is filled with a broad river which has been compared with the Euphrates; when the rains fail, only the wells remain to slake the thirst of men, beasts, and plants.

In the Prophet’s time the first stage of the route from Medina to Mecca ran through al-‘Aṣik to Dhu ‘l-Hulayfah, as does the present road. Numerous traditions speak of the fondness Muhammad had for al-‘Aṣik, the “blessed valley” in which he was once told to pray by a messenger from God. As the valley lay within the territory of Muzayna, Muhammad gave it as a礼物 to Bilal b. al-‘Rahmān of this tribe. Muhammad also established a reserve (ji‘d) for al-‘Aṣik, the “blessed valley”; the valley flourished: wells were dug, gardens and plantations were established, and the poets lavished praise on the lovely scene and the famous well, particularly Bihār ‘Ruma (now known as Bihār ‘Uṭmān after ‘Uṭmān b. ‘Affān, who bought it from its Jewish owner and gave its water to the Muslims) and Bihār ‘Urwah b. al-Zubayr. The water of al-‘Aṣik was so sweet that it was sent all the way to Hārūn al-Raḥīm in ‘Irāq. With the decline of ‘Abbasid power and the increase of insecurity in al-Ḥijāz, the valley lapsed into its old somnolence, to remain there for centuries.

Another ‘Aṣik, sometimes called ‘Aṣik Dhat ‘Irf, by the older authors, extends northwards from the vicinity of al-Ṭā‘if along the inner side of the main mountain range of al-Ḥijāz. Some writers state that this valley is connected with ‘Aṣik al-Madina, but recent hydrographic studies have shown that it empties instead into a large swampy basin called al-‘Aṣik between Mecca and Medina.

A great valley in Central Arabia was known in classical times as ‘Aṣik al-Yamāmā or ‘Aṣik Tamra. Although the descriptions given by the
older authors are meager, there is little doubt about the identification of this valley with the present Wadi'l-Dawasir, a small settlement in which still bears the name Tamra, while a nearby salt flat in the valley bed is still called al-'Akīk. According to al-Handānī (i, 152), Tamra was a town with 200 Jews. The same authority may well be mistaken in connecting the name of this valley with Ma'din al-'Akīk, a mine he places in the vicinity, no trace of which has been found. Other mines with the same name are mentioned, but in such general terms that identifying them may be a hopeless task.

In addition to various other valleys named al-'Akīk in Arabia, there has been at least one in Irāk south of the Euphrates (cf. W. Wright, *Opuscula arab.*, vii, 110; *Hamāsa*, i, 698; *Aghāni*, vii, 123; al-Dinawarī, 260). On the Sudanese shore of the Red Sea a village named al-'Akīk (without the definite article) stands on a gulf of the same name southwest of Sawākīn.


**Aki l** [see Balīgh]

**A kī kī** (A.) is the name of the sacrifice on the seventh day after the birth of a child. According to religious law it is recommendable (*mustāhāb* or *sunna*) on that day to give a name to the new-born child, to shave off its hair and to kill a victim, for a boy two rams or two he-goats, for a girl one of these according to the Shāfī'ī, but in both cases only one according to the Mālikī. If the offering of the *ṭaḥkā* has been neglected on the seventh day, it can be done afterwards, even by the child itself when it has come of age. The greater part of the flesh of the sacrifice is distributed amongst the poor and indigent, but a meal (*waṭīma*) for the family is recommendable.

Some of the older scholars (amongst other Dā'ūd al-Zāhirī) have looked upon the offering of the *ṭaḥkā* as a duty. Abū Ḥanīfa on the contrary regarded it as optional.

The shorn hair of the child is also called *ṭaḥkā*, and the law recommends to the faithful to spend a sum not less than the weight of this hair in silver (or gold) in almsgiving.

The *ṭaḥkā* sacrifice was doubtless derived from old Arabian heathenism. The Prophet is said to have observed: "When some one wishes to offer a sacrifice for his new-born child, he may do so". In heathenish times it was the custom to wet the child's head with the blood of the animal. According to some traditions Muḥammad had allowed the Muslims to do the same. The jurists maintain that this custom is not desirable (*sunna*) but it is done, e.g. in Palestine.

According to Doughty (travels in Arabia Deserta, i, 452) the *ṭaḥkā* is one of the most frequent sacrificial ceremonies in the Arab desert, but there it is only performed at the birth of a boy, never when a girl is born.


**Akhil** [see Balīgh]

**A kīl** n. *Abī Ta'llīb*, elder brother of 'All, who was 20 years his junior. After fighting against the Muslims at Badr, where he was taken prisoner and ransomed by al-Abāṣā, he became a convert to Islam. The sources give contradictory information as to the date of this event (after the capture of Mecca, according to al-Baladhuri; shortly before or after the pact of al-Hudaybiya, according to Ibn Ḥadīj, etc.), as well as on his participation in the Khaybar and Mōtā expeditions, the capture of Mecca, and the battle of Hunayn. During the struggle between 'All and Muṣ'āwīya, he ranged himself on the side of the Umayyad because his brother, it is said, refused to draw on the state coffers in order to pay a debt to him, but the estrangement between the two brothers probably had political causes. Yet 'Akhil would never allow anyone to insult 'All in his presence.

He had "an extremely prosperous household" and a considerable entourage. He died, probably in 50/670, and was buried at Medina. He left several sons who joined al-Husayn at the time of his rebellion against Yazīd; one of them, Muslim, was killed by Ibn Ziyād, and others, either six or nine in number, fell at Karbalā'. 'Akhil left a reputation not only as a great authority on genealogies and the history of Kuraysh, on the strength of which he became one of the four arbiters (bakam) of the law, but also as a man endowed with great natural eloquence; his swift and pungent retorts are often quoted by the historians.


**Aṣkīl**, one of the most significant institutions of Muslim penal law as regards both the origins and the sociological evolution of that law. The term *ṭaḥkā*, pl. *awdāli*, denotes, as its ety-
mology would suggest, the group of persons upon whom devolves, as the result of a natural joint liability with the person who has committed homicide or inflicted bodily harm, the payment of compensation in cash or in kind. This compensation is called diya [q.v.], 'abd, pl. 'aḍābi, and also maṣ'ula, pl. maṣ'ābi, from a root meaning "to bind, shackle": the Arab lexicographers readily explain that it referred originally to the camels of the diya, which were given "shackled" to the victim or his inheritors (cf. Ibn Kutayba, Adab al-Kāthīī, 1346 A. H., 52; LA, xii, 487-8, which has a detailed account); but the classical jurists prefer to relate it to the idea of a "restraint" operating against the exercise of private revenge (cf. Germanic wergeld). The original meaning is perhaps to be found in the classical expression 'abd l-kaṭīb, "to pay the compensation for the victim of a murder", which possibly meant at first "to prevent the victim [from avenging] himself".

This institution has its roots in the ancient Arab tribal principle of joint responsibility (Procksch, Über die Blutrache etc., Leipzig 1899, 56-61; Morand, Études de droit mus. algérien, Paris 1910, 65-7; idem, Introd. à l'étude du droit mus. algérien, Paris 1921, 210-12; Lammens, Arabie occidentale, 189). In Islam, it seems to be a survival not easy to reconcile with the individualist tendencies of religious doctrine which find expression, in the field of moral responsibility, in the Kurān (vi, 164): "no soul bears another's load." Fīhā, however, approved of it (protests were raised by the Mu'tazzilite Abū Bakr al-Asamm, and in Khāridjite circles), and several "kaḍīkh" of the Prophet (conveniently grouped, with a commentary, in al-Shawkānī, Nāṣi al-Asba'ār, 1333 A. H., vii, 80-6) gave it the tardy support of that Tradition: the Muwatta' of Mālik only takes cognizance of such versions as are irrelevant to the question of the 'aḍābi, which it discusses at considerable length without invoking any decision of the Prophet. Its incorporation into Fīhā was accomplished, however, by the imposition of highly restrictive regulations and even, in one of the principal schools of law, by an appreciable change in the principle of joint responsibility.

Firstly, as was to be expected, ta'ḍābi, or joint liability by 'aḍābi, is not permissible between Muslims and non-Muslims (it is allowed between dhimmis, the conditions varying according to the school). Secondly, a factor of much greater importance, four other basic restrictions are laid down in the formula, valid in principle for all the orthodox schools: lā ta'ḥīl 'l-'aḍābi astamwa la-ḥabībī wa-lahubībī wa-lahāsūbī wa-lahā ṣīrāfī;*: "'aḍābi does not intervene in the case of an intentional act, or a slave, or a compromise or a confession". The first of these restrictions, which limits the legal function of the institution to the case of non-intentional homicide or injury ('hāṣa [q.v.]) — and most of those who allow this supplementary category include the quasi-intentional — is extremely important; there is a clear connection between it and the distinction drawn in the Kurān (ii, 178; iv, 92) between intentional and non-intentional homicide. The intentional act of a minor or an insane person is counted by the majority of authors as tantamount to a non-intentional act. The second restriction apparently denotes (the grammatical vindication of this was given by the grammarian al-Asba'ārī to the Ḥanafī kāfūl Abū Yūsuf) that if the victim — and not the guilty party — is a slave, the 'aḍābi of the guilty party does not intervene; but the Ḥanafīs, followed with some hesitation by the Shāfī'īs, see the matter in a different light. The two remaining restrictions mentioned in the formula are represented by the jurists as seeking to prevent any collusion prejudicial to the members of the 'aḍābi.

Even more drastic is the Ḥanafī innovation which affects the members of the 'aḍābi themselves. Among the pre-Islamic Arabs, only the relatives by paternity, real or fictitious, were concerned. The Muslim jurists have not departed from this customary view, with the exception of the Ḥanafīs of 'Irāk, who have accepted and confirmed an Umayyad administrative practice (Schacht, Origins, 207) which gave precedence to the joint liability between companions-in-arms entered on the same pay-roll or diwan. This tallied with the tendency towards state control, because the authorities could in this way directly guarantee compensation for the victim, by means of official deductions from pay. The experiment made by some early Mālikīs, obviously following the example of the 'Irākīs, of taking the diwan into account to a certain extent, was unsuccessful (compare Abī al-Wahhāb, Ḥawlā, ii, 194, with al-Bāghī, Munā'īd, viii, 113-4).

The schools of law are thus virtually unanimous on the point that the 'aḍābi comprise, as in the pre-Islamic period, the 'asaba (cf. waṣaṣra) of the guilty party, that is to say, the group of relatives or acquaintances, after whom come, in the case of a freedman, the patron and his 'asaba (an old Shāfī'ī ruling in favour of the reciprocal obligation of the freedman towards the patron has not been generally accepted). As regards the agnates, the old system of kinship is seen here in all its force and clarity, more plainly even than in the rules governing inheritance; moreover, the agnatic relationship, in such a conservative question of penal law, continues to be interpreted with the greatest strictness: Mālik, for example, stipulates that neither the husband nor the son or a woman who is a guilty party, although they are her heirs, can be a member of her 'aḍābi. The Shāfī'īs are alone in excluding from the 'aḍābi the ancestors and descendants of a man who is the guilty party, though the Ḥanbalis are undecided on this point (Ibn Khudāmā, al-Mughūnī, 1367 A. H., vii, 784). Minor and insane persons are excluded from the 'aḍābi, as are women. As regards the guilty person himself, it is certain that originally he was not party to the 'aḍābi which intervened on his behalf; although certain Mālikīs have incorporated him in it, it can be confidently asserted that this is in imitation of the Ḥanafīs — an additional modification to be attributed to the latter (Brunschvig, in Studia Islamica, iii, 69).

Ḥanafism has not completely excluded from the 'aḍābi either the agnates or the patron by right of manumission; it even includes the contractual patron, to whom it alone of the orthodox schools accords legal status; and it places no limitations of time or degree on the agnatic relationship. But agnates and patrons, under this system, only play a suppletory role. Further, Ḥanafism justifies its theory of the superiority of the military diwan to the 'asaba by declaring itself faithful to the traditional idea of an overriding duty of "mutual assistance" (nusra, ṣalāṣa) as the basis of penal solidarity, and by adding the changes which had occurred during the first century of Islam in the very concept of mutual help, thus there was initiated among the members of this school a development of doctrine which led to the acceptance of the principle that, in default of the diwan, members of the same sub or of the same
profession, in a given locality or district, should between them perform the function of 'əkila. Further developments occurred among the mediaeval Ḥanafis, but the various jurists trod divergent and confused paths (the classical works on ʿibtidād, through being over-condensed, give the illusion of a unified doctrine); some left the judge considerable scope for the exercise of his own discretion, others were inclined to provide a definitely geographical basis for the institution; at least in the absence of agnates.

As a result of the dislocation of the tribes under Islam and their dispersal over vast areas of territory, the problem of a limitation either, again, of a geographical nature, or connected with the degree of kinship, arose in some of the schools, in which the role of the agnates retained its original importance. The Mālikis had early signified their decision (Mudawwana, xvi, 298) that there should be no ʿtaḥbul between the people of Egypt and Syria, for example, because they constituted different ʿiwns (a faint echo of the dīwān theory); and the ʿṢafistīs, who to begin with saw no impediment in any distance, however remote, wondered in their turn whether relations who were near at hand might not be called upon in preference to more closely connected relatives who lived at a distance (see ābd̊gh, ʿibd̊ab, ii, 214, with K. al-Umm, vi, 103). The Ḥanballıs were not inclined to take geography into account at all; but, while the ʿṢafistīs rejected joint liability between tribes considered to be related, they, on the other hand, limited the institution to that fraction of the tribe in which kinship was clearly established (Mugn̊i, viii, 786, 788). Again, within the framework of the social changes occasioned by Islam, and as a mark of its distrust of Bedouin life, there is recorded the attempt of several doctors to prevent ʿtaḥbul between townsmen and nomads: the Ḥanafis al-Sarakhsī emphasizes this point (Mabsūṭ, xxvii, 132-3); the Mālikis, notwithstanding the Mudawwana, loc. cit., on the whole refused to follow this path (al-Badji, al-Muntaka, loc. cit.; Schacht, loc. cit.), a method of assessment among the members. The Ḥanafis, who like accountanty, and who are anxious to embarrass each member as little as possible, have opted for an extremely low maximum, to be the same for all—three or four dirhams per head. The ʿṢafistīs, who aim at relieving the poor, have fixed two rates of contributions according to means, very similar to the preceding ones, but in this case revolving round a minimum—½ dinār for the rich, ¼ for persons of more moderate means, proceeding from the nearest agnates to the most distant. The Mālikis and Ḥanballıs refuse to lay down any fixed amount; each of the agnates, in order of kinship, must pay according to his means; this was undoubtedly the ancient method. In an organized State, if an equal assessment is refused, the case must be referred to a judge; and the schools concerned agree on this.

The ʿəkila reappears in a closely-connected penal institution, the kasāmā (q.v.), but in slightly different forms from the ones just described.

The Imāmī Shīʿītes have made virtually no innovations on the subject of the ʿəkila. Their fundamental solutions are those of the orthodox doctors, with a preference now for one school, now for another. In their eyes, the persons jointly responsible are first and foremost the agnates; the guilty person himself, minors and the insane, and the emancipator too, are excluded; the priority accorded to, or rather imposed upon, relations german to the guilty party. The minimum sum involving the ʿəkila is that laid down by the Ḥanafis; the minimum devolving on each member is fixed either in accordance with ʿṢafī doctrine, or by the magistrate; payment is made, as in the case of the Sunnīs, in three annual instalments.

Finally, can ʿiḥk be said to have succeeded in its effort to preserve, and at the same time to delimit, the function of the ʿəkila? The explanation may lie in the negative. In general, large sections of the old Muslim penal law, even though based on the Kur̊an, fell rapidly into disuse, when faced with competition from the secular, and highly arbitrary, justice of rulers; there was even greater reason why this
should occur in the case of an institution such as the 'akila, which was extra-Kur'anic and no longer corresponded to social reality as far as an increasing number of Muslims were concerned. The evolutionary process initiated during the first centuries of Islam by Ḥanafīsm, in the sense of joint liability on a territorial basis, was indecisive, and unsatisfactory in many respects; taken a stage further by the Ḥanafīs in the course of time, it even went as far as the doctrine put forward by some, that the public treasury, i.e. the state, was responsible in the absence of family or of a military division. Instead of this solution, which was hard to admit, some authors advocated that the diya should be placed to the sole charge of the guilty person—this being the germ of a theory of civil liability which was not further developed (Tyan, Le système de la responsabilité dlictuelle en droit musulman, Beirut 1926, 123-8; Abou Half, Le Droit en droit musulman, Cairo 1932).

It seems that collective responsibility to-day exists only in societies where the joint responsibility of the tribe is still an active force, for example among the Arabic-speaking nomads (the literature on the subject is summarized in Gräf, Das Rechtswesen der heutigen Beduinen, Bonn 1952), or among the settled Berber populations; customary law then predominates, only in varying measure by Muslim law.

*Bibliography:* In addition to the references quoted in the text, all the general works on ʿākīla. For the three principal orthodox schools see Bercher, Les Délits et les Peines de droit commun par le Coran, Beirut 1926. For reference on the Mālikī school see Arévalo, Derecho penal islámico, Madrid 1939, 40-44. Bourham, De la vengeance des Arabes d'avant l'Islam, 1933-44, is of no value. (R. Brunschvicg)

ʿAhnādil, irregular cavalry during the first centuries of the Ottoman Empire, based on and primarily for service in Europe. Their name derives from the verbal noun ʿābin (from ʿāb-mak, “to flow, to pour out”), which means a “raid, incursion into enemy territory”. ʿAhnādil is “the name given to those who carry out ʿābins on foreign territory to reconquer, plunder, or spread destruction”. (M. Zeki Pakalln, Osmanlî tarik deşîmler ve terimleri sölül, Istanbul 1946, i, 36). The treasurer of Meḥmed II, G. M. Angioletto, in his eye-witness account of the campaign against Uzun ʿHasan (1473), gives the best description (trans. Charles Grey): “Besides the five columns we have mentioned, there was also another of the Aganzi, who are not paid, except by the booty which they may gain in guerrilla warfare. These men do not encamp with the rest of the army, but go traversing, pillaging, and wasting the country of the enemy on every side, and yet keep up a great and excellent discipline among themselves, both in the division of the plunder and in the execution of all their enterprises. In this division were thirty thousand men, remarkably well mounted...”.

Tradition ascribes the formation of these auxiliary troops, comprising contingents from the Turcoman tribes of Anatolia, to the Ṣalṭūqids; and in fact, although accurate information is lacking concerning the battle in the plain of Brusa at the end of the 13th century between Erteğrul, supported by the ʿahndil, and the Byzantine-Tatars, it seems probable that this tradition contains the truth. The term ʿābin is also used in connection with naval expeditions. Enver (ed. M. H. Yimanc, Istanbul 1928, 24) records an ʿābin made along the Bosporus with 35 ships. Neshîr mentions the ʿahndil ṭahdilari, or ʿahndil judges’. These irregular units of the Ottoman army established themselves, as the Turks gradually advanced into the northern Balkans, in strategic and wellprotected localities. Frûz Bey of Vidin was ordered by Bâyazîd I to make an ʿābin on Wallachia, and in 1391 the Turks ʿahndil for the first time advanced north of the Danube. Later they numbered not less than 40-50,000 horsemen. They were commanded by what were virtual dynasties of local chiefs (beys); Ewrenos-oghullar (the descendants of Ewrenos Bey [q.v.], at Ůumâldjina, Serez, Iṣhkdrah) in the north-west; Miḥâl-oghullar, descendants of Köłe Miḥâl [q.v.], a Greek renegade of the family of the Palaeologoi (Serbia, Hungary); Türkân-oghullar (Smederevo-Semendire, Greece, Wallachia and in the direction of Venetian territory); Malkoç-oghullar, originally from Bosnia where they were known as Malković (Hungary, Wallachia, Moldavia and Poland); Kâsim-oghullar (at Vienna, 1529).

Towards the end of the 16th century, the ʿahndil lost some of their thrust and importance. In the course of the ill-fated expedition of the Grand Vizier Koçi Sînân Paşa against Mihai Viteazul of Wallachia (1593), they were almost annihilated: at Giurgiu (Yerköyül) on the Danube they remained on Romanian territory, where “the root of the ʿahndil was severed and they withered away”. Again in 1604, Sultan Ahmed I issued orders to ʿAll Bey Miḥâl-oghlu to join the expedition against Hungary. But the ʿahndil rapidly adapted themselves to new forms of warfare. They became artillerymen, armourers, and drivers, and demanded to be entered in the army muster-rolls and to be paid regularly. The statistician of the decline of the Ottoman empire, Koçi Bey, in his Fidâye (ed. A. Wothke, London, 1797/1862, 17) written in 1630, stated that “the ʿahndil contingents (ʿahndil fidâyes) had become either paid troops or regular soldiers, or had relinquished their positions (ʿahndilîlîlî inkar idûb); scarcely 2000 ʿahndil remained”. Their individuality became lost in the main body of the regular Ottoman forces.


ʿAKK, old Arabian tribe, probably identical with the ʿAχ̣̂ṇṭxi (ʿAχ̣̂ṇṭxi) of Poltomy, vi, 7, § 23. H. Reckendorf considered the name ʿAkk as a place-name; but it occurs as a personal name in Thamūdic inscriptions. At the beginning of the 7th century the territory of the ʿAkk in the Tiḥâma of Yaman stretched from Wâd Mawr, over Surdûd, to Wâd Sahîm (i.e. between modern Luḥayya and ʿUqaydayda), where it met that of the ʿAṣ̌ḥar. At that time they
participated in the Meccan cult. Earlier a colony of the Akk was to be found in Akkik (Tamra) = Wadi of Medina, that was to be found in Akkik (Tamra) = Wadi of Medina, that was to be found in the territory of a sub-tribe of Akk (of the same name), but they were annihilated by Tābir and a chieftain of the Akk themselves. During the wars of the conquests some groups from the tribe came to Syria (they settled in the valley of the Jordan), and from there to Egypt and the Magrib, also to Kūfah and Persia. Members of the tribe were prominent in the conquest of Egypt and in the battle of Siffin (on the Syrian side). In Arabia, the tribe preserved its old territory, and even extended it to the north and south.

Wüstefeld, Table A2, shows the divisions of the emigrant Akk, the Turfa those of the tribe in its primitive seat in the 13th century. In the tradition of Medina ( Ibn Ishāk) the Akk are counted among the Adnān, in that of Kūrāsān among the Azd Shānūz (through Uḏdūn, which is often corrupted into Adnān). Both versions are easy to understand: when Kūfah was founded, the Akk were assigned to the "seventh" of the Iyād ( b. Nizār b. Maʿadd b. Adnān), while in Kūrāsān they were assigned to the Azd.

Bibliography: Azrāki, Abūbakr Makha, Cairo 1352, i, 127; Hamdān, Dīstār, 68 ff., 112 f.; Ibn Hshām, Sīra, 6; Umār b. Yūsfūl b. Rasūl, Turfī at-Asbāb fi Mawṣīla al-Anās, Damascus 1949, 64 ff.; Tābarī, i, 1855, 1985 ff., 2495; Lancaster Harding and Е. Littmann, Some Thamudic In-
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AKKĀ, the Acco (Akkū) of the Old Testament, the Ptolemais of the Greeks, the Acre of the French, town on the Palestinian seaboard. Akkā was captured by the Arabs under the command of Shurabhi b. Ḥasan. As the town had suffered in the wars with the Byzantines, Muʿawiyah rebuilt it, and constructed there naval yards which the Caliph Hisham later transferred to Tyre. Ibn Tūlūn constructed great stone embankments round the port; al-Makdisi, whose grandfather executed the work, gives an interesting description of their construction. The port became subsequently one of the naval bases of the Fatimids in Syria. The Crusades marked a new epoch in the history of the town. After an unsuccessful attempt, Baldwin I succeeded, in 1104, in gaining possession of this important port, which then became the central point in the Christian possessions in the Holy Land. Al-Iṣrārī's description of Akkā belongs to this period: a large straggling town, with many farms, a fine, safe harbour and a mixed population. After Saladin had won the great battle of Kār ʿAntīn, Akkā surrendered to him in 583/1187. But since possession of Akkā was vital to the Christians, they again laid siege to the town. The siege lasted for two years, and finally (1191) the arrival of Philippe Auguste and Richard Coeur de Lion led to the capture of Akkā by the Christians. From 626/1229 onwards, Akkā was the principal centre of Christian power in Palestine, and received the name of Saint-Jean d'Acre, after a splendid church built there by the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem. In 690/1291 the Sultan al-Malik al-Ẓahir gained possession of Akkā and put an end to Christian domination in Palestine. The town was completely destroyed, and for long remained a heap of ruins, with few inhabitants. Towards the middle of the 18th century, a revival took place, when Shaykh Ṭāhir, who had founded a kingdom in Galilee, made Akkā his capital. The town was rebuilt, and flourished still more during the reign of terror of Ahmad al-Dżazzār (1775-1813). It was during his rule that Napoleon conducted a fruitless siege of the town, which was protected by the British fleet. Akkā continued to prosper under the peaceful rule of al-Dżazzār's successors, but in 1832 it was taken by Ibrahim Pasha and razed. It rose yet again, only to be bombardcd in 1840 by the Turkish fleet supported by the British and the Austrians. Since then the town has witnessed a certain revival.

Bibliography: Baldhūrī, Fftāk, 106-117; Makdisī, iii, 162-3 (comp. ZDPV, vii, 155-6); Idrīsī (= ibid., viii, 11); Yāḵtū, iii, 709-7; Nāṣir-i Khusrav (Schefer), 48 ff.; other descriptions translated by G. le Strange in Palestine under the Moslems, 328-34; E. Robinson, Neue biblische Forschungen, 115-29; Gürîn, Galīlē, i, 502-25; Palestine Exploration Fund, Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs, i, 160-7; Gaudenzt, Denkmybven, La Syrie à l'époqwe des Mamlouks, Paris 1923; Guide Bleu de Syrie, Palestine, Paris 1923; F. M. Abel, Géografie de la Palestine, Paris 1933-8 (in particular, vol. II, 13); idem, Histoire de la Palestine depuis la conquête d'Alexandre jusqu'à l'invasion arabe, Paris 1952; A. S. Marmadji, Textes géographiques arabes sur la Palestine, Paris 1951, 144-8.

AKKĀRMAN [see Ā KHRMĀN].

AKL, intellect or intelligence, the Arabic equivalent of Greek νοῦς. (1) In neoplatonic speculation, in which in many respects resembles the late Greek doctrine of the Logos and also in many respects corresponds to the Logos christology, ἀγλ is the first, sometimes the second, entity which emanates from the divinity as the first cause, or proceeds from it by means of intellectual creation, νάς and ἀγλα etc. coming after ἀγλ in succession. As first created entity the ἀγλ is also called "the representative" or "the messenger" of God in this world. The neoplatonic idea of ἀγλ as first creation also appears in the ἰδίτ problēma: "The first thing created by God was the ἀγλ etc." (cf. I. Goldzibher, Neuplatonische und gnostische elemente im ἱδίτ, ZA, 1908, 317 ff.). [Cf. also ΦΑΣΑΠΑ, ἸΒΗΜΑΝ-ΑΛ-ΣΑΦΑ; for the role of ἀγλ in ἰσμάλιςμ, ἰσμάλιύσα and δύρος; for ἀγλ in σύλθ theosophy, e.g. ibn ʿArabi and ʿABD AL-RAZZAK AL-KHĀN]. (T. DE BOER) (2) According to the theologians (muḥaddithūn), ἀγλ is a source of knowledge and, as such, is the antithesis of νάς or tradition (see e.g. I. Goldzibher, Vorlesungen über den Islam, ch. iii); the words ἰστρά and ἀγλα (ψόντ) are also used for it. ἀγλ is thus a natural way of knowing, independently of the authority of the revelation, what is right and wrong. (Thus it corresponds to the λόγος of the Stoics, who understood by this term a "natural light" (lumen naturale), which was their criterion for distinguishing between good and bad.) This ἀγλ, possessed by all human beings, is also called ἀγλα μοχαρα (al-Fārābī, R. fi l-ʾAgl (Bouyges); cf. the χονάξ Epsilon of the Stoics and the χονάξ νούς of Alexander of Aphrodisias, De anima (Bruns)). Allied to this meaning of ἀγλ is the view qualified by al-
The philosophers of Islam followed in their accounts of *aql Aristotle and his Greek commentators, more especially Alexander of Aphrodisias. According to them *aql is that part of the soul (for their psychology in general see NAFS) by which it "thinks" or "knows" and as such is the antithesis of perception. Mostly, however, *aql is not regarded as a part of the soul at all, which is then restricted to the lower mental functions, but as an incorporeal and incorruptible substance differing in kind from the soul—an ambiguity which also pervades Aristotle's psychology. *aql is broadly divided into the theoretical (al-nasari) and the practical intellect (al-*amali); the former apprehends the quiddities or universals, while the latter deliberates about the future actions and through the appetitive faculty moves the body to the attainment of the good.

The development of the theoretical intellect in man is the most widely and richly discussed subject of the doctrine. In a brief and rather obscure passage (De anima, iii, 5) Aristotle had said that the potential intellect in man is actualized by an eternally actual intellect (an application of the general Aristotelian principle that for the realization of a potentiality the agency of something already actual is necessary); the latter acts upon it as light acts upon our faculty of sight or art on its material. The disparity between the two analogies obscures Aristotle's view of the relationship between the passive and active intellects, but it was Alexander's interpretation which provided the basis for the Arabs' discussions. According to Alexander (op. cit.) our intellect is initially a pure potentiality which is actualized by the active intellect which is God; when our actualized intellect is not operating, it is *intellectus in actu, or *intellectus in effectu; when it acquires the axiomatic truths (this is called *aql bi 'l-iqm = intellectus in effectu), the second stage (called *aql bi 'l-iqm = intellectus in actu) reflects upon itself and attains to a knowledge of the categories and becomes *aql mustaqfād (*intellectus acquisitus or adeptus). According to Ibn Sinā (al-Shāja', De anima) the potential intellect (*aql bi 'l-suwa, or *aql hayāllāni = intellectus potentialis or materialis) reaches the first stage of its actualization when it acquires the axiomatic truths (this is called *aql bi 'l-malaka = intellectus in habito), the second stage (called *aql bi 'l-iqm = intellectus in actu) when it acquires the secondary intelligibles from the primary intelligibles or axioms, the final stage (*aql mustaqfād = intellectus acquisitus) when it actually contemplates these intelligibles and becomes similar to the active intellect. Ibn Sinā, inspired by Neo-platonism, affirms that the universal cannot be acquired by abstraction from the particulars, but by direct intuition from the active intelligence. The final stage of human bliss comes when the human intellect becomes one with the active intellect, which happens, according to al-Fārābī and Ibn Sinā, only after death, although Ibn Rushd allows such a union during earthly life.

One of the chief difficulties of this whole Greco-Arabic doctrine is the individuality of intellect which they affirm to be incorporeal and therefore; according to their general principle of individuation by matter, universal. Although its individuality is recognized, seeing that the subject of thought is the individual "I", the basic principle of their theory of knowledge, viz. that of the identity of subject and object (a principle laid down by Aristotle in order to ensure the objectivity of knowledge, but rejected by Ibn Sinā), prevented the formulation of the individual ego. This difficulty culminated in Ibn Rushd (De anima), who declared the intellect to be one for all humanity, while recognizing that his theory did not do justice to the individuality of the act of thought.

(4) The Muslim philosophers recognized a hierarchy of separate intelligences (*'āmil mufradāt), each lower one emanating from the higher. These incorporeal beings, usually ten in number and endowed with life, intuitive thought and bliss in varying degrees, create and govern their respective spheres which themselves are regarded as being possessed of souls. Like the Greco-Christian thinkers (e.g. (pseudo-)Philoponus, De anima (Hayduck, 527)), the Muslims identified the separate intelligences with certain angels, the lowest of these, the active intellect, called Gabriel, being the ruling *aql of the sublunar sphere.

**Bibliography:**
al-shar'iyya wa 'l-diniyya (revealed and religious knowledge). According to Mu'tazilite tradition, and Sa'diyya al-mutasharriyyat denotes that which is accessible to the reason and especially, on the ethical level, the natural values of law and morals. Cf. the Mu'tazilite MS al-Madjma 'i?'l-Muhtij (bridged from the Muhtij of the Qadi 'Abd al-Djabbar, end of the 10th century) by Ibn Mattawiyah (Berlin, MS Glaser 526; information supplied by G. Vajda).

In classical kalâm, this distinction operates also within the "religious sciences." Traces of it are found from the time of the first Mu'tazilite disputation, when 'imān diniyyah is sometimes subdivided into 'imān 'akliyyah and 'imān sharhī. In later works (Aghā and Hanafi-Māturidī schools), 'akliyyah denotes the aggregate of subjects in kalâm (i.e. "religious science") which are amenable to reason; that is to say subjects the fundamentals of which, even where they are provided by the gnostics, can be "proved" by "apodictic arguments" (bāhā'). These are contrasted with the subjects called samîyyah, ex aedibus, the fundamentals of which derive only from Kur'ānic or traditional texts (badīth, ijma'). In this latter category, reason only intervenes to resolve arguments of expediency. Two kinds of problems are considered as 'akliyyah: (1) the preliminary subjects of kalâm, which deal with "essentials and accidents," subjects which are in the strict sense "rational," and which assemble the products of logic, natural philosophy, and ontology; (2) 'akliyyah, which deal with (a) the existence of God (wjūd Allāh), and his attributes (ṣifāt), with the exception of the three attributes of Sight, Hearing, and Speech, and of the "vision of God" (ru'yat Allāh), which are considered as samīyyah; and (b) the "acts of God" (al-faḍlah āfādā). The 'akliyyah must always have a scriptural basis, but a basis which reason, for its part, can prove by apodictic arguments. The other subjects, such as prophecy, eschatology, the "statutes and the names," the "command and prohibition" (imāma), are samīyyah. The great classic of al-Djurjani, the Sharh al-Mawdi (8th/14th century for example), has six principal sections; five of these treat of 'akliyyah, and one only, the final section, comprises all the subjects called samīyyah. (L. Gardet)

al-Aкраb (a.), scorpion. This branch of the arachnida, which is met with as far north as lat. 45°, includes, in Asia and Africa, some species whose sting produces effects of a more or less serious nature, and sometimes even death. For this reason the scorpion has always haunted the imagination of oriental peoples; it has found a place among the stars (a constellation and the 8th sign of the Zodiac are named after it), and has played some part in the magic and the interpretation of dreams. As a protection against its sting, magic formulas and, later, verses of the Qur'ān, were used, engraved on rings and other talismans; according to the Traditions, Muhammad saw no objection to this practice. The observer of Arab naturalists, who claimed that the scorpion escaped from pain and intense heat by committing suicide, and that the female carried its young on her back and ultimately perished in this way, have been confirmed in modern times.

Nothing is known of his attitude towards Muhammad up to the time when he joined the Prophet in al-Sukya during the expedition to Mecca in 8/650. He took part in the conquest of Mecca and was one of al-mu'alla al-kububum who were presented with gifts, which gave occasion to a famous verse of 'Abbās b. Mirdā. He took part also in the battle of Hunayn and refused to return his booty, in spite of the Prophet's request. (For Muhammad's somewhat negative opinion of him see also Ibn Hishām, iv, 203.) He participated in the conquest of the vanguard of Tamlīm to the Prophet, the traditional account stressing his arrogant conduct; nevertheless, he was appointed to collect the sadaqát of part of the Banū Ḥānsāla (al-Ansaib, x, 970). Together with other chiefs of Tamlīm, he interceded for the captives of the Banū 'l-Anbar, and was a witness to a letter dispatched by the Prophet to Nadjrān.

During the ridāda, according to Sayf (al-Tabari, i, 1920), al-Aкраb and al-Zibrikān proposed to Abū Bakr to guarantee the allegiance of Tamlīm against the grant of the kharāj of Bahrāyn, and it was only 'Umar who prevented Abū Bakr from accepting the proposal. In view of the situation of Tamlīm at this period, this tradition does not seem trustworthy, but it may reflect 'Umar's attitude towards al-Aкраb (cf. Bayān, i, 253, and Uyūn al-Aṣhār (Cairo), i, 85). Sayf relates also that he took part in the battle of the ridūda alongside Khalid b. al-Walid, and was in the vanguard at the battles of Dūmat al-Djandal and al-Anbār. His name is last mentioned in 32/652-3, when he was sent by Abūnāf b. Kayy to subdue Djūzdān; he must have been a very old man at that time. Al-Baladhurī mentions that his descendants lived in Quraishān.
The behaviour of the scorpion when confronted by human beings, and the effect of its sting on different victims were noted; different species were identified; but above all, efforts were made to discover a remedy against its sting. The best method, apart from sucking the venom from the wound, was to cut the animal open and place it on the affected part. The scorpion played an important part also in Arab medicine; its ashes were an effective remedy against calculi; its roasted flesh would cure the eye complaint known as rih al-sabal. Scorpion oil (dhun al-abhari), prepared in various ways, was considered to possess particularly curative powers; it was used in the treatment of malignant sores, sciatica and pains in the back, orchitis, and falling hair. In addition, cases are quoted in which hemiplegia and fever were cured by a scorpion sting.

On the use of scorpions in war see al-Dakhli, Ḥayawanāt, v, 358; Elliot and Dowson, History of India, v, 550-1. In Arabic literature, the name “scorpion” occurs quite frequently, and always typifies treacherous hostility (Ḥamāsā, ed. Freytag, 195, verse 1; 156, verse 2; Ḥudaydān poems, no. 21, verse 24; Muḥaddithiyāt, ed. Thorbecke, no. 19, verse 12; Nābiqah, ed. Ahlwardt, no. 1, verse 4), or mockery (“Urwā, no. 15, verse 2), or calumny (“Urwā, no. 8, verse 6; Farazdak, Disan, no. 61, verse 3), and similarly in proverbs (Freytag, Proberba, no. 902). The three coldest days of winter (the new moons of November, December and January) were, on account of their “biting” cold, called “the three scorpions” (Calendrier de Cordoue, 10).

**Bibliography:** Dakhil, Ḥayawanāt, v, 353 ff. and the index; Damiri, i, 106 ff.; Kazwini (Wustenfeld), i, 439 ff.; Ibn Masawayh, al-Da’wa; Buluk 1391, iii, 1281; Dozy, Suppl., ii, 152-3; Hommel, Ursprung und Alter araber. Stammesnamen und Mondstationen, in ZDMG, xl., 605; A. Benhamouda, Les noms arabes des étioles, in AIEO, 1951, 155-7. (J. Hell)

**ʻAKRABA** is the name of two localities:
1. A place on the frontier of Yamāma, famous for the bloody battle in which Musaylima and the Banū Hanifa were defeated by Khālid. In its neighbourhood was a grove (ḥadība), surrounded by a wall and, before this battle, known by the name of “Rahmān’s garden”; later on it was called “garden of death”.

**Bibliography:** Tabari, i, 1937-1940; Baladhwur (de Goeje), 88; Yākūt, Maʾāsum li, 220; ii, 694-5. A place of residence of the Ghassānid princes in Dijālān; it is probably identical with the present ʻAkrābā in the province of Dijūrā.

**Bibliography:** Yākūt, iii, 695; Nöeldeke, in ZDMG, xxix, 430; cf. in ZDPV, xii, the map of the Dijāb al-Ḥawrān AB 3. (F. Buhl)

**ʻAKRĀBDHIN,** or ʻArabābdhin from Syriac grābdhān, reproducing Greek γράβδην, “small treatise”, was used by the Arabs as a title of treatises on the composition of drugs, or pharmacopoeias, while the simples which went into the composition were designed by the term al-adnayya al-muhrada [q.v.].

The practice of pharmacology. In the hospitals pharmacological instruction very early made an important part of the medical training. That the big hospitals had a pharmacist on the staff we can infer e.g. from the al-Šaydaḍa fi ʻl-Ṭibb of al-Bīrūnī. The rapid increase in the materia medica, not only of Greek but also of Iranian and Indian origin certainly called for a special body of men and for the separation of the pharmacopoeia from the medical profession. In ordinary outside practice the doctor may have prescribed and compounded his own mixtures (cf. C. Elgood, A medical history of Persia and the Eastern caliphate, Cambridge 1951, 272 f.). As a rule drugs were bought separately from the druggist [cf. al-ʻAttār] and then compounded. The muṣāḥasābīd had to give heed to the various ways in which drugs were adulterated (cf. Ibn al-ʻUkhwāw, Maṣāṣim al-Kitāb (Levy), ch. 25). The practice of preparing substitutes for certain simple drugs is attested by the philosopher al-Kindī who wrote a treatise containing recipes for the preparation of substitutes for rare drugs (Kīmisād al-ʻIr wa ʻl-Taṣāḍdā, (K. Garbers, Leipzig 1948).

**Pharmacological literature.** Galen’s De medicamentorum compositione saevandum locos at genera had been translated into Arabic, under the title Khād Tarkib al-Adnya, by Ḥubayr from the Syriac of Ḥunayn b. Ishāq (cf. G. Bergsträsser, Ḥunain ibn Ishāq über die syrischen und arabischen Galenübersetzung, Leipzig 1925, 231 f.). We are told that surgeons, before they could practise, were obliged to make themselves masters of this work (cf. Ibn al-ʿUṣaybiā, ch. 45).

The first pharmacopoeia to receive universal acceptance throughout the caliphate was written by the Christian physician Sāḥib b. Sahil (d. 255/869), of the staff of the hospital of Ḥunday Sāḥib. According to Ibn al-Naḍim (Fihrist, 297) it contained 22 chapters, according to Ibn Abī ʿUṣaybiā (ʻUyun al-Anbā, i, 161) 17 chapters. It was in common use until the publication of the Aḥrabābdhin of Amin al-Dawla Ḥibat Allāh b. Sa’d b. al-Tilmīḥ (d. 560/1165). Ibn al-Tilmīḥ was a court physician to the famous physician and philosopher Abū Bakr Muḥ. b. Zakariyā al-Rāzī (Brochelmann, i, 269). Of the pharmacopoeias written in the East, the Aḥrabābdhin of Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Bahram al-Kalānīsīt, who wrote in the year 590/1194, is also worth mentioning. In this work, of which several manuscripts have come down to us, the author quoted the Ḥawrān and the Tibb al-Manṣūrī of al-Rāzī, the Kānān of Avicenna and other works (Ibn Abī ʻUṣaybiā, i, 31). Of the great medical compilation written by Naṣir al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. Iyās al-Sāhrāz (d. 730/1330), the 5th part, containing a treatise on compound drugs, was edited by F. F. Guigues (thesis, Paris 1902).

In Egypt the Jewish physician Muṣā b. al-ʻAzār (Moses b. Eleazar) wrote an Aḥrabābdhin for the Fatimid caliph Muṣāṣ (Ibn Abī ʻUṣaybiā, i, 86). In the hospitals of Egypt, Syria and ʻIrāq the al-Dustār al-Bārīsūrīs of Abu l-ʻAṣfāl b. Abī l-Bayān al-ʻIrāsīlī (publ. by P. Shath in BIE, 1933, 13-78) was in common use until it was replaced by the Minādāt al-Dakhdhān of Ibn al-ʻAttār al-ʻIrāsīlī which was published in Kairō in 669/1260 (Brochelmann, i, 648).

In Muslim Spain the study of the text of Dioscorides seems to have inspired an exclusive confidence in the simple drugs. We are informed by Ibn Abī ʻUṣaybiā (i, 49) that the famous physician Ibn
Wafid (d. after 460/1068) very seldom prescribed a compound drug. Like his contemporary Abd Allah b. 'Abd al-Fadl b. Bakr, who wrote an inventory of the plants and trees of al-Andalus (Ibn Abi 'Ubayd, ii, 52), Ibn Wafid seems to have been an enthusiastic adherent of the Dioscoridean tradition in medicine. This is true also of al-Ghafiki, the most important pharmacologist of Muslim Spain. In the Latin tradition the Graeboan of Mesue Junior (according to Leo Africanus this work was written by a certain Masaawayh al-Murindi, who died in Bagdad in 1015, and translated into Latin by a Sicilian Jew) was for centuries the recognized authority on pharmacy throughout Europe and became the basis of later official pharmacopoeias.

For the medical principles underlying the composition and administration of drugs see Tibb.

(A. Lewin)

'AKRABI (plural: 'Akrabi, a South Arabian tribe in the neighbourhood of Aden. Their territory, stretching on the coast line from Bi'r Ahmad to Ra's 'Imran, is very small (a few square miles only). It is crossed by the lower part of the river of Lahidi, which here is nearly always dry; as rain is also lacking, the soil is barren and yields but little fruit. The chief town is Bi'r Ahmad, with a few hundred inhabitants and the castle of the sultan. The 'Akrabi, according to the Rasulid al-Ashraf, Turfet al-Ashraf (Zettersten), 56, 57, belonged to the Kuda (text addt.), and to the expression of "determinative" (= the dlat al-ta*rif addt.), the idea of "syntactic function" (represented by the "particle") may be regarded as signifying also the "instrument of comparison" (= the dlat al-tashbih addt.), the "particle" ka) etc. The term dlat is only met with once. Towards the end of the 4th/9th century the term barf ("particle") may be regarded as signifying also the grammatical "instruments" later called dala and adal. This usage seems to imply a distinction between the idea of "casual action" (connected with barf) and the idea of "syntactic function" (represented by dala and adal), leading to the expression of "determinative", "finality", "comparison".

Bibliography: Ibn Fari, Sabil, 102; al-Tahhawi, Kashshafi Ithlibat al-Funun, ed. Sprenger, Calcutta 1862, art. adal and dala. (R. Bacheere)

ii. In the classification of sciences dala is the name of such attainments as are acquired not for their own sake (as an end in itself), but "as a means to something else", as e.g. philological sciences and law, as ancilliary studies of the religious sciences: al-ulum al-aliyya in contrast to al-ulum al-shar'iyya. Cf. the expression dala al-mundadama, i.e. knowledge and accomplishments which are useful in social intercourse. Consequently that what is called dala differs from what is called adal (q.v.) only in so far as the former takes into account the attainments in their relation to 'ilm; cf. also 'Ulum al-Akhbar (Brockelmann), i, 4. The appellation dala corresponds exactly to the expression dylqawal in the classification of the philological sciences by Tyrannion of Amisus;
ALA — AL-DAWLA AL-SIMNANI

see H. Usener, Philologie und Geschichtswissenschaft Bonn 1882, 23.

Bibliography: Ghazâllî, Ibyâq, Kitâb al-Fîrîn, ch. ii (Ithâb al-Sâda, i, 149); Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, ii, 206; Goldzihcr, in Steinsteiner-Festschrift, 114 (with further references). (I. Goldzihcr) iii. Logic is called dâla, following the peripatetic view according to which it is an instrument (bal-gawwâb), not a part, of philosophy (cf. Goldzihcr, in the bibliography of ii, above; S. van den Bergh, Acerroes Epsilone d. Melaphysis, 128; al-Birûnî, introd. to al-Šaydahâ (ed. M. Meyerhof, in Quellen u. Stud. z. Gesch. d. Naturw. u. Med.; 1932) and Mântîk). For other meanings of dâla see HYYAL, NAWBA.

ALA DÂGH (r.), 11 mountain of various colours), name of various mountains. (1) In N.W. Anatolia, near Bolu. (2) In the Taurus range. (3) In E. Anatolia, near the springs of the Murâd Şû, N. E. from Lake Wan; it served as summer headquarters for the Ulkhanids. (4) In N. E. Persia, S. of the Atrak. (5) In Central Asia, between Drunzaria and the basin of Lake Balkhash. (6) Between the Issik Kol and Alma Ata. (7) In Siberia (in Russian Kuznets Mountains), N. of the Altai Mountains. The local pronunciation for the last name is Alawa.

ALA SHEHIR, 11 the motley-coloured town", town in Anatolia at the foot of the Bo Dagh (ancient Taurus), near the town of Cog. In antiquity and in Byzantine times the town, called Philadelphia after its founder, Attalus II Philadelphus, played an important role (see Pauly-Wissowa, s.v.). It was taken, together with the other towns of Phrygia, by Sulayman b. Kutumûsh in 1075 or 1076, but was recaptured by the Byzantines in 1086 and served as an important base in their operations against the Seljukids. According to Ibn Hûd (11th century), this was the battle between the emperor Theodore Lascaris and the Seldjûkî Kay Khusraw I, in which the latter lost his life (607/1210), was fought near the town (here called for the first time Alâ Shehir), but this is not borne out by the Byzantine historians. The town was besieged by the Germiyan-oghlus Ya'rub b. Mâlik khalwa in 1303, but was relieved by the Germiyan-oghlus Ya'rub b. Abîd Allah, who was taught a particular form of remembrance of God 11dâhîb), viz. throwing the head swiftly hither and thither; this resulted after only one night in powerful manifestations of light. Simnani decided to join as a novice Nûr al-Din 'Abd al-Rahmân al-Kasîrî al-Isfârâînî, by whose command Sa'd Allah had visited him; so in Muharram 686/Sept. 1288 he succeeded in reaching Baghdad, where for the first time he met his shaykh, the well-known ascetic Wâlid b. Umar b. Muhammad b. Umar, in whose house he remained until 688/Sept. 1289. Simnani entered the khâlia and was carried to Shariyâz, where Arghun was founding the city of Sultaniyya (later completed by Uldjaytu). He succeeded, as a result of successful disputations with Buddhist monks 11bhâkshas), who played a great role at the court, in appeasing the Ilkhan's anger, so that he was asked to remain at court at least as a Şâfi. After staying, rather unwillingly, for eighty days, Simnânî escaped to Simnânî, where he reached in Ramaân 688/Oct. 1287. Arghun, having ascertained that he had not gone to Bagdad, let him alone. Sa'd Allah, who had in the meantime visited Bagdad, brought for Simnânî the 'âbâka of Kasîrî, in whose name he entered the khâlia in Simnânî, in Shawwâl 689/Nov.-Dec. 1288. After the dismissal of his father and the execution of his uncle (for the date see SIMNÂNI; 'Alâ al-Dawla's own statements vacillate), he succeeded in reaching Bagdad, where for the first time he met his shaykh Kasîrî personally (Ramaân 688/Sept. 1289). Simnânî entered the khâlia in the Masjid al-Khâlija and undertook, in obedience to an order by Kasîrî, the pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina. He returned to Bagdad in Muharram 689/Jan. 1289, entered the khâlia for the second time (in the Şûnîziyya), and finally returned to Simnânî, where he began to instruct Şûfis in the Kânîshkî Sakkâlâ. After a life of extensive educational and
literary activity he died in his monastery, Shi'iyyabād-i Khudādād, in Simnān, on 22 Ḍa'dib 736/6 March 1336.

Simnān was a Sunnite; he condemned the Shi'iite tendencies of UNgjayty and praised the amīr Cūbān, who did not share them. In spite, however, of his zealous advocacy of war against unbelievers, he rejected the idea of a revolt against Shi'iite oppression and advised, with Ḥasan al-Bayrāz, to show patience under oppression, though not to withhold exhortation or prayer for improvement. In the shī'a he appreciated the love of the Prophet's family, but deprecated their hatred of A'isha. He adapted the Shi'iite belief in the disappearance of the twelfth Imām to his doctrine of the abdāl, who according to him, was raised after his disappearance to the grade of dhikr. He accused Ibn Ḥanbal of idolizing a verb (i'ta'b), by his identification of Being (wujūd) and God; he himself considers Being as an attribute (siḥa) or accident, which, though it is eternally inherent in God, is distinct from His essence (dhāt). For this reason the last degree of the mystic is not khudā, but ukūdāhāyī. The only possible share of man in God is the grace of inner experience. He had a particularly refined feeling for the higher things. To become a mirror in this sense is the aim of manhood and mysticism. Simnān's doctrine was later elaborated by the Cīštī Ahmad-i Sirhindī ([q.v.]; d. 1035/1626) who opposed this renovated doctrine, ukūdāhāyī, to the wujūd-diyāya of Ibn 'Arabī.

Simnān shared his Khurābī strongly mediumistic nature and a preference and capability for visionary experience. He had a particularly refined feeling for spiritual vibrations in his environment; out of a deep sense of the living presence of Khādīr, he insisted on saying "the Lord" Khādir; and at places where he attempted to contact the spirits of the great dead (kawdādūn), he registered the slightest oscillations of experience. Like most of the Khurābīs, in mystical training he accepted the so-called "eight conditions of Dijunayid" (see Meier, Pana'īkh, index), about which we have different statements by him. In addition to the particular dhikr of Kasīrī (cf. above) he had another, viz. the recital of the formula lā ilāha illa'allāh, in four beats; the lā being drawn as it were from the navel, the lālā sunk into the right side of the breast, the illā raised from there, and the allāh thrust into the left side of the breast, the heart (cf. for the recital of this dhikr in two beats Nādir al-Dīn al-Dāyā, Marāšd al-Ṭabād, Teheran 1372/52, 151, and for another practice, 'Aṭīz-i Nasāfī, in WZKM, 1953, 156). Simnān also practised listening to music (samād) and fed in his monastery passing travellers. The greater part of his possessions he left as waḍj for the Shi'īs of his persuasion; he disagreed with the view that the Shi'ī must not have any material possessions, though he demanded that each individual should give away all he had. He denounced begging and in general insisted, in the interest of humanity, upon the most intensive cultivation of the soil, another feature which connects him with Kūbārī and his disciple, Sayf al-Dīn al-Bākhārī.

Simnān aspired to a great number of disciples, hoping that there would be amongst them at least one chosen one. His most important, and for a time most beloved, disciple seems to have been 'Allī Dūstī, who became teacher of 'Allī-i Hamadānī. Names of other disciples are to be found in Ikhbāl-i Sīständ's collections of Simnān's apopthegmata, and especially in Dīstī, Nahkāl al-Ḍunī, 510-24 and Ibn Ḥaḍār al-'Askālānī, al-Darūr al-Kūmīnā, 1, 251. Some of them bore the title of aṭā fundraiser.

There exists as yet no critical bibliography of Simnān and none of his works has been published. For the works in Persian, cf. the catalogues of MSS and for those in Arabic, Brockelmann, II, 263, S II, 281 (delete al-Ḥarīrī al-Shārīd etc. and Tāfīsī al-Sālīhīn). Maghrībī Anwāb al-Kūlūs, al-Urwa li-Ḥal al-Khulānī and Sāfīa'a al-Urwa belong together as different versions of the same work and can be exactly dated: the first 712/1312 (MS Shēbīd 'Allī 1378, not 1328), the second Rāmadān 720/Oct. 1320-23 Muḥarram 721/22 Febr. 1321, and the last Dijunayid II 728/April 1328-12 Dhu 'l-Hijja 728/ 24 Oct. 1328. Some of the surviving MSS are excellent; MS 'Ashīrī I 482 of the Urwa reproduces the autograph, Lālīl 1432 of the Sāfīa'a is dated Šīrāz 683/1283 and was thus written in the lifetime and perhaps under the eyes of the author). The book Fadī al-Shāfī'i (MS Fayd Allāh 2135, not 2133) should probably be called more correctly Fadī al-Tarīkā; it is once quoted by Simnān himself, in accordance with the sub-title of part i, as Tābīn al-Maḥbūl wā-Taswīr al-Dārāqūdī and dates from 712/1312-3. The treatise Mā lā būdū 'l-'Īdīn is in Persian and the treatise on Simnān's affilation, the only correspondence with Dīstī of the same name and is called not Tādākhār, but Ta'dhīb al-Maṣā byłīk. For great importance for Simnān's biography and mystical teaching is the collection of his sayings, made by his disciple Ikhbāl b. Sābīk-i Sīständ preserved in several MSS under the titles of Cīštī Maṭālīs, or Malāfīs-i Sāfīa'a 'Allā al-Dawla-yi Sīständ etc. On this is based the greater part of Dīstī, Nahkālī, 504-15.

Bibliography: Autobiography in Maghrībill, al-Urwa, Sāfīa'a; Ikhbāl-i Sīständ and Dīstī, see above; Nur al-Dīn Dījāfīrī Badaḵšālī, Khwāsāt al-Maḥbūlī (MS Berlin, in Persīc no. 6, 6; MS Oxford, in Ethē, no. 1264); Dawlātshāhī, 251-2; 'Allī b. Ḥusayn-i Wūsī-i Kašīfī, Raṣīkālī Sā'īnī al-Ḥayīdī, Lucknow 1905, 35 (correspondence with 'Allī-i Rāmītānī); 'Abd al-Ḥusayn Nawātī, Ridgāl Kiābābī Ḥabīb al-Sīyār, Teheran 1324, 29-30; Rīqāl Kūl Kbānī Hindāyāt, Riyād al-Afsīnīn, Teheran 1316, 178; and other bibliographical collections; W. Ivanov, in JASB, 1933, 299-303; Maulavī Abdul Hamīd, Cat. of the Arab. and Pers. MSS in the Or. Publ. Libr. at Bankīpore, xiii, no. 905; Mir Valī-ud-Dīn, in JG, 1951, 43-51; F. Meier, in IS, 1937, 14 f.; idem, Die Fawādī al-ṭalām al-Naḥf ad-dīn al-Kūrābī, Mainz 1956, index (F. Meier)

'ALĀ' al-Dīn [see SHURIDS, MA'ĀRĪMĀH, SALĀTĪ].
'ALA\' AL-DIN BEG (commonly 'ALA\' AL-DIN PAŞA), son of 'Oğmân, the founder of the Ottoman state. His figure remains enigmatic, owing to the absence of reliable documents and the tendentious, and rather legendary, character of the early Ottoman chronicles—the same circumstances which are the cause of so many uncertainties in early Ottoman history. In some sources he is called Erden 'All (Ibn Taghribirdi and Ibn Hâdîyar say: "Erden 'All succeeded his father").

According to tradition 'Alâ\' al-Din for some time occupied the post of vizier and commander-in-chief; in effect, in a waâfiyya by him, dated 733/1333, he bears titles which befit a military position. H. Hüsâm al-Din has put forward the suggestion that in reality the two brothers were rivals for the throne and that this fact was purposely distorted in the historical tradition. (Ibn Taghribirdi and Ibn Hâdîyar say: "Erden 'All succeeded his father").

According to tradition 'Alâ\' al-Din died about 1333; the various accounts concerning the circumstances of his death in late authors (such as Nishandji and Bellgh) are not worthy of credit. His tomb is in 'Oğmân's mausoleum. (S. M. STERN)

'ALÂ'IYYA [see ALANYA].

The establishment of various Ottoman institutions is ascribed to 'Alâ\' al-Din: the choice of the coni- cap of white felt as official costume and the waâfiyya founded by him, dated 733/1333, he is mentioned in a waâfiyya by him, dated 733/1333, he bears titles which befit a military position. H. Hüsâm al-Din has put forward the suggestion that in reality the two brothers were rivals for the throne and that this fact was purposely distorted in the historical tradition. (Ibn Taghribirdi and Ibn Hâdîyar say: "Erden 'All succeeded his father").

The historians relate that after the death of 'Oğmân, 'Alâ\' al-Din (who is said to have stayed during his father's lifetime with Edebali in Bileğlik) refused the offer made by Orkhan to assume the direction of the affairs of the state and retired to his property situated in Krotà (or Kudra) in the district of Kete, between Brusa and Mihâkhâlî. 'Alâ\' al-Din is also credited to him by late historians. [Cf. 'Omar Bey vakfiyesi (724), 1941, 276 ff.]

According to tradition 'Alâ\' al-Din died about 1333; the various accounts concerning the circumstances of his death in late authors (such as Nîshânî and Belgh) are not worthy of credit. His tomb is in 'Oğmân's mausoleum in Brusa. Descendants of 'Alâ\' al-Din are mentioned in the latter half of the 15th century by Nîshânî and 'Ashk-pasha-zâde, in the 16th century in landcadasters, in connection with waâfiyya established by their ancestor. —'Alâ\' al-Din founded a tekhe in the Kükkûrtî quarter of Brusa and two mosques in the fortress of Kapûlîja.

Bibliography: 'Ashk-pasha-zâde, Ta'ârîkh, Istanbul 1332, 21, 36 ff.; Nîshânî (Taeşchner), index; Uraji, Tanwarîkh-i Âlî-ê 'Oğmân (Babinger), 5 ff.; Ta'ârîkh-i Âlî-ê 'Oğmân (Gleise); Lüftî Paga, Ta'ârîkh, Istanbul 1341, 27 ff.; Sa'd al-Dîn, Ta'â'î Khâlîfâ, Istanbul 1279, i, 21 ff.; 'Âli, Kunh al-Abârâr, v, 42; Solak-zâde, Ta'ârîkh, Istanbul 1297, 18 ff.; 'Omar, Zavîm, Ta'ârîkh (cf. TOEM, ii, 436-43); Hammer-Purgstall, index; Hüseyîn Hüsâm al-Dîn, 'Alâ\'-al-Dîn Bey, TOEM, xiv, 307 ff., 380 ff., xv, 228 ff., 200 ff. (with excerpts from unpublished sources); I. H. Uzunçarşîlî, Gazi Oğuz Bey waâfiyya (1724), Bel., 276 ff.; IA, s.v. (by I. H. Uzunçarşîlî). (S. M. STERN)
CALAKA — CALAM 349
CALAKA (see NISBA). CALAM, plural ac/am (A), i. “signpost, flag”, used in the latter sense especially with the Arabic liwa?, rāya; the Persian band, dīrāfšā; and the Turkish bayrak = liwā', sandğā: see SANDJAQ, and compare the Latin signa.

It is known that when, before the advent of Islam, the Kuraysh waged war on another tribe, they received from the hands of Kusayy the liwā', a piece of white cloth which Kusayy himself had attached to a lance (Caussin de Perceval, Essai, i, 232-8). During Muhammad’s lifetime, flags were called indifferently liwā' or rāya, less commonly ‘alam. Tradition, however, says that the flag (‘alam) of the Prophet was called ‘ukdā. Other traditions contrast the rāya, the Prophet’s black flag, with his liwā', which was white (Kanz al-‘Ummd, iv, 18, no. 346: 45, no. 995). In another tradition the proposal is made to Muhammad that the faithful should be called to prayer by the raising of a rāya, but he will not consent to this method of summoning them (ibid., iv, 264, no. 5461). In yet other traditions, however, liwā' and rāya appear to be synonymous (ibid., v, 268, no. 5337: 269, no. 15338). The use of the rāya does not seem to have been confined exclusively to Muslims, since, at Badr, Ṭālḥa carried the rāya of the idolaters (ibid., 269, no. 1536). Later, flags played an important part in Islam. The Umayyads adopted white, the ‘Abbasids black, and the Shi‘ites green. Representations of flags occur frequently on various objects, especially in miniatures. One of the oldest representations is that shown on a Persian lustre-ware plate, which unquestionably dates from the 10th century (Survey, pl. 577). For other later drawings of flags, see Underkoweka, 568. Compère also the Moorish flag of the 14th century preserved in Toledo cathedral (Kühnel, Maurische Kunst, pl. 149). Banners and standards were also used in Egypt and Syria during the Mamlūk period (see Leo A. Mayer, Mamluk Costume, s.v. Banners; Mahrzul, Ḥašt, i, 23 ff.: Mārkūn al-bunud). There may at this period have been some differentiation in the use of the various words meaning “flag”.

In epigraphy, an inscription of Kābytāy balances the words sayf and alam with liwā' and alam, which seems to suggest that the first term denotes a military standard, the second a religious flag (see J. David-Weill, Catalogue général du Musée arabe du Caire, Bois d'épigraphes depuis l'époque mamlouke, iv, 193, note 11: Gauduroy-Denomybones, Ihm Fādī Allāh, Matālik al-ābyr fi mamālik al-ansār, XLVD-LVI and 26). Numerous flags with religious inscriptions are preserved in museums; they usually date from the 17th or 18th century and the majority derive from the countries of the Middle East and North Africa. (Cf., among others, a Turkish flag: C. J. Lamm, Mamlūk Mecīn Venetj, Malmö 1940; in Turkish Fana, Malmö 1940.) Some flags are still used in processions conducted by religious orders.

For Turkish standards see TUGH, SANDJAQ. For the emblem of the crescent see HILL, for that of the lion and the sun, aṣṣir u-khurūdī. For heraldic symbols, see ŞĀKH, TANGHA.

‘ALAMA — ‘ALAM 349
‘ALAMA, plural a‘lam (A), i. “signpost, flag”, used in the latter sense especially with the Arabic liwā', rāya; the Persian band, dīrāfšā; and the Turkish bayrak = liwā', sandğā: see SANDJAQ, and compare the Latin signa.

It is known that when, before the advent of Islam, the Kuraysh waged war on another tribe, they received from the hands of Kusayy the liwā', a piece of white cloth which Kusayy himself had attached to a lance (Caussin de Perceval, Essai, i, 232-8). During Muhammad’s lifetime, flags were called indifferently liwā’ or rāya, less commonly ‘alam. Tradition, however, says that the flag (‘alam) of the Prophet was called ‘ukdā. Other traditions contrast the rāya, the Prophet’s black flag, with his liwā‘, which was white (Kanz al-‘Umml, iv, 18, no. 346: 45, no. 995). In another tradition the proposal is made to Muhammad that the faithful should be called to prayer by the raising of a rāya, but he will not consent to this method of summoning them (ibid., iv, 264, no. 5461). In yet other traditions, however, liwā’ and rāya appear to be synonymous (ibid., v, 268, no. 5337: 269, no. 15338). The use of the rāya does not seem to have been confined exclusively to Muslims, since, at Badr, Tālḥa carried the rāya of the idolaters (ibid., 269, no. 1536). Later, flags played an important part in Islam. The Umayyads adopted white, the ‘Abbasids black, and the Shi‘ites green. Representations of flags occur frequently on various objects, especially in miniatures. One of the oldest representations is that shown on a Persian lustre-ware plate, which unquestionably dates from the 10th century (Survey, pl. 577). For other later drawings of flags, see Underkoweka, 568. Compère also the Moorish flag of the 14th century preserved in Toledo cathedral (Kühnel, Maurische Kunst, pl. 149). Banners and standards were also used in Egypt and Syria during the Mamlūk period (see Leo A. Mayer, Mamluk Costume, s.v. Banners; Mahrzul, Ḥašt, i, 23 ff.: Mārkūn al-bunud). There may at this period have been some differentiation in the use of the various words meaning “flag”.

In epigraphy, an inscription of Kābytāy balances the words sayf and alām with band and ālam, which seems to suggest that the first term denotes a military standard, the second a religious flag (see J. David-Weill, Catalogue général du Musée arabe du Caire, Bois d'épigraphes depuis l'époque mamlouke, iv, 193, note 11: Gauduroy-Denomybones, Ihm Fādī Allāh, Matālik al-ābyr fi mamālik al-ansār, XLVD-LVI and 26). Numerous flags with religious inscriptions are preserved in museums; they usually date from the 17th or 18th century and the majority derive from the countries of the Middle East and North Africa. (Cf., among others, a Turkish flag: C. J. Lamm, Mamlūk Mecīn Venetj, Malmö 1940; in Turkish Fana, Malmö 1940.) Some flags are still used in processions conducted by religious orders.

For Turkish standards see TUGH, SANDJAQ. For the emblem of the crescent see HILL, for that of the lion and the sun, aṣṣir u-khurūdī. For heraldic symbols, see ŞĀKH, TANGHA.

Bibliography: In addition to the references already mentioned: Freytag, Einleitung, 262 ff.; Jacob, Altabarabische Beduinenleben*, 136; Mez, Renaissance, 130-1; G. van Vloten, De ophoem der Abbasiden, 137 ff.; idem, Les drapeaux en usage à la fête de Hujjat à Téhéran, Intern. Archiv für Ethnographie, 1892, 109 ff.; Herklotz, On the customs of the Moosulmans of India, 176 ff.; A. Sakisian, in Syria, 1941, 66-80; Phyllis Ackerman, in A. U. Pope, Survey of Persian Art, iii, 2766-82. (J. David-Weill)

ii. Proper noun, see ISM.

‘ĀLAM (A., pl. ‘ālamān, ‘awulim), world. i. The word is found as early as the Kur‘ān, where in borrowed formulae we have references to the rabb al-‘ālam and the seven samawāt. Allāh is its lord and creator who has created it for man as a sign of his omnipotence. This transitory world (dunyā) is of little value—not worth the wing of a midge” is the traditional expression—in comparison with the next (akhirā). We are told very little about the structure of the world (cf. the article MĀJlis); the subjects of interest, in the Kur‘ān as well as in Tradition, are God, the spiritual world and man.

This became altered as Islam took over the inheritance of Hellenistic eclecticism and especially through the translation of Indian and Greek works on science and philosophy. The huge figures with which the Hindus operated were, it is true, ridiculed, nor were the fables of the ancient Greeks about an endless plurality of worlds beside or in succession to one another, believed nor, from the theological point of view at least, was the belief in the eternity of the world accepted; on the one whole however, the picture of the world as given by Greek science was accepted. The teaching of Plato and Aristotle that there is only one universe was naturally easy to reconcile with the monotheism of Islam; cf. Kur‘ān, xxi, 22: “If there were in these two worlds gods in addition to Allāh, both (heaven and earth) would perish”.

On the scientific development of the cosmogonic teaching of Aristotle and Ptolemy in Islam, see the articles NDJUM (Astronomy and Astrology) and the article Sun, Moon and Stars in Hastings, Encycl., of Rel. and Ethics (by C. A. Nallino). Here we must confine ourselves to the speculations of the theologians and philosophers regarding the origin and nature of the world in relation to the existence of God and man. They are mainly based on Plato’s Timaeus or Aristotle’s Πείξ οὐράνιος and Book Α of his Metaphysics and also on the commentaries of Simplicius and Johannes Philoponus. Of the greatest importance for the Islamic elaboration of the Greek philosophy we have the neo-Platonic ‘Theology of Aristotle’ and to some extent the tradition of Christian dogmatics. In reference to Aristotle’s work Πείξ οὐράνιος (“On the Universe”), it should be noted that according to Hellenistic tradition the title of the Arabic tradition is fi ‘l-Samā’ wa ‘l-‘Ālam (“On Heaven and the World”). August Müller (Die griechischen Philosophen in der arabischen Überlieferung, Halle 1873, 51) therefore suggested that the Arab translators of the Aristotelian work had added to it the Πείξ κόσμου which is three hundred years later and influenced by the Stoics. But so far no translation of this work ascribed to Aristotle has been found.

All Muslim thinkers asserted that God is the author of the world although they used different expressions for the coming into existence of the world in distinction to the existence of God: creation (fayd) or manifestation (fadhālī). The image most used, whether emanation or manifestation was talked of, was that of light (mūr) which disseminates itself timelessly.

In general the theologian who adhered to tradition said that the reason for the world was the all-powerful will of God. Mut‘azzil thinkers
laid more emphasis on the benevolent wisdom of the Creator, who orders everything well for the good of his servants. Mystics talked a great deal about the overflow of divine love; finally the philosophers in the narrower sense, as well as a few speculative theologians, regarded the world as the product of pure thought, in itself accidental, but necessary on God's part.

The world forms a whole, a unity in plurality. Even the atomist theologians, who denied any interconnection in nature, were of the opinion that no part of the world but only the whole could be destroyed at once by an act or an omission of God.

The world is a plurality. The traditional distinctions between heaven and earth or between this world and the next continued. But Hellenistic mediatorial theories complicated this originally simple universe. From Plato came the division between the visible world of beings (κόσμος ζωτικός) and the spiritual intelligible world (κόσμος νοητός). Aristotle rather emphasised the distinction between our earthly world of origin and decline (ʾālam al-kawn waʿl-faṣād) and the world of the heavenly spheres. The world of heaven controlled by exalted spirits or souls, consisting of one element entirely, the ether, and provided from eternity with the most beautiful motion revolving in a circle, is far more perfect than the earthly world with its four elementary circles and motions of various kinds. Then came the Stoics who brought God and the world together and worked out a theodicy. Finally came the Neo-Pythagoreans and Neo-Platonists, who took over a great deal from Aristotle and the Stoics, but with Plato, and much more decidedly than he, transferred the central point into the world of God and of pure spiritual existence.

This is the starting point of the cosmological speculations of the Muslim thinkers just as it was for the Gnosis and the doctrine of the Eastern Christian church. Since God is the highest being and everything in the most exalted sense, so also is He the first world. The mystics in Islam (cf. al-Dhūlī, al-Insān al-Kāmil, ch. 1 ff. and Horton, Das philosophische System von Schirāzī, Strassburg 1913, 36, 276 ff.) in so far as they were influenced by Christian dogmatics, ultimately talked of five worlds: 1. the world of the divine being; 2. of his names; 3. of his qualities; 4. of his actions; 5. of his works. Others established mediation between God and the world by triads and tetrads. Emphasis on three qualities of God was very common: power, knowledge, and life (in speculation these were no doubt interpreted as the power of the Creator, the knowledge of the ʿābī and the life of the soul). God's spheres of activity in the world were determined according to his qualities. When for example al-Ghazzāl, speaks of three worlds (ʿālam al-mulḥ, ʿālam al-malahūtī, al-djābarūt), this looks like a triad for the spheres of the Creator's power (for Ghazzālī's immediate sources see Wensinck (Bibli.)).

To distinguish three or four worlds the philosophers as a rule used the neo-Platonic terminology from the "Theology of Aristotle": the world of the mind (ʿābī), of the soul (nafs) and of nature (nabīfa). The soul of man is there the centre of interest which, although associated with a mortal body, remains, in so far as it is intelligent, always associated with the highest world, its origin and the goal of its longing, through the mediation of the world soul and the world intelligence. From the point of view of this soul, only two worlds are as a rule mentioned: the physical and the spiritual, the lower and the upper world. If it is desired to define more closely the sphere ruled by the soul it is called the world of the heavenly spheres and its site (awḥid) is transferred to the sphere of the fixed stars. The world of pure intellectual being has a superheavenly site (al-awḥid al-aṣlī) and nature has its special sphere of operation in the sub-lunary world.

It is not possible here to go into the modifications of this cosmogony in the different philosophers. The main object in all cases is to indicate the different stages of being and parallel with them the stages of cognition. The world is a man on a large scale and man a little world. Now man is made up of a natural body, a conceiving soul and a pure intelligence. The sub-lunary world is therefore also called the world of sensual perception (gahāda, biss); the world of the heavenly spheres that of allegorical conception (waḥm, takhsaywu), if we assume, e.g. with Ibn Sina that the souls of the spheres possess a power of imagining (Ibn Rushd denies this); and the super-heavenly world that of pure thought or of intellectual observation (ʿābī, nasār etc.).

Of the great deal that could still be said let us only emphasise one thing in conclusion, that is the optimism of the mystics, who took over a great deal from Aristotle and the Stoics, but with Plato, and much more decidedly than he, transferred the central point into the world of God and of pure spiritual existence.
the diabarut (Aramaic terms); and, transcending them both, the world of the lāhūt (Kur'ānic terms); and, transcending them both, the world of the Idhūt.

Ldhūt (antonym of mdsūt, “humanity”): the incomunicable world of the divine essence—a world occurring frequently in Hallājīan terminology. In general: the world of absolute divine transcendence, and therefore absolutely superior to all other “spheres of existence”. For some supporters of Munit tendencies, mālākūt and ḍabārūt are, as it were, assumed by lāhūt; this is then the ʿdam al-ghayb, the world of Mystery (uncreated).

ʿAlam al-mulk, a term of Kur'ānic origin, “the world of kingship” (synonyms: ʿdam al-khalq, ʿdam al-ghādīhā, the latter expression being frequently used by al-Ghazzālī): it is the world of becoming, the world here below.

ʿAlam al-malakūt, similarly of Kur'ānic origin, (cf. Kur'ān, vi, 75; vī, 185; xxiii, 88; xxvi, 93): “the world of Kingdom, of Sovereignty”, of which the ʿdam al-mulk is the contingent reflection. It is the world of immutable spiritual truths (ḥabībīk), and hence of the angelic beings, to which are added the cutūs of Islamic tradition, the Preserved Table, the Pen, and the Scales (see al-wād‘ wa-l-wā‘īn), and often also the Kur'ān. The spiritual reality (rūḥ) which is in man belongs to it. So too do the separated intellects, and hence of the angels which partake of them. Al-Dūrjānī (Ta‘rīfū, 246) includes the nūsūs (souls) which are sometimes assigned to the ʿdam al-ḡabarūt. Common synonyms: ʿadam al-ghayb, ʿadam al-amr. This “world of Sovereignty” recalls the “City of the Angels” of Gregory of Nyssa.

ʿAlam al-ḡabarūt, a term originating in Tradition, occurring in various ḥadīth (see A. J. Wensinck, La pensée de G Cached, 83 n. 3) “the world of divine Omnipotence”. In general, the place of barzakh, an “intermediate” world (some texts, however, are inclined to put this last near to the malakūt). To it belong, according to al-Ghazzālī, the impressive and imaginative faculties of the human soul. Sometimes, however, as is pointed out by al-Dūrjānī, following Abū Ṭālib al-Makki (Ta‘rīfū, 77), ḍabarūt is the world of the divine Names and Attributes. Al-Rāshī assigns to it ḥād (decree of divine predestination); the Preserved Table has also been assigned to it.

The mutual inter-relation of these various “worlds”.

(1) The ʿalam al-mithāl can coincide either with the malakūt, or with the ḍabarūt, or with both together. It is in fact stated (al-Ghazzālī) that the world of sensual perception is the reflection, the image, the copy of the ʿalam al-malakūt: cf. the “shadows” of the cave of Plato. In so far as the ʿalam al-mithāl denotes the idea of archetypical images, it also recalls the ḍabarūt and the barzakh. To sum up: malakūt is the world of pure self-existent intelligibilia; ḍabarūt, the world of the archetypical images and symbols of the contingent world, evoking the idea of “transcendental imagination”, in Heidegger’s acceptance. According to the Avicennan cosmogony, the active intellects belong to malakūt, the celestial souls to ḍabarūt.

(2) Whether this hierarchy of “worlds” is considered as real or as a privileged myth, the ṣāliṣa, al-Ghazzālī, and the ṣāriḥiyūn teach, from the standpoint peculiar to each school, how man can elevate himself from the ʿalam al-mulk to the two superior worlds. This is the ḥājī (unveiling) or mukhājīfa. Al-Ghazzālī (Iḥyā‘, iii, 17-19) tells us that the heart (kabī) has “two doors”, the one open towards the world of the malakūt, the other towards the world of the mulk or ẓahāhā. Further, referring to the relationship of the macrocosm-microcosm, the same author sees in man—body, psychic faculties, and spirit—a reflection of the three worlds—mulk, ḍabarūt and malakūt. It can happen, however, that the relationship between the two worlds is reversed. The following summary classification can be made: the world of amr is opposed to the (perceivable) world of ḍabarūt, and the amr combines ḍabarūt, malakūt, and mithāl.

(3) Some ambiguity exists regarding the mutual relation between malakūt and ḍabarūt: (a) the thesis of al-Ghazzālī (cf. above): malakūt, the world of intelligible realities to which belong the Angels, “light-substances” (cf. the Ghazzālīan text of the Miṣkīt al-Annā‘): is practically synonymous with ʿdam al-amr, the world of Command, of the divine Logos uncreated. The ḍabarūt becomes therefore a refraction of the light emanating from this higher world into an intermediate world of archetypal images, and is thence accessible to the insight of a prophet or a gnostic (ʿṣrīf), who borrows from it symbols for the instruction of the people. In the Iḥyā‘, al-Ghazzālī compares the journey through the ʿdam al-mulk to the progress of man on earth; that through the ʿdam al-ḡabarūt to a voyage on a ship; that through the ʿdam al-malakūt to the progress of a man with the desire to cross the barzakh which separates him from the waters. Clearly, therefore, the ḍabarūt is the “intermediate” world, “in contact with both the others”. It “can be manifested in the visible world, although the eternal Power has linked it to the world of the malakūt”, says al-Ghazzālī in the Imlā‘. The superioriety of the malakūt is also affirmed by Ibn ʿAtā‘ Allāh of Alexandria, etc. (b) In other texts, particularly, it seems, those representing the Sufi line of thought of the ḍabarūt and the mulk, the ʿdam al-mithāl is held to be the “City of the Angels” of Gregory of Nyssa. Thus in the Turkish dictionary Ma‘rifet-name (cf. Carra de Vaux, in Bīb.) the following hierarchy in descending order is given: (1) ʿsrā‘ (divine Throne or Tabernacle), (2) ḍabarūt, (3) ʿursī (divine Seat), (4) malakūt, (5) human worlds, including Paradise. The (according to W. Montgomery-Watt, apocopral) Ghazzālīan text al-Durrā al-Fākhira states: the race of Adam, and the animals, belong to the world of the mulk; the angels and the djinn to the world of the malakūt; the “elect among the angels” to the world of the ḍabarūt (cf. Wensinck, op. cit., 99). Or again: the Kur’ān (uncreated), the substantial Word of God, “exists personally” in the ḍabarūt, while ʿalam (salāt, sawm, sabr) belongs to the malakūt.

Al-Suhrawardī, “master of the ḥājīk”, brings together in the same passage (Bīḥmat al-İshrāk, ed. Corbin, 156-7) the “light which permeates the world of the ḍabarūt and the entities of the malakūt”. Other passages from the same work sometimes treat of the ḍabarūt, sometimes of the “victorials” of the malakūt, both worlds being the hierarchized places of archangelic or intelligible irradiations (ıshrābkī).

The mutual inter-relation between the suprasensory worlds can thus vary. Each case where the words are mentioned must be considered in its context, while the indications derived from the etymology can serve as a orientation.

Bibliography: Numerous texts by al-Ghazzālī, among others, Iḥyā‘, Cairo 1352/1933, i, 107, iii, 17-19, iv, 20, 212 ff., etc.; Imlā‘ (in margin of the Iḥyā‘, with inversion of texts 168-71 and 135-41), in Iḥyā‘, i, 49, 170-1, 135, etc. See also Kitāb, Arba‘ in, Miṣkīt, Durrā, etc.; Ibn ʿAtā‘ Allāh of
Alexandria, Miftâh al-Falâq, Cairo, n. d., 5-6; Suhrawardi, Oeuvres philosophiques et mystiques, ed. H. Corbin, ii, Teheran-Paris, 1952; al-Mâdhûl al-'Alîsîyya al-'Alâ'îfîmiyya, ed. by 'Abd al-Rahmân Badawi, Cairo 1947. (On the concept of mîthâl, see the texts of Fârâbî, Ibn Sînâ, and others.) The Rasâ'il of Ibn 'Arabi, Haydarâbâd 1367/1948, still remain to be analyzed.—Carra de Vaux, La Philosophie illuminative d'après Suhrawardi Meqtoul, J.A., 1902, 78; also, Fragments d'escholologie musulmane, Brussels 1895, 27 ff. (with an explanation of the figure in the Ma'ârif-nâmê); S. Guyard, Traité du dârîr et de l'arrêt divin par le Dr. Soufi Abî er-Razzag, 1879, 3-4 (text); A. J. Wensinck, La pensée de Ghazzâlî, Paris 1940, chap. iii; idem, On the Relation between Ghazzâlî's Cosmology and his Mysticism, Med. Ak. v. Wissenschaften, Amsterdam, 1956, 75; A. J. W. Smith, Avicenne et le Réal visionnaire, Teheran-Paris 1954, i. 34 ff. (Ibn Sînâ's idea of mîthâl). (L. GarDET)

AL-ALAM — AL-SHAMATARI [see AL-SHAN- 
TAMARI].

'ALÂMA, mark of ratification or initialling used in the Muslim west, from the time of the Mu'innid dynasty, on all official chancery documents. This 'alâma, in principle inscribed by the sovereign's own hand in the space provided for the purpose at the head of the document, beneath the basmâla, consisted of a doxology, which varied under the different dynasties:

- 'alâma al-bându 'l-ilâhâ, under the Mu'innids and Sa'dids;
- 'alâma al-bându 'l-ilâhâ wa 'l-fâhru 'l-ilâhâ, under the Hâfids; and
- 'alâma al-bându 'l-ilâhâ wa 'l-Nâşrî 'l-ilâhâ under the Nasrids of Granada.

This 'alâma was gradually replaced by illegible arabesque initials, and supplanted, in modern times, by the seal in indelible ink.

At the beginning of the 9th/10th century, the chronicler Abu 'l-Walid b. al-Ahmar devoted a short treatise, Mustawafa' al-'Alâma, to the formula of ratification (cf. Hespéris, 1934, 200).

Bibliography: E. Lévi-Provençal, Un recueil de lettres officielles almohades, Paris 1944, 17-9; the same, Arabica occidentalis, v (in Arabica, ii, 1955, 477); on the 'alâma of the 'Abbâsid caliph of Baghdad, al-Mustâshir bi-l-Hakîr bi-l-ilâhâ; H. de Castries, Les signes de validation des Chérifs saadiens, Hespéris, 1921, 231 ff. (E. Lévi-ProvençAL)

ALAMAK [see NUDJUM].

ALAMIC [see AWANGZA].

AL-'ALAMI, the name of an old Jerusalem family, the nishâb being to one al-'Alam al-Dîn Sulaymân (d. 790/1388). The family traces its descent to Ibn Maqâsh and may have been one of the many Maqâsh families which immigrated to Jerusalem in the 14th century, though Muqâr al-Dîn hints (ii, 616) that it was of Turcoman origin. Two sons of al-'Alam al-Dîn: Masûd (d. 802/1399) and Umâr (d. 806/ 
1403), succeeded one another as governors of the city (nâsir 'al-salâma), and keepers of the sacred places of Jerusalem and Hebron (nâsir 'al-haramayn), and at least three other members of the family became chiefs of police (amir hâdîsh) before this post was merged into the governorship by al-Asfâr of Nablûs, 857/1453. Muhammad al-'Alâmi (d. Jerusalem, 1038/1628), the grandson of the latter, was one of the more famous Sufi saints of his day in Syria. He conceived the plan of building a mosque near the site of the Place of Ascension on the Mt. of Olives, which the Christians of Jerusalem at first thwarted by appealing to Const}

stantineople. But Shaykh Muhammad enlisted the support of Shaykh As'ad b. Hasan, the mujtâhids of Constantinople (al-Mu'âbbid, i, 396), after whom the building, when completed, in 1035/1621 was called al-As'âdiyya, and where Muhammad was later buried. Muhammad's teaching was carried on by his nephew Shâhî (d. 1055/1645), who also became the grand imam of the mosque of Constantine. Early in the present century the Alâmis re-entered administrative life with Fâyûd Allah (who was also the author of the Concordance of the Qur'an, Fath al-Rahmân, Cairo 1927, 1955) and his son, Mûsâ (still alive).

Bibliography: Muhammad, Ums, i, 506, 609; Mu'âbbid, index; Murâdî, i, 49, 71, 116, ii, 330, iii, 88, iv 218; Husâni, Tâdżjîm All al- 

(W. A. S. Khalidi)

AL-ÂLÂMI, Muhammad b. al-Tayyib, Moroc-
can poet and man of letters belonging to the branch of the Shurarâ' 'Alamiyyûn (or descendants of the Moroccan saint 'Abd al-Salâm b. Maqâsh [q.v.], who is buried among the 'Jâlibâ), in Djabal al-'Alâm, north Morocco). Born and educated at Fâs, he lived for a while at Mêkinâ, at the court of Mawlay Isma'il, and died at Cairo, on his way to Arabi to perform the pilgrimage, in 1134 or 1135/ 
1721-23. He has left a work, which is at once an anthology of poetry and a compilation on certain technical subjects, in which there is much information on Moroccan literary life at the beginning of the 12th/18th century; this work, entitled al-Nizâ al-Murîf fi-man lakîtuhu min Udâhû al-Maghrib, was lithographed at Fâs in 1315 A. H.

Bibliography: E. Lévi-Provençal, Chorfa, 1957 (and references quoted); Brockelmann, S II, 684; J. Berque, La littérature marocaine et l'Orient au XVIIIe siècle, Arabic, 1955, 311-2. (L. Lévi-ProvençAL)

ALÂMÎT. (i) The fortress; (ii) the dynasty and state.

(i) THE FORTRESS.

The ruins of the fortress of Alâmit are situated on the summit of a lofty and almost inaccessible rock in the heart of the Alburz mountains, at the foot of the Caspian, Journal of the Royal Geographical Society, iii; J. Shiel, Itinerary from Teheran to Alâmit and Khurram Abad in May, 1837, ibid., viii; L. Lockhart, Hasan-i Sabbâh and the Assassins, BOSOS, v, 675-96; W. Ivanow (who is doubtful
regarding the identification of Alamūt), Some Ismi'ālī Strongholds in Persia, IC, xii, 382-92; F. Stark, The Valleys of the Assassins, London 1934.

(ii) THE DYNASTY.

Alamūt was the center of a Shi`īte state between 483/1090 and 653/1255 with territories scattered unevenly from Syria to eastern Iran, ruled by the head of the Niẓārī Ismai'īlī [q.v.] sect, sometimes called the Assassins.

The state grew out of an attempt by the Ismai'īlls of Iran to break the power of the Sunnite Saldūqs on behalf of the Fātimid rulers of Egypt. Their revolt began in the last years of Malikshāh's reign, spreading especially during the troubled time of Burqiyūrūq; Ismai'īlls seized strongholds in Kūhīstān, Kūmīs, Fārs, al-Dālāl, Erām, and Syria, and elsewhere, and Ismai'īll troops intervened in the civil war. Among the leaders the most important were the learned 'Abd al-Malik b. 'Aṭṭāṣh, dā'ī (chief propagandist) of Iṣfahān, his son Ahmad b. 'Aṭṭāṣh, who seized Shāhādīz near Iṣfahān in 494/1100, and Ḥasan-i Shābabā at Alamūt. He controlled an Ismai'īll strongholds in Kūhīstān and around Alamūt, of which the fortress of Girdkhū near Dāmghān in Kūmīs, and of numerous towns in Kūhīstān south of Khurāsān. In addition, he was the leader of most of the Ismai'īlls under Saldūq control in Iran and the Fertile Crescent and even a few partisans of Niẓār in Egypt. With a later small addition in Syria, the territory of the state remained substantially the same till its end, while the importance of Ismai'īll adherents in the surrounding lands seems to have declined rapidly.

The history of the state was dominated by a sustained hostility between the Ismai'īlls and the surrounding Sunnite and even Shi`īte populations; a hostility expressed on the one side in repeated massacres of all suspected Ismai'īlls in a town and on the other side in assassinations of their most active enemies, such as Niẓār al-Mulk [q.v.]. Assassination was not in itself unusual at that time, but its systematic use by the Ismai'īlls produced a special terror. Especially in the earlier years, Ismai'īlls owing allegiance to the sect leadership at Alamūt lived interspersed among the people, keeping their unpopular faith secret with Shi`īte tabiyya. Those detailed to get rid of some persecuting kādī or amir sometimes stalked their victim with signal devotion, finally killing him spectacularly in public. Any public murder therefore was likely to be an act of Ismai'īlls; hence a nickname of theirs, al-Hāshibhīyya, has come to mean the word assassins in Western languages. (There is no evidence that the use of the drug ḥabbāsh entered in any way into the assassinations.) Eventually, at least, assassination as a weapon became institutionalized, assassins being kept in readiness at hostile courts and their services perhaps even hired out to friendly rulers. Substitution and war almost never ceased between the Ismai'īll state and the surrounding peoples; raiding Ismai'īll villages and slaughtering their inhabitants was considered a pious act among the Sunnites, while the Ismai'īlls in their isolated districts maintained a united front against outsiders until the end.

Ḥasan-i Shābabā died in 518/1124, leaving the leadership to one of his generals, Buzurg-um-mūd, as dā'ī of Daylamān. Buzurg-um-mūd's son Muḥammād succeeded him in 552/1158. During these two reigns defense against Saldūq rulers, especially Sanjīr and Maḥmūd, alternated with local raids against mountain rivals or nearby towns like ʿAskān. Of symbolic importance were the assassinations of two Ḥābbāsīd caliphs, al-Mustansīr and al-Rāshīd. Meanwhile, after playing a calamitous role in the politics of Aleppo and Damascus, the Syrian Ismai'īlls finally acquired for the state the fortresses of a part of Djabal Bahrā, north of the Lebanon.

Muḥammād's son, Ḥasan II, who succeeded in 557/1162, declared himself in 559/1164 no longer simply dā'ī but bāhīla, plenipotentiary of the long-hidden ṣan`am; and probably hinted that he was himself that ṣan`am. Proclaiming the Day of Resurrection, the spiritual consummation of the world, he abolished the Shi`īte qarṣa law as inconsistent with the mystical life in Paradise to which Ismai'īlls were hitherto called; thus consecrating irrevocably the breach with the Muslim community at large. Some objected to the new order, and in 561/1166 Ḥasan was murdered; but his young son Muḥammād II took firm control and carried through his father's policy. Henceforward the ruler of Alamarin was regarded as an Ḥālid ṣan`am, lineal descendant of Niẓār. But external relations remained much as before; Muḥammād had a long and relatively peaceful reign, troubled toward its end by the enmity of the Ḥūraʿrāmāsh. During his reign Syrian Ismai'īllism was dominated by the able Rāshīd al-Dīn Sinān [q.v.], who acted with apparent independence of Alamūt in his quarrells and rapprochements with Aleppo and Salādin, with the Crusaders, and with the Nusayrī mountain-people about him. But after his death in 589/1193 the authority of Alamūt was unquestioned.

The son of Muḥammād II, Ḥasan III, succeeded in 607/1210 and declared himself a Sunnite Muslim, ordering all his followers to accept the Sunnite qarṣa, and aligning himself with, among others, the caliph al-Nāṣir. The Ismai'īlls accepted his decrees outwardly; he made minor conquests in alliance with Uzbag of Ṭāhār-bāyādīān. But when he died in 618/1221 (perhaps by poison) his young son who succeeded, Muḥammād III, was not brought up a Sunnite; and though officially Ḥasan's decrees probably stood, in fact the qarṣa was dropped and the state resumed its political isolation.

Nevertheless, a broad Islamic outlook was maintained. Naṣīr al-Dīn Tūsī [q.v.] and other scholars were attracted to its fortresses; and ambitious quarrells were carried on with Djalal al-Dīn Mangūbir [q.v.] and then with the Mongols; allies were sought even in western Europe. But the Sunnites' ingrained hatred finally prevailed. The Mongol Hūlāgū's first objective in Iran was to destroy the Ismai'īll state. Muḥammād had developed a degenerate character and his refusal to negotiate frightened his generals, who were evidently hoping to circumvent him when a courtier murdered him, in 653/1255.
After ambivalent negotiations and the fall of many fortresses, his son Khwurshah surrendered unconditionally in 654/1256. He was soon killed, and the Isma'iliyya of Daylamān, Kūmīn, and Kuhistān were massacred; the survivors never succeeded in reestablishing the state. The Syrian fortresses survived the Mongols only to be taken by Baybars of Egypt, who however left them as an autonomous community, furnishing assassins to their new overlords.


M. G. S. Hodgson

ALĀN (in Arabic usually taken as al-Lan), a Persian term (Aṣlan < Aryan) of Northern Caucasus, formerly attested also east of the Caspian sea (see al-Birūnī, Taḥfīḍh al-ʿAḍāmīn, ed. A. Z. Validi, in Birūnī’s Picture of the world, 57), as supported by local toponymy. The Alans are mentioned in history from the first century A.D. In 371 they were defeated by the Huns. Together with the Vandals, a part of the Alans migrated to the West across France and Spain, and finally took part in the creation of the Vandal kingdom in North Africa (428-534). On conquering this kingdom Justinian assumed the title of king of “Vandals and Alans”. The Alans remaining north of the Caucasus became neighbours consecutively of the Bulgars, the Turks and the Khaizar, who pushed them out of the plains towards the mountains. In 1197/98 Marwān b. Mūhammad ‘entered the Khaizar country from the direction of Bah al-Lan (Darial)’ (see al-Baladhurī, p. 207 [Ibn al-ṭabar, v, 160]).

The Alans were the ancestors of the present-day Ossets whose name (in Georgian: Ows-et-c; in Russian: Ovsyetski) is derived from a sandjak, a small administrative district in medieval European sources). From 692/ 1293 ʿAḥlāyya belonged to the princely residence of Karaman; Ibn Bāṭūṭah (ii, 257 f.) found there in ca. 1333 Yusuf Beg as prince of the Karaman. According to al-Maqrīzī (al-Sūdākī, s.a.) the town was sold by the Karaman to the Mamlūk sultan Barsbey in 830/1427; but according to the Ottoman chronicles the town was, later in the 15th century, in the possession of a descendant of the Saljuq dynasty. In 876/1471-2 the town was captured by Gedik Ahmed Paşa, Mehmed II’s general (Nesfrī, Taeschner, i, 205 f.). From then on ʿAḥlāyya remained in Ottoman hands and was the capital of a levān (sandjak) in the eyālet of İdel (Kütb ğeçebi, Dīhān-/name, 611).

The old town of ʿAḥlāyya was situated on the mountain, which slopes steeply to the W. and S., but descends more gradually to the E and N. To the north it is connected with the mainland only by a narrow neck of land, and thus forms together with the latter two bays, of which, however, only the eastern one served, and serves still, as a harbour. The old town on the mountain is surrounded by a wall which starts from a strong octagonal tower in the Alpine range. The Alan capital M.gh.s mentioned in the Murādī, ii, 42, should be read *Magas and explained in Arabic as *diyāma, “a fly” (not diyāma as in the Paris edition).

The Alans (or ʿĀs) are frequently mentioned at the time of the Mongol invasion when they were Greek Christians. Their settlements in the 13th century extended towards Darband and the estuary of the Volga. The Alans had close relations with the Byzantines, the Georgians and the Russians (the latter called them Yash). The Mongol conquest led to a further dispersion of the Alans, whose military contingents and settlers are known even in China. The Persian sources know the ʿĀs as Christians at the court of the Mongol sovereigns, but according to Ibn Bāṭūṭah (Defrémyer), ii, 448, the ʿĀs in Sarāy on the Volga were Muslims.


W. Barthold-V. Minorsky
the NE side of the peninsula on the eastern shore, made of red sand-stone (hence the name Klzil Kule) and dated 623/1226, and ascends up to the summit of the mountain at the southern end of the peninsula. The area so enclosed is further divided by two transverse walls, of which the upper, southern one encloses, together with the outer wall, the citadel (i.e. Kal'e) lying at the summit, the other the outer fortress (Dish Kal'e). In Turkish times, the citadel served as barracks for the garrison; it is uninhabited today, but contains the ruins of a Byzantine church. The outer fortress was the residential area of the old town; it contains a küban (caravanserai; not, it seems, a bedestân, as is often stated) of the early Ottoman period, an old, though in its present state only Ottoman, mosque (Kal'e Džami) and the türbe (from 628/1230) of a certain Akšihebe Sǜlān. The mosque called after 'Alá' al-Din, situated outside the outer fortress, does not seem to be very old. On the shore there is an arsenal (gerdane) built, according to its inscription, by 'Alá' al-Din Kaykubâd I; it consists of five large barrel-vaults with five arched openings in each partition-wall, the only building of its kind as yet known from the Saljûq period.

The old town is at present but sparsely populated; a new town arose at the foot of the mountain on the isthmus and on the mainland. It contains no monu-
ments worthy of mention. Not far to the east of 'Alá'yia in the coastal plain on a rivulet, is to be found the ruin of a small, köşk-like building of the Saljûq period, mainly consisting of a barrel-vault in the middle of an area surrounded by a wall. It was probably the country-house of a Saljûq nobleman with a garden. On the line of the wall lies the ruin of a small Christian church.

Bibliography: R. M. Riefstahl, *Turkish Architecture in Southwestern Anatolia*, Cambridge 1931, 53-60 and ill. 99-109, (by P. Wittek), 92-101 and ill.209-213; IA, s.v. Alāiya (by B. Darkot and Mükrimin Hallî Yînanc), with further references. (FR. TAESCHNER)

ALARCOS [see AL-ARAQ].

ALAVY [see ALABA WA 'L-KILA].

'ALAWI ('Alluwî < Ahi 'All, according to V. Maltzan Reisse, 356), tribe and district on the caravangroute 'Adan-Kaţaba-Şanâ', the smallest among the "nine cantons" of the Western Aden Protectorate. It lies between 'Amîr (N) and Hawshâbî (S) territory and formerly belonged to the Āmîr (v. Maltzan, loc. cit.), but later it became semi-independent and signed a treaty with the British in 1895. Population: 1000-1500. The shaykh lives at al-Sawda, which is the only place of some importance, with a landing ground for aircraft.

Bibliography: *Handbook of Arabia (Admi-

'ALAWIS ('Alawîyya), the reigning dynasty in Morocco.

Morocco at the advent of the 'Alawid dynasty. When the 'Alawid Sharif [see SHARIF] succeeded in asserting their sovereignty over Morocco, the country was rent by a serious political, social and religious crisis. The great movement of maraboutism and xenophobia for which the growth of Şâfism and Şarîfism and the development of the religious brotherhoods had for long paved the way, and which had manifested itself as early as the 15th century, the period of incursions by Portuguese and Spanish Christians on the coasts of Morocco, assumed a new form. While the two Sa'did mahâqans established at Fez and Marrâkûsh crumbled into ruin, strong provincial factions, based on a religious allegiance, divided up the country and warred amongst themselves. The marabouts of al-Dilâ' [q.v.], supported by the Berber population of the Middle and Central Atlas, some of whom began to move down into the Atlantic plains, seemed to be the point of establishing a Şinâdja dominance in Morocco. Morocco needed rehabilitation, organisa-
tion, and also pacification, because anarchy and brigandage continued to spread. The 'Alawids, if they were not faced with the task of overcoming the preceding dynasty, had to meet difficult problems on every side.

The establishment of the dynasty. The 'Alawids, of Hasanid descent, had come from Arabia to Tâflâlit at the end of the 13th century. For a long time they played no part in politics. But, in the anarchy which marked the decline of the Sa'did dynasty, the inhabitants of Tâflâlit, threatened simultaneously by Abu 'l-Hasan al-Sâmîlâl and by the marabouts of al-Dilâ', adopted as their leader Mâwliy al-Shârîf. His son Mâwliy Mâhâmmad (sic), who succeeded him during his lifetime in 1045/1635-6, strove for a period of twenty years to organise a small principality in eastern Morocco, but left no permanent structure. Mâhâmmad's brother, Mâwliy al-Râghîd [q.v.], took up his task with greater foresight and determination. The moment was favourable; the country was tired of anarchy and the great marabout organisations were beginning to decline. It was in order to escape from his brother, after Mâwliy Mâhâmmad that Mâwliy al-Râghîd, after the death of their father, al-Shârîf, in 1069/1659, sought his fortune in Morocco. He had managed to collect a small force and, after obtaining funds by killing a rich Jew, Ibn Mâsh'al, he succeeded in establishing himself in eastern Morocco with the aid of the Ma'kil Arabs and the Ayt Inassen Berbers. Gradually he extended his kingdom, and made Tâza his provisional capital. In 1096/1686 he seized Fez; from then on he assumed the role of sultan and applied himself to the subjugation of the marabout powers which shared the Atlantic seaboard of Morocco. First he conquered northern Morocco, and then he defeated the Dilâ'îtes and took possession of their adwîya. In 1079/1669 he entered Marrâkûsh, and occupied Sûs and the Anti-Atlas. But he died at Marrâkûsh in 1082/1672 without having con-
solidated his achievements.

Thus the Filâlî Sharifs had achieved power as a result of a personal venture which for long was situated half-way between banditry and war, and which reached its climax with the conquest of the Morocco of the plains and oases. With a few Arab tribes forming his only genuine support, Mâwliy al-Râghîd, thanks to the weak state of the country and the decline of the great marabout organisations, had successfully carried out the task of regrouping and of imposing law and order. But, in this country, practically everything had still to be put in order. Although the marabout crisis had suddenly ended, the Arab problem, always serious, was about to find a parallel in a formidable Berber problem, the essential phase of which was to be the push of the Şinâdja of the Atlas towards the north and west. The tasks of organizing an army, re-organising a government, and of establishing the place which
Morocco intended to hold in the Mediterranean theatre, still remained.

Mawlay Isma'il (1082-1139/1672-1727) and the consolidation of the dynasty. The work of pacification accomplished by al-Raahid proved impermanent. His brother and successor Isma'il [q.v.] (1672-1727) had to face two rival claimants to the throne and to suppress numerous revolts both in the towns and among the tribes. He deprived Fez and Marrakush, to which he had been obliged to lay siege, of their status as capital cities, and installed himself with his government at Minkasa. Mawlay Isma'il had first of all to solve the problem of the army. He had recourse first to the old expedient of the Arab gisq, to which he added the Ma'qil Arabs of the oases and to which he gave the name of gisq of the Udaya. But more especially he pressed into service the descendants of the black slaves who had been imported in large numbers by the Sa'addzs; these were the 'abid al-Bukhari; but this black militia never had any great military value.

Mawlay Isma'il, who from the beginning of his reign had been unsuccessful in his Algerian ventures and had had to concede peace with the Turks on the usual terms, succeeded in recovering from the Spanish Ma'mu'a, Mahdiyya and al-Arâ'ish (La-rache). The British evacuated Tangier, Mazagan, Ceuta and Melilla remained in Christian hands. Nearly the whole of his long reign was devoted to the suppression of internal revolts, risings by pretenders, and rebellions on the part of the tribes. The task was a heavy one; the country had a long tradition of anarchy, and the crushing financial burdens which the sovereign imposed on conquered territory were a clear incentive to revolt. The hardest campaigns were those against the Singhâjj Berbers. With the aid of some of these, Mawlay Isma'il pacified for a time the Middle Atlas. But he never succeeded in occupying the whole of Morocco.

Mawlay Isma'il's diplomatic relations with Europe have often given rise to misconceptions. The sovereign hated the Christian world. His European policy, based on a desire for holy war and on cupidity, and implemented with reluctance, was fundamentally negative. In spite of the efforts of the European merchants and consular officials in the new town of Mogador, planned by European architects, which was commenced in 1779/1765.

The end of the reign of Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah was marred by the rebellions of his son and heir-apparent, al-Yazid.

The conservative policy of the 'Alawids: prelude to the Moroccan crisis (1204-1311/1790-1894). The short reign of al-Yazid (1204-6/1790-2) was marked by conflict with Spain and a serious revolt in southern Morocco. On the death of this fanatical and bloodthirsty sultan, his brother Sulayman rid himself of two rivals and gave Morocco a brief respite from warfare.

Up to the end of the 19th century, Morocco was spared crises concerning the succession; in each case the heir designate succeeded to the throne without difficulty.

The Sultans Sulayman 1206-38/1792-1822 [q.v.], 'Abd al-Rahmân b. Hishâm (1238-76/1822-59) [q.v.], Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahmân (1792-97/1883-97), and Mawlay al-Hasan (1290-1311/1873-94) [q.v.], were practical rulers endowed with common sense. But their policies, though persevering and flexible in detail, were not progressive. Throughout this period the internal problems of Morocco remained the same. The army was weak; the 'abid had been suppressed but the gisq, restored to a position of supremacy, remained undisciplined and largely ineffective. The best troops were the contingents of the adherent tribes, which were mustered on the eve of an expedition. The energies of the sultans were entirely directed, not always with success, to levying the taxes in the subject territories. They had given up all pretensions to the pacification of the bilid al-siba [q.v.], which gradually increased in size.

In order to put down local revolts and to secure payment of the taxes, the 'Alawid sultans of the 19th century spent part of their time conducting barkas over their territories; the effect of these was often limited and temporary. Diplomacy was employed rather than force; and attempts were made to secure the aloof homage of the tribes which lived in actual independence. By all these means, the makhzen endeavoured to save face, if not at home, at least in the eyes of Europe. It avoided headlong collision with the powerful unsubdued
resolve the first of these clashes, proclaimed the independence of the sultan, the inviolability of his empire, and economic equality among the Powers, while, however, recognizing a certain privileged position for France.

The murder of French dependents and agitation on the Algerian border induced France to pacify the Oujda region and to occupy the Chaouia. A new diplomatic crisis ended with the Franco-German agreement of 1909. France and Spain increased their activities in Morocco.

During all these events the 'Alawid dynasty, engrossed in domestic disorders and preoccupied with its own defence, was singularly inactive. 'Abd al-'Aziz was replaced by his brother Mawlay 'Abd al-Hafiz, who had rebelled against him at Marrakush. Finally the incident at Agadir, which for a moment threatened the peace of Europe, led to a new Franco-German agreement which gave the Reich compensations in Equatorial Africa and made possible the signature of the Protectorate agreement (11 Rabi\'I 1335/30 March 1912). The 'Alawid dynasty, which had seemed on the point of collapse, could thus, under French protection, maintain its position and enter a new phase. Mawlay 'Abd al-Hafiz, who showed extreme ill will in promulgating the reforms anticipated in the Protectorate agreements, abdicated in 1913 and was replaced by his brother, Mawlay 'Abd al-Aziz, who was succeeded in 1919 by his brother Muhhammad; the latter was replaced in Dhu 'l-Hijja 1335/August 1953 by Sidi Muhhammad b. Mawlay 'Arafat.


In October 1955, Sidi Muhammad b. Mawlay ‘Ala‘a went to reside in Tangiers, and a Council of the Throne was instituted in the Sharifian Empire; Sidi Muhammad b. Yusuf was installed on the throne again on 16th November 1955. (Ed.)

ALAWITES [see NUŠAVR].

ALAY, a Turkish word probably derived from the Greek allagion, which was applied to certain divisions of the Byzantine army (cf. Köprülüzade Mehmet Fuat, Bisam Müesselerinin Osmanlî Müesselerinin Tarihi, Türk Hukuk Tarihi ve İktisat Tarihi Mecmuası, i, 277), signifying in Ottoman usage “a troop”, “a parade”, and hence “a crowd”, “a large quantity”, and important parades to which the name was given were the hünkâr alayi, held on the occasion of the sultan’s visit to Eyyüb for his girding with the sword of Oğtân; the alay-i hümâyûn, held on his departure from or return to the capital whether in connection with a campaign or for some other reason; the sûrre alayi, held at the sarây on the despatch of his annual gift to the Holy Cities; the Mevîd and Bayram alayi’lari, held for his visitation of mosques on the Prophet’s Birthday and the two ‘id’s; and the wîlîde alayi, held on the translation of a new Wâlide Sulîmân from the Old to the New Sarây. The word also figures in designations such as alay hizayar, applied to officers commanding the feudal cavalry of a sanjîq or eydây and themselves fieer-holders, and alay ’awâshî, applied either to ’awâshî whose duty it was to clear the route for processions or to those who conveyed commands in battle by shouting. The Alay Köşkû was a pavilion in the Topkâpî Sarayî built in the reign of Murâd III from which sultans might view parades.

Bibliography: I. H. Uzunçarşıli, Osmanî Devleti Saray Tepkîlî, index; i. A. sv. (by the same); Gibb and Bowen, Islamic Society and the West, i/7, index. (H. Bowen)

‘ALÂYA [see ‘ALANYA].

ALBAICÍN [see GHARNAṬA].

ALBARRACÍN [see RAZÍN, BANÚ].

ALBISTÁN [see ELBISTÁN].

ALBUFEIRA [see BALANSÍYA].

ALBURZ (now usually pronounced ELBÜRZ), in Old Persian Hara Berezaiti or “High Mountain”, is a mountain chain which, besides separating the Persian central plateau from the Caspian depression, links the Caucasus range with the Paropamisus. The average height of the western portion is just under 10,000 feet, culminating in Damâward (rv.), which is 18,600 feet high. The northern slopes of the range are densely wooded, but vegetation is scanty on the southern side because of the much lower rainfall. Firdawd gives the name Alburz to a mythic mountain in India. The first Persian geographer to apply the name to the range was Hamd Allah Mustawfî.

Alburz or Elburz is not to be confused with Elbruz, the Caucasian peak. Cf. Le Strange, 368 note. (L. Lockhart)

ALCACER DO SAL [see ǣSHR ABI DĀNĪS].

ALCALÁ [see AL-SALĀ].

ALCANTARA [see AL-KANTARA].

ALCAZAR, Spanish (from Arab. al-kâbîr): castle, citadel (Portug. Alcacer). Famous are the Alcazars of Seville, Cordova, Segovia, Toledo etc. Alcazar is also a frequent name of places, e.g.: Alcazar de San Juan, a town in the Spanish province of Ciudad-Real, Alcazarquivir, the Spanish name of ǣŠahr al-Kabîr (rv.), a town in Mârōcō. ALCAZARQUIVIR [see AL-ḴĀṢR AL-KĀBĪR].

ALCHEMY [see AL-KIMĪYĀ’].

ALCIRA [see MAṬRĀT SHUBIQ].

ALDEBARAN [see NUDJUM].

ALEMBIC [see AL-ANBĪ].

ALEPPO [see ǣHĀRĪ].

ALEXANDER THE GREAT [see ḪU ‘L-KARNA{text.digit}N, AL-ISKANDĀR].

ALEXANDER OF APHRODISIAS [see AL-ISKANDĀR AL-APRŪDĪṢĪ].

ALEXANDRETTA [see ISKANDĀRĪN].

ALEXANDRIA [see AL-ISKANDARĪYÂ].

ALF LAYLA WA-LAYLA, “thousand nights and one night” is the title of the most famous Arabic collection of fairy-tales and other stories. One often reads or hears nowadays “like a fairy-tale from the thousand-and-one nights”, and, indeed, the fairy-tales are the most striking part of the collection. Like all Orientals the Arabs from the earliest times enjoyed imaginative stories; but since the intellectual horizon of the true Arabs in ancient times before the rise of Islam was rather narrow the material for these entertainments was borrowed mainly from elsewhere, from Persia and from India, as we gather from the accounts of the Prophet’s competitor, the merchant al-Naḍr. In later times when Arab civilization had grown richer and more comprehensive the literary influence from other countries was, of course, much stronger. An attentive reader of the “Nights” will soon be astonished by the manifold variety of their contents: they resemble in a way an Oriental meadow with many different beautiful flowers intermingled with a few weeds. On the other hand, the reader will notice that these stories comprise a very wide field: there are stories of King Solomon, of the kings of
ancient Persia, of Alexander the Great, of the
Caliphate and the sultans on one side, and stories in
which guns, coffee and tobacco are mentioned on
the other side.

Its appearance in Europe. The entire
work is enclosed in a "frame-story", and this
was known in Italy in the Middle Ages. Traces
of it are to be found in a novel by Giovanni
Sercambi (1347-1424) and in the story of Astolfo
and Giono which is told in the 28th canto of
Orlando Furioso by Ariosto (beginning of the 16th
century); travellers who had been in the East may
have brought this knowledge to Italy. But the whole
Alf Layla wa-Layla came to Europe in the 17th and
18th centuries. The French scholar and traveller
Jean Antoine Galland (1646-1715) published it for
the first time. Travelling in the Near East at first
as a secretary of the French ambassador, then as a
collector of objects for museums commissioned by
amateurs, he had known the world of the Orient,
and his attention was directed to the great number
of stories and fables told there. After his return to
France he began in 1704 to publish his volumes Les
mille et une Nuits contes arabes traduits en
Français. By 1706 seven vols. had appeared; vol. viii appeared in
1709, vols. ix and x in 1712, vols. xi and xii in
1717, two years after Galland's death. This
delay in the appearance of the later vols. is significant
for Galland's difficulties as to material and also
for his indifference to this side of his work as a scholar.
He was a born story-teller; he had a flair for a good
story and a knack of re-telling it well. Thus he
adapted his translation to the taste of his European
readers, changing sometimes the wording of the
Arabic text and paraphrasing things that were
foreign to Europeans. Hence the great success of
his "Nights". But he was also fortunate in the
material which fell into his hands. He began by
translating Sindbad the Sailor from an unidentified
MS; then he learned that this was part of a great
collection of stories called "The Thousand and One
Nights"; then he had the luck to have sent to him from
Syria four vols. of a MS of that work which is,
except for a small fragment found by Nabia Abbott,
the oldest known and contains the best surviving
text. The first three of his vols. are still in the
Bibliothèque Nationale, but the fourth is lost. In
the first seven vols. of his translation he exhausted
his three vols. of Arabic text which we still have
and added Sindbad and Camalzaman (Kamar al-
Zamān) from unidentified MSS. Then for lack of
material he stopped for three years until his publisher
forced his hand by issuing, without authority, vol.
viii containing Ganem (Ghanīm), translated by
Galland from an unidentified MS, and two stories,
Zeyn Alasnam (Zayn al-ASNām) and Codadad (Khudādād), translated by Pétis de la Croix and
intended for his Mille et un jours. Again Galland
was completely out of material and stopped; he was also
tired and disgusted with the whole matter. But in
1709 he met a certain Maronite from Aleppo, Ḥannâ,
bronght to Paris by the traveller Paul Laca and
at once recognized that he had got an oral source
of the story material. Ḥannâ told him stories in
Arabic, and Galland inserted in his Journal
abstracts of some of these. But Ḥannâ also gave him
transcripts of some. In this way the last four vols.
of Galland's translation were filled out; his Journal
gives full details. Ḥannâ's transcripts have vanished,
but two Arabic MSS of Aladdin have since come to
light and one of Ali Baba. This, then, is the origin
of the book which made the "Nights" known to
Europe and which in the French text and in very
many translations from the French became the
"Arabian Nights" for the great multitude of readers.
For details see H. Zotenberg, Histoire d'Alā’
aldîn ... avec Notice sur quelques manuscrits des
Mille et une nuits et la traduction de Galland, Paris
1888. This contains the Arabic text of Aladdin
('Alā’-al-Dîn) and a study of certain MSS of the
Nights and of the entries in Galland's Journal. See
also V. Chauvin, Bibliographie arabes, iv, Libge
1900, and D. B. Macdonald, A bibliographical and
litanem study of the first appearance of the Arabian Nights in
Europe, The Library Quarterly, vol. ii, no. 4,

For more than a century Galland's French version
meant the Nights for Europe, and two of his stories
whose original Arabic texts were not known were even translated into Oriental languages. But mean-
while other MSS, more or less connected with the
Nights, were brought to light and, from these,
various supplements to Galland were translated and
published. Just as the MSS of the Nights themselves
varied enormously as to the stories which they
contained, so these translators were prepared to
attach to the Nights any story that existed in
Arabic. The following supplements, partly separate
and partly attached to editions of Galland, are of
importance in themselves and as signs of the in-
terests of their times. For further details on all of
them see Chauvin's Bibliographie, iv, 83-120.

In 1788 there appeared as a supplement to the
Cabinet des Fêes, vols 38-41, a series of tales translated
from the Arabic by Denis Chavis. It is significant
for the interest at the time in the whole subject of
the Nights that there appeared, 1792-1794, three
separate English translations of this supplement.
In 1793 William Beloe published in his third vol.
of his Miscellanies some Arabic stories which had
been translated for him orally by Patrick Russell,
the author of The Natural History of Aleppo (1794).
In 1800 Jonathan Scott translated in his Tales,
Anecdoté and Letters certain stories from the MS
of the Nights brought from India by James Anderson,
and in 1811 to his edition of an English version of
Galland he added a vol. of new stories from another
MS, the Wortley Montague MS, now in Oxford.
In 1806 Caussin de Perceval had already added two
vols. of supplement to his edition of Galland. But
Edouard Gauttier in his professéd edition of Galland
(1822-1825) went much farther: besides two vols.
of new tales drawn from all manner of sources he
freely inserted others in the course of Galland's
Nights. Von Hammer in his Die noch nicht übersehen
Ereihungen der Tausend und einen Nachtf Stuttgart
1823, had a much firmer foundation and used a
real recension of the Nights. He had acquired in
Egypt a MS of the recension now known as Zoten-
berg's Egyptian Recension, which through numerous
editions has become the Vulgate text of the Nights;
see the editions, below. Von Hammer's French
translation of a number of stories not in Galland is
lost, but Zinserling (1823) translated it into German,
and this version was rendered in English by Lamb
(1826) and in French by Trebutien (1828). In 1825
M. Habicht began to publish 15 volumes professing
to be a new translation but consisting really of
Galland with some supplements from Caussin,
Gauttier and Scott and an ending from a so-called
Tunisian MS. He began also to publish an Arabic
text. From this text, later on also from Galland, from
Gotha MSS and from a text printed in Egypt, Weli
published his translation within the years 1857-1867.
Editions and translations. The main editions of the Arabic *Alf Layla wa-Layla* are the following.


3. The Second Calcutta Edition: *The Alif Laila or the Book of the Thousand Nights and One Night*, Commonly known as *The Arabian Nights Entertainments*, now, for the first time, published complete in the original Arabic, from an Egyptian manuscript brought to India by the late Major Turner, editor of the Shah Nama. Edited by W. H. Macnaghten, Esq. In four volumes, Calcutta 1839-42.

4. The Breslau Edition: *Tausend und Eine Nacht Arabisch. Nach einer Handschrift aus Tunis herausgegeben von Dr. Maximilian Habicht, Professor an der Königlichen Universität zu Breslau (etc.)*, (nach seinem Tode fortgesetzt von M. Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer, ordentlichem Prof. der morgenländischen Sprachen an der Universität Leipzig, Breslau 1839-43). D. B. Macdonald, in his article on Habicht's Recension in *JRA* 1909, 685-704, and in his article *A Preliminary Classification of some MSS of the Arabian Nights*, in the *E.G.Browne Volume*, Cambridge 1922, 304, discussed the value of this edition. His expert opinion is that Habicht wilfully created a literary myth and enormously confused the history of the Nights because a Tunisian recension of the Nights never existed, and out of many stories which had come to him from many sources he constructed a new recension of the Nights much in the same way that he had constructed his translation described above. However, Macdonald acknowledged that Habicht's texts are given verbatim without any attempt at correction, and are, therefore, "vulgar" in the exact sense whereas all other texts have been grammatically and lexicographically "improved" by learned shaykhs.

5. Later Bulaq and Cairo. Editions. In the latter half of the 19th and in the beginning of the 20th century the complete text of the first Bulaq edition, in the main the same as the second Calcutta edition, was several times reprinted. They are representatives of Zotenberg's "Egyptian Recension" which is the result of a compilation made by a certain shaykh in the 18th century, according to a notice in U. J. Seetzen, *Reisen durch Syrien, Palästina, Phönicien, die Transjordan-Länder, Arabia Petraea und Unter-Aegypten*, Berlin 1854-5, iii, 188; the name of the shaykh is not known, but this notice confirms Zotenberg's hypothesis. The Jesuit Press at Bayrāt has published an independent but expurgated edition from another MS of the same recension (1888-90).

From the Egyptian Recension have been made all the modern western translations. Lane's translation, incomplete but with a very valuable and full commentary, began to appear in parts in 1839 and was finished in 1841. It was made from the first Bulaq edition. Payne's translation from the Macnaghten edition, complete and privately printed, appeared in 9 vols. 1828-84. Three additional vols. contained tales in the Breslau and 1st Calcutta editions (1884), and a 13th vol. (1889) contained Aladdin and Zayn al-Asnam. Since Payne's death in 1876 there have been a number of complete reprint. The translation by Sir Richard Burton, also from the Macnaghten edition, is very largely dependent upon that of Payne and often reproduces Payne verbatim (10 vols., 1885; 6 supplementary vols., 1886-8). Besides the Smithers edition (12 vols., 1894) and Lady Burton's edition (6 vols., 1886-8) it has been completely reprinted several times. On the strange relation between the versions of Payne and of Burton see Thomas Wright, *Life of Sir Richard Burton* (2 vols., London 1906) and *Life of John Payne* (London 1913), and for an attempt at a comparative estimate of the above English translations see Macdonald's *On translating the Arabian Nights*, *The Nation*, New York, Aug. 30 and Sept. 6, 1900, in *Reclam's Universal-Bibliothek* (1893-97) Max Henning published a German translation, 24 small vols.; it is somewhat expurgated and rather prosaic and gives only half the verses. The first 17 vols. give the Nights from the Bulaq edition and vols. 18-24 various supplements, largely translated from Burton. In 1890 J. C. Mardrus began a French translation of the Nights famously from the Bulaq edition of 1835. His translation is not very trustworthy, and it incorporates tales from all manner of other collections than the Nights. Moreover there are translations of the Nights in Polish, French, English, Russian, German, Danish, Dutch, Italian. The Spanish translation is by Vicente Blasco Ibáñez; the English by E. Powys Mathers; the Polish translation is incomplete. The German translation by E. Littmann appeared in Leipzig, 6 vols., 1921-8; first re-edition Wiesbaden 1953, second re-edition ibid. 1954. It contains the complete translation of the second Calcutta edition and the following stories: *'Alā' al-Dīn and the Magic Lamp*, from the Paris MS edited by Zoten (cf. above); *'Aīl Bāb and the Forty Robbers*, from the Oxford MS edited by Macnaghten (*JRA* 1910, 221 ff., 1913, 41 ff.); *Prince Ahmad and Pari Bānā*, from Burton, i.e. an English rendering of a Hindustani version derived from Galland; *Abūl-'Asān or the Sleeper Awakened*, from the Breslau edition; *The Craft of Women*, from the first Calcutta edition; *AH Khawadja and the Merchant of Baghdad*, from the Bulac edition; *The Story of Sindbad the Sailor*, from the Oxford MS edited by Macnaghten; *The Romance of Alī Basha*, from the Bulac edition; *The Story of Sindbad the Second*, from the Bulac edition; *The Story of Sindbad the Seven Viziers*, from the Bulac edition; *The Story of al-Malik al-Ghurân al-Dīn Baybars al-Bunduzdār and the Sixteen Guardians*, from the Breslau edition; *The Craft of Women*, from the Bulac edition; *The German translation by E. Littmann appeared in Leipzig, 6 vols., 1921-8; first re-edition Wiesbaden 1953, second re-edition ibid. 1954. It contains the complete translation of the second Calcutta edition and the following stories: *'Alā' al-Dīn and the Magic Lamp*, from the Paris MS edited by Zoten (cf. above); *'Aīl Bāb and the Forty Robbers*, from the Oxford MS edited by Macnaghten (*JRA* 1910, 221 ff., 1913, 41 ff.); *Prince Ahmad and Pari Bānā*, from Burton, i.e. an English rendering of a Hindustani version derived from Galland; *Abūl-'Asān or the Sleeper Awakened*, from the Breslau edition; *The Craft of Women*, from the first Calcutta edition; *AH Khawadja and the Merchant of Baghdad*, from the Bulac edition.—*The Dutch translation by J. Oestrup was published at Copenhagen in 1917. The Russian translation by I. Krâčkovsky appeared in 1934, the Italian translation by F. Gabrielli in 1949. Problems of origin and evolution. When the Arabian Nights first became known in Europe they served only for the entertainment of European readers; but at the beginning of the 19th century western scholars began to take an interest in the question of their origin. Silvestre de Sacy, the founder of modern Arabian philology, discussed this question in several dissertations: *Journal des savants*, 1817, 378; *Recherches sur l'origine du recueil des contes intitulé les Mille et une nuits*, Paris 1839; in *Les Mémories de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, x, 1833, 30. He denied, correctly, the possible authorship of one single writer and believed
that the book was written at a very late period without Persian and Indian elements; therefore, he regarded as spurious a passage in Murūji dī al-Dhahab of al-Masʿūdī (written in 336/947 and re-edited in 340/952) referring to these elements. This passage, published by Barbier de Meynard in Arabic and French (Les prairies d’or, iv, 89), reads in English: “The case with them (viz. some legendary stories) is similar to that of the books that have come to us from the Persian, Indian (one MS has here: Pahlawi) and the Greek and have been translated for us, and that originated in the way that we have described, such as for example the book Hasār Afṣāna, which in Arabic means “thousand tales”, for “tale” is in Persian afṣāna. The people call this book “Thousand Nights” (two MSS have here: Thousand Nights and One Night). This is the story of the king and the vizier and his daughter and her servant-girl; these two are called Shīrazād and Dināzdāk (in other MSS: and her nurse; in again other MSS: and his two daughters)”. In al-Fihrist by Muḥammad b. ʿIsḥāk b. ʿAbī Yaʿkūb al-Nadīm (written in 377/987), ed. Flügel, i, 304, the Hasār Afṣān is mentioned and a résumé of the frame-work story is given. The Fihrist adds that ʿAbū ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbdūs dī al-Dhajhiyārī (d. 351/962), the author of the Book of the Viziers, began to write a book in which he selected a thousand stories from the stories of the Arabs, the Persians, the Greek and other peoples. He collected four hundred and eighty stories, but he died before he had attained his purpose, i.e. to complete a thousand stories.

Contrary to de Sacy, Joseph von Hammer (Wiener Jahrbiicher, 1819, 339; JA, 1e sér., x, 3e sér., viii; Preface to his Dichtungen, Erzählungen (see above) maintained the genuineness of the passage in al-Masʿūdī with all its consequences. William Lane tried to prove that the whole book was the work of one single author and had been written in the period 1475-1525 (Preface to The Arabian Nights Entertainments, London 1839-41).

The discussion was resumed by de Goeje (De Arabe Nachtiertellerei, De Gids, 1886, iii, 385, and The Thousand and One Nights in the Encyclopædia Britannia, xxiii, 316). He collated the passage in the Fihrist (see above), in which the Hasār Afṣān are said to have been written for Humāy (var.: Humānī), the daughter of King Bahman, with a passage in al-Tābarī (9th century), i, 688, where Esther is called the mother of Bahman and the name Shahr-razād is assigned to Humāy; and consequently tried to show that the frame-work story of the Nights was connected with the Book of Esther. August Müller seems to have been the pioneer towards a freer attitude in his Sendschreiben on the subject to de Goeje (Bezembergers Beiträge, xiii, 222) and in his article in Die deutsche Rundschau, xiii, July 10, 1887, 77-96. He distinguished various layers in the work, one of which he supposed to have been written in Baghdaḏ, whereas to another and larger one he assigned an Egyptian origin. The idea of various layers was worked out with greater accuracy by Th. Nöldeke (Zu den ägyptischen Märchen, ZDMG, 1888, 68) who gave an approximate definition of the texts, by which each could be recognized.

The contents of the Nights were described and considered by Nöldeke several times. In this respect Oestrup`s Studier over 1001 Nat, Copenhagen 1891, are of special importance; they were translated into Russian by Krymski (Istorievane eng 1001 noći, Moscow 1905, with a long introduction) and into German by Rescher, “Oesterups Studier über 1001 Nacht” aus dem Dänischen (nebst einigen Zusätzen), Stuttgart 1925, and a French résumé with notes was published by Galtier, Cairo 1912. Other ingenious discussions of the subject were given by Horovitz, mainly in his article Die Entstehung von Tausendundeiner Nacht, The Review of Nations, no. 4, April 1927; idem, in IC, 1927. See also Littmann, Tausendundeine Nacht in der arabischen Literatur, Tübingen 1923, and Die Entstehung und Geschichte von Tausendundeiner Nacht in der Anhang to Littmann’s translation (mentioned above).

The earliest testimony to the existence of the book of the Thousand Nights was discovered by Nabia Abbott, A Ninth-Century Fragment of the “Thousand Nights”, New Light on the Early History of the Arabian Nights, Journal of Near Eastern Studies, 1949. After that the work is mentioned by al-Masʿūdī and in the Fihrist (see above). In the 12th century a collection of tales called “The Thousand Nights and one Night” was known in Egypt as we learn from a certain al-Kurīf who wrote a history of Egypt under the last Fāṭimid caliph (1160-71), and al-Ghurud, who died in 815/1412, transmitted in his anthology a tale of the Nights, as Torrey recognized (J A O S, 1894, 42 f.). A MS discovered by H. Ritter in Istanbul which is of the 13th or 14th century contains four stories that are in the Egyptian recension. These stories are not stated to be a part of the Nights; they will be published and translated by H. Wehr on the basis of preliminary studies by A. von Bulmerinco. Then follow Galland’s MS and a number of other MSS of the Nights which cover the period from the 15th to the 18th centuries.

We know then that in the common form of the Nights there are a Baghdaḏ and an Egyptian part. Oestrup grouped the separate tales into three layers of which the first one was to comprehend the fairy-tales from the Persian Hasār Afṣāna with the frame-work of the book, the second those which had come from Baghdaḏ, and the third the stories which had been added to the body of the work certainly tales, as for example the extensive chivalric romance of ʿUmar b. al-Nuʿmān, which was inserted when the number 1001 was taken in its literal sense. But the Story of Sul and Şhumal in a Tübingen MS, which is professedly a part of the Nights and which was edited as such by Seybold, certainly never was an integral part of them, because in it a Muslim is converted to Christianity; in the true Nights Christians, Zoroastrians and pagans often adopt Islam, but a Muslim never adopts another religion. The following forms of the Nights were established by Macdonald (The Earlier history of the Arabian Nights, JRAS, 1924, 353 ff.)—meaning by that any collection of stories fitted into the frame-work which we know: i. The original Persian Hasār Afṣāna, “Thousand Stories”; ii. An Arabic version of the Hasār Afṣāna. The frame-work story of Hasār Afṣāna, followed by stories of Arabic origin. iv. The Nights of the late Fāṭimid period; to its popularity al-Kurīf testifies. v. The recension of the Galland MS. From notes in it that MS was in Syrian Tripoli in 943/1536 and at Aleppo in 1001/1592; it may, of course, be older. But it was written in Egypt. There remains the at present still unsolved problem of the relations between it and the other old and independent MSS; there are according to Macdonald at least six such MSS which must be considered.

Nabia Abbott (see above) stated the following six
forms. i. An eighth-century translation of the *Haizdr Afsdna*. According to her belief this was most probably a complete and literal translation, perhaps entitled *Alf Khwarjā*. ii. An eighth-century Islamized version of the *Haizdr Afsdna* entitled *Alf Layla*. This could have been either partial or complete. iii. A ninth-century composite *Alf Layla* containing both Persian and Arabic materials. While most of the former came undoubtedly from the *Haizdr Afsdna*, other current story-books, especially the Book of Sindbād and the Book of Dīdal, are not improbable sources. The Arabic materials, as Littmann had already pointed out, were not so slight or insignificant as Macdonald believed them to be. iv. The tenth-century *Alf Samar* of Ibn ‘Abdūs. Whether this was meant to include, among other materials, all the current *Alf Layla* and to supersede it is, is not clear.

v. A twelfth-century collection augmented by materials from iv and by Asiatic and Egyptian tales of local Egyptian composition. The change of title to *Alf Layla wa-Layla* belongs, in all probability, to this period. vi. The final stages of the growing collection extending to the early sixteenth century. Heroic tales of the Islamic countercrusades are among the most prominent additions. Persia and ‘Irāq may have contributed some of the later predominately Far Eastern tales in the wake of the thirteenth-century Mongol conquest of those lands. The final conquest of Mamluk Syria and Egypt by the Ottoman Salīm I (1512-20) closed the first chapter of the history of the Arabian Nights in its oriental homeland.

The title ‘Thousand Stories’ may have been changed to ‘Thousand Nights’ when, with the Arabs, the frame-work story and other stories were combined; that cannot have been done later than the 9th century. Originally “1000 stories” meant only a very large number of stories; in the same way it is said of Shahrāzād that she had collected “a thousand books”. For the simple mind even 100 is a high number, and “before 100 years” means—even for Oriental historians—the same as “a long time ago”; therefore the number 100 must not be taken in its exact sense. But 1000 is almost the same as “innumerable”. And the Book of the Thousand Nights which was known at Bagdād scarcely contained a thousand separate nights. But why was 1000 changed to 1001? This change may partly owe its origin to the superstitious aversion to round numbers common among the Arabs as among other peoples. But it is very likely that it was also influenced by the Turkish idiomatic use of *bin bir* “thousand and one” for a large number: in Anatólia there is a ruin called *Bin-bir-khisle* “1001 Churches”, but there are, of course, not nearly so many there. In Istanbul there is a place called *Bin-bir-direk* “1001 columns”; but there are only a few dozens of them there. The Turkish alliteration *bin bir* points to the origin of the Persian idiom *haizdr yah* “1001” and of the title *Alf Layla wa-Layla*. Since the 11th century Persia, Mesopotamia, and Syria and the other countries of Eastern Islam were under the influence of the Turks. Thus the title “1001 Nights” at the beginning meant only a large number of nights, but later on the number was taken in its literal meaning, and it became necessary to add a great many stories in order to complete the number 1001.

The various component elements. If then India, Persia, Mesopotamia, Egypt and in some way the Turks were partners in the origin of the Nights we must assume that materials derived from all these countries and peoples are to be found in them. The first outer tests might be the proper names. There are Indian names like Sindbād, Turkish names like ‘Ilb Baha and Khwarjā, names Šahrāzād, Dināzād, Šahzamān are Persian and occur, as de Goeje has shown, in Persian legends; so also Bahrām, Rustam, Ardashīr, Šāhpur and many others are Persian. However, by far the majority of names are Arabic, i.e. old Arabic names used among the Arabian bedouin and later Islamic names. Greek and European names occur in a few cases in stories treating of the relations between Muslims and Byzantines and Franks. Egyptian names refer to places and to months in their Coptic forms. Of Hebrew names chiefly Solomon and David occur; both play an important rôle in Islamic tradition. Besides them Āṣaf, Barakhīyā, Bulūkīyā and others are named. But since in very many cases stories are transferred to other persons and frequently persons without names act in them the question of the names must not be stressed.

However, the frame-work system, which is very common in India but very rare in other countries, is a test of the Indian origin of certain parts of the Arabian Nights. In the Indian popular books it usually runs like this: “You may not do such and such a thing or else you will go the same way as so and so”—“How was that?” asks the other, and then the admonisher begins his story.

The foreign elements in the Nights have been carefully studied by Oesterp. One of the interesting statements he made was that in the Iranian fairy-tales the demons or supernatural powers act on their own account and independently, whereas in the more recent tales, especially in those from Egypt, they are always subject to some talisman or magic object; hence its owner decides the development of the action, not the Djīnas and ‘Irīfs themselves. Only a short summary of the foreign elements in the Nights can be given here.

The frame-story is of Indian origin. That it consists of three different parts which originally were independent stories was shown by Emmanuel Cosquin in *Études folkloriques*, Paris 1922, 265. These parts are: 1. The story of a man who was treasured by a disloyal wife but whose grief was assuaged when he saw that a high personality had the same misfortune. 2. The story of a demon or a giant whom his wife or his captive betrayed with many other men in the most audacious manner. This is the same as the tale told by the seventh vizier in the *Story of Sindbād the Wise*. 3. The story of a clever girl who by her skilful telling of stories averts an evil threatening her or her father or both of them. Of these three parts only the third one seems to have belonged to the original frame-work story, as indicated by al-Mas‘ūdī and by the *Fihrist*; in it, then, only the cruel king, the clever daughter of the vizier and her true old nurse were known. It is probable that the story of the clever daughter of the vizier came at an early date from India to Persia, where it was "nationalized" and combined with the other two parts of the frame-story. A number of tales in the Nights are of Indian origin: such are the stories of pious men that remind us of Buddhist and Jainist saints, the fables of animals, the story-cycles of *Sindbād* (q.v.) the *Wis*, and of *Dīzāyīd* and *Shimās*. Indian motifs are to be found in different passages of the Nights: such are, e.g., the *Story of the Magic Horse*; the poisoning by means of the leaves of a book (by the physician Duban), a practice which points to Indian customs (cf. Gildemeister, *Scriptorum Arabum De Rebus Indicis loci et opuscula*, Bonn
All this passed through Persian before it reached the Arabs.

Quite a number of tales are of Persian origin, especially those fairy-tales in which the ghosts and the fairies act independently; see above. The tales which Oestrup enumerates as being of Indian-Persian origin are the following: 1) The Story of the Magic Horse; 2) The Story of Hasan of Basra; 3) The Story of Sayyf al-Muluk; 4) The Story of Kamar al-Zamān and of Princess Budur; 5) The Story of the Prince Badr and of Princess Djuwār of Samandal; 6) The Story of Ardaşīr and Hayāl al-Nufās. And according to him the relation between the Story of 'Alī Shār and the Persian original, the former containing many details which recur in the probably later narrative of Nūr al-Dīn 'Alī and the Girdle-girl, also to be found in the Nights, is uncertain. The Story of the Jealous Sisters and the Story of Ahmad and Pari Bānā that are found only in Galland give a strong impression of being originally Persian, but Persian prototypes of them have not become known as yet.

Baghdād is situated in the region of ancient Babylonia: it is, therefore, probable that ancient Babylonian ideas should have survived there until Islamic times and might be reflected in the Nights. Even a whole story, the Story of Hayār the Wise, which in some MSS appears as a part of the Nights, is of Old Mesopotamian origin; it probably dates back to the 7th century B.C., and it found its way through the Jewish and Christian literatures into Arabic literature. Khīḍr the Ever-Youthful, has a Babylonian prototype; the journeys of Bulūkīyā and the water of life fetched by Prince Ahmad may reflect motifs of the Babylonian epic of Gilgamesh. But Khīḍr and the water of life were probably transmitted to the Arabs by the Romance of Alexander, and the journeys of Bulūkīyā became known to them through Jewish literature. Above all, the frequent anecdotes about the 'Abbāsīd caliphs and their court and also some anecdotes about their subjects belong to the Baghdād recension of the Nights. The Story of Sinbad [q.v.] the Sailor found its definite shape probably in Baghdad, the romance of 'Umar b. al-Nu'mān [q.v.] contains Persian, Mesopotamian and Syrian materials; the romance of 'Aǰīb and Ġharī points to Mesopotamia and to Persia; the story of the clever slave-girl Tawaddud [q.v.] originated in Baghdad and was in some respects reshaped in Egypt. The Stories of Bulūkīyā, of Sinbad [q.v.] the Wise, and of Khīḍr and Wīrd Khān were certainly known in Baghdad. But there is no certain proof that all these tales were parts of the Baghdād recension. The same is to be said of the four stories of the Istanbul MS found by H. Ritter (see above); it contains four of our Nights stories but does not refer to Alī Layla wa-Layla. These stories are: 1) The Story of the Six Men, i.e. of the six brothers of the harbor of Baghdad; 2) The Story of Drisālārd and the Sea-girl; 3) The Story of Budur and 'Umāyr b. Djuwār; 4) The Story of Ābā Muhammad the Stōkhuf.

Egyptian origin is to be postulated of the stories in which the tricks of clever thieves and rogues are related, of the tales in which the ghosts and demons appear as servants of talismans and of magic objects, and of stories that might be called "bourgeois novels," some of which resemble modern romances of adultery. All these stories date, of course, in their present form from the time of the Mamlūk sultans and of Turkish rule in Egypt. But some of the motifs go back to Ancient Egypt. The clever rogue 'Alī al-Zaybak and his companion Ahmad al-Danaf have their prototype in the bold condottiere Amasī, and the treasure of Khamsinīt is found in the story of 'Alī al-Zaybak, as Nūdīne pointed out. The monkey-scribe in the story of the three dames of Baghādād may have his prototype in Thot, the scribe of the Egyptian gods who is often represented as a monkey, or in Hanūmān the monkey-leader of the Indian Ramayana. It has also been suggested that the ancient story of the Egyptian shipwrecked person is to be connected with Sindbād's journeys, and that the story of the capture of Jaffa by Egyptian warriors hidden in sacks recurs in the story of 'Alī Baba; but these connections are not very likely; see Littmann, Tausendundeine Nacht in der arabischen Literatur, 22.

For possible Greek influences in the Nights see von Grunebaum, Medieval Islam, Chicago 1946, Chapter Nine, Grece in the Arabian Nights.

The various literary genres. It remains to give a summary account of the different classes of literature represented in the Nights; it is here, of course, impossible to mention every one of all the stories, as has been done in the Anhang to Littmann's translation. There six main groups were distinguished: 1) Fairy-tales; 2) Romances and novels; 3) Legends; 4) Didactic stories; 5) Humorous tales; 6) Anecdotes. A few examples of each group must suffice here.

1. The frame-story consists of three Indian fairy-tales. The tales which come first in all manuscripts (The Merchant and the Dìmīn; The Fisherman and the Dìmīn; The Porter; The Three Calendars and the Three Dames in Baghdad; The Hunchback) belong to this class; they are themselves examples of the frame-work system and contain some traits which remind us of Indian prototypes and even of some motifs which have parallels in stories from farther east. The best known fairy-tales are those of 'Alī al-Dīn and the Magic Lamp and 'Alī Baba. Other examples are Kamar al-Zamān and Budur, The Jealous Sisters, Prince Ahmad and Pari Bānā, Sayyf al-Muluk, Hasan of Basra, Zayn al-Aṣnām.

2. The longest romance is that of 'Umar b. al-Nu'mān [q.v.] and his Sons; it has been discussed by Paret (Der Ritterroman von 'Umar an-Nu'mān, Tübingen 1929), and by H. Grégoire and R. Goossens (ZDMG 1934, 213; Byzantinisches Epos und arabischer Ritterroman). The Story of 'Aǰīb and Ġharī is the model of an Islamic popular romance. The stories of the Porter and the Three Dames, of 'Alī al-Dīn Abu 'l-Shādūd, of Nūr al-Dīn and Shams al-Dīn, of Nūr al-Dīn and Maryam the Girdle-girl might be called "bourgeois" romances or novels, as also the story of Ābā Kīr and Ābā Śīr.

Here the love-stories may be added. There are a great many of them in the Nights, and they comprise three groups: a) ancient Arabian life before Islam; b) urban life in Baghdad and Basra, love-affairs with girls or slave-girls in the cities or in the palace of the caliphs; c) love-novels from Cairo which are sometimes frivolous and lascivious. See Paret, Früharabishe Liebesgeschichten, Bern 1927.

Also the stories of rogues and of seafarers are to be mentioned here. For 'Alī al-Zaybak see above; many short stories of the guardians are told before the rulers of Egypt. The famous story of Sinbad [q.v.] the Sailor is based on a book, The Wonders of India, which contained adventures and sailors' yarns collected by a Persian sea captain at Basra in the 10th century. The first part of the story of Ābū Muhammad the Stōkhuf is composed of sailors' stories and motifs of fairy-tales.
3. There are a few ancient Arabian legends inserted in the Nights: *Ḥātim al-Tawfiq, Iram the City of Columns*, the *Egyptian Nights*, the *City of Lebta*, which refers to the conquest of North-western Africa by the Arabs. Other legends refer to pious men and women, among them to pious Israélites (these need not necessarily be due to Jewish authors); the legend of *The Pious Prince*, who was a son of Hārūn al-Rashīd and became a dervish, is reminiscent of the famous legend of Alexis.

4. Didactic stories, fables and parables, especially of animals, are known to many peoples and have found their way into the Nights also, where most of them seem to have originated in India, e.g. the two long cycles of Sindbad [q.v.] the Wise (Sintjas) and of Diālīyatād and Wird Khādān, and many of the fables of animals, but they were sometimes remodelled in their Arabic forms. The long story of the clever slave-girl Tawaddud [q.v.] (in Spain la doncella Teodor, in Abyssinia Tasedal) with its probable Greek prototype correctly discussed by Horovitz belongs in this category.

5. Humorous tales are the stories of Abu 'l-Hasan or the Sleeper Awakened, of Khalīfa the Fisherman, of Diālī'yar the Barmakid and the Old Bedouin, and of 'Ali the Persian; the latter is a typical story of lies. In the stories of Maḥraṯ the Cobbler and of the *Hunchback* there are many humorous traits.

6. The group of anecdotes comprises here all the stories that are not classified in the preceding groups. Collections of anecdotes are the stories of the *Hunchback* and of the Barber and his Brothers, and they are combined to a comedy of great style. The other anecdotes are to be divided into three groups: those of rulers and their circles, those of munificent men, and those taken from general human life. Those of rulers begin with Alexander the Great and end with the Mamlūk sultans: a few of them refer to the Persian kings, a very large number of them refer to the 'Abbāsīd caliphs, above all to Hārūn al-Rashīd who became the ideal ruler in the opinion of later Muslims. Some of these anecdotes may not originate from Baghādād but from Egypt where they were ascribed to him. The munificent men, about whom the Nights tell are mainly Hātim al-Tawfiq, Ma'ān b. Zā'ida and the Barmakids. The anecdotes from general human life are of several kinds: they tell of rich and poor, of young and old, of sexual abnormities (Wardān and the Woman with the Bear; The Princess and the Monkey), of bad eunuchs, of unjust and of clever judges, of stupid schoolmasters (a type known in Greek and Roman literature as well as in modern Egyptian Arabic tales). The *Nocturnal Adventure of the Calīf*, transmitted only by Galland contains three long anecdotes told at large and intermingled with motifs from fairy-tales.

There are about 1420 poems or fragments of poetry in the 2nd Calculata edition, according to Horovitz (in *Zeitschrift Sachau*, Berlin 1915, 375-9) Of these a number of 170 repetitions must be deducted, so 1250 insertions of poetry remain. Horovitz has been able to prove that those insertions whose authors he could discover are to be dated from the 12th to the 14th centuries, i.e. from the Egyptian period of the history of the Nights. These poems and verses are mostly of the kind that they might be omitted without disturbing the course of the prose texts and, therefore, have been later added to them.

**Bibliography:** Has been given in the course of the article. Here special attention should be called to Oestrup's *Studier* and their annotated translation by Rescher (see above), to N. Elisséeff, *Thèmes et Motifs des Mille et Une Nuits*, Beirut 1949, and to the full bibliography given by Brockelmann, II, 724, S. II, 59 ff. For the influence of the Arabian Nights on European literature cf. *The legacy of Islam*, 190 ff.; *Cassell's Encyclopaedia of literature*, s.v. (E. Littmann)

**ALFARD** [see Nūḏūm].

**ALFŪNŠIHO**, the transcription adopted by the majority of the Arab chroniclers of al-Andalus for Alfonso, the name of several monarchs of Christian Spain in the Middle Ages. The forms Iḏfūnsho and Iḏfūnsho, however, which correspond to the old Latin-Gothic form Ídefonso, are also occasionally found.

**ALGARVE** [see ḤARIṢ AL-ANDALUS].

**ALGAVEL** [see AL-GHAZĀLĪ].

**ALGEBRA** [see AL-DJABR WA'L-MUKABALA].

**ALGECIRAS** [see AL-DJAZIRA AL-KHADRA].

**ALGERIA** [A.: BARR AL-DJAZĀIR], modern term indicating the central part of northern Africa between Morocco in the West, and Tunisia in the East.

(i) — Geography.
(ii) — History:
(a) To the 16th century.
(b) The Turkish period.
(c) After 1830.
(iii) — The population.
(iv) — The institutions.
(v) — Languages.

(i) **Geography.**

Algeria comprises the central section of North Africa (also called Magrib, Barbary, Africa Minor, the Atlas region [cf. Magrib] and a large part of the Sahara, and has an area of 2,491,645 sq. km. Situated between latitudes 37° and 19° N., it is bounded by Morocco and Spanish Rio de Oro in the West, by French West Africa and French Equatorial Africa in the South, and by Libya and and Tunisia in the East. Algeria proper, which extends roughly to the southern slopes of the Saharan Atlas, covers only 14.6% of this area, or 320,000 sq. km. It is 2000 km. long, with 1,300 km. of coastline; it is 350 km. in breadth at the Moroccan frontier and 240 km. at the Tunisian, and extends from lat. 32° 9' to 35° 1' in the West, and from lat. 34° 9' to 37° 1' in the East. Tlemcen is at the same latitude as the oasis of Biskra. Algeria proper is a plateau with a mean altitude of 900 m. It is traversed by the Atlas Mt.s., a southern branch of the Alpine chain, which were thrown up in a series of folds during the tertiary and at the beginning of the quaternary period, on the edge of the hard Sahara-African platform. They are divided into two main groups, the Tell Atlas in the North and the Saharan Atlas in the South, which come together in the east and enclose upland plains.

The Tell, the Tell Atlas in relief presents a complex picture, by reason of its excessively folded structure and of the extensive erosion caused by the Mediterranean rains and by the fact that its coastline is near sea level. The successive ridges rise parallel to or at an angle to the coast, cut by deep transverse valleys and separated, in the West, by longitudinal depressions. South of the hills of the Sāḥiḥ (Sahel) of Oran, Dahra, and Beni Menes, and the mountains of Zaccar (1,579 m.) stretches a depression 350 km. in length, following the line of the Sébkha of Oran, the low marshy plains of the Macta and the Mina, and the valley of the lower Chelif (Shalaf). It is
bounded in the South by lines of hills which rarely exceed 1000 m.: the Tessala, Ouled Ali, and Beni Chouroun mountains, and the great massif of the Ouargalis (Warghares) and the Matmâta which rises between the Chelif valley and the high plains. To the West of the valley of the Mina, the inner plains are dominated to the South by table-like limestone and sandstone formations, which rise to between 1000-1500 m.: these are the plateaus of Oran.

To the East of Algiers and the hills of the Sahel the mountain formations are higher and more massive. Between the plains of the Mitidja and Bône (Bôna) there is no important depression, except that of the Wâdi Sâhil-Soummam with its western extension. The mountains of Kabylia, between the Mitidja and the Edough, are of great size and are dominated by a "limestone spine" formed by the Djurgura (highest peak Lâla Khadjûlja, 2,308 m.) [see Kabylia], the Babor (Bâbûr) (2,004 m.), and the highest peaks of the Numidian chain. To the South, the Mittîja and the Medea mountains, the Bîbân ranges, and the Constantine and Medjerda mountains, composed of non-durable marl and schistose material, have comparatively soft or deeply-furrowed contours. The littoral, precipitous and rocky nearly everywhere, affords scant natural shelter against the N-W gales; the bays of Mers el Kebir-Oran (Mars al-Kabîr), Arzeu, Algiers, Bougie (Blidjâya) and Bône face East.

The High Plains. The high plains, wrongly termed high plateaus, are monotonous expanses broken by isolated rocky humps whose moderately-folded structure makes them similar to the Saharan Atlas. Situated below the Tell Atlas, and subject to a climate which is already arid, they form a succession of enclosed basins: the wâdis discharge their alluvia...
are half-buried under their own detritus. The Ksour (Ksour: 2,336 m.), the Amour (Amur: 2,008 m.), the Ouled Nail and the Zblan (or Zab) mountains drop towards the N.E.; they are easily negotiated.

East of Biskra, the Aurès [see Awās] is the largest and highest Algerian massif (Djabel Chellia, 2,429 m.), and is a succession of peaks and depressions running SW-NE.

The desert. The varied terrain of the Atlas region contrasts with the extremely monotone expanse of the desert; for instance its severe plateaus or hamāda, its immense plains which constitute enclosed basins and which are partly covered with sandy or pebbly reg, and finally its erg, vast agglomerations of sand-dunes which cover only 1/5 of its surface [see al-Šāhāra].

The climate is Mediterranean in the Tell Atlas, but it deteriorates in the high plains and the Saharan Atlas where it becomes an arid without actually becoming a desert climate. On the littoral the variation in the mean monthly temperatures is small, because of the humidity. The climate is becoming continental; considerable heat has been known in depressions sheltered from the sea winds, with cold winters in the mountains and on the high plains. Everywhere, except on the littoral, where it rarely occurs, the sirocco (ghēlīf) brings temperatures of 104° F and higher several times a year; in winter, on the other hand, snow covers the principal massifs for 2-3 weeks.

The summer is dry, apart from a few storms, and rain falls principally from October to May. The massifs of the Tell Atlas to the East of Algiers receive more than 31 ins. of rain, and sometimes more than 39 ins. The plains of the West, and the Hodna, receive only some 7-11 ins., except on their northern boundary, and the Saharan Atlas 11-15 ins. on its northern slopes. The desert receives less than 7 ins.

Only the main rivers of the Tell Atlas have water all the year round, and even then their summer flow is very small: these are Mediterranean torrents whose spate is sudden and violent. Such are the Tafna, the Macta (formed by the confluence of the Sig and the Habra), the Shfal (Chëlīf), the Sebāw (Sebou), the Wādī Šahil, the al-Wādī al-Kabīr, the Seybūs (Seybouse), the Meġjerda and its tributary, and the Wādī Melleg (the lower courses of the last two belong to Tunisia). Not one of them is navigable; some are used for irrigation. On the high plains and in the Saharan Atlas the wadis contain water for only part of the year, and then only in their upper courses; many only contain water after heavy rains.

The vegetation has been much impaired by man. Thin forests of non-deciduous and resinous trees still cover the Tell mountains and certain more arid massifs; there are cork-trees on the siliceous and well-watered mountains of the Kabylia and the Béja region; evergreen oaks, or holm-oaks, in different to the soil, even in the Awrams; Aleppo pines on the limestone of the humid regions and on mountains already dry; Barbary thuyas and Kermes oaks in the Oran Tell, and thinly-sown junipers on the drier slopes. A few well-watered peaks still support plantations of cedars. Agricultural expansion and the demand for timber and charcoal have caused the forests to recede: the area under cultivation has chiefly increased at the expense of dense thickets of wild olives and mastic trees, a characteristic of heavy, well-watered soils, and of a thin undergrowth of jujube trees on the drier plains of the Tell Atlas and the high plains of Constantine.

The areas which receive less than 13 ins. of rain annually are the regions of the steppe, a formation characterized by the scarcity of bushes and trees, especially of the latter, and by the presence of perennial herbaceous plants such as alfalfa (10 million usable acres) and esparto, of small ligneous plants such as the artemisia, salt-loving plants growing on the saline soil of the shoffs, and of an annual herbaceous vegetation which burgeons every spring. The desert is only an open steppe without alfa.

Algeria, therefore, comprises two great natural regions in addition to the desert: a Mediterranean region, where the cultivation of cereals, wheat and barley, and of trees like the olive, the fig and the almond is practicable without irrigation, and consequently where a sedentary mode of existence possible: it is known to the indigenous peoples as the Tell; and, secondly, the steppes, where cultivation is not practicable without irrigation or flood waters, and which is devoted to the breeding of livestock on a migratory basis, and to nomadism: natives know this area and that of the desert under the common name of Sahara. This distinction between Tell and Sahara is a fundamental one in the history of the country no less than in its geography.


(ii) History.

(1) To the 16th century.

The region which later became known as Algeria presents a framework not readily acceptable to the historian of Muslim North Africa. The frontiers which are shown on the map cannot set bounds to his field of study; they only assume any significance with the establishment of the Turkish regency of Algiers in the course of the 16th century. During the nine hundred years prior to this event, the future Algeria, which comprises what the Arab writers call central Maghrib (al-Maghrib al-Awsat) together with part of Ifriqiya (near Maghrib), was closely linked with the two neighbouring countries, being almost invariably either subject to rulers coming from these countries or in fear of their domination. Although, in comparison with the two other subdivisions of Barbary or Maghrib, this central region appears to be a large rural area with few towns, populated by nomadic shepherds and hill farmers, it has nevertheless throughout the centuries played a not inconsiderable part in the history of the Muslim West. Only the more important episodes in its history will be mentioned here.

In the middle of the 15th/16th century, North Africa was invaded by the Arabs, the propagators of Islam. The military power of Byzantium rapidly
disintegrated; but the reduction of the Berbers was a more difficult task. Resistance was primarily organized in central Maghrib; inspired, it is said, by Kusayla [g.v.], chief of the Awrâbâ, native bands arose which, near Biskra, engaged Uqba b. Nâfi' [g.v.].—a battle in which the latter lost his life (63/682). The Awrâs in particular seems to have been used as a strongpoint in the struggle against the Arabs; it was in the foothills of this mountain massif that the Kâhina [g.v.], legendary queen of the country, witnessed, after a brilliant success, the destruction of Berber independence (74/693).

The central Magribi again became the centre of autochthonous resistance in the 2nd/8th century, when the Berbers had become converted en masse to Kharidjism. Tlemcen, where Abû Kurra, chief of the Banû Ífrân [g.v.], was in command, was at first their chief centre. In the 3rd/9th century Tihert (near the modern Tiaret), capital of the Rustami [g.v.] mâtums, became the centre of Berber Kharidjism.

The position of this central region, on the borders of the territory which the Aghlabids of al-Kayrawân held in the name of the 'Abbâbîd, explains how the Fātimid [g.v.] power was engendered there among the Kutâma [g.v.] Berbers of Lesser Kabylia at the end of the 3rd/9th century. These new masters, however, were not accepted without a struggle; the Awrâs and its environs witnessed the terrible revolt of the Man with the Donkey, in which the Fātimid cause was nearly lost [see Abû Yazîd al-Nukkârî].

Taking over the role of the Kutâma, the Šinâhidja [g.v.; see also Zîrîds] of central Magrib became, in the 4th/10th century, the most useful allies of the Fātimids and supported their policy of opposition to the Banû Ābd al-Wâd, who were vassals of the Umayyads of Spain. The Banû Šinâh were for the most part nomads, and frequented the central and western plains. The Šinâhidja were settled tribes, and inhabited the central and eastern mountain regions; they founded or developed towns, such as Aghir and the Ka'âfa, capital of the Šinâhidja Banû Ḥammâd [see Ḥamâdhids]. This latter kingdom experienced the repercussion of the serious events which occurred in Ifrîqiya. The invasion of the Banû Tihâb [g.v.] of the Banû Ḥārâbâ by the Fātimids in the middle of the 5th/11th century, which destroyed the kingdom of al-Kayrawân, caused an influx into the Ka'âfa of merchants and artisans, and palaces were built there which betrayed the influence of Fātimid Egypt and of Persia. But it was not long before the Arab scourge menaced, in their turn, the Banû Ḥammâd, who emigrated to Bîjâya (Bougie).

While, in what was later the province of Constantine, the power and prosperity of the former rulers increased, the future provinces of Oran and Algiers acquired new masters. Emerging from Morocco, the Almoravids (5th/11th century) [see al-Murâbi'ûn] overran the country as far as Algiers; the Almohads (6th/12th century) [see al-Muwaḥhidûn and Mu'nâwiûn] extended their sway over the whole of North Africa. Both dynasties, which had in addition annexed Muslim Spain, enriched the cities of their Berber dominions, particularly Tlemcen, with the products of the magnificent civilization of al-Andalus.

At the beginning of the 7th/13th century, the great Almohad empire collapsed, and Tlemcen, which had escaped ravage at the hands of the Arabs and the Almoravids Banû Ghârîb [g.v.], became the capital of the Banû 'Abd al-Wâd [see 'Abd al-Wâdîds], formerly Šanâôt nomads. This new kingdom achieved real economic prosperity; but it was constantly threatened by the Marinids, its Moroccan neighbours, and, at the beginning of the 10th/16th century, it was annexed by the Turkish Muslims.

It was the appearance of the Spanish off the small Berber port of Algiers which led to Turkish intervention in the central region of North Africa and made Algiers the centre of a vassal state. For nearly three centuries piracy, a substitute for holy war, provided the Regency of Algiers with important resources. The country itself, which later became Algeria, and which was divided into three provinces, to some extent evaded the control of its Levantine masters, and its nomadic and settled populations pursued in relative independence an archaic mode of existence, the history of which is, and will doubtless remain, obscure to us.


(G. Marçais)

(2) The Turkish period.

The establishment of the Turks in Algiers was not the result of a deliberate policy of expansion planned and carried out by the Ottomans. It was, on the contrary, at least at its inception, a private venture by two trepida corsairs, known in Western sources as the Barbarossa brothers, 'Arûdî [g.v.] and Khâyr al-Dîn [g.v.]. These two, with a great reputation for valor gained in hunting down Christian vessels in the Mediterranean, came to the rescue of Islam in
Africa, which they saved from the hands of the Spaniards. In 922/1516, the inhabitants of Algiers appealed to Arudj who proclaimed himself sultan, and occupied Miliana, Medea, Tunes and Tiemcen. He was killed at Tiemcen after resisting siege by the Spanish for six months (924/1518). Khayr al-Din restored the situation, which had been rendered momentarily critical by the death of his brother, by presenting the Ottoman Sultan Selim with the newly-acquired territories, thus gaining both increased prestige and the military and financial aid which he needed. He extended his authority over Collo, Bône, Constantine and Cherchell, and in 929 forced the surrender of the Péron of Algiers, a fort which the Spanish had erected on an islet some 300 yards from the shore. In 940/1533 Khayr al-Din was appointed commander-in-chief of the Ottoman fleet, and was replaced at Algiers by beylerbeyis who administered the country either directly or through lieutenants until 995/1587. Aspirations to independence on the part of some of these officials led the Ottoman Government, in 1587, to replace them by pashas appointed for a term of three years. The pashas were eclipsed, after 970/1569, by the aghas of the army corps, who in turn were succeeded by a new power, that of the deys, who ruled until the capture of Algiers by France. The triennial pashas, aghas and deys were more often than not tools in the hands either of the army corps (odej), recruited primarily from the townsmen of Anatolia, or of the ta’ifat al-rusāsā, a guild of corsair captains which, for three centuries, furnished the Algerian treasury with the greater part of its resources. The four aghas who reigned successively from 1659-71 were all assassinated, and fourteen of the twenty-eight deys met the same fate.

The internal organization of the Algerian State is obscure; the scant information of a reliable nature which is available to-day deals for the most part with the era of the deys. The deys, when they managed to stay in power, governed as absolute sovereigns assisted by a council (diwan) composed of the khaṣiṣdār or khaznāḏi (treasurer), the aḏaḏ of the camp (commander of the troops), the waḥlit al-khārji (head of naval administration), the bāy al-maḏār (trusted of vacant estates), and the khōdāḏ al-khānūl or athkhōd (recipient of tribute).

With the exception of the district of Algiers itself which constituted the dār al-sulṭān and was divided into seven regions (masāfān) administered by Turkish kādīs under the direct control of the dey, the whole country was divided into three provinces (beyliḵ), each under a bey, which anticipated the dey’s prestige in the newly-acquired territories. These were the province of Tītīrī, with Medea as its chief town; the eastern province with Constantine as its centre; and the western province, the capital of which was successively Māṣūna, Mascara and, after 1792, Oran. The beys, appointed and dismissed by the dey, ruled their provinces with absolute authority, assisted by kādīs. In the eyes of the central government, they were no more than revenue collectors, tax-farmers who contracted, usually having bought their offices, to pay into the state coffers large sums, the size of which was determined in Algiers. The sum contracted was payable during the financial year, the commencement of which coincided with the appointment of the bey; in several instalments, effected by the bey, his lieutenant and a courier. The bey appeared in person at Algiers during the spring following his appointment and thereafter every three years. His lieutenant travelled to Algiers twice a year, spring and autumn, and the courier, whose office was occasionally discharged by an official described in the archives at Algiers as ṣāḥabiydān (a friend of the bey) went to the capital regularly every month, or every two or three months. The sums remitted to the Treasury by each official remained constant, but each official remitted a different amount. This organization seems to have been designed solely to enable the dey to exercise the closest supervision of the provincial governors, and to dismiss them at the slightest sign of any shortcoming.

This preoccupation with financial matters was apparent throughout the internal organization of Algeria under the Turks. All commissions and offices involving the collection of taxes, dues, imposts or fines were farmed out by the State for sums payable, according to circumstances, in one or more annual instalments. Such a system gave rise to a host of abuses and led to exploitation of the people on such a scale as to render any attempt at winning their sympathies impossible. Moreover, Turkish ascendancy existed more in theory than in fact, and in their garrison-towns in the interior of the country (Bijāya, Bordj Lehaou, Constantine, Medea, Miliana, Māṣūna, Mascara, Tiemcen) the Anatolian yoldaş had often the appearance of troops under siege. In order to maintain their own position, the Turks were obliged to inflame tribal rivalries; the maḏār tribes, when they espoused the Turkish cause, secured not only various financial immunities but also the right to oppress subject tribes (ra’ādīs) and to exterminate rebel tribes. At the same time, the Turks established military colonies (zumal) on all the main communication routes. Thus the Kabylian massif was ringed with posts responsible for ensuring the free passage of troops. Finally the Turks endeavoured to conciliate the religious orders. But they were not entirely successful, and the revolts which broke out at the beginning of the 19th century in the province of Oran and in the Bābūr Kabylia were the work of the powerful Darḵāwa order encouraged and supported by the Sharifs of Fez.

The Turks had no thought of improving the territories they conquered. The future of Algeria, they considered, did not lie in its hinterland. The city of Algiers had come by sea, and they continued to look seawards, and Mediterranean piracy provided the major part of their revenue. The 17th century was the golden age of privateering. In Algiers, about 1650, there were nearly 35,000 captives in the city prisons. Spain made several unavailing attempts to capture Algiers (1541, 1567, 1775). But thereafter French and British naval demonstrations checked the Algerian mariners’ piratical career, and their power declined. Their crews became less audacious. Only one ra’as, Ḥamīdī, deserves mention in the 18th century for the temerity of his exploits. After the middle of the century Algiers, impoverished and shorn of its former importance, suffered a decline in population, a decline hastened by famine and plague. In 1816, after the Congress of Vienna, when Lord Exmouth or the Dutch admiral Van der Capellen, the representatives of Europe, arrived to bombard the town, there were only 1,200 slaves in the prisons. On the eve of the French invasion, Algiers, which had at one time had 100,000 inhabitants, had been reduced to barely 40,000.

The Tuareg, a Negroid people of nomadic origin from the desert of Niger (compare the name of "Tuareg" with the Arabic descriptor "tā’arug), have been prominent in the life of this region for centuries. As early as the 12th century the name appeared in the traditions of the Arabs and Berbers under the form of the Tuareg, who were a powerful tribe living in the vicinity of the city of Timbuktu. The Tuareg have long been known for their strong resistance to European penetration, and their independence has continued to the present day.
first time with the frontiers drawn on the map of Barbary as we know it to-day. Moreover, the fusion between the Arab and Berber elements of the population had become more complete. Algeria entered on its career as an entity, and Algiers attained the status of a capital. 


(5) After 1830.

Following a dispute concerning the supply of wheat, the dey of Algiers Husayn insulted Deval, the French Consul. The Government of Charles X instructed the fleet to blockade the old pirate stronghold. In 1830, influenced by considerations of internal policy, Polignac, the chief minister, decided, despite British objections, to send an expeditionary force to Algiers. The dey surrendered on 5th July and embarked with the majority of his janissaries. France, which did not aim at permanent occupation, entered into negotiation with the other powers. At first the July Monarchy was perplexed by the “embarrassing legacy” of the previous regime. It decided to begin with to confine itself to a limited and temporary occupation. It was not until 1834 that a Governor-General was appointed following the report of an “African Commission”. Until 1841 the French occupation, frowned on by the Chambers, was limited to possession of the principal ports and their environs.

Meanwhile, the situation had changed in the interior. The Turks, the bul-gâhist, and the former makhzen were harassed by the Arabs, and various native states came into being. The bey of Constantine, Ahmad, consolidated his power within his province. In the west, after a period of anarchy, the people accepted or were subjected to the rule of the marabout ‘Abd al-Kâdir [q.v.], who was conspicuous for his bravery, his diplomacy and his organizing ability. French policy vacillated between organizing ability. French policy vacillated between collaboration with the former makhzen and dealings with the new Arab chiefs. But although ‘Abd al-Kâdir twice agreed to sign treaties which strengthened his position, Ahmad refused, and repulsed a French army before Constantine in 1836. The following year a new expedition captured the town, and France decided to effect a definitive occupation of the eastern province. In 1839 ‘Abd al-Kâdir declared war on France. The conduct of operations during Marshal Valée’s governorship was apathe-
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tropical foodstuffs; but the crop which succeeded best was corn, the colonists' crop until about 1881. An economic crisis and the increasing claims of the colonists, who were handicapped by the limited scope of their concessions and who wished to acquire land made available through the establishment of cantonments, led the Government to renew the policy of assimilation. From 1853-60, the country was governed from Paris by a Ministry for Algeria and the Colonies, entrusted at first to Prince Napoleon, and then to the Comte de Chassé, later to Marshal Baudouin. The disorder of the administration forced Napoléon III to restore military government under Marshal Pélissier and, after the latter's death in 1864, under Marshal Mac-Mahon. During this period, despite opposition from the colonists, the Emperor tried to make Algeria an "Arab Kingdom". He protected the tribal collective lands by the senatus consultum of 1863; by that of 1865, Muslims were allowed to adopt French nationality.

In 1870 the colonists expelled the imperial agents and set up the revolutionary government of the "commune" of Algiers. The Government headed by Thiers decided on the establishment of a civil administration. From that time, although the first two governors, Admiral de Guéydon and General Chabrier, came from the armed forces, the civil administration increased steadily in extent and the "Arab bureaus" gave way to "mixed communes".

Complete administrative and financial autonomy was achieved in 1900. The powers of the Governor General were increased, and the budget was henceforth voted by the "Délégations financières", a body representing the various economic interests in the country. Algeria was empowered to raise loans in order to improve its industrial plant, ports, roads, railways, dams etc. An era of prosperity was inaugurated. More varied types of crops were grown, and over an ever-increasing area. European colonization was stimulated; the outlay necessitated by increasingly scientific agricultural methods gave it a capitalist character unknown before the large-scale cultivation of the grape and of citrus fruits. New mines of iron, zinc and phosphates were developed. The native population increased as the result of a high birth-rate coupled with a decreased mortality rate, and the product of more hygienic methods. The economic achievement was very considerable, but social policy continued to be paternal in spirit.

Algeria played a prominent part in the 1939-45 war. After the Anglo-American landings in 1944, a French liberation force was organized there which took part in driving the Germans and Italians out of Tunisia, and participated in the Italian campaign and in the fighting in France. In recognition of the services rendered by Muslims during this common effort, the political régime was improved by the creation of an Algerian Assembly, elected by universal suffrage and consisting of two houses, European and Muslim, with equal rights. The work of economic development was resumed on a more generous scale; a comprehensive scheme for the education of Muslims was drawn up, and an era of social reform was ushered in.


(M. Emerit)

(iii) Population.

Demography. The total population of Algeria, according to the census of 31 Oct. 1948, is 8,681,785, which represents a large increase as compared with previous censuses. It comprises 7,721,678 Muslims and 960,107 non-Muslims; the latter include 876,686 French and 45,516 other Europeans, of whom 1/4 are Spanish. More than 75% of the Europeans live in the cities. In the country they are found chiefly in the Tell, especially in the wine-growing and market-gardening districts. In the department of Oran most of the French are of Spanish origin.

The majority of the Muslims live in the rural areas, and the movement to the towns is a recent phenomenon: 1/5 of them now live in them. They form the majority everywhere except in Algiers and Oran. The population of the largest towns (1948) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Muslims</th>
<th>Non-Muslims</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algiers (incl. suburbs)</td>
<td>245,539</td>
<td>247,722</td>
<td>493,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oran (incl. suburbs)</td>
<td>110,678</td>
<td>174,036</td>
<td>284,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine</td>
<td>77,089</td>
<td>37,249</td>
<td>114,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bône</td>
<td>56,614</td>
<td>14,445</td>
<td>71,059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are five other cities of from 50,000 to 100,000 inhabitants: Tlemcen, Philippeville, Sidi-bel-Abbes, Mostaganem, and Sétif, all situated in the Tell. The distribution of the population in the administrative districts and its density per sq. km. are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Oran</td>
<td>1,990,729</td>
<td>183.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Algiers</td>
<td>2,765,866</td>
<td>136.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Constantine</td>
<td>3,108,165</td>
<td>125.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Territories</td>
<td>816,993</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most populous regions are those of the Tell Atlas where the density per sq. km. generally exceeds 30 and sometimes 60 (Trarà, the Algiers district, the Kabylias); it reaches 114 in the purely rural and mountainous arrondissement of Tizi Ouzou, but drops to between 10 and 30 on the high plains of Constantine (except in the NW) and in the Awrâs and the Hoëna, to less than 10 on the steppes, and less than 1 in the desert.

Ethnography. The Muslim peoples of Algeria, the Berbers [q.v.], have an obscure origin. Of white race, they are, and apparently have been since remote antiquity, of various physical types. The influx of foreigners has not been on a large scale in the course of the centuries, except for that of the Arabs (i.e., Muslims from the East) in certain
regions, and of Mediterranean elements in the cities, where the most recent arrivals are the Andalus (Muslims returning from Spain), Turks and Europeans. But although most of the population calls itself Arab because it speaks Arabic, although the descendants of Turks who married Algerian women call themselves hul-oghlu (kouloughli), although the older citizens, of considerably mixed origin, pride themselves in the term hadar while others boast of being “Andalus”, the bulk of the population has changed little, anthropologically, and has remained Berber. In the Saharan oases the coloured Harratin (see Hartani) cultivate the soil, and the coloured races of the Sudan were for long sold as slaves (‘abid) in the towns. In practice, the terms “Arabs” and “Berbers” are used for Arabic-speaking and Berber-speakers.

49% of Algerian Muslims still speak Berber; they are chiefly the Shamiyya (Chaouia), who spill over extensively from the Ahras, and the Kabyles (kabili) west of Djedjelli; there are also the Beni Menasser of the mountains between Tenes and Cherchell, and small groups in the Mitidjian Atlas, the Wanghars (Ouarsenis), the Tlemcen Mountains and, in the South, the mountains of the Ksour. In the Sahara Berber is spoken by the Tuareg (q.v.), by the Maabbites (q.v.) and some Ksourianis (villagers) of the Saoura, Gourara, Warga and the Wad Righ (Oued Righ). The Berber dialects, which vary from district to district, do not constitute a literary language; Berber is not written, and its literature is transmitted orally. From the 11th century onwards, Arabic was propagated far more by the nomads than by the towns. The sedentary Arab dialects are localised in the cities, in eastern Kabylie and the Tlemcen; everywhere else Berber was pushed back by the bedoun dialects.

The Arabs, who have thus furnished 71% of Algerians with dialects derived from their language, have gradually converted them all to Islam (except for 130,000 Jews, at the present day). Virtually the only rite practised in Algeria is the Malikite; there are a few followers of the Hanafi rite among people of Turkish descent in Algiers and Tlemcen. The Maabbites, Ibadji (Khadrjiite) heretics, form a separate community.

Of the fundamental practices of Islam, which are the same everywhere, the five daily prayers are regularly performed in Algeria only by a minority of the population; the pilgrimage to Mecca, to which the majority pass as natives of the country. They all transmit the baraka to their descendants, if any. But many marabouts have never existed, and their cult is proof of the persistence of pre-Islamic nature cults involving trees, springs, rocks, and mountains (for instance Lalla Khadjiga at the highest point of the Djurdjura). The marabout cult has sometimes gained non-Muslim adherents. Pre-Islamic practices survive in various rites involving magic and sorcery; in the belief in the evil eye, and in sundry agricultural rites. All the non-orthodox popular practices are still widespread in certain country districts, especially among the women.

Islam, in Algeria as elsewhere, has permeated social life. Although the life of the Kabyles in the West, and of the inhabitants of the Ahras and of the Tuareg of the Sahara, remains faithful to customs which owe nothing to Muslim law, the private life of the majority of native Algerians is regulated by this law, especially as regards the law of succession, which, in detail, is extremely complex, and personal status. Polygamy, although of course authorized, is in fact not prevalent, particularly in the towns. Malikite law does not forbid child marriage, and the young girls’ consent to their own marriage, which is arranged by their father, is not required (the right of djabir); women can be repudiated by their husbands without any formality or indemnity, a practice which encourages “successive polygamy”. Agrarian law in Algeria has undergone a radical transformation through the influence of French law.

Ways of life. Social life and economic activity are bound up with the way of life of the various elements of the population.

The tribes of the steppes and the desert, consisting of shepherds who breed sheep, goats, camels and horses, are still more or less nomadic. Omitting the Tuareg and the Sha’dda who are pure Saharans [see al-Ša‘râ], only those tribes will be mentioned which roam between the desert and Algeria proper. Some still spend the summer in the Tell. The Arbâ (Laârba) of the Laârba region, and the Said Atba of the Warga neighbourhood are almost solely pastoral in their way of life, and spend the summer in the Serson and on the southern slopes of the Wanghars. The nomads of the Touggourt Territory, owners of palm-trees and with fewer flocks, spend the summer in the high plains of Constantine; they include the Ouled Djedi and Bouazid of the Oued Djedi, the Arab Sherka (Cheraga), the Amûr and Ouled Sidi Salah of the dependency of Biskra and the Arab Gheraba and the Ouled Moulet of the dependency of Touggourt. Other tribes, which live in the valleys of the Sahara, cultivate a certain amount of grain and grazing the pasturages, spend the summer with their flocks in the Saharan Atlas; for instance the Awlîd Sidi Shâykh, the Awlîd Naîl of the south and the Nememcha in the east.
The steppes are the province of the semi-nomads who, for 6-8 months of the year, remain close to their barley and wheat fields and their winter pasture grounds. The ʿAmūr and the Awdād Nall of the north use the pasture grounds of the southern valleys of the Saharan Atlas and the folds of the high steppes, and spend the summer in the Atlas. The semi-nomads of the high steppes, cultivators of grain crops and collectors of alfalfa, spend the summer with their flocks on the southern slopes of the Tell Atlas. The Hamlian, to the west, are former camel nomads. The tribes of the Ḥodna have no alfalfa and in the summer migrate with their flocks and as labourers to the high plains of Constantine.

The breeding of the horse, formerly used in battle, is on the decline; so also is that of the camel, the beast of burden and trade, owing to the competition of rail and road. Sheep breeding, which flourished between 1880 and 1920, is giving way to the cultivation of cereals. The collective ownership of agricultural land is developing into family ownership and even into private ownership; the tents, made of camel hair, goat's hair and wool, formerly grouped in great dawars, are dwindling; they are only used as temporary dwellings by the semi-nomads, who spend the winter in huts or houses. The economic and social unit, which among the nomads is the tribe or a subdivision of the tribe, is a smaller subdivision or the patriarchal family among the semi-nomads.

In the principal mountain massifs the inhabitants often still retain their Berber dialects and customs; but their way of life depends on local conditions. The Awrâs is the stronghold of the Shâwiyya, who are both agriculturalists and breeders of sheep and goats. Their terraced fields, usually irrigated, support cereals and, depending on the altitude, date-palms, figs, apricots and nuts. Although principally village dwellers, they undertake a winter migration, and to some extent follow a semi-nomadic existence, in the direction of the plains of the north and south; they spend the summer on the upland pasture grounds with the exclusively pastoral people. Their lofty villages, surmounted by fortified granaries (see agadir), are still under the effective authority of gjemâyas. Among the Kabyles, only those of the west (Djerjura, Soumman, Bâbûr, Guergour) have retained their traditional dialects and customs. Their terraced fields chiefly support olive and fig trees; they lack cereals and livestock. For want of space they are emigrating in increasing numbers, principally to the towns of Algeria and to France.

The village (taddari), whether its quarters (kharrubâ) are combined, separate or scattered, forms the economic, social and political unit: the gjemâya officially maintains its traditional authority in Kabylia of the Djerjura. The Kabyles of the east are no less essentially Berber-speaking but of the non-Kabyle neighbours of the Bône region, they live in large clearings where they cultivate barley, sorghum and a few fruit trees; they breed cattle and sheep etc., and work in the forests, mainly stripping cork. Their neighbours have huts made with branches; they live in houses grouped in hamlets and are emigrating in large numbers. In western Algeria the way of life of the Beji Menâsher (Berber-speaking) and of the Trара (Arabicized) recalls that of the Kabyles of the west. The inhabitants of the high valleys of the Wangâhrs and the Oran plateaus, once almost all semi-nomads, now have no more than a few tents.

The fertile plains and hills of the Tell, formerly coveted and menaced by both nomads and mountain dwellers, and only insufficiently exploited by people living in huts and tented camps, gained a livelihood from the cultivation of cereals and extensive stock-breeding, have greatly changed in appearance. In the areas of dense colonization, some of the former jelâbîs have become agricultural labourers while others have profited by the examples before their eyes. The local populations everywhere, whose numbers have greatly increased, have considerably extended the area devoted to the cultivation of cereals, at the expense of rearing of livestock. The old semi-nomad tribes of the high plains of Constantine are now bound to the soil. Tribal connections are forgotten; society is crumbling, but private ownership of property often still remains vested in the family. French schooling, military service, and emigration—usually temporary—to the towns or to France accentuates individualism and family autonomy.

Individualism is getting the upper hand in the cities, without causing loss of solidarity between men of the same origin. The partly-Turkish bourgeoisie of the ancient cities of Algeria (Algeriers, Constantine and Tlemcen) has been to a large extent regenerated by people of rural origin; artisans have gradually disappeared. Both old and new towns now have a prosperous or rich bourgeoisie of landed proprietors and a few business men, members of the liberal professions and various employees, and a large proletariat, burdened with an excessive number of rural immigrants with no manual skill and potentially only mediocre labourers.

**Economy.** The native elements remain the dominant factor in the Algerian economy. They cultivate nearly 1/3 of the grain lands, growing almost entirely barley and wheat, and nearly 2/5 of the bearing olive trees and of land devoted to pulses and tobacco. They own more than 96% of the date palms and nearly all the fig trees. They own 95% of the sheep and goats. The colonists, on the other hand, cultivate the vine almost exclusively, and are almost alone in growing early vegetables and citrus fruits. A fundamental problem is how to increase the volume, still very low, of the native output as a whole, and to improve the quality of livestock. Some Algerians have been trained in fishing by Frenchmen of Spanish or Italian origin. The native peoples provide only the labour force and fill a few lower grades in the mines (iron and phosphates, especially lead and zinc), but they are employed in large numbers in the transport services. Industry, still underdeveloped despite recent efforts, finds in them an ample source of labour, but few skilled craftsmen or specialists. Short-term emigration to the industrial cities and to dockyards in France assures an abundant flow of money into the country.


(iv) INSTITUTIONS.

Algeria is part of the French Union as defined by the constitution of 27 October 1946. In it Algeria holds a peculiar position, which was defined by the law of 20 September 1947 entitled 'the Algerian Statute'. At the head of Algeria, there is a Governor with wide powers. The inhabitants are represented by an elective Algerian assembly which not only has financial powers, as had the "Délégations financières" which it replaces, but also a part in the initiation and adaptation to the country of the laws, the principal legislative body being the French Parliament.

Personal status had previously been defined by the law of 7 May 1946, an entirely new law which bears the name of its author, Lamine-Gueye, and which proclaimed the equality of the inhabitants of the country: "all subjects of French nationality of the departments of Algeria enjoy, without distinction of birth, race, language or religion, the rights attaching to the status of French citizens and are subject to the same obligations". But since alongside the Europeans, who are mainly French, lives a large Muslim majority, whose private life is largely regulated by Muslim law, it is laid down that "citizens who do not possess French civil status keep their personal status as long as they have not renounced it". The citizens of French status are French citizens by birth, Algerian-born Jews, who have been citizens since the Crémieux decree of 24 October 1970, a few Muslims who have applied for French civil status and 2/5 of elected Muslims. All citizens are eligible without distinction for election to one or other college.

The Judicial System. The judicial system is similar to that of the Metropolis. The peoples of Algeria are represented in the Parliament of the Metropolis by 30 deputies in the National Assembly (15 per College), by 14 Councillors of the Republic (7 per College), and by 12 elected persons in the Assembly of the French Union, 6 of these being elected by the Algerian Assembly and 6 by the general councils.

Administrative organisation. The three departments (Algiers, Constantine and Oran), whose prefects have wider jurisdiction than in the metropolis, are divided into arrondissements (7, 7 and 6). Their general councils are made up of 3/5 of citizens of French status and 2/5 of elected Muslims. The communes are large and varied in character. Where the non-Muslim French are found in sufficient numbers, they are Communes de plein exercice (with full powers) in which both Colleges are represented (3/5 and 2/5); dependent on the mayor, where needed, are the kâ'ids (caïds) of the dousars (sections of communes), subdivisions which have their own elected representatives, the djemâ'a (djêmâ). The "mixed Communes", destined eventually to disappear, are headed by officials of the Algerian civil service. These preside over the municipal committee which consists of elected members, the kâ'ids, and the presidents of the djemâ'a of the various dousars. In those areas with native populations which have reached a sufficient stage of development there have recently been set up "municipal centres" which, under the control of a civil servant, are undergoing their apprenticeship to public life.

The increase in the size of the departments has gradually pushed back towards the Sahara the former military districts, which have become the Southern Territories. Covering an enormous area, two of them encroaching on the Saharan Atlas and the high steppes of the west, the four Territories have as their centres Colomb-Béchar, Laghaout (Lagwî), Tougourt and Ouargla (Wargla). They are under the direct authority of the Governor General, acting in the capacity of a prefect; the military commanders who are subordinate to him have the administrative powers of a sub-prefect. The Territories used to be divided into dependencies (annexes) which have become the basis of the present communes: 10 mixed communes under civil administrators, and 9 "native communes" under officers for Saharan affairs or administrators. The kâ'ids of the dousars are subordinate to them, and members of the djemâ'a are elected or nominated. The Algerian Statute provides for the gradual conversion of the Southern Territories into civil districts.

The Judicial System. The judicial system is closely modelled on that of the Metropolis. Algiers is the seat of a Court of Appeal; there are 17 assize courts (with French and Muslim jurors) and 79 courts of first instance. Questions concerning the personal status and the inheritance of French Muslims are dealt with by the kâ'ids of the 84 principal mahkamas (mahâkâmah) and by the bašîk dâsil (bachadel) of the 23 dependencies. But their jurisdiction is always optional, and the interested parties can refer to the
justices of the peace, judges of common law in Muslim matters who apply the provisions of Muslim law, or to the French judicial authorities and to French law. The Kabyles of the west, the majority of whom have preserved their own customs, do not have ḏādis. [Cf. also ʿĀdnah.]


**(v)** Languages.

(i) The Arab dialects of Algeria.

The territory forming the present Algeria was arabised during two distinct periods, in common with North Africa in general. The first period commenced with the Muslim invasions at the end of the 1st/7th century. Although not important from the point of view of their ethnic contribution, these invasions had a considerable military, political, religious, and therefore linguistic, effect. They affected primarily the urban centres. The conquering Arabs established garrisons there, distributing units of the eastern diwān throughout the countries which they wished to control and administer. Just as Idrisid Fez and Aghlabid al-ʿĀrāwān arabised the rural and mountain regions around them, so Tlemcen and Constantine, in Algeria, caused the regions which lay between them and the sea, namely Trâra and eastern Kabylia, to forsake the native idiom and adopt the language of the conquerors. Later, the Shiʿite propaganda, by directly linking the Berber tribes to the Shiʿa movement, very probably played a part in imposing Arabic on certain peoples in the north of the department of Constantine. The arabisation of this first period is responsible for the Arabic spoken in the old centres and in the adjacent mountainous regions; thus its various forms can be called “pre-Hilāl dialects”.

The invasion of the Banī Ḥilāl, the Sulaym and the Maʾṣīḥ inaugurated the second period of arabisation. It began halfway through the 4th/10th century, unleashing the turbulent throng of Bedouin tribes against “perfidious Magrib”. This time the ethnic contribution was important. The movement of populations which was brought about by the invasion of these new-comers threw Barbary into a ferment, and resulted in the widespread diffusion of the language which they brought with them. Not merely small districts but vast areas abandoned Berber for Arabic; at first, no doubt, it was the steppes and high plains devoted “to the pastoral life, where the nomads felt at home; then, as a result of alliances which were offered to them or which they imposed, vast settled regions of the Tell and even of the Sahel. Important transfers of populations continued to take place up to the end of the 8th/14th century; for example the establishment of the Ḥilāl Dawkīda in northern Constantine province, and of the Maʾṣīḥ Ṣubayd Allāh and the Ḥilāl Zughba b. ʿĀmir between Tlemcen and the sea. Through contact with the Bedouin Arabs or under their tutelage, entire Berber tribes, sharing a common mode of existence with the Bedouin, turned to Arabic; for example the Sadwīkh of western Constantine province and sections of the Ṣanāʿa of northern Oran. Arabisation has continued until our own times, penetrating the mountain massifs and ancient Saharan centres which remained the strongholds of Berberism. An unpublished work of al-Ṣabbāgh on the life of the great saint of the Chelif, Sidi Ahmad b. ʿĪṣaṣ, gives us an idea of the linguistic state of this region in the 10th/16th century, and quotes phrases in lugha sanāʾiyā. Berber was still spoken in the Chelif at that period, but now Arabic alone is spoken, except in the mountain massifs of the Bani Menāsēr and Wanghārs which skirt the region. One is tempted to consider that the propagation of the conquerors’ language was particularly encouraged by the Turks between the 9th/15th and the 13th/19th centuries. In the northern regions which they endeavoured to control, they executed large transfers of rural and Bedouin groups, on a scale surpassing that of the dynasties which preceded them in central Magrib.

The upheaval of populations in the course of centuries has been so great that linguistics cannot provide any ethnic criteria. It is doubtless permissible to conjecture that the groups which have remained Berber-speaking include a large proportion of elements of Berber origin, but nothing enables us to assess the proportion of the elements of Arab origin among the Arab-speaking populations. It is most likely that the latter are largely composed of arabised Berbers. No shibboleth, or linguistic criterion, enables us to establish the ethnic origin of the various groups; no dialectal indication, as far as we know, makes it possible to identify the Berber groups converted to Arabic such as the Ulhāṣa, the Huwārā, the Sindjās, the ʿAdjis, the Luwwūṭa or the Kutāma, etc.

As regards the Arabic dialects introduced by the invasions of the 5th/6th/11th-12th centuries, it is generally considered that the territory of the Sulaym was definitely to the east, and that of the Maʾṣīḥ more to the west. The territory of the Hilāl cannot be defined exactly; it was certainly centrally situated, but probably encroached on the territories to the east and west. The dialectal variations of the language which they spoke or which they disseminated are known as “Bedouin dialects”.

(A) Pre-Hilāl dialects. Included in this category are village (or mountain) dialects, and urban dialects (Jewish and Muslim).

(a) Village dialects. These are represented by two groups which have been clearly identified but have not been the subject of equal study; namely, Oran dialects, and Constantine dialects. The former embrace the mountain massif of the Trāra, which extends from the udāf of Moghniyya (Marnia) as far as the sea, and is bounded approximately by the course of the Tafna to the east. Nadrūma (Nédroma) is the urban centre. This area belongs to the Ulhāṣa and the Kūmiyya, and is crossed by the routes connecting Tlemcen with the ports of Huṣayn and Arāghkūn (Rachgoun). Its arabisation dates probably from the Idrisid era. The second group corresponds to eastern Kabylia, and is completely mountainous, having the form of a triangle whose apexes are Dijīdji, Mila and Collo. Historically, the region represents the seaward expansion of Constantine and Mila, which were Arab garrison towns in the Aghlabid period. This is the former Kutāma country, the centre of the Fāṭimid movement.

These dialects are characterised phonetically as follows: uvular ū is changed into velar ū, e.g. kalb for kalb “heart”; ū is pronounced as a palatal,
and often, with a marked degree of palatalisation, ky, or as an affricate, ksh, tsh, or as a fricative, ts, in Oran and Tlemcen, a change which leads to confusion with the fricatives sh and s and the sibilants i (H) and s; and finally, certain elements of vocabulary have survived, such as words of Berber forms with the prefix a- (not taking the Arabic definite article), or of the form i...i, most of them associated with rural life (dwellings, domestic life, domestic utensils, country life, agricultural implements, animals, plants, etc.).

These two types of village dialects unquestionably possess considerable points of difference; but they have certain features in common with the dialect of the Moroccan Dibāla to the west. The Oran group is nearer to the Moroccan group than to the Constante. To the ears of townsmen, and with even more reason to those of the Bedouin, the speech of the Dibāla, the Trara, and the rural Djijellians sounds like a foreign tongue, whose sounds, syntax and vocabulary seem to them alien to Arabic. It is, however, Arabic, and even Arabic of an ancient stock, as is witnessed by certain archaisms, such as the preservation of the old monoliteral fa “mouth” in the Nderoma district, and of the final iyēya among the rural Djijellians; but at the same time it is an Arabic in which appears the Berber method of presenting ideas, and through which the substratum of Berber vocabulary often emerges; an Arabic, finally, which, retaining the marks of the bilingualism which preceded the supersession of Berber by Arabic, is still handled by those, whose ancestors had adopted it, with a beginner’s clumsiness.

(b) Urban dialects. These do not form a homogeneous group, and the listing and description of these dialects is far from complete. They are divided into two classes—Jewish and Muslim.

Jewish dialects. The North African Jews are almost entirely city-dwellers in Algeria. Apart from the semi-nomadic group of the Balbésiya in the Souk-Ahras region, now dispersed, they all live in towns. Only those Jewish communities with a very pronounced Berber element—because of their populousness and strong social cohesion, constitute societies distinct from and virtually alien to the Muslim majority around them, possess any special form of Arabic; for instance the communities of Oran, Tlemcen, Mihama, Médea, Algiers and Constantine. Although the Jewish dialects differ from one city to another, they share certain common characteristics.

The phonetic system is rather changed in these dialects, especially as spoken by women: loss of the interdental th, dh, dh, which revert to t, d, q; the unvoiced dental t becomes the affricate ts, in Oran and Tlemcen, a change which leads to confusion with the fricatives sh and s and the sibilants i (H) and s;
the excessive rolling of $r$, very noticeable in Algiers; a general inability correctly to pronounce back consonants; thus, $k$, glottal check, for $k$, in Algiers, and, in Tlemcen or Oran (as in Jewish Fes), $k$ for $h$, and a for $h$; the muting of the aspirate, especially in Algiers; the decay of the short vowels, in which has forms analogous to, if not identical with, those in Cherchell dialect. In the and and 3rd person pronominal affix of the 3rd person sing, masc., after a consonant.

The morphological forms contain both similar and dissimilar elements. Among the former should be noted reconstruction of defective verbs, for instance of $khdâ"$to take" and of $hla"to eat"; the general use of the plural quadriliteral form $snâdhâ"coffers" and the diminutive $mîlêk"small key", and of the triliteral diminutive $tïzelf"small child"; the frequent use (except at Constantine, Mila, Philippeville) of a sort of curious adjectival diminutive $kîbîr"somewhat large" from $khîr, kîbîl"blackish" from $khîl, already vouched for in al-Andalus; the pronunciation $u$ or $o$ of the pronominal affix of the 3rd person sing, masc., after a consonant. The feminine $ah$ is peculiar to Cherchell; elsewhere it is invariably $ha$, for the 3rd person pronoun.

In other cases, the townspeople have borrowed the language of the neighbouring Bedouin collective, or sedentary Bedouin, groups; for instance, in Tlemcen, Ténès, Blida, Miliana, Médéa, Mila, Philippeville, and Constantine. Although, on the whole, the language of these old centres has remained almost completely dominant: for instance, in Oran, or sedentary Bedouin, groups; for instance, in Oran, Mostaganem, Mascara, Mazouna, and Bône (and similarly, in the extreme east of the Maghrib, at Tripoli and Benghâzî). The case of Algiers and its environs, and that of Bougie, are more complex. Algiers and the Fahs form a melting-pot for urban elements, for old-established rural sedentary population, for newly-arrived rural elements, and for Bedouin who, after a period of acclimatization in the Chélif and the Mitidja, flock to a city life which, although of a proletarian nature, attracts them; Kabylie, moreover, disposes its emigrants there in an unending stream. The Kabylie element, indeed, has so far taken possession of Bougie as to render this ancient capital and mediaeval centre of Arab culture, a Berber-speaking city.

Phonetically, the urban Muslim dialects have on the whole the same characteristics as those of the village dialects and the Jewish dialects. Only the ancients in Ténès, Cherchell, Dellys and Constantine have preserved the interdental. In Médéa, Blida and Algiers both the fricative and the occlusive pronunciation are heard together. $T$ is everywhere converted to the affricate $ts$. The voiced sibilant is variously pronounced: $ji$, with an initial dental, in Tlemcen, Ténès, Cherchell, Médéa, Blida, Algiers, Dellys, Mila, and Constantine: elsewhere as $l$. The exaggerated rolling of $r$ could be said to be a typically urban "articulatory disease": it is, presence in the Jewish dialects has already been noted: it is conspicuous in Constantine, Dídjlî, Cherchell, Tlemcen and Nédrôma (and similarly at Tunis and Fes.) The change of $k$ to $q$, a simple glottal check, exists at Tlemcen; at Dídjlî, a back $k$ is substituted for it; but in all the other towns, it remains $k$. Ibn Khaldîn based the essential difference between the dialects of the sedentary peoples and the dialects of the Bedouin of the Maghrib on the contrast between the intellectual or religious life. It is, alternately, the language of these old centres has remained unstable, and does not lend itself to early extinction, if, indeed, it has not already disappeared. The old cities everywhere bear the marks of the external influences to which the languages have been subjected in the course of centuries, and to which they are still subject; that of the rural populations and that of the Bedouin. The Bedouin dialects, as preserved in the cases of Nédrôma, Dídjlî and Collo, where the dialect tends to conform to that of the surrounding villages. In other cases, the townspeople have borrowed the language of the neighbouring Bedouin collective, or sedentary Bedouin, groups; for instance, in Tlemcen, Ténès, Blida, Miliana, Médéa, Mila, Philippeville, and Constantine. Although, on the whole, the language of these old centres has remained urban, there are others where the Bedouin dialect is almost completely dominant: for instance, in Oran, Mostaganem, Mascara, Mazouna, and Bône (and similarly, in the extreme east of the Maghrib, at Tripoli and Benghâzî). The case of Algiers and its environs, and that of Bougie, are more complex.
fossilized in songs, proverbs, and a few ready-made expressions.

(B) Bedouin dialects. In so far as they are known (and knowledge of them is only approximate and incomplete), the Bedouin dialects of Algeria present the appearance of a composite and heterogeneous mass. The isoglosses which some have attempted to trace form a complex picture; the interpretation of this picture, if it seeks to take an overall view, ignores the diversity of the material and glosses over numerous contradictions.

The following are the identifying marks of a Bedouin dialect. (a) Phonetic. A fairly general retention of the interdentals $th, dh, gh$; an occlusive pronunciation of the unvoiced dental $t$, except in certain oasis dialects in which it is affricated (as at Beni Abbès in southern Oran, or Touggourt in southern Constantine); the voicing of the back velar, $g$, only appearing in loan words and especially in the vocabulary of law and religion; an occasional preservation of short vowels, often complicated by a change in quality attributable to the influence of adjacent consonants or, sometimes, to that of stress.

(b) Morphological. A certain conservatism which preserves in the verbal and nominal forms traces of the ancient tongue; differentiation of gender in the second person singular of verbs and of the independent pronoun: $ghaburi "thou (m.) hast struck"$, $ghabibi "thou (f.) hast struck"$, eni "thou (m.)", eni "thou (f.)"; a fairly widespread use of the dual, going beyond the limited use for nouns of measure and nouns denoting parts of the body which occur in pairs. (c) In syntax and vocabulary. A restricted use of the indefinite article $a$, the use of the undefined noun often being sufficient to indicate a state of indefiniteness; the frequent expression of the possessive relationship by the old method of direct connexion; the use of a vocabulary more exclusively Arabic than that of the sedentary populations.

This group of characteristic forms constitutes a common basis of the Bedouin dialects. They possess other peculiarities, but either they do not all possess them or they are not alone in possessing them: for instance the preservation of the diphthongs ey, ow or their contraction to $i, o$, the sedentary dialects usually resolving them fully, to $i, u$: the use of the form $id$, not yedd "hand", and of the preposition $mid$ (not $madi$) "of", to the exclusion of $ad$, $di$, $dydi$; the use of the plural form $mdid$ (not $mdidi$) "coffers" and of the diminutive $mfitch$ (not $mfitch$) "small key", for quadrilateralers, and of the diminutives $ufeyl, tful$, $tfil$ (not $feyeyel"small child" for trilliterals with a short vowel; the existence of a plural form for trilliterals with a doubled medial consonant and short vowel, $gherref$ from $gherref"old, tough"$, and of a plural $mid$a from $mid"five"$, e.g. $mghabbna$b from $mgb"deceived, afflicted"$; the preservation, in the numerals from 11-19, of the $' of 'ashar, e.g. $khmista'ash"fifteen"$ (especially in southern Oran), the sedentary dialects habitually having $khmista'sh$ etc.

In order to attempt a provisional draft classification of the Bedouin group, only a limited number of those dialectal features which most prominently are possessed distinctive will be selected, some phonetic, other morphological (but not distinctions of vocabulary, an enumeration of which would lead us too far afield):

(i) The pronunciation of the voiced sibilant: $j$ is the pronunciation of the Bedouin dialects of eastern Algeria. The line of demarcation $j/l$ passes
to the east of Philippeville, Constantine and Ouled Rahmoun, curves south of Barika, keeps to the south of Hodna and veering north, reaches the neighbourhood of Mansoura des Bibans. It is also identical with that of the high plains and the Saharan regions of the centre and west of Algeria: the line of demarcation $\text{dj}$/$\text{t}$ passes north of Aln Bessem in the direction of Champlain, leaves Médéa, the Djerbel and the Ouarsenis to the south and, at the altitude of Teniet el-Hadd, crosses the Sersou, proceeds to the south of Trézel and north of Frenda and Saidâ, and swings north towards Mercier-Lacombe, Saint Denis du Sig and the approaches of Tlemcen. $\text{Dj}$ therefore represents the pronunciation of the regions of Constantine, Saint Arnaud, Sétil, Bord Bou Arreridj, Barika, Miscia and the Hodna; of the Algerian Sahel, Mitidja, the valley of the Chelif, Dahra, the plateau of Mostaganem, the mountains of Mascara and the plain of Macta; constituting a more northerly Bedouin group.

(2) The change of the velar fricative $\text{gh}$ to the occlusive back velar $\text{k}$. This characterises the Saharan Bedouin dialects (with the exception of certain oasis dialects), but also extends over a considerable area to the north towards the high Algerian plains: the line of demarcation $\text{gh}$/$\text{k}$ commences south of Aln Sefra, passes to the east of Mecheria, turns back towards the Kherider, follows the Chergui chott, leaves Trézel to the west, crosses the Sersou, passes to the south of Teniet el-Hadd, Berrouaghia and Aln Bessem, passes over the Hodna at the altitude of Msla, skirts Barika, El Kantaara and Biskra, and plunges southwards, leaving Mrâla, Djemaa and Touggourt to the East.

The pronunciation $\text{ak}$ after a consonant of the 3rd person sing. masc. personal affix. This is characteristic of the Bedouin dialects of (i) Oran. The line of demarcation $\text{ak}$/$\text{u}$ commences at Mostaganem, goes down towards Uzès-le-Duc, leaves Tiaret and Trézel to the east, follows the eastern prong of the Chergui chott, and passes approximately half-way between Géryville and Aflou: the Ouled Sidi Cheikh use $\text{ak}$, but the Doum Menia and the sedentary peoples of the Saoura use $\text{u}$; the Bedouin outskirts of Tlemcen and the region which lies towards Aln Temouchent and Oran also uses $\text{ak}$. (ii) Eastern Constantine, comprising: to the north, the inhabitants of mountains of the Cello region, which are a continuation of the Kroumirs and Mogods of Tunisia; to the south, the nomads of the east Sahara and of the Saharan zone which skirts southern Tunisia (the $\text{ak}$ frequently being curtailed to $\text{a}$); this form is found among a considerable proportion of the Bedouin of Tunisia, and throughout Libya; all the rest of Algeria, both north and south, uses the forms $\text{u}$, $\text{o}$.

(4) The structure of the 3rd person feminine of the perfect of sound verbs, when followed by a personal affix with an initial vowel, e.g. $\text{gharbet} + \text{â} + \text{k} “she has struck thee”: (i) $\text{gharbet}$ is the pronunciation of northern-eastern Constantine, as far as a line which starts to the east of Philippeville, reaches Jammepas and the Khroub, turns eastwards, touches Chateau-dun-du-Rumel, and proceeds in the direction of Périgotville; of the region situated to the south of this line, namely the high plains of Sétil as far as Bordj Bou Arreridj, and also of the eastern Sahara as far as the outskirts of Biskra and Touggourt; of the Algerian Tell where the voiced bilabial is pronounced as $\text{dj}$; and finally of north and west Oran, following a line which passes south of Ammi-Moussa, swings southwards between Tiaret and Frenda, follows the Chergui chott and again swerves south, leaving Mechéría and Ain Sefra to the east: (ii) $\text{gharbethek}$ is the pronunciation of the Constantine region, of Ferdjoua, and of the environs of Fedj-Mzaâa as far as Guerroug; (iii) $\text{gharbethek}$ (with the stress on the first syllable) extends south of a line joining Bordj-Bou-Arreridj and Colbert throughout the Hodna, south-west Constantine and the central Sahara; it is the pronunciation of all the Algerian nomads (including Teniet el-Hadd) who pronounce the voiced bilabial as $\text{f}$; and it is also the pronunciation which prevails in eastern and southern Oran.

(5) The syllabic structure of the imperfect of sound verbs, first form, in the plural: $\text{yedhharb} + \text{u} “they have struck”; and that of the triliteral noun $\text{ja’alat}$ (with a suffix commencing with a vowel): $\text{ra’bat} + \text{i} “my neck”; (i) $\text{yedhharbu}$, $\text{rabebti}$ (with the stress on the first syllable) is found throughout the Constantine region except in El-Kantara, on the high Algerian plains and in the whole of the east, central and west Sahara; the dialects of the south-east have a clearly-defined tendency to prolongate the vowel receiving the stress; (ii) $\text{yedhharbu}$, $\text{rabebti}$, with doubling of the medial and stress of the second syllable, is prevalent in El-Kantara and the region of Philippeville; these are the forms in use in the north of Algeria, wherever the voiceless bilabial is pronounced, including Teniet el-Hadd; they are also used throughout north and west Oran; the dividing-line $\text{yedhharboul}$ $\text{yedhharbou}$ passes between Tiaret and El-Ousseukh, follows the northern edge of the Chergui chott, and swings south, leaving Mechéría to the west and Ain Sefra to the east.

(6) The conjugation of defective verbs (imperfect and imperfect a): $\text{masl}$ and $\text{yemsl}$ “to go” and $\text{msd}$ and $\text{yensd}$ “to forget”: (i) northern Constantine, from the Tunisian frontier as far as a line which drops rapidly from Bône towards Ain Beïda, and the eastern Sahara as far as Sidi Okba and El-Oued, use the forms $\text{masl} (\text{masl}) - \text{mshd} - \text{mshu} - \text{yensd} - \text{yensu}$; $\text{msd} (\text{msf}) - \text{nset} - \text{nsu} - \text{yensd} - \text{yensu}$; (ii) central Constantine, from the northern boundary delineated above as far as the outskirts of Biskra and M'doukal, along a line which follows the Hodna depression and rises again towards Mansoura des Bibans as far as Kabylia, has forms which are completely resolved: $\text{masl} (\text{masl}) - \text{mshd} - \text{mshu} - \text{yensd} - \text{yensu}$; $\text{msd} - \text{nset} - \text{nsu} - \text{yensd} - \text{yensu}$, analogous to those of the sedentary dialects; (iii) throughout Bedouin Algeria, from the Sahara to the sea, and in a large part of Oran, bounded on the east by a line which, starting from the outskirts of Oran itself, passes to the south of Saint Denis-du-Sig and to the north of Cacherou, leaves Frenda to the east and proceeds southwards, passing between Aflou and Géryville, the conjugation of verbs with imperfect $\text{i}$ and imperfect $\text{a}$ is characterised by a peculiar usage: $\text{yemsl} - \text{yemshu}$ on the one hand, $\text{yensd} - \text{yensu}$ on the other; this usage is found again in western Oran, from a line running east of Tlemcen, passing east of the Homeyan, and curving westwards north of Ain Sefra; (iv) central Oran, comprising the regions of Aln Temouchent, Sidi bel-Abbès, Mascara, Saidâ, Mechéna, Géryville, Ain Sefra and Ouled Sidi Sheikh, has the forms $\text{yemshu}$, $\text{ensu}$, $\text{yensu}$.

By drawing up a table of all the different characteristics, there emerge, despite the overlapping and contradictions which blur the boundaries and split up geographical areas, four, or perhaps five distinct basic groups: (i) The Bedouin dialects of eastern Constantine, the region of La Calle and Souf (Cantineau’s group
(i) The Bedouin dialects of central and western Oran (Cantineau's group D): the pronunciations are ِ, ُ, ُك, ِك, ُة, َة, ًة, ُة, ِة, ُة, ُه. Diphthongs are either correctly preserved ِء, ُء, or reduced to ِء, ُء.

(ii) The Bedouin dialects of central and Saharan Algeria (Cantineau's group A): the pronunciations are ِ, ُ, ُك, ِك, ُة, َة, ًة, ُة, ِة, ُه. Diphthongs are either correctly preserved or reduced to ِء, ُء.

(iii) The Bedouin dialects of the Tell and of the Algerian-Oran Sahel (Cantineau's group B): the pronunciations are ِ, ُ, ُك, ِك, ُة, َة, ًة, ُة, ِة, ُه. Diphthongs are sometimes preserved or reduced to ِء, ُء, and final ِء is pronounced ِء.

(iv) The Bedouin dialects of the high plains of Constantine, covering the north of Hodna and the belt which extends roughly from Bordj Bou Arreridj to the valley of the Seybouse, occupies an intermediary position between groups i, iii and iv, and the sedentary dialects (Cantineau's group c): the pronunciations are ِ, ُ, ُك, ِك, ُة, َة, ًة, ُة, ِة, ُه. Diphthongs are reduced to ِء, ُء, and the conjugation of the defective verb is completely restored, as in the urban and village dialects; these dialects can be regarded as a complementary group, if not as an independent one: they are the dialects of the old Zrīd state of the Kal'a, a centre of sedentary peoples buried beneath the mass of the Bedouin.

(v) The dialects of the high plains of Constantine, covering the north of Hodna and the belt which extends roughly from Bordj Bou Arreridj to the valley of the Seybouse, occupies an intermediary position between groups i, iii and iv, and the sedentary dialects (Cantineau's group c): the pronunciations are ِ, ُ, ُك, ِك, ُة, َة, ًة, ُة, ِة, ُه. Diphthongs are reduced to ِء, ُء, and the conjugation of the defective verb is completely restored, as in the urban and village dialects; these dialects can be regarded as a complementary group, if not as an independent one: they are the dialects of the old Zrīd state of the Kal'a, a centre of sedentary peoples buried beneath the mass of the Bedouin.

It cannot be pretended that any interpretation of this classification can be other than a hazardous and debatable undertaking. Having due regard to the delicacy of the task, it may be hazarded that group i is connected with the Tunisian group which W. Marçais considers Sulaymite; following him let us call it group S. Group ii is probably an extension of the eastern Moroccan group, which G. S. Colin considers Māṣkilīan; let us call it group M. Group iii comprises the most truly Sahara Bedouin elements, at once the most imposing and the most united, including the Chaamba, the LARBAA, the Ouled Naïl, the Arab Cherra; the dialectal area of these nomads extends over a wide area of the north—more to the east than to the west—covering the nomad's pasture grounds and the grazing lands of the high plains. The northern part of their domain forms a large zone of transition shared with group iv. They are grouped in the valley of the Chelif, and stretch as far as the environs of Relizane and Mostaganem in the west, and into Mittidja and as far as Kabylie in the east. Let us call group iii H* and group iv H** conjecturing a vast implantation there of Hilālī Arabic, the Arab element (perhaps that of the Athbedj and the Zoghba) intermixed with a Zenata element. The proportion of Arabicised Berbers is doubtless more considerable in the north of the high plains and along the Tell Atlas. Group v, an extremely complex group, is inserted like a wedge between the still Berber-speaking groups of Kabylie and the Chaouia region; it to is perhaps consonant with an implantation of Hilālī Arabic (Riyah?) in the formerly 'Adīsia and Kutama territories; let us call it H*.

We do not profess to define the precise disposition of the zones of transition between the various groups, or to determine the possible preponderance in them of one type of dialect as opposed to another. It is, however, suggested that group H* succeeded, in the course of centuries, in spreading further afield, to the detriment of groups H and H**, as a result of the political superiority enjoyed by those forming that group: it was a case of warlike pastoral nomads, imbued with the spirit of conquest, confronting people who were at the same time small agriculturalists and semi-nomadic, semi-settled. In the same way group H* must have imposed strongly on the territories of the settled regions of western Constantine: hence the presence of sedentary dialectal forms emerging from the superimposed Bedouin dialect as surviving witnesses to a group of dialects which have been superseded. On the other hands, more recently we see that not only is Bedouin linguistic expansion being checked, owing to the decline of the pastoral life, to its geographical limitation and even, at many points, to its disappearance, but that the sedentary dialectal elements are gaining ground, especially in the northern areas.

Although any forecast must be risky, one is inclined to believe that the social changes whose effects are daily experienced by the Arabic-speaking peoples of Algeria can divert the spoken idiom into new channels. In the land in which they live, the towns, few in number, enclosed with walls whose gates were closed at nightfall, have remained, for thousands of years, alien intruders in a rural and pastoral, composite and inorganic world. The towns of modern Algeria, whether legacies of the past or recent creations, some of them populous centres, all of them centres of economic activity, exercise a magnetic influence on many a district of the former Regency, even the most distant, to which they represent labour markets and a source of livelihood; and, one might add, melting-pots in which is being produced a know of Algerian Arabic which is capable of causing the extinction of the old regional dialects.


(2) The Berber dialects [see BERBER].

ALGIERS [see AL-BAZA'IR].

ALGOL [see WUDU'M].

ALGOMAIZA [see WUDU'M].

ALGORITHMUS is the old name for the process of reckoning with Arabic numerals. In mediaeval treatises the word is spelt in various ways: e.g. Algorithmus, Alcoharrismus, Alkauresmus, etc., corruptions of the nisba of the oldest known writer on Arabic arithmetic: Muhammed b. Mūsā al-Kurānimī [q.v.]. His book was translated into Latin in the 12th century by an unknown author, and the only known copy at Cambridge has been edited by B. Boncompagni (Trattati d'aritmetica i, Rome 1857). It opens with the words: "dixit Algorithmi", the word is here correctly given in the form of an Arabic nisba, i.e. as a proper name; it is strange that it should afterwards have come to mean the new process of reckoning with Arabic figures, as contrasted...
with the system of counting by the Greco-Roman abacus. Of the numerous attempts to explain the word it is enough to mention a derivation from a philosopher Algis, and a supposed origin from the Arabic article al combined with the Greek ἀριθμός, hence the form "Algarithmus". The right explanation was given by M. Reinaud in his Mémoire sur l'Inde, 303-4, in the year 1849, before the Cambridge manuscript had been edited, but the false acceptance prevailed, and Algorithm (or Algorism) is still used in the sense of "system of numeration, arithmetic". (H. Suter)

ALHABOR [see NUDIUM].

ALHAIOIT [see NUDIUM].

ALHAMMA [see AL-HAMMA].

ALHAMBRA [see GHANATTA].

ALHUCEMAS [see AL-KHUZAMA].

'ĀLI, Muştafa b. Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Mawlaw Čelebi, one of the most outstanding representatives of Turkish literature of the 16th century. Born at Gallipoli in 948/1541, from the age of 10 he studied under Surūrī, great expert in Arabic language and literature, and then under the Arab poet Muḥyī 'l-Dīn. In 965/1557 he presented to the heir-apparent Selīm his work entitled Miḥr u-Māh, a step which determined his future career (see Dozy, Cat. cod. or. bibl. Acad. Lüg. Batavae, ii, 128). He became a member of the circle of his fellow-citizen Muştafa, tutor to the prince, and was for a long time attached to this important figure as a private secretary. Selīm II, on his accession, confirmed him in this post, and about the same time he made the acquaintance of Nīshānjī, great expert in Persian language and literature, and then under the Arab poet Muḥyī 'l-Dīn. In 976/1568 he accompanied Muḥammad to Egypt, but this visit was abruptly terminated by the latter's dismissal. In 1570, Muştafa was placed in command of the army charged with the conquest of Cyprus, and 'Āli, as his secretary, witnessed the achievements of the Ottoman fleet and army. During the following years he lived in Rumelia, and in 980/1572 he compiled the Ḥefṣ Muḏāji or Ḥefṣ Dāsun (MS Lāleli, Istanbul, no. 15114; printed edition in the collections of the İhdād) in which he described, in a pompous style, the end of the reign of Suleymān the Magnificent and the accession of Selīm II. About the same time he compiled a collection of poetry in Turkish, consisting mainly of kaside and ghazals. He also produced a Persian diwan (see Flügel, Die arab., pers., und türk. Hss. der K.K. Hofbibl. zu Wien, i, 651).

'Āli is, however, only ranked as a second-rate poet, as his poetry shows little feeling or sensibility. In 1577, he was again Muştafa's secretary when the latter was placed in command of an expedition to Persia; he was the author of numerous victory proclamations sent from the Caucasus. He took advantage of his stay in those areas to collect a mass of information on the customs and legends of the populations of the Caucasus, and especially those of Glān, Şhrwān and Georgia. After the dismissal of Muştafa, 'Āli returned to Istanbul; the sudden death of his protector placed him in a difficult position, but did not interfere with his literary activity. He dedicated to the Sultan his Mir'at al-'Amālīm which gives an account of the miracles of the Creation and the Prophets (MSS: Istanbul Universities Kütüphanesi, nos. 17399-96; Esad Efendi Kütüphanesi, no. 2407; cf. Flügel, loc. cit., ii, 94; Pertsch, Vers. d.türk. Hss....zu Berlin, nos. 36, 558). Soon afterwards he completed the Nusrānamē, which deals with the expedition to Iran (Esad Ef. Kütüph., no. 2433; Rieu, Cat. of the Turk. MSS, 386).

In 995/1586 he compiled the Manadīš-i Humer-worān, in which he collected important material on some hundreds of calligraphists, miniaturists, illuminators and bookbinders (see Flügel, loc. cit., ii, 386; edited by İmranlı Məhməd Kemal, Istanbul 1926). The Zuwdāt al-Tawārīkh, the Turkish translation of an Arabic work, dates from the same period (Flügel, ibid., ii, 90; Ist. Univ. Kütüph., nos. 2378-2386). Interested in mysticism and pantheism, he gave in the Hilyat al-ridżāl (Rieu, loc. cit., p. 19; Pertsch, Die türk. Hss....zu Gotha, 75; Ist. Univ. Kütüph., nos. 1329, 404) detailed information on the saints, their hierarchy and their influence; he also composed a diwan entitled Lā'ihāti al-Ḥabībīh (Rieu, loc. cit., 261; Ist. Univ. Kütüph., nos. 651, 1963). Appointed hālib of the Janissaries, then defter emini, he applied himself to tracing the course of history down to his own times; he wished, however, to produce his work at Cairo, but the greatest book centre of the Muslim world was no longer in Meḥmed III who, on his accession, accorded him privileged treatment, appointed him defterdar of Egypt, but the hostility of certain wāris caused him to lose this post. From 1000-1007/1592-9 he wrote his great work, Kunh al-Akbār, in four parts (printed at Istanbul between 1277/1661 and 1285/1669 in 5 vols., covering the period up to the reign of Meḥmed II; no printed edition of the remaining period of 150 years exists). In the first part, he recounts the ancient legends concerning the prophets; in the second, he treats of Muhammad and Islam. He was so convinced of the important role played by his nation in the development of Islam that he entitled the third part "The Turko-Tatar chapter". The fourth part is devoted to the formation of the states and to Ottoman history. A geographical dictionary is appended to the work. The Kunh al-Akbār is among the most important Ottoman historical works. Although the information given by 'Āli on the pre-Islamic period is of no great value, on the subject of Ottoman history, especially on the 16th century, he is extremely valuable. His passion for truth even leads him to criticise the actions of certain sultans, and in general he speaks favourably of non-Muslims. His style, poetical to begin with, becomes more simple as he proceeds.

Later he wrote a historical summary of the Muslim World, entitled Fusul al-Ḥall wa l-'Ādāt Uṣūl al-Khaḍār wa l-Nakāh, which is one of the most popular works in Turkish (see, e.g., the MS in Nuruosmaniye Kütüph., no. 3399). As a reward for his literary activities he was appointed pashā of Djiđda; in 1008/1600 he wrote his last work, Ḥalāl al-K gating min al-Ḳadāt al-Tāhir (MS: Esad Ef. Kütüph., no. 2407; Cairo, Bibli. Khdīvī, Cat. des ouvr. turcs, 197), a short but significant work. He died the same year.

'Āli is a particularly attractive character: although, in the circles in which he moved, violence and intrigue seem to have the rule, he showed himself always to be loyal, kind and upright. His integrity and seriousness explain why he failed to win the goodwill of the rough and unpolished men of that period; even the Grand Vizier Siyyawush Pasha, a remarkable man, viewed him with contempt. On the other hand, every writer of the period was his friend.
Bibliography: His life and works have been described by J. von Hammer-Purgstall, Gesch. d. osman. Reiches, iv, 308, 561 ff.; idem, Gesch. d. osman. Dichtkunst, iii, 115 ff.; by Mehmde Tahir b. Rifa‘at, Muzerrih-i‘packages (‘Ali we-Kabib Celebi’i‘n terazim-i Hâlleri, Salonica 1322/1906; and by Ibnu-lmâmî Muhammed Kemâl, ‘Ali b. ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Abd al-Malik. His position was complicated by a year of his birth. His mother was called Zur a bint c but there are also other statements concerning the capital by the caliph al-Walid I. He went to live in Aâl Attâr to great distinction. He was assassinated; the same night in which the caliph C. died his post; and the Abbasids. According to Muslim biographical sources, 302/914 and 37/657, when he was already sixty years old. Whether he was the second after Khadija, or the third after Khadija and Abû Bakr, was much disputed between Shi’ites and Sunnis. He was at that time aged 10 or 11 at most, and Muhammad had taken him into his own household to relieve the boy’s father Abû Tâlib, who had fallen into poverty. One narrative, which is open to criticism on several counts, represents ‘Ali as having occupied the Prophet’s bed on the night when the latter left Mecca for Medina, so that the conspirators, on entering the house in order to kill Muhammad, were surprised to discover his young cousin sleeping there. After restoring to their owners the objects which Muhammad was holding on trust, ‘Ali rejoined the Prophet at Kûthâ. Some months later, he married Muhammad’s daughter Fatima [q.v.], and of their marriage were born al-Hasan and al-Hasayn [q.v.]. During the lifetime of Fâtima ‘Ali took no other wife.

Military exploits. In Muhammad’s lifetime ‘Ali took part in almost all the expeditions, often as standard-bearer, twice only as commander (at Fadak in 6/628, and in al-Yaman in 10/632). He always displayed a courage, which later on became legendary; at Badr he killed a large number of Kurayshites; at Khaybar he used a heavy door as a shield, and the victory of the Muslims over the Jews was due to his ardour; at Únayn (8/630) he was one of those who stoutly defended the Prophet. After the Prophet’s death, he took no part in any military expedition, for reasons unknown. ‘Ali is said to have prevented the Kurayshites from going out to the provinces, but ‘Ughmân renounced his claim and some obstacles were placed in their movements. It is possible that ‘Ali himself had no wish to absent himself from Medina; perhaps it was simply his state of health which kept him from fighting, although several feats are attributed to him at the battles of the “Camel” and Shirin, in 36/656 and 37/657, when he already was sixty years old. In addition, ‘Ali performed several other functions for the Prophet. He was one of his secretaries, and on occasion was charged with missions which might be called diplomatic; on two occasions he was deputed to destroy idols. He executed with his own hand enemies condemned to death by the Prophet, and with al-Zubayr supervised the massacre of the Banî Kurayya (5/627). In 9/631 he read to the assembled pilgrims at Mina the first seven verses of the sûra Bârdâ (ix).

Dispute with Abû Bakr. During the election of Abû Bakr [q.v.] as Muhammad’s successor, ‘Ali, with Tahtâ, al-Zubayr, and several other Companions, remained apart in the Prophet’s house to watch over his body and prepared for its burial. Although solicited to do so by al-‘Abbâs and also, it is said, by Abû Sufyan, he made no effort to keep the control of the Community in the hands of the Hâshimites. When those persons who had at first abstained from recognizing Abû Bakr gradually accepted his election, ‘Ali maintained his refusal for six months. His position was complicated by a...
question of inheritance; Fātimah had asserted a claim to the lands held by her father, which Abū Bakr firmly rejected on the ground of Muḥammad's, saying that "Prophets have no heirs". Whether ʿAbd Allāh really hoped to succeed Muḥammad is doubtful. The Arabs as a rule chose as their chiefs men of mature age (in 11/633 ʿAbd Allāh was a little over thirty) and showed no inclination to legitimism. The Shīʿites, by inventing or interpreting in the light of their beliefs certain words said to have used by Muḥammad concerning ʿAbd Allāh (see Wensinck, Handboek, s.v. ʿAbd Allāh), have always maintained that the Prophet intended to transmit the succession to his son-in-law and cousin, but it is certain, in any case, that in his last illness he did not express this desire.

Relations with ʿUmar. According to the Muslim authors, ʿAbd Allāh was a valued counsellor of the caliphs who preceded him; but although it is probable that he was asked for advice on legal matters in view of his excellent knowledge of the Kurʾān and the sunna, it is doubtful whether his advice was accepted by ʿUmar on political questions. In regard to the famous ḍiwdn, at least, ʿAbd Allāh held a view entirely opposed to that of the caliph, for on being questioned on this subject by ʿUmar he recommended the distribution of the entire revenue without holding anything in reserve (al-Ḥalālḥuri, ap. Caracci, Annali, A.H., 40, § 175). During the lifetime of ʿUmar (and of ʿUṯmān), ʿAbd Allāh held no office, either military or political, except the lieutenantcy of Medina during ʿUmar's journey to Palestine and Syria (al-Ṭabarī, i, 2404, 2522); for this reason he alone was absent from the meeting at Ḏābiyya [q.v.] at which the military commanders and leading personages convoked by ʿUmar gave approval to measures of the greatest importance on the regulation of the conquests and the ḍiwdn. Further evidence of ʿAbd Allāh's lack of complete agreement with the policies of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar is contained in the received tradition relating to the ghūrā [see ʿUṯmān b. ʿAffān], according to which ʿAbd Allāh, on being asked by ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Ṭalḥa whether he engaged himself to follow, together with the Kurʾān and the sunna, the work (jīb, šīra) of the preceding caliphs, gave an evasive answer.

The Opposition to ʿUṯmān. During the caliphate of ʿUṯmān, ʿAbd Allāh, with other Companions (notably Ṭalḥa and al-Zubayr), frequently accused him of deviating from the Kurʾān and the sunna of Muḥammad, particularly in the application of the ḥudud [see al-nuṣrūs]. ʿAbd Allāh insisted upon the duty of applying the divine Law; he was among those who demanded that the legal punishment for drinking should be inflicted on al-Walīd b. Ṭalḥa, viceroy of Kūfah, and in some accounts is said to have carried out the whipping with his own hand. With ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Ṭalḥa he reproached ʿUṯmān with introducing bīda, such as making four rakʿas at ʿArafāt and Mīnā in place of two (cf. Wensinck, Handboek, s.v. ʿAbd Allāh). But on political questions also he ranged himself with ʿUṯmān's opponents and was recognized by them as their chief, or one of their chiefs, at least morally. E.g. (1) when Abū Dharr al-Ḡifārī [q.v.], who preached against the misdeeds of the powerful, was exiled from Medina, ʿAbd Allāh with his sons went to salute him on his departure in spite of ʿUṯmān's prohibition, and provoked thereby a violent dispute with ʿUṯmān. (2) When the rebels who came from Egypt to Medina opened negotiations with ʿUṯmān, ʿAbd Allāh was their intermediary, or one of their intermediaries (see e.g. al-Ṭabarī, i, 2969). (3) When they returned later on to Medina and besieged "the House," the asked ʿAbd Allāh to put himself at their head (idem, i, 2965); although he refused by his attitude he encouraged the rebels during the siege, and there are reasons for suspecting him to have been in agreement with them in demanding the caliph's abdication, at the same time that any participation by him in the bloody conclusion of the conflict is to be excluded. (4) After his election as caliph, his partisans included those persons who are known to have been hostile to the government on economic questions, such as al-Achṣār [q.v.], Ibn al-Kawwāl, Saʿāda and others (al-Masʿūdī, iv, 261; al-Ṭabarī, i, 2916, 2908, etc.). His own programme in face of the various financial demands put forward by the mukhāṭṭatā (division of the surplus of the revenues, distribution of the domanial lands, etc.) is not known. It is recorded only that on becoming caliph he distributed the entire sums which he found in the baʿṭ al-māl of Medina, Baṣra and Kūfah, and the whole of the provisions collected in the baʿṭ al-ṣām (cf. also Annali, 40 A.H., §§ 276-80), an action which is to be regarded not simply as a demagogic gesture but as the consequence of the view that he had previously expressed to ʿUmar. He is said also to have wished to distribute the Sawād (i.e. the domanial lands in al-ʿIrāq), but to have refrained through fear of legal disputes (al-Ḥalālḥuri, Futūḥ, 265 f.).

Apart from this, there is no statement which authorizes us to regard him as an extremist; on the contrary, he was hostile to the Sabaʾiyya, the followers of ʿAbd Allāh b. Sabaʾ [q.v.], and when they exalted him beyond measure he rid himself of them; he tried to cut himself loose from the muḥājarin, the besiegers of "the House" (of ʿUṯmān) and their adherents, as soon as circumstances allowed him to do so (al-Ṭabarī, i, 3165-3, 3182). By his extreme attachment to Islam ʿAbd Allāh was driven to attain an absolute superiority in merit to priority of conversion and to services rendered to Islam in its early days, over other claims such as nobility of birth and political or administrative ability. In his conflict with the government he continually appealed to the duty of applying the Kurʾān and following the sunna of the Prophet, which in his view were being neglected. Whether by this policy, or because, aiming to defend the right of the Ḥashimiyya house to the caliphate, he was bound to oppose the principle which extended this right to the whole of Muḥammad's tribe, he set the Kurayḥ against him, although himself of Kurayḥ; in return he had the support of most of the Anṣār, of the other non-Kurayḥite Arabs who had been amongst the Old Believers, of the mukhāṭṭatā in the provinces, and the depressed classes in general (Adhānī, xi, 31).

Election of ʿAbd Allāh and early measures. When ʿUṯmān was killed the Umayyads fled from Medina and the opposition remained masters of the situation. Since ʿAbd Allāh had respect, he was invited to succeed to the caliphate. The traditions on the manner and circumstances of his election (the most commonly accepted date is 18 Dhu 'l-Hijjah 35/17 June 656) are contradictory in regard to his willingness to accept it. His partisans on the other hand were ready to employ violence against those who refused to recognize him (including Ṭalḥa and al-Zubayr); nevertheless there were some who would not yield and who left Medina, e.g. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar, Saʿd b. Abī Waḳḳās, al-Mughira b. Shuʾba, Muḥammad b. Maslama al-Anṣārī, Uṣāma b. Zayd.
Muʿawiya was therefore able to maintain that the election was invalid because made by a minority; to this ʿAll replied that the election of the caliph was a right of those persons (Anṣār, Muhādjīrūn, or Badr-combatants) who were present in Medina at the relevant time. What is certain is that ʿAll allowed himself to be nominated also by the rebels who had ʿUthmān’s blood on their hands. This was an error, in that it exposed him to accusations of complicity in their crime, although some traditions represent him as vainly endeavouring to rid himself of the most factious of his partisans. In spite of counsels by Ibn ʿAbbas to go slowly, ʿAll at once took some of the measures demanded by the opposition from ʿUthmān: he removed the governors appointed by the latter and wherever possible replaced them by governors of his own party, and satisfied the populace by distributions of money, made with a laudable equity. The report of ʿUthmān’s murder and of ʿAll’s protection of those guilty of it had in the meantime provoked strong reactions in Mecca, Syria and Egypt. Muʿawiya, governor of Syria and cousin of ʿUthmān, accused ʿAll of complicity with the murderers and refused to pay homage to him. ʿAll hastily collected troops to force him to obedience, but another serious rebellion compelled him to delay action in Syria, while Muʿawiya for his part maintained a prudent waiting policy.

Rebellion of ʿĀisha, Ṭabla and al-Zubayr. Although ʿĀisha had supported the opposition against ʿUthmān, she had gone on pilgrimage to Mecca in the siege of “the House”. On her way back she learned of the events in Medina, and in consternation, especially at the news of ʿAll’s election, returned to Mecca and engaged in active propaganda against the new caliph. Four months later she was joined by Ṭabla and al-Zubayr, and shortly afterwards ʿAll learned that all three, with several hundred troops, were marching to al-ʾIrāk by sidetracks. He immediately set out in pursuit, but could not overtake them. The rebels expected to find in al-ʾIrāk the forces and the resources which they needed. ʿAll was absolutely compelled to prevent them from seizing this province, since Syria obeyed only Muʿawiya, Egypt was in anarchy, and the loss of al-ʾIrāk would have involved also the loss of the eastern provinces dependent on it.

The three insurgents proclaimed that the ḥudud must be re-established for all, and that a “reform” (ṭilāḥ) must be put into effect (al-Ṭabarī, i, 3093, 3131, 3132). Since these influential leaders were in part responsible for the fate of ʿUthmān, the reasons for their rising to demand vengeance for his murder, and the meaning which they attached to ṭilāḥ, are obscure. Social and economic motives, inspired by fear of the possible influence of the extremists on ʿAll, seem to provide a more convincing explanation than personal feelings for their action, and especially for the effect which it produced. The moderates amongst those opposed to ʿUthmān had no doubt desired a change of policy, but not one so radical as that now foreshadowed.

While the insurgents occupied Baṣra, and there massacred many of the nafṣār, ʿAll sent his supporters to Ḵufa to invite its population to take its part, and when he had collected an adequate force he marched towards Baṣra. Since both parties aimed at a peaceful settlement of the dispute, an agreement was negotiated, according to which ʿAll should disarm himself from his nafṣār (while guaranteeing their lives), but this was not the conclusion of the affair which the extremists of his party meant to reach. A brawl provoked by them developed into a battle, which became famous in Muslim annals as the “Battle of the Camel” (15 Rashīdūn 1136/9 Dec.-656) [see al-Dāmāl], and in which Ṭalḥa b. ʿAbd al-Zubayr lost their lives, while ʿĀisha was peremptorily ordered by ʿAll to return to Medina under escort.

Conflict with Muʿawiya. Following on this success, ʿAll had hopes of regaining the allegiance of the governor of Syria by opening negotiations with him, but in vain. Muʿawiya demanded the surrender of the murderers of ʿUthmān in virtue of a verse of the Kurʾān (xvii, 33), which forbids the slaying of any person save for just cause (ṭilāḥ bī ʾ-ḥakk), at the same time according the right of vengeance in the case of anyone slain unjustly (maṣūmatum) to his wali, i.e. his near relative. Muʿawiya maintained that ʿUthmān had been killed unjustly; consequently, he proposed to exercise the right accorded by God. In the meantime, he would hold to his refusal to pay homage to ʿAll. The sources pass vaguely over the thesis maintained by ʿAll in rejecting Muʿawiya’s demand, except for the explicit statement in the Waḥṣat Šīfīn of Naṣr b. Muẓāḥim al-Minkarl (570): since ʿUthmān was killed by the people, who were outraged by his arbitrary actions, the murderers should not be liable to the lex talionis. In reality the struggle had much deeper causes; what was at issue was the pre-eminence of Syria or of al-ʾIrāk, and probably also two different conceptions of the policy to be followed in the government of the Muslim State.

ʿAll, finding that Muʿawiya was not to be won over, passed to the offensive; the two armies, each some tens of thousands strong, faced one another on the plain of ʿSiffin [q.v.]. After some skirmishing, interrupted by a truce in Muḥarram 37/June-July 657 and some parleys, battle was joined; there was a week of battles between horsemen and foot-soldiers, followed by a violent conflict (the “night of clamour”, Ṭayvat al-ḥarīm, 10 Ṣafar 37/28 July 657). Muʿawiya’s star seemed to be sinking, when ʿAmr b. al-ʾĀṣ advised him to have his soldiers hoist copies of the Kurʾān on their lances. This gesture, famous in Muslim history, did not imply surrender; by this means Muʿawiya invited the combatants to resolve the question by consultation of the Kurʾān. Weary of fighting—the number of the killed is swollen in the sources to 70,000 or even more—the two armies laid down their arms. ʿAll was forced by his partisans to submit the difference to arbitration, as proposed by Muʿawiya, and further to choose the arbitrator for his side from among the “neutrals”.

So sure were his followers that they were in the right! In these decisions the ʿursāḥ [q.v.], of whom many were in his army (though they were represented in Muʿawiya’s army also), played a large part.

Appointment and task of the arbitrators (taṣḥīḥ). A convention was drawn up at ʿSiffin itself (Ṣafar 37/657), by the terms of which the two arbitrators, Abū Mūsā al-ʾAshʿārī [q.v.] for ʿAll and ʿAmr b. al-ʾĀṣ [q.v.] for Muʿawiya, would announce their decision at a place halfway between Syria and al-ʾIrāk in the presence of witnesses chosen by themselves; the date fixed for the meeting was Ramaḍān, but the arbitrators might advance it or postpone it until the end of the year 37. In the two versions of the convention which have come down to us the points to be examined by the arbitrators are not defined; all that is said is that they were to consult the Kurʾān from the first to the last and, in default of clear indications in the sacred Book, the sunna of the Prophet, excluding what
might give rise to divergences. L. Veccia Vaglieri (see the art. cited in the Bibliography) has shown that their task was to determine whether the acts of which 'Uqayr was accused were major or minor, and in consequence the arbitrators must have reached an agreement, possibly adding some counsels in which he alluded to his preference for the son of 'Umar; cAmr in his opinion — for many sincere believers, of well-known piety, had fallen on the field—had very grievous consequences for him; the defections, which had already begun, increased, and he was forced to return to Kufa and to give up the campaign against Mu'awiyah.

Protests against the arbitration. While awaiting the verdict, the armies returned to their bases. But already at Siffin certain individuals had protested against recourse to arbitration with the cry lā ḫaḏmū sīla līlāh, literally “No decision save God’s”. The phrase implied that it was absolutely improper to appeal to men for a decision since, for the case in dispute, there existed a divine ordinance in the Kur'anic verse xlix, 8/9: “If two parties of the believers fight with one another, make peace between them, but if one rebels (baghāt) against the other, then fight against one that which rebels (al-lāt tabghāl), until it returns to obedience to God...”. In fighting against his opponents 4All had appealed to this verse, since in his view the “rebellious party” had been, firstly, that of 4Abī Ṭālib, Ṭaba and al-Zubayr, and now that of Mu'awiyah. The dissidents maintained, very logically, that it was his duty to continue to fight against Mu'awiyah, as no new fact had intervened to alter the situation.

During the return to Kufa, those had first raised the cry lā ḫaḏmū sīla līlāh (hence called al-muhak-kīma al-ṣūdā; or al-sīla) persuaded many other partisans of 4All that the arbitration was a sin against God, by substituting the judgment of men for His prescription. A group of some thousands proclaimed their repentance and stopped at Ḥarūrāt, near Kufa (whence their name of Ḥarrūrites [q.v.]). The caliph, on a personal visit to their camp, succeeded in reconciling the dissidents, all or in part, evidently by making concessions to them. After his return to Kufa, however, he denied the memory the reports which asserted his intention of infringing the convention of Siffin. When it was learned that he had sent Abu Musa to the meeting with cAmr, the escort and his cousin Ibn al-Ṭahāf, was the first to arrive at the meeting-place of the arbitrators (Ramāḍān 38/17 July 658). It was a massacre rather than a battle, and it seems that 4All was the first to regret it. This action, condemned by contemporary opinion,—for many sincere believers, of well-known piety, had fallen on the field—had very grievous consequences for him; the defections, which had already begun, increased, and he was forced to return to Kufa and to give up the campaign against Mu'awiyah.

Battle of al-Nahrawān. 4All first tried to re-enlist the Khawārijites in his forces by a declaration that he would take the field again against Mu'awiyah. But without effect. The dissidents demanded that he should confess himself guilty of an act of impiety (kufr), which he indignantly refused to do. After promising the amān to those who should submit—and there were some—he attacked the rebels (9 Ṣafar 38/17 July 658). It was a massacre rather than a battle, and it seems that 4All was the first to regret it. This action, condemned by contemporary opinion,—for many sincere believers, of well-known piety, had fallen on the field—had very grievous consequences for him; the defections, which had already begun, increased, and he was forced to return to Kufa and to give up the campaign against Mu'awiyah.

Conference of Aḍhrūh. The situation was completely changed after these events. Henceforward the opposing parties were no longer a caliph and a rebel governor, but two rivals for the supreme office in the State. While Mu'awiyah had gained ground, 4All was struggling in a morass of difficulties: he had been disqualified in the eyes of the Muslim community by the verdict of the arbitrators, and he had lost many of his supporters by his refusal to submit to their decision after consenting to the tākhīm, by the massacre of the Khawārijites, and in general by his vacillating policy. This was the position when the arbitrators and many eminent persons (with the exclusion of 4All and also, it would seem, of his representatives) met at Aḍhrūh in Sha'ban 38/January 659. In this conference the meetings attended only by the arbitrators and certain personages must be distinguished from the final plenary session. In the former the verdict of the arbitrators was promulgated (several sources assert that Abū Mūsā recognized that 'Uqayr had been killed unjustly), and the selection of a new caliph was discussed. The information given in the sources is rather discordant, except as regards the final scene. It can be gathered that 4Amr maintained the cause of Mu'awiyah against Abū Mūsā's preference for 4Abū Allāh b. ʿUmar, who for his part refused to stand for election in default of unanimity; Abū Mūsā then proposed, and 4Amr agreed, to declare both 4All and Mu'awiyah deposed and to remit the choice to a committee. In the public discourses that followed, Abū Mūsā observed this decision, possibly adding some counsels in which he alluded to his preference for the son of ʿUmar; ʿAmr in his
turn declared 'Ali deposed and confirmed Mu'awiya. Several modern historians have adjudged this scene entirely improbable, but the negative attitude towards traditions which are nevertheless explicit and fairly concordant on this point is due to an inadequate appreciation of the preceding events explained above. In the light of these the final scene at Aджр can readily be accepted. The unexpected declaration of 'Amr seems to have been a strictly personal proposal on his part, which, as a man charged with great responsibility, he believed himself entitled, if not in duty bound, to advance. But this declaration, which obviously contravened the agreement previously reached (since Abû Mūsā reacted to it with indignation), was generally judged in later times as a treacherous trick, and was certainly a disloyal act. It is worthy or notice that even in the plenary assembly no voice was raised on behalf of 'Ali; the clash which followed 'Amr's declaration was a reaction against the Umayyads, not in favour of 'Ali. In any case the conference had entirely negative results, for the participants separated without taking any decision on the caliphate.

Last years, death and burial of 'Ali. 'Ali continued to be regarded as caliph by his partisans, though their numbers were daily diminishing, and Mu'awiya by his. In 39/660 the situation was still uncertain. 'Ali, confined to Kufa, remained passive even when Mu'awiya made small expeditions into the heart of al-'Irāk and of Arabia. In Khurāsān and the East Arab rule was thrown off (see 'ABD AL-RAHMĀN B. SAMURA), but a rising in Fārs was skillfully put down by Zi'yād b. Abīmm [q.v.], as governor for 'Ali. In 40/661 'Ali enjoyed no authority in the two Holy Cities, and could not stop an attack by Mu'awiya on al-Yaman. Finally, a Khāridjīte, 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Mūldām al-Murādī [see IBN MÜLĐAM], in revenge for the men slain at al-Nahrāwān, struck 'Ali with a poisoned sword before the door of the mosque of Kufa. He died about two days later, being then 62 or 63 years of age. A questionable tradition asserts that Ibn Mūldam was only one of a group of fanatics who plotted to rid Islam of the three persons regarded as responsible for the civil war, and that Mu'awiya and 'Amr were to have been assassinated at the same time. 'Ali's burial place was kept secret, evidently for fear lest his body should be exhumed and profaned. It was not until the time of Hārūn al-Raṣīlīd that it was announced that his tomb had been identified at a spot some miles from Kufa, where a sanctuary subsequently arose; a town, al-Nadjaf [q.v.], grew up there, surrounded by an immense cemetery, due to the aspiration of pious Shi'ites to be buried in the vicinity of their Imāms.

Personal details. In person, 'Ali is represented as baird, affected by ophthalmia, stout, short-legged and broad-shouldered, with a hairly body and a long white beard covering his chest. In manner he was rough and brusque, apt to give offence and unsociable. He had two nicknames: Ḥaydara, "lion", and Abū Turāb, "dustman", a name probably given to him contemptuously by his enemies, but which was afterwards interpreted as an honorific by inventors of episodes (see Nöthke in ZDMG, 1896, 30). He had fourteen sons and nineteen daughters by nine wives and several concubines; of his sons, only three, al-Husayn, al-Hassan, and Mu'awiya, played a historical role, and five in all left descendants. He was reputed to have a profound knowledge of the Kur'ān, of which he was one of the best "readers" (Suyūṭī, Itkān [Sprenger], 169, 171; the statement that he compiled a recension is to be rejected: Gesch. des Qor., ii, 8-12). Many political discourses, sermons, letters and wise sayings (hitāk) have been ascribed to him; these can be read in Nahdi al-Balāgka, a collection of the 5th/11th century, which includes here and there old historical texts and passages of adāb [see 'AL-QARFR AL-RAd]. On the diwān (in which some poems are perhaps authentic) and the prose works attributed to him, see Brockelmann, i, 43 f., ii, 73 f. His gifts as an orator were doubtless remarkable, but the same cannot be said of his poetic art (H. Lammens, A propos de 'Ali ibn Abī Tālib, Études sur le siècle des Omeyyades, 1930, 1-11).

The personality of 'Ali is difficult to define, since the historian finds no sure guide either in his actions or his discourses, or in the data supplied by the sources. His own will was paralysed or modified by events and the constraint of his partisans. His discourses are obscure in form, and it is not easy to distinguish the genuine from the forged. Since the conflicts in which he was involved were perpetuated for centuries, the sources are sometimes tendentious, and, though less idealizing or hostile than has been asserted, more often reticent. The hostile judgment of Lammens (especially in Fātimā and Mu'awīdā 1896) sometimes obtimes by enforcing the texts, is to be rejected. The milder presentation of Caetani which, while exposing the weaknesses of 'Ali, gives due weight to the pressure of circumstances upon him, remains vague in its general lines. Neither Lammens nor Caetani has brought out the religiosity of 'Ali and its reflections in his policy. There is an abundance of notices on his austerity, his rigorous observance of religious rites, his detachment from worldly goods, his scruples in regard to booty and retaliation; and there is no reason to suppose all these details invented or exaggerated, since all his actions were dominated by this religious spirit. Without attempting to decide whether his devotion to Islam was always wholly unmixed with other motives, this aspect of his personality cannot be disregarded for the understanding that it affords of his psychology. He engaged in warfare against "erring" Muslims as a matter of duty, in order "to sustain the Faith and to make the right way (al-hudūd) triumphant" (al-Balādhuri in Caet., 40 A.H., § 235, d, etc.). After his victory at "the Camel", he tried to relieve the distresses of the vanquished by preventing the enslavement of their women and children, in face of the protests of a group of his partisans; when battles ended, he showed his grief, wept for the dead, and even prayed over his enemies. Even the apparent ambiguity of his attitude towards the Ḥarrūrites can be explained by his fear of disobeying God; though persuaded by them that the arbitration was a sin, he recognized also that to infringe the convention of Ṣifin was equally a sin, and in this painful dilemma chose to allow the arbitration to proceed. Obedience to the divine Law was the keynote of his conduct, but his ideas were governed by an excessive rigorism, and it was perhaps for this reason that his enemies described him as mahdūd, "narrow-minded". Imprisoned in his strict conformism, he could not adapt himself to the necessities of a situation which was very different from that of Muhammad's time, and he lacked the political flexibility which was, on the other hand, the pre-eminent qualities of Mu'awiya. His programme, rather than uncertain, was utopian;
probably he himself discovered the impossibility of realizing it when the power came into his hands, and this may have contributed, along with the external events, to his discouragement in his last years. Caetani observed that the half-divine aureole which soon encircled the figure of 'Ali was derived not only from his relationship with the Prophet, but also from the personal impression which he left on his contemporaries; but he did not indicate the qualities which gave rise to the legend. If it is recognized that his was a profoundly religious spirit, and that he supported by his authority a programme of social and economic reforms, at the same time placing them on a religious basis, this question also may find its solution. [For Shi'ite doctrines and legends concerning 'Ali see Shi'ah.]
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'Ali b. Ḥanīya [see Ḥanīya, Banū].

'Ali b. Ḥammad [see Ḥammad].

'Ali b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Muslima [see Ibn al-Muslima].

'Ali b. Husayn [see sfd b. Ḥaṣīm].

'Ali b. Husayn Zayn al-Abīdin [see Zayn al-Abīdin].

'Ali b. 'Isā b. Dā‘ūd b. al-Dīrārākh, ‘Abbāṣid vizier, b. 243/859 into a family of Persian origin settled at Dayr Ḧumā on the Tigris below Baghdad, who had probably turned Christian before their adoption of Islam. Many of his relatives, including his father and grandfather, were officials in the ‘Abbāsid administration, and he himself seems to have received his first secretarial employment at the age of nineteen or twenty. In 278/892, on the formation of the diwan al-dār by Ahmad b. al-Furat, both ‘Ali and his uncle Muḥammad b. Dā‘ūd were employed in that department as secretaries under Ahmad’s brother ‘Ali, and some seven years later, when independent departments for the Western and Eastern provinces were created, ‘Ali b. ‘Isā and his uncle were appointed to manage them respectively. During the later years of al-Mu’tadid’s caliphate, a feud developed between members of the family of al-Dīrārākh and the brothers Ahmad and ‘Ali b. al-Furat, and this came to a head on the death of al-Muktafi in 295/908, when, after the latter’s brother al-Muṭṭadid had succeeded as caliph largely owing to the exertions of Ibn al-Furat, the Banū ‘Dīrārākh engineered a conspiracy to depose him in favour of ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Muṭṭaz [q.v.]. ‘Ali b. ‘Isā was given control of the diwan in the short-lived government of Ibn al-Muṭṭaz and was consequently fined and banished to Mecca on the restoration of al-Muṭṭadid.

In Mecca, during the first vizirate of Ibn al-Furat, ‘Ali was kept under surveillance until Ibn al-Furat’s fall in 299/912. In 300/913 he was recalled at the suggestion of the general Muḥnis [q.v.], to succeed al-Khākānī as vizier. His first term in office lasted exactly four years, and was marked by strenuous efforts on his part to rehabilitate the state finances. Although he succeeded in augmenting the revenues, his reduction of expenditure earned him the dislike of the court, including the irresponsible and extravagant caliph. During his first year as
Ali B. Isa

Ali, who displayed much interest in the defence of his capital, was again exiled, this time to his native Dayr Kunnah, though he was soon allowed to return to the capital. During the reign of al-Kahir he held a minor fiscal office for some months; and after the accession of al-Radi he was once more arrested, fined, and momentarily exiled to al-Safiya (near Dayr Kunnah), at the instance of Ibn Mulkia, who, however, at the end of 323/935, was obliged to enlist his help in negotiating peace with al-Hasan b. Abi 'l-Haydâr the Hamdânid. Afterwards Nâsir al-Dawla, with whom Ali had been accused of intriguing.

In the summer of 325/936, Ali, having as usual declined the vizierate for himself, acted as general assistant to his brother Abû al-Rahmân for three months. In 328/940, on the accession of al-Muttaqî, he was against appointed to deal with Masûlîm, and after a few months he again acted as assistant to Abû al-Rahmân, though for little more than a week. These were his last employments; and apart from expressing the view, which was acted on, that the Christian relic known as the "Image of Edessa" should be handed over to the Byzantines in exchange for undertaking to refrain from attacking that city in 332/944, he played no further part in public affairs. Six months after the arrival of the Buwayhid Mu'tizz al-Dawla in Baghdad, he died at the age of eighty-nine (29 Dhu 'l-Hijjah 334/1 Aug. 946). Comparatively little is known of Ali's private life. He had two sons, probably the "Image of Edessa". Ibn Khîrîhûm, who became secretary to the caliph al-Mu'tazz in 347/958-9 and died in 350/961; and 'Isâ, b. 302/914-5, who likewise became secretary to al-Târîkh, earned some repute as a traditionist and student of the "Greek" sciences, and died in 391/1001. Ali's ascetic tendencies in religion seem to have been intensised by an attraction to sufism. He is known to have been a friend of the sîwî al-Shîbîlî, and his dealings with al-Hârîri, whom the latter also the philosopher al-Râzi addressed a medical treatise to Ali, who displayed much interest in the improvement of public health, himself founding a hospital in the Karbiyya quarter of the capital. Other foundations of his were at least one mosque on his private estates, a well (called after him al-Djarrâhiyya) at Mecca, and another well and an aqueduct at Sanâa. He was also the author of three, possibly four, books, none of which appear to be extant.
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'Ali b. 'Isa was the best known oculist (kaWdl) of the Arabs. His work, the Tadhkira al-Kahhhânîn, deserves the greater claim to our attention from the point of view of the history of civilization in that it is the oldest Arabic work on ophthalmology, that is complete and survives in the original. The name of the author is also recorded in the inverted form: 'Isa b. Al. All Preference is to be given to the first form as follows from a reference in Ibn Abi Usaibi'a (Uyân al-Acbâb, i, 240) and from quotations in later authors as al-Ghâfikî, Khallasa b. Abî 'l-Mâjahân, and 'Alâ al-Din. The uncertainty as to the form of the name is due to confusion with the court physician of the Caliph al-Mutawakkil, 'Isa b. Al, who lived some 150 years earlier (Fihrist, i, 297, 19; Ibn Abl Usaibi'a, Fihrist, Paris 1903). That the great importance of the Tadhkira in the history of medicine has been entirely unrecognized is due to the barbarous character of the Latin translation and the fact that whole sentences are frequently omitted therein. So the continuity is destroyed and the sense made unrecognizable.

A German translation of the Manual for oculists based on the Arabic manuscripts is contained in vol. i of Die arabischen Augenkrankheiten nach den Quellen bearbeitet by J. Hirschberg, J. Lippert and E. Mittwoch, Leipzig 1904.

Bibliography: cf. the introduction of the last-named work; Brockelmann, I, 635; S I, 884. (E. Mittwoch)

'Ali b. Mahdi [see Mahdis].

'Ali b. Maymond [see 'Ali Khân].

'Ali b. Maymun b. Abî Bakr al-Idrîsî al-Mâjahînis, a Moroccan mystic of Berber origin, born about 854/1450. In his youth he is said to have been the amir of a kabâla of the Banû Râshid in the Djabal Chumâra, but he has relinquished that position because he was unable to enforce among his people the prohibition on wine-drinking. In 901/1495-6 he left Fez, visited Damascus, Mecca, Aleppo, and Brusa, and finally settled at Damascus where he died in 917/1511. His mysticism was of a moderate character; in his Bayân Ghurbat al-Ïslâm bi-Wâsâ'it Şinâjy al-Mutaafa'kha, wa 'l-Mutaafa'kha min Abî Misr wa 'l-Shâm wa-mâ yâlikh min Bîladh al-Âlam, he inveighed against the religious and social abuses which he had noticed in the East (cf. Goldziher, in ZDMG, 1874, 293 ff.). He wrote this work at an advanced age (he commenced it on 19 Muharram 916). On his mystical writings, among which an apology for Ibn 'Arabi calls for special comment, see Brockelmann, II, 124; S II, 152. See also Tash-kopru-zade, al-Shakîbî al-Nâfinîyya (in the margin of Ibn Khallîkân, Bûlûk 1299), i, 540. (C. Brockelmann)

'Ali b. Muhammad [see Sulayhid].

'Ali b. Muhammad al-Zandji, known as Shâhīb al-Zandî, was the leader of the Zandî [q.v., the rebel negro slaves who for fifteen years (255-270/ 888-83) terrorised southern 'Irâk and the adjoining territories. He was born in Warzanin, a village near Rây, and is said by some authorities to have been of Arab origin, being descended from 'Abd al-Kays on his father's side and from Asad on his mother's. His name is generally given as 'Ali b. Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Râhîm. According to Ibn al-Djawzl (al-Muntazam, Hyderabad 1357, v, 2, 69) his real name was

The comprehensiveness of his work laid the foundation of his fame [cf. 'Amâr]; it has been considerably used by later Arab oculists—until the present day—both for the practical and theoretical portions (Ibn al-Kifti, i.e.: "the physicians of this branch work at all times in accordance with this") and has frequently been quoted whole chapters at a time. A commentary on it, written by Dâniyâl b. Shâ'îya, is mentioned by Khâlifa b. Abî 'l-Mâjahân [q.v.] in the introduction to his ophthalmological work. This commentary is not preserved; on the other hand a large number of manuscripts of the Tadhkira itself have come down to us. Even in the Middle Ages it was translated into Hebrew and twice into Latin (Tractus de oculis Jesu b. Halî, Venice 1497, 1499, 1500; edited once more by Fiansier with a second translation, made from the Hebrew version, under the title Epistolâ Iesu filii Haly de cognitioine infirmitatum ocularorum sive Memoriale oculariorum quod compilavit Ali b. Issa, Paris 1903). That the importance of the Tadhkira in the practice of this science". He mentions the work of Hunyad together with Galen as his principal sources. In addition he cites the Tadhkira the Alexandrians, Dioscorides, Hippocrates, Oribasius and Paulus.

The comprehensiveness of his work laid the foundation of his fame [cf. 'Amâr]; it has been considerably used by later Arab oculists—until the present day—both for the practical and theoretical portions (Ibn al-Kifti, i.e.: "the physicians of this branch work at all times in accordance with this") and has frequently been quoted whole chapters at a time. A commentary on it, written by Dâniyâl b. Shâ'îya, is mentioned by Khâlifa b. Abî 'l-Mâjahân [q.v.] in the introduction to his ophthalmological work. This commentary is not preserved; on the other hand a large number of manuscripts of the Tadhkira itself have come down to us. Even in the Middle Ages it was translated into Hebrew and twice into Latin (Tractus de oculis Jesu b. Halî, Venice 1497, 1499, 1500; edited once more by Fiansier with a second translation, made from the Hebrew version, under the title Epistolâ Iesu filii Haly de cognitioine infirmitatum ocularorum sive Memoriale oculariorum quod compilavit Ali b. Issa, Paris 1903). That the importance of the Tadhkira in the history of medicine has been entirely unrecognized is due to the barbarous character of the Latin translation and the fact that whole sentences are frequently omitted therein. So the continuity is destroyed and the sense made unrecognizable.

A German translation of the Manual for oculists based on the Arabic manuscripts is contained in vol. i of Die arabischen Augenkrankheiten nach den Quellen bearbeitet by J. Hirschberg, J. Lippert and E. Mittwoch, Leipzig 1904.

Bibliography: cf. the introduction of the last-named work; Brockelmann, I, 635; S I, 884. (E. Mittwoch)

'Ali b. Mahdi [see Mahdis].

'Ali b. Maymond [see 'Ali Khân].

'Ali b. Maymun b. Abî Bakr al-Idrîsî al-Mâjahînis, a Moroccan mystic of Berber origin, born about 854/1450. In his youth he is said to have been the amir of a kabâla of the Banû Râshid in the Djabal Chumâra, but he has relinquished that position because he was unable to enforce among his people the prohibition on wine-drinking. In 901/1495-6 he left Fez, visited Damascus, Mecca, Aleppo, and Brusa, and finally settled at Damascus where he died in 917/1511. His mysticism was of a moderate character; in his Bayân Ghurbat al-Ïslâm bi-Wâsâ'it Şinâjy al-Mutaafa'kha wa 'l-Mutaafa'kha min Abî Misr wa 'l-Shâm wa-mâ yâlikh min Bîladh al-Âlam, he inveighed against the religious and social abuses which he had noticed in the East (cf. Goldziher, in ZDMG, 1874, 293 ff.). He wrote this work at an advanced age (he commenced it on 19 Muharram 916). On his mystical writings, among which an apology for Ibn 'Arabi calls for special comment, see Brockelmann, II, 124; S II, 152. See also Tash-kopru-zade, al-Shakîbî al-Nâfinîyya (in the margin of Ibn Khallîkân, Bûlûk 1299), i, 540. (C. Brockelmann)

'Ali b. Muhammad [see Sulayhid].

'Ali b. Muhammad al-Zandji, known as Šâhīb al-Zandî, was the leader of the Zandî [q.v., the rebel negro slaves who for fifteen years (255-270/ 888-83) terrorised southern 'Irâk and the adjoining territories. He was born in Warzanin, a village near Rây, and is said by some authorities to have been of Arab origin, being descended from 'Abd al-Kays on his father's side and from Asad on his mother's. His name is generally given as 'Ali b. Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Râhîm. According to Ibn al-Djawzl (al-Muntazam, Hyderabad 1357, v, 2, 69) his real name was
Bihbudh. Al-Birowni (Chronology, 332; translation, 330) states that he was known as Al-Buru'î (the veiled one). He himself claimed to be an ‘Aliid, and gave his pedigree as ‘Ali b. Muhammad b. Ahmad b. 'Isa b. Zayd b. ‘Ali b. Husayn b. ‘Ali b. Abi Tâlib (al-Birowni, loc. cit.; al-Masûdî, Murûdî, viii, 31; al-Tabari, iii, 1742- who gives a slightly different pedigree. On an ‘Aliid of this name, whose father died in prison under Al-Mu'tasîn, see al-Masûdî, Murûdî, vii, 404 and Abu 'l-Faradî al-I'shâhî, Mahdî al-Tâlibîyyun, Cairo 1949, 672 and 689). After a first attempt to win support in Bahrayn, where he is said to have had family connexions, he sought to exploit the disturbed state of Basra in order to establish himself there. He failed, however, and only escaped imprisonment by fleeing to Baghdâd. Not long afterwards new disturbances in Basra favoured his return. This time he sought for support among the negro slaves working in gangs on the salt-flats east of Basra. After a period of preparation he openly declared himself on 26 Ramadan 255/5 September 869. Though claiming to be an ‘Aliid, and using the title of Mahdî, he did not adopt the Shi‘ite doctrine, but instead professed the equalitarian creed of the Khâridjîtes. After a long period of military successes, including the temporary capture of Zubûl, Abûa, and Wâsî, the Zandî armies were at last overcome by a major expeditionary force mounted by the regent Muwaffak, and besieged in their capital al-Mukhtara. The Zandî leader refused the offer of a free pardon and a state pension, and after the final assault on 2 Safar 270/11 August 883, his head was taken on a pole to Baghdad.

Bibliography: The fullest account is that of Tabari, iii, 1742-1787; 1835-2109). Further details will also be found in Masûdî, Murûdî, viii, as well as in Ya'qubî, Hamza Isfahânî etc. For studies on the Zandî revolt see T. Noelleke, Sketches from Eastern History, London-Edinburgh 1892, 146-175; Faysal al-Sâmîr, Thawrat al-Zandi, Baghdâd 1954; and ‘Abd al-Azîz al-Dîrî, Darâyat fi 'l-'Usra al-'Abhâsîyya al-Ma'âshîyya, Baghdâd 1949, 75-106. On the case a few decades earlier at the Sinhâdî courts of the Zîrîds of Irîkîya and al-Andalus, mainly the work of the royal princesses (ummâkhîdî), with the aid of their immediate kin and mawdûlî, in favour of their own sons.

‘Yûsûf b. Tâshûfî had seen this danger so clearly that he was careful not to designate as his successor one of his sons by a Sinhâdî woman, but not even the eldest son, Abu’l-Tâhir Tamîm, offspring of his marriage at Aghmât to the influential Irîkîyan Zaynab, who predeceased him by ten years. His choice fell on ‘Ali, born at Cetua of his union with a Christian captive from Spain, in 477/1084, two years before the battle of al-Zallaka. This young man of 23 years was enthroned without opposition at Marrakûsh on the death of his father, i. Mubarram 500/2 September 1106, with the apparently disinterested support of his elder brother Tamîm. But he was obliged immediately to bring to his senses a son of his brother Abû Bakr b. ‘Yûsûf, Ya'bîya, who was in command at Fez and who submitted without delay. Relying on the judgement of his Andalusian advisers, who had belonged to his father’s entourage, ‘Ali embarked on a policy of the pendulum which he was obliged to follow throughout his reign, namely, constantly to move, like pawns on a chessboard, the majority of the Almoravid amirs, including his brother, who held provincial governorships in the chief towns of Maghrib and Andalusia. The Almoravid governors received threatening letters of recall to the ruler’s side, were dismissed or restored to favour, and were in addition assisted in their duties by administrative inspectors (mâghrib) and secretaries of chancery, who were almost all Andalusians; such is the record of the greater part of the annals of his reign. It will not be recalled here in detail, but this...
lack of continuity in the tenure of the important military and regional commands already shows that the structure inherited by 'Ali b. Yusuf from his father was not resting securely on its foundations.

On the other hand, the fortunes of war for long smiled on the Almoravid sovereign in his djihād expeditions against the Christians of Spain, led by himself or by one of his generals. The aged Alfonso VI had never abandoned the hope of revenging his defeat at al-Zallākī; but he suffered a further humiliation in Shawwāl 507/1110, when Tamīm, the elder brother of 'Ali, defeated under the walls of the fortress of Uclés (Uklidi) the Castilian troops of Count García Ordoñez, accompanied by the infant Sancho, the son of Alfonso VI and Mora Zaida, the step-daughter of al-Mu'tamid b. ʿAbdād. The Christian general and the infant were overtaken and killed a few days later at Belinchón, not far from Uclés. Alfonso VI, aged and broken by this blow, had nothing to wait for but death, which overtook him barely a year later, on 30 June 1109. The throne of Castille was occupied until 1126 by his daughter Urraca. Meanwhile, the young kingdom of Portugal was becoming organised, and, in Aragon, Alfonso the Warrior aimed at the capture of Saragossa, which the Almoravids had finally taken from the Ḥūrids in 505/1110; Alfonso added it to his own dominions nine years later, in 512/1120.

All the chroniclers mention the four successive crossings of 'Ali b. Yusuf to al-Andalus; the first voyage, in the year of his accession, took him no further than Algeciras; the second was a djihād expedition in the summer of 503/1109, which led to the temporary occupation of Talavera, on the Tagus; the third, also inspired by the motive of holy war, was marked by a resounding success—the capture of Cóimbra in 518/1127, after a siege of twenty days. On his fourth crossing, in 515/1122, 'Ali b. Yusuf did not go beyond Cordova. But the operations of the Almoravid generals against Spanish Christendom continued without respite, both in Aragon and in New Castille. One of the last notable victories of the reign was that of Fraga, in the region of Lérida: this town, besieged by Alfonso the Warrior, was relieved by the Almoravid general Yahyā b. 'Ali b. Ghāniya, who inflicted a crushing defeat on the King of Aragon, 23 Ramaḍān 528/17 July 1134.

'All b. Yusuf, despite some undeniably good qualities, was far from possessing the stature of his father Yusuf b. Tashufīn. Although he spent the greater part of his reign in Morocco itself, he seems to have devoted his special attention to Spain and to have reserved the majority of his military forces for the djihād against Christendom, only retaining, for the security of his capital and to guard the Moroccan mountain region, light forces, mainly composed of Christian mercenaries, under the command of the celebrated Catalan Reverster (al-Rubertiay). This policy brought about the downfall of his kingdom. From the moment when the history of the reign of 'Ali b. Yusuf became identical with that of the return of Ibn Tūmarī [q.v.] to Morocco, the preaching of tawḥīd and the first military ventures of the Almohad chiefs, the game was lost, in default of strong and immediate measures against the rebel movement. 'Ali b. Yusuf was gradually forced to face the facts: he had been unable adequately to strengthen the structure bequeathed to him by his father, and had allowed ever larger cracks to appear in it. Soon it collapsed, but the son of Yusuf b. Tashufīn was not himself present at this dramatic climax; he died on 8 Raʾyāb 537/13 January 1143, exactly five years before the capture of Marrakush by 'Abd al-Muʾmin, leaving his son Tashufīn to succeed him on his tottering throne.

Despite these ultimate misfortunes, the reign of 'Ali b. Yusuf must be considered one of the most brilliant periods in the history of the Muslim West. The pro-Almohad historians (followed by Dozy) have tried in vain to disparage the Almoravids; to-day it must be admitted that the first third of the 6th/12th century coincided with a positive renaissance of Spanish civilisation, both in al-Andalus and the Maghrib. The sovereign's literary circle was of the same quality as during the era of the tawāṣīf. Cordova once more became the intellectual and social capital of the kingdom. Ibn Kuzmān gives us an attractive picture of it in his rażājas, and at Sevilla, the muḥallās ʿAbdād gives us information on the urban economy and the part played in it by the representatives of Almoravid authority.

At the same time, however, the hand of Mālikism in its most intransigent form continued to retard the wheels of society. The fakhrās, almost all of whom were natives of al-Andalus, were in a dominating position both at Marrakush and at Cordova. They promulgated autos-da-fé, and burned the ḳulūd of al-Ghazzālī in the parvis of the great mosque of Cordova as early as 503/1109. Thus they aimed at the laxity of morals and against innovations, in the knowledge that the sovereign would lend them an attentive ear. But the other Almoravid nobles and their wives paid no heed to their sermons. A steadily widening rift developed between the Lamtūnī aristocracy and the population of the towns. 'Ali b. Yusuf did not possess the necessary energy to seal it up in time.

Bibliographie: Of the Arabic sources, the most important (Naṣm al-Dżumàn by Ibn al-Kaṣṭān and Bayān by Ibn ʿIḥārī) still unpublished are to be published by E. Lévi-Provençal, Documents inédits d'histoire almorfide; see also the same, Documents inédits d'histoire almohade, Paris 1928, index. For details of the other sources, belonging to later historiography, and assessed at the beginning of the article (ʿAbd al-Wāḥīd al-Marrākushī, al-Hulal al-Mawṣūḥyya, Ibn Khalīdūn, Ibn Khalīkān, Ibn al-Khaṭīb, Ibn al-ʿAṭfīr, al-Nūwārizī, al-Nāṣirī, etc.), see the bibliography of the article al-Murābitūn. Cf. also the short work, now out-of-date, of F. Codera, Desaparición y desaparición de los Almorávides en España, Saragossa 1899; E. Lévi-Provençal, Réflexions sur l'empire almorfide au début du XIIe siècle, Islam d'Occident, i, Paris 1948, 239-56. (E. Lévi-Provençal)

ʿALI b. ʿĀLĪH [see WĀṢĪ ʿALĪS].

ʿALI AKBAR KHĪṬĀṬI, author of a description of China in Persian (Ḵhānān-nāma), which was finished in 922/1516, and originally intended for the sultan Selim, but later dedicated to Suleymān. The book is not a travel-book, but a systematic description in twenty chapters, based partly on observations by the author himself, partly on information collected by him in China. The work was translated into Turkish in the reign of Murād III, probably in 990/1582 (lith. Istanbul 1790/1854); the translation served as the basis for the studies of Fleischer and Zenker.

de Chatay-name, Mélanges Orientaux, Paris 1883, 31 ff.; F. Kahle, Eine islamische Quelle über Chihàl, in: Arch, 1934, 91-110; IA, s.v. (by A. Zeki Velidi Togan).

'ALI AMIR, Turkish historian, b. in 1274/1857 at Diyar Bakr, d. at Istanbul 23 December 1923 (1342). An official of the financial administration, he was primarily interested in the history of the Ottoman Empire, and he took up the challenge of different towns to transcribe Arabic and Turkish inscriptions, to study local history and above all to seek out old documents and historical and poetical manuscripts. In this way he built up a library of unpublished and rare manuscripts, which later enriched the National Library of Istanbul. He published the review Ta'rikh ve-Edebiyyatî, edited the Dîvân Lugâtl al-Turk of Mahmûd Kâshgarî, and was a member of various learned societies. He wrote historical and literary works, and is principally known as an editor of texts. He also helped to classify the archives of the Sublime Porte at Istanbul, and gave his name to one of the catalogues: 'Ali Emiri tasnîfî.


'ALI 'AZIZ EFENDI, GIRIDLÎ, Turkish diplomat and writer, d. 19 Dümâdâ 1 1213/29 Oct. 1798. He was born in Crete, where his father Tâbândji Mehmed Emendi was defterdar. Son of a wealthy father, he lived a carefree life until circumstances constrained him to enter the service of the state (muhasar of Chios, ca. 1792-93 in Belgrad). In 1211/1796-97, he was appointed ambassador to Prussia, arrived in Berlin early in June, 1797, and died there in the following year. Of his achievements as a diplomat little is known; he owes his fame to his writings. 'Ali Efendi, who knew Persian, French, and even some German, is an interesting forerunner of the 19th century Turkish movement of Westernization and self-interpretation. In his treatise Wûridâî (unpublished, MSS in Istanbul Universite Kütûphanesi, nos. T 3383, T 3470, T 1698, and Millet Kütûphanesi, 'Ali Emiri, Şer'îyye 154/123) 'Ali Efendi defends the irrationalism of mystic religiousness (be himself was the disciple of a certain Sheykh Kerim İbrahim of Abana near Sinob) with arguments tinged with 18th century rationalism. He accepts the validation of the God-searching soul between faith and scepticism, and offers the story of his own salvation, modestly admitting its inapplicability to others. An exposé of the ideas of mysticism, and, especially, of the superhuman powers of the sheikh, is also found in 'Ali Efendi's famous book of fairy tales, the Muhâyîyâât-i Lehadî-i İlâhî (written in 1211/1797-98, printed in Istanbul, 1268, 1284, 1290), based mainly on Petis de la Croix's Les Mille et un jours (first printed in 1710-12), but handling its material freely and adding many new stories of various character. This book, which was very popular in the 19th century, may be regarded as the first modern educational novel in Turkish; beside fantastic tales, it contains also stories depicting life in 18th century Istanbul with charming realism. 'Ali Efendi has also left poems, mostly in the Sufi tradition. Finally, he is supposed to have written a (now lost) opus containing his discussions with European philosophers.

**Bibliography:** Saadeddin Nûzût Ergun, Türk sâirleri, ii, 620-2 (containing five poems); IA, s.v. (by M. Cavid Baysun and Ahmed Hamdi Tanpinar); A. Tietze, 'Asîs efendî Muhsâyîlî, Oriens, 1948, 248-329 (containing the translation of one of the tales); E. J. Gibb, The Story of Jawâd, a romance by 'Ali 'Asîs Efendî the Cretan, Glasgow 1884 (translation of the second of the three parts of Muhsâyyîlî). (A. Tietze)

**ALI BABA** [see ALF LAYLA WA-LAYLA].

'ALİ BEY, a Caucasian by birth, was for nearly 20 years the chief personage in Egypt. He had been brought there at an early age, and had been offered as a gift to İbrahim Kanğhâdî, who was the real master of the country from 1156 to 1243. Before his death, the latter conferred on 'Ali the rank of bey, and made him a member of that curious council of 'Powers', whose turbulent authority grew in proportion as the Pasha nominated by the Porte became a shadowy and passive spectator. This Ottoman governor, in order to survive, concerned himself with preserving an apparent neutrality in face of the sanguinary conflicts between the bays, a neutrality which he had to maintain in order to hasten to the aid of the victor.

'Ali distinguished himself at the beginning of his career by the successful defense of a pilgrim caravan against Arab tribes. Appointed bey, he was plunged into an atmosphere of intrigue; each character in the drama was obliged to have recourse to murder, and was himself shadowed by assassins. At first, 'Ali Bey maintained an attitude of prudent watchfulness, confining his activities to enriching himself by every means, and was thus able to collect a substantial number of mamlûk. This policy bore fruit when, from the year 1177/1763, his peers recognised him as their leader. In the course of the following year he conferred the rank of bey on his mamlûk Muhammad Abu 'l-Dâhâb [q.v.], the man who was destined to overthrow him. This rise to power, not achieved without setbacks and disputes, was abruptly checked: 'Ali Bey, forced to take refuge in Syria, established relations with Umar al-Zâhir, the ruler of Acre. Through the good offices of the latter, 'Ali Bey returned to Egypt, with the support of the Porte, and again assumed his prerogatives as shâykh al-balâl.

Two years later, 'Ali Bey had to flee again, but he returned to the capital at the head of an armed force in 1181/1767. A new Ottoman governor was obliged to confirm 'Ali Bey as shâykh al-balâl; however, alarmed by the latter's independent attitude, he tried to provoke a rising against him. It was a failure, and the Pasha was forced to resign (1182/1768). From then on, 'Ali Bey did not trouble to conceal his ambitious designs, and he refused to tolerate the presence of an officer who had any influence. He showed his hostility to the Porte and reduced the number of his Janissaries. Nevertheless he did not throw off the mask completely, and did not refuse the Sultan's request to send a contingent for the war against Russia. He was then denounced at the Porte as a traitor, and accused of having mobilised these troops to aid the Russians: a firman was issued at Constantinople condemning him to death.

Informed of this, 'Ali Bey replied with an arrogant declaration of independence. From then on, 'Ali Bey became entangled in a diabolical web and was
forced to keep his forces in the field without respite. First, he subdued the Arab tribes of Upper Egypt, and intervened at Mecca to install there a pretender to the sarkfate who had sought his protection. The expedition was under the command of his right hand man, Muhammed Bey Abu l-Dhabab.

Conscious of his power, 'Ali Bey struck coinage in his own name: the coins still bore the sultan's name, but the initials of the master of Egypt were inserted under a date which no longer represented the date of the sultan's accession.

He then proceeded to invade Syria with a huge army, again under the command of Muhammad Bey Abu l-Dhabab. Negotiations with the Russians were set on foot but there was no time for them to yield results. The whole of Syria was speedily conquered, but events took an unexpected turn when Muhammed Bey Abu l-Dhabab, after his victorious entry into Damascus, led his army back to Egypt to seize possession of it from his master. 'Ali Bey decided to flee from Cairo in Muharram 86/April 1772, and took refuge once more with the Paşa of Acre. He set about raising another army, with the help of some Russian equipment, and, after a series of successful skirmishes, confronted his rival at Śalihiyya, in the eastern part of the Delta. His army was defeated, and 'Ali Bey himself was severely wounded on the field of battle, died a few days later, 15 Safar 1287; 8 May 1773.

It is difficult accurately to assess the autonomy of 'Ali Bey. As already noticed, the form of his coins was unusual, although 'Ali Bey had declared that the Ottomans had seized control of the country by force, aided by the treachery of the population. A document dated at the beginning of 1285 A.H., shortly before his final departure from Cairo, supplies evidence that he had not dared to proclaim himself officially sovereign of Egypt. It consists of a long inscription carved on the drum of the cupola of the tomb of al-Shāfi'i; it makes no reference to the Ottoman Power, but does not mention 'Ali Bey either, merely stating that the order to restore this tomb was given by the "powerful master of Egypt, who has increased the prestige of this country by his authority".

From a perusal of al-Djabarti, one gets the impression that 'Ali Bey was in many respects a repulsive character, but the morals of the time and the environment must be taken into consideration, and one could express agreement with a contemporary judgment: "He was an extraordinary man, who only lacked a different education and a larger stage to have astonished the world".


'ALI BEY [see *Ali*].

'ALI ILĀHI ["deifiers of *Ali"], a vague and popular designation of sects connected with, and issued from, Shīʿa extremism (ghulāt, [g.w.]). In Persia and Kurdistan it covers chiefly the Aḥl-i Ḥāk (g.w.) and Kuzz-bāsh (g.w.), but may occasionally refer to such smaller communities as Shāri, Shabbak (g.w.) etc. (Ed.)

'ALI KHĀN B. AHMAD B. MUHAMMAD MAṢĪM B. ṢADR AL-DĪN AL-ḤASAYN AL-MADANI, author of biographical works and a book of travels, b. 15 Dhu 'l-Mi‘ād 1105/12 August 1624 in Medina; he was a descendant of Ghiyāth al-Dīn al-Shīrāzī. His father was since 1053/1644 in the service of the prince Ṣahāḥshīrāh; Abū al-Hāl b. Muḥammar Kutb Shāh. 'Ali joined him in Ḥaydarābād in 1068/1657. His father died in 1083/1672, a year after the death...
of his patron, Sháhinnáh 'Abd Alláh, and 'Alí himself incurred the displeasure of the ruler, Abu 'I-l-Fárid. He succeeded, however, in escaping to the court of Awrangžeb, who made him káhàn and disnéân at Burhánpur. He went on the pilgrimage, and visited Bághdád, Náqjaf and Karbálá. In Shíráz he taught at the Mánsúriyyá madrasá and died in that town in 1127/1705 or 1120/1708.

In 1704/1663 he wrote a description of his journey from Mecca to Haydarábád, entitled Sultán al-'Árif; see Úsán al-Aárif. He is best known for his work on the poets of the 11th century A. H., which he wrote in 1082/1671 as a supplement to al-Kháfiqí's Ráykháná: Sulá'áf at-Áṣr fí Muhásíín A'sán at-Áṣr, Caire 1324, 1334. As a supplement to his commentary on his own BÁdííyyá he gives biographies of writers on rhetoric, and also wrote, in addition to various treatises and poems, a biographical collection of Imámí Shí'ís.

Bibliography: Ráwdat al-Dánmat, 412; Hádhábat al-Sálám, lith. Hyderabad 1266, i, 363-5; Rieu, Supplement, no. 990; Brockelmann, II, 527, S II 554. (C. Brockelmann *)

'ÁlI KÁHÁN [see mahríd 'álI káhÁn].

'ÁlI KÚCCC [see begtqendgin].

'ÁlI b. Múmmád al-KÁSHDI, 'ÁlI 'aLí Dín, astronomer and mathematician, b. in Sámarqánd, d. in Istanbul, on 5 Shádán 879/19 Dec. 1474. He received his surname from his father, who served as the falconer (báshdÁ) of Ullóg Beg. He studied mathematics and astronomy in his native city under the amír Ullóg Beg [q.v.], who was at the same time an able astronomer, and KÁddÁ-zádÁ-rÝmÝf, one of the rectors of the celebrated madrása in Sámarqánd which was especially favoured by the amír. All al-KÁshdí succeeded KÁddÁ-zádÁ as director of the renowned observatory of Sámarqánd, and took part in the compilation of the Zidí KúrkÁnti, the principal author of which was the amír himself (cf. its preface).

'Alí al-KÁshdí is said to have left secretly for Kámn, in order to perfect himself in his studies, and on his return to have presented his patron with his Hál Aghálá al-Kámar.

After the murder of Ullóg Beg, 'Alí al-KÁshdí, left Sámarqánd and stayed in Tabárz with the Kák Koyyúnlu ruler Úzná Hásan. He was sent by this ruler on an embassy to the Úttamán sultan Múmmád II; he went back to Tabárz to accomplish his political mission, but subsequently returned to 'Istádb to establish himself there definitely. He was appointed as professor of sciences in the madrása and greatly influenced the development of the sciences in Túrkey.

He composed in Kámn a commentary, dedicated to Abú Sa'íd Khánt, on Nafr al-Dín Tátrysí's Tádríd al-Kádat; he also wrote on grammar and rhetoric. His main works are the Risálá fí l'-Hay'á, Risálá fí l'-Hísáb, and a commentary on Ullóg Beg's Zidí. (The Risálá al-Fáthiyá and the Risálá Múmmádáyya are Arabic translations of the Risálá fí l'-Hay'á and l'-Hísáb.)

Bibliography: Tákhkúprú-zádé, al-ShábáÁk al-Núrmsáníyyá, 177-81; the catalogues of Krafft (Vienna), 139; Dorn (St. Petersburg), 304; Pertisch (Berlin), 351-2; Rieu (Brit. Mus.), ii, 455-7; Wöpcke, in JA, 1862;i, 120 ff.; W. Barthold, Ullóg Beg und seine Zeit, Leipz 1935, 164 ff.; A. Admon, La science des textes Ottomans, 33; idem, Ilim, 32-4; Brockelmann, II, 305, S II, 329 (add: Sharh al-Tádríd, Úniv. 82,016; 'Unbád, 'Árif 2678; Sharh at-Á'Ádáváyyá, Rághib 1285, Úniv. 1532; LÁrt's comm. on the R. fi l'-Hay'á, Rághib 926, Well al-Dín 2307; Mirám Çelebi's comm. on the R. al-Fáthiyá, BÁyázid li-'Umán, 1641). (A. Adman Adývar)

'ÁlI MARDÁN, honorific title given to 'Alí b. Abí Tálib by the Shi'ítès, being an abbreviation of 'Alí khÁnt mardÁn, "All, King of mankind."

'ÁlI MARDÁN, a Kháldí adventurer who acquired power in Bengal, centring upon the capital of Lákhanawádti, in the first decade of the 7th/13th century. Appointed to the iqÁd of Nárán-go-e by Malik Ightíyár al-Dín Muhammad Bákhítihár Káshdí, he took advantage of the latter's defeat by the Hindu Rai of Kámrúp, says Mináhádí al-Síráj, to murder his master at Diwkók on a sick bed. This occurred in 605/1205-6. 'Alí Mardán, however, was later imprisoned by Muhammad Sháhán, putting him in the charge of the kósáw of Nárán-go-e. 'Alí Mardán, in collusion with the kósáw, managed to escape to the court of Kútth al-Dín Aybak and accompanied him to Gháznín where he became a captive of Tádí al-Dín Yildúd when the latter recaptured Gháznín from Kútth al-Dín Aybak (605/1208-9). After about a year 'Alí Mardán escaped and presented himself again before Aybak at Lahore. He was treated with favour and was assigned the territory of Lákhanawádti. According to the Tábáábá-í Násírî, 'Alí Mardán proceeded to Diwkók, assumed power there and brought the whole of Lákhanawádti under his sway. On the death of Kútth al-Dín Aybak in 607/1210, 'Alí Mardán had the khúdá read in his own name and was styled Súltán 'ÁlÁ dí-Dín. He brought the Kháldí nobles of Lákhanawádti under control and overawed his neighbouring Hindu chiefs. His overbearing beha- viour caused discontent among the Kháldí nobles and under the leadership of Malik Húsáyín al-Dín 'Iwáž, they conspired against him and slew him. 'Alí Mardán ruled for something over two years, the probable date of his death being 610/1213.

Bibliography: Mináhádí al-Síráj, Tábáábá-í Násírî, trans. Raverty, i, 572-80; Sir Jadunáth Sárkar (ed.), History of Bengal, ii, Dacca 1948; Cambridge History of India, iii, 397 ff. (P. Hardy)

'ÁlI MARDÁN KÁHÁN, a Bákhítiyárd chief who rose to prominence in the troubled period following the assassination of Nádír Sháh in 1747. In 1163/1750 he captured Isfáhán, and, in conjuction with Kárín Khánt Zán'd [q.v.], placed Ismá'íl, a grandson of Sháh Súltán Húsáyín, on the throne. 'Alí Mardán's oppressive measures led to an open breach with Kárín Khánt, who, fearing for his life, attacked and defeated him. 'Alí Mardán Khánt fled, and was subsequently assassinated by Muhammad Khánt who, according to Mirzá Sádík, the author of the Tárríkht-i Gúth-gádá, was a relative of Kárín Khánt. This 'Alí Mardán Khánt is not to be confused with his contemporaries and namesakes (a) the wáli of Lúritsánt, a Fáyíl Lúr who was wounded at Gúlhábád in 1722 and later vainly endeavoured to relieve Isfáhán, and (b) 'Alí Mardán Khánt Shámlú, whom Nádír Sháh sent as ambassador to Delhi and Con- stantinople.

Bibliography: Mirzá Sádík, Tárríkht-i Gúth-gádá (quoted by Malcolm, History of Persia, London 1815, ii, 116-8); Rúdá Kúús Khánt Hidáyá, Rawdat al-Sá'dáyyí Násírî, Teheran 1268/5, ix, 7-9; Hammer-Purgstall, iv, 477, 478 (this authority's reference to 'Alí Mardán's earlier career, iv, 278 is inaccurate); O. Mann (ed.), Muṣáníl ed-Táríkht-i ba'ándárisf, 7, 8. (L. Lockhart)
ALI MUHAMMAD SHIRAZI [see nābīl].

ALI PASA ARABAZI, Ottoman Grand Vizier. Born at Okhri between 1670 and 1672, died at Rhodes 16 Shab'Dan 1104/21 April 1693. At first smām to various eminent people, then kethbūdā, he became agha of the Janissaries in 1101/1689, and later wazir and kābīm-mabām of the imperial stirrup. Through the support of the kābīm l-'asker Yahyā Efendi and the Shaykh al-Islām Fīdāl, he succeeded Köprülūzade Mustafā Pasha, killed at Szląskamen as Grand Vizier, on 6 Dhu l-Hijja 1102/30 August 1691. Showing no desire to place himself at the head of the army against the Austrians, 'Ali Pasha succeeded in disarming his opponents either by bribery or by dismissal. As a result of this policy he incurred the hostility of the sultan, who eventually dismissed him (28 March 1692), and replaced him by Ḥādiqī 'Ali Pasha. 'Ali Pasha Arabāzī was exiled to Rhodes, but as he represented a possible source of trouble and conspiracy, his enemies obtained his death warrant, and shortly afterwards he was executed at Rhodes. His cognomen is derived from the fact that he sent a ox-cart.

Bibliography: Rāshid, Ta'rikh, II, 166 ff.; Oghmān-zade Tābīb, Ḥadīth al-Wustāra, 178 ff.; Findikli Mehmed Agha, SulāHAND-i Tarikh, ii, 596-614; IA, s.v. (by Resad Ekrem Koşu).

ALI PASHA CANDARLI-ZADE (d. 1407), son of Candarli Khall Khayr al-Din Pasha, was, like his father, kābīm, then kābīm l-'asker, and finally Grand Vizier, and also combined the functions of wazir, that is to say head of the administration and finance, and of army commander, perhaps after the death of his father in 1387. After having directed a campaign in Anatolia against the Karamānīd 'Ali Bey, he conducted the skilful operations in Bulgaria which led to the capture of several fortresses (Pravad, Tırnova, Shehirköyü etc.) before the battle of Kostova (20 June 1389), in which he played a decisive part. Murād I was killed in the battle, and was succeeded by Yeziye Bāyazīd I, who appointed 'Ali Pasha Grand Vizier. 'Ali Pasha accompanied the Sultan in the campaigns in Greece and Bosnia, and played an important part at the siege of Constantinople, commenced in 1391, but abandoned as the result of the invasion of eastern Anatolia by Timūr. After the battle of Ankara (1402) in which Bāyazīd I was taken prisoner, 'Ali Pasha saved the heir apparent Sulayman and took him first to Brusa and then to Adrianople. Up to the time of his death in Radjab 809 (January 1407), 'Ali Pasha remained Grand Vizier to Sulaymān Čelebi, and his skilful diplomacy secured for the latter mastery over the Ottoman territory from Anqāra to the Aegean Sea; deprived of his wazir, Sulaymān Čelebi succumbed to the attacks of Mehmed Čelebi, later Mehmed I (1410). 'Ali Pasha Candarli-zade, like his father, made a contribution to the organisation of the Ottoman administration, notably by codifying the functions of the kādīs, by creating the corps of the ict-oglaṁ—pages from whom numerous imperial officials were recruited, and by making the wazirs persons of influence and respect. The chroniclers have criticised his predilection for the pleasures of life—a taste which he communicated to Bāyazīd I, and which they state that he was not loved either by the people or by government personnel. 'Ali Pasha was buried at İznik (Nicaea) in his father's tomb. At Brusa, a quarter, a mosque and a convent bear his name.

Bibliography: Rāshid, Ta'rikh, II, 166 ff.; Oghmān-zade Tābīb, Ḥadīth al-Wustāra, ii, 101; Taşyār-zade 'Ata, Encyclop. Ta'rikh, 1, 160 ff., and 285, ii, 76-83; Rāshid, Ta'rikh, passim; A. N. Kurat, İnce Krallar Kari (etc.), index; idem, Prut Seferi ve Barış, index; Hammer-Purgstall, vii, 116 ff.; IA, s.v. (by R. E. Koçu).

(Al W. Bowen)


'ALI PASHA DÂMAD — 'ALI PASHA HAKİM-OGHLU 395

'ALI PASHA DÂMAD (1667-1716), Ottoman Grand Vizier. Born at Solôz near Nicaea in 1679/1687, he entered the Seraglio of Ahmed II, and filled successively the posts of hâkîb, rikâbîdâr, châbadâr and rûkâbîdâr; he exercised great influence over Sultan Ahmed III, who came to the throne in 1703, and who made him waṣâr and gave him his daughter Fâtimâ in marriage (Rabî' I 1128/May 1710); he had a hand in the appointment and dismissal of waṣâris, including Köprüülü-zâde Nu'mân Pasha and Bâltadji Mehmed Pasha. The Grand Vizier Khodja 'Ibrâhîm Pasha was condemned to death for attempting to assassinate Dâmâd 'Ali Pasha, and the latter then became Grand Vizier (Rabî' II 1128/4 April 1713). One of his first acts was to sign with Russia the peace of Adrianopol, which fixed the frontier between the two countries between the Samara and the Orel (5 June 1713). Wishing to erase the treaty of Karlovitz, he undertook the Morean campaign, for which the motive was the attacks by Venetians and Montenegrins against Turkish vessels; in 1715, Dâmâd 'Ali Pasha occupied Napoli de Romania, Argos, Coron, Modon, Malvasia, and, in Crete, La Suda and Spîna Longa. At the same time he had to suppress the revolts of 'Othmân-oghlu Naṣîr Pasha in Syria, of the bandit 'Abbâs in Anatolia, and of Kaytâs Bey in Egypt.

In 1716, he initiated an expedition against Corfu, but Venice and Austria concluded an offensive and defensive alliance which forced him to send his troops to Belgrade. The Austrian army, led by Prince Eugène, met the Ottomans at Peterwardein on 16 Shâbân 1128/5 August 1716; Dâmâd 'Ali Pasha was mortally wounded by a bullet in the forehead during the battle, when the Turkish troops had already begun to retreat. He was buried in the garden of the mosque of Sulaymân I at Belgrade; 70 years later, when he captured this town, the Austrian general Landon transferred the tomb to 70 years later, when he captured this town, the Austrian general Landon transferred the tomb to 70 years later, when he captured this town, the Austrian general Landon transferred the tomb to 70 years later, when he captured this town, the Austrian general Landon transferred the tomb to

Dâmâd 'Ali Pasha was at once a fine military leader and a great statesman; he displayed a shrewdness and a great interest in science and poetry. He reopened the garden of the mosque of Sulaymân I at Belgrade; 70 years later, when he captured this town, the Austrian general Landon transferred the tomb to 70 years later, when he captured this town, the Austrian general Landon transferred the tomb to 70 years later, when he captured this town, the Austrian general Landon transferred the tomb to 70 years later, when he captured this town, the Austrian general Landon transferred the tomb to


'ALI PASHA HAKİM-OGHLU, Grand Vizier under the Ottoman sultans Mahmûd I and 'Othmân III. His father, Nûh Efendi, the physician of Mustafâ II, was a Venetian renegade. 'Ali Pasha was born on 15 Shâbân 1100/June 1689; brought up in the seraglio, he held various administrative posts at Istanbul, and then in the provinces; in 1724 he was appointed governor of Adana and subdued the tribes of Cilicia; in 1725 he became governor of Aleppo, and in the same year distinguished himself at the siege and capture of Tabriz. Appointed waṣâr in 1725, he was successively beylerbeysi of Anatolia, ser 'asker of the East, governor of Siwâs, and governor of Diyarbakir. In 1730, again ser 'asker of the East, he defeated Shoâh Tahmâsp III at Kurîdîn (13 Rabî' I 1144/15 September 1731), and captured Hamadân, Urmiya and Tabriz. He became Grand Vizier soon after the peace called after Ahmed Pasha, 15 Ramadân 1144/12 March 1732. His first term of office as waṣâr was marked by wise administration and currency reform. In the field of foreign affairs, the Marquis de Villeneuve, the French ambassador, urged the Grand Vizier to conclude an alliance with France against Austria, but the conditions put forward by 'Ali Pasha (and suggested by Ahmed Pasha Bonneval) prevented the conclusion of the treaty. Dismissed on the resumption of hostilities with Persia (22 Safar 1148/14 July 1733) 'Ali Pasha was exiled to Mytilène, then appointed governor of Bosnia, where he held the Austrians in check for three years, successfully defended Trawnik, and, on 4 August 1737, defeated Marshal Hildburghausen near Banjaluka. In 1740 he was sent to Egypt, where he suppressed a mamlûk revolt; in 1741 he was made beylerbeysi of Anatolia, and on 15 Safar 1155/21 April 1742 he became Grand Vizier for the second time. The following year he was dismissed for wishing to lead in person the eastern expedition against Nâdir Shoâh of Persia. On 24 Ramadan 1155/April 1745, he was nominated commander-in-chief of the eastern army, but in the meantime peace was signed with Nâdir Shoâh (1746). Governor of Bosnia, then of Trebizond, he was made Grand Vizier by 'Othmân III on his accession 4 Dînumâd I 1168/16 February.


'ALI PASHA HAKİM-OGHLU, Grand Vizier under the Ottoman sultans Mahmûd I and 'Othmân III. His father, Nûh Efendi, the physician of Mustafâ II, was a Venetian renegade. 'Ali Pasha was born on 15 Shâbân 1100/June 1689; brought up in the seraglio, he held various administrative posts at Istanbul, and then in the provinces; in 1724 he was appointed governor of Adana and subdued the tribes of Cilicia; in 1725 he became governor of Aleppo, and in the same year distinguished himself at the siege and capture of Tabriz. Appointed waṣâr in 1725, he was successively beylerbeysi of Anatolia, ser 'asker of the East, governor of Siwâs, and governor of Diyarbakir. In 1730, again ser 'asker of the East, he defeated Shoâh Tahmâsp III at Kurîdîn (13 Rabî' I 1144/15 September 1731), and captured Hamadân, Urmiya and Tabriz. He became Grand Vizier soon after the peace called after Ahmed Pasha, 15 Ramadân 1144/12 March 1732. His first term of office as waṣâr was marked by wise administration and currency reform. In the field of foreign affairs, the Marquis de Villeneuve, the French ambassador, urged the Grand Vizier to conclude an alliance with France against Austria, but the conditions put forward by 'Ali Pasha (and suggested by Ahmed Pasha Bonneval) prevented the conclusion of the treaty. Dismissed on the resumption of hostilities with Persia (22 Safar 1148/14 July 1733) 'Ali Pasha was exiled to Mytilène, then appointed governor of Bosnia, where he held the Austrians in check for three years, successfully defended Trawnik, and, on 4 August 1737, defeated Marshal Hildburghausen near Banjaluka. In 1740 he was sent to Egypt, where he suppressed a mamlûk revolt; in 1741 he was made beylerbeysi of Anatolia, and on 15 Safar 1155/21 April 1742 he became Grand Vizier for the second time. The following year he was dismissed for wishing to lead in person the eastern expedition against Nâdir Shoâh of Persia. On 24 Ramadan 1155/April 1745, he was nominated commander-in-chief of the eastern army, but in the meantime peace was signed with Nâdir Shoâh (1746). Governor of Bosnia, then of Trebizond, he was made Grand Vizier by 'Othmân III on his accession 4 Dînumâd I 1168/16 February.

1755; this third term of office as Grand Vizier only lasted 53 days; the slihdar Blykill ʿAli Ağha succeeded in securing his dismissal and his exile to Cyprus; but in the course of the year he was appointed Governor of Egypt, and in 1756 beylerbeysi of Anatolia. Recalled in 1757, he retired to Kütahya, where he died 9 Dhu '1 Hidjdja 1171/14 August 1758. He was buried in the tomb adjoining the mosque which he was responsible for building at Istanbul (1753-4). He was reputed to be a learned, shrewd and liberal man, but quick-tempered and extremely severe in his dealings with officials guilty of extortion.

Bibliography: Wâsîf, Taʾrikh, i, 50 ff.; Küçük Çelebi-zâde ʿÂsim, Taʾrikh, 301, 403, 566, 598; Dâlâwâr-zâde ʿOmer, Ḥadîkat al-Wusûrâ, suppl. i, 42-51; J. von Hammer, Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman, xiv, xv, xvi, passim; Comte de Bonneval, Mémoires, ii, passim; IA, s.v. (by Reşd Ekrem Koç). (R. Mantran)

ʿALI PASHA KHÂDÌM, Ottoman Grand Vizier. At first ab aghaš, then beylerbeysi of Karâmân and subsequently of Rumelia, he distinguished himself in the course of a campaign in Wallachia (1485); waṣrî in 1486, he defeated the Mamûlâks of Egypt at the battle of Aţâbîyûrû in Cilicia (1492), took the fortresses of Coron and Modon (1500), and was appointed Grand Vizier the following year in the course of securing his dismissal and his exile to Cyprus; but in the course of the year he was appointed beylerbeysi of Anatolia; in 1503, he again became Grand Vizier in 1506 and remained in office until his death. He strove to secure the succession of the şâh-zâde Ahmed, second son of Sultan Bâyâzîd II, against the şâh-zâde Korkût, whom he defeated in 914/1508; he also defeated prince Selîm, who had rebelled against his father, at Çorlu (1521). He died when waging the revolt of Kara Blykill-ghullû, at Gökyay, between Siwâs and Kayseri (1515): he was the first Grand Vizier to die on the field of battle; his death shattered the hopes of the şâh-zâde Ahmed. A skilful and upright statesman, esteemed by Sultan Bayazîd II and by the people, ʿAli Pasha was in addition the patron of men of letters and of science, notably of the poet Mesihi and the historian İdris Bulâtî. He built at Istanbul the mosque known as ʿAtîk ʿAli Pasha (1496), together with the adjoining medresse, school and ʿimâret; he was also responsible for a hammarâni at Karâgûmrûk and a mosque at Yassiforen, and it was he who converted the monastery church of Saint Savior in Chora into a mosque, known as Kırîyye Dîmûs. (K. Vollers)

Bibliography: ʿAshk-pasha-zâde, Taʾrikh, 223-9; ʿOthmân-zâde Tâbî, Ḥadîkat al-Wusûrâ, i, 20; Mehmed Hâmidî Şalâk-zâde, Taʾrikh, 299 ff.; J. von Hammer, Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman, iv, i 20, 14, 24-6, 69, 95-114; IA, s.v. (by Reşd Ekrem Koç). (R. Mantran)

ʿALI PASHA MUBâRÂK, Egyptian statesman, born in Istanbul in February 1815, his father being a shopkeeper of the Egyptian Market. At the age of fourteen he obtained his first government post in the secretariat of the Imperial divân and, whether because of his short stature, or of his ability, acquired the nickname ʿAlî. In 1835, having already learnt some French, he was appointed to the translation department of the divân, and three years later was sent with a mission, first to Vienna, where he remained some eighteen months, and then, in 1837, to St. Petersburg. On his return he was appointed Interpreter to the divân; in the following year he accompanied Mustafa Reşhd Pasha [q.v.] to London as Counsellor, on the latter’s appointment as Ambassador; and in 1839, on the accession of ʿAbd al-Medīd, they returned together to Istanbul.

In 1840, ʿAlî first deputed for the Counsellor to the Ministry of Foreign affairs and then replaced him. In 1843 he was appointed Ambassador in London. Returning in 1844, he was made a member of the meğlis-i владî; and in 1845 he deputized for Şekîb Efendi, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, until his replacement by Reşhd Pasha.
During Reshid Pasha's tenure of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ali, who then again became Counselor of that department, was also appointed bowlıkh of the divan; and when in 1846 Reshid was made Grand Vizier for the first time, Ali replaced him as Foreign Minister. In April 1848, after Ali had raised to the rank of vizier, both Reshid and he were simultaneously dismissed, but were restored four months later and remained in office until 1849, when, on Reshid's again being dismissed, Ali succeeded him as Grand Vizier, with Fu'ad Pasha as Minister of Foreign Affairs.

His first Grand Vizierate, however, lasted only two months; and it was not until November 1854, after the outbreak of the Crimean War, when Reshid again became Grand Vizier, that Ali returned to high office, as Foreign Minister. In the interval he had been appointed first mali of Izmir (January-July 1853) and then mali of Khidawendigâr (April-November 1854), also assuming whilst in the latter post, the presidency of the newly formed High Council of the Tanzimât (q.v.). He continued to hold this position while Foreign Minister, as which, in March 1853, at the conclusion of the war, he was appointed a delegate to the preliminary peace conference in Vienna. The same, in the same year, on Reshid's resigning the Grand Vizierate, Ali again replaced him in that office, so that it fell to him in February 1856 to draw up and promulgate the famous bhall-i hümâyûn of that year and in the following month to sign the Treaty of Paris as first Ottoman delegate. Within the next two years, however, the disputes of the western Powers over the affairs of the Principalities led first to Ali's resignation and replacement by Reshid Pashâ in November 1856 and then, in August 1857, to Reshid's dismissal and replacement by Muṣṭafâ Nâ'îl Pasha, with Ali as Foreign Minister. Ali retained this post under Reshid during the latter's last tenure of the Grand Vizierate, and on Reshid's death in January 1858, replaced him in that office for the third time.

In 1859, Ali was again dismissed for having suggested a cut in palace expenditure as one remedy for the financial crisis that then faced the Ottoman government. But after deputizing first for the Grand Vizier Khbrisl Mehêmed Emin Pashâ during the latter's tour of Rumelia in the summer of 1860 and then for Fu'ad Pashâ as Foreign Minister during his absence in Syria, in July 1861, Ali was once more first appointed Foreign Minister himself and then, after the accession of Abd al-'Azîz, Grand Vizier for the fourth time. Two months later, in November 1861, although the new sultan, finding him too deliberate in action, dismissed him in favour of Fu'ad, Ali returned to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Moreover he continued in that office under successive Grand Viziers until February 1867, when, on the resignation of Müterdjîm Rûshdî Pashâ, he took his place. On this occasion he remained Grand Vizier (it was his fifth term) for as long as four years, until his death.

Ali was more or less self-educated, poverty having obliged him, in order that he might earn his living, to forgo the receipt of an âdâlet from the Bûnûm medresê, where he began the study of Arabic, later continued with Ahmed Djewdet Pashâ (q.v.). But he was of a high natural intelligence; though shy and reserved, he was notably witty; he acquired a mastery of French; and from the date of the Paris peace conference he enjoyed a European reputation as an outstanding diplomatist of perfect manners and rare integrity. Among his countrymen he became unpopular. He was in fact secretive, solemn, and overbearing, and was regarded as vindictive. During his final Grand Vizirate 'Abd al-'Azîz would have been glad to get rid of him, but recognized Ali's standing in Europe to be such that he could not afford to; and Ali profited by this security to insist on his correct treatment by the sultan, on his right to have all governmental matters of importance to be referred to him, and on the immunity of ministers and officials from banishment (in the bad old way) except after due trial.

Both Ali and Fu'ad owed all their official training and advancement to Reshid Pasha. But when in 1852 Ali took Reshid's place as Grand Vizier, the latter was hurt; and from that time on a coolness, which was exacerbated by calumniators, and even a certain rivalry, developed between Ali and Fu'ad on the one hand and Reshid on the other, although Ali was not thereby prevented from serving under Reshid on two further occasions. All three were regarded as pillars of the Tanzimat movement. But whereas it was in part Reshid's object to educate the Ottoman public in self-government, Ali was of an authoritarian temperament and after Reshid's death, it was bent rather on the firm establishment of the rule of law and the consequent limitation on the sultans' autocracy. The maintenance of the Empire now depending on the goodwill of the Powers, it was above all his constant concern to forestall their complaints and intervention. But by devoting too little attention to the internal reforms by the promise of which their favour had been gained, he contributed to its decline. However, in 1868, during his last Grand Vizierate, the meğlis-i mali was replaced by a Council of State (shûrd-yi devlet) on the one hand and a High Court of Justice (divân-l ahhâm-l 'adliyye) on the other, with the aim of separating the judicial from the executive powers of the government; soon after an Imperial School (medrese-i sulûdi) was opened in the Ghala'ta Sarayi, where the instruction, on European lines, was in French and the pupils were non-Muslim as well as Muslim; and in 1869 a Ministry of the Interior was created. During the same period education was also promoted by an increase in the number of the Rûshdiyye schools; the army and navy were overhauled; the fleet was enlarged; and an agreement was concluded for the construction of railways in Rumelî.

Ali's most notable actions at this time were his agreement to the evacuation of the Serbian fortresses by Ottoman troops (1876); his visit to Crete curing the insurrection, as a result of which he formulated the nisâm-nâme under which it was governed for the next thirty years (1868); his success in causing the Powers to oblige the Greek government to desist from aiding the Greek rebels; his restraint of the Khidîw Ismâ'îl from exercising powers beyond those already conceded to him; and his opposition to the formation of the Bulgarian Exarchate, which was consequently delayed till 1870, and to the absorption by Rome of the Armenian Catholic Church.

Owing to his lack of interest in the movement for an Ottoman constitution, Ali was savagely attacked during the last years of his life by its most ardent advocates, the refugee Yeni Ofhamallar (Jeunes Turcs), most of whom, however, recognized after his death, that they had done him an injustice; and he was further successively distress by the death in 1869 of Fu'ad Pasha, after which he made himself responsible for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as
well as the Grand Vizierate; by the defeat in 1870 of France, on whom he had long particularly lent; and by the consequent denunciation by Russia of the Black-Sea clauses of the Treaty of Paris. Exhausted by overwork and these calamities, he fell sick in the summer of 1871, and died after a three months' illness on 7th September, aged fifty-six, at his seaside villa at Bebek on the Bosphorus.


ʿALÎ PASHA RIŻWÂN BEGOWÎC [see RIŻWÂN BEGOWÎC]

ʿALÎ PASHA SEMIZ, Ottoman Grand Vizier. Born at Brazza in Herzegovina, he was carried off at an early age during a deşwîrmîhı operation to be brought up at Istanbul; in 953/1546 he became âgha of the Janissaries, and later beylerbeyî of Rumelia. Appointed governor of Egypt in 1549, he took part in the Suliyanî Pera campaign, and succeeded Rûstûm Pasha as Grand Vizier in Shawwâl 968/July 1561, a post which he held until his death in Dhu-ʿl-Kaʿda 972/June 1565. Immediately after his appointment, he negotiated with the Austrian ambassador Busbecq a peace treaty which was signed at Prague 1 June 1562. But the peace policy of ʿAlî Pasha was wrecked by the new Emperor Maximilian II; on the death of the Grand Vizier, Sultan Süleyman I had to undertake a fresh campaign against Austria. An intelligent and shrewd man, ʿAlî Pasha was famous for his corpulence (hence his cognomen Semiz, "the fat") and his wit.

Bibliography: Müşafa Selânikî, Taʿrih, 7-11, İbnîlîmîn Pecêwî, Taʿrih, i, 24; ʿOṯămîn-žade Taʾbî, Ḥadîkat al-Wusârâ, 31 ff.; J. von Hammer, Histoire de l’Empire Ottoman, vi, 86 ff., 146 ff., 199, 208; IA, s.v. (by Tayyîb Gökblîgîn).

ʿALÎ PASHA ŞURMELI, Ottoman Grand Vizier. Born in Dimetoka, he entered the financial administration and was eventually appointed defîrîdâr in 1688; he was dismissed the following year, but in 1703/1692 was again defîrîdâr and wâzîr. Successively governor of Cyprus and Tripoli in Syria, he became Grand Vizier on 16 Radjab 1105/13 March 1694 in the place of Bozokuł Müşafa Pasha, and conducted the Hungarian campaign, during which he unsuccessfully besieged Peterwardein. Sultan Müşafa II, on his accession, retained ʿAlî Pasha in his post, but forced him to undertake a new campaign against Hungary; a revolt of the Janissaries led to his dismissal on 18 Ramâdân 1106/22 April 1695; condemned at first to exile, ʿAlî Pasha was later executed on 4 Shawwâl 1106/May 1695. He instituted the practice whereby the Council of Ministers met four days a week, and changed the Egyptian crown lands, let at fixed perpetual rents, into fiefs on a wardein. Sultan Mustafa II, on his accession, was unable to do so finally before 1802. In the meantime, after the transference of the Ionian Islands and the "four districts" of Preveze (Prevesa), Parga, Voniĉî (Vonitsa) and Butrinto from Venetian to French sovereignty by the Treaty of Campo Formio in 1797, ʿAlî Pasha not only sent a contingent to assist the conquest by Russo-Ottoman forces of Corfu, but also occupied Butrinto and, after several successes against the French, took possession of Preveze and Voniĉî as well. By the settlement of 1802 the "four districts" were to be incorporated in the sandjaţ of Yanya. But it was not until 1819 that the incorporation of Parga, after various vicissitudes, was in fact effected.

In April 1802 ʿAlî Pasha was appointed wâli of Rumelia. The Albanian irregulars employed to suppress the brigandage and revolts that were again rife in the province at this time had themselves mutinied at Edirne; and it was thought that ʿAlî Pasha was alone capable of pacifying them and overcoming the general disorder. However, his success in inducing many of the outlaws to return to their homes so far provoked the hostility of the many Rumelian aṣârî whose interest it was to resist any thorough pacification, that in 1803 his appointment was revoked. He was then given the sandjaţ of Tirhala in addition to Yanya; but it was sought to counterbalance his influence in Albania
by replacing him in Rumelia by Ibrahim Pasha, the *mutasarrif* of Iškodaa (Scutari), whose authority among the Ghegs of the north was little less than *Ali's own among the Turks of the south.

After the resumption of the European war in 1803 close relations were established between *Ali and the French, who supplied him with weapons, munitions, and even gunners. But after Tilsit in 1807, when the Ionian Islands were relinquished by Russia to the French, the latter then proposed regaining the “four districts”, occupied Parga, and, inciting a revolt of the Greeks of Tirhala against *Ali's authority, which, however, was suppressed by his son Mūkhār.

In 1810, after first marrying two of his sons and a nephew to daughters of the *mutasarrif* of Avalonya, and then contriving that the latter should be attacked in his capital, *Ali Pasha* was able to appropriate this *sandjak* as well, under the pretext of flying to the relief of a relative. Mūkhār II was enraged by this episode, but powerless to refuse the appointment of Mūkhār Pasha to Avalonya in place of the dispossessed governor. No less unwelcome to the Porte were *Ali’s acquisition of Ergiri (Argyrocastron) in the following year, and still more his invasion of the Gheg country, where, after overcoming some local resistance, he was able to add the possessions of Tirana and Pekin (Pekinje) and the *sandjak* of Okhri and Elbashā to his dominions.

In the face of repeated protests from Istanbul *Ali Pasha* sought to excite this high-handed conduct, and in the war with Russia resumed in 1809 sent a considerable force to the sultan's aid under the command of Mūkhār and Well Pasha. He also assisted the British forces in their occupation of the Ionian Islands; and in view of these services and his advanced age no attempt was made by the Porte to unseat him before 1820. Then, however, owing in the first place to his falling out with the all-powerful nīgānī Hālet Efendi, and the latter's wish to divert Mūkhūd from his intention of abolishing the Janissaries; in the second place to the intrigues of certain Phanariot Greeks, who saw that he constituted an obstacle to the already projected insurrection in the Morea; and finally to the attempted assassination, contrived by *Ali Pasha, of Pashō Ismā'il Bey, a former kāhhya of Well Pasha in Istanbul, in April 1820 he was dismissed from his Wardenship of the Passes and ordered to withdraw his troops from all regions outside the *sandjak* of Yanya, while Well Pasha was deprived of his governorship of Tirhala. Since there was little doubt that force would be needed to secure his obedience, all the governors of adjacent provinces had previously been warned to hold themselves in readiness to apply it; Khūrshād Ahmed Pasha, recently made governor of the Morea, was appointed to command all the troops engaged in operations against him; and a flotilla was ordered to the Albanian coast. *Ali Pasha* responded by concluding an agreement for mutual aid with the Greek rebel leaders and seeking to provoke revolts also in the Aegean islands, Serbia, and the Principalities; on which the Porte in turn deprived him of his vizzirate, dismissed him from Yanya, and ordered him and his whole family to reside at Tepedelen.

*Ali Pasha* was in fact deprived of all his acquisitions except Yanya itself, in the well stocked citadel of which he was then besieged, while three of his sons and a grandson, the governors of districts formerly in his control, surrendered. Owing to his provocation of a mutiny by the Albanians of the besieging force, a rising of the Suliotes, and the outbreak of the Greek revolt, it was not until the siege had continued for two years that *Ali Pasha* could be induced to give in. He then did so on condition that his life should be spared, retiring with a few supporters to a neighbouring monastery. But Khūrshād Pasha's guarantee was repudiated by Hālet Efendi, whose purposes it suited that the trouble at Yanya should continue. *Ali Pasha*, on learning that his execution had been ordered, decided to fight. He was accordingly attacked and died from a shot wound on 24 January 1822.

Tepedelenli *Ali Pasha* attained some celebrity in Europe owing to his being visited by various writers, notably Lord Byron, and to his efforts to enlist help from both the French and the British in the prosecution of his ambitions. He was brave, bold, and clever, but treacherous and wholly self-seeking. Having acquired great riches, he maintained a semi-royal state, surrounded by a strange entourage of European officers, Greek doctors, poets, *derwishes*, astrologers, and the leaders of brigand bands. Of all the contemporary Muslim rebels against the Ottoman power he contrived to do it most harm, by facilitating the beginning of the Greek revolt.

By the Caliph's order, green flags and green uniforms replaced the Abbasid black all over the empire. It is unlikely that the green colour was at this early date specifically associated with the house of 'Ali, and the precise significance of the change of colour is uncertain (cf. Weil, ii, 216, n. 3; Gabrieli, 37 n. 4).

The full text of the document of appointment is preserved (al-Kalâkshârî, Şubûh, ix, 362-6; Ibn al-Diâwâlî, Mirâtî, Paris Ms. Ar. 5903, f. 149 r-151 r; translation in Gabrieli 38-45). It shows that al-Ma'mûn carefully avoided the larger question of principle as between the claims of the houses of 'Abbas and of 'Ali, and simply appointed 'Ali al-Ri'dâ as the person best fitted by his personal qualities—that is to say, on Sunnî rather than Shî'î grounds. Nor does the document make any allusion to the delicate question of the succession after 'Ali al-Ri'dâ.

The appointment aroused vigorous and conflicting reactions. The various 'Abbâsîd governors, with the exception of 'Ismâ'îl b. Dî̄fârî in Bâṣra, Loyally carried out their orders, and exacted the oath of allegiance to the new heir. The Shî'îs were of course jubilant, though by no means won over by the appointment of a competitor to the house of 'Abbas, who wrote out inscriptions for some of the great mosques of Isfâhân (Masdjid-i Shâh, Masdi'dî-i Luft Allâh) as well as for the dome over the tomb of the shrine of 'Ali al-Ri'dâ and the shrine of Khâ'îdja Râbi' in Mâshhâd. He was also appreciated as a copyist of manuscripts, several of which in his handwriting are still preserved. Some miniatures are also attributed to him, but he is not to be confounded with Ri'dâ-i 'Abbâsî [q.v.].


'Ali Shér Kâ'nî [see Kâ'nî].

'Allî Shîr Navî [see NAVî].

'Ali Tegîn [see KARAKHANIDS].
their descendants that the loyalties of the different groups of the Shi’i (q.v.) were given. The claims made by the Shi’a on behalf of the ‘Alids were broadly of two kinds. For the extremist Shi’a the ‘Alid Imams were the spiritual as well as the religious and political heirs of the Prophet, whose spiritual inspiration they retained or resumed. For the moderate Shi’a they were the legitimate heirs of the Prophet as heads of the Umma of Islam, with a better claim to the succession than that of the reigning Caliphs, whom the Shi’a regarded as usurpers. The early ‘Alids, with the possible exception of Muhammad b. al-Hanaﬁyya and the more probable exception of his son Abû Hâshim, seem consistently to have refused to have any dealings with the extremists, or countenanced their ideas (e.g. A. Chântel, vii, 24 and viii, 33). On the other hand they seem to have acquiesced—if somewhat passively—in the political claims made on their behalf by the moderate Shi’a. The numerous traditions in which ‘Alids reject and denounce the claims of their own supporters (e.g. Ibn Sa’d, v, 77, 158, 235, 238) are almost certainly due to Sunni propaganda, and a more accurate reflection of the political views and claims of the house of ‘Ali will be found in the letter written by the ‘Alid pretender Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allah (q.v.) to the Caliph Mu’tasim in 145/762 (al-Tabari, iii, 209 ff.), and in the verses of such pro-‘Alid poets as Kumayt and Kûhâyir. Muhammad’s letter is also interesting in that the writer claims pure Arab descent on both sides, without admixture of foreign or slave blood—thus accepting the aristocratic Umayyad principle of succession, (which had excluded sons of slave mothers like Maslama) and rejecting the Islamic rule followed by the Husaynids (several of whose Imams had slave mothers), and, later, by the ‘Abbasids. In the early period the claims of the ‘Alids were based on descent from ‘Ali the Prophet’s kinsman rather than from Fâṭima his daughter, since according to the ideas of the time kinship with the Prophet in the male line was more important than descent from him in the female line. (Thus in the revealing speech attributed to ‘Ali at Siffin, he speaks of himself only as “cousin of the Prophet”, Murâdi, iv, 355). Claims based on kinship could thus be advanced on behalf of descendants of ‘Ali by wives other than Fâtimah, and even of collateral descendants of Abû Tâlib (see AH. AL-BAYY). Only after the usurpation of ‘Alid claims by their ‘Abbasid cousins was stress laid on direct descent from the Prophet via Fâtimah. In the development of this new claim, the sixth Imam Dja’far al-Sâdiq seems to have played a role of some importance.

After the abortive rising of al-Hasayn and the massacre of Karbalâ in 61/680, when most of the ‘Alids were killed, the ‘Alid pretenders remained politically inactive, giving recognition and sometimes even help to the ruling house (examples in al-Tabari, ii, 3, 409, 420, 1338; al-Ya’qûbî, ii, 298 ff.; Ibn Sa’d, v, 83, 159; Buhl, 269). They preferred to reside in Mecca or Medina, far from the main political centres, and while maintaining their claims did little to advance them. Such action as they took may be qualified as litigious rather than rebellious, concerned with their estates rather than their political rights (cf. I. Hrbek, Muhammad’s Nachlass und die ‘Aiden, Arch. Or., 1950, 43-9). In the tradition this passivity is naturally given a religious colouring, and appears as the prototype of the characteristic Shi’a practice of tabiyya (q.v.).

Towards the middle of the 8th century growing discontent brought new opportunities to the ‘Alids. In ca. 122/740 Zayd b. ‘Ali b. Husayn (q.v.) led the first ‘Alid bid for power since Karbalâ. After his death, closely followed by that of his son Yahyâ (q.v.) in ca. 125/743-4, the ‘Alid bolt was shot, and both the cause and the opportunity were taken over by the ‘Abbasids. The first major expression of ‘Alid anger and disappointment at the ‘Abbasid victory was the revolt of the ‘Hasanid brothers Muhammad and Ibrahim b. ‘Abd Allah (q.v.), in Medina and Bâṣra respectively. Both movements were choked in blood, and the Caliph Ma’tûr adopted a policy of violent repression towards the ‘Alids, great numbers of whom were arrested and put to death (cf. al-Tabari, iii, 445-6; Murâdi, vii, 404; Makâtib, 178 ff.). Al-Mahdî dealt more kindly with the ‘Alids, as part of a general policy of appeasement, but when this failed to gain ‘Alid good will, it was abandoned by al-Hâdî, whose harsh actions drove the ‘Alids to open revolt. The rising of Husayn b. ‘Ali (q.v.), known as Shâhîb Fakhkh (after the place of his death), in 156/776 was soon suppressed, (Tabari, iii, 551-9; Makâtib, 431 ff.), but ‘Idrîs (q.v.), a brother of the ill-fated Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allâh, escaped to Morocco where he founded the first ‘Alid dynasty. Hârîn al-Rabbage eased the severities of al-Hâdî, but after the revolt of Yahyâ b. ‘Abd Allah (q.v.) in 176/792, when the suspension of the ‘Alids and, the Husaynid Mûsâ al-Kâzîm (q.v.) died in prison. Meanwhile, in 175/792, some Zahyids (of the line of Zayd b. ‘Hasan) took refuge in Daylam, where in 250/864 they were able to establish the first of a series of local dynasties. Al-Ma’mûn on his accession faced the pro-‘Alid revolts of Abu l-Sâ’îrya (q.v.) in association with the ‘Hasanid Muhammad b. Ibrahim, called Ibn Tabatâba (q.v.) in Mesopotamia in 195/814, and of Muhammad b. Dja’far (q.v.) known as Mûshâm Muhammad al-Dibâdî, in Mecca in 200/815-6. His subsequent nomination of the Husaynid ‘Ali al-Ridâ (q.v.) as his heir and his adoption of a pro-‘Alid policy brought some alleviation, but did not save him from a further ‘Alid rising, that of ‘Abd al-Rahmân b. Ahmad in the Yemen in 207/822-3. Under al-Ma’mûn’s successors relations between ‘Abbasids and ‘Alids again deteriorated, reaching their lowest point with the insults and persecutions of al-Mutawakkil. Al-Muntasîr is reported to have treated the ‘Alids with consideration, but the revolts continued. Most of them were suppressed, some few resulted in the appearance of local dynasties of ‘Alid stock, in such remote places as Morocco, Yemen, and the Caspian provinces of Persia.

Most of the rebels and pretenders of the early ‘Abbasid period came from the line of al-Hasan, that of al-Hasayn preferring a life of tranquil piety. It was however the latter that came to have the greatest influence. After the death in 148/765 of Dja’far al-Sâdiq (q.v.), the sixth Imam in the line of al-Hasan, the succession was disputed between his sons Ismâm al-Mûsâ al-Kâzîm (q.v.) and ‘Ismâm al-Mûsâ al-‘Abd (q.v.), whose claims were accepted by the sect known as Ismâ‘iliyya (q.v.), sired a line of Imams from whom came the Fâtimid Caliphs (some authorities however doubt the authenticity of their pedigree). Mûsâ’s line ended with the disappearance of the 12th Imam, known as Muhammad al-Mahdî ca. 260/875-4. After this the aspirations of their followers (see ITHNA ‘ASHARIYYA) became eschatological rather than political, since they could offer assurance to the ‘Abbasid Caliphate, which was therefore accepted even by Shi’ite dynasties such as the Bûyids.
Many dynasties claimed to be of ʿAlid descent. They may be grouped as follows:

1) Ḥasanids: a) N.W. Africa—Idrāsids [q.v.], Sulaymānids [q.v.], ʿSharifs (Šaʿlīds [q.v.], Fillāḥs, (see ʿALAWIDS)).
   b) Yemen—Sulaymānids, Banū ʿUkhraydīr, Rasids [q.v.].
   c) Mecca—Sulaymānids, Banū ʿUkhraydīr, Banū Fuyālata, Banū Ḥātāda (see Makkah).
   d) N. Persia—Zaydids, ʿAlīds.
   e) Ghānā—Banū ʿṢallīh [q.v.].
   f) ʿAṣmū— Ḥasanids.
   g) Cordova and Malaga—Ḥammūdids [q.v.].

2) ʿUsaynids: a) Ifriqiya and Egypt—Fatimids [q.v.]
   b) Yemen—Sulaymānids, Banū ʿUkhraydīr, Rasids [q.v.].

3) Unknown: a) Idrīsīya and Egypt—Fāṭimids [q.v.].
   b) Medina—Banū Muhannā [q.v.].

ALIGARH, town (27° 3′ N., 78° 4′ E.) and district in the Meerut (MIRAT) division of Uttar Pradesh (formerly the United Provinces). In 1941 the district had 1,372,641 inhabitants (86,381 Muslims) and the town 1,32,655 (52,712 Muslims). The town was at first called Koil (KOL) and the citadel, built in 1548, was named Aligarh (high fort) when Nadīl Khuṭān restored it in 1776; previously it had been called Ramgarh, occasionally Sābtgarh after one Sābit Khuṭān or Muhannā.

Koil, which was certainly an old town, was captured towards the end of the 12th century by Kūth al-Dīn Aybēg and was usually subject to Delhi, being a fief of Balban’s eldest son c. 1270. It was ruled from Dijawnpur in 1393 and was independent for a time from 1447. In 1785 Mahtrattas of the Scindia family captured it but were driven out by Lord Lake in 1803. It was often described by Muslim writers, e.g. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (iv, 6).

Modern Aligarh owes its place to its university. In 1872 (Sir) Sayyid Ahmad ʿAlīn [q.v.] began to collect funds, some Hindus contributing, for a boys’ school to be run more or less on English lines. In 1875 the high school was raised to a second grade college. The institution then became a school and the Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College. Sir Sayyid kept the management in his own hands during his lifetime and had excellent helpers in the first principals, Th. Beck and (Sir) Theodore Morison. Finance was a trouble and there was opposition to this breach with traditional Muslim education. Entrance to the college was never restricted to Muslims and the language of instruction was English except in religious subjects. After the founder’s death the management was put in the hands of Muslim trustees. In 1904 332 boys were in the school, 26 students in the college and 36 students of law; of the total 76 were Hindus. In 1909 there were eight teachers of European origin and for some years the professor of Arabic was an European. Later the number of teachers who were not Indians was much reduced. In 1920 the college was created a university and an intermediate college was established for the first two years of the university course, following the recommendations of the Calcutta Commission. At the same time the non-cooperation movement caused trouble, resulting in the foundation of the National University; this was active for two years or so and existed in name for some time longer. Aligarh University continued to develop; in 1929 teachers of Yûnânl (Unani) medicine appeared on the staff, in 1932 the intermediate college was absorbed in the university and new laboratories opened; in 1934 a college of Yûnânl medicine was started and in 1938 an institute of technology and electrical engineering and a Yûnânl hospital were opened. Women were admitted to some degrees in the same year and later further concessions were made to them. In 1945 an agricultural college was opened and in 1947 the staff is found grouped in four faculties, arts, science, engineering and technology, and theology. The separation of Pakistan from India caused a great upheaval and many of the staff left but their places were filled, the university survived and still flourishes. Aligarh has always upheld the Muslim ideal of opening the road to education to the needy; it is to be feared that the pursuit of this ideal may clash with the purpose of a university. In the year 1946-7 there were 3806 students of whom 775 were graduates and 501 first degrees were given in the faculties of arts, science, commerce and engineering; in the following year the numbers were 4285, 1786 and 365.

ALIM, see ʿULAMA‘.

ALIMA, in the Egyptian dialect of Arabic ʿAlime, ʿAlima, plural ʿawalim, literally “a learned,
expert woman”, the name of a class of Egyptian female singers forming a sort of guild, according to the sources of the 16th and 19th centuries. They were engaged to perform in harems at celebrations of marriages or births, during Ramadán and on other occasions. Their art included the improvisation of poems of the mawal [q.v.] type, singing and dancing. They withdrew from Cairo during the French expedition. Well-informed travellers were careful to distinguish them from the ghawazi (sing. ghaziyya) who sang and danced primarily in the streets, making a speciality of lascivious dances and often becoming prostitutes (the most accurate descriptions are those of Savary, *Lettres sur l'Égypte*, Paris 1786, i, 149 ff., and Villoteau, *Description de l'Égypte*, Paris 1826, xiv, 169-82; useful information is contained in Sonnini, *Voyage dans la haute et basse Égypte*, Paris, year vii, ii 572 ff.; Chabrol in *Descr. de l'Égypte*, Paris 1826, xviii, i, 173 ff., 212 ff., 330; Lane, *Modern Egyptians*, London 1836-7, i, 226, 267; ii, 65 ff., 270 ff., Laerty-Hadji (Baron Taylor), *L'Égypte*, Paris 1856, 263-5. The Arabic word as recorded by the travellers appears in French, from the time of Savary (loc. cit.; cf. *Journal encyclopédique*, 1787, ii, 519 ff.), in the form aïmès, later aïmed, and in English (first recorded in 1814 by Byron, *Corson*, ii, 8) as alma or aïmeh. But Baedeker, *Egyptien*, Leipzig 1877, i, 25-6 states that aïwālim of the better class only survived in the harems of the most eminent houses; a debased type was frequently to be seen in the streets accompanied by one or two, usually blind, musicians. Travellers regularly confused the 'almas with the ghawāzī, who were however expelled from Cairo to Upper Egypt in 1834 by Muḥammad 'Aīl. All the latter were found in large numbers at Kena, Esna, Lukxor (Baedeker, *Egyptien*, Leipzig 1891, ii, 81 ff., 258). Flaubert in 1850 associated with them there, and refers to them as aïmès (Voy. en Orientis, Paris 1949, 63 ff.). Most of the aïwālim and ghawāzī held an annual reunion at Ṭantā on the occasion of the mawādir of Sīdī Ṭabdīl al-Badawl (Baedeker, loc. cit., i, 25, 245; cf., referring to the year 1865, A. Rhone, *L'Égypte à petites journées*, Paris 1877, 172-8, and as late as 1933, the parade of prostitutes, in J. W. McPherson, *The Moulids of Egypt*, Cairo 1941, 286.

**Bibliography:**


**ALINDJĀK or ALINDJA** (in Armenian Erniql), a district of the province Sjunik, now ruins within the Naghchėwan territory of the Azerbayčanian Soviet Socialist Republic. The river Alindja flows into the Araxes near Old Djiuva. The ancient fortress of Alindja stood some 20 km. above its estuary on the right bank of the river, on the top of an extremely steep mountain (near the village Khānāqā). The fortress played a considerable role at the Timūrid and Turkmân period.

**Bibliography:** V. Minorsky, *Caucasia*, 14, 1930, 91-4, 112. (V. Minorsky)

**ALISA** (or ALYSA) b. Uγṣṭūr (or Yaghtūr), the biblical prophet Elisha. The Koran mentions him twice (vi, 86 and xxviii, 46, second Meccan period) together with other apostles of Allāh, without special comment. The Arabs have considered the first syllable as the article (discussion of variant readings in al-Ṭabari, *Ṭafsīr*, vii, 156 ff.). Muslim tradition identifies Alīsa with the son of the widow who sustained Elijah during the famine (1 Kings xvii, 9 ff.). This son, a paralytic, was cured by Ilyās (Elijah) and became his disciple, his companion and, eventually, his successor. Because of his parentage, some authors call him Ibn al-'Arūsī (son of the old woman), but others, including al-Ṭabari (loc. cit. and Annālīs, i, 535) give this sobriquet to Ḥazīf (Eskele). In traditional Muslim chronology, Alīsa is placed much earlier in date than Tālūṭ (Saul), and it is he who is said to have been evoked by the witch of Endor. His identification with one of the guardians of the Ark of the Covenant is a further detail derived from the history of Samuel. Some identify him with al-Khādīr [q.v.], or even with Dhu 'l-Kifl [q.v.], who is generally regarded as his successor.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the references quoted in the article, see Tabari, i, 542 ff., 559; Kišāt (Eisenberg), 248-30; Tha'lābi, *Ārdāt al-Madīgālis*, Cairo 1370/1951, 259-61; J. Horovitz, *Koranische Untersuchungen*, 152.

(M. Seligsohn-G. Vajda)

**ALJAMIA**, Spanish transcription of the Arabic al-’adamiyya ("non-Arabic"), a term used by the Muslims of al-Andalus to denote the Romance dialects of their neighbours in the north of the Iberian peninsula—dialects soon coloured with Arabisms which, for the most part, were introduced from the 9th century by Mozarab emigrants who had settled in the Christian countries neighbouring the kingdom of Cordova. The Romance language, the use of which in al-Andalus by all classes of society, especially by the rural classes, alongside Spanish Arabic, has been established, was also called al-’adamiyya. It was only in the latter Middle Ages that the Spanish equivalent of this term, aljamià, acquired the particular meaning which is attributed to it to-day, namely: a Hispanic Romance language (Portuguese, Galician, Castilian, Aragonese or Catalan, depending on the district) written, not in Latin, but in Arabic characters. The literature in aljamià which has been preserved is therefore termed aljamiada.

This aljamiada literature, of which there exists a number of manuscripts, has been the subject of numerous studies in Spain itself, especially towards the end of the 19th century. It comprises in general works of a religious or legal nature in addition to poetical compositions, usually didactic in tone, and a few works of fiction in prose. In considering this literature, a distinction must be made between the works written in Spain itself, before the expulsion of the Moors by Philip III in 1609, and those, more numerous, written after that date, in particular by the Moorish communities established in Tunisia [see moriscos]. In the first group, the most important work, which apparently dates back to the 14th century, is the anonymous "Poem of Yüsuf"; R. Menéndez Pidal, who has edited and commented on this poem (*Poema de Yüsuf: materiales para su estudio*, in *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos*, VIII, Madrid 1902; new edition, Granada 1952), thinks it is the work of an Aragonese Morisco. It consists of a version in Spanish verse of Kūrān, xii (Sānār Yāsīm), embellished with elements borrowed from the Muslim "legends of the prophets". In the second group, the poetical compositions of another Aragonese Morisco, Muḥammad Rabaḍān, a native of Rueda de Jalón, deserve special mention; composed about 1603, they consist of strophic poems which narrate,
following in general Abu ’l-Hasan al-Basri, the various episodes of the sira of the Prophet. About the same period (beginning of the 17th century), an account of a pilgrimage to Arabia was composed, also in rhymed strophes, by a Morisco known as Albichite (al-
bdigd) of Puey Monzón. An anti-Christian polemical poem composed in 1627 by Juan Pérez, a Morisco from Alcalá de Henares, who had emigrated to Tunisia, and whose original name was Ibrahim Taybili, must also be mentioned.

Dating from the same period are the Muslim apologetics written in aljamiado, for instance that composed in 1615 by ’Abd al-Karim b. ’Ali Pérez. To this literature also belong some novelistic prose narratives concerning the Prophet or one of his Companions (for instance Tamlmites whom the Ghassanid king, al-Harith b. Djabala (ca. 529-569), had taken prisoner. Arab tradition connects Alkama with Imru’ al-Kays (d. ca. 540), with whom he is supposed to have fought and won a literary contest as a result of which Imru’ al-Kays divorced and Alkama married the umri Djundab. The style of their work would bear out the suggestion of some artistic association such as the anecdote implies. The oft-remarked similarities between ’Alkama, 1 (Ahlwardt), and Imru’ al-Kays, 4 (Ahlwardt), indicate a certain confusion of the two literary personalities on the part of the rubā‘. Already Ahlwardt, Bemerkungen, 68 ff., noted that in all likelihood ’Alkama’s is the older ode. ’Alkama shares with Imru’ al-Kays a predilection for the longer and more tranquil meters. Stylistic and thematic kinship justifies the grouping of the two poets together as representatives of a distinct “school”.
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AL-CALKAMI — ALLAH

varied from period to period throughout medieval and modern times: the western branch has finally been dominant, and the eastern merely a controlled canal, since the early 20th century; but al-

ALKAMMI, see AL-HINNA"

ALKANNA, see AL-HINNA"

ALKAS MIRZA (or ALKAS, ALKASP), second son of Shâh Isma'il I of the Safawi dynasty, and younger brother of Shâh Tahmâsp I. Born Tabriz 921/1515-6, he fought a successful action at Astarâbâd against the Uzbegs in 939/1532-3. In 945/1538-9 he subdued Shîrvân, and was made governor of that province by Tahmâsp. He rebelled soon afterwards, but was granted a conditional pardon through the intercession of his mother Khan Begl Khanum. At the instance of Tahmâsp, he fought an inconclusive campaign against the Circassians, but again rebelled, minting his own coinage and including his name in the khwba. In 953/1546-7 Tahmâsp launched his second Georgian expedition, and from Gandra dispatched 5000 men against Alkas. Alkas, worsted in several engagements, fled to Constantinople via the Kipîsk plain and the Crimean (954/1547-8).

He incited Sulaymân I to send another expedition against Persia, and in 955/1548-9 he was sent ahead of the main Ottoman army which advanced on Tabriz via Siwâs and Erzerum. The success of Tahmâsp's policy of laying waste the countryside obliged Sulaymân to retire from Tabriz after only five days. Alkas accompanied Sulaymân at the capture of the fortress of Wan, and interceded for the garrison. But he had fallen in Sulaymân's estimation because his presence in Persia had not evoked the support promised, and Sulaymân willingly agreed that Alkas should leave Bagdad and raid Persia with a force of irregulars (he refused to allow him any Janissaries). Alkas marched to Hamadân, where he destroyed the palace of his brother Bahârîm and captured his son Badi-al-Zamân Mirzá, and thence to Kum, Kâshân and Isfâhân. Then, instead of complying with Sulaymân's order to join him, he went on to Shohtâr, and sent a conciliatory letter to Tahmâsp. (Dhâ'l-Hidâdîa 955/January 1549). Proceeding towards Bagdad, he was opposed by Muhammad Pasha, Governor of Bagdad, and fled to Ardalan, where he was handed over to Tahmâsp by Surkhâb Beg, the ruler of Ardalan, on condition that his life was spared. According to Tahmâsp's own account, Alkas was imprisoned at Alamût, where he was killed a few days later, ostensibly as the result of a private feud, but probably with Tahmâsp's connivance.


ALLAH, God the Unique one, the Creator and Lord of the Judgment, polarizes the thought of Islam; He is the sole reason for its existence.

Allah was known to the pre-Islamic Arabs; he was one of the Meccan deities, possibly the supreme deity and certainly a creator-god (cf. Kur'ân, xiii, 16; xix, 61, 63; xxi, 25; xxviii, 38; xlii, 87). He was already known, by antonomasia, as the God, al-Ilâh (the most likely etymology; another suggestion is the Aramaic Alâhâ).—For Allah before Islam, as shown by archaeological sources and the Kur'ân, see lah.

But the vague notion of supreme (not sole) divinity, which Allâh seems to have connoted in Meccan religion, was to become both universal and transcendental; it was to be turned, by the Kur'anic preaching, into the affirmation of the Living God, the Exalted One.

I. ALLAH IN THE KUR'ÂN.

A Muslim tradition tells us that sûra xcvi was the first to "come down" to the Prophet Muhammad; so the mission entrusted to him was from the first the preaching of the Word of Allah ("Preach!"); xcvi, 1 and 3). Allâh, as is said to Muhammad in this first sûra, is thy Lord (rabbuka, xcvi, 1), Creator of man, the Very Generous, "Who teaches man that which he knew not" (xcvi, 3). The great Kur'anic leit-motiv, bismillâh al-Rahmân al-Rahîm, "in the name of God, the merciful Benefactor" (cf. R. Blachère's translation), opens the announcement of the imparted message and is repeated at the head of each sûra. It may be that it contains a reference to the Rahmân of pre-Islamic south Arabia, and that Rahmân should be taken as a divine proper name. The fact remains that the root RHM came to connote, in the course of the Islamic centuries, precisely the concept of benefaction, of clemency, of mercy, and that the expression rahmân Allâh, "God's mercy," was to become, in the spiritual writers, as it were an evocation of the mysterious profundities of divinity in its relations with man.—Hence, from the beginning of Muhammad's preaching, the affirmation of God, Allâh, as benefactor, creator, bountiful, imparting instruction to men through a messenger, of whom He was, in a special way, the Lord.

(A) The great themes.

From a historical point of view, we shall accept the distinctions generally admitted to exist (with some differences as to detail, see Nödeke, Grimmel, Blachère) between the three Meccan periods and the Medinan period, distinctions which roughly agree with some Muslim traditions (cf. Kur'ân). But although these various periods give us a multiplicity of perspectives and new flashes of illumination, there is strictly speaking no progressive revelation of Allâh. The Qur'ân is not a theological exposition of the existence, nature and attributes of God. Muslim faith has always regarded the text of the Qur'ân as God's Word made manifest to man, in which God says what He wishes about Himself. God is "the benefactor Who teaches the Preaching" (iv, 1-2), which is addressed to "the pious who believe in the Mystery (akbat)" (ii, 2-3).

God remains mysterious, unapproachable (xlii, 50-51). He is declared in His transcendent perfections and in His dealings with the world; and every action of the Almighty (af'dluha ta'dlu) is the restatement of the inscrutable mystery, for "the sight cannot perceive Him, while He can perceive the sight" (vi, 103).

Without a risk of breaking the very rhythm of sûras and verses, it is not easy to pick out, still less easy to classify, the themes concerning God. Three seem to us to predominate, but they must be taken as a whole.
1. God of creation, judgment and retribution. He is the "creator (khdlik) of all things" (xiii, 16). He is the absolute originator (kun) of all things, by His command (amr) and His will (fradar). The oldest sūras proclaim God's unlimited sovereignty (rubābiyya) over His creation, particularly His human creation, and His attributes of sovereign judge and king (mālik). The final challenge is given to minds and hearts by the news of the Judgment (yaum al-din; see all sūra lxvi) and the imminence of the Hour (lxxi, 56-57; lxv, 1, etc.), which is known to God alone (e.g. lxxix, 42-44; xlii, 85). The manner of this preaching may vary, but never its essential contents. For variations of theme relate less to God in Himself than to relations between God and the community of believers, depending on obstacles encountered or successive organisations. Thus, for example, the dichotomy of the Elect and the Damned (lxxxiv) at the end of the first Meccan period, and the Medinan leit-motiv of the "hypocrites" (munāfikûn) "whom God will mock" (ii, 15).—The Meccan sūras of the first two periods stress the eschatological advent of the Hour; in them, God appears essentially as the sovereign judge, by means of the rhythm and rapping-out of asseverations. At Medina the same mystery is as it were recalled; presented to the heart's recollection (dhikr), as a witness to the eschatological value of daily life itself, urging the Muslim, whether he be "believer" or "hypocrite", to be constantly mindful of the Hour, in his every action; therefore urging the "hypocrite" to the "return", to conversion.

The same variations and resumptions of a single theme recur in the presentation of the divine management of human history. The Medinese sūras relate in minute detail the story of Adam, proceed to the history of the prophets, from Noah to Jesus, and state what God's will is of the community of believers. But there it appears as a sequence of discontinuous interventions of the immutable decree (badr) of God, which, as the Meccan preaching had already said, encompasses all things, both in and out of time. For God is "the King of life and death" (xlv, 16); a theme constantly reverted to later, e.g. xv, 23; li, 258, etc.). From the very first sūras Noah is evoked (lxxi, 52), and Abraham and Moses (lxxx, 19; lxxi, 36-37), and the tribes of Thamūd (xci, 12 and 14; liii, 51, etc.). In the second Meccan period, God's plans for the Nations, for Thamūd and 'Ad, are mingled with intimations of the Judgment (cf. lxxix and lxxx); to the second and third Meccan periods belong the most fully developed accounts of the history of the prophets. Mixed with the theme of the judgment of peoples, that of the judgment of every individual human being is constantly stated.

2. God, Unique and One in Himself. In all of the earliest sūras, God is ūnā'ī Lord. Subsequently He is called Creator, Benefactor, Help, Judge. He is the Most High (lxxx, 1). He is given these names by virtue of those attributes of His godhead which have some connection with man. The particular attribute of His godhead in which the faith of Islam was to have its focus is first stated: the answer to man's errors and impieties: God the One.

Sūra lii, 39 and 43, contains a condemnation of the Meccans who have been accustomed to ascribe partners and daughters to Allah. For Allah is wūhīd, sole divinity. "Your God is One" (xxxvii, 4), the believers are told. The assertion is constantly repeated throughout the Book, constantly restated in the Medinan period (e.g. li, 126). It is the very core of the preaching concerning God: "It has been revealed to me only that your God is One God", Muhammad says again and again (e.g. xli, 6, etc.).

But in a verse of the first Meccan period is found what is perhaps a stronger affirmation that Allah is One in Himself. In relation to man, sole divinity, wūhīd; in Himself, One in His nature of deity, abīd (cxii, 1).—Sole and One, the two Names come together in the Unity, the launāk, and its absolute transcendence. Such is the meaning of the "witness" of Islam, the shahīdā. As early as that 73rd sūra, which, according to the traditions, gave rise to the conversion of Űmar, the assertion appears: "There is no divinity—save Him (humūn)" (lxix, 9). The second Meccan period proclaims: innā yuallāh-āli āl ibn Ma'dīn (xxvii, 4), that is, "I, I am God—there is no divinity save Me" (xx, 14), and that the mystery of this divine "I" is the Real (khākh, xx, 114; xviii, 44).—Lastly, the short sūra cxii, of uncertain date (referred to some in the Medinan period), is known as the sūra of Unity (launāk) par excellence: God Alone, the Master, not begetting and not begotten; without equal: an assertion of the unity of the divine nature as such, its intrinsic mystery unfathomed (cf. xcviii, 91).

3. God omnipotent and merciful. The twofold aspect of the mystery of God in relation to His creation: Lord of the worlds (lxxxiv, 29; a very frequent expression) in His unquestioned omnipotence and His forgiving benevolence, is found in all periods of the Qur'ān alike, with varying shades of expression and emphasis. The quality of omnipotence is the first enunciated. He is "the Lord of Easts and Wests" (lx, 49; cf. lix, 9); but it is precisely this which encourages the believer to see in Him a protector, a surety (wakil, xlii, 39 and 43), and that the mystery of this divine "I" is the Real (khākh, xx, 114; xviii, 44).—Lastly, the short sūra cxii, of uncertain date (referred to some in the Medinan period), is known as the sūra of Unity (launāk) par excellence: God Alone, the Master, not begetting and not begotten; without equal: an assertion of the unity of the divine nature as such, its intrinsic mystery unfathomed (cf. xcviii, 91).

The quality of omnipotence is the first enunciated. He is "the Lord of Easts and Wests" (lx, 49; cf. lix, 9); but it is precisely this which encourages the believer to see in Him a protector, a surety (wakil, xlii, 39 and 43), and that the mystery of this divine "I" is the Real (khākh, xx, 114; xviii, 44).—Lastly, the short sūra cxii, of uncertain date (referred to some in the Medinan period), is known as the sūra of Unity (launāk) par excellence: God Alone, the Master, not begetting and not begotten; without equal: an assertion of the unity of the divine nature as such, its intrinsic mystery unfathomed (cf. xcviii, 91).

(B) The Signs and Names of Allah.

Thus God, through His prophets, is continually revealing to man the unexpressed mystery of His
ineffability, in which man is asked to believe, and His explicit sovereignty over all creation, and the transcendental perfections by which it is made known. For He is at the same time “the First and the Last, the Manifest (āhir) and the Hidden (bātim)” (lvii 3).

In the first place, man, since he has received a revelation about them, must be able to recognize the “signs of the universe”, which are “signs of God” (dīwān Allāh). So wonderful indeed are the “unfailing” (lākum, 3-4) order and harmony of the world, that man is in danger of worshipping them. But he must recognize that there is nothing imperishable in this order and harmony. As happened to the prophet Ibrāhīm (Abraham); man’s reason, guided by God, must grasp, in the perishable and the mutable, the incontrovertible evidence for the necessary and transcendent existence of the Creator. “To reflect!”, “to reason about the signs of the universe”, is therefore a religious duty for man’s reason, imposed on it by the Qur’ān (ii, 118, 164; iii, 90; vi, 99; xii, 2-3; xxiv, 43-54, etc.). The Qur’ān also teaches it that God alone abides. “All perishes, save His Face” (xxviii, 88; cf. xxxix, 68; lv, 26-27, etc.). At the declared eschatological Hour, God, creator and therefore master of life and death, will annihilate all things, subsequently re-creating everything at the great Gathering (kāsr, i, 44; lix, 2). The wonderful order and harmony of the present cosmos are presented as an invitation to prostrate oneself before the Power Which creates and annihilates (xxxi, 15; xli, 37).

God’s perfections, which cause His transcendence to blaze forth in relation to this order of the world, are the same as those which God reveals. They are essentially the Names (āsma’), which He gives to Himself. “He has the most beautiful Names” (vii, 180; xvi, 110; xx, 8). Muslim piety has carefully picked out from the text of the Qur’ān, supplemented by tradition, the 99 “most beautiful Names” and has never ceased to memorize them and meditate on them. Without wishing to give here an exhaustive analysis of them (see complete list under AL-ĀSMA’), we may say that the following are the main themes which emerge (we shall confine ourselves to a single reference for each, generally the oldest):

God is One and Unique (cf. above), the Living, the Self-subsisting (al-bayy al-bayyûm, xx, 111), the Real, the Truth (al-ḥādî, xx, 114, frequent), the Sublime (al-qāsim, lix, 33, frequent), the High and Great (al-a‘āl al-khâlî, xxxi, 30), Light and “Light on Light” (nûr, nûr al-nâr, xxiv, 35), the Sage (al-hakîm, lxvi, 30, frequent), the Omnipotent (al-tasîn, lxxv, 8, frequent; kâdir, lxvii, 1, frequent), absolute Creator (bâ‘âdî, vi, 101), creating the world (khâlik, xi, 62), Who does not cease to create (khâlik, xxxvi, 81), Who is unlike all creation (“Naught is like unto Him” laya ha-mîglihî gâyî, xlii, 11), the Hearing, the Cleartighted, the Omniscient (al-sami‘, al-bâṣir, al-‘alim, e.g. xlii, 11-12, frequent), the Witness (gâhid, lxxv, 9, frequent), the Bountiful (al-wahâb, li, 58), the Benefactor (al-raḥmân, lxxvi, 37, very frequent), the Surety (al-mahîl, xiv, 19), the Protector (al-mukhlî, lxxiii, 9, frequent), the Generous (al-hartîm, lxxiv, 49), the Merciful (al-raḥîm, lii, 26, very frequent), the Forgiver (gâhûr, lxvi, 20, frequent) Who is everforgiving (gâhûr, xx, 64), the Compassionate (al-ra’îm, lii, 36), the Benevolent (al-naddî, lxxv, 14), the “Best of Judges” (khây al-ḥâkimîn, x, 109), Who punishes in all strictness and rewards in all fairness and forbearance.

A good many of these terms occur again and again. Stress may be laid on one or other of them, now in the Meccan period, now in the Medinan, but nearly all are at least recalled in sūras of both periods. Often the text proceeds by fulgurating affirmations, “with no hollow”, “facing” the believer, like God Himself (sama‘, cxii, 2); often too by allusive parables, which insist and “prove” by the literal veracity with which their parabolic mode of expression is then invested. A single example: the divine omniscience extends to the smallest action of the smallest created thing. These are the words employed: “No leaf falls but He knows it; there is no seed in the darkesses of the earth, no green shoot or dry but it is inscribed in the perspicuous Book” (vi, 59). Or again: “No female conceives or brings forth without His knowledge” (xxxiv, 11). The mind is thus powerfully disposed to recognize the full presence of God in every human deed, in every act of the human heart. He is the creator of every act, whatever it be (xxxvii, 96); He is, in a special way, close to the man He has created (cf. xxxiv, 50); He knows “that which his soul suggests to him”; He is “closer to him than his jugular vein” (i, 16).

(C) Two groups of verses.

Some remarks on two groups of verses which, in the course of the centuries, were to give rise to numerous controversies:

1. Retribution and the divine decree. God’s sovereign omnipotence becomes explicit in His wishes for the world. It is affirmed in His efficacious decree (bâ‘âd), and man, like all creatures, belongs to Him. But at the same time it is affirmed as the omnipotence of the just Judge. The equitable Rewarder, and man must know that every one of his acts will carry its own weight,—of recompense for the good, of punishment for the bad (e.g. ii, 286).

It has been too often and too readily stated that the Qur’ān contains a mass of “contradictory” verses. The truth is that there is no contradiction at all, but contrasted and complementary affirmations, with the aim of producing the required attitude towards God in the heart of man.

The divine omnipotence is indeed monolithic. “God has no account to render”, as Muslim tradition repeatedly says. But here we must be careful of the Qur’ānic manner of preaching. The Qur’ān poses neither the theological problem of predestination (it does not pose any problem), nor the philosophical problem of the nature of human freedom: it evokes the mystery of the relations between creature and Creator. Nor does it pose the problem of the nature of evil. “It is God Who has created you and all that you have done” (xxxvii, 96), an affirmation frequently applied later to every human act. Nevertheless, “every good which comes to you comes from God, every ill which comes to you comes from yourself” (iv, 79). There is nothing here to demand an acceptance of the positive nature of evil.

The verses of the Qur’ān tirelessly proclaim that nothing escapes God, His will and His power, and equally that God is the Bringer of retribution. In a way, the idea of retribution is even dominant. Reward is promised to the just, and punishment to “him who turns away” (cxii, 16). The damned are those “who refuse the help” of God (evil, 2). —In his Index, R. Blaché, (iii, 122) notices between two and three hundred passages which promise retribution in the measure of one’s works. On the Day of Judgment, every soul will be judged
by what it has acquired (xl, 17): "whoever has done
an atom's weight of good shall see it; whoever has
done an atom's weight of evil shall see it" (xxix, 7-8).

The necessity of "doing good", of "ordering what is
right" (al-amr bi 'l-ma'ruf) and "forbidding what is
wrong" (al-nahy 'an al-munkar) is one of the first
commands; the very first, one might say, since the pre-
eminently good act is the declaration of faith in the
One, the sincere sifam. This command is not
addressed only to each man, but, in precise terms, to
the community of believers as such (iii, 104, 110, etc.).

On the temporal plane of the fulfilment of the divine
decrees in the contingent world, man is recompensed
according to his works and his deserts.

But on the intemporal plane of the immutable
decrees, a shift of perspective occurs. Nothing can
have any effect on God's Will (islam) or on His Command (amr). The elect are the chosen of God.

"He bestows His favour on whomsoever He wishes" (iii, 73-74; v, 54; vii, 21; xiii, 41); it is He "Who
brings low and raises up" (iii, 25). And the great
guaranty: "He turns astray whom He wishes, and
guides whom He wishes" (xiv, 4; xvi, 93; xxxv, 8;
vi, 39, 125)—and He whom God sends astray can
have neither surety nor guide (xvii, 97; xviii, 17;
xxxix, 29, 37; vii, 186; xiii, 33). Twice there occurs
this image of specifically Semitic construction, so
close to Isaiah vi, 9-10: "We have placed veils over
their hearts, that they may not understand, and a
dullness into their ears" (Kur'ân, xviii, 57); and "he
whom God, knowingly, has sent astray, whose
hearing and whose heart He has sealed, and on
whose eyes He has set a blindfold..." (xiv, 23).

The first of these two texts (xviii, 57) in fact throws into sharp relief which
seals hearing and heart, and the wrongness of the
one who has turned away from the signs of the Lord.
The second (xiv, 23), closes with a summons to
reform. Verse xiv, 19, states that the wrongdoers are
left to themselves ("they have no patrons but
themselves"), while God is the patron of the right-
teous: thus according with iv, 79, quoted above.

The responsibility of man, the omnipotence and
the peremptory decrees of God: these two lines of
thought combine in the ultimate affirmation of the
Judgment. This way of access to the mystery was
one which presented itself most forcefully to Muslim
speculation in later ages.

2. Anthropomorphic verses. The other group of
verses is one whose picturesque style, if taken
absolutely literally, would seem to ascribe human
attributes or acts to God. These are the mutagâbih,
"ambiguous", verses, as distinct from the mukham
verses, whose sense is clearly established.—Thus:
God dwells on His throne (xx, 5; lvii, 4, etc.); He
comes" (movement in place, lxxxix, 22); the hand of
God (xlvii, 10; li, 47); His face (e.g. iv, 27); His
eyes (xi, 37; lii, 48; liv, 14) etc. Our reason for noting
these texts is that they were later the object of
exegetical and theological dispute.

(D) Conclusion.

The Kur'ânic preaching about God is entirely
centred on its affirmations of Oneness and Unity,
of transcendence and subsistence, of absolute per-
fections. The forbidding inaccessibility of the divine
nature is resolutely maintained; God, omniscient and
"near", can be known only by His Word, by the
Names, the attributes and acts of His paramount
Sovereignty, which He Himself reveals.

It is indeed in His Sovereignty over every creature
that Allâh is manifested. The attributes of omni-
science and omnipotence relate to God's outward-
directed knowledge and power. The declaration of
Oneness pertains to the oneness of the divine nature,
the godhead as such. God in Himself remains the
unexpressed mystery, shayb.

For Islam, the name Allâh is indeed, as Macdonald
said (EI), the proper name of God; in that it
expresses the sole and incomunicable godhead.

Ought one to describe the God of this preaching as
a personal God? This question has no place among
the problems of Muslim theologians. It is weightily
posed by the speculations of western students of
Islam (cf. Macdonald's article, quoted above, in
which he speaks of the "overwhelming personality"
of Allâh): God, personal because living, creating,
acting on the world, speaking to men. But never
can Islam say that Allâh is shakk or shakhs. They
shrink from the assertion made by western scholars;
indeed, they take positive exception to it. There is
a twofold misunderstanding here. (a) Vocabulary.
Shakhs has not undergone, in philosophical Arabic,
the same shift as the Greek sotótauç or the Latin
persona. Shakhs always connotes the individual
silhouette. There is no better term for the concept of
"person"; moreover, it is well suited to the created
person, but suggests a limiting individualization.

(b) The very concept as applied to God: generally, the
Muslim will feel loth to tramnel with it the inacces-
sibility of the divine nature.

But the misunderstanding disappears if we make
it plain that "personal God" implies, in the Indo-
European languages, an absolute perfection: God,
subsisting in Himself, incomunicable in His purpose
of godhead. God, personal because perfect and the
source of perfection, infinitely distinct from every
creature, and the object of faith and worship. Now
this is precisely what the Kur'ân teaches. If it leaves
God's inmost Life in its own mystery, it is so as to
insist on the Word communicated to man through the
prophets, and on the inner attitude demanded of the
believer.—God, sovereign Judge, just and terrible
gubhrâr, lix, 23), is also, by the same token,
protecting, beneficent, merciful. Faced with the incom-
nunicable mystery, the Kur'ân demands of the
believer, in respect of Allâh, reverent fear (tafâwu,
ix, 109) and, at the same time, piety (birr), the act
of which is the same as the act of reverent fear (ii,
189), gratitude (gãdhr; in the verbal form: "you may
perchance be grateful!", as the Book often says,
especially in the Medinan period), confidence
(faâvakul; frequently in the verbal form: "have
confidence in God!", e.g. iv, 81).

The "God-fearing" of the Kur'ân bow down before
the inscrutable omnipotence. For the damned
alone, i.e., "those who have rebelled" (lxxix, 37),
this fear becomes dread of punishment (cf. lxxv
25). The chosen "those who believe in the Mystery,
perform the prayer, and give [in alms] of their goods"
(ii, 3), those "who seek after His face", to use the
beautiful expression so often employed (e.g. xclii, 20);
find in Him their protector (wâklil) and guide (hidâli);
they find with Him the supreme Refuge (ma'râb, e.g.
iii, 14; lxviii, 39).

II. THE DEVELOPMENT IN TRADITION AND KALâm.

*In section iii we shall sketch the most notable
attitudes of the Muslim schools to what we are
now to call the "Mystery of God", in order to
prepare ourselves to the body of problems and the axiology of Sunnite theology.

The traditional science which deals with divine
matters is the 'ilm al-kalâm or 'ilm al-tawfyld,
roughly "theology" or "defensive apology" (see below}
for certain criticisms raised in Islam against its legitimacy. We shall take it in its established form, assuming a knowledge of its historical origins, the influences it underwent, the formation of the various schools (see KALÂM). A reminder: 1) under the Umayyads: the Murji’ites, Kadaries, Diabârites; 2) the Mu’tazilites, originally political (1st/7th century), then doctrinal (2nd/3rd/-8th/-9th centuries), who triumphed under Mamun but were subsequently regarded as “heterodox” for centuries; 3) from the 4th/10th century onward, the official Ash’arites and Hanafite-Muturidite lines.—

The conclusions vary with the diverse attitudes towards the relation of reason (‘âbî) and the Law (âshâ), or of reason (‘âbî) and tradition (naštî, tâkhîdî), or of rational (‘âbî) and authoritarian (samâ’î) proofs.

The šûm al-kalâm came to sustain itself by means of two other “religious sciences”: 1) the science of hadîth provided texts regarded as authoritative proofs, which took up one theme or another of the Kur’ânic teaching, in a picturesque, even mythical, manner (cf. the six “authentic” collections, saštî, particularly the khuds al-tauhîdî of Bukhârî’s corpus). Numerous traditions relate, on the one hand, to God’s mercy and forgiveness (e.g. “My mercy outweighs My wrath or takes precedence of it”, Bukhârî, Taftazân, 169, 173); on the other hand, to His absolute kingship (“I am the King; where are the kings of the earth?”, id., 167, 181); on the one hand, to human responsibility (texts in Bukhârî or Muslim, chap. Kadar), on the other hand, to the preordaining decree (e.g. these oft-quoted hadîths: “All the hearts of mankind are like one single heart between two of the fingers of the Merciful”, and: “Praise for heaven, and I care not; those for hell, and I care not”). Many hadîths had great influence on the formation of current notions and the popular attitude concerning God.

2) The science of tafsîr, or exegetic interpretation, played a leading part in the use and understanding of those Kur’ânic verses which speak of God, particularly the anthropomorphic passages.

Hadîth and tafsîr were employed in various ways by the schools of kalâm.

If we refer to the problems of the kalâm (which is, in its essentials, of Mu’tazilite origin), we find two great principles directly concerning God: 1) the principle of tawbîh or divine unity; 2) the principle of ‘âdl, of the justice of God in connection with the requisit of human actions. As against the “free-thinkers” of their day, the Mu’tazilites had presented themselves as “the people of unity and justice”, ahd al-tauhîd wa l-‘âdl. These problems continued to inspire later schools. Only their titles changed. The great classic manuals of the Ash’arites and Mâturidites (e.g. Šârîf al-Mawdûfî of Dîrîjânî, Muhâdîdî of Taftazânî, etc.) called the first principle mawjûd Allâh wa mîfâdhuhu (“the existence and attributes of God”), and the second afîlahu ta’allâ (“the actions of the Exalted One”). Here are the main questions raised in connection with both.

(A) Ta’wbîh.

1. The Existence of God (wujûd Allâh).

All schools agree in quoting those Kur’ânic verses (cf. above) which bid the reason to “reflect on the signs of the universe”, and to rise thereby to the affirmation of the Creator. But: (a) according to the Mu’tazilites, there is involved in this an obligation inherent in the nature of reason, prior to the promulgation of the Law; (b) according to the Mâturidites, reason should, by rights, have been able to arrive to the knowledge of its Creator, but was actually brought to it by the promulgation of the Law; (c) for the Ash’arites, the employment of the reason and of reasoning in order to rise to God is a purely legal (revealed) obligation. Cf. al-Dîrîjânî, Šârîf al-Mawdûfî, Cairo 1345/1907, i, 251 ff. In other words: if the Law had not laid down the obligation, human reason could never have attained to the existence of God (cf. al-Qâzîzî, al-Îlîkhîdî, Cairo, n.d., 77-8). The affirmation of the existence of God, for the Ash’arite school as a whole, is therefore the result of a rational (‘âbî) argument, prescribed by an argument of authority (here, šârîf).

Whatever the nature of this obligation, the schools are as one with regard to the rational argument itself. What is involved is a proof of the existence of God a novitate mundi, linked with the entirely contingent and perishable character of the world, as the Kur’ân teaches and reason can convince itself. For the kalâm, the temporal beginning and end of the world are demonstrable truths. There is then an inference (istidâl) which proceeds, with no universal middle term, from this utter inadequacy of the created to the necessary (wujûdî) existence of the Creator. Who alone exists from all eternity and alone is self-subsisting (truths taught by the Kur’ân and also accessible to the reason, ʿâbîyyât). This inference, in the early days of the kalâm (Mu’tazilites as well as Ash’arites) was set out as a piece of reasoning in two terms. Among the later mutakallimûn, more directly imbued with the Aristotelian logic, it frequently took the shape of a syllogistic deduction (both forms are found in al-Dîrîjânî). The argument is given in all the manuals as a “decisive” (ka’fî) proof. Only rarely, under influences proceeding from the falsafa, does it take the form of the proof a contingentia mundi in the strict sense. The world is mukâdîth, and in the treatises of kalâm this term stays very close to its etymological sense of “begun” in time (see the works of Wensinck and S. de Beaurecueil, cited in the bibliography, on the proofs of the existence of God).

2. The Attributes of God (ṣifât Allâh).

(a) Relations between essence and attributes. This was one of the most controversial topics. Some old traditionists held fast to the letter of the texts and set themselves against all research that might be called rational. Their opponents, exaggerating the rigidity of the position they were attacking, called them mujâfassins ("corporalists", who give bodily attributes to God), or again, contemptuously, baskhwyya. They accused them of tâkhîb: comparing God to the created.

In their anxiety to purify the concept of tawbîh, the Mu’tazilites extolled, on the contrary, tansîh, "withdrawal", the via remotionis which they applied with extreme rigour: one must deny God every created thing, as the Kur’ân commands. The Djahmites, disciples of the Diabârite Dîjâm b. Safwân, had practically denied the existence of the attributes, God being known only as an inscrutable omnipotence. The Mu’tazilite tansîh, on the other hand, took the theistic standpoint of a ruling God. They recognized the divine attributes of knowledge, power, speech, etc., but asserted that they were "identical with the essence", a distinction which was, for them, hardly more than nominal.

The "orthodox" schools likewise practised tansîh, i.e., they denied God any resemblance to anything:
He is neither body nor substance (dsnhar, in the sense of bounded substance) nor accidents, nor is He localized, etc. (It must be noted that the Karrâmites had recognized God as substance, by which they understood self-existent).—The Aṣḥarite reform, in the name of the “golden mean”, held itself equally aloof from the Muʿtazilite tendency to prove everything rationally, and from the literalism of the madhâessima. This was the famous principle bllk hayy wa lâ tasakhk, “without ‘how’ or comparison”. It accused the Muʿtazilite tansik of amounting to the same as tafsîl, diverting the attributes of all reality and making of God no more than an empty concept. The Aṣḥarites, for their part, while recognizing the entire reality of the attributes, since the Kurâns informs us of them, yet affirmed that this reality can in no way compromise the perfect divine Unity. Simultaneously opposing Muʿtazilites and halâshî, and following al-Ghazzâlî, they later arrived at this approximation: “the attributes subsist in the divine essence; they are not God and are nothing other than He”.

A kindred solution was advanced by certain Aṣḥarites who remained faithful to the conceptualist theory of “modes” (aḥwâl) of the Muʿtazilite Abû al-Hâmid al-Qûrânî e.g. al-Djuwaylî (8th/14th century): on this point the so-called “modern” school (6th/12th-13th century) of FâhÎr al-Dîn al-Râzî, Djurjânî, etc. was at variance with him. The “mode” (bîl) is an attribute which is attached to an existing thing but is itself qualified neither by existence nor non-existence: that is how the relation between the divine essence and the attributes is to be understood.

This difficult theological problem was served by a philosophical instrument which put on striving to improve itself, and making progress, though not without occasionally stumbling. Thus, at the beginning of the Ḥanafite-Mâturîdite line, we find in the Fîkh Akbar II (text of the time of Aṣḥarî, that God is a “thing” (dâyî). Much though this statement might later be ridiculed by some of the muštaḥallîmus, influenced by Greek thought, as used by the ancients it is clearly to be taken in the sense of “existing reality”: “Allâh is thing, not as other things but in the sense of positive existence” (Fîkh Akbar II, Art. 4; cf. Wensinck, Musulîm Creed, Cambridge 1935, 190). It was in this same sense that the term “body” or “bodily substance” (dsâm) was used in speaking of God; this practice of certain Karrâmites and Ḥanbalites was noted by Macdonald (EI).

The Mâturîdites on the whole preferred not to distinguish God’s attributes from Himself but to say: “God is knowing and has a knowledge which is attributed to Him in the sense of eternity”, etc., thus laying stress on the divine Names (the Knowing, Willing, Powerful, Speaking, etc.).

(b) List of attributes. The guiding principle was to affirm no attribute not expressly indicated in the Kurâns: the principle of tâsafîl, “leaving it to God” to elucidate through scripture. The majority of the doctors of halâm, however, considered that it was not being false to the text to pass from the present participle, for example, to the noun, in accordance with the laws of language. Thus there evolved, in the course of the centuries, a list of attributes, enumerated in no particular order, to begin with (so in the Ibâns of al-Aṣḥârî, and then, especially from al-Djuwaylî (8th/14th century): on this order adopted, indeed the appellations themselves, vary with the different schools (cf. Şîfa). To adhere to one commonly-held view, we offer the following list: (1) attribute of essence (sîfât al-dhâli), existence: in the case of God, not distinguished from essence; (2) “essential” (dhâli or naṣîf) attributes, which sometimes divided into (a)’negative’ attributes which emphasize the divine transcendence: eternity (hidâm), permanence (bâkî), dissimilarity to the created (al-mukhâala li l-lahwadîl), self-subistence (ïyâm bi l-naṣîf)—and (b) maʿâni attributes, “adding a concept to the essence”: power (kudr), knowledge (‘ilm), life (hayâ), speech (halâm), hearing (sam), sight (bâs), perception (irdrâ: some denied that this was an attribute); (3) attributes of “qualification” (maʿnawiyya), the maʿâni attributes taken verbally: having power, willing, knowing . . .; (4) attributes of action (sîfât al-aẓâl), designating not an intrinsic quality but a “possibility” of God, which God may or may not do: visibility (ruʿyat Allâh), creation (qalb), actual creation of the contingent world (the Mâturîdite tawwâbin), command (amr), decree and predetermination (kadar and baqâ), whose relations with the divine knowledge and will vary according to the school, consent (ridâ: especially in Mâturîdism), etc.

The Aṣḥarîtes and Mâturîdites agree in taking the maʿâni attributes as eternal, even if their object is contingent; against the Muʿtazilites who maintained, for example (school of Başra), that God has a “contingent” knowledge, with a beginning, of free human acts. On the other hand, Aṣḥarîtes and Mâturîdites diverge over the “eternal” or “begun” character of the attributes of action: the Mâturîdites generally regard them as eternal.

All but four of the attributes depend on the ʿâkhîyya: they are taught by the Kurâns but human reason can “prove” them. The other four, visibility, speech, hearing and sight (“perception” is sometimes included), depend on the samʿiyyya and are knowable only because they have been revealed.

(c) Two controversial attributes. The “vision of God” (attribute of visibility) and Speech were hotly debated.

The vision of God (ruʿyat Allâh) is understood as being through the eyesight, bi l-ʿaṣbâr. The pious traditionists accepted it absolutely, interpreting in this sense Kurâns, lxxv, 22-23, and numerous ḥadîths. The Muʿtazilites denied it no less absolutely, interpreting the Kurânsic text by a philological tâsafîl (cf. below). Aṣḥarîtes and Ḥanafite-Mâturîdites upheld the vision of God, but emphasizing the bllk hayy: every man will see God with his eyesight on the Day of Judgment, the elect will see Him (transiently) in Paradise,—but they will not see Him as one sees an object spatially situated and limited, and it is impossible to specify the manner of this vision (Ibâns, Cairo 1348 h., 14, Fîkh Akbar II, 17).

The “traditional” (samʾ) attribute of Speech is of major importance, since by means of it God manifests Himself to men. The Muʿtazilites, precisely because of this manifesting in time, made of it a contingent “created” Speech (whence the thesis of the created, mâḥkâh, Kurâns). The Kurâns is the Speech of God, but the latter is contingent. The Aṣḥarîtes, taking up that great affirmation which had earned Ibn Ḥanbal imprisonment and flogging, saw in it essential (naṣîf) Speech, subsisting by the very existence of God. Hence the thesis of the “uncreated Kurâns” (gâyîr mâḥkâh, Ibâns, 20-22). But the school distinguished between those who maintained, and its “created” expression: the Book and its recitation by human lips. In the 8/14th century, Ibn Taymiyya, meditating on and reviving the faith of the “pious ancients” (salaf), found Muʿtazilites and Aṣḥarîtes equally
wanting: he reaffirmed the essential Speech of God, which expresses Him and subsists in Him, and declared that this Speech, in its mystery, is Torah, Gospel, Qur'an (Falsūd, Cairo 1329 b., v. 265-7).


The veneration of the Qur'ānic text, coupled with the inscrutable mystery of the One God, soon confronted Muslims thought with the case of the "ambiguous" anthropomorphic (mutazāhībī) verses, which apparently likened God to the created. Are they to be accepted in pure faith, or should they be interpreted (ta'wil) by exegesis (tafsīr)?

(a) The ancient traditionists took these verses at their face value. But it would be idle to bring against them an unqualified accusation of "corporate realism", as their opponents did. The Ashʿarīites themselves declared valid the attitude of the "ancients" who, eschewing all taʿwil or interpretation, took refuge in the taṣīfī or committal to God. God sits on His Throne (istiwāʿ), descends towards the earth, has eyes, has a hand, because the text says so. But no one knows the acceptation given by God to these terms: this attitude was attributed to Mālik b. Anas in particular. It is hardly necessary to add that an attitude like this became "corporate" only insofar as it tried to conceptualize itself and to justify itself discursively, but not insofar as it interiorized itself in adherence to faith.

(b) But the Muʿtazilites, for their part, wished to justify dialectically the Muslim notion of God, in face of the Greek-inspired "God of the philosophers". On the one hand the emphasis placed on the Oneness of God, on the other their confidence in the rational criterion (miẓān ʿaḥāl), led the Muʿtazilites to an extreme use of taʿwil. Their representative in taṣīfī was al-Zamakhshāri, who adopted for his own purposes the philological method of al-Ṭabarī. In this way "shining countenances, looking at their Lord" became, as al-Djubbātī suggested, "beautiful countenances, aspiring to the bounty of their Lord": the vision of God could be denied because He is so obliged, but because He does it. For them, the anthropomorphic (madjādā) metaphor, which act efficaciously on their effects, causes (aṣbāb) which act efficaciously on their effects, and there is a good and an evil (literally beautiful, ugly, ḥasan, ḥabīb) in the nature of things, prior to the elucidation brought by the revealed Law (sharīʿ).

God is bound to do the best (aṣlāb). He does not want evil and does not order it; His will (irḍā) and His command (amr) are identical. Evil is created by man, just as he creates the moral denominations of his acts, since he creates (khalika) all his actions, good and bad.—The two Muʿtazilite groups, of Baṣra and Kūfah, parted company over the concept of the "best" which God always accomplishes, and over its extension.

2. The Ashʿarite school revolted against this attempt at "justifying" God. God "does not come within the grasp of the intellect". He is the just Judge because He does what He wishes. "No obligation for God". What He does is the best, not because He is so obliged, but because He does it. Moral good and evil have no existence prior to the positive divine Law. "If God were to reverse the decision, and to declare good (ḥasan) what He has declared bad (ḥabīb), and bad what He has declared good, there would be no impediment" (al-Djurjānī, Sharḥ al-Mawākiḥī, viii, 182).—Al-Ghazzālī and al-Rāzī, it is true, recognize a "rational" (šakīl) meaning in the "beautiful good" and the "ugly-evil": only on the plane of being, for al-Rāzī (Makāṣṣal, Cairo n.d., 147; Ksāb al-ʿArbaʿīn, Cairo 1335 b., 249); on the plane of the sensible qualities inherent in things, for al-Ghazzālī (Iʿtiṣād, Cairo n.d., 67).

And God, as the Qurʾān says, "guides whom He wishes, turns astray whom He wishes". Everything is fixed by His predetermination (kādir), according to His eternal Will (irḍā), encompassing in its generality the totality of things,—while His decree (kādir), existentialized by His command (amr), is
an “attribute of contingent action”, particularizing in time that which are “begun”, as they pass from non-being to being. As al-Djurjani says (Ta’rīfāt, ed. Flügel, 1845, 181), “kadar is the relation of the essential Will to things in their individual realization”; and again: “Kadar: the passing of possible from non-being into being, one by one, in conformity with kada”. Kada is of the order of pre-foreknowing (azal). Kadar depends on the present order of things (ibid.). It follows that one must distinguish between irdanu and amr; it is the latter which is directly linked with man’s obedience. God wishes the imperity of the infidel and creates it in him, yet commands him to believe.

For man’s “free” action, his iktisāb, is only a special case of more general principles. God is the creator of human acts, whatever they be. The text “God is creator of all that you do” is interpreted in the sense of a creation ex nihilo. True, man has a feeling of his own responsibility. This means that God sets down to his merit or demerit the actions he performs, as the Kur’ān expressly states, and that he rewards or punishes him, as promised. Man receives the “acquisition”, the attribution of his acts (kasb, iktisāb: cf. Kur’ān, ii, 281; lii, 21, etc.). At the end of the last century, Bāḏūrī found this formula necessary: “man is a bound-being, in the shape of a free being” (Hābikya ‘ala ‘l-Dīwānhara, Cairo 1352/1934, 62). On the empirical level, man must therefore continue to act as though he were free. But he must know that everything comes to him from God. If he acts well, it is because God in His Mercy has so decreed; if he acts badly, it is because God has so willed in His justice.

This negation of ontological liberty accords with the negation of the efficacy of the second causes (asbāb): as against the “reprehensible innovation” (bid’a) of the Mu’tazilite thesis (efficacy of the asbāb, according to a “power” created by God), and against the absolute determinism of the causes (“cause” here rendered by ‘ilā) taught in the falsafa, a thesis tainted with kufr (impiety). (Cf. al-Sanūsī, Muḥaddidīn, Algiers 1908, 108-109; al-Bāḏūrī, op. cit., 50.)—For the Ash‘arites, there is nothing efficacious about the second causes, because there is no conservation in being, on the part of God. There are discontinuous series of instantaneous creations, temporal existentializations of the eternal kada. At every instant (masbī), God creates and re-creates the world and the imperfectly whole, extrinsically unified, which is man, and every act of man. The world of “free” acts, as well as the cosmos in its entirety, is a discontinuous sequence of inscrutable divine decrees. The “causes” are but the channels, the tokens, of this divine Will, and the “laws” are a “custom of God” (sunnat Allāh; the expression is still found in Muhammad “Abduh, Risdlat al-Tawfaq, Cairo 1355, 7). It is a custom which God can always modify. For example, when He decides to give proof, by miracles (muṣṣalāt), of the mission of His prophets.

For most of the Ash‘arites, though by no means all, there is an atomistic cosmology corresponding to the discontinuous view of things. Everything is but a concourse of atoms (muhhā, bāharr), connected, disconnected, reunited, by divine decree. If it is true that al-Bāḵūli (4th/10th century) declared atomism to be “coessential” (Masqīgīn) with the Kur’ānic dogmas, it would, in our opinion, be going too far to see in this the pre-eminent characteristic aspect of Ash‘arism, still more of all “orthodox” Muslim theology. This physico-theological atomism is actually of Mu’tazilite origin (Abu ‘l-Hādiyyah; cf. studies by Horten and S. Fines), and matched well then with the ιδρος, the “power” which man was recognized as having over his acts. An impressive line of Ash‘arites, al-Bāḵūli (11th), al-Djurjānī (with some modifications), the “frozen conservatism” of such men as al-Sanūsī, al-Lākānī and al-Bāḏūrī, remained faithful to the occasionalist atomism as being the most favoured explanation of the divine omnipotence over the world. But another line, influenced to some small extent by the disputed theses of the falsafa, passed over it in silence (al-Ḡizzālī, Faḵhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī) or greatly modified it (al-Ǧāhristānī), although still affirming the usual theses on God’s kada and kadar and the simple human iktisāb.

3. Some Māturidites (Abū Ḥafṣ al-Nasafī, al-Tafṣārī) were atomists. But we wish to lay particular emphasis on the more directly psychological aspect in which the Ḥanafite-Māturidite school as a whole regarded the relations between the divine decree and human freedom. From the first, kada and kada were no longer related to the divine Will, but to the divine Knowledge—and, counter to the Ash‘arites, it was kada that was to be eternal, while kada was connected with existentialization in time. Kadar was therefore an eternal foreknowledge whereby God knows, from all eternity, the beautiful (good), ugly (bad) or harmful qualities of His creatures, while kada was God’s existentialization of these same things, created with wisdom and perfection (cf. ‘Abd al-Raḥīm b. ‘All, Naṣm al-Farā'id, 2nd ed., Cairo n.d., 28-30; and al-Bāḏūrī, Dīwānhara, 66).

For the majority of the Māturidites, there exists in things a “rational” (beautiful) and a “natural” (ugly), on the plane of being, not directly on the moral plane (a thesis already noted in connection with the Ash‘arite al-Rāzī). On the moral plane, it is God Who directly creates the basis (asl) of man’s “free” actions, but it is man’s power which makes their qualification (ṣifā) good or bad. (It should be noted that al-Rāzī, Kāhāh al-Arbaʿ, 227, and al-Djurjānī, Sharḥ al-Musabī, viii, 147, ascribes this thesis, whose tenor is Māturidite, to al-Bāḵūli, although all that happens is willed by God; but only the good depends on His consent (ridā). God is not bound, just as the Muṭāzilites say; His action is not just because He wishes it, as the Ash‘arites say: He is above all justice by reason of His knowledge and wisdom. He is unable not to be just.

4. We have no need to follow here the abundant efforts of the doctors of the kalām to strengthen their arguments and to resolve the objections that were constantly cropping up. Those who were not satisfied with the Ash‘arite theory of kasb, of acts imposed from outside, undertook more recondite analyses: thus we have the theory (common to Ash‘arites and Māturidites) of istifā'a (g.v.) or “capacity” [for an act], created by God previously or simultaneously (cf. al-Diwaynī, Irshād, ed. Luciani, 1938, 122/1938, 225/201; al-Djurjānī, Ta’rīfāt, 18, etc.); the theory of tawwīḍ or tawallud (g.v.), which explains the “generation” of the transitive act by the divine occasionalism; and the theory of tawfīk (g.v.) or “facilitation” of acts, especially of good acts, faith and obedience, which is created in man by the divine favour (lutf), and its (positive) opposite, khiddīlān or divine “abandonment” (“creation in man of the power to disobey”), according to a definition by the Māturidite al-Taftāzānī, Maṣbāḥāt, Istanbul ed., 188), etc.
We can see that these efforts of minute analysis, applied to problems of great complexity, may well have looked like disheartening intellectual games, to those who wished to remain true to the sense of mystery of the “pious ancestors,” and who refused to “prove dogma” (cf. al-Djurjānī, Shahr al-Mawābī, I, 34-35) as the later Aṣḥā’:arites aspired to doing. The kalām had its greatest opponents (apart from the jāla’i’i opposition) in the Ḥanbalite and Zāhīrite systems of thought, which were wedded to tradition and mistrustful of the use of reason in matters of faith. Al-Ghazzālī too was very severe with the kalām, on occasion. Yet it is sometimes among these opponents that we find the most pertinent bases of analysis of the relations between the free act and the divine omnipotence.

Thus Ibn Ḥazm (4th/10th-11th century) the Zāhīrite, who denied any criteriological capacity to the reason (one can speak of Ibn Ḥazm’s “nominalism”, but it is a nominalism centred on the effective value of language and its internal laws), and who meant to hold fast to the precise declarations of the scriptures: he rejected the Aṣḥā’ite kābīb, since the texts, he said (Fisāq, Cairo 1347 h., iii, 48) allow neither a “creation” by man of his acts (Mu’tazilīte) nor an “acquisition” conferred by God (Aṣḥā’ite); but his whole refutation, highly discursive, of the opposing theories (id., 51-54) is pertinently developed; while a valuable personal solution is outlined in connection with šiti’ā’i (id., 21-26 and 31).

Al-Ghazzālī, not indeed the Ghazzālī of the Iḥṣā’i, who confines himself to presenting or rather to improving the theses of the Aṣḥā’ites, minimizing, moreover, the scope of the kalām (7-8), but the al-Ghazzālī of the Tahdhīḥ and, above all, of the Iḥyā’ (Cairo 1352/1933, iv, 219) carries out an extremely shrewd psychological analysis on the subject of “choice” and the relations of intellect and will in the free act. He defends an irrational concept of freedom and maintains that God alone, Who acts without motive (gḥayr gharād) is totally free, with a freedom conceived as a free human choice raised to the power of infinity. What the muṭakāhlīmūn called kābīb is an “intermediate stage” (Iḥyā’, iv, 220) which is not at all a participation in the divine freedom. Man acts of necessity, in the sense that everything which happens in him comes not from him but from Another; he acts by free choice, in the sense that he is the place (makhall) of the free act, which operates inevitably in him after the decision of the intellect, this last being only a matter of form. And al-Ghazzālī propounds this formula, which it would be well not to interpret loosely: “Man is forced into free choice” (ibīd.).

This concern with analysis was to dwindle to vanishing point in the later manuals, which, from the 15th century onward, hardly did more than repeat the formulas of the past. At the end of the 19th century, Muhammad ʿAbdūh, wishing to free himself from the dialectic of the kalām, confined himself to saying: “As for seeking further, for wishing to reconcile God’s omniscience and will, which are proved [by the Kurʾān and rational arguments], with the free activity of man, which is shown to us by the evidence [sensory, psychological]; that means seeking to penetrate the secrets of the divine decree. We are forbidden to plunge into this abyss and to concern ourselves with that which reason is scarcely capable of attaining” (Risālāt al-Taḥkīd, 61).

III. VARIOUS MUSLIM ATTITUDES TO GOD.

Some pointers, chosen from the most characteristic:

1. Ismā‘īlī Theology. There is much that could be said about the “schismatic” theologies, of Ḥanbālī Islam on the one hand, of Ṣī‘īte on the other. We shall confine ourselves to the Ismā‘īlī system, which had so many cultural contacts with the Sunnite majority. Integrated in it there is a twofold line of influence: Mu’tazilīte (which continued to act on the Ṣī‘a after the condemnation of the Mu’tazilītes in the time of Mutawakkil and Neoplatonist (consequently, a certain influence from falsafa).

We know hardly anything of the very first phase of development or of its efforts to fix in an original direction such Muslim notions as ān, ṣad, etc. Not until Abu ʿAbd Allāh al-Nasafi (4th/10th century) do we find these primitive conceptions given a new setting in a largely Neoplatonist, emanationist system. Speculation was pursued, and enriched by various trends, with Abu Ḥātim al-Rāzī, Abū Yaʿkūb al-Sījistānī, Nāṣr-i Khusrav, al-Kirmānī (in whom S.M. Stern has found a probable influence of Fārābī: theory of the ten Intellects). Through the Ikhwān al-Ṣafā’, Ismā‘īlism was to influence many falsafa and even Sunnite theologians, up to the time of the conflict waged by Nasr al-Dīn al-Tūsī in favour of Ibn Sīnā.

The emphasis is on the inscrutable mystery of God. A whole “negative theology” developed. No name or attribute can be attached to God in His essence. The perfect ta’wīd does not even attribute existence (Persian: kāsīl) to Him, and the Kurʾānic Names signify only those who bear thought from Him (cf. Idrīs al-Karsi, 8/14th century). The Command (amr), the Speech or Word (kalimāt), the Act of Creation (ibād), the Absolute Knowledge (ʿim makhd) are hypostatized. God is neither eternal nor existing at present. What is eternal is His Command and His Speech; what exists at present is the creation, which emanated from Him at His Command (cf. al-Makrīzī, Khatīb, i, 355, quoted by G. Vajda, Judā b. Nissim ibn Malka, Parts 1954, iii, chap. 1). God remains, absolutely, the Unknowable (Nāṣir-i Khusrav). The tashbīh-taʿlīl dilemma is absorbed into a via negationis, which refers the affirmation of the attributes to the Word or the Command, or to the First or Universal Intellect.—Al-Kirmānī identifies the First Intellect with the Word, and makes the ibād (Act of Creation) one of its attributes.

The emanationist system of al-Nasafi and his successors set up, in fact, the intermediary of the Universal Intellect, from which the world is produced by way of successive emanations. The echoes are heard in the Fusūṣ fi l-ʾilmāma (which, after the researches of S. Pines, REI, 1951, 121-124, is to be ascribed not to al-Farābī but to Ibn Sīnā), and as far as al-Ghazzālī: the muṣājāt of the Mīkhāl al-ʿAnwār.

Ismā‘īlī religious feeling attached itself to a group of Gnostic hypostases. The Will (irāda), Volition (mashā’s) and Command (amr) are sometimes “spiritual grades” above the First Intellect; most often, Will, Command and Speech are identified with one another, and the Universal or First Intellect is itself, as the “manifestation” of God, unknowable and ineffable, operated by His Command. These speculations were rooted in an allegorical tawwīl (“hidden”, bātin, meaning of Kurʾānic verses) and throw readily on Iranian myths. They were later interiorized by certain Ṣī‘īte, and even Sunnite, Sufis.
2. **Falsafa.** It was in falsafa that the term **falsifa** (taken up by kalām) gained currency as denoting the whole mass of questions concerning God. The body of problems was no longer that of the kalām. It came from Greece, particularly from Aristotle, but was pervaded, at least in eastern falsafa (especially al-Fārābī, Ibn Sīnā) by a considerable Neoplatonic inspiration (the pseudo-Theology of Aristotle). Kurānī influence had some effect on this body of problems (e.g. the problem of the divine knowledge of individuals), but the Kurān had ceased to be the chief source. We do not therefore need to set out the questions in detail, as we did in the case of the kalām. We shall note merely that Ibn Sīnā demonstrates the existence of God by the **proof a contingentia mundi** in the strict sense (not overlooking the proof by the "idea of being", Ibrāhīm, ed. Forget, 146). The more flexible philosophic instrument of the falsafa enabled them to affirm the attributes, distinct from the divine essence, by a simple, reasonable (maṣūḥ) distinction but with a basis in reality. The Greek contribution led to an emphasis on the necessary acts of the divine essence. God is the **Faith which thinks itself** (cf. Aristotle), He is the supreme Good (cf. Plato), which necessarily loves itself. He is the Intelligence, exercising intellect on itself; He is Love and the object of love for Himself: **'aša', 'āšā, maṣā', 'išā', 'išāh', maṣēḥ** (cf. Nadjāt, Cairo 1357/1938, 243, 245; corresponding passages of the Shī'ah, etc.). We should mention here an esoteric trend, still imperfectly known, which seems to take up several themes of the Ismā'īlī via negation (intermediaries: Ibrāhīm al-Ṣaḥāfī, al-Tawhīdī; and, at an earlier date, the Ismā'īlī tendency, pointed out by S. Pines, of certain recensions of the *Theology of Aristotle*; see REI, 1956, 7 ff.). The falsafa do not provide us with treatises on **'adl or af'īlu ta'ālā**. Contrary to the kalām, they affirm (and set out to prove) the production of the world by way of necessary and deliberate emanation (cf. Ismā'īlīsm), and its temporal eternity: world without beginning or end, "possible" (mumkin) in itself, necessary by Another (ab alio); contingent in the order of essence, determined in the order of existence. Providence (ِṣī'ā) is the law of emanation itself, necessarily willed by the eternal thought of God.

The second causes cannot fail to act on their effects. There is no longer any problem of human freedom as against divine omnipotence (cf. Nadjāt, 302).

Whatever solution may be adopted as regards the personal survival of the soul, the Active Intellect (šāhī fa'āl) appears as an intermediary between God and man, both in the order of knowledge and in the order of emanation. There is a hierarchy of discrete intellects, up to the First Caused; embracing these, there is the Universal Intellect. For Ibn Sīnā, there is a corresponding hierarchy of Souls, rejected by Ibn Rushd; the latter seems to have been the only one of the falsāsfa to come back, by way of philosophy, to the divine knowledge of the individual in its very individuality, so forcefully taught by the Kurān. What is at stake is the whole attitude of faith with regard to God. Certainly the falsāsfa were Muslims and remained Muslims. But even though their theses might be amended, and reconciled with the affirmations of the Kurān, the God they proclaim is exactly the God attained through reason, and, at the highest, through the flash of intellectual intuition. They set out to prove (their notion of prophecy comes into it: a simple privileged moment of the universal determinism) that the divine reason and the God of the Kurān coincide in every respect. But it is not a question of a verity of faith corroborating reason on its own plane. They treat philosophy on the one hand, the Law on the other, as two sources of equal value; the point at issue is to show that they agree. They attain this end with the help of a rational ta'wil, philosophical and at the same time allegorical. God is, first and foremost, the necessary Being, al-adl al-ma'ārif al-ifṣāfī. The God of the great falsāsfa is a lofty concept of Being, necessary and perfect, supreme Intelligence and supreme Love, producing the world by a mode of necessary and deliberate emanation: in short, an object not so much of faith as of philosophic experience and rich intellectual intuition. The seriousness with which they pursued their researches and reasonings (notwithstanding certain setbacks) led to the integration of real riches into Muslim culture; their analyses sometimes influenced religious thought itself. But here we find ourselves on a different plane from the inscrutable mystery of the Living God, which the Kurān presents for the adoration of the faithful.

3. **Kalām.** We return now to the schools of Sunnite kalām. The falsāsfa no doubt despised the dialectic of the *mutakallimān*, those people "who have broken the religious Law into pieces", as Ibn Rushd put it (*Fasl al-Mafyil*, ed. and tr. Gauthier, Algiers 1942, 29). Their subtleties and debates are often confused, their philosophic arguments questionable. But when they thus set out to defend the dogmas against "those who doubt", it is certainly the God of faith that is involved. The Mu'tazilites, just as much as the Ash'arites, are "men of religion and philosophers second" (Almād Aslām, *Dkāt al-Islām*, Cairo 1362/1943, iii, 204).

The inner attitudes of the two kalām's were nevertheless different. True, the Mu'tazilites took as their starting-point the Kurān and the sovereign Justice of Allāh. But their idea of 'ašā as a criterion of the Law, and later the impact of the "foreign sciences", led them to fix the sum total of faith on an idea of God as being "justified" in the eyes of human reason. They meant to serve and to purify the affirmation of the transcendent Existence, but their drastic tanbih reached the pitch of attenuating the very notion of divine attributes; the Ash'arites were not wrong in accusing them of that. Thereafter the mystery of the divine Oneness, the ta'wil, is as it were encircled by a human concept; expressed negatively, no doubt, but directly attainable on a discursive level. We find something corresponding to this in tasawwuf, in the experience of Dīnaydī. In correlation, and, at the same time, as a counter-part, the 'adl, the divine Justice, was in a way "humanized"; there was a touch of the idea of a just human judge, raised to the power of infinity. In its origins, the Ash'arite reaction was by no means a pure renunciation on the part of the faithful of every elaboration of the data of faith. The "divine version" of al-Ash'ārī was presented as a return to the inner attitude of the "ancients" and a profession of loyalty to Ibn Ḥanbal (*Ibīna*, 9). Yet the Ash'arites accepted the challenge to dialectical combat. This led them far afield; it led them to refine unceasingly, but also to complicate unceasingly, a body of problems which never came to an end, as a result of the multiplicity of objections and the rise of opposing schools. Amid the welter of arguments, it sometimes
becomes difficult to trace that complete resignation, in the nakedness of faith, to the One God, Creator and Judge, which we find in the strata of the Qur'an. The negation of human freedom in its ontological reality turned many lines of thought towards a divine voluntarism, conceptualized as such. This became still more marked after the 13th century, when the Ash'arite (or Maturidite) halām, instead of regenerating itself to keep pace with its contemporary opponents, as its primarily apologetic function would seem to demand, congealed in rather stereotypical manuals. This risk of sclerosis was no doubt one of the main considerations leading to the semi-agnosticism of Muhammad 'Abduh.

There, we believe, lies the explanation of the half-contempt for the halām (a half-contempt which sometimes grows to violent opposition), which is shown alike by the successors of the “pious ancients”, notably represented by the Hanbalite trend, and the mystics of the tasawwuf.

A. The tasawwuf. We cannot hope to analyse here the theological bases of the diverse Shi'a schools or attitudes, with all their fine distinctions (for the first centuries, see L. Massinon, Passion d'al-Ijallādī, Paris 1922, and Lexique technique, 2nd ed. Paris 1954). The important thing to note is that we are no longer dealing with a rational endeavour towards the necessary Being, as in falsafa, nor, as in halām, with a discursive endeavour to find “decisive” or formal arguments for the Qur'ānic doctrine about God. What is involved here is a spiritual experience, a life with God, soon to be understood as an experience of oneness, an inner realization of the ṣuḥūd.

There were some Şūfiş (al-Hallādī, al-Tirmidhī) who rethought for themselves the dogmatic bases of their era; some (Hasan al-Baṣrī) who could, by stretching a point, be called “semi-Mu'tazilī” (Ibn Karrām) who gave their name to a theological school; some were linked to the Ḥanbalite way of thought; there were many Shi'ite Şūfiş; and there were many Sunnite Şūfiş who in no way challenged the regular conclusions of the Ash'arite halām (al-Makḳī, the al-Ghazzālī of the Ḥiyād, many Ṣaḥḥālis, etc.). Finally, a great many, especially from the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries onward, permitted themselves to be influenced by an existential monism of Neoplatonic tendencies.—From the point of view which concerns us, we shall confine ourselves to picking out two main lines of Şūfism, according to a distinction insisted on by L. Massinon:

(a) wahdat al-ṣuḥūd, the oneness of Witness, of which al-Hallādī was the exponent. It seems also to have inspired every mystic of Ḥanbalite influence. The union with God is achieved in God’s bearing witness to Himself and to His mystery of Unity, in the mystic’s heart. The divine transcendence and its absolute Oneness in relation to all creation remain the central object of the act of faith. But the meeting with God is brought about by love (“in His Essence, love, ʿāshā, is the Essence of the essence”, said Hallādī); by love, the dialogue is established between the faithful heart and God, until the supreme “I”, which consummates the dialogue in unity, without destroying it. It is well known how much the official Iṣlām of the 3rd/9th century opposed this union of love (which claimed the support of Kūrān, il., 29 and v. 59), this oneness of the Witness in the duality of natures.

Two intermediate stages. The al-Ghazzālī of the Ḥiyād (13th century), who gave the tasawwuf citizen-rights among the recognized religious sciences: uniting, not without some eclecticism, the dogmatic values of developed Ash'arism and the spiritual values of the love of God (ma'āshā), of dependence and trust (tasawwul), and the diverse ascetic mistic virtues. Another and more important intermediate stage is that of the ṣuḥrah movement and its emanationism, which is by no means purely monist.

The great figure of the master of the ṣuḥrah, al-Suhrawardī of Aleppo (6th/12th century), so well studied by H. Corbin, illustrates a quest for unity which leads to identity in the order of knowledge; but the outer garb of Iranian myth permits him, on a plane of lofty poetic intuition, to leave the Witness its transcendence.

(b) wahdat al-wujūd, the oneness of Existence.—This came to dominate later Şūfism, since Ibn ʿArabī (6th/12th-7th/13th century). Ibn Taymiyya saw (and condemned in it the influence of Ibn Sinā) (discrimination to modify and to complete, not to reject). One may say that the Ghazzālī of the minor works of the last period, so deeply imbued with falsafa, even with Ṣaḥḥālīs, was the forerunner of it. In it, the Neoplatonic monism of the pseudo-Theology of Aristotle meets the Ash'arite tendency which, the better to affirm the One God, denied the creature all real ontological density. In contrast with God, “sole Being and sole Agent”, the created world is but impermanence. The illusory empirical existence, says the mystic, must obliterate itself (jānā) in the only Existence which subsists (bakā), that of God. Interpreting Qurān, xvii, 83, the Şūfī partisans of the monism of the Being said that the human spirit, the rūḥ, is a direct emanation from the divine Command (amr), and is therefore an emanation from God Himself. Cf. already the Ghazzālīan text (inscription discussed by W. Montgomery Watt, Authenticity of works attributed to al-Ghazzālī, JRS 1954, 1 and 2) the Kitāb Lādunisyya (Cairo 175/ 1934, 19). Following some quite different references, we have here something like an echo of the “trace of the One in us” of Plotinus, even indeed—all question of historical channels aside—of the Indian “Thou art That”. The supreme mystical experience is then an experience of unity (ittihād), understood as identification. It readily justifies its chosen course by an allegorical and gnostic tasāwīl of the scriptural texts.

The wahdat al-wujūd, for reasons partly doctrinal, partly historical, never aroused among the jubahā and the mutakalliminūn the opposition encountered in the 3rd/9th century by the wahdat al-ṣuḥūd. One cannot however forget how powerfully the latter might lead the tawakkul—the total dependence of the believer upon God, sovereign Judge and sovereign Unity—to spiritual experience in the strict sense of the term.

5) The “pious ancients”. The adherence to faith of many Şūfiş of the first centuries was in complete accordance with that of the “pious ancients”. In the first centuries, Şūfī and traditionist circles often overlapped.—There was no question of a school, in spite of the fact that these people frequently set themselves in the Ḥanbalite tradition; it was a question of an inner attitude. This reference to the “ancients” (ṣalaf) must be understood as a choice, much more than a chronological distinction: we find it as much in the 14th century, with Ibn Taymiyya, as at the beginning of the hijri era; we find it again, systematized and with a predominantly anti-Şūfī note, among the Wahhābīs and neo-Wahhābīs, among the modern Salafīyya and their contemporary disciples (including, in some measure, the Ikhwan al-Muslihim).
This tendency raised itself many a time against the quibbles and subtleties of the kaldm, against an excessive confidence in rational or dialectical proofs. In his Dhamma al-Kalâm, al-Anṣārī claimed that the Muslim the right not to seek for explanation (tafsīr) of the divine attributes, not to proceed down the “blind alley” of the Āshʿarītes, glossing texts and distinguishing between the attribute and its ḥaqīqah, its “mode of being” (cf. quotation from al-Anṣārī in Ibn Taymiyya, Futūḥāt, v, 473-78). The very personality of the mystic al-Anṣārī would suffice to show us that a tendency that is truly loyal to Western “pious ancients” has no grounds for condemning tasawwuf wholesale, as it often does nowadays; too easily confusing the waṣūfāt al-ghuḍūl with the waṣūfāt al-ruḍūḍ, and the latter with the deviations of the “brotherhoods”.

What remains affirmed is the faith in God Most High. Who speaks to men by His prophets and apostles, revealing no more of Himself than the “most beautiful Names” whereby He indicates and summarizes the name Allah. —No enumeration is needed here. In every age there have been “free-thinkers”, “doubters and deniers”. In every age, intellectual researches on the ilāhīyyāt, and the discursive expression of them, have abounded in Islam. Contemporary thought seems harried on all sides by the diverse trends of the modern philosophies, as it was formerly by Greek or Iranian thought. It may be that a new kalâm will be called into being, a new “defensive apologetics”, that will carry out an extensive re-examination of the questions and problems of its treatises on waṣūfāt Allāh and al-riḍāwīn at-tawās, in the varying light of the idealism, pragmatism, dialectical atheism or existentialism of the moment. But maybe it will be able to avoid the mishaps that befell the ancient kalâm only by going beyond the “contradictory” appearances of the problems posed,—by a vital recourse to God, One, Living, Master of the worlds and of the retribution of mankind, Allāh al-ʿākīd, al-ḥāgy, māliḥ al-ʿislāmīn, māliḥ yawm al-dīn, whereby many sincere believers and “bearers of the Kurʿān” have always endeavoured to live.

Bibliography: I. Characteristic Muslim works:


ALLĀH AKBARR [see TAKBĪR].

ALLĀHĀBĀD (ILAHĀBĀD), an important town in the State of Uttar Pradesh and the seat of the State High Court, is situated on the confluence of the rivers Ganga and Yamuna. Population in 1951: 2,048,250, including 12.8 % Muslims.

History: One of the most ancient towns in India, it was known as Prayāg and regarded as sacred by the Hindus. When the Ḡūrūd Turks occupied Banaras in 1194, the town came under the Sultanate of Delhi, but presumably continued under the administration of autonomous Hindu rajdās, the nearest important military centre of the Sultanate being located at Karā [q.v.] about 45 miles to the west. With the overthrow of the independent Shāhī Kingdom of Ḍīwānpūr in the 16th century and the subsequent rise of the Afghan, the usefulness of the ferry across Prayāg to Dīhāt began to be appreciated. In June 1567, Akbar crossed the Gangā at Prayāg after defeating Kāḥ-i Zamān, the rebel Governor of Ḍīwānpur. In 1574, hā again passed through the town on his way to Bengal. Realising its strategic importance he decided to make it a military centre. From this small township, it became a big city and was given by Abūkār the name of Ilahābād (being changed to Ilahābād through popular usage). In 1579-80, Akbar reorganised the administrative divisions of the empire, it became the capital of the sība (province) of the name, thus...
superseding both Karā and Djawnpūr in importance. Most of the Indian writers and European travellers visiting India during the 17th and 18th centuries testify to its importance. In 1736 the Mahrattās conquered it. After 1750 it changed hands several times, till the British garrisoned the citadel in 1798 and the town in 1801.

Monuments: The citadel built by Akbar (with Asōka's pillar and its famous inscription), and the Khusraw Bāgh, with the tombs of Prince Khusraw, his mother and his sister, are the chief monuments of the Mughal period.

Bibliography: Akbar-nāma (Bib. Ind.), ii, 296; iii, 88, 414, etc.; Ḥim-i Akbar (tr. Sarkar), ii, 94, 169; Ṭabqāt-i Akbar (Bib. Ind.), ii, 211, 286, 379, etc.; De Lact 62; Bernier (1891), 457; Tavernier (1825), i, 15, 95; Thevenot, 92; Nevill, Allahabad, a Gazetteer.

(Ñurul Ḥasan)

Allāhummā is an old Arabic formula of invocation: “Allāhū,” for which also Lahlūmā is found (cf. Nöldeke, Zur Grammatik d. class. Arab., 6). Whether, as Wellhausen supposes in his Reste arabischen Heidentums, 224, it was originally meant for the god Allāh, higher than and different from the old Arabian gods, is rather doubtful, because every god might be invoked as “the God” (just as “the Lord”). It was used in praying, offering, concluding a treaty and blessing or cursing (see Goldz. Ahhandlungen z. arab. Philol., i, 35 ff.; cf. also the expression Allāhūmā hāyyīt = may God good may it do you, al-Akhtal iii, 7). The phrase bi'smika 'l-lahlūmā, said to have been introduced by Umayya b. Abī l-Salt (according to a statement in Abūnā, iii, 187) and used as an introduction in written treaties, has been replaced by others by Muḥammad as being a heathen expression (Ibn Ḥishām, i, 747; Wellhausen, Skizzen u. Vorarb., iv, 104, 128). The simple Allāhummā (Lahlūmā), on the other hand, was retained as inoffensive (e.g. Kur'ān, iii, 26; xxxix, 46; subhānaka ‘l-lahlūmā, x, 10), and in the same way allāhummā na'am = “certainly!”, being in fact the answer on being conjured to tell the truth (al-Ṭabarī, i, 1723). For the peculiar formula allāhummā minkā wa-islāyka (or lāhā) used at the family-offering, cf. Goldz. in ZDMG, 1894, 95 f. (Fr. Bühler)

Al-'Amlākī, name of a wādī in Lower Nubia between the Nile and the shore of the Red Sea, 62 miles south of Aswān.

In the Middle Ages, this small valley resembled a large populous and flourishing town, because it was a gold mining area, using black slave labour. “The nuggets of gold”, wrote al-Ya'qūbī, “appear in the form of sulphide of arsenic, and are made into bars”. Al-Iдрīsī gives more curious information. The prospectors, he tells us, took up their positions at night in order to see the gold dust glistening in the darkness and to mark the sites so that they could be recognised the next day. The prospectors then proceeded to collect and transport the auriferous sand and to wash it in tubs of water to extract the metal, which was then blended with mercury and smelted.

These gold mines, exploited in early times, were abandoned at the end of the Middle Ages. The old workings can still be seen. Gold mining has recently been resumed in the area (Umm Gharayāt).


(G. Wiet)
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17 f.: Almalech). In 1339 some Franciscan friars were murdered in the town (cf. A. van den Wyngaert, Sinica Franciscana, i, 510-1; G. Golubovich, Biblioteca Bio-Bibliografica, ii, 72, iv, 244-8, 310-1). Here was the seat of a Roman Catholic missionary bishop and, probably, of the Nestorian metropolitan (cf. Bretschneider, Med. Res., 38; Barthold, Oeckter semirayyeh, Vyerniy 1898, 64-7; V. Rondalez, in Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft, 1951, 1-17; S. Dauviller, in Mêlanges F. Cavallera, Toulouse 1948, 305-7).

Like the towns on the Ču (q.v.), the Talas and elsewhere, Almaligh was completely ruined by the constant wars and other fighting in the 8th-14th century (cf. Bâbur, ed. Beveridge, i; Mîrzâ Muhàammad Haydar, Ta’rîkh-i Raqîdi, tr. E. D. Ross, 364). Muhammad Haydar mentions the ruins of the town with the tomb of Tughluq Timur Khân (d. 764/1358-68); cf. Dugès (these ruins (at present called Alimt) lie between the Khorgos, the boundary river between the Soviet Union and China and the village of Mazâr and have been fully described by N. Pantusov, Kaukhanshiny Shornok, Moscow 1910, 161 ff. Inscriptions from graves of Nestorian Christians have also been found there (see especially P. Kokovtsov, in Zap., xvi, 190 ff.).

A. N. Bernstem (Pamyatniki stariny almaatinskoy oblasti po materialam ekskpeditsii 1939 g., Issvestiya Akad. Nauk Kazakh. SSR, Archel. series, i, Alma Ata 1948, 79-91) identifies Almaligh with a town (also called Alimtu = Chinese Al-i-tu) near the modern Alma Ata; but in reality this is another, different town having the same name (as an apppellative, “apple town”); it is mentioned in 1390 in connection with Timûr’s campaign against Mughulistan (Yazdi, Zhâfarnâmeh, i, 466 ff.; cf. F. Pètis de la Croix, Histoire de Timur-bes, ii, 66 ff.).

(W. Barthold-[B. Spuler and O. Pritsaak])

ALMANAC [see ANWA; TA’RÍKH].

ALMANZOR [see AL-MÚNASÀR]. ALMÁS—frequently regarded as a noun defined by the article (al-más; correctly al-Álmáš according to Ibn al-Álhir) in LA, viii, 97: ‗the belongs to the root as in Ilyás), a corrupt form from the Greek ἀδέξας (i.e., ἀδέλατη βι-αραβίyya)—the diamond. According to the pseudo-Aristotelian Kułhâl al-Álhir which, on the basis of cognate Greek sources, agrees in the main with the statements of Pliny, the diamond cuts every solid except lead, by which it is itself destroyed. On the frontier of Khurásán is a deep valley in which the diamonds lie guarded by poisonous snakes whose looks alone are enough to kill. Alexander the Great procured some of them by a trick: he had mirrors made in the service of the Kings of Aragon and Castille, who cut to pieces the French army of Philip III the Bold during his campaign of 1285 at Roussillon, and who later, under the name of the Grande Compagnie Catalane, made daring raids in the Eastern Mediterranean.


(E. Lévy-Provençal)

ALMOHÁD [see AL-MUWARIDHÁN].

ALMORAVÍD [see AL-MURÀBITÓN].

ALMUÑECÁR [see AL-MUNÁKKA].

ALP (t.), ‗hero‘, a figure which played a great role in the warlike ancient Turkish society; synonyms: bâbur (bâdhár [q.v.], bûhmen, čapar [q.q.v.]). (Turkish heroic tradition survived in an Islamized form and appears in Anatolia in the stories of Dede Korkud [q.v.] as well as in the poetry of ʿAshık Paşâ and the history of Yazildağolu; cf. Fuad Köprüülü, Bibli.). The word alp, used since ancient times among the various Turkish peoples either as an element in compound proper names or as a title, occurs frequently in proper names also of the Islamic period (cf. the various persons called Alp Tigin, the Saljûk amirs Alp Kusur, Alp Argu, Alp Arslan). Another form is Alp (cf. the Artukids Nadîm al-Dîn ‘All Alp, ‘Imâd al-Dîn Alp); the word alpagh (yalpagh, diamond heavier than i mîthkâl. The sources differ widely about the places where diamonds are found.

—Al-Tîfâgh and al-Kawzmí relate that the pieces obtained through smashing the stone are all triangular (observation of the octagonal fissure?), and the former also says that the diamond attracts little feathers.—It is generally mentioned as being used for cutting and piercing other stones. Aristotle is said to have used it for destroying stones in the bladder. The powder of it must not touch the teeth; applied externally it is a good cure for colic and stomach-ache.


ALMEE [see ʿALIMA].

ALMÉRIA [see AL-MARIVYYA].

ALMICANTARAT [see MUŠANTARÂT].

ALMODOVAR [see AL-MUDAWWAR].

ALMOGÁVARES, or Almugávares, a name, apparently derived from the Arabic al-mughâwir “one who makes hostile incursions”, which was given at the end of the Middle Ages to certain contingents of mercenaries levied from among the mountaineers of Aragon, a tough, sober but disciplined race. Zurita (Anales, iv, 24) gives a picturesque description of them. These were the troops, fighting on foot, in the service of the Kings of Aragon and Castile, who cut to pieces the French army of Philip III the Bold during his campaign of 1285 at Roussillon, and who later, under the name of the Grande Compagnie Catalane, made daring raids in the Eastern Mediterranean.


(E. Lévy-Provençal)

ALMOHÁD [see AL-MUWARIDHÁN].

ALMORAVÍD [see AL-MURÀBITÓN].

ALMUÑECÁR [see AL-MUNÁKKA].

ALP (t.), ‗hero‘, a figure which played a great role in the warlike ancient Turkish society; synonyms: bâbur (bâdhár [q.v.], bûhmen, čapar [q.q.v.]). (Turkish heroic tradition survived in an Islamized form and appears in Anatolia in the stories of Dede Korkud [q.v.] as well as in the poetry of ʿAshık Paşâ and the history of Yazildağolu; cf. Fuad Köprüülü, Bibli.). The word alp, used since ancient times among the various Turkish peoples either as an element in compound proper names or as a title, occurs frequently in proper names also of the Islamic period (cf. the various persons called Alp Tigin, the Saljûk amirs Alp Kusur, Alp Argu, Alp Arslan). Another form is Alp (cf. the Artukids Nadîm al-Dîn ‘All Alp, ‘Imâd al-Dîn Alp); the word alpagh (yalpagh,
As a title, alp was used by Seldjûk amirs, and together with other old Turkish titles such as ḥan, ḥūlūk, ḥilj, was adopted by the states which succeeded the Seldjûk empire. Alp alone is found in an inscription of Ak Sunḳur of Aleppo; in the inscriptions of the Syrian and Mesopotamian ala[beg]s and of the Artuks occur the titles alp ḥūlūk, alp Ḥan ḥūlūk, alp ḥāšâ (cf. RCEA, nos. 2745, 3021, 3072, 3085, 3111-2, 3122, 3146; Van Berchem, Amida, 76, 92, 104, 120, 122; idem, *Arabishe Inschriften aus Armenien und Diyarbekr*, Berlin 1910, 148 ff.; Ibn al-Kalânisî, ed. Amedroz, 284; alp ḥāšâ as title of Zengi; and the dedication of a translation of Dioscorides, in MS Maghdad, Cat. no. 27, to a prince with the title of alp Ḥan ḥūlūk).


**ALP ARSLAN** 'Apud al-Dawla Abû Shuṭaḥ' Muḥammad b. Dâʿûd Ḥāriʾbîg, celebrated Seldjûk sultan, the second of the dynasty (455/1065-463/1073). Born probably in 421/1030, at an early age he led the armies of his father Ghârîb, and brought Pars firmly under his control by suppressing Fâḍlîyâ, who had come to terms with Kawurt. The latter was allowed to retain Kirmân, as a subordinate. A demonstration of force in Karakânîd territory and up to the Caspian (457/1065) reinforced his authority which his father, and previously exercised there. As regards the Ghâzinawids, he kept the peace concluded during the last years of Ḥârıʾbîg’s rule.

His fame in the eyes of posterity rests on his activities on the western front. Like his predecessor Ṭūḥrîbîg and his successor Mâlîkshāh, he had the ambition to march on Egypt to destroy the stronghold of Fâṭîmîd heresy. But he realised the necessity of maintaining his ascendency over the Turkmans, who constituted the military strength of the dynasty, and who were primarily interested in the richly-rewarding campaigns of a holy war (*ghâsa*) on the Christian territories beyond ʿĀdhârâyân, where they where concentrated. Shortly after his accession, therefore, Alp Arslan conducted a series of campaigns against the Byzantines and their Armenian and Geor- gian neighbours, while independent bands of Turkmans raided more deeply into their territories; these campaigns also had the effect of increasing his prestige in certain autochthonous Muslim circles.

In 456/1064 he captured Anf and ʿArsîn, and extracted a pledge of submission from the tiny Georgian kingdom. A further expedition against Georgia, in which the Shâfdâdîd prince of Arrân took part, became necessary in 460/1068. The main advantages accruing from the security of the ʿĀdhârâyân frontiers was ensured, and that the Turkmans had free access to the pasture lands on the Ars. It is difficult to assess what extent the peregrinations of the Turkmans, who simultaneously penetrated to the heart of Byzantine Asia Minor and permeated Muslim Diyar Bâkr and Diyar Mudar, were directed by Alp Arslan; the Turkmans opened the way for him, but withdrew after having gained their booty. Moreover, their activities provoked a Byzantine counterattack against the Syrian and Armenian borders of the Muslim world (1068-9), following which terms were negotiated between the two empires.

Alp Arslan then considered himself sufficiently secure against the Byzantines to listen to an appeal from rebels in Egypt and to undertake the Fâṭîmîd expedition to support orthodoxy and the caliph. He occupied en route Arjûtsh and Manziktîr held by the Byzantines, attacked Edessa, and pushed on without delay to secure the submission of the Mirdâsîd Mâhmûd at Aleppo, who attempted to save himself by a last-minute recognition of the ʿAbhâsîd Caliphate. The sultan’s intention was to advance into Southern Syria, where various Turko- man groups had preceded him, when he heard that the Byzantine Emperor Romanus Diogenes, at the head of a formidable force, was threatening his rear in Armenia, and he had to return with all possible speed. He nevertheless succeeded in regrouping sufficient forces to give battle to the Byzantine army at Mankirt in Dhu ’l-Kaʿda 461/August 1071. The diversity of the Byzantine forces in both their composition and morale, combined with their lack of manoeuvrability, made them no match for the agile Turks who, though far fewer in number, were inspired by the fervour of holy war. By evening, the Byzantine army had been annihilated and, for the first time in history, a Byzantine Emperor was taken prisoner by a Muslim ruler. Alp Arslan’s object was not to destroy the Byzantine empire; he contented himself with frontier adjustments, promises of tribute, and an alliance—a settlement which the downfall of Romanus Diogenes rendered impermanent. In fact, however, the battle...
of Mantzikert laid open Asia Minor to Turkish conquest. In later years there was no princely family in Asia Minor but wished to boast an ancestor present on that glorious day.

Alp Arslan himself met an unworthy end not long after his triumph. At the other extremity of his empire, relations with the Karakhanids, despite marriage alliances, were again strained. At the beginning of 455/1072 he invaded their territory. In the course of a quarrel with a prisoner, the latter mortally wounded him. He died in the prime of life, at the end of Rabī‘ I/beginning of January 1073. He had nominated his son Malikshāh his heir.

In the eyes of orthodox Muslims, Alp Arslan was a leader of men and a commander capable of enforcing strict discipline, generous, just, devout, with an aversion for informers. Christians, remembering massacres such as that at Ānī, ascribed to him a reputation for brutality, in contrast to his son Malikshāh, who was regarded by them in a more favourable light. Space does not permit here an account of his administration, which was essentially the achievement of his vizier Niẓām al-Mulk and which is discussed in the article on the latter and in the general article on the Saljuqids. To Alp Arslan belongs the credit for singling out the Khurasanlūs, the principalities, such as those of the Ṭūrḳ, which is discussed in the article on the latter and in the light of the knowledge and advice” of Alp Takīn. In order to remove him from the capital, the sovereign invested him (Dhu ‘l-Hijjah 349/Jan.–Feb. 961) with the post of Governor of Khurasan, the highest military office, and Pensioned from this post by Mansūr b. Nūḥ, of whose elevation to the throne he had disapproved, Alp Takīn withdrew to Balkh; in Rabī‘ I, 351/April-May 962 he defeated an army sent against him by the Sāmānid ruler, and retired to Ghazna where, after overthrowing the local dynasty, he set up an independent empire. The records disagree as to the date of his death; according to some, he died before 352/963. His learned son Abū ʿĪsāh b. ʿĪsāhīn (whom see Ibn Ḥawkāl, 13, 14) could only maintain his position, in face of a revolt by the former ruler of Ghazna, with Sāmānid aid. Thus the Ghaznavid kingdom only existed at first as a Sāmānid vassal state. Abū ʿĪsāh died childless, and the leaders of the army, on which the new state was based, selected as his successor first the commander of guard Būlāb Tākin (Tīqīn) (355-647/966-747), who left a reputation for integrity, and then Pirī Tākin (Tīqīn). During the latter’s reign a final revolt by the supporters of the former dynasty was crushed. But the victor, Subūk Tākin, the son-in-law and former chief officer of Alp Takīn, was raised to power by the troops (Shābān 356/April 977), and became the founder of the Ghaznavid (g.r.) dynasty.

Bibliography: A concise but comprehensive history of Alp Takīn and his immediate successors, with references to all the sources, is contained in Muhammad Nāzīm, The life and times of Sultan Māḥmūd of Ghazna, Cambridge 1931, ch. i. The chief sources are Gardīzī, Zayn al-ʿĀkhbār, ed. Muhammad Nāzīm, Berlin 1929, and Tabātabā’ī Nāṣīrī, Niẓām al-Mulk’s account in the Siyāṣat-nāma (Schefer), 95-101, is an idealized version designed to place Alp Takīn and Subūk Takīn in a more favourable light. On the effect on the frontiers of Sīstān of the foundation of the new kingdom of Ghazna, see now, in addition to Muhammad Nāzīm’s sources, the anonymous Tarīkh-i Sīstān published by Bahār al-Tahbīn 1314, 326 ff. (W. BARTHOLOD-CL. CAHEN)

ALPAMİŞH. One of the most famous Turkish epics (dastān) of Central Asia, inspired by two classical themes, (1) the quest for the betrothed and the rivalry of the suitors; (2) the return of the husband on the day of his wife’s remarriage (theme of the
return of Ulysses). The Özbek hero Alpamış of the Kungrat tribe repairs to Kalmık territory in search of his fiancée and cousin Barcin. Alpamış triumphs over his Kalmık rivals, marries Barcin and brings her back to his tribe. The second part is the account of a further expedition on the part of Alpamış to Kalmık territory to rescue his wife’s father. Alpamış is captured and held prisoner for seven years by the Kalmık Khan, and is finally aided to escape by the Khan’s daughter; he returns to his native land the very day on which his wife is about to marry—against her will—the son of a slave who has usurped his authority. Alpamış kills the usurper and regains his position as head of the tribe.

It is difficult to determine accurately the date of the composition of Alpamış, although it cannot be before the beginning of the 16th century, or later than the end of the 17th. In the dastın, the Kungrat tribe lives a nomadic existence around Lake Baysun north of Tirmız (now the Surğhan Darya district of southern Özbekistán). The Kungrat only moved into this area with the armies of Shaybání Khan, about 1500. Moreover, in the three versions, Özbek, Kazak, and Karakalpak, Alpamış and the Kungrat are called Özbek, which postulates an origin later than the Shaybání conquests. On the other hand, the main theme of the epic, the struggle of the Muslim Turkish nomads against the ‘infidel’ Kalmiks, places it between the 16th and the 17th centuries, the period when the Kalmiks of the Oyrat Empire were making a series of bloody raids in Central Asia.

Zirmuskin and Zarilov believe that they can detect, beneath the existing versions of Alpamış, an older version, now lost, dating back to the 11th-12th century, a period when the ancestor of the Kungrat were nomads near the Aral Sea (analogy with the Oghuz poem Bamsi-Bayrek) or to still earlier times when they dwelt in the fringes of the Altai (analogy with the Mongol poem Khan Kharakutu).

All the Central Asian versions of Alpamış are in verse, the prose passages serving only to mark the divisions between the various episodes of the poem. The versification is simplified. The repetition of the same rhyme divides the verses into stanzas of different length (2, 4, and 7 verses). This simple poetic form is perfectly suited to the way in which the poem is transmitted, whether recited by a bakhši (“bard”), or chanted by a gāḏir (“minstrel”) with accompaniment on the kobus (two-string violin).

Several versions of Alpamış exist: Özbek, Kazak, and Karakalpak, which correspond fairly closely to one another, but have occasional but obvious differences of detail. The best and the most popular is the Özbek version of the bakhši Fādil (Fazyl) Yuldash (born in 1873 at Kloblaj Laky in the district of Bulungur near Samarkand), the text of which was published for the first time by Ḥāmid ‘Alimджan at Tashkent in 1939, in a slightly abridged form, under the title “Yuldash oghyi Fazyl: Alpamış”. The first part of this work in an abridged form has been translated into Russian verse by V. V. Deržavin and A. S. Kočetov, and the second, in extenso, by L. M. Pen’kovskiy. These two translations, based on ‘Alimджan’s text and with a preface by V. M. Zirmuskin, were published at Tashkent in 1944 under the title: “Fazyl Yuldash: Alpamış”. Finally, in 1949, L. N. Pen’kovskiy published at Tashkent the first complete translation of the Yuldash version, with the title Alpamış, uzbekski epos. There are other Özbek versions, by other bakhšis, which are still unpublished, and which differ in certain details.

The Kazak version (2nd part only) was published by Shayh ul-Islamov at Kazan in 1896, and the complete text was edited by Aimbet ul Kally Tashkent in 1922, and re-edited some years later at Alma-Ata in 1933. It appears under the title Alpamys Batyr in the anthology Batyrlar Zhyry, Alma-Ata 1939, 249-96.

The Karakalpak version (1st part only, with Russian translation) is based on the text of Diya Murad Bek Muhammedov, bakhši of Torńi (A. Divaev, Alpamys-Batyr, Ethnograficheskie materialy, fasc. vii in Shornik materialov diya statistik Syr-Daryinskoy oblasti, ix, Tashkent 1901). The complete Karakalpak version was published in Moscow in 1937 and again in 1941 at Törńi and Tashkent, under the title “Aimbet ul Kally: Alpamys.”

In addition there exist two prose versions, Bashkir and Altai, which are radically different from the central Asian versions. The Bashkir version, Alpamys kem Bärşyn Kk’ylyau, was published by N. Dimytriev, with Russian translation by A. G. Bessonov, in Bashkirskie Narodnye Skazki, fasc. 19, Ufa 1941.

The text of the apparently earlier Altai version Alyp-Manash, established by N. U. Ulagashev, appears in Altay Bulay (the Oyrat national epic), published by A. Koptelev, Novoshirsk 1941, 79-126.

The longest version, that of Fazyl Yuldash, comprises 14,000 stanzas; the Kazak and Karakalpak versions are shorter and comprise 2,500 and 3,000 stanzas respectively.


ALPHABET [see AL-HIDAJ, HURUJ] ALPHARES [see BANUS, BAYARRAT] ALPUENTE [see AL-BUNT] ALPUJARRAS [see AL-BUSJARRAT] ALRUCCABA [see RUKRA] ALSH, now Eloche, a small town in the Spanish Levant (Sharh al-Andalus) 12 m. S-W of Alicante, noted for its palm groves, which still exist to-day, and which were described by Muslim authors such as Ibn Sa’īd and al-Kawzānī.


(E. LÉVI-PROVENCAL)

ALTAI, mighty, ca. 1000 miles long mountain system in eastern Central Asia, stretching from the Saïan Sea in the southwest to the upper Selenga and the upper Orkhon, with the sources of the Ob‘, the Irtilsh and the Yenisei. Here, and in the adjacent country to the north-east as far as the present-day Mongolia, was the oldest home of the Turks and the Mongols and their ancestors. The Turks had here for a long time after their “refuge” in the Ötiikan mountains, the oldest Turkish designation for the southern Altai, as it appears in the inscriptions of the Orkhon, is Altın-yıla (“gold mountains”), in Chinese Kin-shan (same meaning). The name of Ektag, however, mentioned by the Greeks (probably Ak Tagh, “white mountain”), seems to refer to the Tien-shan (E. Chavannes, Documents sur les Tou-kieu occidentaux, 236 f.). It is uncertain whether the modern name, which appears for the first time in the Kalmuck period, is connected with the Mongol ailaan, “gold”; the local population explains it by a false etymology as aili ayt, “six month”.

Documents sur les Tou-kieu occidentaux, (A. Benning and H. Carrère d’Encausse)}
ALTIAINANS is the name of a Turkish tribe in the Altai mountains, partly professing, more or less nominally, Orthodox Christianity, partly Shamanistic; though Islam is not to be found amongst them, they had some contact, though possibly not an immediate one, with Islamic civilization (as attested by loan words such as kuday, "God"); daykan, "the devil". (Cf. for them G. Teich and H. Rébel, Völker... der UdSSR, Leipzig 1943, 28-43, 137 f., 142; W. Radloff, Proben aus der Volkskultur der türkischen Stämme Südsibiriens, i; Aeus Sibirien, ii, 350 ff.; Bol'shaya Sovetskaya Entsklopediya, 441 f.);

The name Altaias has been substituted since about 1874, and more especially in the 20th century, following a proposal of M. A. Castrén, for the term Turanian (q.e.v.), coined by F. Max Müller, as the designation of the assumption community of the Turkish-Mongolian peoples; the even wider concept of Ural-Altaianas comprises also the Samoyeds, Finno-Ugrians and Tunguses. (Cf. e.g. Ural-Altaiische Jahrbiicher, Wiesbaden, since 1952; J. Benzing, Einführung in das Studium der altasiatischen Philologie und der Turkologie, Wiesbaden 1953; with bibliography; W. K. Matthews, Languages of the URSRS, Cambridge 1951). These peoples, however, with the exception of the Turks (q.e.v.), are not touched by Islam.

ALTAIR (see ALTINSH)

ALTAMISH (see ALTAMIISH)

'ALTTH, or AL'TTH, town, to the north of Baghda'd, between 'Ukbara and Sámara, on the eastern bank of the old course of the Tigris. As the course of the Tigris has changed (cf. INGAU), 'Altth is today on the western bank, on al-Shattaya. The extensive ruins of the town are known as 'Alth up to the present day; they lie about 4½ m. N.W. of the modern town of Balad. The town is already mentioned by Ptolemy (v. 20) under the name of Altina. According to the medieval geographers the northern limit of the Sawad or al-Irak was formed by 'Altth on the eastern, Harrba on the western side of the Tigris. The town was a waqf for the benefit of the descendants of 'Ali b. Abi Talib (Yakuti) and some d.linguished traditionists of the 6th and 7th centuries A. H. came from it. A stone dam was built over the Tigris near 'Altth, but no trace of it remains. Near 'Altth lay the convent called Dayr al-'Altth or Dayr al-Adhār, described, among others, by the poet Dji'dhia al-Barmaki.

ALTITI (see SIRKH)

ALTIN (7.), Gold, also used of gold coins. The word is often met with in Turkish proper names of persons and places, e.g. Altin Köprü, Altincah (Altuncah). See also SIRKH.
ALTIN (ALTİN) KÖPRİ, a town of ırak, built picturesquely on a small rocky island in the Lesser Zab river (45° 8’ E., 35° 42’ N.)—and in modern times overflowing on to both banks—serves as a nahiya headquarters in the kadı of Kirkük in the ieva (province) of that name, formerly in the waliyyat of Mosul. The Zab here forms the boundary between Kirkük and the Irbil ieva. Known locally in Arabic simply as al-Kantara, the Turkish name (“Golden Bridge”) is variably explained; some believe it to commemorate a Turkish or Kurdish lady of that name, others that it refers to the rich caravans-tolls of earlier days, since the place lies on the agelong Baghlu-Mosul highway; while others understand it as an abbreviation of Altın-Sü-Köprü, or the “Bridge of the Altın-Sü”. But it is at least equally probable that the river name (now rarely used) itself merely reflects the town name.

The place, no more than an obscure and unrecorded village in medieval times, gained importance in and since the 17th/18th century, after the erection of the two bridges by (it is said) Sultan Murad IV and a period of settled administration. It was visited and has been described by many European travellers, and, now reckoned as healthy as well as highly picturesque, has in late years been greatly improved in cleanliness, amenities, and communications. The famous stone-built bridges, of which the southern contained an almost impracticably high central arch, were destroyed by the Turks in 1918 and later replaced by modern steel structures. The Kirkük-Irbil branch of ırak Railways crosses the Zab immediately upstream.

The inhabitants of Altın Köprü, some 3500, are mixed Kurdish, Turkoman and Arab; this applies also to the thirty villages within the nahiya. Many of the latter lie within the area of the rich and extensive Kirkük oilfield (discovered in 1935/1939, and in full development since 1935/1939); oilfield operations give employment to many of the inhabitants. Their other main occupations are those of agriculture (partly rain-fed, partly aided by modern-type irrigation), of services and supplies connected with road transport, of the characteristic kelek (skin-supported raft) traffic on the Zab, and of wholesale and retail trade.

Bibliography: Turkish period, V. Cuinet, La Turquie d’Asie, ii, 855; S. H. Longrigg, Four Centuries of Modern Iraq, Oxford 1925, and many travellers’ records, such as Niebuhr, Reisebeschreibungen, nach Arabien, Copenhagen 1778; ii, 340; Olivier, Voyage dans l’empire ottoman, Paris 1801, ii, 372; Rousseau, Description du Pachachi de Bagdad, Paris 1809, 85; C. J. Rich, Narrative of a Journey to the Isle of Babylon, London 1839, ii, 10-2; Petersmann, Reisen im Orient, Leipzig 1861, iii, 310; Czernik, in Petersmann’s Geogr. Mitteilungen, Ergänzungsheft, no. 44 (1875), 47; see also K. Ritter, Erdkunde, i, 637-9; E. Reclus, Nomen geopol. univ., i, 432; G. Hoffmann, Auswärts aus syr. Altin after. Mitt. 1850, 263. For the 20th century, S. H. Longrigg, Iraqi 1900 to 1950, London 1953. (S. H. Longriggo)

ALTİN ORDÜ, modern Turkish imitatin of the Russian term “Zolotaya Ordja”, “Golden Horde” [see above].

ALTINTASH (also ALTINTASH, local pronunciation ALTINTES), village in Anatolia, 39° 5’ N, 30° 10’ E, and a nahiya in the vilayet and the kadı of Kutahya (though the capital of the nahiya is not in the village, but in the village of Kürkçüyö, a little to the west), on the small stream in the area of the sources of the Porsuk, somewhat to the west of the Ayfın Kara Hisr—Kütahya road. The village contains a kadı decorated in the 19th century and a modern mosque incorporating older fragments. It stands on the site of an older and larger mosque, the building inscription of which (by the Rûm Sâlîk âlî sân, al-Dîn Kaykâbid) is said to be in the museum of Ağ Sêhir. The inscription which is now above the porch refers to the building of a bridge and bears the date of 666/1267-8; the place has two small old bridges.

In the neighbouring Çakarsaz (called by the inhabitants Çakarsaz) there is an early Ottoman khan (three naves with five girders) with a remarkable porch, into which there are also built antique fragments. Altintast was a stage on the highway from Brusa (and Usküdar) via Kütahya to Ayfın Kara Hisar and Konya, forming the stage probably together with Çakarsaz.

Bibliography: Cf. Huart, Konıa, Paris 1867, 57, 254; 4 All Dowrûd, Memlûk-i 4 Âlîmisûzâne, Ta’riski ve-Dîkâtî, Aq Sêhir, 45; Fr. Taeschner, Das anatolische Wegennetz, Leipzig 1924-6, ii, index. (Fr. TAESCHNER)

ALTINTÅŞ AL-HADJÅ, Abu Sa’ ün (his alleged second name Hârûn which occurs in a single passage of Ibn al-Ahâlî, ix, 394, is probably due to an error of the author or of a抄yist), Turkish slave, later general of the Ghaznavid Sebûk Teğn and his two successors and governor of Khårizm. Already under Sebûk Teğn he attained the highest rank in the bodyguard, that of a “great hâyûd”; under Mahmûd he commanded the right wing in the great battle against the Karâlahânids (22 Rabi’ II 398/4 Jan. 1008, and in 401/1010-1) he is mentioned as governor of Harrât. After the conquest of Khårizm in 408/1017 he was appointed governor of the province with the title of Khårizmshâh and maintained himself in this office until his death in 423/1032. Altintåş seems to have administered the advanced border-province with energy and foresight and to have effectively fought it against the neighbouring Turkish tribes. As, however, by this means he established his own rule even more than that of the sultans, his measures were always regarded with suspicion both by Mahmûd and Mas’ûd, and it is said that both of them made attempts to remove the troublesome governor by treachery. In the spring of 423/1032 Altintåş undertook, by order of the sultan Mas’ûd a campaign against “All Teğn (ci. Karâlahân) and received a mortal wound in the battle of Dabûsîya. He was succeeded as governor by his son Hârûn, but Mas’ûd bestowed the title of Khårizmshâh on his own son Sa’ ün and Hârûn administered the country only as Sa’ ün’s representative. In Ramadan 449/August 1004 Hârûn proclaimed himself independent, but was killed the very next year at the instigation of the Ghaznavids. His brother and successor İsmail Khandan ruled the country till 453/1041, when he was ousted, by order of the Ghaznavids, by Şâh Malik, the prince of DIAND. Thus the dynasty founded by Altintåş came to an end.

Bibliography: ‘Utûb, al-Ta’riski al-Yâmint, 403-6; Gardîd, Zâyn al-Âhâlî, 73 ff.; Bayhaqî (Mörder), 59 ff., 51 ff., 59 ff., 419 ff., 499 ff., 834 ff.; the dates in Ibn al-Ahâlî (cf. the index) are to be rectified according to these authorities. Cf. also the anecdotes, which are probably derived from the lost portions of Bayhaqî’s great work, in Nişâm al-Mulk, Sêyidâ-nâma (Schefer), 206
"ALÜCK [see al-ŻUQQ].

AL-ÂLIŞI, name of a family which included a large number of savants of Baghdad in the 19th and both centuries. The name is derived from Alûs, a place situated on the west bank of the Euphrates, between Abû Kamâl and Ramâdî; according to family tradition, the ancestors of the Âlûs (whose descent is traced back to al-Âsâs and al-Âsâsan) fled there to escape from the Mongol conqueror Hûlâdî; their descendants only returned to Baghdad in the 11th/12th century. Among the numerous representatives of this family who have added lustre to the cultural and political history of Iraq are:

(1) ʿÂBD AL-LÂH SHÂH AL-DÎN, forefather of the family (d. 1246/1830).

(2) ʿABDULLAH ʿABDALLAH AL-DÎN (1217-70/1802-54), son of the preceding; he was muftî of Baghdad for several years, but was also an outstanding professor, thinker and polemist. Among his numerous works are: Fikrîyâ, a treatise on the Kurân, Bûlûk 1301-70/1883-92, 9 vols.; commentaries on grammar and prosody and attempts at makâmât; his doctrinal arguments are contained in al-Risâlât al-Lâmîyya (ed. 1301/1883) and al-Âgiwîdâ al-Ârâbiyya ʿan al-Âsâs al-Ârâniyya (Istanbul 1317). The account of his voyage to Istanbul in 1267-81/1851-2, after his dismissal from his post as muftî, provided the material for there comments on grammar and prosody and attempts at makâmât; his doctrinal arguments are contained in al-Risâlât al-Lâmîyya (ed. 1301/1883) and al-Âgiwîdâ al-Ârâbiyya ʿan al-Âsâs al-Ârâniyya (Istanbul 1317).

(3) ʿÂBD AL-RÂHMAN, brother of the preceding, (d. 1284/1867); a muftî at Baghdad, he was called "the Ibn al-Dîwân of his age and the Ibn Nubâta of his generation".

(4) ʿÂBD AL-ḤAMîD, brother of the preceding, (1232-1324/1816-2006); professor and waṣîf, author of some verse and a Najâr al-Laʿâlî ʿalâ Naṣr al-Mâmîlî.

(5) ʿÂBD ALLAH BÂHÂ AL-DÎN, elder brother of (2) (1248-91/1442-95); Bûsî of Basra, author of a small treatise on grammar, two texts on logic and a commentary on a treatise on mysticism.

(6) ʿÂBD AL-BÂKî SÂD AL-DÎN, brother of the preceding (1250-93/1834-76); Bûsî of Kirkûk in 1292/1875; he wrote mainly commentaries on or adaptations of manuals on grammar or scansion, and a guide to the pilgrimage, Awdâl Manâhîd ilâ Maʿrîjat Mandâš al-Nâdîrî (Ith, Cairo 1277).

(7) MUHAMMAD EIBA AL-DÎN ABU ʿALÂ BÂRÂKÂRÊT, brother of the preceding (1252-1317/1836-97), professor and waṣîf; a defence of Ibn Taymiyya, Dîdîlî ʿalâ Aynîyâ ilâ ʿalâ Muḥâšâma bayn al-Ahmâdîn, which caused a great sensation. He wrote two other polemical works, al-Dîmâdî al-Ârâbî (against the Christians), and Shahâsâ al-Nûmânî fî Ruṣâ al-Nâdûs al-Sulaâyîn; his sermons and exhortations were collected in his Khâtât al-Mawlî, a work of great length which exists in several editions.

(8) MUHAMMAD HÂMÎD, brother of the preceding (1262/1846-1290/1873-4).

(9) ÂHMAD SHÂHî, brother of the preceding (1264/1848-1330/1911-2), Bûsî of Basra.

(10) MUHAMMAD SHUKRI, known also as MUHAMMAD AL-DîN-ZÂDÎ, son of (9) (27 December 1273/14 May 1857); Shawkâl 1324/1867; the best known of his family, a fact which is partly due to the zeal of Muhammad Bahâdî al-Âthârî in publishing his works. He wrote some 50 works on history, fikrî, biography, lexicography, rhetoric and dogmatic controversy; on history, the most noteworthy are the Bulûg al-Ârâb â Maʿrîjat Ahsâl al-Ârâb (printed in 1313/1896), a history of the Arabs of the ghdâtîyya compiled in answer to a question raised at the Oriental Congress (1889), and Taʾrîkh Nadîjî (Cairo 1343); on biography, al-Misk al-Âdâfî (Baghdâd 1348/1930) on the savants of Baghdad in 12th-13th centuries; on dialectology, Awdâl al-Âwâmm fi Minâdît al-Sâlâm; on controversy, a series of violent polemics against Shiʿîsm, against the Rûfīyya Order, in support of the neo-Hanbalî law reform, etc., notably the Ghâyât al-Mâmâni, published under a pseudonym (Cairo 1327). He was one of the most vigorous representatives of modern Islam, striving by means of the written and spoken word and by his example to combat bidâʿa, and he may be regarded as one of the leaders of the Salafiyya movement. 

(11) ʿALLÂ AL-DÎN ʿÂLI, son of (7) (d. 1340/1921); a professor; his only work is a manual on grammar in verse; a collection of biographies is not completely

(12) MUHAMMAD DARWÎS, son of (9) (d. after 1340/1922); professor and preacher; he wrote several unpublished works.

Bibliography: Mahmûd Shihâb al-Dîn al-Âlîsî, Rûh al-Maʿâmî, i, Preface; Mahmûd Shukri al-Âlîsî, al-Misk al-Âdâfî, i, 3-59; Broekelmann, II, 498, ii, 785-89; Muhammad Bahâdî al-Âthârî, Âlam al-Ârâb, 7th, 1-58; Muhammad Shâhî al-Suwarî, Lubb al-Âlîbâ, ii, 218-24, 2130-33; Sarkis, col. 3-8; Ziriklî, al-Âlâmî, iii, 1013-14; ʿAbd al-Hâyy al-Kittânî, Fikrîs, i, 97, ii, 84; Dî: Zaydân, Taʾrîkh ʿÂdîd al-Lugha al-Ârâbiyya, iv, 285; idem, Mashdhir al-Lugha al-Ârâbiyya, i, 49-51, 139-41; L. Cheikho, ʿAlî, son of (7) (d. 1340/1921); a sabrî, son of (4) (29 Ramadan 1273/14 May 1277); kâfî, son of (5) (d. 1343); on biography, the most noteworthy are the Millât al-Âthârî, ii, 77-77; Sandîbî Aʿydn al-Baydân, 99-110; ʿUmar al-Dâiki, Fi ʿl-Âdâb al-Âdâfîhî, i, 49-51; L. Cheikho, Litt., ii, 218-24, 2130-33; al-Misk al-Âdâfî, i, 73, 85-6, 93, 97; H. Pêrêz, Litt. et art. islam., 74-5; L. Massignon, in RMM, 1924, 244-6 (see also xxxvi, 320 ff. and iii, 254); Lughad al-Ârâbî, iv, 343-6, 399-402; Magh., i, 865-69, 1066-71; I. Goldather, Zährînîen, 188, 190; Naṭîm al-Hîmî, Taʾrîkh ʿÂdîd al-Kurân, in MIMA, xxix, 420-22. (H. Pêrêz)

ALWA, name of a Nubian people and kingdom. The kingdom was adjacent to that of Makurra (q.v.) a little below the confluence of the White Nile and the Atbara and stretched southwest well beyond the confluence of the White and Blue Nile; its capital was Sôba, near the modern Khatûm. The Christian kingdom preserved its independence even after the fall of the kingdom of the Makurra and only disappeared in the beginning of the 10th/16th century under the pressure of Arab tribes allied to the Fundjî. (See also NÛBA, and AL-ÂLN.)

ALWAH — CAMADIYA

ALWAND [see AK SOYUNLU],
ALWAND KCH or KUH-I ALWAND (£LWEND),

is an isolated mountain group lying to the south of Hamadhān, and rising to a height of 11,717 feet. To the north and north-east the Alwand Kuh drops steeply off to the plain; to the north-west it is united to the Kūh-i Dā'im al-Barf, a mountain-mass of almost equal height, which is joined to the Kūh-i Almu Kulakh by lower mountain-chains. The latter forms the north-western extremity of the entire Alwand system. The core of the real Alwand consists of granite, judging from the geological formation; only at the base is there to be found isolated red clay of salt formation. Wild rocky precipices, bare cliffs and gorges alternate with fertile mountain pasturages; up to nearly 7,500 feet the southern slopes are clad with groves of walnuts, mulberries and fruit trees. The Alwand Kuh is noted for its abundant water-supply. Mustawfi observes (Nuzhat al-Kulub, Bombay 1921, 153) that in addition to the spring which rises on the highest peak, no fewer than 42 streams flow from this central portion of the mountain chain, some of which are tributaries of the Tigris, others turning eastwards, flow to the interior of Iran. As the result of the plentiful irrigation by the Alwand streams the plain of Hamadhān has always been considered as the most highly favoured region of Iran. Hamadhān itself, the old Ekbatana, which is built in terraces along the foot of the mountain was a favourite summer residence for the Achaemenids kings on account of its cool, lofty position (1860 metres). Two cuneiform inscriptions dating from Darius I and Xerxes I still remain as vestiges of ancient Persian times at a place named Gangi Namah (= treasure-house) on the slope of the Alwand Kuh at a height of 7,000 feet.

Oriental writers relate many legends but few facts concerning the Alwand Kuh. (They mention a source on the summit of the mountain as one of the sources of paradise—probably following old beliefs concerning the locality; cf. Jackson, Persia Past and Present, 146, 170-3.) Al-Kazwim (682 = 1283) gives the best account; he names it Kuh Arwand. Yakut also uses the name Arwand, whereas other Arabian writers employ the later term Alwand (Mustawfi: Alwand Kuh). The Old Persian name Aruanda (Avesta and Pāzand: Arwand) appears in Greek writers (Polybios, Ptolemy, Diodorus) in the form Ὄρους. In Old Armenian the word is found as the name of persons in the form Erwand (Arwand); apart from occasional quotations in general works, in such special anthologies of the genre as Ibn Sa나ţ al-Mulk's Dār al-Tird (ed. Rikaby, nos. 1, 30, 34), Ibn Bughā'is 'U'dat al-Khāli, Ibn al-Khulj's Diayk al-Tawshi (ch. ii), and al-Ṣafādi's Tawshi (nos. 144, 164; for the last two, cf. S. M. Stern, in Arabic, 1955, 150 ff.). MSS of his muwashshah poetry, are to be found in London and Cairo (see Brockelmann, i, 320, 5 L 480), but he is mainly famous as one of the great masters of muwashshah poetry. His muwashshahs are preserved, apart from occasional quotations in general works, and containing classical poetry, are to be found in London and Cairo (see Brockelmann, ii, 392; H. Petermann, Bibliography: The Imperial Gazetted: The Rajputana Gazetted; Government of India Ministry of States, White Paper on Indian States, Delhi 1950.

( P. HARDY)

AMA [see 'ABD].

AL-ʿAMĀ AL-TUTIĪL, "the blind man of Tudela", ABO 'L-'ABBĀS (or ABU ḪABAR) AHMAD B. ʿABD ALLĀH B. HURAYSRA AL-TUTI (OR AL-KAYS), HISPANO-ARABIC POET, B. IN TUDELA, BUT BROUGHT UP IN SEVILLE; D. 525/1130-1. MSS of his diwān, containing classical poetry, are to be found in London and Cairo (see Brockelmann, i, 320, 5 L, 480), but he is mainly famous as one of the great masters of muwashshah poetry. His muwashshahs are preserved, apart from occasional quotations in general works, and containing classical poetry, are to be found in London and Cairo (see Brockelmann, ii, 392; H. Petermann, Poësie andalouz, index, s.v. L'Aveugle de Tudèle.

(S. M. STERN)

'AMADIYA, a town in Kurdistan, at about 100 km. north of Mosul in the basin of the Gara river (a right tributary of the Great Zāb). The town stands on a hill and is dominated by the citadel carved out by the Alawīs.
AMÁDIYA — AMAL

ii/2, 114-5). Less probable is its attribution to the Buyid 'Imad al-Dawla (d. in 338/949, see Nuzhat al-Kalb, 105.) The original form of the name is, therefore, 'Amadiyya, but the modern pronunciation is 'Amadiya.

'Amadiya had Kurdish princes of the Bahdini family, originary of a place called Tārūn (cf. Hoffmann, Auszüge, 222) in the territory of the Shams al-Dīnān (Shamāndīn). Sharaf al-Dīn, 1, 106-15, traces their arrival back to circa 600/1203. In its heyday the principality comprised a number of adjoining territories ('Akr Shūk, Dahīk and even Zakho). The later Bahdini shifted between the Şafawids and the Ottomans and were finally incorporated by the latter, under whom 'Amadiya was reckoned now to the wilayat of Wān and now to that of Mawṣīl. Since the settlement of the Mosul question in 1926 'Amadiya has formed part of 'Īrāq.

Bibliography: Yākūt, iii, 717; K. Ritter, Erdkunde, ix, 717-20, 727; xi, 590 ff.; E. Reclus, Nouv. géogr. univ., ix, 430; G. Hoffmann, Auszüge aus syrischen Akten persischer Mārtyrer, Leipzig 1880, 203, 219 ff.; M. Hartmann, Bohtān (= Mitteil. der Berliner Vorderasiat. Gesellschaft, 1897-1908), 10, note 2; 62, note 1, 107; (M. Rousseau), Description du Pacthali, Paris 1908, 198 ff. and elsewhere (see index, 335); H. A. Layard, Nineveh and its remains 1854, i, 157-62; Sanderczki, Reise nach Mosul und Urmiya, iii, 275 ff.; Thielmann, Streifzüge im Kaukasus, 1875, 250; Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie, ii, 795; Le Strange, 92 f.; Sir A. Wilson, Mesopotamia 1917-20, London 1930, index.

AMAL (Ar.) 1. Amal, performance, action, is usually discussed by the speculative theologians and philosophers only in connection with belief (see ʿilm, Iman) or with ʿilm and nazar. From Hellenistic tradition was known the definition of philosophy as the "knowledge of the nature of things and the doing of good" (cf. Maṣāḥith, ed. van Vloten, 131 f.). Many Muslim thinkers have emphasised the necessity or at least the desirability of this combination (cf. Goldziher, Kitāb Maʿdīn al-ʿUlum, 54*-60*). But it is the intellectualism of the Greek philosophy, in ethics, only briefly mentioned and two theoretical, which are discussed more fully. The activity of the vegetable and animal soul is practical as is that of the soul of man, i.e. the reasoning soul, in so far as the latter chooses not only the useful but also the beautiful and prepares itself for the goals placed before it in this life. The theoretical faculties are of a higher rank. Beginning with sensual perception (animal soul) theoretical reason advances beyond the material world and rises to the intellectual sphere. Practical reason is only servile, theoretical however is independent (cf. al-Fārābī's Musteraṭṭa, [Arabic] ed. Dieterici, 47).

In conclusion it may be mentioned that the philosophers following Aristotle divided sciences into theoretical (nasāʿīyya) and practical (ʿamalīyya). The latter are ethics, economics and politics.

Bibliography: A. J. Wensinck, The Muslim Creed, Cambridge 1932, s. index, s.v. Works; and Tj. de Boer, Ethics and Morality (Muslim), in Hastings' Enc. of Religion and Ethics. (Tj. de Boer)

2. Amal (and the pl. aʿmāl), "that which is practised" and, following the usage of Kurʿān and ḥadīth, "the works". It is opposed complementarily to nazar [q.v.], speculative knowledge, and must be distinguished from fiʿli [q.v.] (pl. aṭfāl), acts. Amal signifies the moral action in its practical context and, secondarily, the practical domain of "acting". In the terminology of falsafa, al-ʿilm al-ʿamāli is practical knowledge, which comprises, according to the list given by Ibn Khuzami (Mafštīḥ al-ʿUlum), ethics, domestic economy and politics, thereby reproducing an Aristotelian distinction. This then is a notion which applies to the "foreign sciences". It was used and developed in falsafa, particularly in distinguishing the "practical" and the "theoretical intellect". Concurrently, the idea of ʿamal šāliḥ, a morally good action, synonymous with maʿrūf, became current in Islam. But the Risāla al-Laduniyya (a text usually attributed to al-Ghazzālī) introduced the distinction between speculative knowledge (here ʿilm) and practical knowledge (ʿamāl) as regards revealed knowledge (ʿilm šarīʿ) itself, and it is canon law (jihād) which is called an ʿamali science. When works on kalām consider the nature of faith (imān) and its relationships to Islam, the "external works" required by the Law are commonly termed ʿamāl. Ibn Ḥazm does the same. (Aṯfāl, on the other hand, is commonly used in order to describe the human acts when discussing the question of free will.) Al-Ghazzālī, especially in the Iḥyāʾ, when speaking of the faith, follows the usage of kalām with regard to the meaning of the term ʿamal and its plural ʿamāl. He considers as permissible the following definition: imān is equivalent to the sum of inward assent (Īsādīk), verbal confession (bāwl) and works (aʿmāl).

Bibliography: Mafštīḥ al-ʿUlum, Cairo 1342, 79) al-Risālah al-Laduniyya, Cairo 1355/1354, 31; Iḥyāʾ ʿUlum al-Dīn, Cairo 1353, 1, 103 ff.; see also the Fisal of Ibn Ḥazm and the treatises of kalām, chap. on al-ʿamāl waʿl-akīmām. (L. Gardet)

3. Amal, "judicial practice": The problem of "jurisprudence" as a source of law has arisen at every period and in every province of Islam. But Morocco has provided the best facilities for studying it, since the discovery there by L. Milliot in 1917 of an ʿamal which has regulative force. In Andalusia, despite controversy, there prevailed a tendency to require judges to follow "practica of Cordova". Jurisprudence entered into compendia of "formularies" (waṭḥāʾīk), "responsa" (fāṣāda) and even "regulations" (bawānim). Part of this material was incorporated in a late manual, the Ṭuḥfā of Ibn ʿAṣiṣ (d. 829/1426), which was destined to have
a great success in Morocco, where the evolution was
determined by local conditions.

At Fez, the jurisdiction of the kādīs was combined with
the action of municipal authorities, and had
to take into consideration special customs. The
resultant of this complicated procedure, once set
down in writing, was precisely the ʿamal, which
found a recognised place in the system from the
end of the 9th/10th century. A short guide to
procedure, the Lāmiyya of ʿAli al-Zābkhāk (d.
Shawwāl 1202/March 1907), expressed already
the technical aspect of the problem. Fikhl is above
all an “art” in the service of orthodoxy and of
urban economy. At the same time, it reflects the
difficulties met with in the existence of unusual
practices, or even what we should call customary
laws. Ahmad b. al-Kāfī (960 — Safar 1025/1522 —
Feb.-March 1612) expounds a Mālikī ʿamal. Al-
ʿArabī al-Fāṣī (6 Shawwāl 488 — 14 Rabīʿ II, 1052/ 14 Nov. 1558 — 12 July 1642) sanctions the
evidence of the kāfīf, “unsifted” witnesses, which emanates
neither from “virtuous men” [cf. adl] nor from professionals,
but from the “man in the street”, and relies therefore on the inherent integrity of the “group” (djamāʿa). This innovation, which was not
imbibed with conditions in rural areas, provoked controversy. Similarly the safīka which, by sanctioning the validity of a sale concluded by a joint
owner, demonstrated the solidarity of the rural family,
was the subject of a work by Māhmmād b. Ahmad Mayyāra (15 Ramaḍān 999 — 3 Dīnān dū, 1072/7 July 1561 — 24 January 1662).

In the second half of the 11th/17th century, ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Fāṣī (17 Dīnān dū, 1040-16 Dīnān dū, 1171-21 Jan. 1662) collected
together several hundred rules in a mnemonic poem
called al-ʿAmal al-Fāṣī. This work, which acquired
at least three commentaries, has given its name to a
whole class of literature. There is also a “general
practice” (amāl mustāb), and especially a Southern practice which, being based on an irregular local system, has great documentary value. An important
part in its formulation was played by the kādī ʿAbbās al-Suktānī (d. 1662/1654) and by the jurists origi-
nating from the old intellectual centres in the Sūs
and influenced by the spiritual movement which developed round the ṣawwās, such as Dīlāʾ and particularly Tamgrūt.

Under the title of “opinions” (adjudīmāt), “judg-
ments” (ʿabbāmāt) or “precedents” (nawāsīr), each
doctor reproduced and, on occasion, revised the
contributions of his predecessors. The lack of criticism
of the sources, and the tendency to cover expedient
solutions by the cloak of doctrinal pretexts, make it
difficult to trace the evolution of ideas, as well as
of this voluminous branch of legal literature as a
whole. Nevertheless, European scholarship, justly
impressed by the continuity and by the practical
value of this literature, is inclined to regard it as
tending to the creation of a positive law. This thesis
has been propounded in a masterly fashion by
L. Milliot. On its part, Moroccan exegesis reduces
ʿamāl to a purely technical plane; when local
customs require it, the kādī has the right to prefer
the “isolated” or “anomalous” opinion (ddālah) to the
“predominant” opinion (mākhāl). This right, limited
by numerous conditions and differentiations, is therefore apt to produce only temporary and isolated solutions. In fact, ʿamāl is virtually a prag-
matic law. But it remains subject to doctrinal criticism which can at any moment revoke it. It is
nevertheless of considerable interest to historians,
to whom it offers factual information, too often
neglected by the chroniclers, and a many-sided
documentation on the development of Moroccan law.

Bibliography: Dogmatic theory of juris-
prudence: Karafī, al-Iḥām fi Tarnīs al-Fāṣī al-
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Sultan Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allāh to systematize
legal practice: ʿAbbās b. Ibrāhīm, ʾIḥām, v. 1358,
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Zābkāk, Lāmiyya, with a commentary by ʿUmar
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1927; ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. ʿAbd al-جادīr al-
Fāṣī, Al-ʿAmal al-Fāṣī, with a commentary by
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Ahmad b. Yāḥyā al-Wangīṣī (d. 914/1509),
the compiler of a legal encyclopedia, the Mīsār;
Muḥammad called al-Kāṭīb al-Mīkānī (835-917)
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(1042-1133/1632-1720); Muḥammad al-Madīqisī
(d. 1139/1726-7); ʿAbd b. ʾIsā al-Alāmī (12th/18th
century); al-Mahdī al-Wazzāmī (1666-1742/885-
1824), author of a new Mīsār. In the South;
the works of ʾIsā al-Suktānī; the “Pole” Muḥam-
mad b. ʾAbd al-Daʾrī (d. 1085/1674-5); ʿAbd al-
ʾAbbāsī (d. 1152-1739-40); Ahmad al-Rasmūkī
(d. 1133/1720-21).

The theory of ʿamāl as positive law was ex-
pounded for the first time by L. Milliot, Démom-
transmissions du havr, Paris 1918, 22-30, with
translation of a passage from Sidjīlmāsī’s com-
mentary on the ʿamāl, 109-17; idem, Recueil de
jurisprudence chrétienne, Paris 1920-23, 3 vol.,
in section iv of the Introduction; idem, La con-
ception de l’État et de l’ordre légal dans l’Islam,
Paris 1949, 644-47. The most recent summary of
L. Milliot’s ideas is contained in his preface to vol.
iv of Recueil de jurisprudence chrétienne,

For Moroccan doctrines on ʿamāl: Ahmad b.
ʿAbd al-ʾAţīz al-Hillī (d. 1275/1661); ʾAbd al-
Bisār, lith. Fez 1309, fasc. i-fasc. ii, 6; al-Mahdī
al-Wazzānī, Hādiyya on the Lāmiyya, Cairo 1349,
330-38; idem, ʾArād ʿal-ʾAmal al-Fāṣī, lith. Fez
n.d. ii, 22-27; Muḥammad al-Kādīrī, Raʾl-ʾIbāʾa
wa ʾl-Malām ʾamman ʿalāʾ al-ʾAmal bi l-ʿaladīsī:
šāhīdīyān barām, n. p. 1308, 7-10, 17-20; Muḥam-
mad al-Hādījī, Al-Fīkhr al-Sāmī, iv, Fez, n.d
229 ff., trans. J. Berque, Essai, 126-29; also cf
ibid., 63 ff.). (J. Berque)
4. *Amal as a legal and economic term, denotes the labour, as opposed to capital; as such, it occurs in the discussion of a number of contracts, e.g. ḥajar (hire), mudarabah (or birad, sleeping partnership), muddābīt and mustārā (agricultural partnerships); [q.v.]. It also denotes the performance of an act or a duty (opp. nīyya, “intention”); hence Suyūtī’s [q.v.] *Amal al-Yawm wa’l-Layla (“Acts to be performed every day and night”); Brockelmann, II, 190, no. 113, and its Shi’ite counterpart, *Amal al-Yawm w’al-Layla w’al-Usbu’ w’al-Shuhur al-Sana (“Acts to be performed every day and night, week, month and year”) by Muhammad al-Isfahānī (Brockelmann, S.II, 795, no. 16), and the tradition al-‘amal bil-nīyyat, “acts are valid according to the intention” (cf. Goldziher, Vorlesungen, 45, Vorlesungen, 41). (Ed.)

AMALI [see TADRIS].

‘AMALIK (or ‘AMALKA), the Amalekites of the Bible. Not mentioned in the Kur‘an, this ancient people is connected by Muslim literary tradition to the genealogical table in Genesis x, either to Shem (through Lud-Lūwush or Arpakhshad), or to Ham. They take the place of the Philistines (the people of Dālīlit-Goliath) and of the Midianites (Balaam persuaded them to incite the Israelites to debauchery), and the Pharaohs are alleged to be of their race. On the other hand, in the mythical pre-Islamic history of Arabia and in the legendary cycle of the Yamamite migrations, they are listed among the first tribes speaking the Arabic tongue, with Tasm, Dżāsir and Thamūd. At the time of Hūd, they lived in the Ḥijāz, but the same prophet is supposed to have preached to them in Babel. Ishmael’s first wife, who was repudiated, was an Amalekite. Their moral corruption merited their destruction. The evil deeds of King ‘Amalik belong to the folklore concerning *jus primae noctis.* Joshua fought against them, and the establishment of Jewish tribes at Ṭāhirīb is said to be an unforeseen result of the war of extermination waged on them by Joshua’s order, but not fully carried out. David also made war on them. Reference is also made to an Amalekite settlement in the Yamâm. Even the confused memories of the Palmyrene empire of Odenathus and Zenobia have been associated with the Amalekites. Nöldeke has clearly shown that apart from the confused biblical references, there is no historical basis to these accounts.

Bibliography: Ibn Hishām, Sīra, (Wüstenfeld), 5; al-Tijān, Hyderabad, 137/1928, 29 ff.; 45 ff.; Tabarī, I, 213, 771, 1131; Aḥqāfī, iii, 12-3; xiii, 109; xix, 94; Malāʿūdī, Mūrūdī, ii, 293; ii, 91, 104, 270, 273 ff.; Kisāʿī (I. Eisenberg), 102, 144 ff., 241; Thālabī, *Ardīs al-Majdūlās*, Cairo 1370/1951, 62, 82. A useful résumé of most of legends is in Caussin’s *Documents sur la diplomatie musulmane*, Paris 1935, with bibliography. The relevant letters, whether genuine or not, from the Prophet, the first Caliphs and their commanders (cf. M. Hamidullah, *Documents sur la diplomatie musulmane*, Paris 1935, with bibliography) are almost exclusively concerned with the granting of permanent security, which is acquired either by conversion to Islam or by political submission to the Islamic state (cf. Aḥl al-Dhimma); at least one reference to safe conducts for foreign travellers exists (Ibn Sa’d, i/2, 37), but *amān* in its later technical meaning was not, as yet, distinguished from the general concept of dhimma. This distinction was made when the religious law of Islam was elaborated. *Amān*, in Islamic religious law, is a safe conduct or pledge of security by which a hārbi or "enemy alien", i.e. a non-Muslim belonging to the dīr al-harb [q.v.], becomes protected by the sanctions of the law in his life and property for a limited period. Every free Muslim, man or woman, who is of age, and according to most doctrines even a slave, is qualified to give a valid *amān*, either to an individual or to a restricted number of hārbis. The *imād* alone is qualified to give an *amān* to undetermined groups, such as the population of a whole city or territory, or to all traders. An *amān*, properly given, is valid whether the fundamental state of war exists between the Muslims and the community to which the hārbi in question belongs, or whether it has for the time being been suspended by treaty or truce. It can be given verbally in any language, or by an intelligible sign. The *musta’mīn* has the right to go, with his property, to his “place of safety”, where he is not exposed to immediate attacks by the Muslims, when his *amān* expires (or earlier), or at the latest one lunar month (according to the Shāhī’s: four months) after the grant of the *amān*, unless he prefers to stay in Islamic territory under the status of the aḥl al-dhimma. Diplomatic envos who are known or are taken to identify themselves as such, automatically enjoy *amān*; but that is not true of traders or of shipwrecked persons. During his stay in Islamic territory, the *musta’mīn* is, generally speaking, assimilated to the dhimmi as far as civil law is concerned; as regards criminal law, the doctrine hesitates, with many variants on details, between subjecting him to the *ḥadd* punishments applicable to the dhimmi or making him only civilly responsible; in any case, if the *musta’mīn* acts against the interest of the Muslims or otherwise misbehaves, the *imād* may terminate his *amān* and deport him to his “place of safety”. The corresponding safe conduct given by the hārbi to a Muslim in their territory, is not called *amān* but *iḍān* (permission).
In practice, letters of amān for individuals are attested from the late Umayyad period (104-108/723-726) onwards. The oldest grants of amān proper, given to whole groups for the purpose of travel or trade, are contained in the treaties between the Muslim administrators of Egypt and the Nubians and the Bedja, of 31/651-2 and 104-116/722-734 respectively. Formularies of a later period are found in al-Kalkashandi, Subh al-‘Aqd, xili, 321 ff. (summarized in Björkman, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Staatshaushaltes im islamischen Ägypten, Hamburg 1928, 170 f.). Al-Kalkashandi mentions, too, the issue of letters of amān by the Muslim political authorities to Muslims and gives examples, mostly from the later period. These are free pardons issued to rebels, and they are, strictly speaking, superfluous or even incompatible with religious law. They were, nevertheless, issued frequently, and the historians provide numerous examples of this kind of amān, which was on occasion unscrupulously broken, from the early ‘Abbāsid period onwards. The institution of the regular amān, on the other hand, made not only diplomatic relations (cf. M. Canard, Deux épisodes des relations diplomatiques arabes-byzantines au Xe siècle, in B Ét. Or., xili, 51-69) but trade between the Islamic and the Christian world down to the middle of the 6th/12th century possible, and letters of amān were regularly granted to traders and pilgrims. It has been suggested that the Islamic doctrine of amān was elaborated, on an old Arabian and Islamic basis, under the influence of the corresponding rules of Roman Byzantine law. From the end of the 6th/12th century onwards, coinciding with the increase in trade across the Mediterranean, the institution of amān was in practice superseded by state treaties between Christian and Islamic powers, which gave the strangers more security and rights. There are natural similarities in details, even the term amān is sometimes used in the Arabic versions of the treaties, and the Muslim scholars, when called upon to give fa’isās on questions arising out of them, naturally thought only in terms of amān (cf. A. S. Ahmad, An Unpublished X/11th Century Fa’isā, in Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Nahen und Fernen Ostens [P. Kahle Festschrift], Leiden 1935, 55-68). Nevertheless, these treaties, which later gave rise to the Capitulations (cf. imtīyāz), did not develop out of the Islamic concept of amān, but represent a type of treaty which had already come into being between the trading cities of Italy and the Byzantine Empire and the states of the Crusaders (cf. R. Brunschwig, La Berberie orientale sous les Hafsides, Paris 1966). The date of its composition is posterior to that of Bagh o-Bahār. He was stimulated to this literary activity by the Director of the Fort William College, Dr. J. B. Gilchrist (d. 1841). The writings of Mir Amān are generally reckoned among those early works which have powerfully contributed to the development of a simple, natural and direct style in Urdu literature.

Mir Amān occasionally wrote poetry under the poetical name of Luṭf; but he did not excel in it and his ghazals seem to have been lost.


AMĀN—AMĀNAT

AMĀN, MIR, (commonly spelt AMAN or AMANAT) (1790-1853), an Indian writer, born at Delhi, who was active at the beginning of the 19th century at the Fort William College, Calcutta. His fame as a graceful writer of Urdu prose rests almost entirely on Bagh o-Bahār, which is an adaptation of the story of the four Dervishes, entitled Ḫiṣṣa Čahār Dārvejeh in its Persian original. It was completed in 1217/1802; and thanks to its plain and perspicuous style, has been widely used as a text-book by Western students of Urdu, and has in consequence been repeatedly printed in India. It has also been translated into English by L. F. Smith under the title of The Tale of the Four Dervishes, Calcutta 1813.

Other translations are due to Duncan Forbes, Hollings and Eastwick. There is also a French translation by Garcin de Tassy, Le jardin et le printemps, poème hindoustani traduit en français, Paris 1878. Another less known work of Mir Amān is Gandh-i Ḥāzī, which is a free translation into Urdu of Aḥḫāb-i Muḥṣīnī, an ethical treatise by Ḥusayn Waṭīr Kāshīfī. The date of its composition is posterior to that of Bagh o-Bahār. He was stimulated to this literary activity by the Director of the Fort William College, Dr. J. B. Gilchrist (d. 1841). The writings of Mir Amān are generally reckoned among those early works which have powerfully contributed to the development of a simple, natural and direct style in Urdu literature.

Mir Amān occasionally wrote poetry under the poetical name of Luṭf; but he did not excel in it and his ghazals seem to have been lost.


AMĀN ALLĀH (see AFGHANISTAN).

AMĀNAT, the poetical name of SAVYID AĞGĀ ḤĀSAN (1231-75/1815-58), a poet of Muslim India, in whom the artificiality and conventionality of the Lucknow school of Urdu poetry reached its culminating point. He began by composing marihīyas or elegies on the tragic death of Ḥusayn the son of ‘All; but soon turned to the ghazal. His poetical compositions have been preserved in two collections, viz., Guldaštā-i Amānāt, compiled in 1264/1847, and his Dīwān, also known as Khāṭām-i Fāṣāhā, collected in 1278 A. H. and published for the first time at Lucknow in 1285 A. H. He also wrote two māshāhs, the second of which is longer (307 stanzas) and of a better literary quality. In the last days of his life, he became inordinately fond of composing

Das islamische Fremdenrecht, Hanover 1925 (supersedes the previous studies, but to be used with caution, cf. Bergsträsser, in Isl. xv, 311 ff.; contains extracts from Zaydl works); M. Hamdullah, Muslim Conduct of State, revised ed., Lahore 1945, 117 ff., 192 f., 200-3; N. Kruse, Islamische Völkerrechtslehre, Göttingen 1953 (not seen); M. Khadduri, War and Peace in the Law of Islam, Baltimore 1955, 162-169, 223 f., 243 f. (J. Schacht)
riddles and enigmas, which seem to have afforded him some sort of mental diversion. He is, however, chiefly remembered for his *Indar Sabhā*, a musical comedy, completed in 1270/1853 and published the next year, along with *Sharḥ Indar Sabhā*, lithographed on the margin. It took the Indian public by storm and became the prototype of many similar plays, written by various authors in subsequent years. In the *Sharḥ*, he reproduces the whole story and also describes the action scene by scene, for those unable to see the play on the stage.


**AMANUS [see ELMA DABHI].**

1. **AMĀRA** (47° 13' E, 32° 50' N), until 1333/1914 the capital of the Turkish sandjak of that name in southern Irāk, has been since 1340/1921 the headquarter town of a liwa of the Irāk kingdom, containing also the dependent saḥās of *All al-Charāb* and Kalva Šalīb. Pleasantly situated on the Tigris about thirty miles from the nearest Persian hills, and potentially rich from the great flood-canals, the abundant crops of rice and dates, and the sheep-breeding of its half marshy and half corn-land territory, ʿAmāra was founded only in 1279/1862 as a Turkish military post to control the ever warring Bānū Lām and Āl Bū Muḥammad tribes. It grew rapidly as a local market and entrepôt, as a centre for the civil administration, as a refuelling station for the river steamers, and as from 1308/1890 as a headquarters for administering the great estates acquired for Sultan ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd II. The town’s main population elements were, and are, Shiʿī and (fewer) Sunnī Muslim Arabs, with communities of Chaldæan Christians, of resident Lurs and Persians, of the “Sabaean” silversmiths, and, until 1370/1950, of Jews. Under the British occupation and Mandate (1333/1915 to 1351/1932) and the Irāk Government the town has expanded and acquired modern buildings, communications and public services; but the particularly difficult problems presented by this district in tribal administration and land-tenure remain largely unsolved.


**AMARKOT, town situated 25° 22' N and 69° 71' E, in the Tharparkar district of West Pakistan (population in 1951: 5,142, including 1,957 Muslims), was, according to tradition, founded by a branch of the Sūmara Rājpūts who embraced Islam during the reign of ʿAllāʾ al-Dīn Khālīdī (694/1294-716/1316). The Sūmras lost the town in 624/1226 to the Sūmras. In 843/1439 the Sodas again came into power. In 940/1532, Humāyūn, after his defeat by Šhr Shāh, sought refuge in Amarkot with the Sūd prince, variously named Bīr Sāl, Prasād or Parsīyā. Akbar was born in Amarkot on 5 Ṣadād 949/23 November 1542. In 999/1590, when ʿAbd al-Rahīm Khān Khān conquered Sind, Amarkot became part of the Mughal Empire, but in 1008/1699 Abu ’l-Kāsim Sūlān, an Afghan prince, displaced the Mughal commander. In 1140/1730 Nūr Muḥammad Kalhoz, the ruler of Sind, expelled the last Sodā chief and took possession of the town. In 1152/1739 Nādīr Shāh, on his way back to Persia after the sack of Delhi, forced Nūr Muḥammad into submission. Later one of the Kāhrās sold the fort to the chief of Djodhpur from whom it was captured by the Tālpūr in 1248/1831, after which it lost its strategic importance. It passed into British possession with the conquest of Sind in 1843. The old fort in which Akbar was born was demolished by Nūr Muhammad in 1746, and it was he who built the present fort. The birth-place of Akbar, about half-a-mile to the north-west of the town, is marked by a stone-slab erected in 1898.


**AL-‘AMASH, ABU MUHAMMAD SULAYMĀN B. MIHRĀN, traditionist and Kūfīn “reader”*. Born in 60/679-680, or 10 Muḥarram 61/10 October 878, of a Persian father, he lived at al-Kūfa and died probably in Rabi’ I 1/148/May 765. He received traditions from al-Zuhri and Anas b. Mālik, and his instructors in hirā’a, were: Ṣītabi, al-Najahi, Yabāy b. Waḥthāh, “Āṣim; Ḥamza was his disciple. His “reading”, which followed the tradition of Ibn Mas’ūd and Ubayy, appeared in the list of “the fourteen”.

A great admirer of ʿAli, he is supposed to have furnished the poet al-Sayyid al-Ḥimyari with the material for the eulogies which he composed in honour of that Caliph.


**AMASYA, town in northern Anatolia and capital of a wilāyet. It preserves the name of Amaseia, under which it was known in antiquity (for its ancient history see Paulus Wissowa, s.v.; F. Cumont, *Studia Pontica*, ii-iii; A. H. M. Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Provinces of the Roman Empire*, index). In 712 it was for a short time occupied by the Arabs (cf. Brooks, in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1898, 193). In the 11th century Amasya came under the dominion of the Dānishmandids, and was annexed with the rest of their territories by the Rūm Sāljiḳ Kılıç Aarslan II. At the division of his kingdom among his sons (588/1339) Amasya fell to Nizām al-Dīn Arghūn Shāh (Ibn Bibi, ed. Houtsou, 5), but was seized by his brother Rukn al-Dīn Sultan. Subsequently it was under Mongol governors, though it came for some time into the hands of Tādż al-Dīn ALTINBAKH, the son of the last Sāljiḳ sultan, Mashūd II. In 742/1341 it was occupied by Ḥābil oglu, and
then passed under the rule of Eretna and his successors. The amir Hadjdii Shadgeldi seized Amasya from the Seljuk emir Eretna-oghlu (Aslarbhadj, Asam, Rasm, 100 ff., 137-40). Subsequently strike broke out between Shadgeldi and his confederate Malik Ahmad on the one side, and Kadjil Burshan al-Din on the other, for the possession of the town (ibidem, 225, 235 ff.). After Shadgeldi's death, his son Ahmad managed, with the help of the Ottoman sultan Bayezid I, to hold Amasya against Burshan al-Din; finally it fell into the hands of Bayezid. After the latter's capture by Tiazur, his son, Mehmed Celebi, succeeded in escaping to Amasya, from which town he started on his campaign against his brothers. Under Ottoman rule Amasya enjoyed the special favour of the ruling house. Bayezid II when crown-prince was the governor of the town; Sulayman I often stayed in it, and received there the Austrian ambassador, Busbecq. Amasya, which had been a cultural centre already in the Seljuk period, became one of the main seats of learning in Anatolia. In the 17th century it was described by Ewliya Celebi and Kadi Celebi. By the end of the 19th century Amasya, lying on the Samsun-Sivas-Kharput road, became an important centre of transit traffic; the Samsun-Sivas railway was completed in 1930. At the end of the 19th century the town had 25,000-30,000 inhabitants (some of them Armenians), in 1940 13,732 (500 non-Turks); the whole wilayet in 1950 had 163,494 inhabitants. Its economy is based on fruit, silk and textiles.

Amasya is situated on the main arm of the Yeshil Irmak (called Tozan or Tokat Suyu), above the confluence of the Tersakan Cay, 400 m. above sea-level, in a narrow and rocky gorge, running from east to west; the gorge widens above and below the town, where its renowned orchards are to be found.

The mountain on the right, southern, side of the river is called Farhād Dagh (local legend makes Farhad the founder of Amasya), while that on the opposite side contains the tombs of the kings of antiquity and the fortress. The most populous quarters and the greater part of the old buildings are in the southern side above and below the town, where its renowned orchards are to be found.

The mountain on the right, southern, side of the river is called Farhād Dagh (local legend makes Farhad the founder of Amasya), while that on the opposite side contains the tombs of the kings of antiquity and the fortress. The most populous quarters and the greater part of the old buildings are in the southern side above and below the town, where its renowned orchards are to be found.

The fortress, of Hellenistic origin, was restored in the Byzantine, Seljuk and Ottoman periods and is described by Ewliya Celebi; now it is in ruins. In the fortress are the ruins of a madrasa built by Kara Mehməd Agha (890/1485) and of a school added by his son Musufa Paşa (917/1511); also ruins of an imaret, a Kbalweh tekkiye and two baths. The mosque called Burmali Minare was originally a Sali- djik foundation; the inscription over the gate bears the name of Kaybhusar II and the date 634/44/ (223-47), but it was repeatedly restored and is now derelict. The same is true of the Gök Madrese, also belonging to the Seljuk period; it was built together with the adjoining türbe, by Sayf al-Din Turuntayy, governor of Amasya, in 666/1266-7. Of the Ottoman mosques, those of Bayezid Paşa (812/1412), of Yürük Paşa (834/1430), of Sultan Bayezid (891/1486), of Mehməd Paşa (891/1486), and the Pazar Djamal (unknown date) deserve mention. There are, furthermore, a lunatic asylum (905/1501), the Emirate of Pir Ilyas (815/1412), the madrasas of Kapı Agha (848/1448) and of Külüb Agha; the türbes of Kbalweh Ghazi (622/1225), of Turuntayy (677/1278), one attributed to Sultan Mas'in, those of Shadgeldi (783/1381), of „Sheh-žade", and of various Ottoman princes; finally the ruins of the palace built for some Ottoman princes (Beyler Saraylı). The monuments of the town have suffered from the earthquakes of 1825 and 1939.


AMAZIGH [see Berbers].

AMBAÌA, town in East Pandjāb, India, situated 30°21' N and 76°52' E, 125 miles from Delhi on the way to Sirhind. The town consists of the old town and the cantonments, four miles away. The population in 1951 was 146,726. Though the neighbourhood of Ambala played an important role in early Indian history, the town itself is first mentioned in the Safar-nâma-i Dāji Ḥasan (Bidjâwar 1909, 2 ff.), according to which it was occupied by the Muslims at the time of the second invasion of India by Mu'tazz al-Din b. Sâm in 587/ 1192. Itutmish (608/1211-56) reported that he had appointed a kadi here. In 781/1379 Piru Tughluk occupied the town together with Sâmanā and Shâhhâbâd. Bâbur camped here on his march to Panipat for the decisive battle of 933/1526. In 956/ 1545 Ambalâ was the scene of a severe engagement between the Niylâz insurgents from the Pandjâb and the Pathân troops under Islâm Shâh Sûr. During the Mughal period the town was a dependency of Sirhind and was a favourite camping ground of the Mughal sultans on their way to Lahore or Kashmir (the place of the camp is still known as Bâdshahi Bagh). It was also a centre of cultural activity. Two of its learned men (Abed al-Kâdir and Nûr Muham- mad) are mentioned in the Maktîbât of Ahmad Sirhindî (i, no. 284, ii, nos. 56, 63, 94, iii, no. 327). A number of madrasas flourished here in the days of Shâhjahân. Sâdîk Muṣṣâlîbî, the compiler of the Aâdâb-i Âlamgiri, a collection of Awrangzib's letters, was a native of Ambala. In 1122/1710 the town was captured by the Sikhs under Banda Bayrâgî. During the anarchy which followed the rout of the Marathas at the hands of Ahmad Shâh Durrânî in 1733/1734 and the infighting among the wards of the Mughal empire, it was occupied in 1763 by the Sikh adventurer Sangat Singh. On his death it passed into the hands of his brother-in-law, Dhyîân Singh, who leased it to Gurbakhsh Singh Kâba; on the latter's death in 1198/1783 his widow, Mâ'd Dayâ Kawr, succeeded him. She was ousted in 1808 by Randît Singh, but re-instated by the British a year later. On her death in 1825 the town was passed into the possession of the East India Company. During the Mutiny the town remained quiet. It took place in 1864 the "Ambala Trials", as an aftermath of the Ambeya campaign against the followers of Ahmad Brîwî. The town is a rail-head, an important military and air base, and has a busy grain market; it is famous for its "durries", or cotton carpets. It has a mosque of the Pathân period and some pillars erected by Shah Shâh Sûr; also the shrines of Haydar Shâh Lakbûkî and Sâtna Tawakkul Shâh, and the congregational mosque, an imitation of the Masjid al-Aksa, deserve mention.

Bibliography: Gazetteer of the Ambala District, 1892-3; Imp. Gaz, of India, 276, 287; Muḥammad

(A. S. Bâzîrîr Ansârî)

**AMBON**, the central island of the South Moluccas, Indonesia. Nearly one half (ca. 25,000) of the population is Muslim, especially in the northern part. Already before the arrival of the Portuguese (1512 A.D.), Islam had been introduced in Hitu, a supply station for the East Javanese spice trade, and in some other villages; according to local tradition, this was done by chiefs who had traveled to East Java, Pasai and Mecca. After the turbulent times of the 16th and 17th centuries the Muslims have remained a stationary, neglected but prosperous community, where the original language and much of the old costumes are preserved.


(J. Noordanuy)

**AMBRA** [see 'ANBAR.]

**ÂMEDDÎ (†),** an official of the central administration of the Ottoman Empire; before the tanîmî, he was directly subordinate to the Reîlî-îl-Kûlâtî; he made copies of reports then by the latter, and also drafted reports on minor matters; in short, he performed all the clerical duties connected with the office of Reîlî-îl-Kûlâtî. Moreover, he was present at meetings between the Reîlî Efendî and ambassadors, and kept official minutes of the proceedings. He, like the Beyîkhî, held the title of Kûlâtî. The name and origin of this office derives from the Persian word amîd meaning "has come, has been obtained", an endorsement on documents acknowledging receipt of the dues payable to the Reîlî-îl-Kûlâtî by newly installed military personnel for their timârs and aîmets. The person making this endorsement was called the Amîdî, and the administrative bureau where the formalities connected with these documents were completed, Amîdî. The terms Amîdî Kûlâtî (secretary to the Amîdî), and Amîdî Kâlemî (the Amîdî department), were also used.

This office seems to have come into being later than the 17th century. After the tanîmî, the office of Amîdî increased in importance and was also known as Amîdî-i Dirân-i Hâmâyûn: its function was to make copies of the documents sent to the sadadet by other ministries and administrative departments which required the sanction of the Pâddâshâh, after resolutions of the Council of Ministers or the Sâdâr-i A'sam; in the case of documents which did not require this formality, its duty was to correct them, register them and send them to the Head Chamber.

Encyclopaedia of Islam

---

**AMÉNOKAL,** the current spelling of the Berber ammâkhal, meaning "any political leader not subordinate to anyone else"; it is applied to foreign rulers, to highranking European leaders, and to the male members of certain noble families; in some regions of the Sahara, the title of ammâkhal is given to the chiefs of small tribal groups, but in the Ahaggar [q.v.], it is only conferred on the overlord of a confederation of noble or subject tribes. The ammâkhal must be selected from among the Ighagaran nobles, and his nomination is submitted for approval to an assembly of the nobles and the chiefs of the subject tribes; political succession is, in principle, established by the virtue of age or authority). Among the Touareg, it is only conferred on the overlord of a confederation of noble or subject tribes. The ammâkhal has a sign of rank a drum (*gëme, see Ch. de Foucauld, *Dict.,* iv, 1922-23), and receives tribute from subject tribal groups. His principal role was that of war leader, but in normal times, he applies the criminal law, settles disputes and concerns himself with relations with neighbouring tribes; he is always assisted by the assembly of notables which ratifies his decisions, and can dismiss him.


(Ch. Pellat)

**AMGHAR,** Berber word corresponding to the Arabic ghâyîkh [q.v.], and meaning "an elder (by virtue of age or authority)". Among the Touareg, it applies to chief of a tribal group who acts as an intermediary between the amnâkhal [q.v.] and his tribe (see Ch. de Foucauld, *Dict. touareg-français*, Paris 1952, ii, 1237; H. Lhote, *Les Touaregs du Hoggar*, Paris 1944, 157-8), or even to the chief of a confederation (cf. H. Bissuel, *Les Touaregs de l'Ouest Algiers 1888, 23). In Kabylia (see A. Hanoteau and L. Letourneau, *La Kabylie et les coutumes kabyles*, Paris 1893, li, 9) and among the Imazighan of Morocco (see G. Surdon, *Institutions et coutumes berbères du Maghreb*, Tangier-Fez 1938, 187-90), the amghar is both the president elected by the ghanda [q.v.] and its executive agent among the tribe or tribal groups which compose it. In the Shûb group in Morocco, the chief elected by the ghanda has the title of mûdîdâm (mukaddâm), and the amghar is more particularly the temporal ruler who owes his authority to force and not to regular election (R.
AMGHAR — AL-AMID1

Montagne, La vie sociale et politique des Berberes

(CH. Pellat)

`AMID [see diyâk bâk].

`AMID (Ar.), title of high officials of the Sâmâni-d-Ghaznavid administration, which the Saljûqids, the inceptors of their institutions and personnel, extended throughout their empire. The word, properly speaking, does not denote a function, but the rank of the class of officials from whom the civil governors, `âmil (as opposed to the military governors, sallâr, shîhâna), were recruited; thus Sîbî b. al-Djâzîl, Mirâd al-Zâmîn, MS Paris 1503, 193 v: “one of the `umâdât” is appointed governor; the same author, supplemented by Ibn al-Aghr, enables one to follow with considerable accuracy the career of the `umâdât of Baghâd at the time of the Great Saljûqids. Some people continued to be known by the title of `amîd after ceasing to be governor; for instance the `Amîd-Khûrûsân Muhammâd b. Mansûr al-Nasawi, a celebrated personage under the rule of the Great Saljûqids; and (according to Ibn Khallûk) the cultured wasir of the Bûyûds Ibn al-`Amîd derived his usual name from his father’s title.

On the other hand Barthold, Turnestan 229, has established that the title `amîd-al-mulk was held under the Sâmânis and Ghaznavids by the sâhib al-barîd; this is supported by various passages, also in the Damiyat al-Kâsir; it is possible that the great wasir of Tughîl-Beg, `Amîd al-Mulk al-Kundart, began his career in this way. Their former title of `amîd was perhaps also kept by wasirs; the famous Djâyâhî Âmîd al-Din in turn was a consequence in point (Ibn Faqîh, ed. Krâphkovsky, i93b).

Under the Bûyûds, the word `amîd is found in compound titles like `amîd al-dawla, `amîd al-dîn, `amîd al-dîyâd. In the 6th/12th century the title still sometimes occurs, even at Baghâd, but it was becoming a rarity at a period when the prerogatives of the civil authorities were being curtailed by the military governors. It does not occur under the Mongols.

It does not seem to have spread to other Muslim countries, which only possessed labâds with `îmâd, `umâda.

Bibliography: All the Arab and Persian chronicles and the collections of letters and poetical anthologies of eastern Persia during the pre-Saljûqid period and of the Saljûqids empire, and Lane.

(C. Caen)

`AMID AL-DIN AL-ABZÂRî AL-ANÎSÂRÎ, Ashâd b. Naṣr, minister and poet, hailing from Abzâr, south of Shahrâz. He was in the service of Sa’îd b. Zangi, atâbeg of Fârs; was sent by his master as an ambassador to Muhammad Khâfirîmshâh, refused the offers which were made to him, succeeded Rukn al-Dîn Salâh Kîrmânî as minister and held his position until the death of Sa’îd. Sa’îd’s son and successor, Abû Bakr, had him arrested on the charge of having held a correspondence with the ruler of Khâfirîm and of having acted as a spy for him. He was imprisoned in the fortress of Ushkunîwân, near Baghdad, and died there at the end of five or six months (Djumâdî I or II 624/April June 1227, after having dictated to his son Tadj al-Dîn Muhammâd an Arabic poem of 111 verses (al-bâsîdîn al-Ushkunwânîyya) in which he deployed his misfortunes and which achieved celebrity as a collection of rhetorical figures.

Bibliography: Mîrkhânî, iv, 174 (= W. Morley, Hist. of the Thabeks, 28); Khânîmâmîr, ii, 4, 129; Wâsîf, 156; Cl. Huart, L’ode arabe d’Ockomad, Recue sémite, 1893; Brockelmann, I, 298, ii, 667, S I, 456. (Cl. Huart)

AL-ÂMIDI, Allî b. Abî Allî b. Muḥ. al-Tâghlîlî Sayf al-Dîn, Arab theologian, born at Âmîd in 551/1156-7; at first a Hanbalite, he later, at Baghâd, entered the ranks of the Shî’îs; he embarked on a study of philosophy which he continued in Syria, became a teacher at the madrasa of al-Kârâfa al-Sûghrâ adjoining the mausoleum of al-Shâfî in Cairo, and in 592/1195-6 became professor at the Djâmî al-Zâfîr. His intellectual powers and his knowledge of the “rational sciences” (sâhiyya) gave him a brilliant reputation, but caused him to be accused of heresy and to flee to Hamâ, where he placed himself at the service of the Ayûbîd sovereign al-Malik al-Manşûr (615/1218-9); on the death of the latter he was summoned to Damascus by al-Malik al-Mu’âzžam who conferred on him the chair of the madrasa al-Âzîzîyya (617 1220-1); he was dismissed from this post after 629/1229 by al-Malik al-Âghrîf for having taught philosophy. He died at Damascus in Šânîr 635/1233.

His numerous works relate to theology (Âkbâr al-Aḥkâr, in MS, a refutation of philosophers, Muṭâzîlites, Sabeans, Manîchêans); the sources of the law (Ikhâm al-Hukkâm fî Usûl al-Ahkâm, dedicated to al-Mu’aṣṣâm, Cairo 1347, summarized in the Munâkha al-Su‘âl, Cairo, n.d.); the art of controversy (Djâtal-Malik al-Mu’âzžam who conferred on him the chair of the madrasa al-Âzîzîyya (617 1220-1); he was dismissed from this post after 629/1229 by al-Malik al-Âghrîf for having taught philosophy. He died at Damascus in Šânîr 635/1233.


(D. Sourdel)

AL-ÂMIDI, Rukn al-Dîn Abû Ḥamîd Muḥammad b. Muḥ. al-Sâmâkandî, Hanâfî lawyer, d. on 9 Djumâdî II 615/3 Sept. 1218 in Baghâd. His chief merit lies in the art of dialectics, which he treated in his al-İrshåd and his al-Tarîkh al-Âmîdîyya fî l-.Dirâs wa’l-Djâdal (in MS).

His name is connected with the translation of an Indian work on Yoga, called Amîtal-kundå. Of this work there exists an Arabic translation, under the title of Mirzâl al-Mu’âzînî li-Dârâl al-Âlim al-İncînî, the various MSS of which offer a slightly divergent text. It was published on the basis of five MSS (which are not all those extant) by Yusuf Husain, in JA, 1928, 291 ff. Persian and Turkish versions also exist. (Cl. also M. de Guignes, in Mémoires de l’Academie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, ancienne série, xxvi, 791; J. Gildemeister, Script. ar. de rebus indicis, i, 185; W. Pertsch, in Festgnschr. an Rohl, 1953, 169-12). In the preface a story is told of a certain Bâhûcârah Brahman Yogi, who came from Kamrûp (modern Assam) to Lakhâwî under the government of Allî b. Mârdân (ca. 605/1208) and was converted to Islam by Rukn al-Dîn al-Sâmâkandî; Rukn al-Dîn in his turn learned from him the practices of the Yoga, and according to the version in some of the MSS, translated the book into Persian and then into Arabic. The account, which is moreover coupled with another, different one, does not, however, throw full light on the true history of the translation of the work and more especially on al-Âmîdî’s share in it.
Bibliography: Ibn Khallikan, no. 575; Ibn Kutlubugha, Tādż al-Tardīm (Fliigel), 171; Sa’dī, Bahā'ī, i, 216; Sa’dī, Dīwān, svv. Irshād, al-Tarīkha, Mīr Dāl al-Mā‘ānī; Brockelmann, I, 568, S 1, 785.

(S. M. Stern)

‘āmil (pl. ‘ammāl) signifies tax-collector, agent, prefect. As the verbal adjective corresponding to ‘amīl (see ‘amāl, section 1), ‘amīl denotes the Muslim who performs the works demanded by his faith, and is often used in conjunction with the term ‘ālim (pl. ‘ulāmā, [q.v.]) as an epithet of pious scholars. As a technical term, ‘amīl denotes (1) the active partner in a society of mudāraba [q.v. or bīrād; (2) the government agent or official, particularly the collector of taxes. In this last meaning, it occurs already in Kūf, ix, 60, though not yet as a technical term.

The Prophet appointed representatives among the tribes or in the areas under his authority in order to collect the sadāqāt [see zakāt] from Muslims and the tribute from non-Muslims; some of them had political and military duties (M. Hamidullah, Documents sur la diplomatie musulmane, Cairo 1941, 63, 212; al-Ṭabarī, Ann. i, 1759-1999-2008; Kattāni, al-Tarāʾib al-Idārīyya, i, 243; Abū Yusuf, Khārid, Būlāk 1302, 46 f.). The ‘āmil of Khaybar was sent to receive the Muslims' share of the crop (al-Kattāni, i, 245).

Under the Caliphs of Medina, ‘āmil generally meant a provincial governor or administrate (al-Ṭabarī, i, 2665 f., 2933 f., 2936, 2944; Hamidullah, 224). Among ‘Umar’s ‘ammāl in ‘Irīk are mentioned the governor, the kāfīl who was also the keeper of the provincial treasury, and two assessors of bārdāji (Abū Yusuf, 20 f.; al-Baladhūrī, Ann. i, 29). The commander of the fleet in Syria under ʿUthmān is called ‘āmil (al-Ṭabarī, i, 3058). The collectors of bārdāji and ḍiyās [q.v.] and administrative officers in the districts (kūra), whose main function was the collection of taxes, were also called ‘ummāl (al-Ṭabarī, i, 3058, 3082-3087; Abū Yusuf, 59).

In the Umayyad and the early ʿAbbāsid periods, ‘āmil continued to be used both of the higher and the lower ranks in the hierarchy of government officials. Under the Umayyads, ‘āmil could mean the governor of a province or his lieutenant (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 1491; al-Baladhūrī, v, 273; al-Kindī, Governors, 63, 65 f.). When finances were separated from other administrative matters, ‘āmil tended to be used more especially as the director of finances in the capital of a province, such as Egypt (al-Kindī, 72-75, 84), ‘Irīk (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 1305) or Khurāsān (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 1256, 1458). These ‘ummāl were appointed either by the governors or by the Caliph (al-Kindī, 70-75; al-Ṭabarī, ii, 1305, 1356). Tax collectors in the districts, too, were called ‘ummāl, as appears from the papyri (A. Grohmann, Arabische Papyri in der ägyptischen Bibliothek, i, 12 f., 121 f., 137). ‘Ummāl were in charge of the grave injustices committed by the ‘ummāl in Kūfa (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 1366). In Khurāsān, these ‘ummāl were usually non-Muslims (ibid. 1740), in other provinces they were recruited both from Muslims and non-Muslims (Zaki Hasan, Les Tulunides, 213, 248).

In Khurāsān, these ‘ummāl were usually non-Muslims (ibid. 1740), in other provinces they were recruited both from Muslims and non-Muslims (Zaki Hasan, Les Tulunides, 213, 248).

In Khurāsān, these ‘ummāl were usually non-Muslims (ibid. 1740), in other provinces they were recruited both from Muslims and non-Muslims (Zaki Hasan, Les Tulunides, 213, 248).

Under the early ʿAbbāsid, ‘āmil could still mean the governor of a province (al-Dījahshīyārī, Wusūrā, Cairo 1357, 134, 139, 151; al-Baladhūrī, v, 402). For Egypt, the ‘āmil bārdāji was usually appointed by the central government in Baghdād (al-Makrīzī, Khāliṣ, i, 15), though full powers were occasionally given to the governor (al-Kindī, 120, 125). More commonly, however, the term is used of tax collectors in the districts; we hear of an ‘āmil kūra (Rasā‘īl al-Butlāghā, ed. Kurd ‘Ali, iii, 403), of ‘ummāl al-Ṣawād (see sawād) (al-Dījahshīyārī, 134), of ‘ummāl bārdāji (ibid., 93, 233), of ‘ummāl of a governor and ‘ummāl of cities (al-Kindī, 194, 200; Rasā‘īl al-Būlāghā, iii, 86).

By the 4th (10th) century, ‘āmil had normally come to mean a finance officer. The ‘āmil of a province had beside him an ‘āmil (al-Ṣāḥī, Wusūrā, 156), and when the ‘āmil and the ‘āmil worked together, their power on the province was practically unlimited (Ibn al-Aḥšī, viii, 165 f.). The local ‘ummāl (‘āmil kūra, ‘āmil bārdāji, ‘āmil naḥṣiya) were responsible for encouraging agriculture, for keeping irrigation works in order, for collecting revenue, and for submitting balance sheets of their areas (al-Ṣāḥī, 71, 193, 313, 318; Miskawayh, Edīfis, i, 27 f., ii, 23; al-Ṣāḥī, Letters, ed. Arslan, 211)

There are also references to ‘ummāl appointed for specific duties, not all of them purely financial, such as the ‘āmil ma‘ṣūrin, in charge of the police (Miskawayh, i, 139; combined with bārdāji, ii, 29), the ‘āmil masāḥik, in charge of the fortified frontier posts (ii, 48), or the ‘āmil quitarghi, in charge of the financial administration (Kumān, Ta’rīkh, 149). Occasionally, a chief ‘āmil was represented at the seat of the central government by a nāṣib (Miskawayh, i, 324).

The full development of the system of ‘ummāl is presupposed by the writers on the constitutional law of Islam (al-akhām al-sulāmīyya), such as al-Māwardī and Abū Ya‘la. They distinguish ‘ummāl (governors) of provinces with full and with limited powers, and ‘ummāl appointed for specific duties. The ‘āmil of a province is appointed by the Caliph, by the wāṣir or by the governor, and the governor or the ‘āmil can appoint ‘ummāl for the districts.

The same system prevailed under the independent dynasties, with variations in details. Under the Tulūnids and the Khākhāwīs in Egypt, most of the tax collectors were Copts (Zaki Hasan, Les Tulunides, 213, 248; Kūshf, al-Takhīhid, 136 f.). Mention is made of the ‘āmil al-ma‘ṣūrīn, the chief of police (Ibn al-Dāya, al-Mukdār, ed. A. Amin and al-Dārim, 70 f.). The ‘ummāl of the Fāṭimid in Egypt were supervised by nazāris and muḥārīf (al-Makrīzī, Itīḥād, i, 139; Kūshf, iv, 77 f.). The same is true of the ‘ummāl of the Ayyūbīd (Ibn al-Mamātī, Kawkān al-Dawāsir, ed. Aḥṣī Suryāl ‘Aṭīyya, 303). Under the Mamlūks, the local ‘ummāl or ‘ummāl al-būlād were landlords of villages or local farmers (A. N. Poliak, Feudalism, 45 n. 1, 47 n. 1). For the Sāmānids, see Gardīzī, Zayn al-Ākhbār, Berlin 1951, 51; for the Ghzānawīs, Niẓām Arūdī, Cāhār Māhā, 48; for the Saʿdawīs, Nizām al-Dīn al-Ṣiyāsāt-nāma, 28; Balkh, Fārs-nāma, 122; for the Ilkhānids, the Dījahshīyārīs and the Ak Koyunlu, Dīwashīn, Ta‘rīkh-i Dījahshūvyā, ii, 33; V. Minorsky, in BSOAS, ix, 950; A. K. S. Lambton, Landlord and Peasant in Persia, 102 f.; for the Timūrids, Khāndīmir, Dastur, 179; for the Saʿdawīs, Minorsky, Ta‘ṣīkāt, vol. 756-764, 82a-b; Lambton, 116.

In Muslim India, ‘āmil at first denoted a governor in charge of the general administration, then came to mean a collector of taxes in a small district (Moreland, Agrarian System of India, 270; Lybyer, Ottoman Government, 294).

The Ottomans used ‘āmil of a tax farmer; later, the term was little used, except occasionally for a
subordinate tax collector in the provinces (Mantran and Sauvaget, *Règlements fiscaux ottomans* 20). Muslim North Africa and Spain continued the Umayyad usage, and *āmil* meant a governor or administrative officer, responsible for general administration and finance. This continued until the end of the Umayyad Caliphate (Ibn 'Idhārī, *al-Bayān al-Muqrib*, passim; E. Lévi-Provençal, *Histoire de l’Espagne musulmane*, i, 92).

**Bibliography:** the sources mentioned in the text, and Dozy, *Supplements*, s.v.; A. Max, *Renais-

**sance des Islams*; F. Köprülü, in *IA*, s.v. (particularly useful for the later period).

(A. A. Duri)

*ʿĀmil* (a.; pl. *ʿadmil*), derived from *ʿamil* (*fi* = to act upon), signifies as a grammatical term a regens, or to express it in the way of the Arabic grammarians a word, which, by the syntactical influence which it exercises on a word that follows, causes a grammatical alteration of the last syllable of the latter, i.e. a change of case or mood. Two kinds of regencia are distinguished, one which can be recognized externally (*laṣṭ*) and one which is only to be supposed logically, but which is not expressed (*maṇaʿ*).

The *ʿamil laṣṭ* again is of two kinds: (1) the case where it concerns a whole series of mutually dependent words, which can be treated analogously according to the same rule (as for example in the *ṣāf* construction); (2) the case in which each regens requires special treatment (e.g. *bi, lam*); these two sub-divisions are named *ʿamil ḫiyāṣ* and *ʿamil sanaʿ* respectively. It makes no difference whether the regens is expressed as in *bāma Zayd*, or whether it must be supplied grammatically from the sentence as a form of the verb, as in *Zayd fi l-ʿām*.

Indeed the absence of a regens is a very frequent occurrence in Arabic grammar (cp. al-Ẓamakhshari, *Mufassal*, index s.v. *īḍmār ʿāmil*). This case must be distinguished from the complete absence of the regens in the case of the *ʿamil maʿnaʿ*, for in this second kind it is impossible to supply the *ʿamil* grammatically, although it can be done logically; grammarians usually cite as an example the subject of the nominal sentence, whose *ʿamil* cannot possibly be supplied.

**Bibliography:** Sprenger, *Diet. of techn. terms*, 1045; Sprenger, *Kitāb al-Taḥrif*, 1045; Diurdianl, *Dīdima Zayd*, (ed. Erpenius); (G. Weil).

*ʿAML* (a.; pl. *ʿadmla*) is a very frequent term in the sources mentioned in the text, and Dozy, *Supplements*, s.v.; F. Kopprü, in *Fr. Ph.*, 301. According to Yakūt, iv, 291, they also occupied a part of the country of the *Ismaʿili*, a day’s journey to the S. of Aleppo, which he says was named after them *ʿĀmila Mountain*. This isolated reference (cf. *JA*, 1855, i, 48) is the more surprising in that the corresponding text of the *Marāṣīd* gives *ʿĀmira* instead of *ʿĀmila*. To avoid the difficulty, G. le Strange (*Palestine*, 75) supposed an emigration towards the N. during the crusades, but without giving references. The Arabic historians of this period are ignorant of this change of place, and continue to use the synonymy *ʿĀmila-Dīall* (*Re-

**cueil des historiens des croisades*, *Hist. or.*, ii, 88; cf. *Āmil* read *Dīall*; iii, 491, 543). The application to the *ʿĀmila* of the passage from the *Kūrān*, *xxxi*, 3, by the poet Dīzār is only a sneer of the Tamimite who was jealous of the favours enjoyed by Ibn al-Rūḥī. The Dīzāl *ʿĀmil*a in the Lebanon was, and is, an important Shīʿite centre, and several eminent Shīʿite authors bear the name *Isbu* ʿĀmilī. [For further details see *Mutawallī*.]

(H. Lammens-W. Caskel)

AL-ʿĀMILI, MUHAMMAD b. ḤUSAYN BAḤIʿ AL-Dīn, with the tāḥālāt of Bahāʾ, born 935/1547, died 1030/1621; author of several works in Arabic and Persian, on a variety of subjects. Originating from Dīzāl ʿĀmilī in Syria, he migrated to Persia, and eventually obtained an honoured place at the court of Shāh ʿAbbās. The best-known of his works is the anthology *al-Kaṣḥūl* ("the beggar’s bowl"), frequently printed in the East; he also wrote an exposition of Shīʿite fiqh (in Persian), under the title of *Dīyāmi*-i ʿAbbāsī, and was the author of various works on astronomy and mathematics. As a Persian poet, he distinguished himself by a *mathnawi* called *Nān u-Halawv* which, according to Ḥīth, formed a sort of introduction to the Matnawī of Dīzāl al-Dīn Rūmī. A second *mathnawi* entitled Shīr u-Shahrār, is less known.


AL-ʿĀMIL, AL-HURR [see al-Hurr al-ʿĀmilī].

*ʿĀmin*, "safe", "secure"; in this and the more frequent form *āmin* (rarely *āmin*, rejected by grammarians) it is used like *āmen* and (Syriac) *amin* with Jews and Christians as a confirmation or corroboration of prayers, in the meaning "answer Thou" or "so be it", see examples in al-Mubarrad, al-Kāmil, i, 577 note 6; Ibn al-Dizārī, *al-Nāṣr*, ii, Cairo 1345, 442 l., 447. Its efficacy is enhanced at especially pious prayers, e.g. those said at the Kaʿba or those said for the welfare of other Muslims, when also the angels are said to say *āmin*. Especially it is said after *sūra 1*, without being part of the *sūra*. According to a hadīth the prophet learned it from Gabriel when he ended that *sūra*, and Bilāl asked the prophet not to forestall him with it. According to another hadīth, *salāt* the *ismā* says it loudly or, according to others, faintly after the *fāṭihah*, and the congregation repeats it. It is called God’s seal (*lāba* or *ḥalām*) on the believers, because it prevents evil.

**Bibliography:** *LA*, s.v.; *laṣṭ* to *sūra 1* by Zamakhshari and Bāyāwī; Wensinck, *Concordance et Indices de la tradition Musulmane*, s.v.; Gold-

*zīher in *RSOI*, 1902, 207-9."
AMIN (Ar. pl. umand), “trustworthy, in whom one can place one's trust”, whence al-Amin, with the article, as an epithet of Muhammad in his youth. As a noun, it means “he to whom something is entrusted, overseer, administrator”: e.g. Amin al-Wahy, “he who is entrusted with the revelation”, i.e. the angel Gabriel. The word also frequently occurs in titles, e.g. Amin al-Dawla (e.g. Ibn al-Tilmidh others), Amin al-Din (e.g. Yūkī), Amin al-Mulk, Amin al-Saltana.

In addition to these general and undefined uses of the word amin, there are other more technical uses, of importance in the history of Muslim institutions. Thus amin is used to denote the holders of various positions “of trust”, particularly those whose functions entail economic or financial responsibility. In legal works the word denotes “legal representatives”; under the early 'Abbasids the amin al-ba'um was the officer in charge of the administration of the effects of orphan minors (Tyan, Organisation judiciaire, i, 384). In a wider connotation the word applied to treasurers, customs officers, stewards of estates etc. (see Ibn Mammātī, Kauwānīn al-Dawāwīn (Atiya), ch. 3, regarding Egypt, and for the West, Lévi-Provençal, Hist. de l'Espagne Musulmane, iii, 40; E. Le Tourneau, Fr. avant le Protectorat, index, and in particular 299 n. 3; etc.).

The most important technical meaning of the word amin is “head of a trade guild”. In this sense the word often has the plural aminīdī (Le Tourneau loc. cit.). But the use of the word amin in this sense seems to have been always limited to the various countries of the Muslim west; the east, in pre-Ottoman times, preferred in general the term 'arīf [q.v.], and, in modern times, has employed a variety of terms. For general information on the heads of trade guilds, and for the bibliography, see 'arīf, 'infi. For the Ottoman period, see EMIN. (CL. CAHEN)

AL-AMIN, MUHAMMAD, 'Abbāsīd Caliph, reigned 193/809-13. Born in Šawwāl 170/April 277, of Hārūn al-Rashīd and Zubaydā, niece of al-Manṣūr, he was thus of pure Hāshimite stock both on his father's and his mother's side; hence he was given priority in the order of succession over his brother 'Abd Allāh (the future al-Ma'mūn), who was born six months before him but of a slave mother. In fact, the first bay'a as heir to the throne was accorded to him by al-Rashīd in 175/792, when he was barely five years old, and it was not until 18/799 that al-Ma'mūn was designated second successor.

The whole question of the double succession was settled with due solemnity by al-Rashīd in 186/802, in the “Meccan documents”, designed to eliminate all uncertainty and all conflict between the two heirs: in the first of these documents, al-Amin acknowledged al-Ma'mūn's right of immediate succession to himself, and his virtually absolute sovereignty over the eastern half of the empire; in the second document, al-Ma'mūn took cognizance of these rights, and declared in his turn his loyalty and obedience to his brother as caliph, whether or not the latter had respected his obligations. The system of obligations and counter-obligations by these documents shows clearly that al-Rashīd recognized the delicacy of the situation created by the double nomination and by the latent conflict between the two brothers (prof-

ably different both in character and interests), and tried to preserve a precarious equilibrium between them by these juridical and religious formulas.

When al-Rashīd died at Tūs, on 3 Dhi-mādād II 193/24 March 809, al-Amin was recognized as caliph at Baghdād and throughout the empire, while al-Ma'mūn hastened to return to his fief of Khurāsān. The following year (194/810) al-Amin, by suddenly introducing the name of his own son Mūsā in the Friday Prayer after that of al-Ma'mūn, took a step which, without formally violating the Meccan agreement, revealed his intention of setting it aside, by placing alongside his brother a later successor who suited him better. There followed a brisk exchange of diplomatic correspondence between the two brothers (supported respectively by the wasīr al-Faḍl b. al-Rabī', and by the future wasīr al-Faḍl b. Sahīl), the text of which has been preserved by al-Ṭabarī, and which assumed the form of political manoeuvring or a “cold war” between Baghdād and Marw preceding the armed conflict. Al-Amin tried to entice his brother to Court, to persuade him to give up his right to the control of several important areas of Khurāsān, and to obtain his consent to a modification in the order of succession. The respectful and prudent, but firm, resistance of al-Ma'mūn induced him to precipitate matters and, at the beginning of 195/end of 810, he formally violated the Meccan documents and substituted the name of his own son for that of al-Ma'mūn (and of the third brother al-Kāsim, the future al-Mu'tasim), as direct heir to the throne. To smash the resistance of al-Ma'mūn, who was declared a rebel, 'Alī b. ʿĪsā b. Māḥān was despatched at the head of an army, an act which marked the commencement of open hostilities between ʿIrāq and Khurāsān (Dhu-mādād II 195/March 811).

The war was conducted for al-Ma'mūn by his redoubtable general Tāhir b. al-Ḥusayn (q.v.); in the first clash near al-Rayy, the latter defeated and killed 'Alī b. ʿĪsā, and then 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥanīfa al-Abnāwī who was sent against him with a second army. The whole province of al-Dībāl fell rapidly into the hands of the Khurasānī troops, against whom al-Amin vainly flung contingents levied from among the Syrian Arabs. The attempt to use this Arab element as a weapon against the Persian element, which supported al-Ma'mūn en bloc, failed completely, while in Syria grave disorders occurred, and in Baghdād itself, as the result of a coup effected by al-Ḥusayn b. 'Alī b. ʿĪsā, al-Amin was temporarily declared deposed and al-Ma'mūn was recognized as caliph; but the attempt failed (Radjab 196/March 812) and al-Amin, restored to the throne, had to face the Khurasānī armies which were then approaching the capital. Baghdād was invested in Dhu-l-Hidjād 196/August 812 by two corps under the command of Harhama b. A'yān and Tāhir, who had meanwhile completed the conquest of Khūzistān; throughout the remainder of the empire (ʿIrāq, Mesopotamia, Arabia) al-Amin's authority waned; he was declared deposed (makhluq) and replaced by his brother. Despite this, the desperate defence of the capital lasted for more than a year, during which there grouped themselves around the Caliph the most turbulent social elements of the empire (known as “the naked”, 'urdā), who in the course of bloody fighting barred the path of the besiegers. The position was not clarified until Muharram 199/September 813, when all resistance was overcome and al-Amin requested Harhama for a safe-conduct. But while he was making his way towards that former loyal general of his father, who had promised him his life, he was intercepted by Tāhir's men, who feared that their prey might escape, and was captured and put to death (night of 24 of 25 Muharram 199/24-5 September 813). It
appears that al-Ma'mun was not directly responsible for the murder of his brother which, however, was not unwelcome to him and which left him de facto the sole ruler of the empire.

The war between the two brothers has been viewed by some as an aspect of the conflict between Arabism and Iranism at the beginning of the 'Abbásid dynasty; in fact, it was primarily a dynastic dispute, although admittedly there were certain ethnic factors in the origin of the two rival brothers and in the deployment of the forces on which they relied for their support; but although Khuşášun and Persia in general supported the al-Ma'mün bloc, it cannot be asserted that al-Amin was the conscious champion of Arabism, or that the Arabs were solidly behind him. He had the superficiality and indolence of the hedonist, ignorant of the complexities of political intrigue, and was concerned solely to secure supreme power for himself and his descendants; the policy necessary for the achievement of this aim, conducted, incidentally, without much serious consideration, was less his own work than that of his minister and councillor al-Faḍl b. al-Rabīʿ [q.v.], who is depicted by the sources as his evil genius and who, in the hour of danger, abandoned him to his fate in order to secure a pardon for himself from the victor.

The loyalty and obstinate resistance of Baghdad during the siege was not due so much to legitimist and dynastic ideals as to the excessive liberality of the Caliph and to the belligerent instincts of the dregs of the city, who regarded the situation as an opportunity for licence and booty. Thus al-Amin had no one actually at his side except a small group of courtiers and poets, companions of his debauches, like Abu Nuwas, who remained faithfully at his side until the end and who sincerely lamented his death in his elegies. His memory, in Muslim historiography, is associated with that of the Umayyad Caliphs Yazid I and Walid II, who were also libertines and hedonists, but who possessed political and artistic abilities altogether lacking in the frivolous 'Abbásids. During the four years of his reign (or three years if the year of the siege is not counted), there is no outstanding administrative or political measure with the exception of the cold (and later hot) war designed to eliminate his brother who, far superior in intellect and political acumen, in the end justly supplanted him.

Bibliography: The chief source is Tabarî, iii, 600-974 (summarized in Ibn al-Aṣ̄ālîr, vi, 152-227; other sources are Ya'kūbî, ii, 493 ff., 524-38; Dinawarî, 388-96; Fragmenta Historiorum Arabiciorum (cor de Goeje), 320-344; Ibn al-Ṭiktakā, 291-97; more anecdotal, but valuable for the siege of Bagdad, Masʿūdī, Murūdī, vi, 415-87. Western works, apart from general histories of the caliphate, include F. Gabrieli, Documenti relativi al califfato di al-Amin e al-Ma'mun, in RSO, 1928, 341-97.

AMINA, a legendary wife of Solomon. He one day entrusted to her the ring, on which his dominion and his wisdom depended. She gave it to a demon who had assumed the form of Solomon, and it only returned to the king after many adventures.

Bibliography: Grünbaum, Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sagenkunde, 222 fl.

ĀMİNA, Muḥammad's mother. Her father was Wahb b. 'Abd Manāf of the clan of Zuhra of the tribe of Kuryash, and her mother Barra biat 'Abd al-‘Uzza of the clan of 'Abd al-Dār. It is said that she was the ward of her uncle Wahb b. 'Abd Manāf, and that on the day he betrothed her to 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Muțṭalîb he also betrothed his own daughter Hāla to 'Abd al-Muṭṭalîb (Ibn Sa'd, i/1, 58). If this report is correct it may be an example of some forgotten marriage-custom. Āmina seems to have remained with her own family and to have been visited there by 'Abd Allāh, who is usually said to have died before Muhammad's birth. So long as Āmina lived, Muhammad was under her charge, and hence presumably lived with her family (except when sent to a wet-nurse in a nomadic tribe).

Āmina's death when Muḥammad was six is said to have taken place at al-Abwā', between Mecca and Medina, as she returned from a visit to Muḥammad's kinsmen there. Though this visit to Medina is mysterious, there are no strong reasons for rejecting the above details. The same is not true of the stories connected with her pregnancy, such as her alleged statement that she saw a light going from her, which lit up the palaces of Buṣra (Bostra) in Syria.

Bibliography: Ibn Hishām, 70, 100-2, 107; Ibn Sa'd, i/1, 60 f., 73 f.; Tabarî, i, 980, 1078-81; Caetani, Annali, i, 119 f., 150, 156 f.

AMIR, commander, governor, prince. The term seems to be basically Islamic (Naḳâḥid, 7, 964; Ibn Durayd, Djamhara, iii, 437. In the Kur'ān, only the expression ʿulāʿ-l-ʿamr is found (sūra iv, 59, 83), but amir occurs often in traditions (cf. Wensinck, Concordance, s.v.).

The sources for the early period frequently use the terms ʿamīl (q.v.) and amir as synonyms (cf. Hamidullah, Documents, 36, 38 and 59, 83). In the reports on the meeting of the sakīfa, amir is used for the head of the Muslim community (Tabarî I, 1840, 1841; Ibn Sa'd, II, 3, 126, 129). During the caliphate of Medina, the commanders of armies, and occasionally of divisions of an army were called amīrs (or amir al-dījāsh or amir al-dījand), and so were the governors who were initially the conquering generals (Tabarî, annales, I, 1884-5, 2013, 2054, 2532, 2503, 2566, 2634, 2637, 2645, 2662, 2775, 2864, 3057; Kindl, governors, 12, 13, 31, 32, 300, 302, 305; Hamidullah, 207, 257).

The Umayyads began to distinguish between administrative and financial duties. Yet during most of this period, amīrs had full powers, administrative and financial, and felt that their authority in their province was equal to that of the caliph (Tabarî, annales, II, 75; Kindl, governors, 35; Maṣfūdī, Murūdī, V, 308-312). The local population in the Eastern provinces saw the amir as a Katbūdad (Lord) (Tabarî, II, 1636) or Șāh (King) (Tabarî, II, 300).

The amir organizes the army and appoints ʿarīfs who keep the register of their units, maintain discipline, distribute pay and report incidents. He conducts expeditions personally or through his lieutenants, and concludes agreements. He leads prayers, builds mosques and sees to the establishment of Islam in conquered territories. The administration of justice is usually in his hands and, with a few exceptions, amīrs appoint ʿāljīs. The amir maintains peace and order through the prefect of police (ṣāḥib al-ṣarṭa) whom he appoints. He usually has a chamberlain (ḥādīb) and a bodyguard. He appoints a postmaster (ṣāḥib al-barīd) to report on his subordinates and generally on matters of interest. Representatives (ʿāmis or amirs) in
important sub-provinces are appointed with the approval of the Caliph and at times directly by him (Tabari, II, 1140, 1501, 1504).

The amir supervises the mint and strikes silver coins, usually with his name on them. Some amirs were famous for their good dirhams. But the type of currency, its weights and minting places are at times regulated by the caliph.

The amir with full powers is responsible for financial policy. He issues instructions about the time and methods of laying by taxes, the measures used and the amounts required. An amir could revise the system of taxation and revise the rates of pay of the troops. The amir pays his troops and officials, provides funds for public works such as the construction and repair of bridges, canals, roads, public buildings and fortresses, and sends the balance of the revenue to Damascus.

The powers of the amir are greatly reduced, however, when the caliph appoints an amil for the kharadji. Ibn al-Habbab, 'amil of Egypt under Higham, could even have the amir changed (Kindi, 72, 76; Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, Futah misr, 178).

The amir takes the bay'a or oath of allegiance in his province for the caliph or to the heir designate. He may lead a delegation from his province to convince the caliph or to offer their homage. He tries to influence public opinion in his province through tribal chiefs, poets, quşas, or money and threats (Baladhuri, Ansab, IV/ii, 101, 116-7; Pedersen, in Milanges Goldschmer, I, 232).

When the amir leaves his province or capital, he appoints a khallifa to represent him (Kindi, 13, 35, 49, 62, 65; Tabari, II, 1140).

Amirs receive salaries and administrative allowances ('amadi). Some amirs looked for other sources of wealth such as trade, appropriation of part of the revenue, speculation on the sale of crops taken in taxation, and presents. Some amirs amassed great wealth, and the caliphs tried to bring them to account; this degenerated to a system of torturous investigation at the end of the appointment under the later Umayyads.

The caliph, especially in difficult times, takes the views of the Arabs of the province into consideration when appointing an amir (Baladhuri, Futah, 146; Diahshiyarl, 57). A new caliph usually appoints new amirs, especially in the later Umayyad period.

Umayyad administrative traditions were carried by the Abbasids, but were gradually modified by new tendencies. The Abbasids created a bureaucracy to replace the tribal aristocracy and centralized administration.

Amirs were frequently members of the 'Abbasid family, but generally they were members of the bureaucracy, and whereas they were generally Arabs under the Umayyads, many were now Persians and later Turks. The amirs played a prominent role and were expected to report regularly on the operations of the amirs and the affairs of the province. The Kādil, too, became practically independent of the amir since he was appointed directly by the caliph. The amir's term of office is generally short.

A new official, the sabih al-nazar fi 'l-mazdlim, is appointed to consider complaints about injustices of the government officials, including the amirs.

Most amirs in the early 'Abbásid period continued to be responsible both for civil and financial administration, but soon it becomes customary to appoint a finance officer ('amil) together with the amir (Kindi, 185, 192, 213).

The amir was primarily concerned with maintaining order and ensuring the collection of taxes. Amirs occasionally increased taxes, abolished them or exempted people from paying, arresting Local discontent with the amir, especially when it lead to trouble, was at times investigated and could lead to his dismissal (Diahshiyarl, 99-100; Kindi, 192; Tabari, III, 716-721).

New developments took place before the end of the first 'Abbásid period. Ma'mūn appointed his brother Abū Isbāk amir of Egypt, but he stayed at the capital and sent two representatives, one for kharadji and the other for saidli. Absentee amirs in Egypt followed until the rise of the Tūlūnids (Kindi, 185 ff.).

Another development was the appearance of amirs who, appointed by the caliph, were given a free hand in their province against payment of tribute. Such amirs established dynasties and limited their relations with the caliph to receiving his 'ahd (deed of appointment), reciting his name in the khubta and striking coins in his name. This was the case of the Aghlabids and the Tāhirids. Others shared with the caliph the attributes of sovereignty by adding their own names to his in the khubta and on gold coins, for instance the Tūlūnids, the Ikhshīdids, the Sāmānids and the Ḥamdānids.

To further notice the rise of amirs who conquered their territories by force and then sought the 'ahd of the caliph, in order to acquire a legitimate basis of their authority. Such were the Ṣaffārids and the Ghaznavids. These amirs were practically independent. The Buwayhids, amirs by conquest, went even further. They conquered Baghdad, usurped all authority from the caliph and made him their pensioner, appointed wazirs, and interfered with the succession to the caliphate. Only the fact that the Caliph was still considered the source of all political authority by the people prevented the Buwayhids from overthrowing the 'Abbásids and made them seek the 'ahd from them.

The Umayyads in Spain called themselves amiris until 'Abd al-Rahman al-Nāṣir assumed the title of caliph. Their governors and the governors of the Fātimids were called not amir but saud.

Al-Māwaridī (d. 422/1031) reflects the full development of the institution. After distinguishing amirs with full powers from amirs with limited powers, he deals with the amirate acquired by force (imrat al-istiḥāṣ); he admits this as lawful in order to avoid rebellion and division, on condition that the 'ahd given requires the amir to follow the sharī'a (cf. Gibb in Isl. Cult., 1937).

On the other hand, during the 4th/10th and 5th/11th centuries the traditional bureaucratic administration collapsed and was replaced by the rule of the military. This influenced the status of the amirate, and under the Sādīqah, the Ayyūbid and the Mamluks, the title was given to military officers of all ranks (also to the smaller Sādīq princes). Ibn Dīmā's (d. 733/1333) reflects this development when he states that in his days amirs were commanders who were given fiefs in order to maintain their troops, and that their primary duties were military (Isl. III, 367).

Bibliography: the main literary source for the ancient period is Tabari, 'Annals, supplemented by the other historians, in particular Baladhuri, Ibn 'Aṣk al-Hakam, Kindi Maktafi and Kalb'ashandi; the primary archaeological sources are the coins and (for Egypt under the Umayyads) the papyri. See also A. A. Dūrī, al-Nuzum al-islāmiyya, and the references given in the text. (A. A. Dūrī)
AL-AMIR BI-AHKAM ALLĀH ABU 'ĀLĪ AL-MANṢŪR, the tenth Fātimid caliph, b. 13 Muharram 490/31 Dec. 1096. He was proclaimed caliph as a mere child of five by the vizier al-Afdal on the death of his father al-Mu'tāsidī (14 Safar 490/8 Dec. 1096). For the next twenty years the government was in the hands of al-Afdal [q.v.]. In 515/1121 al-Afdal was assassinated by Nizārī emissaries, but the caliph was accused of complicity. Al-Ma'mūn b. al-Batā'īhī [q.v.] was made vizier, but was in his turn imprisoned on 4 Ramadan 519/1125 (and executed child of five by the vizier al-Afdal on the death of his father al-Afdal [q.v.]).

In 515/1121 al-Afdal's son (496/1102); Tādju al-Jalāl b. Nadjah b. Kanna [q.v.] was made vizier, but was in his turn imprisoned on 4 Ramadan 519/1125 (and executed child of five by the vizier al-Afdal on the death of his father al-Afdal [q.v.]).

The whole tribe is Muslim, though the purity of the belief and adherence to observances vary widely not only individually but among the sections. Their political unity is a tenous one, resting on a loose federation not infrequently threatened by secession. Tribal government is in the hands of a paramount chief (diqāl) and a council of headmen (šerfāf) elected by the different sections. Formerly elective, the chief's office became hereditary in 1829, and since 1897 separate chiefs, though close kin, have been ruling over the Eritrean and Sudanese branches of the tribe.

The relations of the tribe with neighbouring groups were, and still are, marked by frequent raids and blood feuds. Though internal conflicts were not infrequent they never followed class lines. The modern political and economic changes, however, which seriously weakened nabṭdb prestige, also caused the serfs to show signs of restiveness, visible in sporadic acts of lawlessness and ‘passive resistance’.


AMIR I. (al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Salāḥ al-Dīn) founded in Yemen the dynasty of the Banū Tābirī, after the fall of that of the Rasūlīd about the year 855/1451 in conjunction with his brother ʿAllī (al-Malik al-Mudjāḥid Shams al-Dīn). He lost his life during an unsuccessful attempt to capture the town of Sanjā in 870/1466. Bibliography: see the following art.
AMIR II. (b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb, al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Šašāl al-Dīn), was the last prince of the house of the Banū Tāhir; he ruled in Yemen 894/1488-923/1517. Already in 922/1516, the Egyptian admiral Ḥusayn occupied the capital of Yemen, Zabīd, because 'Āmīr refused to supply the fleet sent out against the Portuguese with provisions. Ḥusayn left his brother Barsbay behind in the city; and in the following year 'Āmīr, who had taken flight together with his brother 'Abd al-Malik, fell in a battle with Barsbay. As in the interval the Mamluk dynasty had been overthrown by Selīm, the Ottoman Sultan, Yemen also fell into the power of the Ottomans.


'ĀMIR B. 'ĀBD AL-KAYS (later 'ĀBD ALLAH B. 'ĀMIR B. 'ĀBD AL-KAYS) was the last prince of the house of the Banū Ḥāfiz; he ruled in Yemen 894/1488-923/1517. Already in 922/1516, the Egyptian admiral Ḥusayn occupied the capital of Yemen, Zabīd, where he died, presumably because he had been overthrown by Selīm, the Ottoman Sultan, who had taken flight together with his brother Barsbay. As in the interval the Mamluk dynasty had been overthrown by Selīm, the Ottoman Sultan, Yemen also fell into the power of the Ottomans.

The circulation of the coinage of 'Uthmān ibn Ṭāhir in the eastern region, until that peace was broken by 'Āmīr b. al-'Āshīr, is not only an eloquent man whose sayings have been preserved, but also a significant example, which includes him among the “eight” principal sukkād, still recognizes him as a forerunner and attributes to him a number of miracles.

Bibliography: Dāhīz, Bayān, index; Ibn Ḥatīyāb, 'Uyūn, i, 508, ii, 370, ili, 184; Balḳhī, Ḥāfiẓ, v, 47-8; Ibn Ǧābīl, Tahākī, vii, 73-80; Ṣaḥīḥ, ibn Abī Ḥārīm, index; Abū Nu'aym, Ḥiyā, ii, 87-95, no. 163; Ibn Ḥaḍār, Ḥiṣāba, no. 6284; Massignon, Essai, index; Pellant, Milieu baśrien, 96.

(Ch. Pellant)

'ĀMIR B. ŠAŠA'A, a large group of tribes in Western Central Arabia. It is mentioned first in a South Arabian inscription of Abraha in 547 or 544-45 (G. Ryckmans, No. 506, in Le Muséon, 1953; J. Ryckmans, ibid., 339-42; Caskel, Entdeckungen in Arabien, 1954, 27-31). Judging by that inscription and by the later area of the 'Āmīr, their original area began to the west of the Turaba oasis and extended towards the east, past Ranya, to the upland south of the Riyād-Mecca road. Here it ended at about the 44th degree of longitude, but the north-western borderline can not be ascertained. From this area the tribe of Kīlāb (b. Rabī' b. 'Āmīr) advanced to the north and northwest into that territory in which the Ḥimā Dariyya [q.v.] was later founded, and into the adjacent southern district as far as Siyy to the west; the tribe of Ka'b (b. Rabī' b. 'Āmīr) advanced to the east and northeast into the southern Tuwayk. Only in the Tuwayk (b. 'Āmīr never left their territory, Harrat Banī Hilāl = Harrat al-Nawāṣif. Earlier inhabitants of the Himā, such as a part of the Muḥārib, the Ghāni and the Numayr (who are counted among the 'Āmīr in later genealogies, cf. however 'Āmīr b. al-Tufayl, xii, 1) became more or less dependent on the Kīlāb, whilst the Ka'b assimilated the little-known inhabitants of the Tuwayk oases, and finally settled there themselves, particularly the sub-tribes of Dja'da and Ḥarīf. Of the sub-tribes of the Kīlāb, the Dja'd reached the centre of the Ḥimā and their old villages near Turaba, the 'Ābd Allāh along what is today known as 'Arq al-Subāy, the Abū Bakr migrated from the southern Himā in a south-easterly direction to Karīj = Karīj on the Riyād-Mecca road, and the 'Āmīr from the south-eastern Himā to Damīk, whence both turned to the southwest into the above mentioned upland. The sub-tribes of Ka'b also migrated between their old and their new areas: the Ḥushayr north of the Wādī Birk (= Birk)-Surra towards the road, the 'Ādīlān went there along that Wādī, the 'Ukayl migrated from the Wādī Dawāsir-Wādī Ḳanṣ northwards to the upland, but they also went south in the direction of Nadīrān. Thus the two areas of migration touched along a considerable stretch. This fact and also the fact their migrating areas were large, explains the remarkable solidarity of the Ka'b and the Kīlāb, while their internal unity, as usual, left much to be desired. The Kīlāb had the Rābāb and Tamīn as neighbours in the east, the Ṭaʾāsīd in the northeast and tribes of the Ghatafan in the north and northwest. There was a latent state of war with all these, whilst relationships with the Sulaym, and especially the Ḥawāzīn, in the southwest were amicable. To the south, Kīlāb and Ka'b had a feud with the tribes on the border, especially with the Ḥuḍayrī, but also with South Arabian tribes like the Murād, Ṣudā' and Dji'īf (of Sa'd al-ʾĀshīr) which had been bedouinized for some time and were pressing towards the north. They did, however, live in peace with the Bal-Ḥāriṯ b. Ka'b and their satellites Nāhī and Diʿār in the Nadīrān region, until that peace was broken by 'Āmīr b. al-Tufayl's marauding expeditions. Note worthy among the “days” of 'Āmīr are the battle of Shīb Djabala (on the eastern border of the Himā), where they repulsed an army of Asad, Dhuḥayn and Dārim-Tami in ca. 580.

The house of Dja'far (rather a family than a subtribe before the times of Islam) had some vague authority over the Kīlāb. It held this position thanks to a pact with the 'Āmīr b. 'Āmīr b. Rābī' according to the later genealogy a “brother” of the Kīlāb and Ka'b, without always being a match for the Abū Bakr, the strongest Kīlāb tribe.

The 'Āmīr, as Ḥums [q.v.], were on good terms with the inhabitants of Mecca. Nevertheless, the relations with the rising community of the Muslims in Medina were peaceful, since both were opposed to the Ghatafan. These relations were not seriously threatened—not even by the incident of Bi'r Maʿdīn until the prophet demanded not only the political, but also the religious, union of the tribes. In 629, a gang of marauding Muslims penetrated as far as Siyy; soon afterwards, the head of the older line of the Dja'far, ʿAlkama b. ʿUla'ba, embraced Islam. 'Āmīr b. al-Tufayl, however, his opponent, remained unregenerate. After Muhammad's victory over the Ḥawāzīn near Ḥusayn (8/630), the 'Āmīr effected their union without further friction. There was hardly any fighting against the 'Āmīr in the rigid

The part played in the wars of conquest by the 'Āmīr was not considerable. Yet the 'Ukayl reached Spain with the Syrian armies, and the Dja'da and Ḥushayr reached Persia with those of Ḳaṭa and Baṣra. Other groups followed after the conquests.
Some ‘Amīr settled in Northern Syria and others on the far side of the Euphrates. There they settled on the land, while those on this side at the Euphrates slowly reverted to a nomad existence. Here we meet the old units of ‘Amīr: Kilāb, Kūshayr, ‘Adlān, ‘Ukāyil, as well as Numayr. The Kilāb remained on the Syrian side. From them sprang the Mirdād dynasty. The Numayr and ‘Ukāyil, however, went over to the Dā’iṣ between 940 and 955. Some decades later, their leaders attained political power there. (cf. Numayr, ‘Ukāyil). There was little immediate change amongst those ‘Amīr who had stayed in Arabia. Through the establishment of the Ḥimā, the existing dissensions between the Dā’iṣ on the one side and the Dībāb and ‘Abbās b. Khubār on the other grew worse, while the ‘Ukāyil temporarily occupied areas near Bīja and Taḥlīḥ which had been left empty after emigration. Larger displacements did not occur until after the first ‘Abbāsids. The Kūshayr advanced into the steppes to the northwest until the Numayr stopped them. The Kilāb were also concerned, in the Central Arabian risings shortly before the middle of the 9th century (defeated 846). After the annihilation of the Numayr (847), the Kilāb began to advance from the west, and the ‘Ukāyil from the south, into areas which had been swamped by the former for so long. The expeditions of the East-Arabian Karmaṭians started a new wave of migrations: in the east, the Khafafda (q.v.)—‘Ukāyil and later the Muntasik (q.v.), reached ‘Irāk, the ‘Ukāyil in the west reached Palestine, and the Kilāb Transjordania. There were no important poets among the Kilāb before the last quarter of the 6th century (Labīb, ‘Amīr b. al-Tufayl); among the Ka’b until shortly before the hijra (al-Nābiḥa al-Dajā’il). Of the poets of early Islamic Ṭahār must be mentioned among the Kilāb, Ibn Mukbīl al-‘Adlānī and Muzāhīm al-‘Ukāyil among the Ka’b.

Bibliography: The Dīwāns of the poets mentioned above (cf. articles on each); Nahā’id Dā’iṣ wa’l-‘Arabād, ed. Bevan, passim; Wājdī, transl. Wellhausen, 308; Wellhausen, ‘Aṣrān, iv, 133, 142-6; the Arabic Geographers; Max Freiherr von Oppenheim, Die Beduinen, i, 58 f., 222-7, 281, ii, 174, ii, 12-8, 127-32, 208 ff. (cf. also Hilāl, Kūshayr, Numayr, ‘Ukāyil.)

‘ĀMĪR B. AL-TUFA’IY, ancient Arab hero and poet, sprung from the Mālik, the younger line of the Dā’iṣ b. Kilāb, belonging to ‘Amīr b. Ṣaṣa’a. In the nineties and the past the third part of the 7th century he took part in many marauding expeditions, sometimes leading his own men. After the death of his father, who appears to have fallen in the south fighting against the Khāṭḥam, he took over the conduct of the war until the loss of an eye at the battle of Fayf al-Rib (against the Khāṭḥam, ca. 614) rendered him unsuited for this post. In the beginning he suffered some setbacks, and he himself lost eight or nine of his relatives. In one battle other tribes of the ‘Amīr b. Ṣaṣa’a must have suffered grievously, for bitter reproaches were made to him from their side. The unfortunate result of Fayf al-Rib was not his fault; nevertheless the Dā’iṣ held him responsible for the loss of men and horses. It is possible that this dissension formed the basis for the legal contest, or the struggle for precedence, which broke out a short time after between ‘Amīr and the head of the older line, ‘Alkama b. ‘Ullāja. Though the arbiter gave no verdict, ‘Amīr recovered his good reputation through this suit; the poet al-Aṣqāḥ seems to have provided essential help in accomplishing this. After the death of his uncle ‘Amīr Abī Bara’ (ca. 456-55), he became, formally, the head of the Dā’iṣ, the mightiest Bedouin leader of Central Arabia, as before he had been the greatest warrior.

Legend connects ‘Amīr several times with the Prophet and depicts him as his bitterest Bedouin opponent. He is supposed to have attacked Muslim missionaries treacherously at Bīr Mā‘ānā and have organised a plot to assassinate the Prophet. This is true to the extent that he did not submit to the sovereignty of Medina and died a heathen, probably shortly before the taking of Mecca. The accusation of treachery goes back to an exchange of hidjāḍ between the poets of Medina and those of the Dā’iṣ (the verses of whom have been lost or suppressed). In this ‘Amīr was accused of occasioning the catastrophe of Mā‘ānā by breaking the covenant of protection. It is true that there was an engagement of protection entered into by his uncle, only that ‘Amīr could not fulfil it among the Sula’yim, who had killed the “holy band”, in reality a pillaging expedition; cf. Lyall, Dīwāns, 84-91.

The fragmentary impression left by the dīwān of ‘Amīr is caused not only by the unsatisfactory tradition. ‘Amīr appears really to have cultivated only the small forms of ṭakhir and hidjāḍ. In the case of no. 29 he created a perfect work of art through expansion of a framework which also occurs elsewhere; no. 11 is moving through its humanity, the complaint about the loss of his eye. In no. 16 he shows himself, uplifted by a recently won victory, equal to the hurtful scorn of al-Nābiḥa.

Bibliography: The Dīwāns of ‘Abīd Ibn al-Abrāq and ‘Amīr Ibn al-Tufayl, ed. Sir Charles Lyall, 1913; Aṣḥāb (Geyer), nos. 18, 19; Labīb (Brockelmann), nos. 45, 51; Mubṭadālīyyāt (Lyall), no. 5; Aḥān, xv, 50-4, 132; Ibn al-Aḥīr, 1, 481 f., 484 f.; Ibn ‘Abī Dābīb, ‘Īd, iii, ayyām, nos. 15, 16; Mubṭadālīyyāt, 50-4, 704 ff.; Nabhād (Bevan), 457-72 and index. (The prose texts have no independent historical value and can serve only in helping to understand the poems.)

W. CASKEL

AMIR AKHÚR, in Persian Mīr ‘Aḵūr, “high equerry”, one of the highest officials in the court of Oriental princes. Under the Mamluks the amīr ‘akhūr was the supervisor of the royal stables. He was generally an amīr of a thousand and had under his orders three amīrs of fourty. In the Circassian period he occupied the fourth place among the grand amīrs, cf. A. N. Poliak, Feudalism in Egypt, Syria, etc., London 1939, 30; D. Ayalon, Studies on the Structure of the Mamluk Army, BSOAS, 1954, 63, 68.

D. AYALON

AMIR ‘ALÍ, SAYYID (1849-1928), Indian jurist and writer, descended from a Shi‘ite family which had come from Khurāsān with Nādir Shāh and remained in India, finding service with successively the Mughal and Awadh courts and finally the East India Company. He was educated at the Muhsinīyya (“Hooghly”) College near Calcutta, where he learned Arabic and also came into close contact with the English and their literature, as well as studying their law (see his Memoirs, in J, 1931-2). He was once in England in 1869-73, being called to the Bar in 1873, and settled there permanently with his English wife (née Isabelle Ida Konstan) on retirement from the Bengal High Court in 1904. His activities were significant in many fields: as a professor of
Islamic Law, at the Bar, on the Bench, in social service, government administration, politics, and as a writer. Some of his works became, and have remained, standard authorities for Anglo-Mohammedan Law. In 1883 he became one of the three Indian members (and the only Muslim) on the Viceroy's Council, and in 1909 he was appointed the first Indian member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in London. In the field of social service he sponsored a juvenile reformatory in Allahpur (Calcutta), and in London he was a protagonist in the British Red Crescent Society.

On the political front he founded in 1877 a "National Mahommedan [sic] Association", which presently was a nation-wide organization with 34 branches from Madras to Karachi; its programme was "primarily to promote good feeling and fellowship between the Indian races and creeds, at the same time to protect and safeguard Mahommedan interests and help their political training" (Memoirs, 1932, 10). Amir 'Ali sensed, expressed and fostered a nascent political self-consciousness in Indian Islam, disagreeing with the then conviction of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan as to the adequacy of modern (western) education for the Indian-Muslim community as a guarantee of its position in the country. After moving to England he was instrumental in setting up the London branch of the Muslim League (speech in IC, 1932, 335 fl.); his loyalty to and real affection for Britain led him, however, to resign in 1913 when the League joined with the Indian National Congress in talk of "Home Rule." He was involved in negotiations in London over the projects for political reforms in India. After the First World War he came into prominence as London champion of the khilafat movement; a letter to 'Ismet Pasha signed by him and the Aga Khan, being published in Istanbul before reaching the government in Ankara, roused strong opposition in Turkey, where the khilafat was presently abolished altogether.

It is, however, as a writer that his basic contribution was made. While a student at the Inner Temple, he wrote in answer to a western account of Islam a study of Muhammad's life and message, which was published in London (1873). This became the basis of a developing work which he subsequently kept revising and republishing throughout his life, under the eventual title of The Spirit of Islam (editions in 1891, 1922, 1953). This liberal modernist interpretation of Islam was favourably received and has remained influential in the West; its influence in the Muslim world, not least outside of India, has also been marked, and it has been translated into Turkish.

His other major book (apart from legal works), A Short History of the Saracens (London 1899; 10th repr. [revised] 1951; also in Urdu transl.), also contributed to a new attitude towards the Islamic past on the part of many, both western and Muslim. These two books, and the other smaller presentations on Islam which he preferred, were supplemented by a steady stream of articles, both in India and especially in Britain (chiefly in the Nineteenth Century), in which he pleaded the cause of Islam before the bar of world opinion. His historical significance lies in considerable part in his role in the creation of favourable appreciation of Islam in the West, and perhaps also in awakening or facilitating such a favourable appreciation of Islam among westernized Muslims.


AMIR DÄD, "amir of justice", minister of justice during the Seldjük rule, especially in Asia Minor; other amirs bore this name as a fixed title (cf. Ibn al-Aghrî, index s.v.).

AMIR AL-HÂDIDI, leader of the caravan of pilgrims to Mecca. In 9630, after which date non-Muslims were excluded from the hajj: the Prophet nominated Abû Bakr to conduct the pilgrimage and to prevent pagans from taking part in it. In 10/631 he presided over it himself. Thereafter this duty belonged directly to the caliphs, who either undertook it themselves or nominated an official to act in their place (e.g. the Governor of Mecca or Medina, a high official etc.). When the authority of the Caliph was disputed, there were sometimes several rival leaders of pilgrimages to the Holy Places (e.g. in 68/688 there were four, of whom one was 'Abd Allâh b. Zubayr). Great importance was attached to the function of presiding at the ceremonies, which entailed authority over all the assembled pilgrims (hajjda bi 'l-nâs). When this president came from the seat of the caliphate, the sources sometimes underlined his role as leader of a particular caravan, for example by calling him amir al-hajjida al-'Trâbi. Under the shadowy 'Abbâsid Caliphs of Cairo (after 660/1262) the office became secularized and nominations were made by the Mamlûk sultans. The amir al-hajjida al-Miṣrî, usually a commander of a thousand appointed annually, claimed pre-eminence at the Holy Places. The title of amir al-hajjida was sometimes used for the leaders of other caravans (Damascus, 'Irât). Each of these had absolute authority over his own pilgrims (supply organization, travel arrangements, protection of merchants, the sick and the poor, police duties, application of Kur'ânic penalties). He was assisted by a specialized staff, and took any measures necessary to avoid attack by Bedouin. The Mamlûk sultans of Cairo who used their amir al-hajjida to support their policy of establishing gradual control over the Hijâz, symbolized by the maḥmal [q.v.], and to distribute gifts or suwar [q.v.], the Ottoman sultans did the same after 923/1517, but their amir al-hajjida (Cairo, Damascus and, for a short period, Yemen), were appointed for a period of years until recalled. In Egypt under the Ottomans, up to the end of the 18th century, one of the principal beyûs held the post. The discharge of their duties necessitated heavy expenditure, a large part of which was met by the sultans; but as a result of the fact they received many gifts; that the effects of those who died on the way without heirs legally reverted to them, and that they carried on trade on their own account, the holders of this office could make a handsome profit. It was a great honour to be required to fill the post. Ibn Sa'dî, who ruled the Hijâz from 924-5, prohibited any practice which recalled former Egyptian or Ottoman control of the Holy Places. The military escorts and the maḥmal which formerly accompanied the amir al-hajjida could no longer appear in Sa'dî's Arabia. The amir al-hajjida had now only a diplomatic role, and he ministries of their respective countries dealt with the material organization of the pilgrimages. In 1954, Egypt abolished the title of amir al-hajjida, replacing it by ra'is ba'thâl al-hajjida (Head of the Pilgrimage Mission).
AMIR AL-HADJDJ — AMIR KHUSRAW

**Bibliography:** J. Jomier, *Le Mabmaï et la caravane égyptienne des pèlerins de La Mecque*, Cairo 1953 and references quoted. (J. Jomier)

**AMIR HAMZA** (see HAMZA b. 'ABD AL-MUTTAQ). 
**AL-AMIR AL-KABIR,** "great amir," title which had originally been granted in the Mamluk kingdom to all those who had seniority in service and in years. Consequently there was a whole group of amirs of which every individual was called al-amir al-kabir.

In the days of SHAYKHUDDIN AL-QUMARI (752/1352) the title became reserved for the commander-in-chief (adabak al-^asdr) of the kingdom. From that date onward it became the most common title of the commander-in-chief beside that of his rank.

**Bibliography:** M. van Berchem, *CIA, L’Egypte*, 276, 290, 452, 593; Makrizi, *Histoire des Sultans Mamlouks*, transl. Quatremeré, i, 3; Poliak and Ayalon, as quoted in AMIR AL-KHUSRAW (D. AYALON)

**AMIR KHAN,** 1768-1834, the famous Pathan predatory chief and associate of DIswant Rao Holkar, was born at Sambhal in the Muradabab district of Rohilkhand. As a young man he and his adherents were employed by various zamindars and Maratha officials as sikhinds for the collection of the revenues. He rapidly developed into a leader of banditti and as such was successively employed by the rulers of the Indore and Bhajpur. In 1798 he received the title of nawab from DIswant Rao Holkar. The following year he plundered Saugor and the surrounding country. In 1809, in combination with the Pindaris, he planned to attack Berar but his designs were frustrated by Lord Minto’s despatch of troops to that area. By the year 1810 the size of his army had increased to 8,000 infantry, 20,000 cavalry, and 200 guns. In the same year, realizing the strength of the British, he concluded a treaty with Lord Hastings, the governor-general, by which, provided he disbanded his army, he was guaranteed in the possession of his territories. He thus became the founder of the state of Tonk [q.v.] which, since 1948, has been merged into the Union of Rajasthán.


**AMIR KHUSRAW DILHAWI,** the great Indo-Persian poet, was born in 651/1253 at Patiyali in the district of Etah, Uttar Pradesh, India. His father, Sayif al-Din Mahmud, was a Turk who had entered India in the time of Sultan Shamsal-Din Iltutmish under whom he took service as an army officer. His mother was a daughter of ‘IMAD AL-Mulk, master master of the kingdom. Amir Khusraw, according to his own statements, early showed great promise as a poet. From the age of eight when his father died, Amir Khusraw was cared for by his maternal grandfather. After the latter's death, Amir Khusraw took service with ‘ALI AL-DIN KHYLLO KHAN, nephew of Sultan Balban and then with NAISR AL-DIN BUGHRA KHAN, son of the sultan, when he was appointed governor of Sämàn. After accompanying Bughra Khan to Bengal, Amir Khusraw returned to Dihli and accepted the patronage of the sultan’s eldest son, Muhammad KHAN Nizamuddin and accompanied him to Multan. In 689/1284 Muhammad was killed in battle with the Mongols and Amir Khusraw himself was captured only to escape soon after. He returned to Dihli and attached himself to Malik ‘ALI SARJANBASHI HATAM KHAN and went with him to Oude when Sultan Muizz al-Din Kaykubad went to meet his father Bughra Khan in 680/1281. Hatam Khan was appointed governor of Oude and Amir Khusraw remained with him for two years before seeking permission to return to Dihli, where he accepted the patronage of the Sultan.

In the reign of DJALAL AL-DIN KHALJI 689/1290-695/1295, Amir Khusraw was given a royal pension of twelve hundred tankahs annually and, according to Barni, was a great favourite of the Sultan. But on the murder of Djalal al-Din Khalji the poet transferred his allegiance to his assassin ‘ALI AL-DIN KHALJI who confirmed him in his pension but proved an exacting patron. ‘Ala al-Din Khalji’s reign, 695/1295 to 715/1315, saw Amir Khusraw’s most prolific period. Amir Khusraw also enjoyed favour under Sultans Kutb al-Din Mubarak Shah 716/1316-720/1320 and Ghiyath al-Din Tughluq, 720/1320-725/1325.

During his lifetime, Amir Khusraw became a disciple of the CISHTI saint NIJAM AL-DIN AWLĪYA of Ghiyathpur and when the poet died in 725/1325, a few months after the accession of Sultan Muhammad Tughluq, he was buried at the foot of Niżam al-Din Awlīya’s grave.

The following works of Amir Khusraw are extant.

(a) Five *disaans*, viz., (a) *Tuhfat al-Sighdr,* poems of adolescence collected about 671/1272; (b) *Wasaq al-Hayal,* poems of middle life collected originally about 683/1284; (c) *Ghurrat al-Kamal,* poems of maturity collected originally about 693/1293; (d) *Bahiyya Nahiyya,* collected about 716/1316; (e) *Nihayat al-Kamal,* collected about 725/1325.

(b) The *Khamsa,* viz., (a) *Malaʾ al-Anwar,* 668/1228; (b) *Shirin u-Khusraw,* 668/1228; (c) *A’ina-i Sinkandari,* 669/1229; (d) *Hashi Dihlī,* 701/1301; (e) *Madjnūn u-Laylá,* 698/1298.

(c) *The Qasaliyya,* or lyrical poems.

(d) The *Prose Works,* viz., (a) *Khaḍūn al-Fulūh,* the victories of Sultan ‘ALI AL-DIN KHALDI; (b) *Ajāl al-Fawā'id,* a collection of the sayings of Niżam al-Din Awlīya presented to the saint in 715/1315; (c) *Fājdārī Khusraw,* collected in 719/1320, specimens of elegant prose composition.

(e) The historical poems, viz., (a) *Kirān al-Sa’dāyin,* completed in 688/1289, a *malasnāi* on the meeting of Sultan Mu’izz al-Din Kaykubad and his father NAISR AL-DIN BUGHRA KHAN on the banks of the Sarjū in Oudh.; (b) *Miftah al-Fulūh,* a *malasnāi* on four victories of Djalal al-Din Firuz Khalji, completed in 690/1291 and forming part of the *Ghurrat al-Kamal.* (c) *Dwaqal Râni Khyr Khân or Ashikà,* a *malasnāi* completed in 715/1316 on the love story of KHYR KHAN, son of Sultan ‘ALI AL-DIN KHALDI, and Devaldi, the daughter of Râdja Karn of Nahrwâla, with a later continuation telling of KHYR KHAN’s estrangement from his father, his confinement in the fortress of Gwalior, his blinding and eventual murder at the instigation of Malik Kâfûr; (d) *Nuk Sipēr,* a *malasnāi* describing the glories of Sultan Kutb al-Din Mubarak Shah Khalji’s time, completed in 718/1221; (e) *Tughluq-nāma,* a *malasnāi* on the victory of Ghiyath al-Din Tughluq over Khusraw Khan in 720/1320.
Amir Khusraw and the History of his Times. The works of Amir Khusraw provide the fullest single expression extant of medieval Indo-Muslim civilization. They reveal, as perhaps does no other surviving body of Indo-Persian literature of the time, the religious, ethical, cultural and aesthetic ideas of courtly, educated and wealthy Indian Muslims of the 8th/14th and 9th/15th centuries.

Amir Khusraw was not an historian. No more in his "historical poems" than in his diwans and ghazals does he attempt a critical account of the human past. Amir Khusraw wrote to please his patrons by appealing to their imaginations, emotions and to their vanity as courtly educated Muslims. For Amir Khusraw the life of man in history is a pageant of stereotyped formal action by god-like sultans and great men, who personify Muslim ideals of conduct.

Bibliography: Storey, Section II, Fasciculus 3. M. History of India, London 1939; Muhammed Wahid Mirza, Life and Times of Amir Khusraw, Calcutta 1935. (P. Hardy)

AMIR MADJILIS, master of audiences or ceremonies, one of the highest dignitaries of the Saidjiks of Asia Minor [see saJdik(6)]. In the Mamluk kingdom the amir madjilis had charge of the physicians, oculists and the like. The sources do not elucidate the connection between the rank of amir madjilis and this particular task, which seems to be of no special importance. Altho the rank of amir madjilis was in the early Mamluk period superior to that of amir silah [q.v.], neither of them was of great significance at that time. In the Circassian period the amir madjilis, though inferior to the amir silah, was third in importance amongst the highest amirs of the kingdom.


AMIR AL-MUMININ, "Commander of the Believers" (the translation "Prince of the Believers" is neither philologically nor historically correct), title adopted by 'Umar b. al-Khattab on his election as caliph. Amir, as a term designating a person invested with command (amir), and more especially military command, is in this general sense compounded with al-mum'inin to designate the leaders of various Muslim expeditions both in the lifetime of the Prophet and after, e.g. Sa'd b. Abi Waqas [q.v.], the commander of the Muslim army against the Persians at Kadsisiyah. Its adoption as a title by 'Umar may more probably, however, be connected with the Kur'anic verse "Obey God and obey the Apostle and those invested with command (ulam-ta'la) among your people" (iv, 58/62). From this time on until the end of the Caliphate as an institution, amir al-mum'inin was employed exclusively as the protocollar title of a caliph, and among the Sunnis its adoption by a ruler implied a claim to the office of caliph [see khilifa], whether in its universal significance (as by the Umayyads, 'Abbásids, and the Shi'ite Fātimids) or as implying independent Islamic authority (as by the Umayyads in al-Andalus from 1316/928 [see 'ABD AL-RAHMĀN I]), the Mu'minids in the Maghrib [see E. Lévi-Provençal, Trente-sept lettres officielles almohades, Hosp., 1941, 1 ff.], and several of the minor dynasties in al-Andalus before and after the Muwāḥḥid conquest). The Mu'minin caliphate was claimed from 650/1253 by the Ḥāḍid amirs of Ifriqiya, and was after the extinction of the 'Abbásid caliphate at Baghdaḍ in 656/1258 fleetingly recognized as the universal caliphate by the Mamλūk sultans of Egypt, until their establishment of the new line of 'Abbásid caliphs in Cairo [see 'Abbāsids]. In the Maghrib itself the Ḥāḍid claim was contested by the Marinids in Morocco, who also adopted the title of amir al-mum'inin in the 8th/14th century, and were followed by all the succeeding sultans in Morocco.

By the political jurists the title amir al-mum'inin was interpreted in a general sense, without special reference to command in the Holy War, except in so far as the proclamation of dīthād remained a prerogative of the caliphate. In other Muslim circles, however, especially among the Zaydis (see below), its association with active prosecution of the dīthād still survived. In this sense it was occasionally employed by the early Ottoman sultans (see H. A. R. Gibb, in Bibl.); but it was never formally adopted by their successors as implying a claim to the universal caliphate, even after the occupation of Egypt by Saлим I in 922/1517. In the same sense it was assumed by various leaders of Muslim armies in West Africa [see AHMAD AL-GRAVÉEN and AHMAD LOBBO], and is still employed as the style of their successors in N. Nigeria.

Among the Shi'a, the Imāmīs in general limit the title to 'Ali b. Abī Ṭālib exclusively; the Ismā'īlīs apply it to such of the Fātimid caliphs as each sect recognizes; while the Zaydis regard it as legitimately claimed by any 'Alīd who seeks to establish his claim by force of arms (hence its present use by the Imāms of al-Yaman). Among the Khawārīd the title was rarely used, except by the Rustamids [q.v.] of Tāhtar.

Very occasionally the term is applied in a figurative sense to outstanding scholars; e.g. the traditionalist Shu'ba b. al-Ḥaḍidādī is described as amir al-mum'inin fi 'l-i'rādiyya (Abū Nu'aym, Ḥilālat al-Awṣiyā', vii, 144), and the grammarian Abū Ḥaṭṭān al-Qarnāfī as amir al-mum'inin fi 'l-naḥw (Makkar, Analectes, 826).


AMIR AL-MUSLIMIN, i.e. lord of the Muslims, a title which the Almoravids first assumed, in contra-distinction to Amīr al-Mu'minin [q.v.]. The latter title was born by the independent dynasties; the Almoravids, however, recognized the supremacy of the 'Abbāsid and did not wish to arrogate to themselves this title of the Caliphs. So they established a kind of sub-caliphate with a title of their own. Afterwards the African and Spanish princes bore either the one or the other of these titles, according as they sought after the independent caliphate or recognized any supremacy.

Bibliography: M. van Berchem, Ţiţres califiens d'Occident (Journ. As., series 10, ix, 1945-355). (A. J. Wansinck)

AMIR SILĀH, grand master of the armour. In the Mamλūk kingdom he was in charge of the armour-bearers (silākhārīyya) and supervised the arsenal (silākhāna). It was his duty to bear the sultan's arms in public ceremonies and to convey them to him in battle and other occasions. In the early Mamλūk period the office of amir silāh was not
very high (cf. AMIR MADJLIS); under the Circassians it was the second office among the highest amirs of the kingdom. The amir silah had the right of sitting as the ra’ al-maysara in the sultan’s presence.


AMIR AL-UMARA, chief Emir, commander-in-chief of the army. As the name shows this dignity was originally confined to the military command. But the pretorians continued to become more powerful, and already the first bearer of the title, the eunuch Mūnis, soon became the real ruler, for it was to him that the weak and incapable Caliph al-Mu’tadid owed his rescue on the occasion of the conspiracy on behalf of ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Mu’tazz in 926 (908). After the appointment of Muḥammed b. Rā’Ik the governor of Wāsīt in 934 (Nov. 936) as Amir al-Umara by the Caliph al-Rā'id, this despotate ruler could not but hand over to him the entire civil authority, and his name was even mentioned in the public prayers together with that of the Caliph. So the Emirs became in reality virtual rulers, while the Caliphs sank more and more to mere shadows of their former power.

This title is very rarely met with in Mamlūk sources. According to one source it was synonymous with baklarbaki, a title given to the atābak al-asākir. It seems, however, that other amirs also bore the same title. Cf. D. Ayalon, in BSOAS, 1954, 59.

In Ottoman usage amir al-umard and its equivalent mir-i mirān are common synonyms for beylerbeyi (q.v.).


AMR AL-HANYYA [see MIRGHANIYYA].

‘AMIṣ (not Amīr, often implied in literature), territory of the ‘Amīr, a sub-tribe of the Djiṭa’da, forming one of the “nine cantons” of the Western Aden Protectorate, with some 27,000 inhabitants (Brit. Agency, 1946). The sultan (amir) resides at Deīl (Dhala), a small town on the south-eastern slope of Djabal Djiṭā, about 10 miles south of Kaṭaba and the border of Yaman. According to von Maltzan the name Djiṭā was applied not only to the country and the capital (Bilād Djiṭā) but also to the reigning sultan, a mamlāk of the Zaydī Imams of Yaman who had made himself independent and created fairly good order in the district. A treaty with the British was signed in 1904 and supplemented in 1944 by an adviser agreement with the Government of Aden, which gives instructions to the tribal guards of the amir. Deīl has a permanent military landing ground for aircraft. A sub-grade school has an average of 50 pupils.

Bibliography: v. Maltzan, Reise, 353 ff. (with full details); Abdullah Mansūr (Wyman Bury), The land of Us, 1911, 17 ff.; and the references given in ‘ALAWI. (O. Löfgren)

‘AMIṣIDS, the descendants (and clients of al-Mansūr b. Aḥbār al-Malik) of Harūn ar-Raṣīl, founded the dynasty of the ‘Amīṣids in Valencia, where he ruled 212-53/1021-61. He was succeeded by his son ‘Abd al-Malik al-Muṣaffar (q.v.), 453-7/1061-5. After a ten years’ interval under al-Maḥmūd of Toledo, ‘Abd al-Malik’s brother, Aḥbār al-Maṭ‘ al-‘Azīz, ruled in Valencia 468-78/1075-83. In this last year the city was wrested from Aḥbār’s son, the ġāšī ‘Uqmān b. Aḥbār al-Bakr, and fell into the power of al-Kādir, who had been dethroned in Toledo. [For further details, see BALANSIYYA] — To the former clients of the house belong Muḥārak and Muṣaffar, who ruled Valencia for a short time from 401/1010-1 onwards, and Muṣaffar al-‘Amīrī (q.v.), who became the ruler of Denia and the Balearic Islands.

(AL-‘AMK, large alluvial plain of northern Syria, situated N-E of Antioch and framed in the tectonic depression which separates the Elma Dagh, or Amanus, from the Kurd Dagh, and which stretches as far as the lower spurs of the Taurus. With a mean elevation of 260 ft. above sea level, it is largely covered by a lake fringed with marshes, called Buḥayrat Yaghra ("the lake of Antioch") or Buḥayrat Yaghra, and in Turkish Aḵ Deniz; fed from the north by the ‘Aḏrīn (q.v.) and the Kara Su, streams which are violent when in spate, the lake discharges its waters in the direction of the Orontes which, before receiving this outlet, the Kutük ‘Aṣl, follows the depression without discharging its waters into it; it flows several metres above the depression and is separated from it by an alluvial or rocky shelf. The marsh, which varies in size in the same season, lends itself to the raising of buffalo and to fishing (eels and silurus; hence the alternative name Buḥayrat al-Sillawr, which appears in the "Casal Sellorie" of the Crusaders), while the perpetually flooded areas bordering the marsh are reserved for the extensive cultivation of cereals.

About the 9th century before Christ, Assyrian inscriptions point to a kingdom on the plain of Antioch, the lake being perhaps of less consequence than now, named ‘Unki; the toponym ‘amk, Semitic in origin and vouched for by the Aramaic stele of King Zakir, derives from a common noun which still has the meaning in Arabic of "depression", or more exactly, according to Ibn Khurraḏaḏbīh (97), "any prairie surrounded by mountains"; this explains the title ‘Amk, formerly given by historians to this country, as distinct from the ‘amk MarĪs, further north.

As a corridor region commanding the approaches to Antioch, the plain of the ‘Amk, under the name of Amyk’s Pedion, was the site of important battles in the Hellenistic era. After the Muslim conquest, it became part of the disputed zone between the Arabs and the Byzantines, to whom it was given by the treaty of 359/969. Guarded by various forts which cut it off from the Syrian hinterland (Artāb, ’Imm, Ḥārim, Ṭizin), it was, like Antioch, momentarily reoccupied by the Muslims; the latter had to cede it to the Crusaders, and it was only finally recovered by Nur al-Dīn in 1049 after the battle fought near Yaghra, a place situated north of the lake where the sultan Kayt-bay later camped during his famous tour of inspection of the Syrian territories. During the Mamlūk and Ottoman periods, the ‘Amk formed part of the province of Aleppo, and was crossed by the routes from Antioch to Aleppo (via Eṭṣur al-Ḥadīl, south of the lake) and from Antioch to Marās, and by the post road Ayas-Bağrās-Aleppo, which passed to the north of the lake after crossing the Amanus by the Baylān pass (see BAGRAS).

The numerous projects under the French mandate, designed to increase the value of the plain and to drain the lake, all failed to provide a satisfactory solution. The return to Turkey in 1939 of the sandījah of Alexandretta, which included the ‘Amk, deprived
the plain of its position as a corridor region, which was one of the main reasons for the interest displayed in it, and because it lies on a route between the ancient cities of Damascus and Bagdad. Ibn al-'Adim, Zuhda (Dahan), ii, 292; Ibn al-Aghir, xi, 89 and Hist. Or. Cr., ii, 164; Yākūt, i, 316, 514, 516, 727; Abu 'l-Fidā', Tabākūm, 41-2, 49, 261; Pauly-Wissowa, i, 1996, Suppl., 172; G. Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems; London 1890, 60, 71-2 (wrongly makes a distinction between the lake of Antiscus and that of Yaghrā), 301; R. Dussaud, Topographie historique de la Syrie, Paris 1927, index (particularly 425 and 432-9); M. Canard, Histoire de la Dynastie des H'ramidides de Jazira et de Syrie, Paris 1940, index (particularly 133-8); M. Gaudefroy-Demombynes, La Syrie à l'époque des Croisades, Paris 1933, 23; Ch. Clermont-Ganneau, Rec. Archol. or., iii, 255; J. Sauvaget, La poste aux chevaux, Paris 1941, 95; J. Weulersse, L'Oront, Tours 1940, 77-80. (D. SOURDEL)

AL-AMMĀN wa-l-KHĀṢṢA [see al-Khāṣṣa].

'AMMĀN, capital of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. Population (1953) approximately 108,000. It is now a small floating population, chiefly refugees from Palestine of about 30,000.

The site has been occupied since earliest prehistoric times. The Citadel Hill (Djabal al-Ḳal'a) is undoubtedly the site of the ancient city often referred to in the Old Testament as Rabbah Ammon. "Rabba of Ammon". Of this ancient city little now remains save some tombs on the hill sides, and a short stretch of Iron Age city wall, perhaps 9th. or 8th. century B.C. The early Israelites (c. 1300 B.C.) failed to secure control of either the city or the district until the determined assault of David during the 11th century B.C. During this attack occurred the episode of Uriah the Hittite, whose name was still traditionally associated with the site in the 10th century A.D. (al-Makdisī, 175). Under Solomon 'Ammān regained its independence. In common with the rest of the country it became a vassal of Assyria during the 8th. and 7th. centuries B.C., but maintained a precarious independence during the Babylonian period. When Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-227 B.C.) conquered the town he renamed it Philadelphia, by which name it was known in Roman and Byzantine times. The Seleucid King Antiochus III captured it about 218 B.C. In the first century B.C. 'Ammān joined the league of the Decapolis, and the Nabateans occupied the city for a short time, but were driven out by Herod the Great about 30 B.C. From him the Romans took over and rebuilt it on the standard Roman provincial plan, with theaters, temples, Forum, Nymphaeum and a main street with columns. Some of these monuments still exist. In Byzantine times 'Ammān was the seat of the Bishopric of Philadelphia and Petra, one of the sees of Palestine Tertia under Bosra. This title is still held by the Greek Catholic Bishop. (For details of ancient history, see Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. Philadelphia.)

Excavation on the Citadel on the site of the present Museum have shown that it was still flourishing when it was captured by the Arab general Yazīd b. Abī Sufyān in 14/635, almost immediately after the fall of Damascus, and on the Citadel at least there were some fine private houses of the Umayyad period. These are of some importance archaeologically, as only the palaces of the Ommayad Caliphs have so far been excavated, and they give us the first evidence of how the ordinary man lived in this period. There is also a square Dḥassānī or Umayyad building on the Citadel.

In common with the rest of Jordan, a decline apparently set in with the removal of the Caliphate from Damascus to Baghdād. Ibn al-'Adīm, writing in 292/903, mentions 'Ammān as belonging to Damascus. Al-Makdisī, writing some 80 years later (375/985) gives a rather full account of the city as it then was (175; quoted by Yākūt, iii, 760). Al-Makdisī puts the town in the district of Filastīn and calls it the capital of the Balka' district (156; cf. also 180, 184).

Yākūt, iii, 710, in 622/1225 refers to it as the city of Dākīyanus or the Emperor Decius, and connects the legend of Lot and his daughters with 'Ammān. He still calls it one of the fruitful towns of Filastīn and capital of the Balka'. But al-Dimāghṣī, 23 (writing about 699/1300), assigns it to the Kingdom of Karak and says that only ruins remain. Abu 'l-Fidā', 247, writing a mere 20 years later says "it is very ancient town, and was ruined before the days of Islam".

It is difficult to account for this sudden drop in the town's fortunes, for no historical or natural catastrophe has been recorded from this period. Thereafter writers are silent on the subject of 'Ammān, and when the first western travellers started to penetrate east of the Jordan in the early 19th century, it was no more than a very small village. In 1295/1878 a group of Circassians were settled there by the Turkish authorities, but it remained a mere handful of houses for many more years.

The first systematic exploration of the town and its environs was that made by Major Conder and his party in 1881, when the ruins of the mosque with a square minaret, perhaps the one mentioned by the al-Makdisī, were still standing. They were still there when the much fuller survey of Butler was carried out in 1907, but he considers the main wall to have been either Roman or Byzantine. Exactly when it was destroyed cannot be ascertained probably soon after the First World War.

In 1340/1921 'Abd Allāh b. al-Ḥusayn [q.v.] made it the capital of Transjordan, and it has grown steadily ever since. Its greatest period of prosperity came during and immediately after World War II since the end of which the city has increased in size at least 50%. It is now the capital and administrative centre for the Kingdom on both sides of the Jordan, and contains the Royal Palace, Houses of Parliament and head offices of all the Ministries. Some fine Government buildings, including a Museum, and Schools have been erected during the last few years, but in the early days of its growth many monuments of the past have disappeared.

AMMAN — 'AMMAR AL-MAWŠIĻI

Jahrbuch der Königlich Preußischen Kunstsamm-
lungen, 1904; W. M. Thomson, The Land and the
Boat; iii. ii. Tristram, Land of Israel, 1843;
M. van Berchem, in Journal des Savants, 1903, 476;
Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan,
i, 7 ft.; Bollettina de Arte, Dec. 1934; Quarterly of
the Department of Antiquities of Palestine, i, xii,
xiv; Khayr al-Din al-Zarakhli 'Amān fi 'Am-
mān, Cairo 1925. (G. Lamkenter Harding)

AMMAN, MIR [see AMAN, MIR]

'AMMAR, BANU, a family of kādās who
governed the principality of Tripoli (in Syria) for
forty years preceding the capture of the town by
the Crusaders in 502/1109.

The first ruler of the family, Amīn al-Dawla
Abū Ṭālib al-Ḥasan b. 'Ammār, who had been kādī of
the town, declared himself independent after the
defeat of the Fātimid governor, Muḥtār al-Dawla b.
Bazzāl in 462/1070. He made the town an
important intellectual centre and founded a
rich library.

On his death in 464/1072 his two nephews quar-
reled about the succession. Djalāl al-Mulk ʿAlī
b. Muḥammad succeeded in evicting his brother.
The authority of Djalāl al-Mulk must have been con-
siderable, as he maintained himself for almost
thirty years. In 473/1081 he took Djabala from the
Frankish chieftains. He manoeuvred as well as he
could between the Fātimids and the Saldjufcids, as Ibn
al-Kalanisi has pointed out: “The towns on the sea,
Tyre and Tripoli, were in the hands of their
authority of Djalāl al-Mulk must have been con-
sequently, when he decided to leave the town in
501, however, he decided to leave the town in
order to seek help against the Franks. The inhabi-
tants, however, faithful to the Fātimid dynasty,
called in the Egyptians, but in spite of the great
efforts made by the Fātimids, they tried to obtain the
good will of the Turks by diplomacy and presents”.

The last ruler, the Banū al-Mulk 'Ammār
(brother of the preceding), succeeded in 49/1099,
and for some years withstood the attacks of the
Crusader Raymund of St. Gilles and his successor.
In 501, however, he decided to leave the town in
order to seek help against the Franks. The inhabi-
tants, however, faithful to the Fātimid dynasty,
called in the Egyptians, but in spite of the great
efforts made by the Fātimids, they tried to obtain the
good will of the Turks by diplomacy and presents”.

A fragmentary inscription by Djalāl al-Mulk is
extant, in which his name figures alone. One can
therefore conclude that the Banū 'Ammār had
detached themselves from the Fātimids and that this
action drove them towards the caliphate of Baghdād;
they proceeded, however, with caution, as their
subjects showed 'Ālid sympathies.  

Bibliography: M. Sobernheim, Matières pour un
Corpus inscriptionum arabicarum, Syrie du Nord,
30 ff.; Ibn al-Kalanisi, Taʾrikh Dimashq, arabic
text and translations of Gibb and Le
Tourneau, index; Wiet, Inscription d'un prince de
Tripoli, Mémorial Henri Basset, ii, 279, 84; R.
Groussset, Histoire des Croisades, iii, 785; A History of
the Crusades, Univ. of Pennsylvania, i, 660.

(G. Wiet)

'AMMAR, BANU (or Banū Thābit, dynasty
which ruled in Tripoli (of the West) 727/1327-
32/1400). Its founder, Thābit, a Syrian Jew;
his name, Thābit b. Ḫwāra Berber, died after a rule of
few months, and was succeeded by his son Muḥammad.
During the reign of Muḥammad's son, Thābit, the Genoese
surprised and plundered Tripoli (756/1355); Thābit
was killed by the neighbouring Arab chiefs with
whom he was seeking refuge. In 771/1370 or 772/1371
Abū Bakr b. Muḥammad expelled from Tripoli
the governor of the Banū Mulk of Kāthāb (Gabès),
Abū Bakr died in 792/1392 and was followed by his
nephew ʿAlī b. 'Ammār. In 800/1397-8 the Hāfṣid
Abū Fāris succeeded in arresting ʿAlī whom he
replaced by two members of the same family, Yaḥyā b. Abī Bakr and his brother ʿAbd al-Wāḥid.
On 6 Raqqā 803/31 May 1401 Abū Fāris captured
Tripoli, imprisoned the brothers and brought to an
end the dominion of the Banū Mulk. 

Bibliography: Ibn Khaldūn, Hist. des Berb.,
i, 196 ff.; Munadjidimbashi, ii, 955; R. Brunschvig,
La Berbérie orientale sous les Hafṣides, i, 150, 173,
191, 205-7, 212-3, ii, 106 (with further references).

(G. Wiet)

'AMMAR, B. YASIR b. ʿAMIR b. MĀLIK, ABU`
'I-YAṣṢĀN, a Companion of the Prophet, later
a partisan of ʿAll. His father, a Mālīk of the Maḥāz-
ümite Abū Ḥujayfa, had married one of his
master's slaves, Sumayya, who was manumitted,
but Yāṣir and his family remained with Abū Ḥujayfa.
They were early converts to Islām, and
suffered severe tortures. 'Ammār is said eventually
to have emigrated to Abyssinia; after the hidjra he
returned to Medina. He took part in the early
campaigns, and fought at Badr, at Uhud, and, in
general, in all the battles of Muḥammad, who at the
time of the muḥākāt between the Muḥājidūn and the
Anṣār, paired him with Ḥujayfa b. al-Yamān. Under Abū Bakr, he lost an ear at the battle of
Yamānā; in 21/641 he was made governor of Kūfa
by ʿUmar; in this capacity he took part in the
conquest of Khūzistān. He was from the first a
partisan of ʿAll; from 35/656 onwards, ʿAlī placed
exceptional confidence in him. Later, when the Banū
al-Mulk, the Banū of the Camel (see al-Ḍjama), caused him
to rally the population of Kūfa to ʿAll, and he was one of those
who led the Prophet's widow ʿAisha prisoner to
Baṣra. He lost his life at Sīfīn (37/657) at an
extremely advanced age. Several centuries later, his
tomb near Sīfīn was still pointed out.

'Ammar was considered to have an excellent
knowledge of the Traditions of the Prophet, and in
addition owed his renown to his great piety and
to his devotion to Islām. Later, writers hostile to the
Umayyads did not fail to glorify him by inventing
hadīths in his favour, and by discovered in the
Kūrān allusions referring to him (i, 207; iii, 62; 1
vi, 52, 122; xvi, 43, 108, 111; xxviii, 4, 61; xxix,
132; a notable prophecy attributed to Muḥammad
concerns the death of 'Ammār at the hands of the
"rebel band", which he condemns to Hell.

'Ammar had a son, Muḥammad, also famous for
his knowledge of hadīths, and a daughter, Umm al-
Ḥakam.

Bibliography: Ibn Saʿd, iii, 176 ff.; Ibn
Kutayba, Maʿṣīfī, 48, 111-2, 239, 252; Nawawi,
Tahdhib, 485-7; Ibn Ḥaḍār, Isbā, no. 5704;
Dāhib, Uṣmānīyya (ed. by Pellat, in prepara-
tion), index. (H. Reckendorff *)

'AMMAR AL-MAWSILI, ABU`-KĀSIM 'AMMAR
B. ʿAll, one of the most famous, and certainly the
most original of Arab oculists. He lived first in
Irāk, then in Egypt; he travelled widely, as he
gained his knowledge of the Greek medical
literature and translated it into Arabic. He
visited Palestine and Egypt in the other, he practised his
profession and performed operations. His work on
ophthalmology was composed in Egypt, in the reign
of al-Hākim (996/1020); thus he was a contemporary

...
of the more famous, but less original, oculist 'Ammār b. 'Īsā (q.v.). If 'Ammār's Tadhkira b. 'Airs is overshadowed by the future emperor Leo the Isaurian. Leo subsequently made it a formidable stronghold, which successfully resisted al-Hasan b. Kahtaba in 46/666; it was occupied in 49/669 in the course of Yazël's expedition against Constantinople, but was retaken by Andreas, the general of Constans.

In 89/708, Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik defeated a Byzantine army before Amorium. In 98/716, at the time of Maslama's expedition against Constantinople, it was besieged by one of his lieutenants, and relieved by the future emperor Leo the Isaurian. Leo subsequently made it a formidable stronghold, which successfully resisted al-Hasan b. Kahtaba in 162/779, in the reign of al-Mahdī, then in 181/997, in the reign of Harūn al-Raḥīf. It only fell in 223/838 to the powerful forces of al-Mu'taṣim, whose Turkish troops besieged it for twelve days, and who finally took it only as the result of treachery.

The capture of Amorium was the subject of a famous poem of Abū Tammām. Forty-two of the prisoners taken to Sāmarrā were executed there on 6 March 845. Their martyrdom is celebrated in the Acta XLII martyrum Amorrierum. The town destroyed by al-Mu'taṣim was rebuilt, but was again burnt down in 319/931 by Thāmil, amir of Tarūs. Thereafter it does not seem to have played any part in history, although in the 12th and 13th centuries it was still an important place, according to the geographers al-Iṣdrī and Ḥāmād Allāh Mustawfī.


(3. CANARD)

AMORIUM [see 'AMMARIYYA].

AMR, a term which occurs in many verses of the Qur'ān in the sense of command, viz. of God. (A paper by J. M. S. Baljon, The amr of god in the Koran, is to appear in Acta Orientalia.) These Kur'ānic passages formed the point of departure for the speculations of theologians and philosophers, in which the Muslim element is often so contaminated, with doctrines of Hellenistic origin, that it loses all character. Nevertheless, the term itself does not seem to have an exact parallel in the relevant Greek terminology, so that it seems that the various theological notions about the divine command were originally formed by Muslims.

This conclusion supports the hypothesis according to which the longer version of the *Theology of Aristotle*, the one which forms the basis of the Latin translation and of which the Arabic original has been discovered by Borisov, was elaborated in a

Encyclopædia of Islam
in the discourse of the representative of the Hanafiyya one finds notions current among the Isma'iliis, but put in a form which avoids giving offence to Sunni orthodoxy. In the Djami' al-Hikmatayn attributed to Nasir-i Khusraw (ed. Corbin, 254) the “world of the amr” is the Isma'ili hierarchy, while the “world of the khalq” is the physical world.

Another theme, often treated by the Shi'is, is the contradiction, assumed by some as possible, between the amr, God's command to perform an action, and the divine will which prevails it.


On the concept of al-amr bi 'l-ma'ruf wa 'l-nahy 'an al-munkar, see mu'tazila.

(S. Pines)

'AMR b. 'ADI b. NASR b. RABI', first Lakhmid King of al-Hira. His father was a famous Lakhmid poet. After a ruse (which frequently appears in Arab legend, cf. the story of 'Abbasa bint al-Mahdi) to win the hand of Rakash, sister of Djadhlma-Abrah, whose father he was, 'Amr, the offspring of this union, succeeded in winning the favour of Dadhima, but was then carried off by the giinn, was considered lost, and was finally restored to his uncle. After al-Zabbab (identified with Zenobia, queen of Palmyra) had seduced and killed Dadhima, 'Amr succeeded the latter on the Lakhmid throne and established his capital at al-Hira; then, with the aid of the sage Kusayr, he succeeded, by means of a stratagem related at length in the historical sources, in avenging his uncle's death and in killing al-Zabbab. Such is the account of the Arabic sources, and it is difficult to doubt the existence of 'Amr b. 'Adi, who lived in the 3rd century A.D. (Caussin de Perceval, Essai, ii, 35, gives the dates of his reigns as 268-88, but the historians credit him with a reign of 118 years); moreover, his name appears in the inscription of al-Namara. On the other hand, the fact that he is mentioned in the commentary on numerous proverbs proves that, as the historical reality of this personage and of the events involving Zenobia became blurred, legend made use of his name to fix the time of events displaced from their historical sequence, and of stories invented to explain proverbs which had become unintelligible; thus, in representing him as the conqueror of Zenobia, legend attributes to him the role played by Aurelian who, in 270-3, seized possession of the Kingdom of Palmyra.

Bibliography: Djabit, Hayyam, i, 302, v, 279, vi, 209; Ibn Kutayba, Ma'darif Cairn 1333/1934, 202; Tabari, Ibn al-Ashir, index; Mas'udi, Muradi, iii, 183 ff.; Marzubanl, Mas'djam, 205; Thallib, Thimard al-Kulah, 505; Maydanl, Cairo 1352, i, 243-7, ii, 83-5, 145; Caussin de Perceval, Essai, ii, 18-40; G. Rothstein, La mishk, Berlin, 1899, index.

(Ch. Pellay)

'AMR b. AL-AHTAM (SINAN) b. SUMAYY al-KHAṣṣa, an eminent Talmudite famous for his poetic and oratorical talent, and also for his physical beauty which earned him the surname of al-Mukabhal (“anointed with collyrium”).
Born a few years before the *hijra*, he made his way to Medina in 9/630 with a delegation from his tribe; in 11/632, he was a follower of the prophetess Sādījī b. Ma`āsir *q.v.*, but he was converted to Islam and took part in the wars of conquest; he conveyed the news of the capture of Rāshāh to Umar in verse; he is said to have died in 57/676. His poems, some of which have come down to us, are superficially brilliant rather than profound; according to tradition his eloquence provoked the famous remark by the Prophet: *inna min al-baydn la-sihr*.

*Biography:* Ibn Kutayba, *Shīr*, 401-3; al-Mufaddal al-Dabbi, *Mu`addalihyyā* (Lyali), 245-54, 830-7; *A`ghānī*, iv, 8-10, xii, 44, xxı, 174; Balādhurī, *Fuwāḥ*, 387; Mubarrad, *Kāmil*, i, 476; Ṭabarī, i, 171-16, 1919; *Nahāsah* (Freitag), i, 723; Ibn al-Aṣḥāḥ, *Usād*, Cairo 1886, iv, 87 ff.; Ibn Ḥadījā, *Īṣābā*, no. 5770; Ibn Ṣubayr, *Ṣark* al-ʿUyān, Alexandria 1290, 77 ff.; Marzubānī, *Mu`ājam*, 262. (J. Wensinck-Ch. Pellat) ʿAMR B. AL-ʿĀṢ (al-ʿĀṣī) AL-SAMH, a contemporary of Muḥammad of Kurayshite birth. The part which he played in Islamic history begins with his conversion in the year 8/629-30. At that time he must already have been of middle age, for at his death which took place probably in 42/661 he was over ninety years old. He passed for one of the most wily politicians of his time, and we must endorse this verdict. The more clear-sighted inhabitants of Mekka already foresaw shortly after the unsuccessful siege of Medina that this fact was the turning-point in Muhammad's career. It is not strange therefore that men like Kālid b. al-Walīd, Uthmān b. Taḥla and ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ went over to Islam even before the capture of Mecca. Not much importance is to be attached to the story of their conversion. That of ʿAmr is said to have taken place in Abyssinia under the influence of the Christian Negus! — Muḥammad at once made use of his newly-gained assistance: after a few small expeditions he sent ʿAmr to Ṣumān, where he entered into negotiations with the two brothers who ruled there, Dīṣyart and Ḍabbāb b. Diʿulanda, and they accepted Islam. He was not to see the Prophet again. The news of the latter's death reached him in ʿUmān, and he occasioned his return to Medina. But he did not remain there long. Probably in the year 12/633 Abū Bakr sent him with an army into Palestine. The accounts of the conquest of this country [see *Filastīn*] are known to be somewhat confused (cf. also Caetani, *Annali dell' Islam*, A. H. 12); but this is certain, that in this undertaking ʿAmr played a most prominent part. The subjection of the country west of the Jordan especially was his achievement, and he was also present at the battles of Ḍajdān and the Yarmūk as at the capture of Damascus.

Yet his real fame is due to his conquest of Egypt. According to some sources he betook himself there with his troops on his own responsibility. It is more probable, however, that Umar was informed of the matter (cf. Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, vi, p. 93) or even that it was undertaken under his orders. It is certain that re-inforcements were soon sent out to him under al-Zubayr. For the history of the conquest cf. the article *Misr*; only the following need be mentioned here: In the summer of 19/640 the Greeks were defeated at Heliopolis. In 20/641 Babylon was occupied by the Arabs, in 21/642 Alexandria lay in their power [see *Mu`awwirs*]. But not only the conquest of Egypt was the work of the genius of ʿAmr; he also regulated the government of this country and the imposition of taxes. He founded Fustāṭ, which was later called Miṣr and in the 4th/10th century al-Ḥākima.

We can understand, that ʿAmr felt himself wronged, when the Caliph ʿUthmān recalled him in favour of Abī Allāh b. Saʿd, shortly after his accession to the throne. He retired into private life, occasionally giving utterance to his mortification. When circumstances became threatening for ʿUthmān, ʿAmr was wise enough not to commit himself as a partisan of his enemies; but he secretly incited ʿAlī, Ṭabla and al-Zubayr against him. From his estates of al-Sabʿ (Beer-Sheba) and Ḍajdān he awaited the development of events with the greatest anxiety. Yet it was not till after the Battle of the Camel (see *al-Djamal*), when only the two opponents ʿAlī and Muʿawiyah survived, that he once more came to the front, associating himself with Muʿawiyah. At the battle of Ṣiffin he commanded the Syrian cavalry. When the battle turned in favour of ʿAlī, he conceived the clever device of placing leaves of the Kurʾān on the lances. The ruse was successful and the battle remained undecided. A court of arbitration was agreed upon, which was to consist of Abū Mūsā ʿl-ʿAṣhrār and ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ. Before the day appointed came, ʿAmr rendered Muʿawiyah the important service of occupying Egypt for him. It was an easy task to dispose of the youthful ʿAlīd governor, Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr: he defeated him (early in 30/650) and put him to death.

In the same year (40/659) ʿAmr proceeded to Adhurb [q.v.] to the court of arbitration (according to al-Ṭāʾīrīdī's chronology in Ṭabarī, i. 1407). Here again he gave a brilliant proof of his political talent. He succeeded in conducting matters so far that Abū Mūsā declared both ʿAlī and Muʿawiyah unworthy of the highest office. ʿAlī lost thereby his title of Caliph, Muʿawiyah however, who had only fought for "Uthmān's blood", lost nothing. Until his death [see above] ʿAmr remained Governor of Egypt. On 15 Ramaḍān 40/22 January 661 he escaped by mere chance assassination at the hands of Zādawayh, one of the three Khāridjites who are said to have chosen the three leaders, ʿAlī, Muʿawiyah, and ʿAmr, as the victims of their fanaticism. ʿAmr felt unwell on that day and left the leadership of the Ṣalātī to Khāridjī b. Ḥuḡḥāf. So the latter was mortally wounded. "I meant ʿAmr, but God meant Khāridjī", the assassin is reported to have said after accomplishing his deed.

*Bibliography:* Ibn Ḥadījā, *Īṣābā*, li. et seq.; Ibn al-ʿAṣḥāḥ, *Usād al-Qaḥāba* (Cairo, 1880), iv, 115; Nawawi (ed. Wustenf.), 478 et seq.; Balādhurī (ed. de Goeje), see Index; Ṭabarī (ed. de Goeje), see Index; Ibn Saʿd iii. 21; Wustenfeld, *Diözese von Agypten (Ahd. d. Gesell. d. Wissens. zu Göttingen, xx)*; Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, vi, 51 et seq. 89 et seq.; Ya`ṣībī (ed. Houtsma), see Index; Caetani, *Annali dell' Islam*, see Index; Butler, *The Arab conquest of Egypt* (London, 1902); S. Lane-Poole, *History of Egypt* (London 1901) vi. (A. J. Wensinck) ʿAMR B. HIND, son of the Lakhmid prince al-Mundhir and of the Kindite woman Ḥan; after the death of his father, he became "king" of al-Ḥira (554-570 A.D.). He was a warlike and cruel prince; the story of how he sent the poets al-Mulātamānis and Ṭarafa to the governor of Bāṣrayn with letters...
containing their own death warrants, is well-known. The severity of his character earned him the
name of an ancient idol (see Rothstein, Lahmiden, 46 ff.). He was assassinated while dining by the poet
Amr b. Kulghum [q.v.], because the latter's mother had been offended by the mother of 'Amr b. Hind.

**Bibliography:** G. Rothstein, Die Dynastie der Lahmiden in al-Hira, 94 ff.; Nöldeke, Gesch. der Perser
und Araber zur Zeit der Sassaniden, 107 ff.; Caussin de Perceval, Essai sur l'histoire des Arabes
assaumi l'Islamisme, ii, 115 ff.; Ibn Katayba, Shi‘r, (de Goeye), index, Idem, Mu‘arrif, (Wüstenfeld),
318-9; Aghani, ix, 178 ff.; xxi, 186-207; Mubarrad, Kamil, i, 97-8; Tabari, i, 900; Ibn Nubata, Sarh al-Uyun, Alexandria 1290, 240 ff.; Ya‘kubi, i, 239-40; Hamza al-Isfahani, (Gottwald),
i, 109-10; Ibn al-Athir, i, 404 ff.

(A. J. Wensinck)

**'AMR B. AL-LAYTH.** Persian general, brother and successor of Ya‘qub b. al-Layth [q.v.], the
founder of the Sa‘farid [q.v.] dynasty in Sindjast. Said to have been a mule-driver in his youth, and
later on a mason, he was associated with his brother's campaigns and in 259/873 captured for Ya‘qub the
Tahirid capital Naysabur. After Ya‘qub's defeat at Dayr al-‘Akul and subsequent death (Shawwal 265/
June 579), 'Amr was elected by the army as his successor. He made his submission to the caliph,
and was invested with the provinces of the former Tahirid principality in Eastern Persia and Sind,
together with Fars, and the command of the ghurja in Baghdād and Sāmarrā (Safar 266/Oct. 879). He
reoccupied Fars in 268/881-2, but obtained effective control of Khurāsān only in 268/883, after a long
struggle with Ahmad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Khudjistāni (d. 268/882) and Rāfi‘ b. Harthama. In the interval,
he was twice dismissed from the command of the ghurja and formally divested of his provinces (in
271/885, after a severe defeat by the caliph's forces under Ahmad b. 'Abd al-‘Aziz b. Abi Dulaf, and
again in 276/890), and also lost Fars in 274/887. Confirmed for the third time as governor of Khurāsān
and Sindjast in 279/893, he finally reestablished his control of the former in 285/896, after a transient
reoccupation by Rāfi‘ b. Harthama. Thereafter, at his own request (arising out of his ambition to
restore in his own favour the former Tahirid suzerainty over the Sāmānid family in Transoxiana)
he was granted the tawliya of Mā‘warid al-Nahr, in 285/898. His attempt to enforce his rights of
suzerainty was, however, cut short when in Rabi‘ II, 285/April 900 the Sāmānid Isma‘il [q.v.] defeated
his forces and captured him at Balkh. 'Amr was sent to Baghdād and after remaining in captivity there
for over a year was executed on 8 Di‘ama‘d I, 289/20 April 902. For his organization of government and
the general significance of his campaigns in the history of Persia, see the art. Sa‘faridūn.

trans., Sketches from Eastern History, London-Edinburgh 1892, 176-206; W. Barthold, Turkestân, 210-225; ibid., Zur Geschichte der Safariden, Fest-

schrift Nöldeke I, Giessen 1906, 177-191; B. Spuler, Iran in Früh-islamischer Zeit, Wiesbaden 1952, 69-81 and index. (W. Barthold *)

'AMR b. LUHAYY, the legendary founder of polytheism in Arabia and the ancestor of the Khuzâ'î (q.v.) at Mecca. The Ka'ba being, according to the Kur'ân (iii, 30), "the first sanctuary ap-

pointed for mankind", it was necessary to believe that polytheism was a later corruption. Neither the Djiyrum, Isâbîy's relatives, nor the Prophet's tribe, the Kuraysh, were likely to be responsible for it. So the blame was laid on 'Amr b. Luhyay, the leader of the Khuzâ'î, who was said to have expelled the Djiyrum from Mecca. He was said to have "changed the religion of Abraham" by introducing the idols either from Hit in Mesopotamia or from Ma'abh in the Balkâ and placing them around the Ka'ba. Others maintained that he fetched the five idols of Noah's contemporaries (mentioned in Kur'ân, lxxi, 23) from Djiyda and distributed them amongst the Arabs over whom by dint of his wealth and liberality he was believed to have an absolute command. He was also accused of setting free certain camels in honour of the idols, a superstition degenerated in Kur'ân, v, 103/2 as an invention of the unbelievers. He was made responsible for the divination by arrows, for the pagan fâhîya, in short for everything heathen. It was even told, that the Prophet had seen him in hell and that he closely resembled in appear-

ance his contemporaries (mentioned in Kur'ân, ixxi, 35; F. E. Bustânî, al-Ma'dîjîn al-Hadîthâ, i, Beirut 1946, 305-314; Dhâhib, Bayân wa Hâyawan, index; Ibn Kutayba, Shîr (de Goeje), 219-22; Buhtûrûf, Hamâsîn, index; Ibn Durayd, Ighîsîhâ, 245; Ibn Hisân, index; Aghânî, index (especially xiv, 25-41); Marzubânî, Mu'asâm, 208-9, Baghdâdî, Khîzânî, ii, 445; Âmîdî, Mu'hâfîzî, 130; Ibn Hâshîîr, Isâbîî, no. 5970; see also: C. A. Nallino, Letteratura (= Scrivuti, vi) 48 (Fr. Trans. 76-2); O. Rescher, Abriss, i, 117. (CH. PELLAT)

'AMR b. MAS'ÂDA b. SA'îd b. Ôôtî, secretary of al-Ma'mûn, was of Turkish origin, and was a relative of Îbrâhîm b. al-Abâs b. al-Šâîl (q.v.). His father had been secretary of chancellery under al-

Maşûrî. He himself served the Barnettides, and was later for many years one of al-Ma'mûn's chief assistants, in charge of the Chancellery and also of various financial posts which seem to have brought him substantial profits, but he never received the title of wârî. He accompanied the Caliph to Damascus and on his expedition into Byzantine territory, and died at Adana in 217/832. He was noted for his epistolary talent, and the Arab authors have preserved several specimens of his work.

Bibliography: Ibn Ta'tûrûf, index; Ya'kûbî, index, Tabarrî, index; Dhâhibîyâhî, Wusârâ; index and D. Sourdrel, in Millenages Massignon: Bayha'dî, Mâkûin, (Schwally), particularly 473-76; Masûdî, Tanbîh, 332; Aghânî, Tables: Tanbîhî, Farâ'dî, Cairo 1938, i, 74-5, 105, ii, 25-6, 38-45; Yâkût, Irshad, vi, 88-91; ibn Khallîkân, Cairo 1948, iii, 145-9, Mub. Kûrd 'A'llî, in MMIA, i, 192-218. (D. Sourdrel)

'AMR b. SA'îD b. AL-ŠIS b. UMAYYAH AL-UMAWI, known as AL-ASHDÂK, Umayyad governor and general. Governor of Mecca when Yazdî b. Mu'âwiyah came to the throne (60/680), he was the same year appointed governor of Medina. On Yazdî's orders, he sent an army to Mecca to subdue the anti-

Caliph 'Abd Allâh b. al-Zubayr, and entrusted the command to a brother of the latter, 'Amr; but 'Amr was taken prisoner and, with his brother's consent, flogged to death by his personal enemies. At the end of the following year, al-Ashdâk was dismissed. Later he went with the Caliph Marwân on his Egyptian expedition and, when Musâ'îb b. al-Zubayr invaded Palestine in an attempt to reconquer Syria during the Caliph's absence, Marwân sent against him the Caliph, who forced him to withdraw. At the conference of the after the death of Yazdî, 'Amr had been mentioned as a possible eventual successor to Marwân; he was the Caliph's nephew through his mother, and was also related to him on his father's side; since he was also well liked in Syria, he could have become a source of danger; but when Marwân had consolidated his position, he enforced the Caliph in favour of his two sons 'Abd al-Malîk and 'Abd al-'Azîz. When 'Abd al-Malîk came to the throne, he entertained fears of 'Amr which were not entirely founded; in fact, in 69/698, when the Caliph undertook a campaign against 'Irâk, al-

Ashdâk took advantage of his absence to assert his longevity, place his death in the caliphate of Mu'âwiyah; but it is more likely that he lost his life either at al-Kâdisiyah or at the battle of Nihawand (21/641), as stated by the most reliable authorities. His poetry, devoted to fighting, seems to have been characterised by its brevity and clarity of expression, but only a few examples of it have come down to us.

Bibliography: Verses and appreciation can be found in: Abharyâs, Rawd al-Ahâb, 233; F. E. Bustânî, al-Ma'dîjîn al-Hadîthâ, i, Beirut 1946, 309-314; Dhâhib, Bayân wa Hâyawan, index; Ibn Kutayba, Shîr (de Goeje), 219-22; Buhtûrûf, Hamâsîn, index; Ibn Durayd, Ighîsîhâ, 245; Ibn Hisân, index; Aghânî, index (especially xiv, 25-41); Marzubânî, Mu'asâm, 208-9, Baghdadî, Khîzânî, ii, 445; Âmîdî, Mu'hâfîzî, 130; Ibn Hâshîîr, Isâbîî, no. 5970; see also: C. A. Nallino, Letteratura (= Scrivuti, vi) 48 (Fr. Trans. 76-2); O. Rescher, Abriss, i, 117. (CH. PELLAT)
right to the caliphate and to stir up a dangerous revolt at Damascus; Abd al-Malik had to return, and Amr only submitted after receiving a promise safeguarding his life and liberty. The Caliph, however, soon decided to remove this potential threat; he had Abd al-Malik brought to the palace where, according to tradition, he was killed by 'Abd al-Malik himself (70/689-90).

Bibliography: Bahalhurt, Ansab al-Asghar, iv/B, index; Ibn Sa'id, v, 175; Ya'qubî, ii, 81 ff.; Tabari, i, 1779 ff; Ibn al-Athir, ii, 318 ff.; Masudi, Muradî, v, 198 ff.; 206, 233 ff.; ix, 58; Aqbeh, index; Marzubani, Mu'jam, 231; Wellhausen, Das arabischen Reich, 188, 188; Buhl, Die Krisis der Umayyadenherrschaft im Jahre 683, in ZA, xxvii, 50-84. (K. V. Zettersten)

'AMR b. 'UBAYD b. BÂB, one of the first of the Mu'tazila, with the kunya, 'Abd Uthman. His grandfather Bâb was captured by Muslims at Kâbul. He himself was born at Baklî in 80/699 and was a masâelâ of a branch of Tamîm. His father apparently moved to Başra, and 'Amr seems for a time to have been a member of the school of al-Hasan al-Basri; though al-Djâhîz also speaks of him as a pupil of al-Faqî B. 'Isa al-Rakây. He also had some connexion with Yazîd III. He gained a great reputation as an ascetic, and was known at the court of al-Mansûr, to whom he apparently spoke fearlessly on religious and moral questions, while refusing all reward. For his strength of character al-Mansûr respected him highly, and on his death composed a eulogy of him in verse. He died in or about 144/761.

There is some obscurity about his precise relationship to Wââsîl b. 'Aqîa and their respective parts in founding the Mu'tazila. The story of how Wââsîl went apart (hâlam) from the circle of al-Hasan is also told of 'Amr both with al-Hasan and with his pupil Katâda; and the early writer Ibn Kutayba (d. about 270/884) knows of 'Amr but not of Wââsîl. Bishr b. al-Mu'tamir (d. 210/825) speaks of his own party as followers of 'Amr and some opponents as followers of Djahm (Intisâr, 134). 'Amr's views are usually said to be similar to Wââsîl's, apart from a slight difference in attitude towards the parties at the battle of the Camel; and Wââsîl had married 'Amr's sister. So there was doubtless some relation between them, but it is possible that 'Amr did more than Wââsîl, who died thirteen years earlier, to create the later Mu'tazila, especially as Abu 'l-Hudhayl al-'Allâl was 'Amr's pupil (Intisâr, 61).

Bibliography: Khayyat, Intisâr (Nyerberg), 67; 97 f., 134, 206; Ahsâri, Makâhid, 16, 148, 222 f.; Nawbahkhâl, Fârik al-Sâha, 11; Ibn Kutayba, Ma'dâfî, 243, 301; al-Sayyid al-Murta'da, Mumya, 18, 22-24; Djalîz, Bayân (Cairo, 1345/1926), i, 202, 245; Bahadâd, Farh, 15, 98-101, 224, 306; Shahrastani, Mislâl, 17, 33 f.; al-Mas'ûdî, Muradî al-Dhakâb, vi, 208-12, 223; vii, 234-36; Ibn Khânkân, 80, 514; A. S. Tritton, Muslim Theology, London, 1947, 50, 60-62 with further references. (W. Montgomery Watt)

AMRITSAR, capital of a district in the Pandjab (India). Pop. (1911). town 325,747, district 1,367,047, of whom 4,585 Muslims. The population of the Muslims in the district declined sharply after Partition. It was founded by the fourth guru of the Sikhs [q.v.], Râm Dás (1574-81), upon a site granted by the emperor Akbar, where he excavated the holy tank from which the town derives its name (amrita saras, "pool of immortality"); initially it was called guru ka chah or chah guru and Râmdâspura). The next guru, Arjuna (1581-1606) completed the Harmandir (in English, the "Golden Temple"), the chief worshipping place of the Sikhs. In 1762, Ahmad Shâh Durândî despoiled the temple and the tank, but it was quickly rebuilt by the Sikhs. With the establishment of independent Sikh power after 1764, the town has been important for its entrepôt trade.

Bibliography: Imperial Gazetteer v, 310 ff.; Sarkar, Fall of the Mogul Empire, ii, 87; R. Gupta, Studies in Later Mogul History of the Pandjab; Cunningham, A History of the Hindus and Turks of India; Guzik Singh, A Brief History of the Harimandir or Golden Temple of Amritsar (1894); Ratan Singh Bhangu, Prachin Panth Parkash (1830, in Gurmukhi). Cf. also Bibliogr. under sikhs.

( Nurul Hasan)

'AMS (see masyarî)

ÂMU DARYA, the river Ouxus. Names. The river was known in antiquity as "Oxos" (also "Oxos", Latin Oxus); length 2494-2540 kms. The present Iranian designation is traceable to the town of Âmûl [q.v.], later Âmû, where the route from Kûrshân to Transoxania crossed the river as long ago as the early Islamic period. The Greek name is, according to W. Geiger and J. Markwart (Wehrot, 3, 89) derived from the Iranian root "to increase"; a derivation from the homonymous root meaning "to sprinkle" is also possible. (Cf. the name of the Wakhsh, a tribuary of the Âmû Darya). In Sâsânian times the river was called Weh-rûh or Beh-rûh (Markwart, Wehrot, 16, 35). The Arabs and Islamicised Persians for a long time called it, especially in learned works, Dây'bûn (used by Gardizi in the 11th century as an appellative for a river in general); this name derives from the Biblical Gilon, one of the rivers of Paradise. In Chinese it is known as Kui-shû, Wu-hu or Po-tsu. The region north of the Âmû Darya is called by the Muslims Mâ warâ' al-Nahr [q.v.], "land on the other side of the river", Transoxania.

The upper course of the river. The Âmû Darya rises from several rapid head-waters. The most southerly of these, the Pandji (rising from the Wakhshâb—in the Middle Ages Dijarâb, cf. Markwart, Wehrot, 52; Barthold, Turkestân, 65—and the Pâmir Darya), has its source in the Pâmir. After following initially a course from East to West, it turns North near Iğhâshâm and receives on the right (E.) the Ghûnd and the Ak Šû [q.v.], and flows from there once more westwards. There follow as tributaries on the right bank the Yağzûlâm and the Wanîbâ, and lastly the Kûlîb Darya. All these rivers as well as those to be named later are fed by several headwaters and tributaries.

The most important and highest tributary of the Pandji on the right bank is the Wakhshâb (also known as Kîlî Šû or Surkhâb), which is regarded as the upper course of the Âmû Darya in the Zafar-nâma of 'Ali Yazdi (1424-5, ed. M. Ilahdad, Calcutta 1885-8, i, 179 ff.). On the other hand the inhabitants of today, as well as the mediaeval geographers, consider the Pandji as the upper course proper; modern geography favours the Ak Šû.

The modern area of the Âmû Darya began to become known from the 19th century onwards (cf. the map in A. Schultz, Landeskundliche Forschungen im Pamir, Hamburg 1916, 24-5; details in Pamir). The Arabic geographers did not entirely grasp the true state of affairs; moreover, the inter-
interpretation of the names of the headwaters given by them is controversial. Al-Istakhrl, 296 (= Iba Hawkal (Kramers), 475), names five headwaters of the Amu Darya; the co-ordination of these names with the designations in use today proposed by W. Barthold, with which, in general, V. Minorsky associates himself, appears the most plausible: (See Barthold, Turkestan, 68 ff.; Minorsky, Huddid, 208, 366; different identifications were proposed by Marquart Zeitschr., 339, and Le Strange, 435). The area of confluence of these streams was known in the 13th century as Arban (in the Zafernama Arhang), in al-Biruni Hu(b)sara. Al-Makdisi, 22, counts as sixth headwater the Kawaqhiyin river. The Kukcha and the Kunduz river are other left-hand tributaries mentioned by the Arabs (al-Tabarí, ii, 1590; Ibn Khurramadibb, 331; Ibn al-Fakhr, 324, Ibn Rusta, 93; Minorsky Huddid, 353 f.). From the right enter the Kafirimahan (260 kms.; in the Middle Ages Rámídh, in Ibn Rusta, 93, Zámil, today the name of one of its headwaters) and the Surkhán (200 kms.; in the Middle Ages and in the 14th century Çağhán Rûdh). It is from the mouth of the Kafirimahan at Pandjab (Aywad of today; Barthold, Turkestan, 73) that some geographers consider the Oxus proper to begin. The last (right-hand) tributary before the mouth (1275 kms. distant) is the Surkhán Darya, as the Shrubad and Kálíf rivers do not, on normal circumstances reach the Amu Darya, and the Zarafshan [q.v.] too loses its waters and does not join the Oxus. Similarly numerous rivers on the left-hand side run out in the sand before reaching the Amu Darya. The (lower) Murgâb did not in Islamic times reach it; it remains doubtful how far Greek sources, which indicate that this did occur in their time, are correct (Ptolomy, vi, 10 [cf. Murgâb]; the Har Rûdh [q.v.], Aries, ran out in the sands of the Kara Küm (Strabo, xi, 58; Ptolomy, vi, 17, cf. Pauly-Wissowa, ii, 623 f.).

In the upper region of the Amu Darya lie the districts of Wâkhân (on the Pandij), then Badakhshân (on both sides) and Shughân with Shârân (Sharân) S. and E. of the junction of the Pandij with the upper Murgâb, further N. Darâwâz. Between the Amu Darya and the Wâkhân lies Ghutatalân. The Wâkhân flows through the Pâmîr region (the name Fâmîr occurs already in al-Ya`qûbî, al-Bulânî, 390 and al-Dimashki) and then touches Zaght (thus correctly in Gardîzî, ed. Nârimp, 35) and Kûmîd. Between the Wâkhân and Kafirimahan lay in medial times Wâsh-djûrûd (the Faydâbûd of today) and Kuvâdîjûn (the Kabûdiyân of today). The Surkhân valley contained the province of Câghânîyân (Arabic Saghânîyân). On the left bank lay, W. from Badakhshân, the province of Tacchâristân (approximately up to Balkh). At this point the Amu Darya enters the desert tract between the Kara Küm of the present day (on the left) and the Hulu Küm (on the right) which would have been impossible without irrigation from the Amu Darya, is a sure indication that in that time the Unguz cannot have been the sole lower course of the Amu Darya. Historical maps for the mediaeval period in Minorsky, Huddid, 335; Le Strange, maps ix and x; Atlas Istorii SSSR, i, Moscow 1949, 4, 12, 25; A. Herrmann, Atlas of China, Cambridge (Mass.) 1935, 24, 32, 49, 60; for later times cf. Atlas Istorii SSSR, ii, Moscow 1949, 15, 17 right bottom, 18; Burhân al-Dîn Khân Kushkeli, Kutanagan i Badakhshan, transl. from Persian into Russian by A. A. Semenov, Tahtsent 1926; A. Herrmann, Atlas of China, 66 (distribution of nationalities); Westermann's Atlas zur Weltgeschichte, iii, Brunswick 1953, 134, 135.

The following were places of particular importance on the Amu Darya in the Middle Ages: Tîrmîdî, Kâlîf, Zamm (Kârkî; left), opposite to which lies Akkahlîkah, Amul (Cardjûy; left), opposite to which is Firâbrû, finally various towns of Khârizim. [cf. the articles].

The water of the Amû Darya rises in its middle course, which is 3570-5700 ms. broad and 5-8 ft. deep, in April-May, and becomes low again in July. It frequently floods the areas on its banks, particularly to the right, hence from time to time a more luxuriant growth of bushes and vegetation is produced there. The river is in this neighbourhood not directly tapped for irrigation; nevertheless there ran along its left bank in the Middle Ages a strip used for agricultural purposes; from the 14th century on it apparently began to turn into a steppe (Barthold, Turkestan, 81 f.).

The lower course and its changes. From the middle course onwards, somewhat beyond Kâlîf, the course of the Amu Darya shifted in various directions in prehistoric or even in historical times. According to Ptolemy the course of the Amu Darya in the area between Kâlîf and Zamm (or Kârkî) turned in approximately a W. direction (as opposed to the NW direction of the present day) and ran into the region of the Kara Küm desert. Al-Birûnî too assumed such a course for the river in a previous epoch (cf. A. Z. V. Togan, Birûnî's Pictures). In actual fact it is possible to trace a former bed which branches off at Kârkî, goes between Repetek and Öt Hâşîqî and finds its continuation in the (former) Unguz river bed. Between 1928 and 1940 for instance the Amu Darya showed a tendency to flow S. in this vicinity, so that from the geological point of view a similar course is not out of the question. The theory of a bed in Unguz (in spite of the molluscs which al-Birûnî reports having found there) requires further geological research before further conclusions can be drawn from the extremely uncertain reports of the old geographers. Al-Birûnî's account is that the Amu Darya/Unguz flowed into a great desert lake but did not reach the Caspian. On the other hand Strabo (xi, 50) reports a discharge into the Caspian Sea. The culture of Khârizim, however, which has ten centuries' history behind it, and which would have been impossible without irrigation from the Amu Darya, is a sure indication that in that time the Unguz cannot have been the sole lower course of the Amû Darya.

Al-Birûnî supposes that as a result of obstructions of the riverbed, the Amû Darya later, instead of flowing into the Unguz, squeezed through the narrow river-gorge (360 m.) between the Düldül Atlâghân and the Tûye Moyun (at the present day Fitnyak, 384 kms. from its mouth) it is called Dâhân-i Shîr = Fân al-Asad, "lion's mouth"). But geological research here too indicates that this break-through must have come about already in prehistoric times. Below this pass there branch off the large side canals which render possible the oasis culture of Khârizim.
The Arabic geographers of the 10th century give Tahiriyya, S. of the river-gorge, as the southern limit of this area of irrigation. In the 11th century Dargarun, further NW (N. of the gorge) was generally regarded as the limit (Bayhakt, ed. Morley, 859). The S. boundary of the Khdnate of Khiva was first fixed further S. (S. of Pitnyak) after the Russian conquest of 1873.

Opposite the present-day Sadwar (three farsakhs on the other side of the gorge) there branch off to the right the Gawkh*ara, and after five more farsakhs the Kirya canal. They extended, respectively, N. to the Sultan Uways Daghli chain and E. from it to the same latitude and formed the basis of the rich cultural development during and preceding the Islamic era on the lower right bank of the Amu Darya N. of the present-day Dorkult (Turtkuli), the capital of the province of Karakalpakia. (Cf. Tolstov, in Bibl., and Kharizm).

Further NW and N. the main bed of the Amu Darya has repeatedly shifted in historical times and does so even at the present day. The question has been thoroughly debated whether the Amu Darya had in earlier times a different lower course. De Goeje quoted historical sources to the effect that the river has always in historical times emptied itself—albeit in separate main branches—into the Aral Sea. W. Barthold opposed this view and supposed that the Mongols by piercing a main dam with the object of conquering the town of (Old) Urgandj [v.u.] in 1221, diverted the river towards the W., so that it flowed into the depression and the sea and marsh tracts of the Sarf Kamiah and finally into the Caspian along the eastern edge of the Cina (Cink) ridge and further through the Ozyob (Russian Uzboj) until the end of the 16th century. Barthold quotes in support of his thesis statements by Hamd Allah Mustawfi (213 transl., 206; 117, transl. 170), Hafs-i Abr, (see W. Barthold, Aral, 44 f.), and Zahir al-Din Marashli. The latter (ed. B. Dorn, Mohammed. Sources etc., i. Petersburg 1850, 436, transl. 436) speaks of a fleet which travelled up on the Djayhun from the mouth of the Ozyob in the Caspian. Khvandamir (iii, 244 6) reports that the sultan Hsuyan Baykara travelled from Aghriqa (the Balkhun mountains) to Adjlak (now Aq Ka'a) and crossed the Amu Darya "after seven days". But most of this evidence is subject to doubt, and Khvandamir himself in his geographical appendix definitely makes the Amu Darya flow into the Aral Sea. Everything considered, the evidence adduced by de Goeje seems to have more weight than that relied on by Barthold.

Barthold's views, however, found widespread support among historians and Le Strange, A. Herrmann and A. Zeki Velidi Togan (Divran's Picture; recapitulated in IA, i, 423-6) contended that the Amu Darya flowed into the Caspian even at an earlier period.

Barthold, and following him Togan, viewed the 16th century as the time of the shifting back of the mouth of the Amu Darya to the Aral Sea. Both refer in this connection to the reports of the English traveller Anthony Jenkinson in 1538 (in R. Hakluyt, The Principal Navigations etc., i, London 1598, 449) and of the Ottoman traveller Saryj in 1550/52 (Barthold, Aral, 77; idem, Oroschema, 93) as well as to Abu 'l-Ghazl (b. 1603), who dates a shifting of the Amu Darya 30 years before his birth (thus ca. 1573). The Khvandamirian writer Ağli and the chronicle of Khiva by Mu'nis (19th century) place this event in the year 1578 (Barthold, Aral, 69-74).

Thus the discharge of the Amu Darya into the Aral Sea is unequivocally established for the period following the 16th century.

Although the question of the course of the lower Amu Darya seemed to be settled by the satisfaction of the historians by the theory that the Ozboy up till the 16th century formed the lower bed of the river (cf. A. Herrmann, Gibt es noch ein Oxus-Problem?, Petermanns Mitteilungen, 1930, 280 ff.), yet geographers and geologists have always rejected this view (see A. S. Ke's, I. P. Gerasimov and K. K. Markov, and S. P. Tolstov, in Bibliogr.). At the present state of geological research, it appears that a temporary diversion of the Amu Darya into the Sarf Kamiah has been established; on the other hand, the Ozboy was clearly not the river-bed of the Amu Darya on its way to the Caspian in historical times.

Shifting of the channels of the Amu Darya in the delta proper is not a matter of doubt either in historical times or at present. The early Islamic capital of Kharizm, Khv [v.u.] gradually decayed owing to shifting of the bed of the river. The interpretation of the reports of the 10th century geographers is, however, uncertain. They speak of a series of lakes (Khalidjan); according to Ibn Rusta, 92, these were on the edge of the Siyah Kuh (Cin), but according to al-Istakhri, 303, and Ibn Hawkal (Kramers), 480, on the Aral Sea; al-Makdisi, 288, 343 f., gives no details. (Cf. also Barthold, Turkestam, 152; idem, Oroshenie, 84; idem, Aral, 22). The town of (Old) Urgandj lay after the Mongol conquest 'on the right bank of the river' (i.e. the Darya'llik). The breaking off of the connection to the Sarf Kamiah in the 16th century may be accepted as a fact: possibly the resumed intensive irrigation took away the necessary water. At all events (Old) Urgandj lost its water-supply and was replaced by the towns of Wazir (since ca. 1450, ruined in the 17th century, ruins near the present day fortress of Dëw Ka'a) and (New) Urgandj. Finally the emergence of Khiva as capital of the province is to be attributed to these shifting. The delta "island" (Aral) now took on importance. From here a new system of canals going to the left was constructed in the 19th century, and (Old) Urgandj was once again enabled to regain some kind of existence.

For the settlement and the population in the area of the mouth of the Amu Darya, cf. ku'arizm, Khiva, Alan, Przhezhe, Oghuz, Turkmen, Uzbek, Karakalpak, Sart.

In the delta and in the lower reaches of the Amu Darya occurs a covering of ice, which on the average holds from the end of December to the end of March, and which caused astonishment to the Arab geographers and travellers (Ibn Bat'tUt, ii, 450 f., iii, i f.). It nearly cost Yaqut his life in 1219 during his flight from the Mongols. In particularly severe winters it is up to 21 in. thick. The upper reaches also frequently freeze over in the mountainous regions.

In recent times there have been various projects for the diversion of the Amu Darya into the Caspian. In 1716 Peter the Great commissioned Prince Alexander Beković-Cerkeskii (actually Dewlet Kizden Mirza, cf. Brockhaus-Efron, Entsiki, Sover, iii, 356 f.; Bol'shaya Sovetskaya Entsikl., iv, 406, with references) to investigate the possibilities of establishing a waterway almost right up to the frontiers of India. In 1873 the project was once more explored and pronounced basically feasible. It appeared that the way from Čardjuli through
the Unguz was the most suitable, since it would thus not be necessary to await the protracted
felling up of the Sarf Kambush depression (cf. A. I. Glučevskiy, "Propusk vod r. Amu-Dar'ı po staromu
genya ruslu v Kaspiyskom More, St. Petersburg 1893). After an extensive flood in 1952 the Soviet
Government is said to have tackled anew in 1953 the project for a diversion of the powerful and incal-
culable Amū Daryā through a part of the Ozboy.

The upper course of the Oxus: J. Wood, A journey to the source of the River Oxus, London 1872 (with historical geographical introduction by H. Yule); J. Markwart, Wehret und Arang, Leiden 1938 (especially 52 ff.; cf. also index).—The Oxus-Ozboy problem: M. J. de Goeje, Dar altē Bēt des Oxus, Leiden 1875; Barthold, Sokhtēvānī
ob arā'kīm more i nisīyā-yāh Amudārī, Tashkent 1902 (in German: Nachrichten über den Aralsee
und den unteren Lauf des Amudara, Leipzig 1910); V. Lokhtin, Ṛkha Amu-Dar'ya i eya
dreemī soyedinenie s Kaspiyskom Morem, St. Petersburg 1879; Le Strange, 433-45, 453-58
and index; D. D. Bukinšc, Starye rūstela Oksa i amu-dar'inskaya problema, Moscow 1906; A. Herrmann, Altē Geographē des unteren Oξuv-
gebiete (Abh. G. W. Gütt., N.F. 18/4), Berlin 1914; F. Kolāček, Ėtāt Oussbāw pendant les temps
historiques un ancien lit de l'Amou-Daria?, Spisy vydavatē přirodoaeskou fakultē Masarykovy
University, 1927 (with map); W. W. Tarn, The Greeks in Bactria and India, 1938, 491-5.

The use of the column and the capital in Muslim
art, and in particular in religious architecture, is
connected with the adoption by the builders of
mosques of the oratory with multiple aisles and of
the court surrounded by galleries. The column,
like the lotus-bud capital of
Abbasid monuments of Samarra
century in the
end of 3rd/9th century)
in Persian, whose brick and tile architecture admits of
specialized variants, and predominates in western Islam. In the
Persia, whose brick and tile architecture admits of
capital is no longer slightly convex, and its diameter
is equal throughout its length, the plan being
is circular or polygonal. The capital assumes various
forms which can be classified in two main groups,
both perhaps derived from the Corinthian capital,
but each possessing a distinctly localized development and
decor.

The first group consists of capitals whose cam-
panula or lyre-shaped outline (Herzfeld) has perhaps
been contaminated by the lotus-bud capital of
ancient Egypt. This capital appears in the 3rd/9th
century in the Ābbāsid monuments of Sāmarrā
and Rāqākā (4). It passes, with many other elements,
into the Tūlūnīd architecture at Cairo
(end of 3rd/9th century) (B), and is preserved in Egypt under the Burdžī (C) and Circassian
(Mamlūk). The base has a similar, though inversely,
outline. This bell-shaped capital is also found in
Persia, whose brick and tile architecture admits of
few real columns. It crowns the small imitation
columns of the faience
mīNAMESPACE (E).

The general outline of the second group of capitals
is rather that of the Corinthian corbel; it appears as
a simplified form of the latter, by eliminating the
vigorous reliefs of the Corinthian column and its local
grooves, and predominates in western Islam. In the
3rd/9th century, al-Kayrawānī possessed small
capitals related to Coptic models, with four smooth
leaves joined at the bottom and curving inwards at
the point like a hook (F). From them derived, in
the same region, the Fatimid capitals of the 4th/10th and 5th/11th centuries, with a limb of flowing floral designs surmounting shafts decorated with whirls or inscriptions in scroll form (G), and, from the 7th/13th century onwards, the Tunisian capitals (H). About the same period, the monuments of the Umayyads of Spain were ornamented with capitals copied from the two classical models: Corinthian and Composite (I), rounded off, as in the Great Mosque at Cordova, or scored with deep grooves as at Madina al-Zahra (and half of the 4th/10th century). These were the prototypes of the many beautiful variants offered by the Aljaferia of Saragossa (5th/11th century) and the Almohad mosques of Tinmel (J) and Marrakush (6th/12th century). In the 7th/13th century there emerged the Hispano-Moresco capital with a cylindrical lower portion and a parallelipped upper portion (K), which is recognizably a development from the Corinthian corbel which is both logical and in harmony with the Islamic plastic ideal. Various types can be found in the mosques and madrasas of North Africa and in the Alhambra at Granada. The latter has also some capitals in the shape of stalactites, probably an imitation of Persian originals. (G. MARCAIS)

AMUL, name of two towns: (1) A town in the south-west corner of the east Mzarandarãn plain; it stands on the west bank of the Harhaz river, 12 miles south of the Caspian Sea, in the district which, according to the Classical writers, was the home of the Mdarpds (Amul may be the modern Persian form of the (hypothetical) Old Persian Amdarha). Ibn Islendiyãr (Ta’rîh-ê 1 Tabaristan, Teheran 194?: 62 f.) states that Amul was founded by Amulã, daughter of a Daylamite chief and wife of King Firuz of the Uzbegs. (A Relation of a Journey begun in 1610, London 1632, 106-7). In order to distinguish the town from Amul no. 2, definitions were sometimes added to the name, as Yâkût points out, and it was called either Amul Zamm (cf. e.g. al-Baladhuri, ed. de Goeje, 410 and 420), i.e. the Amul near Zamm (the modern Kerki, 125 miles to the south-east), or Amul Diayhûn, i.e. the Amul on the Diayhûn (Oxus), or Amul al-Sâhît, i.e. the Amul on the river. Yet another name of the town, which occurs already in the Middle Ages, is Amûyâ (cp. especially al-Baladhuri, 410; Yâkût, i, 365) or Amû (Yâkût, i, 70); this last is perhaps merely a dialectical form of Amul, from which the later medieval name of the Oxus, Amû Daryá (river of Amû) may have been derived (thus Barthold, cp. AMU DARYA); it seems more likely, however, that this Amûyâ may be derived from Amû, an ancient local name of the Oxus. The modern name, Çąrdjîǰ, “the four streams”, refers to the important ford over the Oxus near by. Çąrdjîǰ is now connected by rail with Marw and Krasnovodsk to the west, and with Bukhârâ, Samarkand and Tahkent to the north-east; the railway crosses the Oxus by a long bridge go the north-east of the town. Bibliography: Yâkût, i, 69, 70, 365; Le Strange, 403 f., 434; Marquart, Eranafir n. d. Geogr. d. Pseudo Moses-Xenarchus; Berlin 1901, 136, 311; id. Untersuchungen zur Gesch. von Eran, Leipzig 1895, ii, 57. (M. STRECK)

The town appears to have received its present name of Çąrdjîǰ in the time of the Timurids; in his account of the events of 903/1497-8, Bâbur (Bâbur-nâmâ, ed. Beveridge, f. 58) mentions the passage of the river at Çąrdjîǰ (Çąrdjîǰ gizân). In 910/1504 the fortress of Çąrdjîǰ in Muhammad Sâikh, Shâyâbânî-nâmâ (Melioranskij, 197; Çąrdjîǰ bâfast, in Barâk’s Persian Shâyâbânî-nâmâ, quoted by Samoilović, Zap. Vost. Old. Arkh. Obseč., xix, 173: Kaifa-yi Çâhâr-djîǰ) had to surrender to the Uzbegs.

During the period of Uzbeg domination, as in the Middle Ages, the most important passage of the
Oxus was at Čardjūy; boats were always kept in readiness for this purpose; bridges of boats were occasionally built for the passage of large armies, as, for example, for Nādir Shah's army in 1533/1740. Čardjūy, is, however as far as is known, nowhere mentioned in any authority as a large town in this period, still less as the residence of a prince or governor of importance. (Cf. Burnes, Travels, iii, 7 ff. [visited the town in 1832]; more reliable than J. Wolff, Narrative of a Mission to Bokhara, 1844, 162 ff.; Mushketow, Turkestan, St. Petersburg 1886, 606 ff. [visit of 1870]).

In 1884, the Turkmen of Marw had to submit to the Russians; the old caravan route was replaced by a railway which reached the Amū Daryā in 1886. The importance of Čardjūy, as a result, rapidly increased; the town, which was the residence of a bāq of Bukhāra, had before the Revolution about 15,000 inhabitants.

10 miles from Old Čardjūy near the Amū Daryā railway station, on ground ceded by the amir of Bukhāra to the Russian Government, a new town arose which was the seat of a Russian military commandant and which had a population in 1914 of 4,500. In 1907 a railway bridge was built across the Amū Daryā thus ensuring railway communication between Čardjūy-Bukhāra and Tāshkent.

Under the Soviet regime new Čardjūy has become an important administrative and, since 1924, an industrial centre. In 1926, its population increased to 13,959, of whom 8,069 were Russians, 846 Armenians, 525 Caucasians and only 458 Turkmen; in 1933 it rose to 14,500; the Turkmen always forming a small minority. In 1935 it was the second town of the Soviet Republic of Turkmenistān, and for a time (before 1930) there was a proposal to make it the capital of the Republic. Since 21 Nov. 1939 New Čardjūy has been the chief town of the oblast of the same name. It is a modern town designed on a rectilinear plan, and the town-planning scheme visualizes an eventual population of about 200,000. It is the home of numerous industries, and an important centre of communications—rail (Krasnovodsk-Tāshkent and Čardjūy-Kungrat lines); road (the Čardjūy-Khiwa motor road); and, river, the Amū Daryā being navigable from Termīndī to the Aral Sea.

Old Čardjūy (now Kaganovitschek) is now a small workers' town situated 5 miles from the outskirts of Čardjūy, and has retained its character as an ancient indigenous town. In 1931 its population was 2,042, mainly Turkmen of the Salor tribe, and Uzbek.

The district (oblast) of Čardjūy, created on 21 Nov. 1939, has a total area of 36,000 sq.m. and is situated in Eastern Turkmenistān. The oasis of Čardjūy, which stretches between the Amū Daryā and the Kara Kum desert, forms the centre of this district; it is a rich agricultural area (cultivation of silk, horticulture, cotton plantations, vine-growing, breeding of harabul sheep). (A. Beningisen).

AMULETS [see HAMA'IL].

'AMŪR (Djabal), a mountain massif in southern Algeria. The mountains of the 'Amūr, named after a section of the people who live there form part of the Saharan Atlas of Algeria, together with the mountains of the Ḫāsur and the Ouled Nail which form a continuation to the S-W and N-E. Nearly all over 3,900 ft., they rise slightly above the high steppes of Oran (3,275-3,900 ft.), and drop sharply down to the Saharan foothills (2,975-3,275 ft.).

Between the ranges, which run S-W to N-E, stretch large synclinal watercourses with flat lands, with the occasional contrast of deep valleys which form scarped plateaus such as that of El-Gā'dā. The altitude gives the region cold winters, temperate summers and a relatively heavy rainfall. Thus the mountains of the 'Amūr, are still covered with forests, especially in the north-western ranges (4,920-5,575 ft.) and on El-Gā'dā (3,950-4,590 ft.): these forests are mainly of juniper. Mediterranean flora mingles with that of the steppe, such as alfa, which prevails on the southern slopes.

Inhabited from very early times, as is witnessed by the rock carvings and graves scattered over the massif, the Djabal 'Amūr was for long ignored by the historians. The earliest inhabitants mentioned are the Rashīd Berbers who have given their name to the massif. They were to some extent superseded, in the course of the 8th/14th century, by the Arabised nomads of the Sahara, the Amūr, perhaps partly of Hilāli origin, who settled in this mountain massif. and the name Djabal 'Amūr was substituted for that of Djabal Rashīd.

Numerous traces of villages (ḥāsur) point to the early existence of agricultural life on a wider scale than to-day. The Djabal 'Amūr is primarily a pastoral mountain region; flocks of sheep and flocks of sheep and goats move from the north to the south of the massif and along its fringes, and the inhabitants live in tents often carried on the back of oxen. The 'Amūr make excellent knotted carpets. Afrou, the administrative and economic centre, has developed at the expense of the four surviving ḥāsur.


'AMWAŚ or 'AMWAŚ, the ancient Emmaus, still marked by a large village, was situated in the plain of Judæa at the foot of the mountains, some 19 miles from Jerusalem, and commanding one of the principal approach routes to the latter. The site of a victory won by Judas Maccabæus in 166 B.C., it was fortified by the Seleucid general in 160 B.C. and became under Caesar the chief tow of a topharchy, only to decline to the size of a small market-town after being burnt by Varus in 4 B.C. Its strategic importance, however, led to its being selected by Vespasian as the site of a fortified camp, and it had again grown to the size of a small city when it obtained from Elagabalus in 221 A.D. the title of Nicopolis, its Christian colony embellished it with a basilica which, as excavations have discovered, was rebuilt successively by the Byzantines and the Crusaders.

The conquest of the area by the Arabs, which according to the sources occurred in 8/633 after the victory of Aδiδαγαιν, or in 7/658 after that of the Yarmūk, marked its final decline; it was chiefly known as the source of the notorious "'Amwaś plague" which left its tragic record in contemporary annals and which claimed 25,000 victims including the famous chiefs Abû 'Ubayda, Mu'āsch b. Djabal and Yazīd b. Abī Sufyān. Its position as administrative capital was taken over by Ludd, and then by Ramla, founded in Umayyad times; the Arab geographers confined themselves to mentioning the small town, which played no part even during the period of the Crusades, when it experienced the same fortunes as Jerusalem down to the temporary
retrocession to the Franks under the treaty of Jaffa between al-Malik al-Kamil and Frederick II.

... the appearance of trans-desert steamer traffic, downstream only; and the traditional caravan-road from central ʻIrāk to northern Syria, passing through ʻAna—a main element in its early importance—is little used since the appearance of trans-desert motor traffic. The town is flanked to the west by the tribal area of the ʻAniza sections in the Syrian desert, and to the east by the Ṣhammar Djarba in the Djižāra, while the river banks are the area of the settled cultivating and sheep-breeding Dulaym. It is, under the ʻIrāk Government, the headquarters of a .badā group, and includes the additional nābiyās of al-Ḳā'im, Dju'bba, and Ḥadīthā. The townspeople, practically all Sunni Arabs—with small Jewish and for their weaving of cotton-cloth and woollen mats and cloaks: the men, whom lack of space for expansion forces largely to emigrate, are known for their skill as Euphrates boatmen, and in earlier times, of the Rhomaeans). The name, recorded in cuneiform inscriptions as Anat or Khanat, was identical with the Greek Ἄνατολι in Byzantine pronunciation; Anatolia, Asia Minor, the mountainous peninsula—including its base—proceeding from the southern part of the Asiatic continent towards Europe (Balkan peninsula)—known as Asia Minor (Μικρὰ Ἀσία) in antiquity—is situated between 36° and 45° N and 26° and 45° E. Together with the Balkan peninsula it has formed a bridge between Central Europe and Western Asia throughout its history. Arab geographers in the Middle Ages, and Turks until far into Ottoman times, called the country Bilād al-ṣūr (country of the Rhomaeans).

The name ʻAnatolh (rising of the sun) is used first and foremost as a geographical term by the Byzantines, as „Orient“ or „Orient“ to denote all that lies east of Constantinople, i.e. especially Asia Minor and Egypt. A prefecture „per Orientem“ (περὶ Ἑλλάδος ἐν τῇ Ἁπάντως Ἑλλάδος) appears, however, in the reorganization of the administration by Diocletian and Constantine as one of the four large sections of the empire; it consists of the five dioceses of Aegyptus, Orientis (Ἄνατολι in the stricter sense), Pontus, Asia, and Thracia, that is to say, the Middle East, Thrace, Egypt and Libya. The administrative term ʻAnatolh disappears with the introduction of the division into themes (at the beginning of the first half of the 7th century); the name ʻAnatolikŏn or θέμα τῶν Ἀνατολικῶν is now applied to the theme (administrative area) around Amorium and Iconium. This considerably smaller administrative unit is called al-Nāṭolūs, or some-
thing similar, (explained as al-mashrifc, "the east") by Ibn Khurradadhbih (107, transl. 79); al-Natollk (explained as al-mashrifci, "the eastern") by Kudama, (ed. de Goeje, 258, transl., 198); cf. H. Geler, Die Genesiss der byzantinischen Themen-Verfassung, Leip- 

The name of the theme Anatolikon disappears again with the Turkish conquest. The general geographical term Anadolu reappears however, and gradually becomes Anadolu with the Turks. To begin with, this meant only western Anatolia. The large Ottoman province (eyalel or wilãyet) of this name embraced the area of the former western Anatolian Turkish principalities (see next article). The term Anadolu as name of a province disappeared at the time of the reorganisation of the provinces during the tanzimdt (middle of the 19th century). From then on "Ana-
tolia", used geographically, came to mean the whole peninsula (roughly as far as the line Trebizond (Trab-
zon) Erzingjan-Bireddik-Alexandretta) which today forms the main part of the area of the Turkish republic. “Anadolu”, as it is used today in Turkish, is the whole Asiatic part of modern Turkey, including Mesopotamia: al-Djazlra (Diyarbakr), Kurdistán (Van and Bitlis), as well as to Armenia (Kars). It is in this sense that the term is used in the present article (the islands in the Aegean Sea are not taken into account). In 1950 the overall area of Turkey was stated to be 767,119 sq. km. Of these, Thrace has 23,453 sq. km. and Anatolia 743,654 sq. km. The number of inhabitants in the whole of Turkey was 20,934,670 in 1950; of these, 18,262,229 lived in the European part of Turkey, and 19,308,441 lived in Anatolia. [For pre-Turkish Anatolia, see RUM].

(F. Torschner)

(ii) PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY

General survey of the nature of the country. Anatolia consists of a spacious high plateau, ringed by longitudinal and even higher mountain ranges to the north and south. The central plateau contains Central Anatolia. The northern part of this ring may best be collectively called the northern Anatolian border mountains; the southern section is formed by the Taurus system. Central Anatolia is ringed off by hills to the east and west as well, where the northern and southern ranges come into contact. Thus there is the mountainous ridge of western Anatolia, with the Aegean coastlands lying beyond it. In the east, there are the chains of mountains of the upper Euphrates region and—as a sort of outpost of Anatolia—the high plateau of Mount Ararat.

As might be expected from the geographical position, the winter temperatures along the coast of Anatolia are mild, ranging from an average of over 5° C. on the Black Sea coast to over 8° C. on the southern coast during January. A large part of the country lies within the reach of the system of low atmospheric pressure which moves from west to east and influences the weather in western and central Europe throughout the year. Hence humidity in Anatolia is comparatively high during the winter. In summer, the coastal areas become oppressively hot, with average temperatures for July and August of 22° in the north and over 27° in the south. Northern winds prevail and bring a dryness, typical of the Mediterranean climate, to the west and south coast in summer, whilst, coming from the sea, they bring rainfall even in summer to the northern coast.

On the south and west coast, natural vegetation is largely of the evergreen variety common in mediterra-
nean countries. In many places it has been made into arable land, whilst the rest has deteriorated into shrubs and sparse grazing ground. More luxuriant vegetation appears along the northern coast, which is more humid in the summer and where plants which need more water grow in woods, bushes and cultivated fields.

The border mountains naturally have colder—in parts extremely cold—winters, their summers are less hot, and the humidity is higher than along the coast. The sides of the mountains are naturally wooded. In the case of the western, southern, and eastern rims, these woods consist largely of “dry forest”, particularly oak and coniferous trees. Many of them had to be sacrificed in the drive for arable and grazing land. In the northern mountain chains nearer the coast, “damp forest” prevails, in which the beech and the pine play a large part in the higher regions. “Dry forest” replaces “damp forest” even in northern Anatolia on the inner mountain ranges, owing to the decreased humidity. “Damp forest” has great resilience and is therefore less threatened by human activity.

The central Anatolian plateau—ringed by its border mountains—is cold in winter, with average temperatures for January below freezing point, whilst it is very hot in the summer, the July/August average reaching 24° C. Since there is considerably less rainfall here than there is in the coastal areas and their mountains, it is a steppe. Despite erroneous information on some maps, there are no stretches of desert in central Anatolia. Even in the driest districts it is possible to grow barley and wheat without artificial irrigation, relying solely on natural rainfall, with moderate success.

There are steppes on the southern edge of the eastern Taurus where Anatolia and Mesopotamia meet. Although they are not much above sea level, they are a long way from the sea, and as a result winters are less mild and less humid than along the mediterranean coast, and summers very hot and dry.

The Northern Anatolian border mountains. The range of north Anatolian border mountains (often known as the Pontic Mountains in Europe) consists of comparatively straight parallel mountain ranges from 1200 m. to 1500 m. in height, often rising to over 2000 m. These are fairly broad and some have plateaux. To the east, in the so-called Zigana mountains (called after the Zigana pass south of Trabzon) there is a long stretch over 3000 m. in height, and here one finds alpine forma-
tions. The mountains are made up largely of slate, sandstone, marl, volcanic stone, and crystalline substances. In the west one can trace—through the mountains south of the Sea of Marmara—a relation to the inner Dinaric mountain ranges of the Balkan peninsula. In the east, the southern Caucasus mountains form the link with the northern Iranian mountain ranges.

On the plateaux of the naturally wooded northern Anatolian mountain ranges, especially in the middle part, woodland has been turned into arable land up to a height of 1500 m. Growing of grain and raising of sheep and goats (in the east also cattle) form its economic basis. The long spacious valleys between the ridges, where hot summers and the presence of water make agriculture possible, are the main areas of settlement. Of these the most important is the row of basins of Bolu-Gerede-Cerkesh-Ilgaz-Tosya
in the eastern part of the ancient Bithynia, the basin area of Safranbolu-Kastamonu-Boyabat, the centre of the ancient Paphlagonia, and, in the regions of the ancient Fontus, the basins on the upper Yeşil İrmak (Iris) around Amasya, Zile and Tokat, and in the east, the Kelkit-Coruh furrow which is over 500 km. long.

On the north coast, mountains rise steeply out of the Black Sea; there are few bays. The coastal strip is very narrow and much cut up by valleys; it is densely populated, especially in the east, and maize, beans, and particularly hazelnuts are grown around Giresun [q.v.] (Cerasus), Tarabzon [q.v.] (Trapezus, Trebizond, modern Trabzon), and Rize [q.v.]. The only larger flats are in the deltas of the rivers Yeşil İrmak [q.v.] (Iris) and the Kızılı İrmak [q.v.] (Halys), but these are partly swampy. The more fertile soil produces excellent tobacco. The peninsula of Kojdaeli [q.v.] and the Thracian peninsula are flat, and the plains of Adapazarı [q.v.] on the lower Sakarya (Sangarius) are very fertile.

A part from the Bosphorus, there is only one harbour which is protected against the north-western gales of the Black Sea, and that is Sinop [q.v.] which, however, because of its unfavourable hinterland, is at present of little importance. Samsun [q.v.] (Amisos) has the best access—both rail and road—to central Anatolia. The coal-mining and industrial areas of Zonguldak [q.v.] and Ereğli [q.v.] (Herculea Pontica) are now being greatly developed. In the past, the silver, lead, and copper mines in the Zigana mountains were of some importance (Gümüşhâne [q.v.], Murgul near Borçka, and others).

The subsidence of land which has created the Aegean between Anatolia and the Balkan peninsula, has also affected the northern Anatolian mountain ranges in the Marmara region. As a result, there are hilly districts and plains around the Sea of Marmara (the basin of which is only deep in parts). These have a very favourable mediterranean climate. Silkworm is cultivated near Bursa [q.v.] (Brusa), and wine produced around Tekir Dagh [q.v.] (Rodosto). Gowing to its unique geographical position, the city of Byzantium, Constantinople, Istanbul [q.v.] grew up and retained its importance for thousands of years. Situated on the bridge between Anatolia and the Balkan peninsula, the most important times of the city were naturally those in which it played the rôle of the natural capital of an empire stretching over both areas. Yet even today, it is Turkey's gate to the world and her principal import harbour. The Straits here are obviously not a borderline of continents or cultures. Such a boundary might rather be found in the sparsely populated steppes and heather regions in eastern Thrace.

The Taurus (Toros) System. On the whole, the Taurus system in southern Anatolia is considerably higher than the northern Anatolian border ranges. For long stretches, the mountain chains and broad waves of elevations rise to more than 2000 m. and at times to more than 3000 m. To the south-east of Lake Van (Wan) there are even heights up to 4176 m. in the ice-covered Dijilo Dagh. Limestone predominates in these mountains. The mountain ranges are often strongly bow-shaped, thereby making clear sections. To the west of the Gulf of Antalya (Adalia, Attalia) the mighty ranges of limestone mountains of the Western Taurus—the highest of which are sometimes referred to as Lycian Taurus—point outwards in a S and SW direction towards the sea and towards Rhodes, Crete and the outer fringes of the Dinaric Mountains of the Balkan peninsula. Between the Gulf of Antalya and the Adana plain stretches the mighty arc of the Central Taurus. The Cilician Taurus, which often occurs, refers to its better known eastern wing. The Taurus system continues in two parallel chains to the east of the Gulf of Alexandretta. An outer chain stretches from the Amanus Mountains to the chains south of Lake Van by way of the chains south of Malatya and south of the Murad River. An inner chain—the western section of which is sometimes called Anti-Taurus (a name given with little justification)—runs from the ridges of the upper Seyhan region north of Adana to the Urmiya area by way of the chains south of the upper Euphrates (Kara Su) and the upper Aras (Araxes). Between these two there are a number of basins, those of Elbistan, of Malatya, Elazığ (Elaziz, Kharput), of Çapakçur, Muş and Van. This whole mountain system is best called the Eastern Taurus. (In earlier works, nomenclature varied: in addition to Anti-Taurus, other names for parts of the system were employed, such as Armenian Taurus and Kurdish Taurus, without determining the precise use of each). The above-mentioned row of basins separates the chains of the inner from those of the outer Taurus. Thus, seen as a whole, the eastern Taurus system (with these two ranges) describes an arc towards the north, and its southern end merges into the southern Iranian border ranges.

There are considerable longitudinal basins between the mountain ranges in the Western and the western part of the Central Taurus. Several of them contain lakes, the famous lakes of the old districts of Pisidia and Isauria. These basins are the main centres of habitation. In some places there are valuable special cultures, as for instance near Isparta [q.v.] and Burdur [q.v.]. The limestone mountains are thinly populated because of the scarcity of water. Grazing ground of a poor quality—used by goats and sheep in summer—has largely replaced the former "dry forest". Habitation in the Central Taurus, which is really one large massif, is restricted to the few narrow valleys. Here, too, the higher ranges serve chiefly as grazing ground (payla) for sheep and goats in summer. The eastern Taurus, which, as we have seen, stretches out more broadly, has a larger area in its basins which could be inhabited, but at present they are only thinly populated. As far as rainfall—which decreases with the distance from the mountains—permits agriculture exclusively based on rain water, habitation is also possible in the as yet thinly populated southern foothills of the eastern Taurus. It is possible in the vicinity of the ancient centres of Diyarbakır (Diyarbakır, Amid), Urfa [see AL-RUHA] (Edessa), Gaziantep ('Aynţāb [q.v.]), Halab [q.v.] (Aleppo), but not much further to the south. The most propitious area of these eastern foothills is the Hatay [q.v.] in the west around Antakya [q.v.] (Antiokh), where the nearby Mediterranean makes the growing of citrus fruits and other Mediterranean crops possible.

On the whole, the coastal strip of the Taurus offers only a narrow stretch of alluvial land and few hills which invite habitation. These few make possible the cultivation of Mediterranean plants, and in parts of citrus plants. There is, however, danger from malaria. Generally we find limestone mountains (with little water) rising at a small distance from the sea. The only really large arable area is the Adana [q.v.] plain—in which also Türşu [q.v.] lies—the Cilician plain of antiquity, formed by deposits from the rivers Sayhān [q.v.] (Saros) and Diāyān [q.v.] (Pyramos). In recent years cotton growing in this
area has increased considerably. The tufaceous limestone plain of Antalya [q.v.] with sheer drops to the sea, is less favourable; Anatolia's southern coast—in as much as it is a longitudinal one—has no protected landing places for larger ships. Iskandarûn [q.v.] (Alexandretta) and Mersin [q.v.] have some importance as harbours of the Adana plain and the Hatay and as the harbours for shipping the chromium ore of the eastern Taurus. This part is played more to the west by the small harbour of Fethiyye for the western Taurus.

Aegean Anatolia (Ege region), the area between the two bordering mountain systems show less relief. There are several distinguishable units. In the west, there is Aegean Anatolia, in modern Turkish called the “Ege region”, between the southern Taurus in the south, which corresponds roughly to the area of Ionian colonisation of the ancient Greeks. Here the broad valleys of the Bakır Cay (Calcus), Gediz (Hermus), the greater and lesser Menderes (Kayster, Maeander), penetrate to a depth of 200 km. into the peninsula, in an area of crystalline rocks (called Lydian-Carian rock by Philippson) between the mountain peaks running from west to east at heights between 1000 m. and 2000 m. Thanks to these valleys, the mediterranean climate can penetrate deeply into the country. This area is densely populated. Tobacco, olives, figs, and grapes—largely dried for raisins—are grown here. More recently, cotton growing has gained some importance.

The coast, running at right angles to the mountain ranges, has many bays, coves and good natural harbours. The larger rivers, however, carry a great deal of sediment and gradually fill in the bays. Ephesus and Miletus, which were harbours in antiquity, are today several kilometres inland, and the otherwise excellent harbour of İzmir (Smyrna) is only saved from being filled up by diversion of the river Gediz Çay. İzmir [q.v.] is linked by railway to all the above mentioned valleys, and has thus become the economical centre of the region and the principal harbour for exporting the agricultural produce of Turkey. Bergama [q.v.] (Pergamum), Manisa [q.v.] (Magnesia), Tire [q.v.] Aydınlı [q.v.] (Güzel Hisar) and Denizli [q.v.] are local centres of this area.

The Western Anatolian Ridge. Where in the east the valleys of Aegean Anatolia come to an end, a huge ridge rises between the re-entrant angle of the Taurus system on the one hand, and the southern border chains of the sea of Marmara on the other hand, in the area around Afyun Kara Hisar-Kütahya-Uşak. This is formed by huge plateaux which reach a height of 1200 m. to 1500 m. Massive ranges rise above these which frequently exceed 2000 m. There is a gradual decline in height to 1100 m towards the northeast and the upper Sakarya (Sangarius). This large rise is the western Anatolian ridge. The plateaux consist largely of flat tertiary deposits of clay and sand which had once risen and were later cut into by the valleys we see today. They are steppes. Only the higher mountains reach the natural tree-line, but most of the woods have been cut down.

The growing of grain and the raising of sheep and goats form the livelihood of the scanty population. Several roads and railways lead to the inland plateau on the one hand and branch off near Afyun Kara Hisar [q.v.] (Afyonkarahisar) to the basins in the western Taurus, to the lowlands of the Ege region and to the Sea of Marmara on the other.

Central Anatolia. The inland plateau of central Anatolia comprises large stretches of flat country at a height of 800 m. to 1200 m. These were formed by recent sedimentation in the bottoms of the landlocked basins of Konya (Iconium), such as the Tuz Gölü (“salt lake”), a huge flat salt pan at a height of 900 m. often erroneously marked down as Tuz Gölü (“salt desert”) on our maps. They also exist on the upper Sakarya and in certain places on the Kızıl İrmak. There are also other broad plateaux of horizontal new tertiary deposits, and flat plains over creased subsoil.

Mountains of considerable height are, however, also found in central Anatolia. They rise from 500 m. to 1500 m. above the surrounding plateaux. There are some gigantic recent volcanoes which are, however, not active at present, such as the Erdjiyas Dagh [q.v.] (3916 m.), the Argeaus of antiquity, near Kayseri, and the Hasan Dagh (3256 m.) near Nigde.

The mountains are of vital importance to human existence. In dry central Anatolia, surrounded by high mountains, the lowest areas are the driest, while the high mountains catch the rain. Hence the most favourable regions for settlement are, on the one hand, on the highest plateaus, such as for instance in the area of the bend of the Kızıl İrmak, in the Cappadocia of antiquity, and on the other hand at the foot of the surrounding mountains, where fast rivulets come forth. Most of the important towns are in the latter of these two positions, such as Ankara [q.v.] (Ankya, Angora), Eski Shehir [q.v.], Konya [q.v.] (Iconium), Nigde [q.v.] Kayseri [q.v.] (Caesarea), and Sivas [q.v.] (Sebastia). All these have—or had—land that can easily be irrigated. There is little population in the steppes, where the basis of livelihood is the growing of wheat and barley and the raising of sheep and angora goats, although thanks to recent mechanisation the cultivated areas have been increased and improved; there is least of all in the particularly dry basin of the Tuz Gölü and of Konya, the Lycaonia of antiquity, with a great deal of “Artemisian steppe”.

Traffic is easier through the central plateau than through the mountainous borders. For this reason this plateau, which has always been the centre of Anatolia, has become even more important since the capital shifted to Ankara and the road and rail network of Turkey was extended.

The upper Euphrates area and the Ararat highlands. Geographically, the eastern limit of Anatolia is to be found on the upper Euphrates, where the mountain chains of the northern Anatolian border mountains and the eastern Taurus are joined by the rising of new mountains between the two systems. In this region of mighty chains of high mountains, where peaks generally exceed an altitude of 2500 m. (often 3000 m.), the scanty population is found only in the valleys, more especially in the longitudinal ones. Along these, too, run the roads from Anatolia to Erzincan [q.v.] and Erzurum [q.v.] (Erzerum) has always been to guard these roads.

The eastern Taurus on the one hand, and the northern Anatolian border mountains on the other, divide again east of the meridian of Erzurum, thus forming a highland which, at 1500 m. to 1700 m., is an even higher basin than that of Central Anatolia. There are considerable volcanic deposits of recent formation over a creased basis. Huge recent (at present inactive) volcanoes, such as Ararat ( Ağrı-dagh [q.v.]) (5172 m.), Alağöz Dagh (4094 m.),
Sthan Dagh (4434 m.) rise above the highlands, and in places, such as at lake Van, have led to a generation. The scanty population speaks either Turkish or Kurdish. Thus it seems appropriate to give this eastern border region of Turkey—which is actually outside the geographical Anatolia—the name of the Ararat Highlands. This name would be neutral, yet geographically characteristic.


(H. Louis)

(iii) Historical Geography of Turkish Anatolia

(1) The conquest of Anatolia by the Turks, first phase, and the state of the Saldı̈ık of Rûm.

The main part of Anatolia remained untouched by the conquests of the Muslim Arabs. The boundaries of the Byzantine empire remained: in the north-east, the Christian states of Armenia and Georgia; to the south of these, Kâlikâl (formerly Theodosiopolis, then Arran al-Rûm, Erzurum) and—at times—Kamalgh were the furthest outposts of the armies of the caliph; hence the Taurus, the "land of the passes" (bildûk al-dûrûb), formed the boundary as far as the Mediterranean. Though frequent raids into Byzantine territory were made, the Arabs never occupied the land. These border regions, comprising the outermost parts of Northern Encyclopaedia of Islam

Syria and Upper Mesopotamia, were the "military area of the protecting fortresses" (gûnd al-tawâṣûm, or simply al-tawâṣûm, [πτὶ]; Manbij or Antakya (Antioch) was the capital of this region, whilst the armed fortresses of the "Syrian marches" (thughûr al-Shâm) with Tarsûs as its centre, and the "Mesopotamian marches" (thughûr al-Diâstra) with Malatya (Melitene) as their centre, formed the outer border. In their changing fortunes of the war between Byzantines and Arabs, these border areas suffered greatly, but they remained, in the possession of the Arabs. Not until the conquests of the great emperors Nicephorus II Phocas (963-69), John Tzimiskes (969-76), and Basil II (976-1025) did these areas return to Byzantine ownership. At the time of the death of the last of these three, the whole of the territory of Turkey as we know it today, with the exception of Amida (Diyar Bakr) and its surroundings, was Byzantine (compare E. Honigmann, Die Ostgrenze des Byzantinischen Reiches von 363 bis 1071, Brussels 1935). Then, however, the rivalry between the military nobility and the nobility of civil servants began in Byzantium. These, particularly when the latter were in power, led to a weakening along the borders.

The Turkish conquerors of the house of Saldı̧ık found the Byzantine borders in past the Middle East, they sent their Turkish warriors against the frontier, in order to fight the holy war (djâhâd). They did, in fact, achieve several breaks through into Byzantine Anatolia (456/1064 conquest of Anî in the Byzantine-Armenian border area, laying waste Cilicia and storming Cæarea (Kayseriyya). After the death of emperor Constantine X Doukas, the death of the civilan nobility (May 1067), Romanus IV Diogenes, a member of the military nobility, was raised to the throne on the battlefield (1 Jan. 1068) because of the desperate position which had arisen. To begin with, he fought the Turks successfully, so that the Saldı̧ık sultan Alp Arslan was obliged to go against him in person. The numerically superior Byzantine army was routed by Alp Arslan near Manzikert (in the vicinity of Lake Van, (456/19 August 1071) because of lack of discipline among the mercenaries and treachery by the opponents of the emperor. The emperor was captured, but he was freed by the sultan after a lenient treaty had been concluded. The defeat, however, caused a revolution in Constantinople, which brought the opposing party to power. Romanus IV lost his throne and was blinded. He died soon afterwards (summer 1072).

With the fall of the Emperor Romanus, the treaties between him and Alp Arslan became void, and the Turks renewed the holy war against Byzantium. This was fought not by regular Saldı̧ık troops, but by individual leaders, the most successful of whom was Malik Dânîşshmand (q.v.) Ahmad Ghâzi who operated in north-eastern Anatolia. Bands of Turkish warriors roamed the countryside and interrupted communications between towns, paralysing Byzantine administration. Eventually the successor of Alp Arslan, sultan Malikşah (since 465/1072), despatched a member of the house of Saldı̧ık, Sulaymân b. Kûlûmûf, to lead the Turkish cavalry in Anatolia in the war being waged against Byzantium. His task was facilitated by the existing confusion over the succession to the throne in Byzantium. Emperor Michael VII Ducas and—after his abdication (1078)—Nicephorus III Botaniates, obtained Sulaymân's assistance to gain their aims. On their
part, they had to recognise his rights to those parts of the country which the Turks had occupied, and to hand over the recently conquered cities of Cysicus and Nicea (1087). Sulaymân established his headquarters in Nicea (Turkish İzîk). The Emperor Alexius I, who began his reign in 1081, confirmed Sulaymân’s rights to settle his Turkish troops in the occupied territory, whilst nominally retaining Byzantine suzerainty. In actual fact, Sulaymân ruled over practically the whole of Anatolia through his troops which roamed the country. Byzantine administration was virtually superseded.

After his successes in Anatolia, Sulaymân turned to the east, to extend his rule in this direction. He did succeed in capturing Antioch (Antakïya), which was still Byzantine, but met with heavy opposition from the Saldjûk amirs, especially from Tutush, the brother of Malikshâh, when advancing towards Aleppo. He was beaten and fell in battle (1086).

In the meantime, Turkish bands fighting the holy war in Dîjarbâyân had conquered the Christian kingdom of the Bagratids in Armenia (473/1080). Following this, the Bagratid Ruben and his faithful followers founded a new state in Cilicia, known as the kingdom of “Lesser Armenia”. It survived until the 14th century (1375) under his successors, the Rubëts. [See note.]

After the death of Sulaymân, Anatolia was left to its own devices for some time. Other Turkish leaders settled in the country together with their troops and founded dominions there: the aforementioned Malik Dânîshmand Ahmad Ghâzî in the north-east, with Sebastia (Sivas) as headquarters; the amîr Mengüçük [i.e. Ghâzî with Tepîrke (Divriği) and Erzûnku and in the west, in Smyrna, a certain amîr called Trchaxas by the Byzantines. Only after the death of sultan Malikshâh (1092) did his successor, Barkûkâr, permit the son of Sulaymân, Kûlîdî Arslân, to return to Anatolia, but he found it difficult to establish himself among the Turkish princes. Trchaxas, who was advancing against Constantinople by sea, was repelled with Byzantine aid.

At the beginning of the first crusade, the allied Byzantines and crusaders gained a victory over the Turks under Kûlîdî Arslân and Malik Dânîshmand (or his son, Ghâzî Gümüşteğin) near Nicea. The Turkish headquarters at Nicea was besieged and taken on 20 June 1097. On 1 July 1097, the victory of the crusaders near Dorylaeum, near the Eskîghîrî of today, decided the fate of western Anatolia and opened the way for the crusaders through the rest of the Turkish territories. They reached Antioch, which was taken after a long siege (3 June 1098). Here the principality of Antioch, the first crusader state, was founded under the suzerainty of Byzantium. The county of Edessa (today Urfa), in Mesopotamia, was founded in the same year. After these successes by the crusaders, the Emperor Alexius found little difficulty in driving the Turks from western Anatolia and in re-incorporating this area into the Byzantine empire. He also re-inforced the border—running straight through the middle of Anatolia—against the region remaining under Turkish occupation. This, for the time being, checked the Turkish conquests.

After this set-back, the area of Turkish conquest remained limited to central Anatolia for over a century. The whole of the west (roughly from Dorylaeum), and the Black Sea and Mediterranean coasts remained in Byzantine possession, Cilicia became the Kingdom of Lesser Armenia, and the regions of Antioch and Edessa formed the aforementioned crusader states. Amid (Dîyar Bakr) was the seat of the amîrâbât dynasty of the Artûkids [i.e.]. Later (1144), Edessa was conquered by the amîrâbât Zengî of Mosul; later still (1168), Antioch was taken by the Mamlûk sultan Baybars. Kûlîdî Arslân had to share the centre of the country, occupied by Turks, with Malik Dânîshmand, or his son, Mengüçük. The former retained the steppe in Central Anatolia, with Konya—the “Iconium of antiquity”—as his capital; the latter retained the mountainous north-east with Sivas and Erzûnku respectively. There was a heated quarrel over some places, especially Meliteme (Malatya), which Kûlîdî Arslân eventually managed to decide in his own favour (1104 or 1106). Kûlîdî Arslân failed, however, in his attempt to make conquests further to the east, in Mesopotamia (Mosul). He was beaten by the confederated Saldjûk amirs on the banks of the Khabûr, and died during the retreat (9 Shawwâl 500/3 June 1107). Concerning events at this period, see also Cl. Cahen, La première pénétration turque en Asie Mineure, Byzantium, 1946, 5-67.

Thus the Rûm Saldjûk state [see Saldjûk] or the Sultanate of Iconium, as the crusaders called it, was a rather limited territory in the poorest part of Anatolia. The Rûm Saldjûks under Mûsûd I retained this area and, having beaten the crusaders of the second crusade in the second battle near Dorylaeum (26 Oct. 1147), forced them to continue their way through Byzantine instead of Turkish territory. The Rûm Saldjûk state was considerably extended when Kûlîdî Arslân II succeeded in incorporating the Dânîshmandid state (1174), which he secured against the claims of the Byzantine Emperor Manuel I Comnenus by the victory in the Phrygian mountain passes, near Myrioecephalon (pass of Cardak, 17 Sept. 1176), in which he surrounded and routed the Byzantine army. The aged Sultan Kûlîdî Arslân II was involved in the disputes which arose after he had divided his land among his sons. Owing to this, the German Emperor Frederic Barbarossa was able to take the route through Turkish Anatolia even capture its capital Konya (18 May 1190), but this had no lasting consequences, particularly as the emperor himself was drowned not long afterwards (10 June 1190) in the river Saleph (Calycadnus in antiquity, Gök Massachusetts) today.

The crusaders of the so-called fourth crusade conquered Constantinople (1204) and erected a Latin Empire there, at the instigation of the Doge Enrico Dandolo of Venice; the Byzantines, under Theodore Lascaris, founded a Greek Counter-Empire in western Anatolia with Nicaea for its capital; and the brothers David and Alexis, of the imperial house of the Comneni, had, with the help of Queen Thamar of Georgia, formed the empire of the so-called “Great Comneni” in Trebizond. The Rûm Saldjûk sultan Ghiyath al-Dîn Kayhûsraw I, the youngest son of Kûlîdî Arslân II, succeeded in conquering Attalia (Adaliya, Antîliya), thereby gaining access to the Mediterranean for his kingdom (1207). He was not, however, successful in advancing further into western Anatolia. He was beaten by Theodor Laskaris near Hosas, in 1210, and fell in battle (possibly in single combat with his adversary). Theodor Laskaris and his successors protected the eastern border of their Nicaean empire with a strong system of fortifications which, for the time being, made it impossible for the Turks to advance in that region. In 1214, Kayhûsraw’s son and successor
al-Dīn Kayḳūbād, the brother and successor of Kayḳūwās, and the greatest of the Rūm Saldjūḳ sultans, extended the frontier of his empire on the medi-
terranean and took the fort of Galonoros (καλλον ἐρος), which he expanded into a sizable harbour town, to which he gave the name ‘Alīkīyā (now Alaya or Alanya), and where he had his winter residence. In the east, in upper Mesopotamia, he also won territory from the Artuḳids of Ṭūms and Ṭūn Kayḳūfā and forced them to recognise his supremacy. In 625/1228, he annexed the Mengūjik principality of Erzingān, and in the east he also made further conquests (Erzerum 1230, Akhlāt 1231, Kāhpū 1234). Under his rule, Rūm Saldjūḳ culture and power reached their peak. His son and successor Ghiyāṭ al-Dīn Kayḳūhsrwārī II (acc. 634/1237) succeeded in incorporating Āmid into his empire, and at that time the eastern borders of the Rūm Saldjūḳ kingdom were roughly those of Turkey today.

(2) The conquest of Anatolia, second phase, and the beginnings of the Ottoman Empire.

Two things in the middle of the 13th century brought about a change of conditions. The first of these was the Mongol invasion of the Middle East, which also affected Anatolia. Although the Rūm Saldjūḳ army was defeated by the Mongols under Baydu Ṣawī near Kūndū in eastern Anatolia (6 Muhārram 641/26 June 1243), there was no actual conquest of the Rūm Saldjūḳ Kingdom, but the Mongols advanced as far as Ākṣaīrya and did much plundering. The Kingdom grew more and more into the role of a vassal state of the Mongols, first of Bāṭū, the conqueror of eastern Europe, then of the Mongol rulers of Persia, the Ilḫānāns. A new stream of Turkmen came to Anatolia with the Mongols, partly as their followers, partly because they had been driven by them from their original homes. They increased the partly-nomad Turkmen element already present in Anatolia, and played an important part. Those of most immediate importance were the hordes led by Karaman [q.v.] b. Nūrā Sūfī (thus probably a member of a ḍawrūrī family). He founded a state on the border of Lycaonia and Cilicia around Ermenik (the ancient Germanicopolis) in the Taurus foothills. In 1227, Karaman’s son, Muḥammad Bēg, tried to gain the dominion over the Rūm Saldjūḳ kingdom by means of a pretender by name of Dīmīrī, and he conquered Κονδσ for his protection. But the town was re-taken by a Mongol retaliatory expedition, and Muḥammad Bēg had to retreat into the mountains with his Turkmen. Dīmīrī escaped to the north-west, but he was beaten by Saldjūḳ troops on the Šaḳaras (Muhārram 676/June 1277), taken prisoner, and executed.

The other important event was the reconquest of Constantinople by the Byzantines under the Emperor Michael VII Palaiologus and the restoration of the Byzantine Empire. The power of the empire was, however, past. The emperors of the house of Palaeologus were increasingly engaged in the Balkan peninsula, and they had to ward off the covetousness of the Latins. The remaining strength of the empire was taken up with this. The emperors were unable to devote the necessary attention to conditions in Anatolia, and allowed the defensive system—built up by the Lascarids—to fall into decay. This made it easy for the Turkmen hordes which, were pouring into Anatolia to pursue the holy war and to gain a hold on the western parts. These, with their greater fertility as compared with the inner region, had already tempted them. The Palaeologus were thus forced progressively to surrender their Anatolian territories, and the Turks, especially in the open country—met with hardly any resistance. By about 1300 most of western Anatolia was in Turkish hands, and there was now hardly a district in which there were no Turks among the non-Turkish inhabitants. Eventually, only a few fortresses (such as Prusa, Nikaeas and Nicomedias in Bithynia; Sardes, Philadelphia and Magnesia in Lydia) and some ports (such as Smyrna and Phocaea on the Aegean and Heraclia on the Black Sea) remained in Byzantine possession, as isolated Byzantine possessions in Turkish territory.

The Turkish hordes generally operated independently of each other under their leaders who founded principalities (amirates) in the conquered districts. We know little about their early history, although one gathers that there were quite a number of such small semi-nomadic states, of which some were of only ephemeral importance. By about 1300, a small number of principalities had emerged. The most powerful of these was, to begin with, Germiyan [q.v.] in Phrygia, with Kūṭāyā (the ancient Cotyaem) as its capital. According to al-ʿUmāri, the Turkish amirs of western Anatolia paid tribute to the Germiyan at some periods, and according to Ibn Bāṭīṭa they were feared by them. Temporarily they extended their power into central Anatolia, and Germiyan in 1300 as far as Ankara (according to an inscription). Incidentally, they do not seem to have been Turkmen originally, but possibly Yazīdī Kurds (compare Cahen, Notes sur l’histoire des Turcomans d’Asie Mineure au XIIIe siècle in JA, 1951, 335-54; concerning the origin of the Germiyan, especially 349 ff.). A whole circle of principalities grew up around Germiyan and some of the founders of these seem to have come from Germiyan. The second greatest of these western Anatolian principalities at that time, was Dīāndār [q.v.] in Paphlagonia, with Kastamonu (Castra Comneni, today Kastamonu) as its capital, and the harbour town of Sinob (Sinop, Sinope) also belonging to it. To the west of it, in northern Phrygia (around Eskişehir-Dorylaeum), was the principality of Oṭhūmān with Sūqūd as its centre. After the conquest of some fortresses there, it soon expanded as far as the Sea of Marmara. Still further west, in Mysia, was Karasla [q.v.] with Balikesi (Palaæocastro) and Berghama (Pergamum), which included the coastal area of the Sea of Marmara as far as the Hellespont (Dardanelles). Next to it, in the Aegean coastal region, were Sūarkanā [q.v.] in northern Lydia, with Māghnīsā (Magnesia, now Manisa); Ayδn [q.v.] in southern Lydia and the hinterland of Smyrna with Tīr; and Menteše [q.v.] in Caria, with Milas (Mylasa) and Muḥla. Lastly, in furthest south-western Anatolia, were Tekke [q.v.] in Lycia and Pamphylia with Adalā (Antalya), and Ḥamīd [q.v.] in Pisidia with Ḥarama. At about the same time, the Rūm Saldjūḳ state ceased to exist. For some time past, the importance of the reigning sultans had been replaced by that of the Mongol governors who resided in Sivas. After the death of ‘Alāʾ al-Dīn Kayḳūbād III (707/1307 or 708/1308), the last of the shadow sultans, the empire simply became a province of
the Mongol Ilkhan Empire of Persia. By exploiting
this condition, the Karamans [q.v.] tried to extend
their territory from their Taurus foothills; they
succeeded in conquering the town of Laranda (now
Karaman), which they made their capital. They did
not, however, succeed in taking Konya, as this was
held by the Ilkhan conqueror Cöpân and his son
Temürtaşh. The latter actually extended the domain
of the Ilkhan Empire by conquests in the west,
where he fought with the Turkish petty princes.
In the twenties, unrest in the Ilkhan Empire spread
to Anatolia (Temürtaşh fled to Egypt in 728/1328).
The conquered territories were lost, and the Karamans
succeeded in capturing Konya; but they kept
Laranda as their capital. During the course of the 14th
century, the Karamans extended their rule westwards
in southern Anatolia, and thereby came into contact with the Turkish states which were
developing in western Anatolia.

With the continuing decay of the Ilkhan Empire,
the Mongol governors declared themselves independent
as amirs (or sultans) of Rûm, and sought the
support of the Mamlûk sultans of Egypt. In 1325
the latter brought the kingdom of Lesser Armenia
to an end, and a Turkmen dynasty, named Râmânâ
[q.v.], founded a new state in its Cilician territory
soon afterwards, with Adana as capital, under
Egyptian supremacy. Another family of Turkmens,
the Dughâdhir (Arabicised as Dhu ‘l-Kadr [q.v.])
settled in the Eastern Taurus area including Elbistan,
also under Egyptian supremacy.

In the west, the principality of Ghâzî ‘Othmân,
and his descendants, the Ottomans [see ʿûthâmînî],
extended more and more at the expense of the remaining Byzantine territory. After northern
Phrygia and the territory as far as the Sea of
Marmara had become Ottoman, the towns of Prusa
(Brusa, Bursa, 6 April 1326), Nicaea (Iznik, 2 March
1331) and Nicomedia (İzomîk, now İzmit, 1337)
fell into the hands of Orkhan, the son of ‘Othmân.
Brusa became his capital. Turning quarrels over
the succession in the neighbouring principality of
Karaş to his advantage, Orkhan annexed its
territory (736/1336). Thus the whole southern coast
of the Sea of Marmara became Ottoman territory,
including the access to the Dardanelles. Acquisitions
in Anatolia—usually peaceful ones—coincided with
the conquests on the Balkan peninsula under Murâd I. Soon after his accession (761/1360), he
conquered Lika and obtained the nominal
sultanship of Rûm (Sivas)—but governed in actual
fact by the heads of the guilds forming the akâbi [q.v.]
union and practically independent. Some time later,
he obtained the principality of Hamûd (783/1381),
thereby extending Ottoman territory considerably
to the east and south. Murâd’s son and successor
Bây zd I simply annexed all Anatolian Turkmen
rulers—shortly after his accession (792/1389),
including Karaman and the territory of the Mongol
governors. This, however, resulted in an attack by
Ttmur, and Bây zd I was beaten in the battle near
Ankara (19 Dhu ‘l-Hijja 804/20 July 1402). Ttmur
reinstated the deposed Anatolian rulers, and, apart
from the original Ottoman territory, only the original
Mongol territory in the northeast of Anatolia
remained in Ottoman hands. From there, Mehemmed I
unified the empire once more, and under Murâd II
the western Anatolian principalties gradually merged
with the Ottoman Empire. The Ottomans’ only
remaining rival was Karaman. Murâd’s son, Me-
hemmed II, completed the rounding off of Ottoman
territory in Anatolia after having given it a natural
centre by conquering Constantinople (29 May 1453).
He put an end to the empire of Trebizond in 1461,
and to the principality of Karaman in 1469, incor-
porating both into the Ottoman Empire. The
attempt of the Turkmen ruler Üzün Hasan, of the
House of the Ak Köyunlu, to force Mehemmed to
cede the annexed provinces failed with the loss of the
battle of Terdžên (east of Erzindjan, 878/1473).
Ottoman rule in Anatolia was completed in the east
when Mehemmed’s grandson Selim I (921/1512)
incorporated the principality of Dughâdhir into the
empire and conquered Diyar Bakr, and when he
reduced the principality of Râmânâ into a tributary
province (in Cilicia) to vassalage and gained the allegiance of the Sunnite Kurdish chieftains. In the north-east,
his rule was further extended into the Caucasian
foothills by campaigns of the Ottoman Sultans and
their generals against Persia. These were generally
directed towards the north-east (Sülêymân, 940/1534,
955-56/1548-49, the sâr-kâsher Mustafa Pasha, 968/
1578, against Georgia, and Murâd IV, 1045/1634,
against Erivan). The whole of Anatolia henceforth
remained undisturbed in Ottoman possession and
has been taken over by the Turkish Republic in
our day.

The only change in more recent years has been the
transfer of the districts (sandjak) of Kars, Ardahân
and Batum which went to Russia in accordance
with the Berlin Treaty of 13 July 1878, which in
this respect confirmed the peace of San Stefano
(3 March 1878). But the peace of Brest-Litovsk
(3 March 1918) returned this territory to Turkey.

The earlier Ottoman organisation. The
Ottoman Empire extended so quickly that it soon
became necessary to divide it up into political
regions. In the beginning these were simply districts
of the feudal cavalry, “standards” (sandjak [q.v.]
or liwâ?) which were under a district commander of the “standard” (sandjak begi or mir-i liwâ?). Under
Orkhan, the second Ottoman ruler, there were
already four of these. (1) Sultan-üyülüs [q.v.] which
incorporated the original territory of the Ottomans
around Eskişehir and Sögi; (2) Khuritâmâş (eli)
“the ruler’s land”), administered by the ruler
himself, with Brusa and İzni; (3) Kökdâ-eli [q.v.]
the feudal tenure which Orkhan had bestowed upon
his general Akçe Ködia, the Bithynian peninsula
with İzni; and (4) Karasî-eli [q.v.] the former
principality of Karaf, with Balikesri and Berghama.
Under Murâd I, when the empire extended still
further after the conquests in the Balkan peninsula
and further regions of Anatolia, Ottoman territories
were united into one province on each side of the
strait (eyâlet, later wilâyet), each under a pašâ
with the title of beglerbegi (later wâli). Thus, to
begin with, there were two provinces, with the
names of Anatolia (Anatoli, later pronounced...
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Anadolu and Rumelia (Rum-eli). Each of these was subdivided into districts of the feudal militia (sandjak or eydlet). When the Turkish principalities in Anatolia became part of the Ottoman Empire, they were made into such sandjaks, but retained their original names. The gradual growth of the empire is thus shown in its political divisions. Later on, when the Ottomans penetrated further to the east, under Bayezid I and particularly under Mehmed II and Selim I, newly acquired areas no longer became sandjaks of the eydlet of Anadolu, but became provinces in their own right. Independent of this division into provinces and sandjaks was a separate division into judicial districts (kada), each of which was under a judge (kadi). Furthermore, there were domains (hukumet) ruled by local dynasties, direct vassals to the Sublime Porte. This whole system was finally fixed by the laws of Sultan Süleyman I (Kanuni). According to this, (cf. the printed edition of Kâtip Celebi, Dîthân-nûmâ; cf. also J. v. Hammer, Des osmanischen Reiches Staatsverfassung und Staatsverwaltung ii, 249 ff. and P. A. v. Tischendorf, Des Lehnsystems in den musulmischen Staaten, Leipzig 1872, 62 ff.), there are the eydlets in Anatolia: (1) Adana (601, also mentioned as sandjak of Aleppo); (2) Ankara, (3) Aydîn (Smyrna/Izmir); (4) Bithlis; (5) Diyar Bakr; (6) Erzerum; (7) the sandjaks of Marash and Urfa of the eydlet of Halab (Aleppo), as well as some kadaş; (8) some kadaş and nâîyes of the eydlet of Istanbul; (9) Kastamûnî; (10) Kudiâwendigâr (Brusa); (11) Konya; (12) Ma'mûret el-Azîz (Khârîût, since 1880); (13) Siwa; (16) Biga; (17) Izmîd. [Articles on each of the preceding.] This division was kept—with some alterations—until after the First World War.

Under the Turkish Republic, the eydlets were abolished, and sandjaks were raised to wildjâys. These were called iî in the course of the language reform. Their number varied. On 20 October 1935, there were only 57 wildjâys, at the end of 1935, a further 5 were formed (from the districts, kada, now îî, of the neighbouring wildjâys); in 1939, Hatay was added (ceded by the French mandate of Syria, see above) as the 63rd. (The 63 provinces of January 1st 1940 with their districts at that time are enumerated by G. Jäschke, Türkei, Berlin 1941, 22-4). In 1953 Uşak was added as the 64th eydlet. On January 4th 1954 the overall area of the Turkish state consisted of 64 provinces (of which only 4 are in the European part of Turkey, the other 60 in Anatolia) and 533 districts. Of the Anatolian provinces, however, Çanakkale is partly on European ground; the province of Istanbul, on the other hand, is mainly in Europe.

Geographically the provinces are grouped into the following 8 zones (bo'lge) (the names in the modern spelling): (1) the Black Sea Coast: the provinces of Trabzon, Ordu, Rize, Zonguldak, Giresun, Samsun, Sinob, Kastamonu, Bolu, Çoruh; (2) the coast of the Sea of Marmara and the Aegean Sea: the Asiatic parts of the provinces of Istanbul (districts Üsküdar, Kadiköy, Beykoz, Adalar, Kartal, Şile, Yahyalı) and Çanakkale (districts Çanakkale, Ayvakk, Biga, Bayramlı, Bozaada, Ezine, İzleği, Yenice), and the provinces İzmir, Kocaeli (İzmit), Aydın, Bafkisir, Bursa, Manisa, Muğla; (3) the Mediterranean coast, the provinces of Hatay (Iskenderun), Seyhan (Adana), Içel (Selefe), Antalya; (4) European Turkey: the European provinces of Istanbul, (districts Beyoğlu, Beşiktaş, Sarıyer, Fatih, Eyüp, Eminönü, Bakrköy, Çatalka, Silivri) and Çanakkale (districts Eceabat, Gelibolu, İrmiş), and the provinces Kırklareli, Tekirdağ, Edirne; (5) western Anatolia: the provinces of Denizli, Bilecik, Kütahya, Aykonarakhisar, Isparta, Burdur, Eskişehir—and since 1953—Uşak; (6) central Anatolia, the provinces Tokat, Çorum, Amasya, Kayseri, Malatya, Ankara, Çankiri, Yozgat, Sivas, Maraş, Niğde, Kirşehir, Konya; (7) south-eastern Anatolia: the provinces Gaziantep, Mardin, Urfa; (8) eastern Anatolia: the provinces Kars, Elazığ, Diyarbakr, Gümüşhane, Erzurum, Erzincan, Siirt, Bitlis, Tunceli, Ağrı Muş, Bingöl, Van, Hakkâr.

(4) Population.

Turks and non-Turks. At the time of the Turkish conquest of Anatolia, it had already been Hellenised. The Hellenisation of the various old-Anatolian peoples (begun in Greek and Roman times) was completed during the course of Christianisation. Now, remnants of the old peoples (for example the Lazes), remain only in the mountains, especially those near the Caucasus foothills. Such areas are at the same time refuges in which ancient
religious communities, such as the Paulicians, survived as sects. By the time the Turks came, Anatolia was, however, on the whole Greek speaking and mainly adhered to the Byzantine Orthodox Church. Only the Armenians in the east, who were Monophysites (Gregorians), remained ecclesiastically apart from the Greeks and were not Hellenised. Being merchants, Armenians had probably spread towards the west as far as the capital, even in pre-Turkish times.

A new central-Asiatic race with a new religion, Islam, came to Anatolia with the Turks. In the beginning it may well have been a minority, compared with the Greeks, but, since it consisted of the ruling classes in the Turkish occupied territories, it succeeded in spreading. The reason for this was probably that many members of the old population, who had lost contact with their spiritual centre in Constantinople, felt this spiritual isolation, turned to Islam and were thereby assimilated to the Turks. Initially, this process was a very slow one. In any case, at the time when Marco Polo travelled through Anatolia in 1272, the inhabitants do not appear to have been Turkicised (cf. E. Oberhummer, Die Türken und das Osmanische Reich, Leipzig-Berlin 1947, 42). On the other hand, the documents of the Patriarchate of Constantinople prove clearly, as A. Wächter, Übersicht über das Verfassungs-Recht des byzantinischen Reichs vom 13. bis zum 16. Jahrhundert, Leipzig 1903) shows, that, especially in the 14th century, when increased numbers of Turks occupied Anatolia, the Orthodox Christianity gradually receded, and with it the land gradually lost its Greek character. This may be due, on the one hand, to emigration from the Turkish occupied areas, but on the other hand also to assimilation to the Turk. Here one must distinguish, however, between the regions with long established Greek inhabitants, such as the western Anatolian coastal regions, which held on to Greek culture and Christianity with great tenacity (as also did those areas which had been under Greek rule for a long time, like Trebizond), and the central Anatolian regions with their only superficially Hellenised and Christianised population (especially in northeastern Anatolia, where the Persian Mongols, the Ilkhan—or, themselves had only taken to Islam since Ghazan—ruled for a time with the true ardour of renegades). Christianity in Anatolia was hard hit by Timur, who—as everywhere else he appeared—let the Christian population feel his hardness and cruelty with a special severity.

The position of the Christians improved when Mehmed II granted the Greek Orthodox Church a secure position in the Ottoman state for political reasons after the conquest of Constantinople, and made it into a pillar of his empire side by side with Sunni Islam. Thus the Christian communities, Greek (see KOM) as well as Armenian (see ARMAN) in Anatolia were freed from their spiritual isolation, and hold their own until this day. The so-called system of the millets (q.v.) according to which non-Muslim religious communities within the Ottoman Empire enjoyed considerable autonomy, saved these from further shrinking. In this manner, a modus vivendi evolved during the flowering of this empire which did justice to both Muslims and non-Muslims. In the 18th and 19th centuries, there was a positive revival of Anatolian Hellenism, and Armenians were still referred to as "The faithful people" (i.e. faithful to the state) (millet-i şâdîhâ) in the 19th century. On the whole, linguistic and religious areas were identical, except in central Anatolia (in Konya and Kayseri), where the Greeks adopted Turkish as the language of social intercourse and of the house (partly in Greek script), whilst the Armenians by and large accepted Turkish as the language of social intercourse (partly in Armenian script), whilst retaining Armenian—their ecclesiastical language—as the language spoken at home.

Apart from Turkish inhabitants, either city dwellers or peasants, there are—or were—nomad and semi-nomad elements as well as migrating shepherds in Anatolia, who belonged to Islam but were of differing languages and races: Turks, Kurds and Circassians. In the case of Turks (so-called Yürlük and Turkmen [q.v.]), their origin is debatable: they may be Turkmen who kept to their nomadic way of life, or remnants of races of varying origin which became Turkicised. By religion they are mostly 'Alawites, i.e. they confess to Shi'ism of some type or have at least Shi'ite leanings. The Kurds (q.v.) who are for the most part Sunni Muslims, have a closed area of settlement in the south-eastern provinces. The Circassians (Cerkes [q.v.]), lastly, had mostly immigrated from the Caucasus at the time when Russo-Christian rule spread over the Caucasus. Apart from these, one frequently meets returns Muslim emigrants (muhâ-la-di'ran) all over Turkey especially from the Balkan countries, who preferred to leave a country with a Christian government and to seek a new home in Turkey which belongs to the dâr al-islâm. Those people are, however, not nomads but are assimilated by the town or country area in which they settle.

The comparatively amicable relations between Muslims and non-Muslims deteriorated when the western powers began to meddle in the affairs of Turkey in the 19th century. On the grounds of the treaty of Kütük Kaynarjâ (1774), Russia claimed the protectorate over the Christian Orthodox inhabitants of Turkey, and awakened anti-Turkish feelings in them. Coming from western Europe, nationalism gained ground amongst the Christian part of the population. The Turkish reaction to this was a dislike for these Christians which soon became hatred. The Armenians felt this most strongly, since they, as neighbours of Russia, were particularly under the suspicion of being in Russian service. The insistence on effecting the reforms laid down in the Berlin Treaty (1878) led to bloody clashes with the Kurds in the years 1894-96. In the First World War, following an invasion by the Russian Caucasian army into the Van region, during which—according to Turkish opinion—the Armenian population behaved disloyally, the whole population was forcibly moved to Mesopotamia, and many of them perished. The remainder emigrated after the war. There was a war against the Greeks in 1919, when, supported by Great Britain, they occupied Smyrna and advanced as far as the Sakarya in 1921. The Turks under Mustafa Kemal Pasha beat the Greek army which retreated from Anatolia, and the greater part of the Greek population retreated with it. The remainder was exchanged by treaty (30 January 1923) for the Muslim inhabitants of Greece (with the exception of the Turks in western Thrace and the Greeks in Istanbul). Through this action Anatolia became a 90% Turkish and 99% Muslim country. With the exception of the Arabs living on the Syrian border, the small non-Turkish Muslim pockets will hardly be able to withstand Turkish influence indefinitely. One may also expect a gradual Turkicisation through military service and the influence of the schools among the Kurds, who have no cultural tradition of their own.
End of the 19th century. The statistics on p. 472 show the population of Anatolia during the last decade of the last century according to their religions, as given in the work of V. Cuinet (see Bibl.) on the basis of the imperial and provincial sanednames. As there was no official census in Turkey at that time, the numbers are largely based on estimates and only to a small extent on actual figures. Additional inaccuracies come from the fact that the principle on which these statistics were based was not consistent throughout the various wilayets. For some of them we have detailed figures (in certain cases, even separate data for men and women), in others only summary ones. Thus, for example, the fact that Shiites and Yazidis are mentioned separately only in some wilayets, does not necessarily mean that there were none in some others. The statistics may, nevertheless, serve to give at least a rough picture of the composition of the population of Anatolia before the First World War.

Abbreviations:

- w = wilayet, s = sandjak, k = kadâ, n = nahiye, i.s. = independent sandjak.

In the case of the administrative areas belonging to the wilayets of Istanbul and Halab (Aleppo), Ist. and Hal respectively is added in brackets.

The proportion prevailing there (1:4) might also prove right for the other wilayets.

Concerning the races, the statistics show clearly that at that time the Armenians (Gregorian, Catholic and Protestant Armenians together 1,142,775) were concentrated in some eastern wilayets (Erzurum, Bitlis and Sivas, to a lesser extent also in Van, Ma'muret al-Aziz, Diyâr Bakr and Adana), although even there they were a minority in comparison with the Muslim part of the population (Turks and Kurds). In the case of the Greeks, one must add to the Orthodox (1,042,612—25,890 Syrian Orthodox = 1,016,722 Greek Orthodox) the Uniates (16,811), who were included under Catholics in these statistics; their total was thus 1,033,533. They were concentrated in the districts belonging to the wilayet of Istanbul, and in the wilayets of Khuwâwendigâr, Aykdn (Izmir) and Trabzon, to a lesser extent in Sivas, Konya, and Adana. They, also, were a minority everywhere compared with the Muslims (and in Sivas and Adana also as compared with the Armenians). It is more difficult to arrive at the racial composition of those elements of the population which are described as Muslims, because the statistics generally give merely a total figure. Only for some eastern wilayets are the races for the Sunnite Muslims given as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Turks</th>
<th>Arabs</th>
<th>Circassians</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w. Adana</td>
<td>93,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Diyâr Bakr</td>
<td>310,644</td>
<td>54,650</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>365,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anat. districts of w. Halab</td>
<td>177,048</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>177,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Ma'muret al-'Aziz</td>
<td>267,616</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>267,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Van</td>
<td>30,500</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>30,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>879,008</td>
<td>424,138</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>1,520,646</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If one adds up the members of non-Islamic religions, then the composition of the population—according to religions—appears as follows for the time of Cuinet (actual figures and percentages):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Muslims</th>
<th>Non-Muslims</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,696,714</td>
<td>5,577,745</td>
<td>15,274,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78.9 %</td>
<td>21.1 %</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the non-Muslims, 2,410,272 were Christians of various denominations.

These statistics show some peculiarities which need explanation. Particularly obvious is the high number of “Copts” (2,867), but only a very small number of these are actual Copts (i.e. Christian Egyptians); by Copts (Kitbîî), the Turks usually mean the non-Muslim gipsies. These “Copts” should therefore be added to the number of gipsies (2,867 + 37,752 = 40,619). The Column “foreigners” includes not only real “foreigners”, (edînebî) but also immigrated Ottoman citizens (yabandîl), whose home is not in the wilayet in question. The two categories are mentioned separately only for the wilayet of Erzurum (1,220 edînebî + 4,986 yabandîl = 6,206).

One can only surmise to which race the occasionally separately mentioned members of Muslim sects (usually Shiites) belonged (total number 533,677). In Van and Bitlis they are given as Yazidis (5,400 + 3,863 = 9,263), and in the case of Diyâr Bakr it is stated that the figure 6,000 for members of different sects also includes Yazidis. We may assume that these were on the whole Kurds. Of the others, by far the greater part probably consisted of Shiite Turks, in Arab areas probably also Naşrî Arabs. If one deducts the figures for Shiites and Yazidis as well as those of Arabs, Kurds and Circassians there remains the figure 8,537,863 for supposedly Sunnite Turks, which still contains small elements of Shiites, non-Turkish Sunnites, and also Lazis, and emigrants from former Ottoman provinces which had come under Christian rule (muhâddirîn). To the number of Arabs a considerable number of Christians of various denominations should be added as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Syrian Orthodox</th>
<th>Syrian United</th>
<th>Chal. United</th>
<th>United Maronites</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w. Adana</td>
<td>20,900</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>20,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Diyâr Bakr</td>
<td>4,990</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Bitlis</td>
<td>4,539</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anat. distr. of w. Halab</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9,865</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9,865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Van</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6,002</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25,890</td>
<td>18,467</td>
<td>4,539</td>
<td>62,858</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the addition of the total of the non-Uniate Jacobites, Chaldeans and Nestorians (168,706) one arrives at the total of 231,289 for Christian Arabs of differing denominations; of these, however, some Chaldeans and Nestorians, as well as Uniate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Muslims (*Shiites and Yazidis)</th>
<th>Greek and Syr. Orthodox</th>
<th>Armen. Gregorian</th>
<th>Armen. Catholic</th>
<th>Armenian Protestant</th>
<th>Other Catholics (Uniate and Latin)</th>
<th>Non-Uniate Jacobites and Nestorians</th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>*Copts</th>
<th>Gypsies</th>
<th>Others (Foreigners)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h. Adalar (Ist.)</td>
<td>2,990</td>
<td>5,010</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,050</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10,503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Adana</td>
<td>158,000</td>
<td>67,100</td>
<td>69,300</td>
<td>11,550</td>
<td>16,600</td>
<td>4,539</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>403,539</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Ankara</td>
<td>768,119</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>83,663</td>
<td>8,784</td>
<td>2,451</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>62,850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Antakya (Hal.)</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,084</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>892,901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Aydin (Izmir)</td>
<td>1,093,334</td>
<td>20,828</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>22,516</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,396,477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. 'Aynatâb (Hal.)</td>
<td>65,085</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,046</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>5,906</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>86,988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Beykoz (Ist.)</td>
<td>5,444</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2,988</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9,494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.s. Biga</td>
<td>106,583</td>
<td>17,585</td>
<td>1,436</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2,988</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>129,438</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Bilis</td>
<td>354,000</td>
<td>3,093</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>125,500</td>
<td>3,840</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>6,190</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>398,625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Diyâr Bakr</td>
<td>*6,000</td>
<td>14,240</td>
<td>57,890</td>
<td>10,170</td>
<td>11,069</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>38,074</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>471,642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Erzrum</td>
<td>500,782</td>
<td>3,725</td>
<td>120,273</td>
<td>12,022</td>
<td>2,672</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6,16</td>
<td>6,206</td>
<td>645,702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Gebze (Ist.)</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>19,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Khudawendigâr (Brusa)</td>
<td>1,296,593</td>
<td>230,711</td>
<td>85,354</td>
<td>3,033</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3,255</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7,319</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,626,839</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Iskenderûn (Hal.)</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4,146</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>23,330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.s. Izmid</td>
<td>129,715</td>
<td>40,795</td>
<td>46,208</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>222,760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Kâdûkoû (Ist.)</td>
<td>9,374</td>
<td>8,137</td>
<td>10,480</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td>32,211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Kaflûja (Ist.)</td>
<td>16,796</td>
<td>3,387</td>
<td>4,080</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>25,183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Kartal</td>
<td>10,876</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>18,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Kastamonî</td>
<td>992,679</td>
<td>21,507</td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,079</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,018,912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Kilis (Hal.)</td>
<td>73,520</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>2,774</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>83,888</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Konya</td>
<td>989,200</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,088,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Ma'mûret</td>
<td>323,566</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>61,983</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>575,314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Mar'ash (Hal.)</td>
<td>134,438</td>
<td>5,505</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>2,463</td>
<td>7,866</td>
<td>18,505</td>
<td>8,918</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>179,853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Sivas</td>
<td>*279,824</td>
<td>76,068</td>
<td>129,523</td>
<td>10,477</td>
<td>30,433</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,086,015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Shîle (Ist.)</td>
<td>15,750</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>19,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Tirabzôn</td>
<td>806,700</td>
<td>193,000</td>
<td>44,100</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,047,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Urfa (Hal.)</td>
<td>122,665</td>
<td>5,060</td>
<td>2,437</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,738</td>
<td>6,218</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>143,485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Uskûdar (Ist.)</td>
<td>71,210</td>
<td>12,180</td>
<td>15,800</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>105,690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Van</td>
<td>241,000</td>
<td>*5,400</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>92,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,976,714</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,042,612</strong></td>
<td><strong>977,679</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,749</strong></td>
<td><strong>85,347</strong></td>
<td><strong>56,179</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,706</strong></td>
<td><strong>47,299</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,867</strong></td>
<td><strong>37,752</strong></td>
<td><strong>79,555</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,254,459</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chaldaeans have to be added to the Kurds. In these statistics, one may assume that the 2,675 Catholics not contained in the number of the Uniates were largely Latins, i.e. Occidentals (missionaries etc.) with or without Ottoman nationality, who had not been included under the heading "foreigners".

Thus, for the time of Cuinet we have roughly the following picture of the ethnic composition of Anatolia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1945</th>
<th>1950</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunnites</td>
<td>8,547,863</td>
<td>8,547,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shi'ites</td>
<td>462,414</td>
<td>462,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazidis</td>
<td>9,203</td>
<td>9,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christians</td>
<td>2,410,272</td>
<td>2,410,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>47,299</td>
<td>47,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsies</td>
<td>12,582</td>
<td>12,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown and foreigners</td>
<td>2,675</td>
<td>2,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,790,174</td>
<td>18,790,174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures for several official censuses for the Turkish Republic are already available: namely, those of 1927, 1935, 1940, 1945, and 1950, but the last of these is given as only "provisional" (muvakkat). The particular figures can be found in the individual articles on the capitals of the various ilıı (wilayets) enumerated above, ch. 3, last paragraph.

The total for 1945 is 18,790,174 and 20,934,670 for 1950: 1,496,612 and 1,729,562 in European Turkey and Anatolia respectively in 1945; 1,598,255 and 19,336,475 in European Turkey and Anatolia respectively in 1950.

Definite figures for some towns exist for 1950. According to these, there are 5 towns of over 100,000 inhabitants: Istanbul (1,000,022), Ankara (286,781), Izmir (230,508), Adana (177,799), and Bursa (100,007); and the following 6 towns between 50,000 and 100,000 inhabitants: Eskisihir (88,459), Gaziantep (72,743), Kayseri (65,489), Konya (64,509), Erzurum (54,360), Silvas (32,269).

There are also figures for the distribution of the town and the country population for 1945 and 1950. The percentage rate, worked out for the purpose of this article, is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>18,790,174 : 100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>20,934,670 : 100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At Turkey's overall area of 767,119 sq. km., this produces a density of population of 24.49 per sq. km. in 1945 and 27 in 1950. The official percentage of town and country population (both as a whole and according to individual wilayets) is only available for 1935. According to this, there were then 23.5% of the population in towns and 76.5% in the country. With these figures, one must bear in mind that according to the law of 1930, every place with a municipal government (beldeye teşkilatı) counts as a town. Such a body is to be set up both in all places of more than 2,000 inhabitants and also (irrespective of this minimum figure) in all 18,790,174 centres of which some have hardly 500 inhabitants. If judged by western standards, the proportion would alter in favour of the country population.

H. Louis, Die Bevölkerungsstatistik der Türkei, Berlin 1940, bases his work on the publication of the census in Turkey in 1935. It can be seen from the map that the three most densely populated areas in Anatolia are the following: 1) the western Anatolian coastal strips together with the river valleys, leading into the interior, especially that of the Maeander (Buyuk Menderes Cay), 2) the coastal area of the Black Sea, 3) Cilicia, the new sandıqah of Hatay, and the plain towards the Euphrates, which, geographically, belongs to northern Syria; compared with this, the centre with its steppes and the mountainous north-east show the lowest density of population. The distribution is caused by the nature of the country, and has probably always been roughly the same—at least since the Middle Ages—and should remain so at any rate in the near future. Figures for religious and linguistic divisions are only available for 1945 (21 Ekim 1945 Genel Nüfus Sayımı, Recensement général de la population du 21 Octobre 1945, Türkiye Nüfusu, Population de la Turquie, vol. 65, Ankara 1950). According to these, Turkey can be divided up linguistically as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Group</th>
<th>1945</th>
<th>1950</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>18,497,801</td>
<td>19,292,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-Islamic</td>
<td>292,154</td>
<td>292,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,790,174</td>
<td>18,790,174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to religions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>1945</th>
<th>1950</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christians</td>
<td>202,044</td>
<td>202,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>76,965</td>
<td>76,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without religion</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12,582</td>
<td>12,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>292,154</td>
<td>292,154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the non-Muslims there were:
These rough statistics, when compared with those at the end of the last century as given by Cuinet, clearly show an enormous change which was caused by the events during and shortly after the First World War.

More detailed information can be gained from the following division into both categories which is reproduced here in shortened form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Muslims</th>
<th>Catholics</th>
<th>Orthodox</th>
<th>Protestants</th>
<th>Gregorians</th>
<th>Christians of unknown denomination</th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>Without religion</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>16,546,681</td>
<td>4,955</td>
<td>10,705</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>17,581</td>
<td>3,847</td>
<td>11,836</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16,598,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurdish</td>
<td>1,499,570</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5,208</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,497,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>235,668</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>7,071</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>247,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>9,898</td>
<td>4,536</td>
<td>73,083</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>88,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circassian</td>
<td>66,981</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>66,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>3,390</td>
<td>2,895</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>42,019</td>
<td>4,301</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yiddish</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50,216</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laz</td>
<td>46,979</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>46,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgian</td>
<td>39,870</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>40,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnian</td>
<td>78,447</td>
<td>11,214</td>
<td>19,957</td>
<td>2,342</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>10,712</td>
<td>13,286</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>4,582</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>98,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judeao-Spanish etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatar etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,497,801</td>
<td>21,530</td>
<td>103,839</td>
<td>5,213</td>
<td>60,260</td>
<td>10,782</td>
<td>76,965</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>12,582</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>18,790,174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to the totals of the division into languages, the following facts stand out from the figures given for individual wilayets, (the numbers are again given in round figures). The Arabic speaking people live together densely in the south-eastern wilayets, and form the large majority in the eastern speaking people live together densely in the south-eastern wilayets. The number of Jews under "other languages" includes the 10,866 who speak Judeo-Spanish. The Gipsies, who in Cuinet's statistics were given with the rather large figure of 40,000, have disappeared altogether from the new statistics. As they do not speak a different language from that of the people amongst whom they live, nor profess a different religion, one may assume that they are present, unrecognised, in the various groups of the statistics.

(5) Development of Communications.

Being a thinly populated peninsula with steppes in the centre and few usable harbours, Anatolia has little traffic. Long distance traffic from Istanbul to the east mostly tries to bypass Anatolia, preferring to the difficult overland roads the easier sea routes to Trabzon on the Black Sea, or to Ayas at the mouth of the Deyhân in the Middle Ages, to Payas in the Gulf of Issus under the Ottomans, and to Iskenderun (Alexandretta) in recent times. Throughout the ages the main caravan tracks led from these harbours to the interior of Asia. Traffic inside Anatolia was generally only of local importance. There were always through-roads, usually leading to or from Istanbul (which was regarded as the undisputed metropolis even at times when Anatolia did not regard it as its political capital).

Three types of such roads can be distinguished in Turkish times: (1) Military roads; (2) Caravan routes; (3) Postal routes. All three types follow the nature of the country and circumvent the interior steppes, passing through adjoining regions, but keeping to the inside of the border-mountains. They prefer the edges of the steppe where animals
can graze and where the towns are situated. The routes follow roughly the same lines, though they do not coincide altogether.

The main Military road (on which the armies of the sultans moved in the 16th and 17th centuries against Persia and Caucasia) described a large arc south of the central Anatolian steppe from Uskudar via Izmid, Eskişehir, Akshehir, to Koyna and from there via Ereğli, Niğde, Kayseri to Sivas, then via Erzincan and Erzurum to the east. When Selim I marched against Syria, he too went to Kayseri and only from there through the Anti-Taurus to Elbistan and Marash. The route from Ereğli through the Cilician Gate (Gülek Bogazı) to Adana and further into Syria was usually avoided, particularly for difficult transports, and especially because the Gülek Bogazı is easy to block. In 1638, for instance, Murad IV sent the artillery he needed for the capture of Bagdad by sea as far as Payas, only transporting it overland from there onwards with the aid of buffaloes. The northern Caravan route (to be mentioned below) was used for small detachments only. The reports of the Imperial armies often give the sites of the camps on the main Military road, but these are frequently at a considerable distance from the inhabited places along the route.

The most important of the Caravan routes is the one leading diagonally across from Uskudar via Gebze, then, after crossing the Gulf of Izmit from Dîl to Iznik, following roughly the Military route via Eskişehir to Koyna and Ereğli, then through the Cilician Gate (Gülek Bogazı) to Adana and thence to Syria or Mesopotamia. The route via Antakya to Syria is, at the same time, the route which two pilgrims took to Damascus and Medina, the holy places of Islam, and it is often mentioned in this capacity. There is also a northern caravan route of some importance which goes from Uskudar to Amasya via İzmit, Bolf and Tosya (or, bypassing Amasya, via Niğde), and thence to Erzincan and Erzerum and further to the east; alternately, from Amasya via Tokat, Sivas and Malatya to Diyarbakır and further to Mosul and Bagdad; from Uskudar onwards this route is called Bagdad Yolu. An older variant of this—used by Busbecq in 1555—follows the diagonal route as far as Eskişehir and then goes on to Amasya via Ankara. Lastly, the north-south route which bypasses the central Anatolian steppe to the east is of some importance. In Salgirk times, this route branched off at Koyna, the capital, and went right across the steppe, past the beautiful Sultan Khân and Aksaray to Kayseri and on to Sivas, where it connected with the northern route as well as with those leading to the east (Erzincan and Erzerum). In Karaman and Ottoman times it went from places at the foot of the Taurus, Laranda (Karaman), or Tivaktı (via Niğde) to Istanbul. In western Anatolia, only roads leading from Izmir seem to have had some local importance and little is reported of them.

Postal routes, like the caravan routes, were divided into three “arms” (kol, for this term, which is also used as a technical term in administrative language, cf. Redhouse, A Turkish and English Lexicon, 1942; H. W. Duda, Balkantürkische Studien, Vienna 1949, 58 ff, note 8). In the 17th century, according to the Dziânam-nâmâ, the middle one of these “arms” embraced the entire length of the diagonal route together with its offshoots as far as Damascus; the right one, the whole west Anatolian network, and the left, the northern caravan route with its extension as far as Bagdad. According to reports of postal routes in the 19th century, the diagonal route forms the right arm together with the western Anatolian network, the northern caravan route the central one, whilst the left one does not leave the central one until Tokat, whence it embraces the eastern network to Erzerum. (Concerning the development of road and route-nets in Anatolia prior to the 19th century, cf. F. Taeschner, Das Anatóliokos Wegenetz nach Osmanischen Quellen, Leipzig 1924; idem, Die Verkehrslage und das Wegenetz Anatoliens im Wandel der Zeiten, Petermanns Geographische Mitteilungen, 1926, 202-6).

The word “roads” can be applied to these routes only in a limited sense, as roads were not built with foundations; except where Roman roads could still be employed, they are simply much used and well-trodden tracks, along which caravanserais, wells, and bridges have been erected by benefactors for the comfort of the travellers.

This tripartite route-system has been gradually falling into disuse with the expansion of railways in the 19th and 20th centuries, though the railway follows roughly the track of the old routes—at least in the case of the diagonal road.

The building of railways naturally did not replace the building of roads, which also has been encouraged (to a certain extent) since the tansımâdî period. (For the means devised to finance the building of the roads: corvée and road-tax, “yol parası”, see G. Young, Corps de Droit Ottoman, IV, Oxford 1906, 245 ff., “Routes et Prestations”)

The history of railway building in Anatolia began with the granting of a concession to a British company for a railway from Smyrna (Izmir) to Aydın in 1856, and the line was opened 10 years later. In the last decades of the Ottoman Empire the following sections were opened in Anatolia:

1. British Company: Smyrna (Izmir) — Aydın 1866, — Dinar 1889 (with branchlines to Ödemiş, Tire, Söke, Denizli and Čivril); Egridir 1912;
3. Narrow Gauge Railway Mudanya-Brusa (Bursa) 1875, rebuilt by a Franco-Belgian Company in 1892 (not in use now);
4. German Company (since 1888) Anatolian Railway: Haydar Paşa — Izmit 1873 (with a branchline to Adapazar); Eskişehir — Ankara 1896, — Eskişehir — Afyon Karahisar (with a branchline from Alayunt to Kütahya) — Konya 1896; Bagdad Railway: Konya — Bulgurlu 1904; Toprakkale — İskenderun 1913; Bulgurol — Adana — Toprakkale — Alepp (Alepo) — Nusaybin 1918 (with a branchline to Mardin);

Thus the railways consisted—with the exception of the short stretches which linked Adana and Brusa with their harbours—on the one hand of a network based on Smyrna (Izmir) and opening up the rich agricultural districts of western Anatolia, on the other hand of a diagonal line, with a branch to Ankara, which linked the capital to the far-distant Arab provinces of Mesopotamia, Irak and Syria. Plans for a railway system in the Black Sea area and in north-eastern Anatolia broke down because of Russian opposition.

Existing railways were nationalised at the beginning of the Turkish Republic in 1920 (“Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Devlet Demiryolları”), and the system has since been extended and based on Ankara as
its centre. This extension began as early as 1922 with a narrow-gauge railway Ankara—Irmak—Yahsi Han 1925—Yenice and in the Kayseri direction 1925. This was later extended in wide gauge.

There are the following lines: (1) Ankara-Kayseri 1927—Sivas 1930—Erzincan 1938—Erzurum 1939—Horasan 1950—Sarıkamış under construction. Here it will link up with the broad gauge railways which the Russians built in 1896: Gümrük (Alexander-dorp, now Leninakan) via Kars to Sarıkamış. The line was continued in narrow gauge from there to Mamahattun via Erzerum during the First World War. (2) Ilica (in the Gulf of Edremit)—Edremit—Pamukluk (narrow gauge) 1924 (unused since 1953); (3) Fevzi paşa (on the Adana—Aleppo line)—Malatya 1931—Diyarbekir (Diyarbakır) 1935 (with a branchline to Elazığ)—Kurtalan 1944; (4) Samsun—Çarşamba (narrow gauge) 1926 (no longer in use); Samsun—Amasya—Sivas 1932; (5) Kütahya—Balikesir 1932; (6) Kayseri—Ulkışla (more specifically: Bogazköprü—Kardeşgedik) 1933 (since then through-trains to Syria and Iraq—The Taurus Express—go via Ankara and no longer via Konya); (7) Irmak—Fılyos 1935—Zonguldak 1937—Kozlu 1943—Eregli planned, under construction as far as Çamlı; (8) Afyon Karahisar—Karakuşu (near Dinar), Baladiz (near Eğirdir), and Bozanöi (also near Eğirdir)—İsparta 1936; (9) Çetinkaya (on the Sivas—Erzincan line)—Malatya 1937; (10) Elazığ—Geneç 1947—Muş under construction—Tavan (on Lake Van) planned; (11) Köprüağrı (near Fevzi paşa)—Maras 1948; (12) Narlı (near Fevzi paşa)—Gaziantep 1948—Karkamış formerly Djarabulus (on the Euphrates, on the border of former Syria) under construction. (Cf. G. Jäschke, Geschichte und Bedeutung der türkischen Eisenbahnen, Zeitschrift für Politik, 1942, 559—566; concerning the Bagdad railway in particular, cf. H. Bode, Der Kampf um die Bagdadbahn 1903—1914, Breslau 1941; R. Huber, Die Bagdadbahn, Berlin 1943).

The increased use of motor transport and the consequent decrease in rail transport, has already resulted in the closing of local lines (Mudanya—Brusa, Ilica—Edremit—Pamukluk) and threatens to outdo rail transport in Turkey. As a result there has been a fresh emphasis on road construction (Mukbil Gökdogan, Strassenbau und Verkehrspolitik in der Türkei, Stuttgart 1938). In recent years the road network in Turkey has been greatly expanded —partly with American aid—and there are now numerous bus lines (cf. R. W. Kerwin, The Turkish Roads Programme, The Middle East Journal, 1950).

Since the Anatolian rivers are not navigable, there is no real inland shipping (except in the case of the greater rivers just above their mouths, and the use of rafts of inflated skins (kelek) on the Tigris). Nor are there any artificial waterways. The project of linking the Sabandja lake with the Sakarya on the one side and the Gulf of Izmit on the other by canal has been considered twice (1999/1900—91 and 1964/1953), but on neither occasion did it get past the preliminary stages (see Sabandja).

Conditions for sea shipping are not very favourable either: the north and south coasts have few natural harbours, and the many bays along the west coast are of little use because the river estuaries are silted up by the rivers (cf. above, ii, "Anatolian conditions"). Apart from Smyrna (Izmir) and the most important harbour, there are a few—admittedly unimportant—harbours along the west coast, such as Foça (Selcuk). In ancient times and in the Middle Ages it was a considerable rival of the port of Smyrna, because it jutted further out into the sea), Bodrum (Halicarnassus), and Fethiye (Makri), which are only of importance for coastal shipping. In recent times only Smyrna has had any importance as an overseas harbour, though Foça also held a similar position in the Middle Ages.

Unlike the ports on the western coast which can be easily reached by the river valleys from the centre of Anatolia, the few ports on the north and south coasts are difficult to reach. On the north coast, Sinop (Sinope) rather inaccessible because of its mountainous hinterland—and Samsun (Suvor) (Amisos) are of some importance, particularly in the 19th century. On the south coast, the ports of Antalya (Mersin) (Adalya, the ancient Attalia and Satalia of the Crusaders) and Alanya (Alaçati) (AliKöyya, Galonoros in Byzantine times, the Candelor of the European merchants in the Middle Ages) have been of importance ever since the Middle Ages. More recently, the harbour of Mersina (now Mersin) has also been of importance since it was built in 1804. The only ports for landward goods which with traffic across the continent were actually those at the "base" of the Anatolian peninsula i.e. Tarabzun (Mersin) (Trebizond) on the Black Sea, and one on the Mediterranean (in the Middle Ages Ayas (Mersin), Laiazzo of the crusaders, Payas in Ottoman times, low Iskenderun, Alexandretta); caravans from Trebizond went to Adherence of Pergamum and Persia, and from the above-mentioned Mediterranean ports to northern Syria (Aleppo), Mezopotamia (Mosul) and Irāk (Baghdād).

(6) Economy.

Anatolia has always been an agricultural country and it has largely remained one in spite of the considerable incipient industrialisation. In the centre—wherever the land is fit for more than grazing—the main crop is grain, whilst fruit and vegetables are cultivated in the coastal areas and near rivers where gardens can be watered with the aid of waterwheels. Fruit-growing is characteristic particularly of the districts on the Black Sea (apples from Amasya are famous throughout the country, and Cerasus, now Giresun, is supposed to be the original home of the cherry), hazelnuts are grown in many areas. Along the Aegean Sea (with its Mediterranean vegetation) figs, olives, melons (watermelon, karpus and sweet melon, kavun), and mulberry trees and vines are grown. The woods in the Black Sea area (especially the "Wood Sea", ağat demisi, of former times near Sabandja) were extensive enough to meet not only the local demands for timber for building, wood for burning and charcoal but also part of the need of the capital, which got the remainder of its supply from woods on the European side.

The steppes in the centre of the country are most propitious for the raising of cattle. Various types of sheep and goats are found here, including Angora goats whose wool (çakmak) is in great demand (mohair). Anatolian horses have been famous since the Middle Ages. The "Aziziyev" stud farm in Phrygia used to supply from woods on the European side.
The silver mines of Gümüşhâne between Trabzon and Erzurum, and those of Gümüş
Hadidi Koy near Amasya, must be mentioned as the oldest; here, too, were the mints for silver coins.
Copper was found in Kure (between Inebolu and Kastamoun) and in Ergani Ma'den (near Diyarbakr).
Near Eskigehir is the only area in the world where “Meerschaum” is found. This was in great demand in
the 19th century for pipes (füle) and similar articles, but since “Meerschaum” is no longer in fashion now,
production is much reduced.

Arts and crafts have been playing a considerable part, especially ceramics (introduced from Persia as early as the Saljuk period). Magnificent examples of Rûm Saljuk ceramics are found especially in buildings in Konya. The golden age of Ottoman ceramics began when Selim I brought craftsmen back from Tabriz during his Persian campaign (1514), and settled them in Istanbul and Iznik. In the 16th
and 17th centuries, Iznik was the centre for the production of the classical Ottoman pottery with blue and green as the main colours, contrasting effectively with the interspersal bright “Bolus-red”.
The tiles produced in Iznik adorn mosques and turbes in Istanbul as well as the Topkapi Saray. Of vessels, the plates (known as “Rhodes plates” to the trade) are the best known and most exported product of the potteries. In later years (under Ahmed III) potteries were founded in the Tekfûr Saray in Istanbul and in Kütahya (concerning Turkish Fycence manufacture in Iznik and other places, cf. K. Otto-Dorn, Das islamische Iznik, Berlin 1941, 109 ff., and the list of sources by R. Anhegger, ibid, 165 ff.). [Cf. also ANADOLU 1939/36]

Besides pottery, textile goods form a characteristic part of Anatolia’s produce, particularly rugs. The Turks brought this skill from the east and developed it (mainly in Uşak, Kula, Gözde and others) partly in the Persian tradition, partly in a more popular style. The rugs best known in Europe are those made in the 19th century, which are loosely knotted, with long threads and known as “Smyrna” rugs after their harbour of export, although they were actually made in the Uşak area. The Anatolian silk industry was also of great renown; the centre for which was in Brusa. Its products, of which the broacades with inwoven gold and silver threads are of an especially high artistic quality, were chiefly woven for the court and for higher society. Concerning Turkish textile production cf. Tafrîm Öz, Türk Kumaş ve Kaftanlari, Istanbul 1946-57; idem, Turkish Textiles and Velvets, Ankara 1950. Lastly, coarser weaving (külim) of rugs and mats must be mentioned; such mats cover the mosque floors in winter. [Cf. also ANADOLU 1939/36]

Trades in towns were organised into guilds. These guilds (ciniyêt, from the singular ciniyét) which were “fraternities” somewhat similar in character to a darâigî order, maintained and guarded traditions, quality and integrity. In cases of accident, their members were protected against loss by the spirit of comradeship, and the resultant esprit de corps gave them a power to which—at times—even the government had to yield. The guilds were supervised by the clerk of the market (müstâbâci) who, in turn, was subordinate to the Kâdi—an institution belonging to the sharia. (Concerning Turkish guilds cf. Osman Nuri, Meşgül-i Ummâr-i Belediyeye, I, Istanbul 1922, chap. Eşnâf, 479-768; Taescher, Die Zünfte in der Türkei, Leipziger Vierteljahrschrift für Südosteuropa, 1941, 172-58; and ŞINF concerning economy in early Ottoman times in general, cf. Afez İnan, Aperçu général sur l’Histoire économique de l’Empire Turc-Ottoman, Istanbul 1941.)

The ancient guilds began to disintegrate in the 19th century when state reform (tanzimât) opened
the way to commercial reforms on western European lines and to a western legal code (partly by direct
adoption of European legal codes). Finally the guilds were formally dissolved on 13 Febr. 1325
M./26 Febr. 1910 (the Gediik on 16 Febr. 1328 M./
1 March 1913). Modern organisations (grouped into trade unions in 1943) took their place. Improvements
were made in agriculture, as for instance the irrigation to bring water to the Konya plain carried out
by the Bagdad Railway (1907-1913), and new cultivations (e.g. cotton in the Cilician plain) were introduced.

Attempts to bring Anatolia into line economically with European countries have been particularly marked since the foundation of the Turkish Republic. Cf. (amongst others): Orhan Conker and Emile Vitmeur, Redressement économique et industrialisation de la Nouvelle Turquie, Paris 1937; Ahmed Oguz, Die Wirtschaftslenkung in der Türkei, Berlin 1940; Schewket Raschid, Die türkische Landwirtschaft als Grundlage der türk. Volkswirtschaft, Berlin-Leipzig 1932; M. Thornburg, G. Spry, G. Soule, Economical Appraisal, New York 1945; The Economy of Turkey. An Analysis and Recommendations of a Development Program. Baltimore 1951.


Muhammad ‘Âçîkî’s Manâsîr al-‘Awi‘îmî (1066/ 1598) brings to an end the geographical literature of the mediaeval type. In the geographical section, he begins with a Turkish translation of what older authors—al-Idrisî, Abu ’l-Fidâ‘î and others—have said; in the case of places which he himself has visited, this is followed by an account of what he has seen. These reports, which are interspersed throughout the work, are of the greatest importance and would merit an edition, especially since they were used as a basis for later works.

Those original works by Ottoman writers which have survived are more revealing than any of the
Finally, the official handbooks (Dewlet-i 'Aliyye-i 'Osmâniyye Sâlînamesi) which are available for the 88 years from 1263 H/1847 to 1354 Mâliyye/1918 and the Sâlînames of that time, together with other sources, are exploited in the important work by V. Cuinet, La Turquie d’Asie, Paris i, ii, 1892, iii, iv, 1894. Under the Turkish Republic, a similar series was started (Turkiye Djihâdnâmâtyesi Dewlet Sâlînamesi), but only 5 volumes have appeared so far (i, 1926; ii, 1927; iii, 1928; iv, 1929; v, 1930), and they do not contain nearly as much material as the earlier salînames of Ottoman times.

Lastly, the lists of place-names may serve as sources for the most recent period, for instance: Son teşkilât-i mühimâyeye Köylerimizsin adları, Istanbul 1928; Iârâre Taksimât, 1942, Istanbul 1942; Tûrkiyeye De Meshkun Yeter Kılavuz, 2 vols., Ankara 1946 and 1950.

Key to the map of Anatolia in the 17th century.

This map is based on the Bevölkerungskarte der Türkei, : 4,000,000, by H. Louis, 1938. The entries are mainly taken from the Djihâdnâmâ of Kâthib Celâbi, and therefore reflect conditions in Anatolia in the 17th century. The map shows the approximate limits of the eyâlet (within the present-day boundary of Turkey) as red broken lines, and in some cases those of the liwâds (or sanâdik), as red dotted lines. It further shows the more important roads indicated by Kâthib Celâbi, Ewliya Celâbi and other sources, the main communication routes as double red lines, other routes as single red lines. The names of the towns (in red) and of mountain peaks (in black, with heights in metres) are abbreviated, and the following list explains these abbreviations; first comes the name as it appears in the Djihâdnâmâ and in the other sources of the 17th century, then, in brackets, the antique or Byzantine name (if known), the modern name (if different from the old one), the administrative district (except in the case of towns which have gained importance only later and therefore do not occur in the ancient sources; these have been put in brackets on the map), and finally the reference to the square of the map. The names of the capitals of eyâlets are printed in small capitals; those of the capitals of liwâds in italics. General abbreviations: B. = Büyük; Ç. = Çay; D. = Dağ; E. = Eyâlet; G. = Göllü; I. = İrmak; L. = Liwa; N. = Nehir, Neîni. For practical reasons, the transliteration has been based on modern Turkish orthography.

A D = Ağrı Dağı (Ararat: L 3)
A D = Adana (E. Adana: F 4)
A D = Adıcevar (E. Van: K 3)
A D = Adapazar (D 2)
A D = Amid (Diyarbakr) (Diyarbakr; E. Diyarbekr: J 4)
A E = Aksaray (E. Karaman: E 3)
A H = Ahiska (K 2)
A H = Ahat (E. Van: K 3)
A K = Antakya (Antiochia; L. Antakya: G 4)
A K = Afyon Karahisarlı (L. Karahisar-i Şâhîb: D 3)
A K = Aksaray (E. Karaman: E 3)
A L = Alanya (‘Alâ’ıya, Alan, Kaloneros; L. Içel: E 4)
A L = Alaş (Alaşehir) (Philadelphia; L. Aydîn: C 3)

The wealth of information may be expected from documents kept in Turkish archives, but research into these is only in its beginning (Omer Lutfi Barkan, Turkiyeye İmparatorluk devletlerinin nüfus ve arazi tahâleri ve Hakana mahsus defterler, Istanbul 1941, and XV ve XV linci asırıarda Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda sıraden ekonomisinin hukuki ve malî esasları, Kanuni, Istanbul 1943).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANADOLU 479</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am = Amasya (Amaseia; E. Sivas : F 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anr = Anmara (Amystris; L. Bolu : E 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ank = Ankara (Ankyra, Angora; L. Ankara : E 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ant = Antalya (Attaleia, Adalya; L. Tekke : D 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ard = Ardağan (E. Cildir : K 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As = Ays (E. Adana : F 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aş = Açşehir (Philomelion; E. Karaman : D 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab = 'Ayniştan (Gaziantep; E. Marash : G 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atş = Altıntaş (E. Germiyani : D 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av = Arvyn (E. Cildir : I 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ay = Ayaş (L. Ankara : E 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayasoluk (Ephesos, Hagios Theologos, Selçuk; L. Aydın : B 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bb = Bayburt (E. Erzerum : I 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bb D = Binboğa Dağ (G 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd = Bodrum (Halikarnassos; L. Mentese : B 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDr = Burdur (L. Hamid : D 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be = Bendereği (Heraclea Pontica, Ereğli; S. Bolu : D 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bg = Biga (L. Biga : B 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bir = Bir (Birecik; L. Bire : H 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bk = Balikesri (Balikesir; L. Sultan Oyiği : C 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bl = Bolu (L. Bolu : D 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blk = Bilecik (L. Sultan Üyüğü : C 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bz D = Boz Dağ (Tmolos : C 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Br = Bursa (Prusa, Brussa; L. Hudavendigar : C 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brs = Bergama (Pergamon; L. Karaslı : C 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bs = Bitlis (E. Van : K 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bş = Beyşehir (E. Karaman : D 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bt = Batum (I 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buz D = Buz Dağ (H 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bv = Boluvari (L. Karahisar-i Sahib : D 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By = Bayezid (Doğu Bayazit; E. Kars : L 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çav = Çav (L. Karahisar-i Sahib : D 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çk = Çerçe (L. Kankırı : E 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çt = Çıldır (E. Çıldır : K 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cln = Çaldıran (E. Van : K 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čm = Čorum (E. Sivas : F 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čnk = Çınemük (E. Van : K 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čl = Çorlu (Tuzlulon ; B 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ďg = Divriği (Tephrike; E. Sivas : H 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr = Denizli (L. Germiyani : C 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dv = Develi-Karahisar (Develi; E. Karaman : F 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ds = Düze (L. Bolu : D 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ec = Erciş (E. Van : K 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed = Edirne (Adrianopolis ; B 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edr = Edremid (L. Karaslı : B 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egn = Ergani (E. Diyarbekr : I 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egı = Egirdir (L. Hamid : D 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ek = Ermenek (L. Isel : E 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elb = Elbistan (E. Marash : G 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El D = Elma Dağ (E 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm = Elmali (L. Tekke : C 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Em = Erzerum (Arzan al-Rüm, Erzurum; E. Erzerum : I 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Er = Ereğli (Herakleia; E. Karaman : F 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Er D = Erçivas Dağ (Argaios : F 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es = Eskişehir (L. Sultan Üyüğü : D 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fc = Foca (Phokaia; L. Saruhan : B 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fn = Finike (L. Tekke : D 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gbz = Geğüz (Dakibyza, Gebze; L. Kocaeli : C 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gd D = Geyik Dağ (E 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gdis = Gires (L. Saruhan : C 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gh = Gümüşhane (Gümüşhane; E. Erzerum : H 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gh A = Güzelsaray-Aydın (Aydın; L. Aydın : B 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gk = Gülek kalesi (E. Adana : F 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gt = Gümüşkale (E. Karaman : F 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gs = Gebze (L. Saruhan : C 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gt = Gümüşkale (E. Karaman : F 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H B = Hai Değ (F 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H D = Hekin Hanı (E. Sivas : F 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H K = Hişn-İ Kef (Hişn Kayfâ, Hasanküfet; E. Diyarbekr : I 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hk = Hersek (L. Hudavendigar : C 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hl = Halep (Aleppo : G 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H M = Hiş-i Manşūr (Hüsnüname, Adyaman; E. Marash : H 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hm = Hamâ (G 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hs = Hınıs (E. Erzerum : I 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hp = Harput (Hartbirt, Elazığ; E. Diyarbekr : H 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hr = Harran (Karrhai; E. Rakka : H 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hs = Horsan (E. Erzerum : K 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsp = Hisn Esmea, Homs : G 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsk = Hasankale (Pasinler; E. Erzerum : I 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ib = İnebolu (L. Kastamonu : E 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I D = İğdır Dağ (E 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ig = İğjen (E. Karaman : D 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIm = İz никомид (Nikomedea, Iznit; L. Kocaeli : C 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In = İnzık (Nikala; L. Kocaeli : C 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Io = İnönü (L. Sultan Üyüğü : D 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ir = İzmir (Smyrna; L. Sûlû : B 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is = İskilip (E. Sivas : F 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isk = Iskenderun (Alexandreia, Alexandretta; L. Antakya : G 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isp = Isparta (L. Hamid : D 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka = Kuşadası (Scala nuova; L. Aydın : B 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kb = Karabük (Karapınar; E. Karaman : E 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke = Kalecik (L. Kankırı : E 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K D = Koku Dağ (C 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kg = Kılıç (E. Erzerum : I 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kg ă = Kangal (E. Sivas : G 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K H = Kaldın Hanı (E. Karaman : E 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kh = Kemah (E. Erzerum : H 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khs = Karahisar-i Şarkı (Şabın Karahisar; L. Karahisar-i Şarkı : H 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kk = Keskin (E. Sivas : E 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kkl = Kırkkilise (Kırklareli : B 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kr = Kırklareli (L. Kankırı : E 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kl = Kula (L. Germiyani : G 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kh = Köylühisar (L. Karahisar-i Şarkı : G 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kls = Kılıç (L. Kılıç : G 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klt = Kelkit (E. Erzerum : H 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kmm = Kastamonu (L. Kastamonu : E 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>km = Kirmasti (L. Hudavendigar : C 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kn = Konya (L. Antakya : G 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kr = Kür (L. Kastamonu : E 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS = Kafe-i Sultanîye (Çanak Kalesi; L. Biga : B 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ks = Kars (E. Kars : K 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ksr = Kayseriye (Kaysarîye, Kayseri; E. Karaman : F 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kst = Kostantiniye (Konstantinopolis, İstanbul : C 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ks = Kırşehir (E. Karaman : F 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ks D = Keş Dağ (Ulu Dağ, Olympus of Bithynia; C 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ks D = Keş Dağ (Ulu Dağ, Olympus of Bithynia : C 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Km = Kirmastî (L. Hudavendigar : C 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ks = Konya (L. Antakya : G 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kr = Kür (L. Kastamonu : E 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS = Kafe-i Sultanîye (Çanak Kalesi; L. Biga : B 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ks = Kars (E. Kars : K 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ksr = Kayseriye (Kaysarîye, Kayseri; E. Karaman : F 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kst = Kostantiniye (Konstantinopolis, İstanbul : C 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ks = Kırşehir (E. Karaman : F 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ks D = Keş Dağ (Ulu Dağ, Olympus of Bithynia : C 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ks D = Keş Dağ (Ulu Dağ, Olympus of Bithynia : C 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Kzm = Kagizman (E. Kars : K 2)

Lt = læke (Leukai, Osmanlı; L. Sultan Üyüğü : C 2)

Lf = Lefke (Leukai, Osmanlı; L. Sultan Üyüğü : C 2)

Lb = Lileburgaz (B 2)

Li = Ladika (Laodikeia : G 5)

M = Memiç (G 4)

Mc = Mecit (E. Karaman : E 4)

Md = Medediz Dağı (F 4)

Mdn = Mustafakemalpaşa (E. Karaman : E 4)

Mf = Meyyafırıkın (Sıvan; E. Diyārbekr : I 3)

Mgz = Müğla (L. Menteşe : C 3)

Mgn = Maghnia (Magnesia, Manisa; L. Surihan : B 3)

Mhč = Mihalıç (Karacabey; L. Huvadendigator : C 2)

Mk = Makri (Fethiye; L. Menteşe : C 4)

Ml = Milas (L. Menteşe : B 4)

Mlk = Malkara (B 2)

Mlt = Malatya (Melitene; E. Marşasq : H 3)

Mız = Malazgirt (E. Van : K 3)

M N = Ma'sarrat an-Nu'man (G 5)

Mr = Marsa (Marasha; E. Marşasq : G 4)

Mrđ = Mardin (E. Diyārbekr : I 4)

(Ms) = Mersin (F 4)

MsL = Mosul (K 4)

MsS = Misis (Mopsuestia; E. Adana : F 4)

Mus = Muz (E. Van : I 3)

Mv = Manavgat (L. Içel : D 4)

Mz = Merzifon (E. Sivas : F 2)

N = Nusaybin (Nissibis; E. Diyārbekr : I 4)

Ngd = Ngide (E. Karaman : F 4)

Nv = Nevşehir (F 3)

Nv = Neyşehir (F 3)

Os = Osmanlı (E. Sivas : F 2)

Or = Ordu (E. Trabzon : G 2)

Ps = Payas (Baiia; E. Adana : G 4)

Ra = Ra's ul-ayn (E. Rakka : I 4)

R U = Rohatı/Urf (Edessa; E. Raka : H 4)

Rv = Revan (Erivan : L 2)

Rz = Rize (E. Trabzon : I 2)

Sb = Sabuncu (Sapanca; L. Kocaeli : D 2)

Se = Sırıcı (E. Raka : H 4)

S D = Sultan Dağı (D 3)

Sf = Selefi (Seleukeia; Silifke; L. Içel : E 4)

S G = Seydi Gazi (Nakoleia; L. Sultān Üyüğü : D 3)

Sg = Söğüt (L. Sultan Üyüğü : D 3)

Sh = Siwyra (E. Ankara : D 3)

Sia = Sis (E. Adana : F 4)

Sk = Siverek (E. Diyārbekr : H 4)

Sp = Sinop (L. Kastamonu : F 1)

Ss = Samsun (Amisos; E. Sivas : G 2)

Ssl = Susit (Susit; L. Karas : C 3)

Sı = Şiran (Şırın; E. Diyārbekr : I 4)

Sv = Sivas (Sebasteia; E. Sivas : G 3)

Šk = Şarklı (E. Sivas : F 3)

Šl = Sil (L. Kocaeli : C 2)

T = Tercan (Manakhatun; Er. Erzurum : I 3)

T D = Tekeli Dağı (G 2)

Tl = Tadmir (Palmyra : H 5)

Tl = Tefeni (L. Hamid : D 4)

Tvl = Tiftik (L 2)

Th = Turhal (E. Sivas : G 2)

Tt = Teşke (E. Sivas : G 2)

Tkd = Tekirdağ (Rhacodesos, Rodosto : B 2)

Tr = Tire (L. Aydin : B 3)

Trb = Trabzon (Trapesös; E. Trabzon : H 2)

Třs = Tarabulus-i Şâm (Tripolis : G 5)

Ts = Tosya (E. Kankırı : F 2)

Tv = Tavsanlı (L. Germiyen : C 3)

Tt = Tortum (E. Erzurum : I 2)

Tv = Tavşan (E. Van : K 3)

U = Uluburlu (L. Hamid : D 3)

Uk = Ulukışla (E. Karaman : F 4)

Ur = Urmia (L 4)

Uş = Uşak (L. Germiyen : C 3)

Üsk = Üsküdar (Skutari; C 2)

Vst = Vostan (E. Van : K 3)

Vf = Vêlîفس (L. Hamid : D 3)

Yf = Yalovaş (L. Hamid : D 3)

Yz = Zeyyat (F 3)

Zb = Zafranbolu (L. Kastamonu : E 2)

(Zg) = Zonguldak (D 2)

Zl = Žile (E. Sivas : F 2)

Zr = Žara (E. Sivas : G 3)

(FA. TAESCHNER)

ANADOLU. In the time between the 15th and the 18th century, this was the name applied to the province (eylül) comprising the western half of Anatolia [cf. preceding article] and embracing largely the western Anatolian Turkish principalities. At the beginning, Ankara was the capital and the seat of the governor (beglerbegi), later it was Kütahya. The eylül of Anadolu contained the following military districts (sandik or isbu) which were partly former principalities (in the order given by Katib Celebi in Djihân-nûmâ): 1) Germiyân with Kütâhya as its capital; 2) Şarûkhan with Mëghnîs (now Manisa); 3) Aydın with Tire; 4) Menteşhe with Mughlla; 5) Tekke with Antalîya; 6) Hamîdî with Ibrâhîm; 7) Kârâbîşûlî with the capital of the same name (later Aliyân Kârâ Hâşar); 8) Sultan Üyûgî (often in the corrupted form of Sultan ʿOlı) with Eskişehir; 9) Ankara with the capital of the same name (also called Engûri); 10) Kânkûfî with the capital of the same name (now Çankırî); 11) Kastamonî with the capital of the same name (now Kastamonu); 12) Bolî with the capital of the same name (now Bolu); 13) Khudâwendîgîr with Brûsa (Bursa); 14) Kôşta-elli with İznikûmîd (later İzmîd, İmîdî). In addition there were the following sandik which were under the Kapudan Pasha: 1) ʿOlısî with Balîkşî; 2) Bîglî with the capital of the same name and Kâlî-e Sulṭânîye (or Canak Kâlîsî); 3) Şughîla with İzmîr. [Cf. individual articles on each of the preceding].

When other eylûls besides Anadolu were formed in the Asiatic part of Turkey, the term Anadolu was loosely applied to the whole Asiatic half of the empire, inasmuch as there was in addition to the "Military Judge" (fyddi 'asker, "Military Judge") of Anadolu, raised the sandik or isbu of Kûfûdawen, dissolved the excessively large eylül of Anadolu, raised the sandik of Kûfûdawen, Aydûn, Ankarâ and Kastamonî to the status of wilayets, and assigned the remaining of wilayets to these.

Bibliography: Katûb Celebi, Djihân-nûmâ, Istanbul 1145/1732, 630 ff. For further bibliography cf. ANADOLU, preceding article. (FA. TAESCHNER)
ANADOLU HISARI, a fortress (also known as Güzeldje Hisar, Yenidje, Yeni, or Akça Hisar) at the narrowest part of the Bosporus, built by Bayezid I in 797/1395 in order to cut off communications between Byzantium and the Black Sea (cf. Ağılıkpaşa-zâde, ed. Giese, Leipzig 1928, 61, 121, 131; Nefrî, ed. Taeschner, i, Leipzig 1951, 90; Bûhûât, Tarîh; Shâlah-zade, Ta'rikh, Istanbul 1298, 64; Sa'd al-Dîn, Tâdî al-Tawdîrikh, Istanbul 1279, i, 148; Mûneddîjim-bâshî, Şahîf al-İدبâr, Istanbul 1285, 310). Some improvements were made by Mehmed II during the erection of Rûmeli Hisarî [q.v.] in 856/1452 (hence he is wrongly named as the founder of Anadolu Hisarî cf. Kâtip Çelebi, Siyyihat-î-nâmî, i, 664). Anadolu Hisarî played an important role before the battle of Varna, during the passage of Murad I’s army from the Anatolian to the European shore (cf. Nefrî, loc. cit.; Sa’d al-Dîn, 379; Mûneddîjim-bâshî, 358; Lutfi Paşa, Tavârîkh-î Aî-i Ət’âmîn, Istanbul 1341, 117). After the conquest of Istanbul, the fortress lost its military importance, and when further changes in political power made it necessary to protect the Bosporus again, Murad IV built fortifications at Rûmeli Kavâglî and Anadolu Kavâglî in order to repel the incursions of the Cossacks. The fortress is described by Ewliya Çelebi (Siyyihat-î-nâmî, loc. cit.); after a long period of neglect, it was thoroughly restored in 1928. The sub-district called Anadolu Hisarî (already mentioned by Ewliya Çelebi), has about 5000 inhabitants (including Kanlıdja and Cubuku). The rivulets Göksu and Küfriük Su, known as the “Black Ear”, Persian čâhâr kulak, are found in much of the southern coast of Anatolia, 36° 6’ 18” N, 32° 3’ 2’’ E, capital of a kada in the wilayet of İçel, with 2734 inhabitants (1945; the kada has 23,725 inhabitants). It is situated in a plain formed by the mouth of a little river, ca. 5 km. from the promontory of Anamur Burnu which forms the southernmost point of Anatolia. The town is called in medieval portulans Stailmîrî, Stalemura, etc. On the coast, at the foot and on the slopes of the Anamur Burnu lie the extensive ruins of the late antique and early Christian town of Anemourium or Anemorium.

At the east end of the plain of Anamur, close to the shore, lies Ma’ṣûrîyê Karîsî, a well-preserved medieval fortress, which was made use of and repaired by the Ottomans; this is recorded by an inscription from 874/1469-70. Inside there is a small mosque.


'ANÂNIYYA, Jewish sect of the adepts of Anân b. David (c. 760 A.D.), rather incorrectly considered to be the founder of the Karaite schismatic faction; his schism was only one of many which affected Rabbinical Judaism during the 8th-9th centuries. The Muslim authors seem to have taken most of their information about 'Anân and his sect from Karaite sources, especially Kirkîsânî, but they have only used a small part of the mass of information supplied by him. The author of the al-Dâr wa ‘l-Târîkh represents 'Anân as a sort of Mu’tazilite, who professes the divine unity and justice and rejects anthropomorphism. The 'Anânîyya of Ibn Hazm are in fact the Karaites. Al-Birûnî is interested in their particular views regarding the calendar. Al-Shahrastânî, in addition to briefly mentioning their calendar and their prohibitions concerning food (M. Badran has rejected the correct reading into the footnote) comments on their favourable attitude to the person of Jesus. The later Muslim sources throw no fresh light on the subject. No Muslim author mentions the alleged meeting between 'Anân and Abû Ḥanîfa in the prisons of al-Manṣûr. Although hiyyâ is recognized as a source of the law both by the Karaites and by the Ḥanafîs, there is nothing to suggest that the latter influenced the former.


ANAPA, a former fortress on the Black Sea, situated on the Bugur river 40 km. S. W. of the Kuban estuary. Built by French engineers for Sultan 'Abd al-Hamid I in 1781, it was unsuccessfully attacked by the Russians in 1787 and 1790, but stormed by Gen. Gudovich in 1812. Returned to Turkey by the treaty of Yassy (1791), it was in 1808 taken by the Russians but returned to Turkey in 1812. In 1828 it was blockaded by Admiral Greig and Prince Menshikov and ceded to Russia by the treaty of Adrianople of 1829 (article 4). In 1846 a town was built at Anapa. During the Crimean war it was first blown up by the Russians, then reoccupied in 1856. In 1860 the inhabitants of Anapa were removed to Temrik. In recent decades Anapa was used as a beach and rest home for children. It was destroyed by enemy action in 1942-3, and is now restored.
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ANAPA — ANAZA


ANAS B. MALIK ABU RAMZA, one of the most prolific traditionists. After the hidjra his mother gave him to the prophet as servant; according to his own statement he was then ten years of age. He was present at Badr, but took no part in the battle, and is therefore not counted among the combattants. He remained in Muhammad's service up to the time of the Prophet's death; later he took part in the wars of conquest. He also played small parts in the civil wars. In the year 65/684 he officiated as imam of the salat at Basra on behalf of the rival caliph 'Abd Allah b. al-Zubayr. When 'Abd al-Rahman b. al-Ash 'ath revolted, al-Hajjaj charged Anas with being a partisan of the rebel just as he had formerly taken the part of the enemies of the Umayyads, 'Abd b. al-Zubayr; and although Anas was highly respected as a Companion of the Prophet, he was removed from his post as imam of the princes. Al-Dhahabi states that al-Bukhari alone, 70 in Muslim alone, and 128 are expanded by the early caliphs. It became the rule for the preacher to hold in his hand, or to lean upon, a staff (kadib), sword or bow when he ascends the pulpit at the Friday service. All these are symbols expressing the same idea as the 'anaza, essentially that of authority (cf. the spear of Murdock). Among the ancient Arab staff and pulpit were attributes of judge and orator.

The word survives as an architectural term in the Maghrib, where it signifies an external mihrab for those praying in the court of the mosque; see Kirtäs (Tornberg), 30, 31, 32, 37 (inscribed, dated 524 H.; cf. KCA, no. 3051); E. Pauty, in Hesp., 1923, 315-6. Bibliography: Bukhārī, i, 105-6; 536; 241; Ibni Sa'd, ii/1, 167 ff.; Samhûdi, Bâlûk, i, 267 = Wüstenfeld transl. 127-8; Wensinck, Handbouk, s.v. sutra; idem, Mohammed en de Joden te Medina, 141; Juydnoll, Handbook, 84, 87-8; Schwarlose, Waffen der alten Araber, Leipzig 1886, 212 ff.; G. C. Miles, Mihrâb und 'anasah, Archaeologica orientalia in memoriam Ernst Herzfeld, N.Y. 1932, 156-171 (early iconographical representation, full references).

(Ch. C. Miles)

'ANAZA, a very ancient, but still existing, Arab tribe. The classical genealogical scheme 'Anaza b. Rab'îa (Wüstenfeld, Tab. A 6) has in recent times changed in the same way as in the case of other tribes such as the Banû 'Ajîyya in Northern Hijâz and Wâ'il, the ancestor of the Bakr and Taghlib, is taken to be their tribal ancestor; in the most recent genealogies Kuraysh (apart above Wâ'il). Whether or not the Rab'îa groups are inter-related, as implied in the genealogy, they were in any case connected by neighbourly and other ties in their home, the Yamâmah. The 'Anaza were living in the Tuwayq to the south of the Wâdi Nisâ'h; there, in Haddâr, a remnant of them, the Banû Hizzân, remain to this day. Sections in al-Aflâj have disappeared and 'Anaza villages appear from the 9th to 10th years. The dates most frequently mentioned are 91-93/709-711.

Traditions attributed to Anas are found, collected together, in the Musnad of al-Ṭaylîsî (Haydarâbâd 1321, Nos. 1959-2150) and in the Musnad of Ahmad b. Ḥanbal (Cairo 1313, iii, 98-292). Al-Dhahabî states that al-Bukhari and Muslim record between them 278 traditions from Anas, of which 80 occur in al-Bukhari alone, 70 in Muslim alone, and 128 are common to both. It is not surprising that many traditions were attributed to the servant of the Prophet; but while they may contain some genuine material, it is likely that they are mainly attributions of a later age, so Anas should not be blamed for all the strange statements given currency on his authority.


ANATOLIA (see Anadolu).

ANATOMY (see taba'în).

'ANAZA, short spear or staff (LA, vii, 251), usually synonymous with ḥarbâ. In the Muslim ritual the 'anaza first appears in the year 2/652. When Muhammad first celebrated the 'id al-ASHBOARD, Bilâl carried a spear (reputedly the gift of al-Zubayr, who had received it from the Nâṣirah before him on his way to the musâlah [q.v.]; during the service this spear was planted in the ground and served as sura and bibâ [q.v.]. The same was done on the 'id al-a'râf. This custom or carrying a spear or staff on ceremonial occasions was observed and expanded by the early caliphs. It became the rule for the preacher to hold in his hand, or to lean upon, a staff (kadib), sword or bow when he ascends the pulpit at the Friday service. All these are symbols expressing the same idea as the 'anaza, essentially that of authority (cf. the spear of Murdock). Among the ancient Arab staff and pulpit were attributes of judge and orator.

The word survives as an architectural term in the Maghrib, where it signifies an external mihrab for those praying in the court of the mosque; see Kirtäs (Tornberg), 30, 31, 32, 37 (inscribed, dated 524 H.; cf. KCA, no. 3051); E. Pauty, in Hesp., 1923, 315-6. Bibliography: Bukhārī, i, 105-6; 536; 241; Ibni Sa'd, ii/1, 167 ff.; Samhûdi, Bâlûk, i, 267 = Wüstenfeld transl. 127-8; Wensinck, Handbouk, s.v. sutra; idem, Mohammed en de Joden te Medina, 141 ff.; Juydnoll, Handbook, 84, 87-8; Schwarlose, Waffen der alten Araber, Leipzig 1886, 212 ff.; G. C. Miles, Mihrâb und 'anazah, Archaeologica orientalia in memoriam Ernst Herzfeld, N.Y. 1932, 156-171 (early iconographical representation, full references).

(Ch. C. Miles)
where we find today the Wald Sulaymân, who are closely connected with them. The Wald 'All were to the west of Khaybar, and their close relatives, the Ĥesene, were most probably there too.

The new migration of the 'Anaza, the first stage of which lasts for over a century (ending with the arrival of the Dîjâls (Ruwał) in Syria in the second half of the 18th century), began before 1700. In 1703 there was a mass which turned in Ma'ân, in 1705 on the Euphrates. This migration achieved its aims because the power of the amirs of the Mawâl in the north of the Syrian desert had been waning since the end of the 17th century, and because the tribe of Ghazîyîya was about to vacate the hinterland of Karbalâ and go over the Euphrates. The second stage of immigration into Syria and Mesopotamia began about 1800 and was due to the Wahhâbî. The 'Anaza were partly on their side ('Amârât), and partly fled from their tax-collectors. In the 19th century the history of the 'Anaza is governed by their relations with the Turkish authorities and the house of Rasûlîd, the Shammar amirs of Hayîl. At the turn of the 20th century the Ruwâl and their hereditary šaykhs, the Šabîlân, play an important part (the oasis of Dîjâl was in the possession of the Šabîlân from 1900 to 1922). In the first World War, the 'Amârât joined the English after the fall of Baghdâd (11 March 17). The Ruwâl did not take part in allied operations until September 1918. Their šaykhs, al-Nûrî b. Šabîlân, entered Damascus with the British and Arab troops in October 1918. In the post-war troubles the 'Anaza frequently changed sides. The political reorganisation in the Middle East distributed the 'Anaza over Syria, 'Irâq, Transjordan and Saudi-Arabia. The Fadân, Šabîa and Ruwâl are regarded as Syrian, the 'Amârât (with the exception of those who stay permanently in the Nadîdî), are regarded as 'Irâkî citizens, although they periodically leave the territory of that state during their migrations.

There have always been two opposing groups within the 'Anaza: the Dânî Muslim (Ḥesene, Wald 'All, Dîjâl/Ruwâl) and the Bighr (Fadân, Šabîa and 'Amârât). The last flare-up of this old animosity was quelled by the French in 1929. The Shammar, especially since the 'Anaza's advance to the north, and the inhabitants of the Şâfâ and the Hawrân, particularly the Druze, are the hereditary enemies of the 'Anaza. This is the reason why the 'Anaza sided with the government in all Druze risings.

The 'Anaza's modern grazing areas are as follows. The Fadân: in summer the area east of Aleppo and Hamâ, especially to the east of the Euphrates; in winter the Syrian desert (al-Bighr-al-Şa'ara, at times as far as al-Rûdâh). The Šabîa: in summer to the east and northeast of Hamâ; in winter in the Syrian desert to the south of the Syria-'Irâk border. The 'Amârât: in summer in the Euphrates, southeast of the Khûbûr, mostly on 'Irâkî territory, in winter in the south-eastern Syrian desert (al-Wudîyân). The Ĥesene: in summer to the east of Hamâ; in winter in the Syrian desert close to the Syria-'Irâk border. The Wald 'All: in summer to the northeast of Damascus and in the Hawrân plain; in winter in the heart of the Syrian desert as far as Dîjâl and Taymân. Of the sections which remained in Arabia, the Fâd Khanârî and the Wald 'All (both Dânî Muslim) have their tents between the Harra of al-'Uwayrid and that of Khaybar; the Wald Sulaymân (Bighr) migrate between the Harra of Khaybar and the southern border of the Nufoûd as far as Bédâ Nashîl (to the southwest of Hayîl), where a budra settlement of the iḫšûn was founded in the twenties.

The northern 'Anaza are camel breeders. Sheep breeding is the main occupation of the Ĥesene and the Wald 'All (since 1900), and since 1920 the Fadân and Ruwâl have also increasingly taken to this. The Ĥesene and Wald 'All—also, more recently, the Šba'as—have for some time been farming the land. In former times the 'Anaza had a right to the harvest of Khaybar; the tribes living there have retained that right. In the Ottoman times the 'Anaza had a right to the jûrû, a payment for protecting the pilgrims' caravans in their area. If this was not, or only partly, paid, then they reimbursed themselves by plundering the ḥajj (as e.g. in 1700, 1703, 1757). A further source of income was the tolls raised from the caravans, and the ḥiżawâ (protection money) collected from the settled population. The more prominent families among whom the office of šaykhy is held, have considerable property in land, some of which dates back to donations of 'Abd al-Ḥamîd. In the Dîzârî this is partly cultivated, following American methods, in partnership with town-dwellers.


ANBADUKLIS, the Arabic form of the name of Empedocles (often corrupted into Abidûkîlîs, etc.). Some authentic information about his doctrines came down to us by way of such channels as the works of Aristotle, the doxography of Ps.-Plutarch (e.g. i. 3, cf. ed. Badawi; also quoted in Abû Sulaymân al-Mantrîlî, Şûrû al-ﾘşâma, introduction; al-Makdisi, al-Badî', i, 139, ii, 75), etc. The authentic Empedocles, however, plays no role in Islamic philosophy; on the other hand, his figure was appropriated by late Neoplatonic circles, and treatises in which Neoplatonic speculations were put into his mouth were translated into Arabic. The main representative of this literature is the Book of the Five Substances, the Arabic translation of which is lost, but parts of which are preserved in excerpts from a Hebrew translation made from the Arabic (see D. Kaufmann, Studien über Salomon b. Gabirol, Budapest 1899, 1 ff.). It seems that the quotations in Ps.-Magdûlî, Gâyat al-Ḥamîm, 243, 289, 293-4, are from some closely related source (289 = ed. Kaufmann, § 14). Various Neoplatonic ideas attributed to Empedocles in Ammonius, Avâl-Falâsîfâ (MS Aya Sofiya 2450: see fols. 1099 ff., 1309), in which Neoplatonic doctrines are distributed among a number of ancient Greek philosophers. This work, quoted in al-Bûrînî, India', 41-2, transl. 85 (the passage from Empedocles = MS Aya Sofiya, fol. 1309), was also the main source of al-Shahrastânî's account of the ancient philosophers and also of that of Empedocles (al-Mshâl, 230 ff.). In addition, however, al-Shahrastânî reproduces another text by "Empedocles" (262 l. 1-263 l. 18) from another source, "Shahrarâsî" in his Rawdat al-Afîrâf, though mainly basing himself on al-Shahrastânî and Ibn al-Kifîlî, also has some additional passages (extracts in Asîn Palacios).
According to Sa'id al-Andalusî Ibn Masarra was acquainted with books by Empedocles; for a discussion of his alleged indebtedness to Ps.-Empedoclean doctrines, see Ibn Masarra.

In the biographical literature Empedocles is counted as the first of the five great philosophers Empedocles, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle) and is deemed to have been a contemporary of David and to have derived his philosophy from Lukmân; see al-'Amîrî, al-Abad al-`Amîdî, quoted in the Siyyân al-Ukma, introduction; Sa'id al-Andalusî, Ṭabâhât al-Umam, 21 (who follows al-`Amîrî or a common source); Ibn al-Kiftî, 15-6 and Ibn Abî Usayyîbî, i, 36-7 (both of whom follow Sa'id); al-Shahristânî, loc. cit. (who uses the Siyyân).

Bibliography: M. Steinschneider, Die arabischen Übersetzungen aus dem Griechischen, Philosophie, § 41 idem, Die hebräischen Übersetzungen, index; P. Kraus, Jâhir ibn Ḥayyân, ii, index; M. Asin Palacios, Ibn Masarra y su escuela, chs. iv-v (= Obras escogidas, i, 33 ff.); a monograph on the Ps.-Empedoclean writings is being prepared by S. M. Stern.

(ANBAR (A,), ambergris (ambre gris, ambra grisea, to distinguish it from ambre jaune = amber), a substance of sweet musk-like smell, easily fusible and burning with a bright flame; highly valued in the East as a perfume and as a medicine. It is found floating on the water in tropical seas, (spec. gravity 0.78-0.93), or on the shore, sometimes in large lumps. Ambergris probably is a morbid secretion of the gall-bladder of the sperm-whale in whose intestines it is found. Kazwîn mentions it amongst the oily minerals, together with mercury, sulphur, asphalt, mineral tar and naptha; it is one of the various commercial varieties and its addition to various marvellous theories of its origin, that it is secreted by an animal and found in the body of salt-water fish. There is, he says, no difference of opinion as to its originating in the sea; the 'sea of Zandî' especially (i.e. the part of the Indian Ocean stretching along the east coast of Africa) washes it ashore at certain times in big lumps, mostly of the size of a large bale (4-5 kg).—He states further, that it strengthens the brain, the senses and the heart in a wonderful way; it increases the mental activity, of its origin, of the various commercial varieties and their provenance in the Encyclopaedia of al-Nuwayrî who follows Aḥmad b. Abî Ya'qûbî (i.e. al-Ya'qûbî) and al-Husayn b. Yazîd al-Sirrî (i.e. Abû Zayîd al-Ḥasan al-Sirrî, the continuator of the Aḥkâm al-Ṣin wa l-Ḥind; both sources are known to him through the Dîjayb (or Tabîq) al-`Arûz wa Râbî’ al-Nâfâz by the Physician Muhammad b. Aḥmad al-Tamîlî (GAL, I, 237). There is an interesting reference to varieties called 'fish-ambergris' and 'beak-ambergris': the former also called 'swallowed ambergris' (al-mâbdî) is said to be got from the body of a large fish called bâl or 'anbar which swallows the ambergris floating on the sea and dies in consequence; the body is cast ashore and, bursting open, gives forth the ambergris which it contains. The 'beak-ambergris' (al-mândîḥîr) contains the claws and beak of a bird which alights on the lumps and being unable to get away perishes on them. This fable is obviously founded on the fact (pointed out by Dr. Swedlaur) that ambergris frequently contains the hard mandibles (beaks) of a cuttle-fish which serves as food to the spermwhale. Al-Dîmašqî specifies various kinds with regard to their commercial value.


ANBAR, BANU 'L- [see Tamâsî].

AL-ANBÂR, town on the left bank of the Euphrates, 43° 43' E, 33° 22.5' N. Arab geographers give the distance from Baghûd to al-ANBÂR on the mail route as twelve (Yâkût: ten) farsaqâ (cf. Streck, Babylonien, i, 8); as measured by Musîl (p. 248) it is 62 km. = 38 m.

Al-ANBÂR lies on the north-western projection of the Sawâd on a cultivable plain near the desert, near the first navigable canal from the Euphrates to the Tigris (the Nahr ʾĪsâ), and controlled an important crossing on the Euphrates (cf. Musîl, 267-9, 307; Le Strange, in JRAS, 1895, 66). The town is pre-Sâsânî. Mariqî identifies it with MŠYK or Maskin, but Arab authors (al-Bâlahîrî, 249-50; Ibn Kûrradâjibîh, 7; Kûdûmà, 235) distinguish between the two. The suggestion that al-ANBÂR is of Babylonian origin (Hilperek in Exploration in Jûl lands, Philadelphia 1903, 298) needs confirmation by excavations, though the head of an ancient canal and the remains of an ancient settlement (Tell Aswad, ca. 3000 B.C.) can be seen north of the plain.

Al-ANBÂR's strategic importance as the head of the irrigation system of the Sawâd and the western gate (from the side of the Roman Empire) to the capital led Shâpur I (241-72 A.D.) to rebuild it and turn it into a garrison town with a double line of fortifications and a Citadel. He named it Fârzâ Shâpur ("victorious Shâpur") to commemorate his victory over Gordian IV in 243 A.D. (Herzfeld, Samarra, 12; Mariqî, 47; cf. al-Mâkdisî, al-Bâdî, 94; Ḥamza, 49; al-Dinawarî, 51). Other authors erroneously referred the name to Shâpur II (al-Tabârî, i, 839; Yâkûtî, i, 367, ii, 919; Ḥamd Allâh Mustawfî, 37). The official name appears as Pîrîsorda in Ammianus Marcellinus, as Pîrîsorda in Zosimus; it is also used in Syriac and by the Jews. The Arabs retained the name Fârzâ Shâpur for the surrounding district (farsaq) belonging to the province (astâd) of al-ANBÂR (Le Strange, Lands, 50-60; Streck, i, 16, 19). The name is of Arabic origin (stomat = "granny" or "granny" in Persian) came into use by the 6th century A.D. and is due to the storehouses of the Citadel (Mariqî, 113-6; cf. al-Bâlahîrî, 296; Yâkûtî, i, 368, 749).

The town was an extensive and populous one, the second in its size in Babylonia, (Ammianus, xxiv, 2). It was the seat of a Jacobean and a Nestorian bishop (cf. I. Guidi, in ZDMG, xxxii, 433, and works on the Jewish centre (Musîl, 356; Mariqî, 114; Newman, Jews in Babylonia, 14). Its garrison was Persian, while its population contained an Arab element (al-Tabârî, i, 749, 2095). The tower played a considerable part in the Emperor Julian's campaign against Persia Al-ANBÂR was taken as early as 12/634 by Khâlid,
who expelled the Persian garrison and concluded a treaty with the inhabitants (al-Baladhurî, 245; al-Tabari, i, 2059; Musli, 293, 328-9). The third mosque in 1'irâk was built in al-Anbâr by Sa'd b. Abi Waqâkâs (al-Baladhurî, 289-90). When asked by Umar to found a garrison town (dâr khitâra) in 1'irâk, Sa'd first thought of al-Anbâr, but changed his mind because of the fever and the flees infecting the town (al-Dinawarî, 131; al-Tabari, i, 2360). Al-Hadjîdî cleared the channel of al-Anbâr (al-Baladhurî, 274-5, 333).

In 134/752 Abu 'l-'Abbas moved his seat to al-Anbâr and built a city at half a farsakh (ca. 2.5 km.) above the town for his Khurâsânî troops, with a great palace in the centre (al-Baladhurî 287; al-Dinawarî, 273; al-Tabari, iii, 80); he died and was buried there (al-'Â'aqibî, i, 434; al-Baladhurî, 283; cf. al-Mâkdisî, al-Bad'â', iv, 97). Al-Manṣîr resided in the town before the foundation of Baghdad (145/762). Al-Rashîd stayed twice (180/799 and 187/803) at al-Anbâr, the population of which partly consisted of descendants of the Khurâsânîs (al-Dinawarî 38; al-'Â'aqibî, i, 510; al-Tabari, iii, 678). Judging by its khâridjî, al-Anbâr was still prosperous in the early decades of the 3rd/9th century (Ibn Khurrâdâbîh, b. 42; Ku'dâma, 237). As the caliphate weakened, al-Anbâr was exposed to the raids of the beduins, who attacked the town in 269 and the district in 286 (al-Tabari, iii, 2048, 2189). Its capture and devastation by Abu Tâhir the Karmatian in 315/927 accelerated the process of decay (al-Mas'ûdî, Tanbîh, 382). In 319/931 the beduins caused much damage (al-Dînawarî 38; al-Ya'qîbî, 291). When al-Mu'izz li-Dîn Allâh ascended the kubâ', t.1, 2439-40), the population of which is visible at the north end of the ruins). In 320/932 al-Anbâr was surrounded by a wall of sun-dried bricks (part of which is visible at the north end of the ruins).

The ruins of al-Anbâr are situated five km. north-west of al-Fallûjû (cf. Musli, 296; Herzfeld, Samarra, 131). They extend from NW to SE and have a circumference of irregular shape of about six km. The ruins have kept the name Anbâr (cf. Musli, 174; Obermeyer, 219; Ward, in Hebrâica, ii, Chicago 1885, 83 ff.). The remains of a square fortified building, built of Parthian sun-dried bricks, are to be seen in the NE corner. The mosque lies ca. one km. SW from the former and belongs to early Islamic architecture: it is rectangular, with one line of columns on three sides and five lines on the side facing the kibla.

The Nahr al-Karma or al-Sâkliwiyâ, which leaves the Euphrates to the west of these ruins, cannot (at any rate in the earlier part of its course) be identical with the Nahr Tûa (see Herzfeld, 13; Le Strange, J.R.A.S., 1895, 70), as the latter was excavated under the 'Abbasids and branched off one farsakh below al-Anbâr. It is more probable that Nahr al-Sâkliwiyâ is identical with the pre-Islamic Nahr al-Rufayl, and flows partly in the bed of a ancient canal (cf. Musli, 268; Maricq, 116; Suhra, 123; map of the Iraqi Directorate of Survey, 1934, 1: 50,000). It seems that this canal lost its importance in Islamic times.


(M. Streck-[A. A. Durâ])

AL-ANBÂR, ABU BAKR MUHAMMAD B. AL-KÂSIM (properly IBN AL-ANBÂR), traditionist and philologist, son of Abû Muhammad (cf. AL-ANBÂR, ABU MUHAMMAD); b. ii Radiab 231/3 Jan. 850; d. Dhu 'l-Hijjah 328/940. He was a disciple of his father and of Thâlabi, lectured in his father's lifetime in the same mosque, and was famous for his phenomenal memory and his meticulousness.

The following of his works are extant: al-Addâd, ed. M. Th. Houtsma, Leiden 1881; al-Zâhir; al-Idâh fi 'l-Wâbî wa 'l-Îbîda'; on the passages in the Qur'an where 1â is written instead of 1â', probably an extract from al-Hâfiz fi Khdî Allâh; Mkhâsar âth Allâh fi Dhikr al-Alîhât; al-Mukhâskar wâ 'l-Mu'mannâth. His commentary on the Mu'sâllâkât (for MSS see Brockelmann, S I, 35) the following portions were published by O. Rescher: 'Tarâfa, Istanbul 1329/1911; 'Antaraa, in ARSO, iv-v; Zuhayr, in MO, 1913, 137-95. Ibn al-Ashîr in the preface to the Nikâyà mentions al-Anbâr's Kharib al-Hadiht among his sources.

*Bibliography:* Fihrist, 75; Zuhayrî, Tabâbâ, ii-3; Anbârî, in MO, 1920, 27; al-Kâtîb al-Baghdâdî, Ta'rikh Baghad, iii, 185-6; Anbârî, Nusha, 330-42; Yâqût, Irshåd, vii, 73-7; Ibn al-Kîffî, Inbâh al-Ruwât, iii, 201-8; Ibn Khallîkân, no. 653; G. Flügel, Die gramm. Schulen der Araber, 168-72; Brockelmann, 1, 122, S I, 182.

(M. Strecker*)

AL-ANBÂR, ABU 'IBN AL-RAHMÂN B. MUBâr B. ABâ Sâ'îD KÂMÎ AL-DîN (properly IBN AL-ANBÂR), Arabic philologist, b. Rabî II 513/July 1119, studied philology at the Nišâmiyâ in Badîd under al-Djavâlîfî and Ibn al-Shâgari and himself became a professor for this subject in the same madrasa; subsequently, however, he returned to public life in order to devote himself entirely to his studies and pious exercises. He died on 9 Shâbân 577/19 Dec. 1181. He wrote a biographical history of philology, from the beginning to his own time, under the title of Nûshtâ al-Allâhî fî Tabâbâ al-Usdâbî, lith. Cairo 1294. His easy manual of grammar, Asdr al-'Arâbîyya, has been edited by C. F. Seybold, Leiden 1886, his great collection of differences between the schools of Basra and Kûfâ, al-Mqâla fi Masâlî al-Khâmây bîn al-Nakâmîyân al-Bâsîrîyîn wa 'l-Kufîyîn by G. Weil, Leiden 1913. Other treatises by him are extant in MS. A dictionary by him, al-Zahîrî, is quoted by 'Abd al-Kâdir al-Baghdâdî, Khânûn al-Adâb, ii, 352; al-Wâbî wa 'l-Ibîda'; by al-Sûyûtî, Sharh Shawâhid al-Mughânî, 158.

AL-ANBARI, ABU MUHAMMAD AL-KASIM B. MUH. B. BASHSHAR, traditionist and philologist, d. 304/916 or 305/917. He wrote a commentary on the *Mufaddalyydt* which was revised by his son, Muhammad: *The Mufaddalyydt ... according to the recension and with the commentary of Abu M. al-Q.*

AL-ANBARI, ABU MUHAMMAD AL-KASIM B. MUH. B. BASHSHAR, traditionist and philologist, d. 304/916 or 305/917. He wrote a commentary on the *Mufaddalyydt* which was revised by his son, Muhammad: *The Mufaddalyydt ... according to the recension and with the commentary of Abu M. al-Q.*

AL-ANBARI, ABU MUHAMMAD AL-KASIM B. MUH. B. BASHSHAR, traditionist and philologist, d. 304/916 or 305/917. He wrote a commentary on the *Mufaddalyydt* which was revised by his son, Muhammad: *The Mufaddalyydt ... according to the recension and with the commentary of Abu M. al-Q.*

AL-BASHSHAR, traditionist and philologist, d. 304/916 or 305/917. He wrote a commentary on the *Mufaddalyydt* which was revised by his son, Muhammad: *The Mufaddalyydt ... according to the recension and with the commentary of Abu M. al-Q.*

AL-ANDALUS, or AL-ANDALUS, geographical term which, in the Islamic world up to the end of the Middle Ages, denoted the Iberian peninsula, that is, modern Spain and Portugal. (i) Toponymic significance of the term Al-Andalus; (ii) Geographical survey; (iii) Outline of its historical geography; (iv) Population of Al-Andalus; (v) Development; (vi) Survey of the history of Al-Andalus; Appendix: The *Andalus* in North Africa; (vii) Islam in Al-Andalus; (viii) Andalusian literature and culture; (ix) Andalusian art; (x) Spanish Arabic.

(i) Toponymic significance of the term Al-Andalus

The name Al-Andalus is hypothetically connected with that of the Vandals (al-Andalish), who named Baetica "Vandalicia" when they crossed the Iberian Peninsula before their invasion of North Africa; al-Andalus is mentioned as early as 98/716 on a bilingual *dinâr*, the Latin inscription giving as its equivalent the term "Spania". The latter term, or its doublet "Hispania", were the only ones by the earliest Spanish Latin chroniclers to denote the Iberian Peninsula as a whole, that is, the two Spains, Christian and Muslim. On the other hand, the use of the term al-Andalus by Arab writers appears always to have been confined to Muslim Spain, whatever its territorial extent, which was progressively reduced in size by the Christian Reconquest (the Spanish equivalent "Reconquista" will always be used in this article). Even when Islamic power in the Peninsula was restricted to the tiny Nasrid principality of Granada, the term al-Andalus was used to denote the territory of this small Kingdom alone. On the other hand, there had been in existence for some time in the Muslim chroniclers the names (in Arabic form) of Ighbániya (Hispania, España) and the Christian principalities formed as a result of the Reconquista: Liyún (Leon), Kashtála or Kashtála (Castilla, Castile), Burtukál (Portugal), Aragón (Aragon), Nabárра (Navarre).

From the name al-Andalus—the form al-Andalus is sometimes found, especially in Ibn Kuzmán—derive the ethnic form andalusí and the collective form al-Andalusí. This term is retained in modern usage to denote the geographical area formed by the Sub-Mediterranean region (littoral zones and highlands) corresponding, from East to West, from the modern province of Almeria to that of Huelva, to the natural region of Andalusia (Spain, Andalucía), the inhabitants of which are called Andaluces (sing. Andaluz).


(ii) Geographical survey

1. Physical situation. S-W of Europe, the Iberian Peninsula forms a massive promontory almost pentagonal in shape, joined to the continent by the range of the Pyrenees, and washed on the remaining sides by the Atlantic and the Mediterranean. It is situated between 43° 27' 25" and 35° 59' 30" N, and 9° 30' and 3° 19' E. Its surface area is about 229,000 sq. m., modern Portugal constituting less than a fifth of this total (modern Spain has an area of 195,000 sq. m.). The situation of the peninsula at the western end of the Mediterranean basin, with a large Atlantic seaboard, explains many episodes in its history.
Cut off by the barrier of the Pyrenees from the rest of the continent of Europe, it is only separated from Africa by the narrow Straits of Gibraltar, bounded to the N. and S. by the bridgeheads of Tarifa and Ceuta. It has as a result acquired an insular character, which has for long isolated the Iberian bloc from trans-Pyrenean influences, while leaving it open from earliest times to Oriental influences via the classical Mediterranean approach route.

The Spanish Peninsula has one of the most broken terrains in Europe. A general examination of its structure reveals that it consists basically of a large central plateau which constitutes at least half of the total area, the Meseta, with a mean altitude of 1,965 ft., comprising the two Castiles, Old (Castilla la Vieja) and New (Castilla la Nueva), and the Estramadura. The Meseta is bounded by high mountain escarpments; to the North, the Cantabrian range; to the North-East and East, the range of the Iberian Mts.; to the South, the successive tiers of the Sierra Morena (Subbaetic range); to the West, the high table-lands of Galicia and Portugal. The plateau possesses three deep lateral depressions; those of the Ebro, the Guadalquivir and the lower Tagus. To the South, the upheaval of the ‘Penibaetic system’ has thrown up a mountain mass which comprises the greater part of Upper Andalusia and forms a confused series of ranges (Span. sierra, "saw"; Ar. al-shārār), of which the highest is the Sierra Nevada (highest point; the Mulhacén, 11,420 ft.).

As a result of this tortuous orographic formation, the mean ground elevation of the Peninsula is not less than 1,100 ft. The additional fact that the proportion of lowlands, of an altitude of less than 1,065 ft., is only 40%, shows the difficulties which have always been encountered, over the greater part of the country, in exploiting a soil which, because of the inadequate rainfall and the meagre supply from the rivers, is generally arid.

2. Climate.—The Peninsula has a dry, generally temperate, climate, despite extreme variations of temperature in the high regions, which escape the moderating influence of the Atlantic or the Mediterranean. Here the winters are severe and the summers torrid. The sub-littoral zones are an exception, especially the largely exposed depression of maritime Andalusia.

As regards rainfall, a distinction must be drawn between dry Spain and wet Spain. The latter comprises, starting from the western prong of the Pyrenees, the Basque country, the Cantabrian coast and nearly all modern Portugal. Dry Spain, which covers nearly 2/3 of the Peninsula, has an essentially erratic rainfall, varying from the annual average of 23 ins. to less than 15 ins. In many cases, the beneficial effects of the rain are nullified by evaporation, wherever it is not possible, as in the Levante (the region of Valencia and Murcia), to remedy this state of affairs by the irrigation of parched lands.

The North and North-West of the Peninsula, and in general all the Atlantic seaboard, enjoy, as a result of the humidity and prevalence of clouds which are features of the region, comparatively mild weather. Similarly, in the Mediterranean zone, from Catalonia and Levante to the Andalusian coast, the winters are mild, with a characteristically high sunshine record and clear, bright atmospheric conditions.

3. Hydrography. The physical formation and climate of the country, and the frequently impermeable nature of the soil, explain the Peninsula's water shortage and the irregularity of the supply from its rivers, which are nearly always dry during the dog-days, when evaporation is at its highest. These rivers have the same characteristics as North African wādīs; they are either almost completely dry, or else sudden spates transform them into torrents, with the disastrous concomitant effects of erosion and removal by alluvion.

The rivers which flow towards the north and west are in general coastal rivers of no great length, the chief one being the Miño (Portuguese Minho), which forms the northern frontier of Portugal and discharges its waters into the Atlantic. Three other rivers, which have an extremely irregular supply of water and which drain the waters of the Meseta, also flow towards the Atlantic; the Duero (Port. Douro), the Tagus (Span. Tajo, Port. Tejo), and the Guadiana, whose estuary forms the southern frontier between Spain and Portugal. The most important river of the Peninsula is the Guadalquivir which, rising in one of the mountain groups in the South-East of the Meseta, is swollen by several tributaries, the most important being the Genil, which issues from the Sierra Nevada and is fed in summer by the melting snows from that massif. The Guadalquivir is the only river in the Peninsula whose lower course is navigable (over the last 75 miles). Several wādīs of a torrential nature reach the Levantine coast; they issue from the edge of the Meseta and provide, by means of dams, rather uncertain reserves of water for irrigation. The chief of these are the Segura and the Jucar, to-day used for the improvement of the huerta of Valencia.

The Ebro, which rises in the Basque country, is fed by the southern slopes of the Pyrenees (Aragón, Segra) and, after a difficult course, during which the gentleness of the gradients gradually reduces the volume of its waters in its lower reaches, turns towards the Mediterranean, into which it discharges after crossing an alluvial delta of considerable size.

4. General characteristics. The subsoil of the Peninsula is especially rich in metalliferous strata: lead, silver, iron, copper, manganese, marble. It is also rich in the natural salts, saltpetre, magnesium and silicates. The vegetation varies completely between dry Spain and wet Spain. In the former, three types of vegetation, more often associated with the Mediterranean zone, predominate: the forests (non-deciduous trees, various kinds of pines and holm oaks or cork-trees), the foothills (Span. monte bajo), and the steppe (scrub, esparto). In wet Spain, on the other hand, the countryside is green all the year round, owing to the presence of forests and natural prairies.

As a result of this natural variety Spain is a country of the greatest possible contrast. It is a commonplace to state that it is frequently possible to pass almost without transition from a river valley (vega), with its luxuriant vegetation, to the steppe burnt by the sun and the wind.


(iii) Outline of the historical geography of al-Andalus

1. Descriptions of al-Andalus. The works of the Arab geographers, both eastern and western, which have come down to us constitute the essential part of our knowledge of al-Andalus in the Middle Ages, its development and the exploitation of its
natural resources. First, there are the Road Books (tnasdlik) published by De Goeje in BGA, which only devote a limited amount of space to Spain: the oldest, those of Ibn Khurradadhbih, al-Ya'ḳūbī, Ibn al-Fākh and Ibn Rusta, contain such brief descriptions that one assumes that up to the 4th/10th century al-Andalus was a province of Islam little known to the eastern world. From the time of the restoration of the Marwānid Caliphate at Cordova, the geographical documentation of al-Andalus becomes systematised, although still not elaborated in great detail. The expositions on al-Andalus by al-Ḳistakrī (d. 322/934) concern agriculture and commerce, and describe fourteen itineraries in the interior of the Peninsula. His contemporary Ibn Ḥawḳal had the advantage of having himself visited Spain and of having brought his documentation up to date by the interrogation of informants en route; the picture of al-Andalus revealed by the pen of this pro-Ραinterested writer, is too often partial, but it is nevertheless the first rational description, at once full and coherent, of the Cordovan Kingdom, which has come down to us. Equally worthy of attention is the account of the Palestinian al-Mukaddasī (end of 10th century) who, although he had not himself visited the Peninsula, makes important statements, apparently based on good authority, concerning in particular the intellectual life, the language, the metrology and the trade of the country.

From the time of the Caliphate, and in the centuries following, all the descriptions of al-Andalus, written primarily in the West, were indebted to the description which the celebrated Cordovan chronicler of oriental origin Ahmad al-Rāzī (d. 344/955) placed at the head of his great work, now lost, and which was used as a source for quotation, usually without acknowledgement, particularly by the compiler Yāḳūṭ in his Mu'tjam al-Bulūdān. The "Description" of al-Rāzī is only known to us in a Castilian version, published in 1854 by P. de Gayangos and derived from a Portuguese version executed about the beginning of the 14th century at the order of King Denis of Portugal (1279-1325); the author of the present article has translated it into French and attempted to reconstruct the original Arabic (in And., 1953, 51-108).

It is thus clear that the plan of the "Description" of Ahmad al-Rāzī, though on the whole only sketched in outline, has served as a framework for most later descriptions; among the latter pride of place must be given to the description of the Andalusian Abū 'Ubayd al-Bakrī (d. 487/1094), which unfortunately is lost, but which can be largely reconstructed from the notices on al-Andalus in the al-Rawd al-Miḥāṭir of the Maghribī compiler of the 7th/14th century Ibn 'Abd al-Mun'im al-Ḥimyarī, who has also made use of material from al-Sharīf al-Idrisī. To this list must be added, in addition to the collections of 'aḍāla'īyāt relative to al-Andalus contained in the works of al-Kazwīnī and al-Dīnāshkī, the notices, sometimes of considerable length, collected by the Maghribī al-Makkarī (17th century) in the first volume of his Naḥf al-Tīb.


On the geographical literature of al-Andalus, the most complete work, despite many inaccuracies, is that of J. Alemanny Bolufer, Le Geografie de la Península Ibérica en los escritoresárabes, Granada 1921 (extract from the Rev. del Centro de Est. hist. de Granada y su reino). Cf. also al-Idrīsī, Nazḥat al-Muḥāṭāt (Dozy and de Goeje, Description de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne, Leiden 1866, text 165-214, Fr. trans. 197-266); E. Lévi-Provençal, La Péninsule ibérique au moyen âge d'après le Kitāb al-Rawd al-miḥāṭir, Leiden 1938.

2. **Physical geography of al-Andalus** according to Muslim geographical tradition.—According to al-Rāzī, al-Andalus forms the extremity of the fourth climate towards the West. It is a country mainly watered by numerous rivers and sweet water springs. The geographers, after this declaration, usually launch into panegyrics and devote much space to laudes Hispaniae rather in the manner of Isidore of Seville.

Al-Andalus is triangular in shape. Each of the angles of this triangle corresponds to a place famous in the traditions of Hispanic legend. On the angle at the apex, in the South-West, rises the temple of Cadiz, Ṣanām Ṛādās (q.v.); the second angle is situated on the latitude of the Balearic islands between Narbonne and Bordeaux (sic); the third, in the North-West, corresponds to the Torre de Hercules, near Corunna. These ideas are also partly illustrated by the maps of the Road Books, Ibn Ḥawḳal and al-Idrīsī. Al-Rāzī has clearly grasped one of the characteristics of the physical structure of the Peninsula: in his opinion, a distinction must be made between western Spain and eastern Spain, taking into account the direction of the winds, the rainfall and the course of the rivers. In western Spain, the rivers flow towards the Atlantic and rain in brought by the westerly winds. In eastern Spain, the rivers flow towards the Mediterranean, and easterly winds prevail and the rivers flow eastwards.

Other landmarks are often given to mark some of the points of the "triangle" formed by al-Andalus: Cape St. Vincent, at the south-western extremity of Portugal, in Arabic the "Church of the Crow" (Kanīsat al-Qurūb); the Temple of Venus, at the opposite extremity, Haykal al-Zahrā (Port-Vendres).

On approaching al-Andalus from continental Europe, Gaul (خلاف) or the "Great Land" (al-Ārād al-Kabīrā), one must cross the range of the Pyrenees by one of the passes (abwāb) or "gates" (bādā'), in order to reach the land of the Gascons (البَغْشَكَنِيس), or that of the Franks (الإِفْرَانِدِي). From there, it is possible to reach the shores of the Atlantic, called the "Sea of Darkness" (Baḥr az-Zulūmāţ) or the "green sea" (al-Baḥr al-Ḥayyār) or the "Surrounding Sea" (al-Baḥr al-Muḥāṭir). In this dangerous ocean a number of intrepid mariners carried on coastal trade between the land of the Blacks or the "Great Sea" (al-Baḥr al-Kabīr), the "Middle Sea" (al-Baḥr al-Muṭawassīt) or even the "Tyrrenian Sea" (Bahr Ṭirān).

In the opinion of al-Rāzī, there are only three mountain ranges in Spain, which traverse the Peninsula from one sea to the other, and none of which is crossed by a river. The first of these ranges is the Sierra Morena, called Mountains of Cordova (Dībāl Kūrtūbā), which rises from the Mediterrenean coast of Levante and terminates in Algarve, on the Atlantic. The second is the Pyrenean range,
between Narbonne and Galicia. The third cuts Spain obliquely, from Tortosa to Lisbon. It corresponds to the transverse range called al-Shārār, according to al-Idrīsī. However, the geographer is obliged to mention in addition the Sierra Nevada (Djabal Shulayr, “Mons Solaris”) and the Serranía of Málaga (Djabal Rayyo) which extends as far as Algeciras.

The chief river of al-Andalus is the “Great River” (al-Wāḍī ʿl-Kabīr), Guadalquivir, also known as al-Nahr al-Aṣ zam and Nahr Kurtaba “River of Cordova”. It is sometimes referred to by its ancient name of Nahr Bīṭī (“Baetsi”). It is 370 miles in length. It is the river of Baetica, the richest part of the Peninsula, and waters Cordova and Seville. Its chief tributaries are the Genil (Wāḍī Sindjil or Shanil), which flows through Granada, Loja and Ecija; the Guadalquivir (Wāḍī Shīb); the Guadalmar (al-Wāḍī ʿl-ʿAmmar), thus named because of the reddish colour of its waters; and the Guadalbullón (Wāḍī Bullūn).

The Guadiana (Wāḍī Anā) has a total length of 330 miles and rises not far from the source of the Guadalquivir. It runs underground for part of its course, and re-emerges in the Calatava region. It discharges into the Atlantic at Oporto (Burtukal). Another important river, also flowing into the Atlantic, is the Miño (Portuguese Minho), Nahr Minyo, which crosses Galicia from East to West and is 300 miles long.

Of the rivers which flow towards the Mediterranean, al-Raṣī only mentions the Segura (Wāḍī Shaḵūra) which rises near the sources of the Guadalquivir and the Ebro (Río Ebro = Wāḍī Ibrū); the latter rises at Fontibre, in Upper Castile and eventually reaches the sea not far from Tortosa, a distance of 204 miles. The Ebro has numerous tributaries, including the Rio Gallego (Nahr Djullik), which comes down from the mountains of Cerdagne (Djibāl al-Sirṭāniyin).

3. Urban toponymy and territorial divisions of al-Andalus. Al-Andalus is notable, at all periods of its Muslim history, for the number of its urban centres, and provides a contrast with the relative poverty of North Africa, as regards population centres of equal importance. Nearly all the towns of Roman Spain survived the Arab invasion and continued to prosper. On the other hand, the new towns founded by the conquerors were not numerous and were almost always built for strategic reasons or as coastal bases intended to neutralise the aggressive ambitions of the Fāṭimids in the western Mediterranean, or else assumed a diminutive form, as Toldūm, Toledo becoming Toletula/Tulayṭūla. Certain place-names of historical interest had their origin in pons, Ocelli becoming Madinat Sālim/ Medinaceli, which gave rise to the mythical existence of a pseudo-founder named Sālim. Towns with a descriptive Arabic name were the exception: e.g. the “Green Island”, al-Ḍajāza al-Khādīr (Algeciras). Some places bore the name of the Arab or Berber tribe which had populated them after the conquest: Balīy (Poley), Ǧaḥfīk north of Cordova, Miknas (Mequinenza) in Aragon. In Levante, as evidence of a more profound Arab influence, many place-names were the names of “stages” coupled with an Arab forename: e.g. Manzīrī ʿAṭī (Mislata) and Manzīr Māṣ (Masana), in the suburbs of Valencia. Many place-names of the Valencia region were formed like names of tribes, with Bēni plus the name of the eponymous ancestor (see Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. mus., iii, 326-8).

At the time when Ahmad al-Rażī wrote his description of al-Andalus, Muslim Spain was already separated from Christian Spain by a boundary line, a sort of no man’s land, flanked along its periphery by three Marches (thughūr): al-aʿdā, al-aṭwāt, al-adnā. Already many regions of the Peninsula, long since evacuated under the pressure of the first manifestations of the Reconquista, had been finally deserted by al-Andalus; the Hispanic March in the East, the Basque country in the centre, the Cantabrian coast in the West. Famous expeditions led against Santiago de Compostela (Shant al-Makīn) by the ‘Amīr al-Mansūr was no more than a spectacular raid without lasting effect. During the period of the Caliphathe, therefore, Islam definitively lost part of Spain and did not seek to recover it. The provincial organisation of al-Andalus, however, remained unchanged.

This organisation dated from the 8th century, and was therefore prior to the Marwānid restoration. It was based on the provincial districts (kūrā), which had a chief town, a governor and a garrison. The lists of kūrās under the Caliphate differ widely; al-Mukaddasī gives an incomplete list of only 18 names. Yākūt enumerates 41, a figure approached by al-Rażī, who describes successively 37. Later, al-Idrīsī introduced a division not into kūrās, but into “climes” (iklim), with no administrative significance and putting forward many names which must be firmly rejected as apocryphal. By utilising the information given by al-Rażī, who follows a concentric order round the capital, and al-Bakrī, the principal features of each of the main kūrās of the provincial organisation under the Caliphate can easily be determined. The kūrās usually had the same name as their chief town, apart from a few exceptions noted below: the most important kūrā was that of Cordova, bounded to the north by that of the Fāh al-Ballūt (Llano de los Pedroches, “plateau of the oaks”), whose chief place was Ǧaḥfīk (doubtless the modern Belalcázar: cf. F. Hernández, in And., 1944, 71-109). On the other side of the fluvial plain of Cordova (al-Kanbānīya, modern la Campina), to the south of the Guadalquivir, lay the small kūrās of Cabra (Kabra) and Ecija (Istidīja). Further west were the rich districts of Carmona (Karmūnā), Sevilla (Iṣbīliya) and Niebla (Labla). The kūra of Oscoño (Ukhsīnūba), with Silves (Ṣībī) as its chief town, corresponded to Algarve (Gharb al-Andalūs, i.e., the southern border of modern Portugal on the Atlantic. North of this district lay that of Beja (Bādja). The southernmost part of al-Andalus was divided into four kūrās: Meron (Mawrūr), Sidona (Ṣadḥūna), chief town Calsena (Kalṣānā), Algeciras and Taracarona (Ṭakurunna), chief town Ronda (Runda). Further east, the kūra of Málaga (Mālaḵa), which was called Rayyo, had as its first chief town Archidona (Urjūṣhūna); it was adjacent to the kūra of Elvira (Ilibra, formerly Iliberris), a
little to the west of modern Granada (Gharnata). The kura of Elvira adjoined those of Jaén (Diawyn) and Pechina (Badjia), the chief town of which was transferred to Almeria under Al-Hakam II.

The Levante seaboard (Shark al-Andalus) on the Mediterranean was divided from South to North into three large kūras: Tudmir, the old kingdom of prince Theodemir the Goth, with Murcia as its chief town, Játiva (Shatiba) and Valencia (Balansiya), which extended as far as the delta of the Ebro. Inland, beyond the region of Toledo constituted a kūra, extended eastwards by the kūra of Santaver (Shantabariyya), with Ucles (Uklidî) as its chief town. It is probable that, under the Caliphate, the Balearic Islands (al-Djazzâ'ir al-Sharkiyya) constituted a separate provincial district. In the western half of al-Andalus, the same applied to regions which had been pacified, such as Merida (Mârida), Badajoz (Batallyaw), Santarem (Shentarîn), Lisbon (al-Ushbûna) and perhaps Cóimbra (Kûlumriyya).

Nine of these kūras, called mudjannada, still enjoyed under the Caliphate a privileged position, because their territories had been granted as fiefs in 125/742 by the Governor Abu l-Khattâr al-Kalbi to the Syrian gjund brought to Spain by the general Babshir b. Bizir [q.v.]: these were the districts of Elvira, fief of the Dâmascus gjund; Rayyo, fief of the al-Urdunn gjund; Sidona, fief of the Filaštîn gjund; Niebla and Seville, fief of the Hîms gjund; Jaén, fief of the Kinnasrin gjund; Beja, Ocosoba, and also Murcia, fief of the gjund of Egypt.

A certain number of outlying districts are mentionned by al-Râzî in the territory of the Upper Marches: Taragona (Tarakkâña), adjacent to Lerida (Lârida); Barbàntânia (Boltaâña), with its stronghold of Barbastro (Barbâstro); Huesca (Wâshka); Tudela (Tuflîa), with the fortified towns of Tarazona (Tarasûna); Arnedo (Arnât); Calahorra (Kalahurra); and Najera (Nâdjîr). Bibliography: Lévi-Provençal, La "Description de l'Espagne" d'Ahmad al-Razi, in And., xxviii, 1953, passim Histo. Esp. mus., iii, chap. vii (4) and xii. See also separate articles on the various towns.

(iv) Population of al-Andalus.

The complete absence of reliable statistics, and, the silence of the geographers, precludes any computation, even a relative one, of the size of the population of al-Andalus at the period of its greatest geographical expansion, i.e., at the end of the 10th century. If one agrees with the conjectural estimate that the population was about ten millions during the Visigoth period on the eve of the Conquest, it must, in view of the small number of Muslim emigrants of other races, have remained roughly the same, with probably a higher proportion of urban dwellers and villagers than rural elements. On the other hand, more weight can be attached to the hypothesis that the distribution of the population over the various regions of the Peninsula was always dictated by physical environment, and that the density of the population in any particular area depended on the altitude and the nature of the country, the climate, the fertility of the soil and the possibility of irrigating it. It is not going too far to conjecture that those regions of al-Andalus which to-day have the smallest numbers of inhabitants already displayed the same characteristic at the time of the Caliphate of Cordova.

Among the components of the Muslim population of al-Andalus, a distinction must be drawn between the mass of neo-Muslims, i.e., Spaniards who became Muslims after the Conquest as the result of more or less spontaneous conversions, and the elements of other races. Among the latter, who settled in the country in the wake of successive, though numerically small, waves of immigrants, the Berber element seems to have been the most important; the Berbers do not seem to have come from all parts of Barbary, but from the regions of the Maghrib nearest to al-Andalus, the Moroccan Djaibal and Rif. These Berbers, who came from the other side of the Straits of Gibraltar, when political or economic circumstances did not force them to return with all speed to their country of origin, were thrust back towards the uplands by the Arab emigrants who formed the aristocracy so that the latter might enjoy exclusive rights over the most fertile tracts of Andalusian soil. From certain information given by authors such as Ibn Hazm, in particular in his Djamâhara, it might be supposed that the Berber colonies only occupied in a sporadic fashion certain territories of the coastal zone, and that they were obliged to settle in the Meseta. Once they were established, presumably these Berbers of al-Andalus rapidly became arabicised, even to the extent of ceasing to use their original dialects. It was not until the end of the 10th century that the influx of further contingents, justified by the large-scale recruitment of Berber mercenaries in central and eastern Maghrib, introduced into al-Andalus a mass of North Africans, who precipitated the ruin of the structure of the Caliphate and congregated in ethnic groups, which formed the following century the Berber i'âla opposed to the Andalusian i'âla.

The Arab element in al-Andalus was never more than a minority. The majority entered the country either at the time of the Conquest or in the course of the following years, and were later reinforced by contingents of Syrian gjundis and by the emigrants who flocked from Asia at the time of the Marwând restoration in Spain. The Arabs originally probably only numbered a few thousand before inter-marriage with the native women and the system of wa'âlî produced an impressive number of people who, rightly or wrongly, claimed an Arab origin. At all events, it is a fact that the Arabs represented an especially turbulent and aggressive element in the early centuries of the history of al-Andalus, and that although they despised work on the land, they nevertheless retained for themselves the best land, and left to crop-sharing colonists the task of farming the land and paying them their due share of the crops.

A third alien element in Andalusian society, which should be alluded to here although it formed only a relatively small proportion of the population, was the Negroes and Slavs. The Negroes ('abdî) of the Sudan, brought to Spain by traders specialising in the slave trade, eventually not only constituted a steadily increasing guard of mercenaries, but intermixed with the rest of the urban populations as the result of the marriage of Negro women, who were specially prized, and sought after also for their domestic virtues. The Slavs (Šâglîba [q.v.]), on the other hand, who were the product of captures in continental Europe from Germany to the Slav countries, or were captured in the course of raids on the borders of al-Andalus, eventually, during the second period of the Caliphate, constituted, especially at Cordova, a numerous and active group which weighed heavily in the economy of the Cordovan
state and contributed in no small measure to its rapid collapse.

The Berber, Arab and other Muslim foreign elements, important though they were, were numerically far inferior to the much more important group of the Spanish neo-Muslims, who were known in al-Andalus by the generic terms muslīma or, more especially, muwāllad. These were Spaniards who, during or after the Conquest, had adopted Islam in order to enjoy a better personal status than that of dhīmmī. The complete and rapid arabisation of all these converts to Islam, to which in the vast majority of cases they displayed a deep and sincere attachment, is a remarkable phenomenon. In a short time the muwāllads became assimilated into Muslim society and enabled the rulers of the country, by the rational use of their services, to make good the lack of emigrants of old Muslim stock. Many muwāllads, soon fused in the melting-pot of Andalusian society, lost even the memory of their Spanish (Iberian or Gothic) origin, although they often bore Romance names. The co-existence within Islam of elements of population of such diverse origin, led to their gradual fusion, a process which was aided by the adoption of an identical way and rhythm of life, and by the bilingualism which, at least in everyday life, placed Spanish Arabic and the Romance tongue (al-adjamiyya) on the same footing.

The Muslim population of al-Andalus, which was so composite in origin, but which gradually became relatively homogeneous, was divided in the 10th century into a certain number of social classes, in the same way as the rest of the Islamic world, ḥāsya and ʿāmma. The former comprised the great noble families who were often hereditary grantees, while the middle class, composed of merchants and small land owners, soon became a sort of urban bourgeoisie, though without charters or immunities. In contrast, the plebs or ʿāmma, in the towns and particularly in the country, constituted an obscure mass subjected to severe vexation by authority. As there is virtually no information on the agrarian law which was in force in al-Andalus, one is compelled to postulate the existence, undoubtedly necessary, of a rural proletariat, composed of day-labourers tied to the soil and leading a particularly wretched existence, mostly unable to escape their servile condition.

The tributaries (muḥādīdūn) in Andalusian society formed an important part of the population and comprised both Christians and Jews. The former, usually grouped under the general name of Mozarabs, all belonged to that part of the Spanish population which, at the time of the Conquest, had refused to renounce its faith in order to adopt that of the conquerors. In the large towns at least, notably in Cordova, Seville and Toledo, the Mozarab communities were organised under the protection and control of the Muslim central authority, with a leader responsible to that authority, the comes (kāmis), sometimes also called defensor or protector. He exercised over his community the powers of a police magistrate, and had the duty and responsibility of collecting the taxes; he was assisted by a special judge, censor or ḥāds ʿl-adjam, who settled disputes between the Mozarabs. The territory of al-Andalus, up to the end of the 11th century, remained divided into the same ecclesiastical districts as at the time of the Visigoths, namely, three metropolitan provinces (Toledo, Lusitania and Baetica), each with an archiepiscopal and several dioceses. The details have been preserved for us by al-Bakrī in what he calls “Constantine’s partition”. The names have been preserved of some very rare church dignitaries of al-Andalus under the Caliphate. The Mozarab community about which we possess the most information, though not numerically the most important, is that of Cordova.

We have even less information as to the numbers and activities of the Jewish communities in the towns of al-Andalus, each of which had a Jewish quarter (ḥarār or madīnāt al-Yād, Juderia). At the same time, in the 11th century, and especially in the Zirid Kingdom of Granada, the part played by Jewish excise officials and treasurers, the importance of the Banu ʿl-Naghrillā family, the pogrom unleashed in Granada following the murder of the Crown Prince Buluggūn b. Bādis b. Ḥabūs b. Zirī, and the importance accorded in the economy of the small state of Granada to the large Jewish community which formed the bulk of the population in the town of Lucena (al-Yussāna), give rise to the belief that the Jews of al-Andalus, at all stages of the Reconquest, in the service of Muslims or Christians, played an active part in the country as counsellors and ambassadors, and that they controlled the main commercial channels between al-Andalus and continental Europe on the one hand, and the Muslim East on the other. In this connection, much may be expected from the study of the documents obtained in particular from the Geniza of Cairo.


(v) THE DEVELOPMENT OF AL-ANDALUS

It is primarily the geographers who have given us more or less detailed information on the manner in which the soil of al-Andalus was cultivated and its vegetable and mineral resources exploited. We also possess a fairly extensive technical literature, formed by agronomic works of various periods, notably those of al-Ṭīhanī, Ibn Wāfīd, Ibn Baṣṣāl, Ibn Luyūn and Ibn al-ʿAwwām. Mention must also be made of the “Cordovan Calendar of the year 961”, published in 1873 by Dozy, at the same time as a definitely later version, and attributed to the Cordovan chronicler ʿArbīl b. Saʿīd (q.v.). Unfortunately, this technical literature gives us practically no information on the methods of cultivation and on contracts of lease, questions on which certain juridical works give us information which is too vague for complete reliance to be placed on it.

1. Agriculture. As to-day in Spain, there was a distinction between dry land (Span. seco = Ar. baṭl) and irrigated land (Span. regadio = Ar. sabī), the former being reserved for the cultivation of cereals. Owing to the poor quality of the soil and unfavourable climatic conditions, the cultivation of cereals was quite inadequate to provide the population with wheat and other bread grains; consequently al-Andalus, at certain periods of famine, had to rely on imports of North African wheat. Some varieties of Andalusian wheat (Toledo) were especi-
ally renowned. Millers used either horse-driven mills (tātiuna) or water-mills (rafya).

Vast stretches of country, especially in Andalusia and the Aljaferia region, were covered with olive-trees, and the olive oil industry was always extremely active there. Extraction methods were primitive, but the quantities of oil produced were sometimes in excess of local needs, and the surplus was exported to the rest of the Islamic world.

The cultivation of the vine, like other forms of dry cultivation, seems to have been extensively practised. Raisins were used for cooking, and above all the consumption of wine was virtually tolerated and its sale regulated.

It was, however, in the sphere of crops needing suitable irrigation that the Andalusians soon achieved an unchallenged supremacy, although it is not possible to attribute to them the invention of the system of irrigation which they used, in particular in the East of al-Andalus, and which still exists without substantial modification. The simplest form of irrigation was that practised with the aid of a network of irrigation channels (sāḥiya, Span. acequia) which criss-crossed the littoral plains of the Murcia and Valencia regions, and in which the flow of water depended entirely on differences of level. Water rights were fixed by custom according to a code, patriarchal in character, which is also still in use to-day. On the higher ground and in the valleys of rivers such as the Guadiana, Tagus and Ebro, irrigation could only be carried on with the aid of pumping machines, named, according to their type and function, ma'awira (Span. and Fr. noria) or sāniya (Span. aceña). This irrigation was used for the cultivation of vegetables and trees. The geographers vie with one another in their praises of the fruits of al-Andalus: cherries, apples and pears, almonds and pomegranates, and above all figs, of which numerous varieties were known in Spain. In some unusually sheltered coastal strips it was possible to grow crops of a sub-tropical nature: sugar-cane, bananas. The palm-groves of Elche (Alsh [q.v.]) were one of the sights of the country. Finally, the cultivation of aromatic herbs and plants used for making cologne was also carried on on a considerable scale; saffron, safflower, cumin, coriander, madder and henna, on the one hand, flax and cotton on the other. Silk cultivation flourished, mainly between Granada and the Mediterranean.

The geographers, in their descriptions, have devoted little space to the rearing of saddle- and draught-animals or animals for meat. Horses were bred in the grass-lands of the lower Guadalquivir, and Andalusian mules were already celebrated by the time of Ibn Hawkal. Cattle, sheep and goats were reared everywhere, making use of the meagre pasture available. Apiculture, for the production of honey, was also practised.

The forest region of al-Andalus was exploited for the needs of the towns, notably charcoal. Pines, numerously on the edge of the Meseta, were felled for use as joists or ships' masts. The great steppe-like expanses of the south-east furnished an abundance of dwarf palms and esparto, used in basket-making and domestic purposes.

2. Mineral exploitation. The richness of the subsoil of al-Andalus justified mineral exploitation from earliest times, and the process continued during the Muslim era. Apart from gold, extracted from the gold-bearing sand of certain rivers, veins of silver and iron were mined north of Cordova, and deposits of cinnabar were exploited at Almaden and Ovejo. Copper was produced from pyrite mines of the Huelva region. Alum, sulphate of iron, lead and galena were also extracted. Muslim Spain was also renowned for its marble and precious stones. Like the Romans before them, the Andalusians made use of many thermal springs, nearly all of which still retain their old name of Alhama (Ar. al-hdamma).

The exploitation of the rock-salt mines and the salt-deposits on the coast at Cadiz, Almeria and Alicante was a flourishing industry. Fishing was carried on, especially with string-nets and tunny-nets (Ar. al-madrab): sardines and tunny were caught in large quantities.

Bibliography: The preceding is developed at length in Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. mus., iii, 233-98; see also idem, Esp. mus. Xth siècle, 157-94. Cf., for the period 11th to 13th century, C. E. Dubler, Über das Wirtschaftsleben auf der iberischen Halbinsel vom XI. zum XIII. Jahrhundert, Geneva-Zürich 1943; A. Carbonel T.-F., La mineria y la metalurgia entre los Musulmanes en España, Cordova 1929.

(vi) General survey of the history of al-Andalus

It is only possible to give here a brief outline of the development of the history of al-Andalus during the seven centuries of Muslim occupation of the Iberian Peninsula. For greater clarity, this outline will be divided into a number of chronological compartments, which will allow the presentation of a chronologically connected account without the necessity in most cases of going into events in greater detail.

1. The conquest of al-Andalus.
2. The history of al-Andalus up to the Marwânid restoration.
3. The Marwânid Kingdom of Cordova.
4. The Caliphate and the 'Amirid dictatorship.
5. The collapse of the Marwânid Caliphate and the partition of the Kingdom of al-Andalus.
6. The Kingdoms of the 'Abasas up to the battle of al-Zâlâka.
7. Spain under the Almoravids.
8. Spain under the Almohads and the progress of the Reconquista.

1. The conquest of al-Andalus. Of all the conquests undertaken by the Arabs in the first century of Islam, the conquest of al-Andalus is most remarkable for the speed and despatch with which it was accomplished. The accounts which have reached us of successive stages culminating in the extension of Muslim power over the whole of the Iberian Peninsula are particularly brief and unreliable; legend rapidly obscured historical reality with a veil which is nearly always impene- trable. It is clear that at the opportune moment the Arabs profited by the decayed state of the Visigoth Kingdom of Spain to turn their attention to it, and that they had the effective co-operation of many of the Spaniards themselves, desirous of throwing off a yoke which had become insupportable to them, to aid them in conquering it. The opportunity was tempting, at a moment when Arab power had just established itself firmly in North Morocco, and when the post of Governor of Ifrikiya and the Maghrib was in the hands of Mūsâ b. Nuṣayr [q.v.]. To the latter, and to his lieutenant, the ma'wâl.
Tārik b. Ziyād [q.v.], belonged the glory of the conquest of al-Andalus.

It seems certain that Musa b. Nusayr himself took the decision to try to occupy new territories on the other side of the Straits of Gibraltar before referring the matter to the Caliph at Damascus; Mūsā took this step as a result of promises of support which he had received from the exarch of the town of Septem (Ceuta), which had remained a Byzantine possession despite the recent fall of Carthage into Muslim hands. This dignitary, Count Julian, facilitated the first Muslim landing, which was merely a raid led by the Berber officer Tārif on the island of Tarifa ([Dżazrat Tārif]) in Ramadān 91/July 710. The success of Tārif’s raid encouraged Tārik, the lieutenant of Mūsā b. Nusayr, to place on a war footing an assault force of 7,000 men, which, with the aid of Count Julian’s flotilla, established itself on Andalusian soil in the neighbourhood of Gibraltar ([Dżabal Tank]) in Rajdāb or Shab‘ān 92 April-May 711.

The decisive battle between the Muslim assault force and the regular troops of the Visigoth king, Roderic, which occurred a few weeks later, on 28 Ramadān 92/19 July 711, at Wādī Lago (Rio Barbate), ended in disaster for the Visigoths, who wavered and fled, while Tārik decided to advance further. The cities of the Gothic kingdom fell one after another: Cordova was taken by the freedman Mughīth at the beginning of 93/Oct. 711 and Toledo fell without resistance. Mūsā b. Nusayr, anxious not to leave to Tārik alone all the prestige of the conquest, entered Spain shortly afterwards, in another as rulers of the newly-conquered territory which a number of governors succeeded one 2. Ayyūb b. Habib al-Lakhmī (97/716), for six months.


5. ʿAmbasa b. ʿSuḥaym al-Kalbī (102-107/721-726).

6. ʿUḍhra b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Fihrī (107/726).


8. ʿUḍhayfa b. ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Kālsī (110/728).


15. ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Kaṭān (for the second time) to 123/741.


20. Yūṣuf b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Fihrī (129/746-130/756), one of the proclamation of ʿAbd al-Rahmān III.

Bibliography: (For 1 and 2): Sources and bibliography listed in detail in Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. mus., i, p. 8, note 2, Ibid., 1-89, contains a detailed account of the conquest and the period of the governors. Cf. also Dozy, Recherches, i, 1-83; E. Saavedra, Estudio sobre la invasión de los árabes en España, Madrid 1892.

3. The Marwânīd Kingdom of Cordova. (138-300/756-912). The circumstances attending the arrival in Spain of the Marwânīd pretender ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Muḥāwiya, which enabled him to rally to his cause a large number of clients and partisans of his family and eventually defeated the governor Yūsuf b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Fihrī near Cordova, where he was proclaimed amir of al-Andalus on 20 Dhul-Hijja 138/15 May 756, are narrated in the article on this prince (see ʿAbd al-Rahmān I).

List of amirs of al-Andalus up to the proclamation of ʿAbd al-Rahmān III


2. Hīshām I b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān I, born 139/757, amir 172/288 to his death, 3 Safar 180/17 April 796.


4. ʿAbd al-Rahmān II b. al-Ḥakam I, born 176/792, amir 206/822 to his death, 3 Rabī' II 238/22 September 852.


7. ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad I, brother of the latter, born 229/844, amir from 275/888 to his death, 1 Rabī' I 300/16 Oct. 912.

Among the noteworthy features of this period of the Marwânī amirate of al-Andalus, which lasted more than a century and a half, are the introduction
of the Mālikī madhhab into Spain during the peaceful reign of Hishām I, and the efforts of the amirs throughout almost the entire period to deal with the revolts instigated in the Marches by the Berbers, the Arabs and the muwallads, and to wage a holy war on the frontiers of the Kingdom. The attempts made against al-Ḥakam I (in particular the famous "revolt of the Suburb") on several occasions placed him in a dangerous position. Moreover the Reconquista, as a result of the aggressive spirit of the first Asturio-Leonese princes and the Franks of the Spanish March, gradually gained ground (final recapture of Barcelona).

The internal crisis was relieved for a time by ʿAbd al-Ḥaḥān II [q.v.], who fought simultaneously against the Franks, the Gascons and the Banū Kasi [q.v.] of the Ebro valley, crushed the Mozarab revolt at Córdova [850-9], and threw back into the sea the Norsemen (Urdummiṭiyān or Madāṣiḥ) who had landed on the coast of Seville. This great ruler, who broke with the "Syrian tradition" introduced into Spain by his great-grandfather ʿAbd al-Ḥaḥān I, organized the state of the Ābbāsid model.

His work was continued by his son Muhammad I. At the end of whose reign, however, occurred the recorded insurrection of ʿAbd al-Ḥaḥān b. Marwān b. al-Djilïlī [q.v.] and the rising of the whole of southern Andalusia under ʿUmar b. Ḥāṣūn [q.v.], whose revolt continued during the following reigns; further, during the reign of the amir ʿAbd Allāh, serious fighting broke out between Arabs and muwallads in the Elvira and Seville regions.


His reign of fifty years represented not only the high-water mark of Marwānī rule in the Peninsula, but also the most flourishing period in the Muslim history of al-Andalus. On the death of ʿAbd al-Ḥaḥān, 22 Ramadān 350/4 November 961, he was succeeded by his son al-Ḥaḥān II, who was already nearly fifty years old, and who reigned until his own death on 3 Safar 366/8 October 976. The latter's reign was also a successful and prosperous one. Cordova, in the words of the Saxon poetess Hroswitha, was the "ornament of the world", and at the same time, under the stimulus of a prince like al-Ḥaḥān II, who was a man of letters and a bibliophile, one of the most active centres of philological, literary and juridical culture in the entire Muslim world at that time, Christian Spain requested his arbitration, and the Reconquista seemed finally to be checked.

When he died, al-Ḥaḥān II only left as his successor a young son unfit to rule, Highām II, born in 354/965 of the union of the Caliph with the Gascon umm walad ʿubb. Once the palace intrigues were frustrated, the way was clear for a man of ambition and energy, who soon seized the reins of power and directed the destinies of the Caliphate with a dictatorial hand: the celebrated "major-domo" Muḥammad b. Abī Ṭājir, the future al-Ḥaṣān [q.v.]. The stages in the brilliant career of Ibn Abī Ṭājir, who speedily led him to the highest honours, will not be recounted in detail here. But this highly-talented politician showed himself also to be a general and a strategist who was both able and successful in his undertakings. He mounted successive attacks in the dīnāʾīd against the Christian kingdoms to the North, inflicted on them severe defeats and even succeeded in capturing and destroying the famous sanctuary of Saint James of Compostela (Santiago, Ṣaṅṭ Ṭābūb) in the course of his campaign of 387/997 against Galicia. Al-Ḥaṣān died at Medina (Medina Sahīlī) on his return from a final campaign to North Castle, on 27 Ramadan, 399/9 August 1002. He left Muslim Spain intact and, following ʿAbd al-Ḥaḥān III and al-Ḥaḥān II, had even been able to extend Andalusian political influence over the whole of western Barbary.

One of al-Ḥaṣān's most skilful achievements was to respect throughout his life the external trappings of the Caliphate and to keep intact certain of its prerogatives on behalf of his nominal master Highām II. The latter bequeathed the same powers of "major-domo" or hāḏīb to the favourite son of al-Ḥaṣān, ʿAbd al-Ḥaṭīm, who succeeded his father and adopted the honorific surname of al-Muẓaffār. He remained in power until his death in 399/1008 see ʿAbd al-Ḥalīm b. Abī Ṭājir for the details of the history of his "septem". On 22 Ramādān 399/22 March 999, the Caliph al-Ḥaṭīm b. Abī Ṭājir and his replacement by his brother ʿAbd al-Ḥaḥān ushered in a period of disastrous disorders in the Spanish Caliphate which soon brought about its downfall.


5. The collapse of the Marwānī Caliphate and the partition of the Kingdom of al-Andalus. The military policy of al-Ḥaṭīm had resulted in the introduction into Muslim Spain of a large number of mercenaries of North African Berber origin who, after his death and that of his successor, formed a centre of agitation against the Andalusians themselves and against the powerful Slav bloc. The train was fired by the insane desire of ʿAbd al-Ḥaḥān Sanchuelo to have himself designated heir-presumptive to the throne by the Caliph Highām II (Rabiʿ I 399/November 1008). This designation was extremely badly-received at Cordova and, following a plot against him, the ʿAmīrīd hāḏīb was executed by the supporters of the Marwānī pretender Muḥammad b. Ḥišām b. ʿAbd al-Ḥaṭīm b. ʿAbd al-Ḥaṭīm near Cordova on 3 Raḍāb 399/3 March 1009 (see ʿAbd al-Ḥaṭīm b. Abī Ṭājir, Amīr)

From then on, the Kingdom of Cordova went through a period which was fatal to its destinies; pretenders and counter-pretenders, supported by the Berbers or by the enemies of the Berbers, hastened the ultimate downfall of the Caliphate.

List of the last Caliphs of Cordova

Hamudid Caliphs

The Andalusian, Slav and Berber "factions" (†adayiwa, pl. †anawid) did not wait for the collapse of the Cordovan caliphate before splitting up the territory of al-Andalus into a multitude of small states, most of which had only an ephemeral existence and among which emerged only a few large political blocs, the Kingdoms of the Abbadids of Seville, the Almohads of Badajoz, the Zirids of Granada, the Hudhul-NuNids of Toledo and the Hudids of Saragossa.

Bibliography: Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. mus., ii, 291-341 (and bibliography quoted on p. 291, note 1); and see HAMMUDIDS. For 3-5 see UMAYYADS.

6. The Kingdoms of the †adayiwa up to the battle of al-Zallaka. The history of Spain in the 11th century is characterized by the vigorous efforts of the Reconquista, stimulated by energetic and enterprising Christian monarchs who were more and more conscious of the necessity of re-establishing national unity at the expense of Islam. The internal history of the Kingdoms created by the dismemberment of the Spanish Caliphate is particularly dull and devoid of interest. As portrayed by the chroniclers, it presents a picture of constant turmoil—oppressing interests, rivalries and perpetual disputes, through which it is not always possible to trace a guiding thread. The ethnic groups, to which belonged the dynasties which outlived those which were rapidly absorbed by their more powerful rivals, joined issue with one another. Andalusians fought against Berbers, and Slavs fought against both. Before long there was no hope of restoring the Caliphate, and the increasing weakness of each of these states only whetted the appetite of the Christian monarchs, who levied heavy tribute from them: this policy was followed particularly by King Alfonso VI, who succeeded, by skilful diplomacy, in effecting the peaceful occupation of Toledo (1085) and in making himself the arbiter in disputes between the muluk al-tawdi'if.

The danger became so great that, whether they wished to or not, the muluk al-tawdi'if were forced to seek help from the Almoravids. The turning point came with the intervention of North African troops led by the amir Yusuf b. Tashhufin, who defeated the forces of Alfonso VI at Saragossa (al-Zallaka [q.v.]) on 22 Rajab 479/2 November 1086. This victory was not followed up, and Yusuf b. Tashhufin, soon wearying of the spectacle of the disunion of the Andalusian kings and their compromises with the Christian monarch, dethroned them one after the other and simply annexed the greater part of al-Andalus to his dominions. From that moment, Muslim Spain was only the vassal of the Magrib.

Bibliography: See the usually accurate lists given by A. Prieto y Vives, Los Reyes de Taifas: estudio historico-numismático de los Musulmanes españoles en el siglo V de la heégira (XI de J. C.), Madrid 1926. See also Dozy, Hist. Mus. Esp., vol. iii; A. Gonzales Palencia, Hist. de la Esp. mus., 54-69; and Abbaiids, Aftaisids, Almoravids, Almohads, Andalusi, Timurids, etc.; for a list of the dynasties of the †anawid cf. Muluk al-tawdi'if.

7. Al-Andalus under the Almoravids. The Almoravid occupation of Muslim Spain was completed by the recapture of Valencia (495/1102), which had fallen into the hands of the Cid Campeador Rodrigo Diaz in 478/1085, and by the surrender of the Hûdî capital of Saragossa on the death of al-Musta’in (503/1108). Al-Andalus then experienced, despite the domination of society by the jâhîlds, several decades of prosperity, marked by the indisputable successes of Almoravid arms (victory of Uclés in 502/1108) which, however, were unable to recapture Toledo. Saragossa itself fell in 512/1118 into the hands of Alfonso the Warrior. Christian pressure on al-Andalus increased, and achieved the greater success because the son and successor of Yusuf b. Tashhufin, ’Ali, threatened in Morocco itself by the Almohads, soon became incapable of offering serious resistance to the manifestations of revolt which were appearing on all sides. The time was ripe for another change of masters in al-Andalus. [See Al-Murabitûn.]


8. Al-Andalus under the Almohads, and the progress of the Reconquista. After a period of thirty years, in the middle of the 12th century, during which certain movements took shape to weave a new pattern of “Kingdoms of †anawid”, al-Andalus submitted to the authority of the Mu’mînîn dynasty of Morocco. The Almohads maintained for nearly a century an increasingly precarious grasp on those parts of the Peninsula which still belonged to Islam. The Reconquista won back more territory each year. In Catalonia, Ramón Berenguer IV occupied successively Tortosa and Lerida, but the chief architect of the Reconquista was King Alfonso VIII of Castile (1158-1214), who gained possession of Silves, Evora, and Cuenca. The Muslim victory at Alarcos (al-Arâk), won by the Almohad Caliph Abu Yusuf Ya’kub, 8 Shawwâl 591/18 July 1195, had no lasting effect. Less than fifteen years later, the Christian coalition, comprising troops from Castile, Leon, Navarre and Aragon, inflicted a crushing defeat on the Muslims at Las Navas de Tolosa (al-Lahabo), 15 Safar 609/17 July 1212, which was followed by the fall of Ubeda and Baena. The capture of Cordova occurred less than a quarter of a century later, followed by the capture of Valencia by Jacques I of Aragon (636/1238) and of Seville by Ferdinand III (646/1248).

Bibliography: See al-Árak, al-’Ibâb, Ishbi-Iviya, Balânsiya, Kurštûba, Mu’mînînids.

9. The Nasrid Kingdom of Granada and the conclusion of the Reconquista. For a further two and a half centuries the “Kingdom of Granada”, despite successive amputations, continued to be the only territory on the Iberian Peninsula still under the authority of a Muslim ruler; bounded by the Mediterranean from Gibraltar to Almeria, this kingdom did not extend inland beyond the mountain massifs of the Sierra of Ronda and the Sierra d’Elvira. The ancestor and founder of the Nasrid dynasty (or Banu ‘l-Ahmar), Muhammad I al-Ghalib biMullah, took possession of Granada in 635/1237-8 and organized the fortress called al-Hamrá, the Alhambra, as a royal palace; at the same time, he agreed to become the tribute-paying vassal of the King of Castile, Ferdinand I, and then of his successor Alfonso X. Henceforth the policy of kings of Granada was to try to achieve a precarious balance in their alliances concluded either with the Christians, or with the Mârînids of Morocco, who intervened militarily on Andalusian territory and occupied certain points such as Tarifa. Moroccan co-operation was gradually proved to be illusory:
the sultan Abu '1-Hasan suffered a grave defeat on the Río Salado (741/1340). Granada still retained some of the prestige of a capital by virtue of its monasteries and literary gatherings, in which men like Lisán al-Din b. al-Khāṭirī were conspicuous. In the following century, with the advent of the Catholic Kings, Ferdinand of Aragon and Isabella of Castile, the Christian offensive became co-ordinated and was conducted on a wider scale. Loja fell in 1486, Vélez-Malaga, Malaga and Almería the following year, Baza in 1489, and Granada eventually surrendered to the Catholic monarchs on 2 Rabī‘ I 897/January 1492.

**Bibliography:** See Naṣīrs. See also, on the fate of Spanish Muslims, whether converted to Christianity or not, after the conclusion of the Reconquista, Moriscos. (E. Lévi-Provençal)

**Appendix: the “Andalus” in North Africa**

As a generic term al-Andalus is especially well known in the North African context where it denotes that element of the Islamic population which derives its origins from Spain. Generally speaking, the Andalusian element only appears in relief from about the end of the 15th century, but here we have to do with nothing more than the culmination of a long historical trend.

In the course of Hispano-Islamic history emigration to the Maghrib not infrequently served the inhabitants of al-Andalus as a means of escape from internal crisis. Andalusian commercial and external interests also played a great part in bringing Hispano-Islamic elements to the littoral of the Western and Central Maghrib.

From about the middle of the 12th century, when Muslim disasters in Western Andalusia sent a stream of emigrants to Kāṣr al-Kutāma (al-Kāṣr al-Kabīr), the advance of the Reconquista was to prove an increasingly important, though by no means the sole cause of emigration to North Africa. With the protracted disintegration of Islamic Spain emigration progressed sporadically until the 15th century when the critical events which foreshadowed the fall of Granada marked the beginning of what was to prove a veritable diaspora, of which North Africa and Morocco gained the most appreciable effects. By the end of the 16th century the number of Andalusian expatriates on Maghribi soil was such that they could be accounted an important minority of its population.

The advent of the 17th century brought new developments and it is not long before we see the outcome of the general expulsion of the Moriscos. From their ports of disembarkation large numbers are said to have made for Fez and Tlemcen, from where others succeeded in joining their compatriots at Algiers, and in Tunisia, where a policy of immigration was actively encouraged by Ummān Dāy, the influx was considerable.

The Andalusians thus established in 17th century Tunisia a fairly detailed picture can be drawn. Their case is somewhat different from that of their 13th century precursors who are best known for their great political role in the Ḥafṣid state. Appearing as a highly organised and exclusive community under a supreme head (gāyybh al-Andalus), they seem in their village communities to have enjoyed certain legal rights together with a large measure of independence in local government. The monopoly of a highly successful and well organised ḍā’īyya industry enabled them so to modify the economic system that the amin al-shawwāṣa became de jure amin of commerce, presiding over a commercial tribunal to which all corporations were subject and whose members were, with only two exceptions, recruited from the Andalusian gāyybhā. In the agricultural field Andalusian skill, fostered by the enlightened Ummān Dāy, was turned to the exploitation of the fertile north, where the Moriscos ably applied their knowledge of irrigation and the techniques of husbandry to arboriculture and market gardening. During the 16th and 17th centuries the introduction and traffic of raw silk as well as the manufacture of stuffs, fabrics and embroidered goods were great specialities of the exiles. At Algiers, for instance, the silk industry was very much in their hands and contributed much to the wealth of the city. Much, on the other hand, that they might have contributed to the Maghrib was lost. In Morocco, for instance, the Shā'īds sought mainly to exploit them as a military force. For the rest, their occupation with piracy, and the slave trade must have accounted for the disappearance of traditional skills. Their traces, however, still survive in many spheres and many North Africans proudly proclaim their Andalusian origin which is in many cases apparent from their patronymics.

Tunisie, Tunis 1920-30, ii-iv passim; Peiresc, Lettres inédités, communiquées par M. Millin, Paris 1875, passim; id., Lettres publi. par Th. de Larroque, vii, Paris 1898, passim; Ximenez, Colonía Trinitaria de Tunes (Bauer), Tetuan 1934, passim; Ager, Corporations tunisiennes, Paris 1909, passim; Despois, Tunisie orientale: Sahel et Basse Steppe, Paris 1935, index.

(vii) ISLAM IN AL-ANDALUS

Al-Andalus was always a stronghold of Malikism and a centre of orthodoxy from the beginning of the 9th century, when the madhab of Medina was adopted and supplanted that of al-Awza'i. During the Marwânid period, as the new madhab had the official support of the rulers of the country, there was no possibility of the implantation of other rites, and all Khârijî or Shi'i tendencies were suppressed in their early stages; the Andalusians could only direct their legal and theological activity towards the elaboration of manuals of ji'ah, and to a permanent attachment to the method of tabâa. In the 3rd-4th/9th-10th centuries, however, there is apparent an infiltration, admittedly slight, of the Shafi'i and Zahirî schools, the latter represented in Spain by the bard Mundhir b. Sa'id al-Ballî (d. 335/946) until it found its "standard-bearer" in the person of the famous Ibn Ḥazm [q.v.]. Similarly, there is apparent at certain periods a certain spread of Mu'tazilism, which corresponded to a revival of ascetic tendencies, whose principal representative was the Cordovan philosopher Ibn Masarra [q.v.] (d. 319/931).

The representatives of Andalusian Malikism whose names and sometimes works have come down to us are legion. Nearly all of them have received biographical notices in the collections printed in the Bibliotheca arabico-hispana. After the fall of the Caliphate, jurisprudence was held in even greater esteem than before, and the social class of the faqih frequently formed the most influential and active section of the population, especially under the Almoravides. From a doctrinal point of view, al-Andalus was scarcely affected by Almohad propaganda, and Malikism reigned supreme up to the end.

Bibliography: General survey in Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. mus., iii, 453-88. (E. Lévi-Provençal)

(vii) ANDALUSIAN LITERATURE AND CULTURE

See 'Arabiyaa, B, Appendix.

(ix) ANDALUSIAN ART

The Iberian Peninsula, by virtue of its geographical position, which encloses the western end of the Mediterranean, and by reason of its predominantly Mediterranean characteristics, has been since ancient times an area favourable to the germination of Oriental influences. Possession of a common religion and a common language, the two factors, says Sarton, which constitute the strongest bond between peoples, strengthened relations between the two regions, relations which benefited also by the religious obligation of the pilgrimage to Mecca. Artistic trends and forms reached the Iberian Peninsula from the Orient over a period of eight centuries; some of these were developed to a greater degree and extent than in their country of origin. In Hispanic art there are echoes of the art of Byzantium and its cultural zones, of Syria, Mesopotamia, Persia, Egypt and Irîfiyya. In Syria as on Iberian soil, the art of the Middle Ages was modelled on the pattern of the art of Imperial Rome. The coincidence of certain forms in the works of these two countries points sometimes to their common origin and not to a direct relationship between the two. But, whereas in the eastern Mediterranean, civilisation developed without interruption from the first centuries of the Christian era and during the first centuries of Islam, the Iberian Peninsula, and the West as a whole, experienced grave crises and a considerable decline in its standard of civilisation.

We do not know many details of the transition from Visigothic Spain, whose lack of homogeneity and decadence are shown by its feeble resistance to the invaders, to Spain under Islamic domination. In the artistic sphere, works and remains of this obscure period and of the subsequent Islamic periods are lacking, with the result that in many cases the gaps must be filled by guesswork.

The art of al-Andalus developed with an original and distinctive character of its own. During the period of contact with the Orient, between the 2nd/8th and 9th/15th centuries, certain monuments of incomparable beauty, perfection and originality, such as have been preserved in no other Muslim country, were built there: the mosque at Cordova, unique both for its complex and skilful construction and for the richness of its decoration; the palaces of Madinat al-Zahra', whose art and magnificence have never been surpassed; the Aljaferia of Saragossa, a palace of extraordinary originality and decorative profusion, the reconstruction of which is being undertaken at the present time; the Giralda tower, a monumental minaret which is one of the most beautiful in the Islamic world; and, finally, a huge palace, the Alhambra of Granada, wonderfully preserved despite its extreme fragility, in which architecture and the natural beauties of water and vegetation have combined to create one of the most inspiring scenes in the world.

Architecture

Umayyads. In default of older buildings, the study of Islamic architecture in al-Andalus must start from the oldest part of the Cordova mosque, built by 'Abd al-Rahmân I between 166 and 170/784-6, i.e. three-quarters of a century after the invasion and conquest of the Peninsula. By the time of the death of this amir, only the finishing touches remained, and these were executed by his son Hishâm (172-180/788-96).

This early oratory occupies the N.-W. portion of the building, which is still preserved to-day. The mosque is rectangular, with stone walls, divided into eleven aisles running North to South, perpendicular to the kibla wall, the central aisle being larger than the others. The aisles are separated by marble columns deriving from Roman or Visigothic buildings. On the capitals rest square impost blocks, which in their turn carry rectangular stone piers, the overhang being supported transversely by means of corbels and terminating above in an impost. The piers are linked longitudinally by two ranges of arches; the lower arches, horseshoe-shaped, are suspended and support nothing; above, a second range consisting of semi-circular arches, springs from the impost and supports the walls. By this method of construction it was possible to erect a huge building on slender columns, making the maximum use of the interior space and, for the faithful, ensuring a good view of the imâm leading the prayer. Owing to the fact that the width of the supports was
increased in proportion to their height, it was possible to support the roofs and to place rain-water gutters in the thickness of the walls.

The method of construction with double superimposed arches, which gives the Cordova mosque an original beauty and a unique character in mediaeval architecture, is not found in any other mosque. In the other hypostyle mosques, the arches separating the aisles are supported by means of wooden beams which give them the appearance of temporary constructions. It is astonishing to find in Cordova in the second half of the 8th century such a perfect structure, in view of the apparent lack of architectural ability which is suggested by the use of columns originating from earlier buildings.

Repeated attempts have been made to establish the origin of these forms. The system of double arches could be inspired by Roman architectural works, for example aqueducts. Stone was used as constructional material in Syrian architecture, but also in Visigothic architecture in Spain. The arrangement of the ashlar alternately as stretchers or as piers is frequently found in Roman buildings of the East and the West, which have inherited it from Greek buildings. Visigothic architecture made more general the use of the horseshoe arch, specimens of which are found in Roman and eastern Islamic architecture, although fewer than in the Peninsula. The alternate use of stone and brick in the voussoirs of the arches was frequent in Roman architecture, from which it passed into Byzantine architecture.

The originality of the mosque of 'Abd al-Rahmân I resides in the plan and general arrangement of the building, with its numerous parallel aisles, the central aisle being larger, as in the eastern mosques, and perhaps also in the wall buttresses and probably in the stepped crenellations which crown them.

The growth of the population of Cordova, in the reign of 'Abd al-Rahmân II (206-38/822-52), necessitated the enlargement of the mosque. By demolishing the mihrâb and piercing the kibla wall, the aisles were extended southwards. The portion added follows the lines of the earlier work, but, among a larger number of capitals originating from earlier buildings, there are eleven which were finely cut for the purpose and were inspired by classical models, and four, from the mihrâb, which were later transferred to that of al-Hakâm II. The latter are not inferior to the finest Roman capitals, and are evidence of the existence of a workshop of selected artisans. These works were commenced in 218/833; the first prayer before the new mihrâb took place in 234/848, but the work was incomplete at the death of 'Abd al-Rahmân II. His son and successor Muhammad I completed them in 241/951, a date which appears in an inscription on the St. Stephen door, whose bevelled decorations, inspired without doubt by Roman mosaic motifs, are of the Byzantine type of Roman architecture.

'Abd al-Rahmân III (300-50/912-61), left in the Great Mosque a memorial of his long and glorious reign, by constructing in 340/951 a new and monumental minaret, of square section like the Syrian minarets.

In 326/936, 'Abd al-Rahmân III, proclaimed caliph, began the construction of the royal city of Madinat al-Zahrâ', at the foot of the Sierra, less than five miles from Cordova. The work proceeded until 365/976, a period of forty years, during which the grandeur and power of the Andalusian caliphate reached their zenith, as is witnessed by the disfigured ruins of the palaces of this city, the seat of the court and officialdom, and by the enlargement of the Cordova mosque at the initiative of al-Hakâm II. The portions of Madinat al-Zahrâ' until now brought to light are the ruins of stone buildings—dwellings, offices and reception halls, the last-named situated at the end of patios and consisting of several parallel aisles, separated by horseshoe arches on columns, following a basilica-type arrangement common in the East. For its decoration, the two caliphs, fired by the ambition to construct buildings of exceptional splendour and richness, imported materials and skilled craftsmen from the other end of the Mediterranean. The roofs and ceilings have gone—Madinat al-Zahrâ' was sacked and burnt several times during the early years of the 11th century and later served as a quarry up to a recent date—but there remains part of the stone and marble surfaces of the walls of many of the rooms, numerous columns and capitals of the same materials, and pavements of stone, marble and brick. The richly decorated surface of these buildings was entrusted to workshops of skilled craftsmen, some of whom came from the eastern Mediterranean; they possessed different training and different techniques for the working of stone and marble, but were especially familiar with the general characteristics of two-dimensional reliefs with vegetal motifs (there are a few simple geometrical motifs, of Byzantine origin), the majority far-removed from the vine and the acanthus motifs which derive from them. A magnificent hall, discovered in 1944, and at present in course of reconstruction because among its ruins were found many reliefs from the decorated surfaces of the inner walls, was decorated from 342 to 345/955-7.

The same craftsmen from the palaces of al-Zahrâ' worked on the enlargement of the Great Mosque at Cordova; this work, initiated by al-Hakâm II, was put in hand in 350/961, and the principal part was completed in 355/966. Workers in mosaic, requested from the emperor of Byzantium, had a hand in its decoration. An Oriental influence is also noticeable in the four vaults of intersecting arches in the extension, although no comparable example of an earlier date has yet been discovered in the East. The increase in the height of the walls of some bays in order to form vaulted lanterns probably comes from the mosques of Ifrikiya of the 9th century, although the vaults of the latter are of Byzantine origin. The arches, intersecting equally, but in plan and not in space, form an open lattice-work which, by an ingenious and skilful constructional technique, supports the cupolas. Some of the arches are cusped and 'Abbâsid in origin; there are also a number of broken arches. The former were, from then on, combined with intersecting arches, one of the favourite themes of Hispano-Muslim art, used purely as decoration—following a process common to all Islamic art, but in al-Andalus carried to its ultimate conclusion.

In this extension, which dates from the reign of al-Hakâm II, and which in fact constitutes a new mosque contiguous to the original, decorative forms of an incredible richness blend with a magnificent blaze of colour to cover the walls and the vaults, composed of vivid mosaics, with arabesques (atârique, al-tauârikh), the majority of cut stone, with the background painted red and inscriptions in other kinds of blue, and various motifs of the Byzantine and pedestals. The mosque of al-Hakâm II, like the hall of 'Abd al-Rahmân III at al-Zahrâ', illustrates an art utilising its resources to the full, at its peak,
which, without parallel in the contemporary West, is an expression of the grandeur of the Cordovan caliphate.

The third and final enlargement of the Great Mosque was due to the initiative of the powerful al-Manṣūr, the minister of Hishām II, and was carried out between 377-80/987-90. It maintained the unity of the whole by repeating once more, as regards the engaged piers and the arches, the construction of the originals, without any novel feature, and inferior in richness and style. The doorways reveal a process of unification of the great variety of decorative techniques displayed at Madinat al-Zahrā', but the result is heavy and monotonous.

Few traces remain of the work executed during the period of the ḥā'i/s as in the 5th/11th century. In the mosques, on the evidence of the texts and such traces as remain, the division into aisles perpendicular to the kiblah wall by means of horseshoe arches on columns, is repeated. The princes of the ḥā'i/s built palaces rather than religious edifices. They could not rival their predecessors, rulers of a unified Spain, in power or wealth but they tried to imitate, at least in appearance, their splendid residences. In place of the solid stone walls of Madinat al-Zahrā', they erected walls of clay and brick. The surfaces of stone and marble, as in the Alcazaba of Malaga, by wooden columns. The polychromy conceals the poverty of the interior under an ephemeral display of richness and luxury. The reduction in grandeur and solidity, and the lack of architectural greatness, were compensated for not only by the more agreeable and picturesque aspect of the 5th/11th century buildings, but also by the introduction of running water in the halls and patios, and by the use of plants in the patios, doubtless as a result of an Oriental influence, perhaps via Ifriqiya.

The decorative art which sought to conceal the structural poverty of these palaces was a direct successor of the art of the caliphate but with an evolution towards the baroque, essentially Hispanic, by the transformation of the architectural elements of Cordova and Madinat al-Zahrā' into other purely decorative elements, consisting of involved and complex designs and profuse ornamentation.

A work which is highly characteristic of the art of the ḥā'i/s is the palace built in the immediate vicinity of Saragossa by al-Muqtadir b. Hād (441-74/1049-81).

The 6th/12th century, i.e., the period of Almoravid and Almohad domination in al-Andalus, was one of the most fruitful periods of Western Islamic art, and at the same time one of the periods in which there occurred the greatest assimilation of forms originating from the eastern Mediterranean.

The Almoravids, Berber nomads from Africa, without a cultural tradition, remained on the fringe of the artistic trend. But the political union of Muslim Spain and Barbary for a period of just over a century (the 6th/12th and the first years of the 7th/13th), at first under the Almoravids and then under the Almohads, resulted in the spread of Andalusian art across the Straits of Gibraltar, into regions with a mainly rural civilization and without large urban centres. [Cf. AL-MURĀDIṬUN (section on art)].

The construction of the Almoravid mosques shows changes as compared with the earlier Hispanic mosques, probably as the result of Mesopotamian influence. In place of the columns which had hitherto separated the aisles, they built brick pillars; this resulted in increased stability, enabling them to do away with the wooden tie-beams, but also in a loss of space and in reduced visibility. Compared with a hypostyle oratory, an oratory with brick pillars always seems heavy and monotonous.

No Almoravid mosque has been preserved in al-Andalus. The Great Mosques of Tiemcen and Algiers, originally devoid of decoration, were built probably in the last years of the 5th/11th century, before Andalusian influence reached the African shore. This occurred during the reign of 'Ali b. Yūsuf (500-37/1106-43), during which the mosque at Tiemcen was enriched with splendid and profuse Hispanic decoration, which covers the surface of the mihrāb as well as the walls and the cupola of the bay which precedes it. This decoration, according to an inscription in cursive letters which forms part of it, was completed in 530/1136. About 529/1135, 'Ali b. Yūsuf enlarged the al-Karawiyin Mosque at Fez, still closed to non-Muslims, in which there are intersecting arches obviously of Cordovan origin, and vaults formed by stalactites (called mocárabes in Spanish), originating from Persia or Ifriqiya, which span some of the bays. Its amazing perfection shows that this was not one of the first experiments with these imported elements.

The most characteristic Almoravid work of the decorative style is the Kubbat al-Barudiyyin of Marrākush, built probably between 514 and 526/1120-1130. The central portion of this small rectangular building is covered by a small cupola of curved brick. Within, eight arches intersect, in a fashion similar to those of the cupola which covers the bay in front of the mihrāb in the mosque at Cordova. These arches are mistilinarian in the Marrakesh specimen, composed of cusp curves and right-angles, and the surfaces contained between their springings are covered, like almost all the others, with delicate plaster arabesques, around large scallops. This is a Hispanic work of extraordinary richness and unusual imagination; it expresses in an eloquent manner the anti-classical tendency to fragmentation and decorative excess which breaks out periodically in the course of the history of Spanish art.

The Almohads who, like their predecessors, lacked a cultural tradition, and were governed by their fundamental asceticism which condemned all luxury and all excess, as befitted a movement purporting to restore the purity of early Islam, influenced artistic evolution by placing severe restrictions on ornamentation, which was reduced to basic essentials, with precise and well-defined lines, on large, plain backgrounds. [Cf. AL-MUWAHIDŪN, section on art]. As no Almohad oratory has survived in Spain, we do not know whether these characteristics extended to them also; the remains of the Great Mosque at Seville, completed during the reign of Yaʿqūb al-Manṣūr (572-94/1176-98), lead one to suppose that they displayed richer decoration than those preserved in the Maghrib.

The Almohads influenced artistic evolution in other respects as well. Inspired by the memory of the past greatness of the Cordovan caliphate, as witnessed by its buildings, they built huge, symmetrical and well-planned mosques, solid, tall minarets, and great city gates, veritable triumphal archways in honour of the dynasty.

In the remainder of the Almoravid and Almohad palaces there appear two types of patios which later reached an extraordinary pitch of development in the art of Granada: the court with two transverse
pathways forming four squares of vegetation, with projecting pavilions on the shorter sides (El Castillejo, in the Vega of Murcia), and the type with a portico on one or two of its sides (the Yeso, in the Alcazar of Seville).

Almohad military architecture uses, in al-Andalus, arrangements deriving from Byzantine architecture and as yet unknown in the West. For instance, the bent gates (walls of Badajoz, Seville and Niebla); the barbicans; the polygonal towers (Cáceres, Badajoz, Seville) and other towers outside the walls (Cáceres, Badajoz, Écija). With the stalactites, there arrived from the Orient cursive epigraphy (plaster decorations of the Mauror at Granada, and of the Castillejo at Murcia), and glazed or varnished ceramics used for exterior architectural decoration, of which the first example known in Spain is in the Torre del Oro at Seville (617/1220-21).

After the collapse of the Almohad empire, the last foothold of Islam in Spain was the tiny Kingdom of Granada, established a little before the middle of the 7th/13th century. The universally famous palace of the Alhambra at Granada, and nearly all the other buildings remaining from this final period, are not earlier than the 8th/12th century.

Nasrid [see NÁŠRIDÉS] or Granadan art, is a brilliant final phase of Islam in the Peninsula, which maintained its position partly on the fringes of official dynastic Almohad art, enriched by the legacy of the latter and by a few importations from the East, without forgetting the changes wrought by the inexorable march of time. It also represented, in its decorative aspect, the revival of the national tradition of dense, flat and fine ornamentation, after the brief Almohad deviation; the extent to which the latter spread through Spain is not known.

The craftsmen of Granada adorned the last days of a moribund civilisation with the most exquisite examples of what human genius and art can produce in the decorative field. With poor and fragile materials, they created large, strong, plain masses and severe, purely architectural volumes, like the Tower of Comares and the Gate of Justice, in the Alhambra, compositions as serene, harmonious and original as the patio of the Alberca, and cleverly planned interiors, such as those which are arranged in echelon from the Lions' Court to the platform of Daraja, in the royal palace at Granada. At the same time they constructed fortifications which are more important than the Hispano-Almohad ones which have been preserved, and Granada was enriched by public buildings, houses and palaces embellished with exquisite art. From modest residences to the royal palaces which surrounded the city, every building had its patios, fountains, cisterns, pavements of brilliant coloured tiles, plaster decoration and skilfully-assembled wooden roofs.

It is in the royal palace of the Alhambra, miraculously preserved despite its great fragility, that the art of Granada acquires its characteristics of magnificence and grandeur. The patios of the Alberca and of the Lions, built in the middle of the 8th/14th century, are the development in the al-Andalus, commencing at least from the 4th/10th century, was of extraordinary richness and perfection. "The most skilful craftsmen", wrote an 8th/14th century historian, "agree that the minbars of the mosque at Cordova and of the Kutubiyya at Marrakush are the finest in existence; Orientals, to judge from their works, are not experts in wood-carving". According to al-Idrissi, the minbar of the Great Mosque at Cordova is without equal in the world; it was made in the reign...
of al-Ḥakam II. It is described as an incomparable example of the cabinet-maker’s art, with inlays of ivory and fine woods.

The minbar of the Kutubiyya was made at Cordova between 534/1140 and 538/1144. It is covered with a delicate ornamentation of geometric interlacing figures in marquetry, consisting of small pieces of rich woods of various colours, bordered by fine lamellae of ivory; exquisite wood-carving fills the spaces between the traceries.

One of the greatest artistic glories of the caliphate was the caskets and jars of ivory (ṣafājī [q.v.]), whose antecedents must be sought in the sphere of Byzantine culture. They were in the court workshops during the 4th/10th century and the first half of the 5th/11th, Arabesques are the predominant feature of their ornamentation, although there is no lack of representations of animals and human beings, whose Mesopotamian origins go back to eras well before Islam.

Ceramics also achieved a singular development in al-Andalus [cf. Ṣafājī]. During the period of the caliphate were manufactured what are known as “ceramics of Madinat al-Zahrāʾ”, or of “Medina Elvira”, because numerous examples have been found in the ruins of these two cities. On a white background, the decoration consisted of patterns in green (oxide of copper) outlined in dark brown (manganese). These ceramics are of Byzantine origin, but they developed independently in al-Andalus.

From ʿIrāk and Iran came the immensely rich gold faience. There is evidence of its manufacture in al-Andalus from the 5th/11th century; it may be earlier still. This luxury technique reached its greatest development and perfection in the 8th/14th century, with productions which were exceptional for their shape and richness, such as the superb vases of Malaga, the pride of those museums and collections which possess the rare specimens which have been preserved. Some have only decoration in gold; in others, gold ornamentation is combined with blue. From the 4th/10th century, we have fragments of ceramics with the colours separated by thin outline plates (cuerda seca), which appear to be of Spanish manufacture; on the other hand, engraved pottery, without glazing, only appeared, it seems, in the 6th/12th century.

Several specimens of the famous “baldachins”, imported from Baghdād, which mark the peak of mediaeval silk-manufacture, are preserved in Spain. ʿṢārīṣo (Syrian) and Graecisco (Byzantine) fabrics, mentioned in numerous documents of Christian Spain of the 4th/10th and 5th/11th centuries, are evidence that the rich fabrics emanating from the Orient reached Spain.

At Seville and Cordova, there were in the 4th/10th century workshops producing ṣirāz, i.e., silk fabrics and brocades designed for ceremonial robes. Fabrics and robes were among the best-appreciated gifts. At the time of the Almoravids, the looms of Almeria were famous. During that period, the Byzantino-Sasanid tradition of decoration was still in force; it consisted of tangential circles with representations of animals arranged symmetrically inside, following the technique and the style of the ʿAbbāsid capital. The Almohad sovereigns suppressed the ṣirāz. The circle then disappeared from silks, and was replaced by geometric designs, traceries of straight and curved lines, rhombi, star-shaped polygons, etc.; from the 7th/13th century, decoration by means of multiple parallel bands bearing inscriptive and geometric elements, finally prevailed. The silks of Granada are of this type.

We have already alluded to the bronzes of the caliphate—lamps, chandeliers, ḥandīlī, waterspouts in the form of animals, mortars, perfume-burners, etc.—and to the difficulty of establishing their place of origin because of their resemblance to the Fatimid bronzes. The perfection of the artistic metal-working technique in the 6th/12th century is illustrated by the plaques of engraved and chased bronze which cover the wooden leaves of the door of the patio of the Great Mosque at Seville, and its magnificent door-knockers, of cast and chased bronze, which remain on the very spot where they were made.

Museums and collections have preserved specimens of repousse silver bracelets dating back to the period of the caliphate. The technique of repoussé is less commonly found in gold jewelry, in which there is a predominance of filigree-work and wire threads forming settings filled with precious-stones or pieces of glass, a technique which survived until the last days of the Kingdom of Granada. Several swords are of this type, such as that of Boabdil in the Military Museum at Madrid, a masterpiece of the goldsmith’s craft, of consummate elegance, whose hilt, of silver gilt and ivory, has a decoration of filigree work and polychrome enamels set in frames.


(L. Torres Balbás)

(x) Spanish Arabic

I. Of all post-classical Arabic dialects, the Arabic spoken in the Iberian Peninsula is the best known, as regards the mediaeval period.

As early as the 4th/10th century, the philologist al-Zubaydi al-Iṣḥābī wrote a treatise on the errors of speech of the common people in al-Andalus. In the middle of the 6th/12th century, Ibn Ṭuṣmān [q.v.] wrote some sāgīlas [q.v.] full of linguistic and sociological interest, the majority of which have been preserved. In the 7th/13th century, the mystic al-ʿṢaḥḥārī [q.v.] also composed sāgīlas of which numerous collections are known. Unfortunately, the nature of the subjects dealt with in these dialect poems means that they are of less interest than those of the preceding poet.

In the middle of the 13th century, too, the reconquest of the Kingdom of Valencia by the Christians and the requirements of religious propaganda among the Muslim population, resulted in the production of a copious anonymous Vocabulista, Arabic-Latin and Latin-Arabic, which has been published. At the end of the 9th/15th century, the reconquest of the Kingdom of Granada led Br. Pedro de Alcalá to compile in his turn an Arte and a Vocabulista, giving the Arabic in Roman transcription; the latter work is particularly valuable, but the prose texts of the Arte are often incorrect.

These are only the essential sources. Many secondary sources exist: minor composers of sāgīlas; several ḡarrājīs of muwāṣṣāḥāt [q.v.]. As regards
prose, there are documents in archives, private correspondence, account sheets, etc. Finally, as regards vocabulary, the authors of technical works written in classical Arabic point out numerous dialectal names: historians, geographers, doctors, botanists, agronomists, works on hisba, etc.

There is reason to suppose that Spanish Arabic must have ceased to be a living language towards the end of the 10th/16th century, the date of its extinction probably varying in different provinces. At all events, the Moriscos who, driven out of Spain, reached Tunisia and Morocco about 1610, seem to have no longer spoken Arabic, but Spanish. The Arabic-speaking period, in the Iberian Peninsula, would therefore have lasted for about eight centuries. This long period of time, combined with the division of the country into separate physical and political units, as well as the heterogeneous character of the Arab population, ought, it would seem, to have favoured the formation of separate Arabic dialects, as had occurred within the Romance linguistic framework: this does not seem to have happened. It is true that the documents we possess are disparate, both in time and space, thus precluding any worthwhile comparison. At the most, one can try to distinguish between the dialects of the South (Seville, Cordova, Granada), those of the East (Valencia, Murcia) and those of the Marches (Aragon). In the case of Toledo, we only possess notarial documents, drawn up in an extremely debased form of the classical language.

To sum up, as far as we are able to tell, Spanish Arabic seems to have preserved a high degree of homogeneity. But one must not forget that our only documentation relates to the urban dialects. It is possible that the rural dialects, spoken by people who moved about less than the inhabitants of towns, may have been more differentiated.

Although Spanish Arabic became extinct towards the end of the 10th/16th century, as a spoken language, it survived in the poems which still served as 'words' to the "Andalusian" airs that were played and sung by the inhabitants of the towns, from Tunisia to Morocco.

II. General characteristics: (In what follows, the origin of certain linguistic facts will be denoted as follows: Q = Ibn Kuzman; V = Vocabulista of Valencia; G = Vocabulista of Granada).

A. Phonetics. Consonants.

As in all post-classical dialects, the lateral Q (ق) is represented, phonetically, by D (ظ) and, exceptionally, by D. The interdental: t, d, are preserved, at least until late 15th century Granadan. C appears to have been, originally, an affricate: k = d; in Q and V it does not assimilate the definite article. In G, it does assimilate, which can correspond either to a pronunciation k, or to a weakening of the first occulsive element. As regards kaf, there is evidence of a "weak" Spanish pronunciation, but we do not know exactly what this "weakness" consists of. Apart from the consonants of classical Arabic, Spanish Arabic has the following, usually in Romance loan-words (or developments from the substratum): p and t, written respectively in Arabic ٍ and ق. G (Old Romance or Ibero-Visigothic), transcribed by gj; this creates a problem for Romance scholars. There is a noticeable tendency, especially marked in G, for the final-n after ay to disappear: ay "where?", bay "between", gharayy "two months".

Vowels.

Short Vowels. We must wait for the transliteration of G into Roman characters in order to have an idea of the nuances of the short vowel system: a/e, i/e, u/o, governed by the nature of the preceding or following consonants. This is largely the position in present-day Magribi.

Up to the end of the 15th century, short vowels in open syllables are relatively stable. The only short vowel threatened with elimination is that occurring in the second of two internal open syllables: yat- (a)hallam "he speaks"; yata(y)āšamu "they quarrel with one another"; dat(ā)lāt "she enters".

Of the short vowels, that of the quality a is the most dominant. In nouns, it is that of segol whatever the nature of the preceding stressed vowel. It is also that of the first syllable of names of instrument of the classical type mis'afal, and that of the last syllable of the diminutives = CwChayya C and CwSanCwC. In verbs, the quality a appears at the beginning of the imperative of 1: aklab 'write', and at the beginning of the imperfect of the forms V, VI, VII, VIII and X. By analogy with the vocalisation of the perfect, this quality also appears in the imperfect of all derived forms (except, sometimes, III) and in both forms of the quadrilateral. Many vowels (short and always unstressed), seem to separate consonantal groups which are difficult to pronounce. Such a group may be initial (a process known to classical Arabic): uprurul "frontal" or final: halalt-laik "I have written to you". In addition, in poetry, a disjunctive vowel freely appears after a word ending in CVC and followed by another word beginning with a consonant. It can be internal, as in the case of nouns of the type, RvRvRv, in which R is either R, L, N, M, or B, or 3, e.g. aklab "intellect", sifal "real", Abbahal "work", saldab"smooth and supple", humar "red", Aben-Zuhar "Ibn Zuhr".

Long Vowels. In nouns, the sequence a-x tends to become a-i-a. The vowel a, not supported by a strong (back) consonant tends to become palatalised. The stage most readily reached is ـ; the Arabic letter ـ is also regularly used in aljamiado to transliterate the Romance vowel ـ. In G, this last pronunciation is reserved for the ـ of bookish vocabulary. In the words (not verbs) belonging to popular vocabulary, the palatalisation reaches the maximum degree; i, hence bib "door" written بيب, with a ya?

Diphthongs: The classical diphthongs a-x are preserved in their correct form, except in a few link-words: kif, kaf, kaysa; is las, laysa.

Accent: This is only known to us as regards of the 15th century—the result of the notations of P. de Alcala, which have been assembled and studied by A. Steiger. Several Granadan scripts in Arabic characters show that, under the influence of stress accent, short vowels in open syllables became prolonged.

B. Morphology

The Verb: There are no 2nd persons feminine. In the perfect tense, the suffix of the 2nd person plural is—lum. In the imperfect, the 1st persons are of the pattern nakhab—nakhabu. In the 1st and 2nd persons of the perfect, the "doubled" verbs in the 1st form follow the classical conjugation: halat. I "have opened". In the case of verbs with R weak, the imperfect plural is of the pattern yamsu "they set out", yaltabu "they meet". In the derived forms including the 1Ind, the form of the imperfect is in—a—,
like that of the perfect. The use of the passive with vowel-change is well attested, but only in the 1st form; it is sometimes imitated by the VIIth. While the majority of the real settled dialects created an indicative present, Spanish Arabic evolved a contingent tense, which also functions as an unfulfilled conditional (after a prothesis with lau) and as an optative. It is formed by the imperfect preceded by ham (G. = kwm), which is constant and of which the final -n is normally assimilated by the preformatives t- and y-. The patterns of the perfect, for forms V and VI, are af'ta'il, af'ta'l, derived secondarily from the imperfects yat(a)/at(a), yat(a)/at(a). On the same basis, we have af'ta'il for the 1Ind form of the quadrilateral. Note that, in these forms, the formative is assimilated, not only by the dental occlusives, but also by the sibilants (s, z, x) and the fricatives (s, g). In a nominal clause, various negative copulas derived from the classical laya; la; lar; in; is G. are used. Finally the use of -sh, to reinforce an interrogative or a negative, appears to be unknown.

Substantives: A real indefinite article is found: wuld-al-faras “a (certain) horse”. The dual is clearly obsolescent. It is only used for parts of the body occurring in pairs, and for words expressing measure. The plurals af'tul and af'tul are those ordinarily used. The type ma'sul is only used for singulars with medial or final long vowel is of the type fu^ai^al, af'tul, fdal, “eyebrows”, “as”, “how much?”), ni, “very, many”.

Grammatical link-words: The following should be noted: 1ahhal “how much?”, bahl “as”, ghaba “now”, kurna j-ash “for what reason?”, maqat, “at all events, at least”, yadda “also, equally” (the classical ayhah), ni, “same”, alqumus “a little”, fawat “late”, ttkam “it!” (for inkam), y'-sal “would to God that . . . .” (utnam).

D. Vocabulary

Attention will only be drawn to the following:

dukah “mouth”; u'dí “face”; plur. khîfâ “coins, minted silver”; wil “father”; mulkâ “poor, bad”; akhal “black”.

Bibliography: A) Texts: De Gunzburg, Le Disc de lbn Quzman, fasc. 1 (the only one which has appeared): photographic reproduction of the unicum, Berlin 1896; Nykl, El Cancionero de Ibn Quzman, Madrid 1933 (the preceding text transcribed in Roman characters, with the translation of a selection of the texts; see review, in Hesp., 1933, 165). Schiaparelli, Vocabolista in Arabico, Florence 1871; Pedro de Alcala, Arte para liggermente saber la lengua arauiga-Vocabolista arauigo in letra castellana, Granada 1505 (photographic reproduction issued by the Hispanic Society of America, New York 1928; a re-issue, partially corrected of the first edition by Paul de Lagarde, Petri Hispani de Lingua Arabica libri duo, Gottingen 1883); Martin de Ayala, Doctrina, en lengua arauiga y castellana, Valencia 1566 (reproduction in photographrap by Roque Chabas, Valencia 1911). The Arabic Ms. No. 3 (1389) of the Fagnan catalogue of the Bibliothèque-Musée d’Alger shows that it consists of a translation, in Spanish Arabic, by a certain cleric Bartolome Dorador, at Guadix, of a Castilian text written in 1554 by M. de Ayala, then Bishop of Guadix; Yafil, Madmîm al-aghâni wa 'l-tâh min kalâm-al-Andalus, Algiers, n.d.

ANDARAB “between the waters”, a frequent toponymic in Iranian countries.

(1) A district in northern Afganistān watered by the river Andarab and its tributary Kāshān, al-Iṣṭaḵārī 270 (Andarābā). Its present centre is Bānū, see Būrānān Kūkhkāt, Kāltāghān wa-Badakhšān, Russian trans., Tashkent 1926, 28-34. The Kāh-wak pass connects it with the silver-mines of Pāndjīr (Pāndjīshīr). The mint of Andarāb was used by several dynasties, and especially by the local Ablā Dādōddīs (coi. 10,000-10,000 BC), see B. Vasmir in Wien. Num. Zeit. 1924, 48-63. The rulers of Andarāb bore the title of šāh-šāisīt. See Hūdād al-Ālam, 109, 341; Le Strange, 427.

(2) A town (Andarābā) near Mārw in which Sūltān Sānḍiḍār has a castle built, see Barthold, Istoriya orosheiniya Turkestana, 1914, 63.

(3) A place in Arrān, at one day’s march from Bāḍara, al-Iṣṭaḵārī 182, probably identical with the present-day Lāmbarān on the Kāshān river, which flows to the south of the Terter.

(4) According to the Nuzhat al-Kulub, 231, a place on the river of Ardabil (now Bālīghīl-su), where it flows north of M. Sāwālān above its junction with the Ahar river. (V. Mǐnɔrskỳ)

ANDARŪN [see Enderūn].

ANDI. The term “Andi peoples” embraces eight small Ibero-Caucasian Muslim peoples, some 50,000 in number, ethnically akin to but linguistically distinct from the Awar [q.v.]. They live in the basin of the Koyus of Andi, which runs from north to south across the mountainous western portion of the Soviet Autonomous Republic of Dāḡjastān [q.v.].

The group comprises: (1) the Andi proper, numbering 8,686 in 1933, about 10,000 in 1954; (2) Aţbāwī (or Ācnād), 4,610 in 1933; (3) Būgulā (or Kānāvāna), 3,627 in 1933; (4) Bāndīk, 1,685 in 1933; (5) Godoberti, 1,500 in 1946; (6) Camalār, 5,101 in 1933, about 7,000 in 1954; (7) Kārata (or Kirddī-Kalal), 6,255 in 1939; (6) Tindī (or Tindal, Iderī), 4,777 in 1933.

The Andi peoples were converted to Islam by the Awar between the 13th and the 17th centuries, and are, like them, Sunnis of the Shafī school. Each Andi people has its own language, belonging to the Andi group is fixed by writing, the Andi using the language of the Awar. The Andi were conquered by the Russians (Russian form of the name: Andiẓān). At that time it had 36,620 inhabitants who lived largely by agriculture and horticulture. Since then, petroleum fields and iron mines have been opened in the district. On the 17th and 18th of May 1898 a national-religious rising under the Shāh Kāzīr performed in the Margilān district which Soviet historians attribute entirely to social motives, was put down after much bloodshed. (cf. such Soviet literature as Narody Daghestana, ac. of Sc., Moscow 1955; Z. A. Nikōlf’skaya, Istoričeskie pred-podpuki natsional’noy konsolidatsii Awarsev, Sovetskaya Etnografiya, 1953, 13-124; Bobs̄haya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, 2nd edition, 212.) Apparently the town suffered greatly from the Mongol raids and had to be rebuilt towards the end of the 13th century under the Caghatay Khans Kaydu and Duwa (Hamīd Allah Mustawfi, 246). Since then the place has been inhabited almost exclusively by Turks whose separate tribes apparently settled in different quarters of the town (Barthold, Vorlesungen, 221 following “the Aymon of Ermen”); their language became the model for the whole of Farghānā. It was used by ‘Ali Shīr Nawā’ī (according to the Bābur-nāma, Kazan 1857, 3). Andiẓān remained the capital of Farghānā and the centre of trade with Kashgār throughout the 14th and 15th centuries. In the 15th century it became the capital of the Khānate of Khān and continued to be an important market for agricultural products.

In 1875, when the Khanate was subjected, it was conquered by the Russians (Russian form of the name: Andiẓān). At that time it had 36,620 inhabitants who lived largely by agriculture and horticulture. Since then, petroleum fields and iron mines have been opened in the district. On the 17th and 18th of May 1898 a national-religious rising under the Shāh Kāzīr performed in the Margilān district which Soviet historians attribute entirely to social motives, was put down after much bloodshed. (cf. such Soviet literature as Revolyutsiya v Sredney Asii, i, Taškent 1928, in which: Sang-zāda: K 30-leitu Andiizanovskogo vosstaniya 289 g.; E. G. Fedorov, Ocherki natsional’no-ossesobodit’shego dvokh tashkentskog in Sredney Asii, Taškent 1925; K. Ramzin, Revolyutsiya v Sredney Asii v obraskah i kartinakh, Moscow 1928.) In 1902 the town lost 4,500 inhabitants (there were 46,982 in 1900) in an earthquake (F. N. Cherkísh, etc., Andiizanskoe semeyrasenye 1902 g.,
St. Petersburg 1914). After the suppression of the Basmachi [q.v.] rising (since 1916) Andijon became part of the Soviet Republic Uzbekistan in 1924 (number of inhabitants in 1939: 83,700; partly Russian) and it is now the centre of a separate district (since 6 March 1941; 3,800 sq.km.) and the centre of an important cotton-growing area. Since 1937-38 there have been petroleum finds in the area (comp. W. Leimbach: Die Sowjetunion, Stuttgart 1950, 340 f., with map). Today the town has a teachers training college, an agricultural college, a training college for women, an Uzbek theatre, a regional museum etc.


**ANDIJUMAN,** a Persian word already in frequent use in the 5th/11th century in the sense of “meeting, assembly, army”. In modern times, it denoted primarily religious or confessional associations; then, at the beginning of the 20th century, at the time of the establishment of the parliamentary régime in Iran, political groups. One of the most celebrated of these groups was the **andijuman-i milli** ("national club") of Tabriz, founded 1324/17 December 1906, by the leaders of the constitutional movement; other groups, moved by the same liberal tendencies, were then organised in the principal provincial towns [see Iran]. Later, other **andijumans** were set up by Persians in Istanbul and Bombay, and in India by the inhabitants of those parts. To-day, the term is applied primarily to learned or professional societies: the **andijuman-i adabi-i Iran** ("Persian Literary Society") preceded the foundation of the Farhangistan-i Iran ("Iranian Academy") in 1355/1936; since 1346/1926, the **andijuman-i ahkamiyeh-i milli** ("Committee for National Development") was created in Istanbul, under the name of **Endiumen-i Dinâh.** Inspired by Ahmed Djewdet Pașha [q.v.], it was modelled on the French Academy, with forty Turkish members and a number of corresponding members, including such European orientalists as Hammer, Bianchi, and Redhouse. Its programme included the encouragement of the letters and sciences in Turkey and the advancement of the Turkish language. The Academy was first mooted at the Council of Education (Medlis-i Ma'ṣūri) in 1261/1845, and was formally authorised by an irāde of 27 Radjaib 1267/2 May 1851. It was publicly inaugurated on 19 Ramađan 1267-18 July 1851, with a speech by Muṣṭafâ Reşid Pașha, indicating the part the academy was to play in the renovation of Turkey. Its work was however impeded by the political instability of the time, and it petered out in 1279/1862 without having accomplished much more than the sponsorship of a few books, which included the Ottoman Grammar of Djewdet and Fu'âd Pașhas, part of the history of Djewdet Pașha and his Turkish translation of the Prolegomena of Ibn Khaldûn. After the revolution of 1908 a number of learned societies appeared, the most important of which was the Ottoman Historical Society (Ta'rikh-i 'Oğmâniyân Endiumen), founded in 1911.

The term **Endiumen** was also used in Turkey for various parliamentary and administrative committees, for the standing provincial and municipal committees, and for certain educational committees operating under the Ministry of Education. Such were the **Endiumen-i Teftih we-Mu'dâne**, (established 1329/1882, and the provincial and local educational committees (Ma'âri Endiumen) established in 1328/1910 to initiate and supervise elementary education.—The word was also used for certain clubs founded on the European model, the first of which appears to have been the **Endiumen-i Ülêt**, founded in Istanbul in 1287/1870. In recent years it has been replaced in many contexts by words of Western or Turkish origin.


In India and Pakistan there have been and are several **andijumans** in different fields; the two most important, influential, and enduring are:

(1) The **Andijuman-i Tarâbi-i Urdu** which was founded in 1913 within the scientific section of the Mohammadan Educational Conference (itself established by Sir Sayyid Ahmad Kâñn) with Sir Thomas Arnold and Muhammad Shibli Nu'mân as its first president and secretary respectively. Its aims were to defend the Urdu language against Hindi as the language of the masses, and to develop and enrich it. Under its impulse and auspices books were written in Urdu and various others were translated from the English. In 1912 the **Andijuman** moved its headquarters from Aligarh to Awrangbâd (Deccan) since when it has been under the able and zealous secretaryship of Mawlawi 'Abd al-Hâkîm. In its new seat, where it was supported by the Haydarâbbâd State, the **Andijuman** showed vigorous activity not only in writing and editing Urdu works and classics but also in translating from the English (some translations were also made from the French, Arabic and Persian), works on history, philosophy, science and others of general interest. The **Andijuman** thus, supplemented the work of the 'Ummâniyya University (established 1928) which, in pursuance of its programme of giving all instruction in Urdu, concentrated on translating texts rather than general
works. But, besides issuing a learned quarterly called "Urdu" (which still continues) and another entitled "Science", and attempting to find means of improving Urdu script and print, perhaps the most important pioneering work has been the publication of the lists of translations of scientific, philosophical and professional technical terms and the issuing of English-Urdu and Urdu-English Dictionaries, modelled on the Oxford Concise Dictionary of English. In 1936, the Andijum moved to Delhi and in 1948 to Karachi, where an Urdu College has been established giving all instruction (including modern science) in Urdu and hoping to become a University.

The Andijum has played, through its institutions and its leaders, an important role in the awakening of the Muslims of the Panjâb. Besides High Schools for boys and girls, the Andijum runs an Islamiyya College for Women, an Industrial School, a Tibbiyya College and Dispensary (on traditional lines but with some blend of modern medicine), an orphanage etc., and had a missionary school (İsľâmi-i Islâm College). It also issues a weekly paper called İsmâ-yî Islâm and has its own press.

Bibliography: For (1) see a detailed account in Orientes Modernos, 1955, 331-43 and 536-48 by A. Hausani, also At-i Islam and professional technical terms and the issuing of English-Urdu and Urdu-English Dictionaries, modelled on the Oxford Concise Dictionary of English. In 1936, the Andijum moved to Delhi and in 1948 to Karachi, where an Urdu College has been established giving all instruction (including modern science) in Urdu and hoping to become a University.
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ANHALWARA — ÂNI

Gujjarat in 980/1572, it became the centre of the sarkdr of Pattan in the suba of Gujjarat. It was the residence of the Catholicos of Arménia. As numerous inscriptions prove, Gagik retained the Persian title of shahdnshdh which also appears in an Armenian form (ark'aysit arka'i); he was also styled "king of the Armenians and Georgians". The remains of a church erected by Gagik in 1001 were excavated in 1905 and 1906; among them was found a statue of the king, with the model of the temple in his hand, and wearing a Muslim turban; the same headgear is also found in a relief portrait of his predecessor Smbat II, preserved in the monastery of Halbat.

Under Gagik's successors the kingdom rapidly decayed and in 1044 it became a part of the Byzantine empire but the growth of the town of Âni was further encouraged by the Byzantine governors (catapans): an Armenian inscription ascribes to the catapan Aaron the erection of a magnificent aqueduct conducting water from the hills of Alagida to the town.

The Greek rule was ended by the sultan Alp Arslan who conquered and destroyed Âni in the year 1064; according to Ibn al-Ashir, x. 27, the town possessed at that time 500 churches. In 1072, a year after the defeat of the emperor Romanos Diogenes, the sultan sold Âni to the Muslim dynasty of the Shaddadids [q.v.], and down to the end of the 12th century the town remained (apart from a few interruptions) the residence of a branch of that family. At that period the town had two mosques, one of which collapsed during the second half of the 16th century; the other, which had survived, was used (since 1907) as a museum for the objects discovered during the excavations. There are also Christian buildings belonging to the same period; the Shaddadids acted as beneficent rulers even towards their Christian subjects, and being related by marriage with the Bagratids, they were recognised by the Christian population as native and lawful kings. The walls of the town were repaired and furnished with some towers during their rule.

Âni was for the first time conquered by the Georgians in 1124, under David II, who laid the foundation of the power of the Georgian kings; the town was given as a fief to the Armenian family of the Zak'arids, (in Georgian: Mkhargrdzeli = Longiman), who extended the walls of the town so as to reach the steep banks of the Arpa-Cay. The Armenian tradition ignores the fact that the Georgian rulers (like their Greek predecessors) favoured the Greek-Orthodox tendency, which accordingly predominated in the architecture of the period. There was no religious persecution of Muslims during this period, just as there had been no persecution of Christians under the Shaddadids; a Muslim contemporary, whose gloss is found in Ibn Hawkal, 242, confirms that the Georgian king protected Islam against all injury, and made no distinction between Muslim and Georgian. Probably in connection with the
ANI — ANIS

foundation of the Trebizond Empire (1204), Ānī became an important centre of international trade; see A. Marshak, O torgove s gorodačk Armenian, Erevan 1934, 278.

Ānī was besieged unsuccessfully by the Khīrīz-mshāh Djalāl al-Dīn in 1226, and conquered by the Mongols in 1239; but even after this conquest the town remained for a time in the possession of the Zakharids; an inscription on the main gate that at a later period it was considered the 'private domain' (khāt-i indī) of the Mongol rulers of Persia; but it never regained its former importance.

According to tradition, Ānī was finally destroyed by an earthquake in the year 1319; but both inscriptions and coins of a later date have been found. A variety of copper coins struck at Ānī by the Ilkhan Sulayman (1339-144) is called by the Turks "monkey-coin" (maymān silkēsī), the coins bearing the image of a hairy figure. Coins bearing the name of Ānī were struck as late as the 14th century by the Djalār, and even in the 15th century by the Kara Koyunlu, though actually the mint must have stood outside the town, perhaps in the fortress of Mahbuberd (less than 2 miles from Ānī). The excavations have shown that, after the decay of the palaces and churches, a rude and miserable population had built their dwellings on the ruins. At the time of Ker Porter's visit (November 1817) it was possible to distinguish these houses and their separate rooms, as well as the streets of the later period, which are but 12-14 feet wide. Later the name of Ānī was preserved only by a Muslim settlement standing near the ruins. After the war of 1877-8 Ānī was incorporated in Russia, but restored to Turkey by the treaty of 1921. It is now in the administrative division of Ani in the 6th/i2th century is al-Farīki, written in Persian in 608/1211, and described by the Arabic geographers of the 9th and 10th centuries; Yakūt, i, 70, gives Ānī a single line; Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī, Nuzhat 93, states merely that the district has a cold climate and produces much corn and little fruit.

The only Islamic source containing firsthand material on Ānī in the 16th/12th century is al-Fārīkhī's Ta'wil Ma'ydārānīn, Br. Mus., Or. 5803 and Or. 6370. See also the didactic chronicle by the local scholar Burhān al-Dīn Anāwī (Anī al-Kulub, written in Persian in 608/1211, and described by F. Köprülü in Bell, 1943, 379-521). Cf. also Ibn al-Aghār, x, 27 (not quite accurate). See Minorsky, Studies in Caucasian History 1933, 79-106.

The ruins were first visited in 1893 by Gemelli-Carreri (Collection de tous les voyages faits autour du monde, ii, Paris 1788, 94) and described at length in 1817 by Ker Porter (Travels, i, London 1821, 172-5). In 1839 plans of the town were sketched by Texier (Voyages en Arménie, Paris 1842, Atlas, plate no. 14) and in 1844 by Abich (ed. M. Brosset, Rapports sur un voyage dans la Géorgie et dans l'Arménie, St. Petersburg 1857, Atlas, plate no. 23 and Brosset, Les ruines d'Ānī, St. Petersburg 1860, Atlas, plate no. 30). The Christian monuments were described by Muravyev, Trudy 2 Armēniya, St. Petersburg 1848; for the Muslim inscriptions see Khanykov (1848), cf. Mélanges Asiatiques, i, 70 ff. and M. Brosset, Rapports etc., 3e rapport, 121-50; the Album compiled by Kästner (1859) contains pictures of architectural monuments on 36 leaves, and a collection of Armenian, Arabic, Persian and Georgian inscriptions on 11 leaves (ed. Brosset, Les ruines d'Ānī, 10-63). Among Armenian writers Nerses Sarkisyan and Sarkis Djalalyantz collected Armenian inscriptions, and their material was used in Alishan's historical work on the history of the town (Venice 1855, in Armenian, cp. Brosset in Mélanges Asiatiques, iv, 392-412, now obsolete).

Russian excavations began in 1892 and were carried on systematically by Prof. N. Y. Marr in 1904-1917. Their results were published in numerous reports in Russian periodicals and in a special series (Amyskaya seriya) containing guide books and studies by Marr, J. Orbeli, Barthold etc. In more detail see N. Marr, Ani, Kniznaya istoriya goroda i raskopki, Moscow 1934, and the architectural studies by T'oros Toromian (in Armenian), Erevan 1942-4. V. and I. Kratchkovsky, Is arabskoy epigrafiki v Ani, in the presentation volume to N. Y. Marr, Moscow 1935, 671-93. (W. Bartold-[V. Minorsky])

ANİS [see HAYAWAH].

ANIS, the pen-name of Mīr Bābar 'Alī, Urdu poet of Lucknow, India, who was noted chiefly as a writer of marthiyas or elegies on the death of the Shi'a martyrs of Karbalā. He was born at Fyzabad (Fayḍābād) in 1216/1801 or 1217/1802; but, in his early manhood, migrated to Lucknow, where he enjoyed the patronage of the Shi'a rulers of Oudh and their nobles. When the kingdom of Oudh was annexed by the British in 1856, he left Lucknow and visited many other places like Patna, Benares, Allahabad and Hyderabad-Deccan; but ultimately returned to his favourite city in his old age and died there in 1291/1874.

The chief merits of his poetry lie in the beauty and appropriateness of his dictio, the perfection of his art, his remarkable powers of description, his successful delineation of character and the striking use of rhetorical figures. The emotional effect of his marthiyas was heightened by the strong and dramatic manner in which he recited them in the presence of large audiences. In his special branch of poetry, Anis had a serious rival in the person of his contemporary Dabir [q.v.]. Each poet had thousands of enthusiastic partisans, who maintained that he was superior to his rival. The citizens of Lucknow were thus divided into two camps, the Anisites and the Dabirites, each extolling the qualities of its own favourite poet. Opinion is still divided on their relative merits; but there is general agreement that they share the honour of raising the Urdu marthiyā to its greatest heights and that their cultivation of the poetic art undoubtedly contributed to the refinement and enrichment of the Urdu language.

The works of Anis were published under the title, Marthiyā Anis, in four volumes at Lucknow in 1876, and have been reissued several times since then. There is another edition in three volumes by S. 'Alī Ḥaydar Ṭāhātabā'ī (Badāyn 19-20). A good idea of his writings may also be obtained from Wāhābī-i Karbalā, a volume of selections so arranged by S. Ṣa'īd 'Alī Kākwarrī as to make a single connected story (ed. and ed., Lucknow 1944).

Bibliography: R. B. Saksena, A History of Urdu Literature, Allahabad 1940, 126-130, 131-33; T. G. Bailey, A History of Urdu Literature No. 152, Calcutta 1932; M. Husayn Ḡāzār, 'Ābā-Ḥayāt, Lahore c. 1880; Shibli Nu'mānī, Muwā-
The foundations of a large Roman bath have recently been discovered on the road towards the north (to Cankirl).

Spiders are applied to external wounds to stop the flow of blood; they are also used for polishing cornished silver. The spiders themselves are founded on the fact that the spider makes its web with extraordinary rapidity.

The weaving spiders make their webs according to mathematical rules; according to others the female only is capable of making a web; as material they use spittle. When putting an end to the havoc wrought by this species of bird, after Islam, the 'anfa' in the beginning endowed with all perfections, has become a plague; one of the prophets of the "Interval" (jatra), either Khâlid b. Sinân or Hânâzâl b. Sâfwân, is credited with having put an end to the havoc wrought by this species of bird. According to al-Dàjmîrî, the 'anfa' in Islamic tradition is assimilated with the simurgh, which plays some part in Iranian mythology, and probably with the Indian garuda, the mount of Vishnu; thus a Shi'ite group, the Shumaytiyya (see al-Shahrastâni, in the margin of the text) created by God, the one deserving most mention is the temple of Roma and Augustus, erected on older foundations. Of those which survive, the one deserving most mention is the temple of the mountain to the north, the citadel, called Ak Kal (or Kal'e), a fairly regular rectangle; and, on the crest of the mountain to the north, the citadel, called Ak Kal'e ("white castle").

Ancyra, at one time the capital of the Galatian tribe of the Tectosages, and later within the sphere of power of the Pontic King Mithridates, was finally incorporated into the Roman Empire in the year 25 B.C. It was then embellished with the buildings required by a Roman town. Of those which survive, the one deserving most mention is the temple of Roma and Augustus, erected on older foundations. On its walls we find the most famous of all antique inscriptions: the Monumentum Ancyranum, an account (in Latin and in Greek) given by the Emperor Augustus of his reign. In Christian times the temple was converted into a church; in Muslim times, the building was the seat of a Dervish saint, Hâdîji Bayârm Wall, whose ârâb and mosque stand beside the ruined temple. A column (Bilâls Minaresi) rises towards the north, being crowned at its summit by an extensive castle. This summit is 976 m. above sea level and 110 m. above the valley of the neighborhood, and thus also a political centre. The old town—dating back to prehistoric times—was situated on the plateau of the castle hill; it gradually spread over the slope outside the fortifications and even to the western side of the plain at its foot. The original layout of the castle itself may well date back to the prehistoric period. In its present form it dates back to Byzantine days, and it was frequently extended and restored in Seljuk times. Its walls contain many ancient remains. There are three distinct parts: the "outer castle" (Dîsh Kal'e) which can be reached by the Hîşr Kapîl, whose walls encircle the castle to the south and to the west; the "inner castle" (Kî Kal'e), a fairly regular rectangle; and, on the crest of the mountain to the north, the citadel, called Akl Kal'e ("white castle").

Ancyra has probably always been a centre for the caravans going through Anatolia in all directions, and thus also a political centre. The old town—dating back to prehistoric times—was situated on the plateau of the castle hill; it gradually spread over the slope outside the fortifications and even to the western side of the plain at its foot. The original layout of the castle itself may well date back to the prehistoric period. In its present form it dates back to Byzantine days, and it was frequently extended and restored in Seljuk times. Its walls contain many ancient remains. There are three distinct parts: the "outer castle" (Dîsh Kal'e) which can be reached by the Hîşr Kapîl, whose walls encircle the castle to the south and to the west; the "inner castle" (Kî Kal'e), a fairly regular rectangle; and, on the crest of the mountain to the north, the citadel, called Akl Kal'e ("white castle").

Ancyra, at one time the capital of the Galatian tribe of the Tectosages, and later within the sphere of power of the Pontic King Mithridates, was finally incorporated into the Roman Empire in the year 25 B.C. It was then embellished with the buildings required by a Roman town. Of those which survive, the one deserving most mention is the temple of Roma and Augustus, erected on older foundations. On its walls we find the most famous of all antique inscriptions: the Monumentum Ancyranum, an account (in Latin and in Greek) given by the Emperor Augustus of his reign. In Christian times the temple was converted into a church; in Muslim times, the building was the seat of a Dervish saint, Hâdîji Bayârm Wall, whose ârâb and mosque stand beside the ruined temple. A column (Bilâls Minaresi) erected by Emperor Julian (or Jovian?) should also be mentioned. The foundations of a large Roman bath have recently been discovered on the road towards the north (to Cankirl).
In the year A.D. 51 Ancyra was visited by St. Paul, who founded one of the oldest Christian communities there—to which he addressed his Epistle to the Galatians. Christianity survived in this town until the First World War.

In A.D. 620 Ancyra was taken by the Persian King Khusrav II Parviz on his campaign against Asia Minor. After his defeat near Niniveh A.D. 627 he had to withdraw from the country—hence also from Ancyra. Subsequently Ancyra—capital of the Bukellation theme—frequently suffered at the hands of Arab raiders. As early as 654, the Arabs held the town for a short space of time.

In 806, the Caliph Harun al-Rashid besieged and plundered the town; as did his son, the Caliph al-Mu'tasim, in 838. In 871 the town was plundered by the Paulicians of Theophilus (Diwrigi), and in 931 it was threatened by the Arabs of Tarsus.

Ancyra came under Turkish supremacy after the Emperor Romanus IV was defeated by the Seljuk Sultan Alp Arslan, near Malakzéred, in 1071 (the exact date is not known—the city was still Byzantine in 1073). During the First Crusade, however, it was re-conquered for the Byzantine Emperor by Raymond of Toulouse in 1101. Soon afterwards (it is not known exactly when), the city reverted to the Turks: first the Seljuk: then, in 1127, the Dānishmendids; and finally, after the death of the Dānishmandid Malik Muhammad Ghāzī (1143), back to the Seljuks.

When the Rūm Seljuk empire was divided up under Kılıç Arslan II (1190), Ankarā went to his son Muhuyi 'l-Dīn Mas'ūd. In 1204, however, it was taken from him by his brother Rukn al-Dīn Sulaymān Shāh, who reunified the Rūm Seljuk empire. The oldest dateable work of Rūm Seljuk art is of the time of Prince Mas'ūd (Safar 594/Dec. 1197-Jan. 1198), a wooden minbar in the so-called 'Alla-ı Dīn mosque in the fortress of Ankarā.

After the death of the Sultan Kaykhusraw I in 1219, his son 'Alla-ı Dīn Kaykobād—revolting against his elder brother, the Sultan 'Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs I—obtained the fortress of Ankarā. After a year's siege, however, the city had to surrender to the other brother and Kaykobād was imprisoned in Malatya, whence he returned only after the death of Kaykāwūs (in 1219) to succeed to the throne. His reign (1219-37) introduced the Golden Age of the Rūm Seljuk Empire. It is commemorated by the "White Bridge" (Ak Köprü) over the Cubuk Suyu of 619/1222, an hour's journey to the north-east of Ankarā. This bridge connects Ankarā with Beypazar and the west. It cannot be stated with any degree of certainty whether the beautiful bridge over the Kızılı irmak near Köprüköy (to the south-east of Ankarā) on the road to Kırşehir and Kayseri, the Çeşnirg Köprüsü, is of the same period. It bears no inscription but its name may well refer to the amir Sa'īf al-Dīn Ayya Caşnır who is repeatedly mentioned by Ibn Bībī, e.g. in connection with the handing over of Ankarā to Kaykāwūs I (Ibn Bībī, ed. Houtsma, index).

The large so-called Arslan-Khāne mosque, outside the gate to the fortress (which may be regarded as the main Friday Mosque for the area of the city lying outside the fortress), dates from the late Seljuk period, when the empire had sunk to the position of a protectorate of the Mongol Ilkhan Empire of Iran. It is a mosque with wooden pillars and with open beam work, containing a beautiful wooden minbar which was donated by two brothers belonging to the Ağıhs in the year 689/1290. It also contains a mihrâb with beautiful faience facing. The Kızılbeý Dîami is of roughly the same period. Its minbar bears an inscription of 699/1299-1300 mentioning a certain amir Ya'qūb b. 'Alla-ı Dīn Kaykobād. He was possibly a member of the Turkmen dynasty of the Germiyan-oghlu. Towards the end of the 13th century the Seljuk rule appears to have been merely nominal, whilst other rulers made their influence felt in Ankarā, such as the Germiyanid Ya'qūb and the members of the Abih fraternity (q.v.).

In the beginning of the 14th century, after the collapse of the empire of the Seljūks of Rūm, Ankarā belonged to that part of Anatolia which was incorporated into the Mongol Ilkhan empire of Iran. There are coins made in Ankarā for the Ilkhan from the year 703/1304 to 742/1342. There is also a Persian inscription of the Ilkhan Abū Sa'id (over the entrance to the fortress) dated 730/1330, in which the taxes payable by the population are recorded (cf. W. Hinz, in Bel., 1949, 745 ff.). The Ilkhan rule extended over the area towards the west, beyond Ankarā, as far as Siwrişahr. After the collapse of the Ilkhan Empire, Ankarā belonged to the territory of the amir (after 1341, Sultan) Eretna of Siwās, and his descendants. It may be assumed, however, that the rule over Ankarā of both the Ilghāns and the Eretnids, was merely one of military occupation and tax collection, whilst the actual government remained in the hands of rich merchants and craftsmen of the city who were able to exercise considerable influence through the Abih organisation. Abih Sharaf al-Dīn (d. 751/1350) appears to have been the most prominent personality. He made donations to the main mosque in Ankarā, the Arslan-Khāne mosque, and he lies buried in a türbe beside this mosque. In the inscription on his wooden sarcophagus (now in the ethnographical museum in Ankarā), he calls himself abīh mu'azzam.

According to John Cantacuzenus (ed. Bonn, iii, 284), Ankarā is supposed to have been occupied for the first time by the Ottomans in 1334 under Suleyman, the son of Orkhan, but the Ottoman chronicles make no mention of this. This occupation, if it occurred, can only have been a temporary one. It was not until the beginning of the reign of Murād I (762/1361) that Ankarā became Ottoman. The early chronicler Nasifī (ed. Taeschner, i, 52, ii, 80 (57) reports that Ankarā was at that time in the hands of the Ağıhs, and that they handed it over to Timūr. Beg. Murād's rule in Ankarā in the year 763/1361-2 is proved by an inscription in the 'Alla-ı Dīn mosque in the fortress. In the early days of Ottoman rule, the wealthy Abih families seem to have retained some influence in Ankarā, as we can gather from inscriptions in the mosques they built (such as that of a certain Abih Ya'qūb of 794/1391 and a certain Abih Eren of 816/1413). Later on there is no mention of them.

On July 20th 1402, there took place, on the Cubuk Ovası, north of Ankarā, the battle in which Timūr defeated Bāyezīd I and took him prisoner. During the time of the subsequent fights between Bāyezīd's sons, Ankarā belonged to the area of Mehmed Celebi. On various occasions he had to defend the city against his brothers, in 1404 against 15a Celebi, in 1406 against the quarrels between Sultan Bāyezīd II and his brother Dīm, the governor of Ankarā decided in favour of Dīm in 1482, until Bāyezīd succeeded in conquering the city. During the reign of Ahmed I, Ankarā became the centre of a revolt led by a native of the town, a robber chieftain by name of Kalendar-
oglu. This revolt spread over most of Anatolia (1607) until it was put down by the Grand Vizier Kuyudju Pasha in 1608.

The most prominent figure in Ottoman Ankara is Hâdji Bayram Wall [q.v.] (753/1352 to 833/1429-30), the founder of the dârâsh order of the Bayramiya. His türbe and the mosque belonging to it (an attractive building with a tiled roof and a flat wooden ceiling inside, built in the beginning of the 15th century) are close up against the ruins of the temple of Augustus. There are a number of small and medium sized mosques of Ottoman times in Ankara. Amongst these some are worthy of special mention, such as the İmâret Dîvânî (built in 831/1427-28 by a certain Karâja Beg, perhaps the one killed in the battle of Varna in 848/1443) in the style of an ancient Ottoman citadel, and beside it stands the türbe of its founder (d. 969/1561-62) concerning mosque and türbe see Niket Turhan Dağlıoğlu and A. Saim Çılgın, in Anadolu Vakfılar Dergisi, ii, 1942, 213-22; E. Egli, Sinan, Der greatest of Ottoman architects. It has one dome, and beside it the present Muslim quarter, which occupies the height overlooking the port and the European city. Since 425/1053 it has possessed a Great Mosque, certain mosques of Ottoman times in Ankara.

In Ottoman times, Ankara was the capital of a sanâbat (province) of the eyalet of Anadolu. In the beginning it was at the same time the capital of the eyalet, until Küttâhiyya took over this function. Under the re-organisation of the internal government in the tanzimat times (law of 7 Dümâdâ II 1281/Nov. 1864), Ankara became the capital of a vilayet with the sanâbat of Ankara, Yozgat, Kırşehir and Kayseri. The sanâbat of Ankara had the following vilâyet: Ankara, Ayaş, Bala, Zir, Beyözü, Diblikâbaği, Haymana, Sifrihisar, Mihallekât, Nallihan, Yabanabâb. Ankara is famous under the name by which it was formerly known in Europe, Angora, as the home of the beautiful white long-haired goats, which are bred all over central Anatolia. Their silky hair (mohair, Turk. hîtik) is a commodity in great demand. The long-haired Angora ("Persian") cats and rabbits also enjoy considerable fame.

Since 1892, the town has been connected by railway with Haydarpasha, opposite Istanbul. Before the First World War it was a small town; Cuinet gives 27,825 inhabitants for the time round about 1890, with a Christian minority of ca. 10%. Other reports about the number of inhabitants of Ankara agree with this. The figure 70,000, given by Sâmi Bey Frâşgeri, Kasım al-A‘lâm, i, 439, is undoubtedly exaggerated.

After the meeting of the National Congress at Stîwâs in June 1919, that town remained for some months the centre of the revolutionary government. The seat of the government was moved to Ankara in October, and Mustafa Kemal entered it on 27 Dec. 1919. On 13 Oct. 1923, by a decision of the Great National Assembly, Ankara was declared the capital of Turkey. (Cf. Gazi Mustafa Kemal, Nutuk, i, 240, 572; G. Jäschke, in WI, 1926, 262 ff.). In view of its increased importance and growing population Ankara underwent great and rapid changes after 1925. The town plan was designed by H. Jansen. The most important suburb, on a spur of the Elmalı Dağ, is Çankaya. The mausoleum of Atatûrk, a work of the Turkish architect Emin Onan, stands on a hill in the SW. Ankara is the seat of a University and of other educational institutions. According to the preliminary returns for the census of 1935 Ankara had 453,151 inhabitants.

Bibliography: E. Mamboury, Ankara, Guide touristique; J. Deny and R. Marchand, Feuille manuel de la Turquie nouvelle, Paris 1920-34 (bibliography by G. Vajda); A. Galanti, Ankara Tarîki, Istanbul 1950-1; IA, s.v. (by D. Darkot); K. Ritter, Erdkunde, xviii, 472 ff.; Reclus, Nouvelles géogr. univ., ix, 373; M. Galib, Ankara, Istanbul 1341/1923; Fauly-Wissowa, s.v. Ankira; G. de Jerphanion, Mélanges d’archéologie anatoliennne MFOB, 1928, 144 ff.; Grégoire, in Byzantion, iv, 437-61, v, 327-40; W. Ramsay, The Historical Geography of Asia Minor, London 1890; P. Wittek, Zur Geschichte Angoras im Mittelalter, Festschrift für G. Jacob, 1932, 359-54; Ewliya Celebi, Siyâhatname, ii, 426-43; Hâdji Hâlifa, Dîrân-nîmâ, 633; the travel-books of Busbeq, Tavernier, Lucas, Poujoulat, Texier, Barth, A. D. Mordtmann, Humann-Puchstein (for titles see ANADOLU); W. Ainsworth, in JAMS, 1840, 275 ff., 312 ff.; W. J. Hamilton, Researches in Asia Minor, London 1842; V. Cuinet, Turquie d’Asie, i, 247 ff.; Sâl-names of the vilâyet of Ankara; H. Louis, Türkiye coğrafyasınnın bazıı esâdîrleri, Birinci coğrafya kongresi, 1941, 223 ff.; Ankara şehrinin Jausseley, Jansen ve Brix tarafından yapılan plan ve projelerine ait tasamameler, Ankara 1929. (F. TAESCHNER) ANNA see SIKRA. AL-‘ANNABÂ, the present town of Bône, on the Algerian coast, east of Algiers. It is not known when it received the name of al-‘Annabâ or, according to Leo Africanus, Bilda el-‘Unnab, "city of the jujubes", a reference to the fruit grown there. The early Arab geographers call it Buna, derived from its ancient name Hippona and testifying to its long history. It was successively a Phoenician settlement, a Punic city, a possession of the Numidians, and a Roman city named Hippo Regius, it played a major role during the Christian era when Saint Augustine was bishop there (395-430). Captured by the Vandals (430), retaken by the Byzantines, it became a Muslim possession at the end of the 7th or beginning of the 8th century. The urban centre has occupied various sites in the course of the centuries. Al-Bakri is the most precise on the question. He distinguishes three settlements: the town made famous by "Agushin, the doctor of the Christian religion", situated on an eminence, very probably that on which the basilica of Saint Augustine stands to-day. At its foot, stretches "the jujubes", a reference to the fruit grown there. The early Arab geographers call it Buna, derived from its ancient name Hippona and testifying to its long history. It was successively a Phoenician settlement, a Punic city, a possession of the Numidians, and a Roman city named Hippo Regius, it played a major role during the Christian era when Saint Augustine was bishop there (395-430). Captured by the Vandals (430), retaken by the Byzantines, it became a Muslim possession at the end of the 7th or beginning of the 8th century. The urban centre has occupied various sites in the course of the centuries. Al-Bakri is the most precise on the question. He distinguishes three settlements: the town made famous by "Agushin, the doctor of the Christian religion", situated on an eminence, very probably that on which the basilica of Saint Augustine stands to-day. At its foot, stretches "the jujubes", a reference to the fruit grown there. The early Arab geographers call it Buna, derived from its ancient name Hippona and testifying to its long history. It was successively a Phoenician settlement, a Punic city, a possession of the Numidians, and a Roman city named Hippo Regius, it played a major role during the Christian era when Saint Augustine was bishop there (395-430). Captured by the Vandals (430), retaken by the Byzantines, it became a Muslim possession at the end of the 7th or beginning of the 8th century.
features of which recall the Great Mosques at al-Kayrawan and Tunis, and which later received the name of the holy man Sidi Abū Marwān (died 505/1112).

Like al-Bīdajaya, Bōne was a base for active piracy, and was for this reason attacked by the Pisanes and Genoese (1034). Roger II of Sicily captured it in 1153 and installed a Hammādīd prince there. In 1160, it was taken by the Almohads. In the middle of the 13th century, it was annexed to the Hafsid dominions; but, frequently independent of Tunis, it was furnished with governors from al-Bīdajaya or Constantine. In 1533, it appealed to Khayr al-Dīn, the ruler of Algiers, and was occupied by a Turkish garrison, which remained there until 1830.


---

The characteristic feature of the Banū Annāz was typically semi-nomadic, in that it occupied Kirmānshāh and the castles Khūlāndān and Aranba (probably Khālidjī and Aranga near Kangāwar?) which belonged to the Kūfi Kūrs (i.e. the Kurs of the Hasānwayhid federation).

In 431/1040 a war broke out in the region between Šīrāz and Iran, which was one of the manifestations of the period "between the Arabs and the Turks" when, in the wake of the western expansion of the Buyids, numerous principalities of Iranian origin sprang up in Ḡarbābābān and Kurdistan.

As the rise of the Banū Annāz was based on the Shāḥdānjī Kurds, the dynasty should be considered as Kūrīd, although the Arabic names and titles of the majority of the rulers indicate the Arab links of the ruling family. The organisation of the Banū Annāz was typically semi-nomadic, in that it combined clans living in tents with strongholds serving as treasuries and refuges in time of danger. The characteristic feature of the Banū Annāz dominion was the constant displacement of their territories and the constant displacement of their little-known centres.

There were two periods in the history of the Annāzids. At first the external centres between which the family shifted were Baḥdād, with its branch of the Buyids issued from Abū ad-Dawla, and Rayy, with its branch of descendants of Rukn al-Dawla. In the immediate west the Shāḥdānjī were constantly involved in the tribal affairs of the Arabs Banū Buḳayl and Banū Marṣūd. In the east, they were separated from Rayy by the dominions of the Kūrīd Hasānwayhd. In the second period, the appearance of the Salqūcs and their Turkish (Ghuzz) tribes completely disorganised the life of the Banū Annāz who leaned now on the newcomers, now on the Buyid epiphanes, or fended for themselves in various tribal combinations.

The founder of the dynasty was Abū l-Fāṭā Muḥammad b. Annāz who ruled in Ḥulwān (at the foot of the pass leading up to the Iranian plateau). The fact that Hīlāl b. Muḥassin (Eclipse, ii, 432) calls him adīgh and nādīgh suggests that he was attached to the administration of Bahā ṣ-dawla (379-403/989-1013) and through that channel established himself in Ḥulwān where he ruled 20 years (381-401/991-1010). In 387/997 he temporarily seized Daḵūk̄ā from the ʿUklī. In 392/1002 he joined the commander Ḥaḏīḍī b. Ḥaḏīḥ in the campaign against the Banū Māryād. Later in the year he entered the service of Amīl al-Diyyūsāḥ. In 389/999 he destroyed the family of Zāhmān b. Ḥirbālī, lord of Ḥulwān and he retired to Baḥdād, though according to Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 157, he died in Ḥulwān.

(2) His son Husām ad-Dīn Abū l-Shawk Fāris (401-37) succeeded him in the principal lie (Ḥulwān), but at the same time his brothers became autonomous: Muḥāfīl b. Muḥammād in Shahrāzūr (q.v.), and Surkhāb in Bandānjīn (Mandal), on the border of the southern Kurdish tribes and the Lurs (q.v.). This division led to a number of complications. In 405/1014 the Buyid Shams al-Dawla (of Ḥamadān) clashed with the Ḥasānwayhd Hīlāl b. Baḍr who was killed and his son Tāhir captured. During Shams al-Dawla's absence in Rayy Abū l-Shawk occupied Kirmānshāh (Karmīlsīn). Shams al-Dawla returned to Ḥamadān and released Tāhir (405/1015) who rapidly defeated the Annāzids. Abū l-Shawk submitted to him and gave him his daughter, but then suddenly attacked and killed him. Shams al-Dawla himself marched against Abū l-Shawk but the battle was fought near Kirmānshāh (and witnessed by Avicenna, see his autobiography in Ibn Usayyibī's, ii, 4), lost the day (c. 406/1015).

The Buyids of Rayy were succeeded (in 398/1007) by their maternal relative the Kūkūydz 'Ālā al-Dawla. By that time Abū l-Shawk had already expanded up to Daynwarzar (and Shūbū-Khast), which 'Ālā al-Dawla now occupied. In the struggle between the western Buyids Abū Kūljīgār and Daynwarzāl, Abū l-Shawk (420/1026) helped the latter but insisted on the reconciliation of the rivals. In the same year parties of Ghuzz occupied Mawsīl and Abū l-Shawk was ready to assist Daynwarzāl, but the Arabs lost the day. In 426/1037 Abū l-Shawk sided with Abū Kūljīgār who was besieging Daynwarzāl. In 460/1059 he again occupied Kirmānshāh and the castles Khūlāndān and Aranba (probably Khālidjī and Aranga near Kangāwarz?), which belonged to the Kūhī Kūrs (i.e. the Kurs of the Hasānwayhd federation).

In 431/1040 a war broke out in the region of Daynwarzāl between his son Abū l-Fāṭāh and Muḥāfīl, who took Abū l-Fāṭāh prisoner. Abū l-Shawk marched against his brother (in Shahrāzūr). But Muḥāfīl appealed to the Kūkūydz 'Ālā al-Dawla who arrived and annexed Kirmānshāh and Daynwarzāl (432/1040). When his other brother, Surkhāb, made a pact with the Dīwānī (now Dīlāf) Khūrs, Abū l-Shawk turned for help to Dīlāl al-Dawla. Meanwhile 'Ālā al-Dawla pushed on to Mardj (Kerind?) and Abū l-Shawk took refuge in the castle of Sirwān (on the Dīlāf). Finally 'Ālā al-Dawla contented himself with Daynwarzāl and then suddenly died in 433/Sept. 1041. In 434/1042 Abū l-Shawk again attacked Muḥāfīl who fled to Snda (perhaps Senne?). Abū l-Fāṭāh had died in captivity and the brothers made peace.

In 435/1043 Dīlāl al-Dawla died and at the same time a new enemy threatened the Annāzids. In 437/1045 Tughrīl sent his half-brother Hīlāl b. Hīlāl Vīnāl to the west, and Abū l-Shawk fortified himself in the castle of Sirwān (see above), while the Ghuzz devastated his dominions. He died in Rāmādān 437/ April 1046.
The Kurds rallied now round (3) Muhalhil who hastened to reoccupy Kirmanshah and Daynawar (438/1047), whence he ousted Badr b. Hilal appointed by Ibrahim Yinal. It is possible that Muhalhil relied on some local tribes of Shahrazur, for his nephew (4) Sa’di (Su’dâ) b. Abi ‘l-Shawk felt disappointed by his uncle’s neglect of himself and the Shâhdandjan. He went to join Ibrahim Yinal (438/ Sept. 1046), who reinforced his Shâhdandjan by a troop of Ghuzz. In Huwilâb Badr read the hâkems for Ibrahim. He also occupied Bandandjian, and his uncle Surkhâb sought refuge in Diz-i Dolya (cf. the name of the Kurdish tribe Dolo between Sharabâb and Khamiânî). But then defeated and captured Sa’dî and his ally, the chief of the Djaqwân tribe. Soon, however, the Lurs, who were Surkhâb’s subjects, extradited their master to Ibrahim, who had one of his eyes blinded. By that time, Sa’di had been liberated by a rebel son of Surkhâb. As Sa’dî was not too favourably received by Ibrahim, he returned to Daskara (near Shahrazur) and sought the help of Bağdâd.

Ibrahim appointed a relation of his to occupy Surkhâb’s dominions and remitted Surkhâb to him to facilitate the surrender (Du’mâd II 439/Dec. 1047), but the envoy was defeated by Sa’di’s ally Abu ‘l-Fath b. Warrâm (*Warâm < Bahram?) Djaqwân. Then the Ghuzz defeated Sa’dî and spread on the left bank of the Tigris. Sa’dî sought refuge among the Banû Mazayr Arabs and Ibrahim captured the last important castle of the ‘Annâzids, Ka’at al-Sirwân (see above). Muhalhil also had to flee from Shahrazur (439/1047). During the siege of Tirânshâr (Tirân? by the Ghuzz, plague broke out among them and in 440/1048 Ibrahim ceded Sa’dî to them to Mâhdâshâ (west of Kirmânsâh). Muhalhil re-occupied Shahrazur but in 442/1050 he felt obliged to pay homage to Tughrîl-bek, who received him kindly and re-instated the ‘Annâzids: Muhalhil in Sirwân, Dâkûtâ, Shahrazur and Sângân (Zimkân? a left affluent of the Diyaîlâ); Surkhâb in Dizî Mâhkî (cf. the Kurds Mâhkî in north-western Luristan) and Sa’dî in the two Râwânds (near Nîhâwând). In 444/March 1053 Sa’dî was placed in command of Tughrîl’s van and advanced to Nunmâniya, clashed with his uncle Muhalhil and made him prisoner.

Meanwhile Bağdâd was occupied by ab-Bâsârî (q.v.). Muhalhil’s son (5) Badr went to ask Tughrîl to intervene for the liberation of his father. Tughrîl offered to exchange Muhalhil for one of Sa’dî’s sons kept by him as a hostage. Sa’dî disliked the offer and suddenly revolted against Tughrîl and sided with al-Malik al-Râhîm, the Bûyîd. He was defeated by Tughrîl’s generals and Badr. Muhalhil must have died at that time. Badr proceeded to Shahrazur, while Sa’dî remained in the castle of Rawshân-Khâsh (on the right bank of the Diyaîlâ), and even in 446/1054 the Ghuzz were unable to dislodge him.

After the occupation of Bağdâd by Tughrîl (447/ 18 December 1055) the sources are silent on the ‘Annâzids but some survivors of the dynasty can be traced even at a considerably later time. Under 455/1110, Ibn al-Athîr, x, 238, reports on the attack of Kâcharî (a Salghur Turkman) on (6) Surkhâb b. Badr. The commanders in Khurshid (Silurzi) curtailed Surkhâb’s possessions, until the latter contented himself with being a mere shîhâna on his behalf in Mânrûd (near the Mungerre range in Central Luristan). Finally the whole of Mânrûd was incorporated by Khurshid. This Surkhâb was undoubtedly a descendant of Surkhâb, lord of Bandandjian and Mâhkî, and with him the last scion of the ‘Annâzids must have disappeared.

Bibliography: Hûlîl b. Muhammîn, in Margoliouth, The Eclipse, iii; Mughîml al-Tawdrîkh (written in 520/1126), Teheran, 1318/1938; this book adds some interesting details to our principal source Ibn al-Athîr, x, 280; the founder of the dynasty of Lesser Lur (q.v.) Khurshid (Silurzi) curtailed Surkhâb’s possessions, until the latter contented himself with being a mere shîhâna on his behalf in Mânrûd (near the Mungerre range in Central Luristan). Finally the whole of Mânrûd was incorporated by Khurshid. This Surkhâb was undoubtedly a descendant of Surkhâb, lord of Bandandjian and Mâhkî, and with him the last scion of the ‘Annâzids must have disappeared.

ANNIYYA, an abstract term formed from the conjunct particle an or anâna, “that,” is the literal translation of the Aristotelian term ṭû ānî and means therefore the fact that a thing is, its “thatness” (the particle anâna is used also substantively and al-anâna has the same meaning as al-anâniyya). The principal passage where Aristotle employs this term is in Anat. Post. II. 1 and the important distinction he makes there between the fact that a thing is (ṱû ṭûn) and the question what it is (ṱû ṭût) is the fundamental source of the later discussions about existentia and essentia. Indeed, the most pregnant sense in which the term anâniyya is used by the Muslim philosophers is the meaning of existentia, i.e. the existence in reality of a particular individual in opposition to its essentia, its intrinsic nature, its “thatness,” māhiyya, quidditas in the Latin translations. When, for instance, abu-Salih al-Malhâmî al-Fâlajî expounds the general doctrine of the Muslim philosophers that in God existence and essence are unified, he uses the terms anâniyya and māhiyya. Since, however, in philosophy existence and non-existential being are often confused—in Greek philosophy the terms ṭû and ṭûn serve to express both meanings and Aristotle himself uses (Met. VII 17. 1041* 15) ṭû ānî and ṭû ānâna, as synonyms (the Arabic translation of these terms here, in the edition of Bouyges p. 1006, is al-anâna and al-anâniyya)—we find the term al-anâniyya used also for non-existential being. For instance in a passage in Aristotle’s Metaphysics X 10.1057* 23 the non-existential being of truth and falsehood is rendered
by "anniyya (the Greek has ὃνομα) and Averroes in his comment on this passage explains the term by μεmβρέα.

A special feature of the pseudo-Aristotelian neoplatonist treatise is the "Theology of Aristotle" and the liber de causis in which ὀνομά and ὑπονόμω are constantly translated by "anniyya, whereas the category ὑπονόμω (identity) is rendered by ρυτίς. But in other translations e.g. the translation of Aristotle's Metaphysics ὀνομά is often translated by ἀναπίνω (e.g. in Book V, 7, where a definition of ὀνομά is given) and we often find the terms, "anniyya, ὑπονόμω and ἀναπίνω often used interchangeably.

It may be remarked that the fanciful derivation of "anniyya from 'ana, e.g. given by some Persian mystics and which has been adopted also by some modern European scholars, cannot be maintained, if only for grammatical reasons. The correct derivations from 'ana: *anniyya* and *anniyya* are both found in later Arabic philosophy for instance in Shīrāzī (17th Century).

Bibliography: We do not possess a satisfactory lexicon of Arabic philosophical terms. However, the examples given by Bouyges in the accurate indexes to his edition of Aristotle's Metaphysics with Averroes' Commentary may be studied with profit. Although the term is frequently used by Avicenna, it is found neither in Ghasálī's Tahdīfī nor in Averroes' Tahdīfī al-Tahadīfī.

(S. Van den Bergh)

AL-ANŠĀR, "the helpers", the usual designation of those men of Medina who supported Muhammad in distinction from the Muhādirūn or 'emigrants' i.e. his Meccan followers. After the general conversion of the Arabs to Islam the old name of al-Aws and al-Khazrajū jointly, Banū Kayla, fell out of use and was replaced by Ansār, the individual being known as an Anṣārī (cf. Kurān, ix, 100/101, 117/128). In this way the early services of the men of Medina to the cause of Islam were honourably commemorated. Anṣār is presumably the plural of naṣīr, but the latter is never used as a technical term. The verb naṣara has the connotation of helping a person wronged against his enemy. This is sufficient to explain why the Muslims of Medina were called al-Anṣār (sometimes ansār al-nabi, "the helpers of the Prophet"), but the choice of the name may have been influenced by the resemblance to Naṣārū, "Christians"; e.g. Kurān, lxi, 14, "Be helpers of God as Ḩāsalā Maryam said to the disciples, Who are my helpers towards God?" (cf. iii, 52/45).

Muhammad's first effective contacts with Medina were at the pilgrimage of 620 A.D., with six men of the Khazrajū. As the reconciliation of the Aws and the Khazrajū, however, was part of his aim, he seems to have insisted on the Aws being represented at the negotiations; and in the traditional accounts of "the first and second 'Akaba" [p.xxx] about a sixth of those who pledged themselves to Muhammad were men of the Aws. Medina had suffered so much from the feuds of the two tribes [see al-Aws, al-Khazrajū, al-Madīnah], that the ready acceptance of Muhammad's claims must have been partly due to the hope that he would be able to restore and maintain peace. While there is much obscurity about the details, it is clear that most of the inhabitants of Medina, apart from the Jews, had entered into the agreement with him. The chief exceptions were four clans of the Aws, called Ḫuṭṭān, Wāḥil, Wāṣif and Umayya b. Zayd, and part of a fifth, ʿAmr b. ʿAwf, all of which had close relations with the Jews. These non-Muslims are to be distinguished from the Munāfikūn or 'hypocrites', since the latter were parties to the agreement with Muhammad who afterwards disapproved of him. Despite these defections, the Aws were important among the Anṣār, and indeed the leading Anṣārī, until his death in 5/627, was Saʿd b. Muʿādh, chief of the clan of Ḥāḍir al-Asghal of the Aws.

The following table shows the number of men of the various clans present at "the first 'Akaba" (A 1), "the second 'Akaba" (A 2), and the battle of Badr (B). The last column (W) gives the number of women of the clan who are given notices in Ibn Saʿd, viii; this may be taken as a rough indication of the total strength of the clan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clan</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ʿAbd al-Ashghal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zafar</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAmr b. ʿAwf</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aws Manāt (Ḵaṭma)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures suggest that a leading part in the approach to Muhammad was played by clans like al-Naḍijār, and Salīma, which had many members but had produced no great leaders in war. The two chief men of Medina at this time, Saʿd b. Muʿādh and ʿAbd Allāh b. Ubayy were not at al-ʿAkaba, and their clans (ʿAbd al-Ashghal and Banū ʿAl-Hubih) seem to be relatively badly represented.

It is disputed in the primary sources whether the Anṣār took part in any of the first small Muslim expeditions. They constituted, however, about three quarters of the Muslim force at Badr. Of the leaders Saʿd b. Muʿādh was the most zealous in the cause of Islam; not merely ʿAbd Allāh b. Ubayy, but Uṣayy b. Ḥudayr (a rival of Saʿd b. Muʿādh for the chieftaincy of ʿAbd al-Asghal) and Saʿd b. ʿUbaydā were absent from Badr. At least until the siege of Medina in 5/627 ʿAbd al-ʿAsghal b. Uṣayy was trying to prevent the growth of Muhammad's power; but the others threw in their lot with Muhammad after Badr. At the meeting to deal with "the affair of the lie (tāḥshīl) against ʿAlī's chastity, it was clear that the first man among the Khazrajū was now Saʿd b. ʿUbaydā. Indeed, shortly afterwards, on the death of Saʿd b. Muʿādh, he was recognized as the leader of the Anṣār as a whole. These continued to be one of the main foundations of Muhammad's power, though about the time of the expedition to Tabūk in 9/630 a small section became disaffected.

Throughout Muhammad's residence at Medina the old feuds were slowly being forgotten, and the
Ansar were coming to feel themselves a unity, especially in contrast to the Muhaddirun or "emigrants," with whom they rarely intermarried. The cleavage between the Aws and the Khazraj was a factor of occasional importance as late as the meeting after Muhammad's death at which Abu Bakr was made caliph; but nothing is heard of it subsequently. After the wars of conquest the Ansar, despite their honourable position in the new Islamic nobility, declined in influence. They mostly opposed Qhidmân and supported 'All. Later they constituted a "pious opposition" to the Umayyads and took the side of the 'Abbâsiyád. Before the 'Abbâsiyád came to power, however, the Ansar had largely become merged with members of Kurâyah and other tribes who had settled in Medina.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Hishâm; Ibn Sa'd, iii/2; Caetani, Annuali, i, ii/1; F. Buhl, Muhammad, Leipzig, 1930; W. Montgomery Watt, Muhammad at Medina, Oxford 1956.

(W. Montgomery Watt)

**'ANSÂRA,** the name of a festival. Ibn al-Hâdîdî (Tâdît al-Mulâk, Cairo 1312) derives the word from the Arabic root َاَلٍنْ. For more than three-quarters of a century, Dozy, on the one hand, and Eguilaz y Yancas on the other, have attributed it to the Hebrew ã'sârâ (with the variants ã'sâlî, ã'sârâ, ã'sérât, depending on the district) or in verse, which are considered writings in glossaire, 135-7; Eguilaz y Yancas, Glossario, 187-8).

In the Magrib, 'ansâra (with the variants 'ansara, 'ansâla, 'ansâra, 'ansârathe, depending on the district) denotes the festival of the summer solstice, celebrated on the 24th June in the Julian calendar, or the 5th-6th July in the Gregorian. Though known throughout Morocco, and almost everywhere in Algeria, it is not known, it appears, in Tunisia. The magico-religious character of the acts which make up its popular ritual is not in doubt: (a) fire rites intended perhaps to give greater strength to the sun at the time of the solstice; the burning of braziers full of plants, of hives, or of huts, thus producing copious smoke which is supposed to have the virtue of purification and fecundation; (b) water rites, ablations, sprinklings, the mingling of water with the ashes of the ritual brazier, by virtue of which the fructifying humidity is besought to combine with the sun; (c) pomorphism.

His works are the exact expression of the varied aspects of his rich personality: in the field of mysticism, he bared his soul in the Mandzîl al-Sâdirîn, a valuable spiritual guide, to the Hebrew *asdra (*asereth) or in verse, which are considered writings in glossaire, 135-7; Eguilaz y Yancas on the other, have attributed it to the Hebrew ã'sârâ (with the variants ã'sâlî, ã'sârâ, ã'sérât, depending on the district) or in verse, which are considered writings in glossaire, 135-7; Eguilaz y Yancas, Glossario, 187-8).

His works are the exact expression of the varied aspects of his rich personality: in the field of mysticism, he bared his soul in the Mandzîl al-Sâdirîn, a valuable spiritual guide, to the Hebrew *asdra (*asereth) or in verse, which are considered writings in glossaire, 135-7; Eguilaz y Yancas, Glossario, 187-8).

His works are the exact expression of the varied aspects of his rich personality: in the field of mysticism, he bared his soul in the Mandzîl al-Sâdirîn, a valuable spiritual guide, to the Hebrew *asdra (*asereth) or in verse, which are considered writings in glossaire, 135-7; Eguilaz y Yancas, Glossario, 187-8).
Yahya, Arab physician born at Antioch, son of the ra'is of Karrat Sidr Ḩabīb Al-Najdījī, undertook, though quite blind, long journeys which led him also into Asia Minor. There he learnt Greek, on the advice of a Persian physician who had cured him of a malady from which he had long suffered, in order to be able to study the sources of medical science in the original texts. Later, he lived at Damascus and Cairo, and died in 1086/1579 at Mecca, after less than a year's stay there.

His chief work is a large, exhaustive medical hand-book in which he followed Ibn al-Bayārī, named Taḥṣīl ʿl-ʿAḥāb wa ʿl-Ḥāmi' ʿl-ʿAḥāb al-ʿUḍāb, Cairo 1304-5/1887-8, 2 vols. (in the margin: the Ḥadyl of a pupil and the work al-Nuẓa al-Mubāhidja fi Taḥṣīl al-ʿAḥāb wa Taʾdīl al-ʿAḥāb, on therapeutics); see Leclerc, in Notices et Extraits, XXIII, 13; recent study by Ḥasan ʿAbd al-Salām. As the Art of Love was then considered as an appendix of medicine, he also edited the work of Muhammad al-Sarradāj (d. 500/1106) on love, under the title Ṭazīyīn al-ʿAṣwād bi-Taḥṣīl ʿl-ʿAṣwād al-ʿUḍāb, Būlāk 1295/1878, 1 vol. 405/1014-5. At Antioch, he had at his disposal new works, and he again revised his history and gradually completed it by an account of contemporary events, neglecting no opportunity to obtain material on this purpose. Although none of the manuscripts of his work which we possess goes beyond 425/1034, it is probable that his history continued beyond that date and that he brought it down to 455 and possibly even to 458. Yahyā b. Saʿīd does not describe events year by year, but arranges his material under the reigns of the caliphs (first the ʿAbbasids, then the Fātimids) and under countries. He displays special interest in Egypt, Syria and the Byzantine Empire, and a moderate interest in Baghdaḍ, but only mentions North Africa in connection with the early Fātimids. He used not only the Muslim sources, but also the Greek and local Christian sources with which he became acquainted at Antioch. His work abounds in chronological information, in most cases both the  Ḥijra and the Seleucid dates being given, the latter being taken from the sources and converted, perhaps by himself, into the Ḥijra dates. Yahyā's work is very important for the history of Syria—Mesopotamia and Byzantium in the 4th/10th and 5th/11th centuries; it is equally important for Fatimid Egypt and naturally for the life of Christian circles and ecclesiastical affairs. The problem of his sojourn in Egypt and the relationship between his history and the Arab chronicles of the same period is difficult to solve.

**Bibliography:** This will be found in the notice on the author in the French edition of A. Vasiliev, Byzance et les Arabes, ii, La dynastie macédonienne, 2nd part, Extraits des sources arabes, by M. Canard, Brussels 1950; in this was made of the fundamental study by V. Rosen, The Emperor Basil the Bulgar-Slayer, Extracts from the Chronicle of Yahyā of Antioch (in Russian), St. Petersburg 1883, a brief summary of which had been given by A. Vasiliev in the Russian edition of Byzance et les Arabes, ii, St. Petersburg 1902, 58-9. The only complete edition is that of L. Cheikho, B. Carra de Vaux and H. Zayyat, CSCO, Script. ar., 3rd Series, vol. 7, Paris 1900; the text and trans. by Vilatjian (Patrologia orientalis, xvii, 1924, and xxii, 1932) stops at the year 404; cf. also G. Graf, Gesch. der christl. arab. Litteratur, ii, 49-51. (M. CANARD)

**ANTAKIYA.** Arabicised form of Antiocheia, town in northern Syria, situated on the Orontes (ʿAṣaf) river, 14 m. from the Mediterranean coast. Founded about 300 B.C. by Seleucus I, and occupied by Pompey in 64 B.C., it became the largest and most important Roman city in Asia and capital of the Asian provinces of the Roman empire. Its gradual decay dates from the foundation of the Sāsānīd empire, which diminished its political and economic influence in the Tigris-Euphrates basin and made it the object of repeated Persian attacks. It was occupied and pillaged for the first time in 258 and 260 by Shāpur I, who removed many of its inhabitants to Dūndē-Šāpūr (q.p.) in Susiana (cf. al-Ṭabarī, i, 827), and from 266 to 272 it was subject to Zenobia, queen of Palmyra. Nevertheless, despite endemic internal conflicts and disastrous earthquakes (to which the region has always been liable), it maintained its prosperity until its siege and destruction by Shāpur II (Anusharvan) in 540, and a further deportation of its inhabitants to the Persian empire (cf. Th. Nöldeke, Ges. d. Perser u. Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden, Leipzig 1879 105, 239; M. Streck, Babylonien nach
Under the early caliphates Antioch is seldom mentioned. It was the headquarters of the frontier military organisation called al-‘Awāsim [q.v.], and appears to have remained an active centre of intellectual life. With the rest of N. Syria, it was annexed by Ahmad b. Tūhān (q.v.) in 265/878, remaining in the possession of his successors until 285/898, and occupied by the Ḥamādān Sayf al-Dīn [q.v.] in 333/944. Recaptured in 358/969 by the Byzantine general Michael Burtzes, it was governed by Byzantine dukes until 477/1084, when it fell by treachery to the Saljūqid Sulaymān b. Kūtumlūf [q.v.]. His possession of the city was disputed by the ‘Ukaylid ruler of Mosul and Aleppo, Muslim b. Kurayṣ [q.v.]; Sulaymān defeated the latter (who fell in the battle) near Antioch in Safar 478/June 1085, but was himself defeated and killed by his kinsman Tūṭush in the following year. This conflict brought about the intervention of the Saljūqīdīn sultan Malikshāh, who gave Antioch in fief to the Turkish amir Yaghūṭ-siyān. It was from this governor that the city was finally ceded by France to the Turkish amir Yaghūṭ-siyān. It was from this governor that the city was
permitted to use the remains of the walls to rebuild the city are relatively small, the inhabitants having been
identified by Muslim tradition with the un-
permitted to use the remains of the walls to rebuild
because of its mild sub-tropical climate, its fertile
surroundings (producing citrus fruit and sub-

Antioch remained thereafter a minor dependency of the Mamlikūd nīṣābūr and later Ottoman pashalık of Aleppo. After the First World War it was occupied by French troops in February 1919 and attached to the French mandated territory of Syria. When a brief episode by Salah al-Dīn Baybars Bundukdārī [q.v.] on 4 Ramadan, 666/26 May, 1268. During this period it was ruled by the Norman dynasty descended from Bohemond, whose principality waxed and waned with the changing fortunes of the Crusading forces, but whose capital was never seriously challenged except for a brief moment by Sūlāmīd al-Dīn [q.v.] in 1184/1188. Antioch remained thereafter a minor dependency of the Mamlikūd nīṣābūr and later Ottoman pashalık of Aleppo. After the First World War it was occupied by French troops in February 1919 and attached to the French mandated territory of Syria. When a brief episode by Salah al-Dīn Baybars Bundukdārī [q.v.]

The extant remains of the Byzantine and mediaeval city are relatively small, the inhabitants having been permitted to use the remains of the walls to rebuild their homes after a severe earthquake in 1872. It has no Muslim monuments of importance except the sanctuary below Mt. Silpius, the former cathedral, called by the name of Ḥā bid al-Nādjarīd (“the Carpenter”) [q.v.], identified by Muslim tradition with the
nenamed believer referred to in Kūrān, xxvi, 12 f.
tropical plants such as bananas) and because of its beautiful countryside. There are many waterfalls, and the Lycian mountain ranges on the western shores of the bay rise to a height of 2000 m. like a backdrop. The mountains are inhabited by a primitive population of Śiḥite religion, called the Takhtağlıs "woodcutters") [q.v.].


Sirat ‘Antar, the romance of ‘Antar, rightly considered the model of the Arabic romance of chivalry. This sura surveys five hundred years of Arab history and includes a wealth of older traditions. The story in the Kitāb Al-Āḥānî of how ‘Antar, the son of a slave-girl, was adopted into the tribe of Banû ‘Abs for saving them at a time of great crisis bears the stamp of a flourishing but already legendary tradition. The Sirat ‘Antar, far transcends the unconscious development of a legend. By a bold stroke ‘Antar, the solitary hero, is raised to be the representative of all that is Arab, ‘Antar the pagan is made the champion of Islam. The romance thus comes to reflect the vicissitudes of the Arabs and Islam through half a millennium; the tribal feuds of the old Arabs; the wars against Ethiopian rule in the Sudan, who becomes the mother of two sons, who are placed at the side of his. Shortly before his death, ‘Antar comes to Rome. The king of Rome, Balkam b. Markas is hard
pressed by Bohemund; 'Antar kills Bohemund and liberates Rome. On a campaign of reprisal against the Sūdānese, 'Antar goes from kingdom to kingdom deeper into Africa till he reaches the land of the Negus. Here he discovers in the Negus the grandfather of his mother Zabiba. Even more fantastic are the campaigns against Hind-Sind, against the Christian king Laylamān in the land of Bayḍāʾ, in the land of the demons. 'Antar's death is brought about by Wizr b. Dāhir called 'Antar under the delusion that he has missed. While dying, and indeed when dead, still sitting on his steed Abbigār, 'Antar still wards the enemy off from his people. 'Antar's marriage with 'Abla was childless but from his secret marriages and love-affairs, several children were born including two Christians, and indeed Crusaders, Ghadanfar, Coeur-de-Lion, son of 'Antar and the sister of the king of Rome whom 'Antar had made and left in Constantinople, and Djiurān (i.e. Geoffroi, Godfrey), the son of 'Antar and a Frankish princess. 'Antar's children avenge and lament the death of their heroic father. Ghadanfar and Djiurān then return to Europe. 'Abs becomes a convert to Islam.

Analysis. The following are the main elements that have contributed to the growth of the Sīra:
1. Arab paganism; 2. Islam; 3. Persian history and epic; 4. The Crusades. 1. The Arab paganism it owes the chivalrous and knightly Bedouin spirit of the work, the majority of the characters in it, who often have historical features, the feuds between the sister tribes of 'Abs and Faḍhāra; in connexion with the race between Dāhir and Qābāra, the most powerful of the Akhbar al-ʾArab, like Zuhayr's marriage with Tumaclir, Zuhayr's death, Malik b. Zuhayr's marriage with Tumaclir, Zuhayr's death, Harīth and Lubna, an anecdote of Rabiʾ a b. Mufcaddam etc. 2. To Arab paganism, it owes the chivalrous and knightly Bedouin spirit of the work, the majority of the characters in it, who often have historical features, the feuds between the sister tribes of 'Abs and Faḍhāra; in connexion with the race between Dāhir and Qābāra, the most powerful of the Akhbar al-ʾArab, like Zuhayr's marriage with Tumaclir, Zuhayr's death, Malik b. Zuhayr's death, Harīth and Lubna, Djiurān and Khālid, anecdotes of Hāṭum Ţayyi, the splendid figure of Rabīʾ a b. Muḥkaddam etc. 2. To Islam, the introduction with a long midrash to heaven in a box borne by eagles, several African traditions (probably taken from geographical works on Africa). There are also links with...
European legends. The marvellous signs at the birth of Charlemagne (in Pseudo-Turpin) resemble those recorded in our romance at the birth of Muhammad, but Pseudo-Turpin undoubtedly borrowed from an older source. Artificial birds made of metal, which sing in various tunes by means of bells and organ pipes are described in French and German epics and also in the Sirat 'Antar. But here we have to deal with the historical marvel of the Chrysotriklinium in Constantinople, and with a similar thing in the Ctesiphon of the Sámanids and also in the capital of the Tatar Khâns. Some coincidences are very striking. Hârîth al-Zâliîm beats his sword Dhu 'l-Hiyat against a rock, so that it may not fall into the enemy's hands; the rock is broken but the sword is uninjured, just as is the case with Roland's Durandal. ' Antar instructs his son Ghâdîbân, who wishes to slay Khusraw and seize the power for himself, on the subject of kingship by God's grace just as Girard de Viane does his nephew Aimeri who wants to kill Charlemagne. ' Antar's horse Abdjar takes flight to the desert after ' Antar's death, so that he may not serve another master, just as Renaud de Montauban's Baiart escapes to the forests of the Ardennes. Very remarkable is the parallel between the duel between Roland and Oliver and that of ' Antar and Rabî'a b. Muşaddam; the sword of the one combatant breaks in two and his magnanimous opponent gets him another; the duellists are reconciled and become brothers-in-law. But such poetical developments have their origin in a similar chivalrous outlook, the relations of the knight to his sword, to his horse, to his overlord and to his opponent.

Chivalry in the Sirat ' Antar. The Sîra is rightly recognised to be a romance of chivalry. In the pagan period among the Arabs the ideal of masculine virtue was mursawa, futuawa; alongside of this we have more frequently in the Sirat ' Antar furusya along with farasa and tajurrasa. The knight is called jâris. ' Antar is called 'a father of knights', Abu 'l-Fursân, sometimes Abu 'l-Fursân, Âlî 'l-Fursân, Fâris al-Fursân, Afrus. Not everyone who rides a horse is a knight. The knight's qualities are courage, fidelity, love of truth, protection of widows, orphans, and the poor (' Antar arranges special meals for them), magnanimity, reverence for women (' Antar begins and ends his heroic career protecting women; he swears by 'Âbla, by 'Âbla's eye, conquerors in ' âbla's name), liberality, especially to poets. The knights are also poets, especially poets of the Hîdżâz, who are found in hundreds in the Sirat ' Antar. The Sîra also knows the institutions of chivalry. We meet pages and squires, not only the sahrâ'îya of Ctesiphon; ' Antar himself trains several thousand squires. The Sîra even describes tournaments on a great scale, in the Hîdżâz, in Hîra, in Ctesiphon, the most splendid in Byzantium where ' Antar's lance strikes the ring 476 times. These toursneys have many features in common with those of Europe, fighting with blunted weapons, tilting at the ring, decorating and bellying the lists, the presence of ladies and girls. These agreements have been explained in the most diverse ways. In the one hand Delécluze saw in ' Antar the model of the European knight, in the Sirat ' Antar, the source from which Europe had obtained all its ideas of chivalry, while on the other hand Reinaud simply found European ideas, customs and institutions imitated in the Sîra (J.A., 1833, i. 102-105). In this some have seen the starting point for the study of the question of the origin of the Sirat ' Antar.

Origin. The Sirat ' Antar itself frequently and readily talks about itself and its origin. It professes to have been composed by al-'Asmâ'î in the time of the Caliph Hârûn al-Rashîd at his court in Baghhdâd; ' Asmâ'î lived for 670 years, of which 400 were in the Dîhlâliya; he was personally acquainted with ' Antar and his contemporaries, concluded the composition in the year 473/1080 and recorded traditions from the mouths of ' Antar, Hamza, Abû Tâlib, Hâtîm Taṣỳy, Amru 'l-Kâîs, Hâni b. Mus'âd, Hâzim of Mecca, ' Ubaydya, ' Âmar b. Wudd, Durayd b. al-'Simma, ' Âmir b. al-'Tuhayl. In fact we have a regular romance regarding the origin of the romance. The repeatedly mentioned nâwî, nâtî, muṣânnî, sâhîb al-bârât, ' Asmâ'î and other authorities have the same significance for the Sirat ' Antar as the Dîhlâns, Pehlew books and the hoary authorities in Firdawsi, or as the chronicles of St. Denis for the French epic. It is simply fiction when the Sirat ' Antar tells us that it exists in two versions, one for the Hîdżâz and the other for ' Irâk. The invention of a Hîdżâz recension is intended to encourage the belief that 'Asmâ'î collected from ' Antar and his contemporaries in the Hîdżâz the information, which was utilised in the romance. The Hîdżâz as the home of the romance is a pure invention. On the other hand ' Irâk may really have made a considerable contribution to the composition of the Sirat ' Antar. For the date of origin of the Sirat ' Antar we have the following clues: 1. In a religious dialogue between a monk and a Muslim (Das Arabischen übersetzt von K. Vollers, Ztschr. f. Kirchengeschichte, xxix, 49) the monk mentions the exploits of ' Antar. 2. About the middle of the xith century the former Jew Samaw'al b. Yahyâ al-Maghribî, a convert to Islâm, describes his career and mentions that in his youth he was fond of long tales like that of ' Antar (MGW, 1898, xxlii, 127, 418). 3. The evidence contained in the book itself. The appearance of Bohemund, Djufran (Godfrey of Bouillon), perhaps also of the king of the beggars, Tafur, brings us to the period after the first Crusade, that is at the earliest in the first half of the xith century. The composition of histories of ' Antar must therefore have already been begun in the xith century — on the evidence of the religious dialogue above mentioned. According to Samaw'al b. Yahyâ a book of ' Antar of considerable size was actually in existence in the middle of the xith century and if Bohemund and Djufran already appeared in it, it must have been completed at the beginning of the xith century. At the same time the meddahs may have continued to add a great deal to it and in particular continued its islâmisation. The midrash of Abraham which is quite an inorganic addition and the legends of Muhammad and ' Ali could belong to any period. An original ' Antar can be reconstructed with philological probability. In vol. xxxi., the dying ' Antar reviews his heroic career in his swan-song. He proudly recalls his victories in Arabia, ' Irâk, Persia, and Syria. But he makes no mention of Byzantium or Spain, of Fez, Tunis, or Barka, of Egypt, or Hind-Sind, of the Sudân or Ethiopia. This original ' Antar may have arisen in ' Irâk (under Persian influence or perhaps in emulation of Persian epic poetry). The swan-song makes
no mention of children, and knows of only one love of Antar's. This original Antar therefore should be called Antar and 'Abla. Following a genealogical stimulus, the later epic made royal ancestors be found in the Suddan and royal descendants in Arabia, Byzantium, Rome, and the land of the Franks. The Crusades next found an echo and a reaction in the 'Antar story. The Crusaders came from the land of the Franks via Byzantium to Syria. 'Antar goes in a kind of reversed crusade from Syria via Byzantium to the land of the Franks and brings about the victory, if not yet of Islam, at least of Arab ideals and culture over European Christianity. The whole geographical area and historical range of the novel is filled with the exploits of Antar.

The romance of Antar seems to be first mentioned in Europe in 1777 in the Bibliothèque Universelle des Romans (JA, 1834, xiii, 256); it was first introduced to European scholarship in 1819 by Hammer-Purgstall and to comparative literature in 1851 by Dunlop-Liebrecht (Geschichte der Prosadichtungen, xiii-xvi). The study of the problem of scholarship raised by the Strat Antar was begun by Goldzinner (mainly in his Hungarian works). The Strat Antar was for long a favourite subject of study in France. In the Journal Asiatique the work was often discussed and partly translated. Lamartine went into raptures of admiration and enthusiasm for Antar (Voyages en Orient: Vie des grands hommes I. Premières Méditations Politiques, Première Préface). Taine places Antar beside the greatest epic heroes - Siegfried, Roland, the Cid, Rustam, Odysseus and Achilles (Philosophie de l'Art, ii, 297). These tributes are not unmerited. The Strat Antar unfolds before us the ever changing, glowing panorama of a particularly attractive period with an extravagant power of imagination, a skill in narration which never fails throughout the 32 volumes, and a poetical style of inexhaustible richness.


(B. Heller)

'Antara, "the valiant" (see JA, vii, 183, which also gives the meaning "blue-bottle"); the word is probably derived from the root 'Ir which expresses the idea of violence. Several warrior-poets of Pre-Islam bore this name; see Āmidī, 151-2. "Antara b. ʿAbdādādār, warrior-poet of the 6th century A.D., belonged to the 'Abs tribe of central Arabia (see Ḥafṣanī). The short notice by al-ʿIṣfahānī, in the ʿAghāni, suggests that by the 4th/10th century he is called poet and 'Abdādār. Following exaggerated popular accounts which had already made 'Antara a hero of fiction. Restricted to positive facts, the biography of this man is extremely sketchy. Born of an Arab father and a black slave, 'Antara, in his youth, lived in slavery as a shepherd;

(R. Blachère)

'ANTARI (A.), noun derived from 'Antar [q.v.], denoting in Egypt: 1) a strong woolen garment worn over the kafiri; 2) a short garment worn under the kaftan.

The latter usage, assimilated by popular etymology to 'Antari, derives from the Turkish Entari, a word of Greek origin.

Bibliography: Dozy, Suppl. ii, 180 and references quoted.

(ED.)

'ANTÀRÍTOS [see TÁRTÒS].

ANTEMURU, tribe of south-eastern Madagascar, comprising 85,000 sedentary agriculturists living in the low river valleys, from the Matatana in the south to the Namurana in the north, and eking out their livelihood by fishing. Of their number, 25,000 members of certain clans claim to come from Emaka, a region which they liken to Mecca. According to their written traditions, some siyama "Muslims", accompanied by kafiri "pagans", passing through the Comoros and the north-east of Madagascar, settled during the 7th/13th century, near their present territory. They found there, and assimilated, other groups of the same origins.

It seems likely that an Indonisian community was augmented by an influx of groups which had in varying degree been Islamised, and came probably from the east coast of Africa, which had been penetrated by the descendants of immigrants from the Persian Gulf. The prestige of these "Islamised" elements was such that the Indonesian dynasties and some clans ascribed to themselves an Arab origin.

It is possible to distinguish two successive waves of immigrants; the earlier introduced divination based on geomancy, while the Antalaotha of the more recent influx introduced writing in Arabic characters and paper-making. The latter was introduced in addition: plants (the vine, pomegranate, hemp, the copal-tree), the game of chess, a few prayers, a period of comparative fasting, some words of Arabic origin, and above all a calendar.

Since the 10th/16th century, the fame of the Antemuru magicians has extended their influence throughout Madagascar. Isolated from the Muslim world, they look upon writing not as a vehicle of communication, but as a means of preserving their magico-religious secrets. The development of the occult sciences has represented a corresponding decadence of the Islamic tradition. The astrological calendar has supplanted the Muslim lunar calendar; prayers, their meaning not understood, have become magic formulas. This decadence is most marked in the tribe which dwells to the north of the Antemuru, namely the 12,000 Antamabo or Antambahawaka.

Since the beginning of the 19th century the over-population of Temuru territory has led to a temporary exodus to the north-west of Madagascar. There, they live with the Cormanian Muslims. This has given rise since 1913, and especially between 1926 and 1939, to a new Islamic revival among some of the 2,000 literates belonging to the clans of the Antalaotha group.

After 1924, the development of coffee-planting, which created new resources, checked the migration to the north-west. Relations with true Muslims again came to an end. The Islamic revival, opposed by the Christians as well as by the traditionalist magicians, declined, despite several attempts by Pakistanis to make converts.


ANTIÖCH [see ANTİNYA].

ANTÜN FARAH [see FAHAR].

ANÜSHIRWAN B. MUHAMMAD AL-KHASHANI, Sharaf al-Din Abu Nasr Nasr, was treasurer and 'ārid al-djiaykh to the Saldjuk sultan, Muhammad b. Malikshâh. After being succeeded by Shams al-Mulk b. Nisâm al-Mulk as 'ārid al-djiaykh he went to Baghdad. He was imprisoned during the reign of Maḥmûd b. Malikshâh for a short period but subsequently appointed waṣir by Maḥmûd (521/1127-522/1128). From 526/1131-528/1134 he was waṣir to the caliph, al-Mustarshid. In 529/1134 he became waṣir to Mas'ud b. Muhammad and held office until 530/1135-6. He died in Baghdad in 533/1138-9 according to Ibn al-Athîr, but according to the Tadjîrî al-Salafl of Hindî Shâb b. Sandjâr in 532/1137-8. He composed a work in Persian on the
events of his time, entitled Futur Zaman al-Sudur wa Sudur Zaman al-Futur, which was later translated into Arabic by ‘Imad al-Din (q.v.). Al-Bundari’s abridged version of this translation has been edited by Houtsma (Recueil de textes relat. à l’hist. des Seldjoucides; ii, Hadj-dj Khalifa mentions another work by him, entitled Naafi‘al-Masdur, but this is probably the same as the Futur Zaman al-Sudur mentioned above (see Mirzâ Muhammad Kazwini, Manafi‘Tawâhid wa Insikâdî, Tehran, 1350 solar). Anûshirwân was praised by various contemporary poets. It was he who encouraged al-Harîrî to compose his mabâmas.

Bibliography: Recueil de textes relat. à l’hist. des Seldjoucides; ii; Ibn al-Athsîr, x, xi; Sibt b. al-Dinwâlî; Hindu Shâh b. Sanûdar, Tadjîrîb al-Salâm.

(Â. K. S. Lambton)

ANWA (â.), a system of computation among the early Arabs. The singular nawâ, connected with the root madâ ‘to rise with difficulty, to lean, to support one’s weight on’ (q.v.), denotes the acronychal setting of a star on or after its heliacal rising and heliacal setting of its opposite (rabîb); by extension, it is applied to a period of time and, in the language of the later Middle Ages and the modern era, it has come to mean “cloud, rain, storm, tempest” (see Dozy, Suppl., s.v.; Beaussier, s.v.; H. Wehr, Arab. Wörterbuch, s.v.), on account of the pluvial role ascribed to the stars contemplated. In the plural, anwaâ denotes the whole system based on the acronychal setting and heliacal rising of a series of stars or constellations; it also appears in the title of a number of works which constitute a separate class of their own.

1. The system of the anwaâ.—To estimate the passage of time, the early Arabs possessed a primitive system—perhaps already influenced by the “Calendar of the Pleiades” (cf. J. Henninger, Sternkunde, i14 and references quoted)—which can be summarized as follows:—(a) on the one hand, the acronychal setting of a series of stars or constellations marked the beginning of periods called nawâ, but within which the duration of the nawâ proper was from 1-7 days. The stars themselves were responsible for rain and were invoked during the istikhâla (q.v.); knowledge of these anwaâ enabled Bedouin trained in this science to foresee the state of the weather during a given period; (b) on the other hand, the heliacal rising of the same series of stars or constellations, at six monthly intervals, marked out the solar year by fixing a number of periods probably about 28. Such maxims as have survived suggest that this was the very basis of the calendar.

Some time before Islam (cf. Kur‘ân, x, 5; xxxvi, 39) the Arabs learnt from the Indians to distinguish the “stations” (or “mansion” (mansila), pl. mandisi (q.v.)) of the moon, numbering 28. Perceiving that the list of these mansions corresponded grossus modo with their own list of anwaâ, they proceeded to combine the two ideas and to adjust their anwaâ to make them coincide with the mandisi, by dividing the solar zodiac into 28 equal parts of approx. 12° 50’; thus the 28 anwaâ identified with the 28 mansidi (see list in the article mansîzî) are determined by 28 stars or constellations constituting 14 pairs (the acronychal setting of the one corresponding to the heliacal rising of the other) and marking the beginning of 27 periods of 13 days and one of 14. These modifications, the date of which cannot be fixed accurately, were definitely completed after Islam, the passage from one system to the other being favoured by the development of astronomy, and by the anathema hurled by the Prophet against the anwaâ, which are not mentioned in the Kur‘ân. The old system, however, still survived, on the one hand empirically among the Bedouin tribes (cf. for example the nawa, pl. nawwâs of the Marâjî of southern Tunisia in G. Boris, Documents linguistiques . . . Paris 1951, 208-11), on the other hand traditionally, and with complete identification of the anwaâ with the mansions, in the specialised works which have perpetuated it among certain rural populations (see Ed. Westermarck, Ritual and Belief in Morocco, London 1926, ii, 177, and Wisdom in Morocco, London 1930, 313-17).

2. The anwaâ in Arabic Literature.—As might be expected, it was the lexicographers who first assembled Bedouin ideas on the subject of the anwaâ and published them in lexicographical works of which we shall consider only those entitled K. al-Anwaâ, leaving aside the K. al-Azmina and others which fall into the same category. The following are the principal writers mentioned as being authors of works entitled K. al-Anwaâ, none of which has as yet come into our possession: Ibn Kumâs (d. 207/822), Mu‘arrîdî (d. 195/810-11), al-Nâdír b. Shumayl (d. about 245/859), al-Ashâmî (d. 213/828), Ibn al-Kûbâyî (d. 233/848), Ibn al-Arîbî (d. 243/858), al-Mubârrad (d. 285/898). On the other hand, we have the K. al-Anwaâ of Ibn Kutâyba (d. about 276/889) which has recently (1957) been printed at Haydarâbâd, and we have fragments of that of Abû Hanîfâ al-Dinawârî (d. after 285/895), the works of al-Akhrash al-Ashâr (d. 315/927), al-Zâdadîhî (d. 310/922), Ibn Durâcî (d. 321/933), the K. al-Anwaâ of Ibn Lût (d. 330/941) and others are also lost. Basically these works contain an explanation of the system of the anwaâ, a list of the mansions (i.e. the modified anwaâ), a table of the dates of the rising and setting of the stars which determine them, the system of the winds and the rains, etc.; the explanation is accompanied by maxims and poetry, usually with a commentary.

From the 3rd/9th century, however, astronomers in their turn showed interest in the anwaâ; al-Hasan b. Sahl b. Nawbakht, Abû Ma‘shar al-Balkhî (d. 272/885-6), Thâtib b. Kurrâ (d. 289/902), and Ibn Khurradâbîh (d. 300/912-3), wrote K. al-Anwaâ while al-Bûrûnî (d. 440/1049) devoted to this subject a chapter of his Athâr and reproduced in part (424-75) the K. al-Anwaâ of Sinân b. Thâtib b. Kurrâ (d. 331/943), which is an almanac.

One would expect, indeed, to see Arab authors producing almanacs on the lines of those which they found in conquered territories, and, although we only have the almanac of Sinân for Irânî, it is probable that Egyptian authors composed them at an early stage, as is proved by certain chapters of Ibn al-Mammâtî and al-Mâktrâtî, and by the names of the Coptic months which appear in the calendars produced in Spain. For the latter country, we in fact possess an almanac published by Dozy under the title of Calendrier de Cordoue de l’année 961 (Leiden 1873) and still entitled K. al-Anwaâ, as is that of the mathematician of Marrâkûsh, Ibn al-Bannâ (d. 721/1321) which has been published by H. P. J. Renaud (Paris 1926) and others which are now lost, are attributed to al-Ghâribî (d. 403/1012-13) and al-Khâtîb al-Umâwî al-Kurtubî (d. 602/1205-6).

These calendars are solar and, under each day, the author gives information on the anwaâ, the length of the day and night, agricultural practices, etc., with, in the Calendrier de Cordoue, notification of
ANWAR, AL-HAFIDH SA'DULLAH [see ENWERI].

ANWAR-1 SUHAYLI, title of the Persian version of Kalila wa Dimna by Kâshî (q.v.).

APAMEA [see APÂMIYA].

APOLLONIUS OF TYANA [see BALNUS].

ARAB, the Arabs.

(i) The ancient history of the Arabs.

(ii) The expansion of the Arabs; general, and the "fertile crescent".

(iii) The expansion of the Arabs: Iran in early Islamic times; Appendix: The Arabs in Central Asia.

(iv) The expansion of the Arabs: Egypt.


(See also AL-ARAB, DJAZIRAT, as well as ARABIYYA and the articles on the several Arab countries).

(i) The ancient history of the Arabs.

(For the ethnic origins of the Arabs cf. AL-ARAB, DJAZIRAT, section on Ethnography, cf. also para ii, below).

The early history of the Arabs is still obscure; their origin and the events governing their early years are equally unknown to us. Probably we would know a good deal more about them, if Uranius' five books of Arâbôxâd, which constituted a special monograph on the Arabs, had been preserved. What we know about them is derived chiefly from the Assyrian records, the classical writers, and, as far as the history of the last three centuries before Islam is concerned, from Muslim tradition and some pre-Islamic Nabataean and Arabic inscriptions.

Possibly "the Aramaean Bedouins", who in 880 B.C. interfered in the affairs of Bet-Zamâni on the upper Euphrates and helped to overthrow the local vassal of the Assyrian king Assur Naṣîrpal, were predecessors of the Arabs. Their anti-Assyrian policy was subsequently followed by the Arabs, who first appear in the light of history in 854 B.C.: Gindibu, the Arab with 1000 camel troops from the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden Pilot, 1932, 130.

(G. FERRAND).
was situated somewhere south-east of Damascus. Certainly the bedouin element of the Arabian Peninsula—for which Aram, 'Eber, and Khabiru are probably synonyms—was to be found originally in the area which extended between Syria and Mesopotamia and which, including Syria, was the oldest centre of the Semites.

If the hypothesis, presented by F. Hommel (Ethnologie, 550), that the land of Magan corresponds to Arabic Ma'in and forms the starting point for the foundation of the South Arabian kingdom of Ma'in, were established—though it would be difficult to prove it—the South Arabian tribe of the Minaeans must have detached themselves from Arab nomads settled in this country, which had already been included in the Babylonian Empire by Naram-Sin (2291 to 2244 B.C.). The traditional pro-Babylonian policy of the Arabs would, therefore, be understandable because of their old political and cultural relations with Babylonia.

The geographical position of the land of Arabi between Syria and Mesopotamia, and the rôle of the Arabs in the traffic on the commercial routes leading from the Persian Gulf to Syria, from Syria to Egypt and Southern Arabia, and along the Wadi Dawsār through the highlands of Najd to Ma'in, influenced historical events in the Near East. The struggle for the possession of these important high roads characterises the course of history during the last two millennia B.C. and the Roman period.

Already in 738 B.C., during the reign of Tiglat-Pilesar III (745 to 726 B.C.), who had occupied Gaza, the terminal point of the "incense" road from Southern Arabia to the Mediterranean Sea, Zabibē, the queen of the Arbei region, sent tribute to the Assyrian king. She probably ruled the oasis of Alutum (Dūmat al-Djandāl) and was high priestess of the Kedar tribe, to which the oil paid tribute. In 734 B.C. Tiglat appointed the Arab Idibā'il as his representative in the land of Muṣri (Midian and Northern Hijāz), through which the "incense" road passed, and in 732 B.C. he subdued another queen of Arbei, Samsī—who had, apparently joined a coalition of the king of Damascus and several Arab tribes, among them Masā' (Massa in Genesis xxv, 13 f.), Tema (Ṭaymā'), Khāyappa ('Elā, a Midianite tribe in the territory of Ḥesma, east of Ṭaymā?), the Badana (south-east of the oasis of el-'Elā'ī-Dāyān) and Sabā (the Sabaeans)—conquered two of her cities and besieged her camp, so that she sent white camels as a tribute; the aforementioned Arab tribes were also compelled to pay tribute, and Idibā'il (the Adbeel of Genesis xxv, 13), who resided near Gaza, was forced to recognise Assyrian suzerainty. In order to be sure of the loyalty of queen Samsī's land, Tiglat-Pilesar III appointed a resident at her court. As the cities subdued by the Assyrian king were situated on the caravan road in southern Hawrān and northern Hijāz, it is obvious that the object of the struggle was the possession of the northern part of the caravan road from Mārib to Gaza (Ghaza). Nevertheless his success in subduing these people was neither complete nor lasting, for in 715 B.C. king Sargon II (722 to 705 B.C.) again defeated the Khāyappa as well as the Tamādī (Ṭamādī, west of the oasis of Ṭaymā') and the Marsimani (south of al-'Aḵaba), and Samsī, queen of Arbei, and the Sānāeans are again recorded as paying tribute. In 705 B.C. the Arabs (Yatī'e was then queen of Arbei) helped the Babylonian king Marduk-apal-iddina against Sennacherib, king of Assyria (705 to 681 B.C.); but the Arab troops were taken prisoner by the Assyrians, and Sennacherib seems to have possessed considerable influence over the Arabs, as Herodotus (ii, 142) calls him "king of the Arabs and Assyrians" (F. Hommel, Ethnologie, 574). In 689 B.C., after the defeat of Babylon, Sennacherib attacked the camps of the Arab clans subject to queen Teʾelḫunu, routed them and pursued them into the inner desert around Adummatu (Dūmat al-Djandāl). The settlers of this large oasis were dependent upon the Kedar tribe, which had control over Northern Arabia (the Palmyrene). The queen and priestess of Adummatu, Teʾelḵunu, and her lieutenant Khazaʾil, king of Arbei, had taken refuge here; the latter, after a dispute with the queen, fled into the inner desert, but was pardoned by Assarhadon, Sennacherib's successor, who recognised him as chief of all the Kedar. Khazaʾil died in 675 B.C., and his son Uaiteʾ (Yataʾ) succeeded him, paying a heavy tribute to the Assyrian king, who had sent back Teʾelḵunu's daughter Tabuʾa to Khazaʾil as queen and priestess. In 676 B.C. Assarhadon made an expedition against the Bāzu (Buz) and Khazaʾ (Ḵazāʾ) in the depression of the Wādī Sirhān. When Šaṃash-šum-ukīn, the king of Babylon, revolted against Assurbanipal, the Kedar under Uaiteʾ began hostilities against him and plundered the western borders between Ḥamā and Edom, but were driven back to the desert; when they again plundered the Assyrian provinces, they were forced to flee to Hawrān, while king Uaiteʾ, expelled by his own subjects, who were enraged by the devastation of their lands during the campaign, was captured and brought to Niniveh. The Nabayati and the Kedar, settled in the Palmyrene and south of Damascus, and the Harar in the southern Sirhān valley were also subdued by Assyrian forces coming from Damascus, while an auxiliary detachment, which fought in Babylon on the side of the Babylonian king, was completely destroyed after the capture of that capital. Arbei and the tribes of the Nabayati and Kedar again recognized Assyrian suzerainty. About 580 B.C. the Kedar are mentioned as having been subdued by Babylon.

Strenuous efforts had been made during the Assyrian period to restore order in Arabia, but as a whole this was an impossible task. The utmost that could be achieved, was the protection of the important trade routes and the punishment of razzias, undertaken by the independent or rebellious tribes. If the title of "kings" reappears frequently in the Assyrian records, this title scarcely meant more than a local chief or shaykh, and it is much later before a really kingly power is exercised by these Arabian chiefs. So "the kings of Arabia and all the kings of the Arabs, who live in the desert," of whom Jeremiah xxv, 23 f. foretells the ruin, are the nomad chiefs. The kings of Arabia are the chiefs of the settlements, e.g. the inhabitants of the oasis of Buz in the depression of Wādī Sirhān. Some of these settlements are occupied by the Neo-Babylonian kings, e.g. Ṭaymāʾ, which was occupied by Nabonid (552 to 545 B.C.). Some years later (539 B.C.) Arab warriors helped King Cyrus II to take Babylonia (Xenophon, Cyropaedia, vii, 4, 26; v, 13).
[Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, ii, 1, 5). The "King of the Arabs" mentioned in Herodotus (iii, 4) may be a king of the Libyans (the Lāitānī) of Agatharchides; the latter had occupied the Northern Hijāz, i.e. the colony of the Minaeans known as Mūṣrān ("border-land") in the land of Midian, with the centre of Agra-Hegra, between 500 and 300 B.C., and were followed by the Nabataeans.

When Alexander the Great had conquered the Achaemenid Empire, he also subdued Arabia according to Livy (xiv 9) and Pliny (Hist. xii, 62). The Arabs now had to supply clothes and arms to the Greek army, and they participated in military actions, e.g. in the defence of Gaza (Arrian, *Anabasis*, ii, 25, 4, Curtius Rufus, *Memorabilia*, iv, 6, 30) and in the battle of Raphia (217 B.C.) on the side of Antiochus III. Although the western part of Arabia was occupied by Ptolemy after the death of Alexander, the majority of the Arabs joined Antiochus (Polybius, v, 71); presumably these Arabs are the predecessors of the Nabataeans. Arab colonies, established at the foot of the Lebanon and in Syria, mainly served the traffic on the great commercial route Petra-Damascus-Mesopotamia (Pliny, Nat. Hist., vi, 142, Strabo, xvi, 749, 755, 756), as nomad Arabs ("Arabes Δικτυαται") were also settled by Tigranes with this end in view (Pliny, Nat. Hist., vi, 142). In the Mithridatian war Arabs fought along side the Romans, but in the Syrian war they harassed the Roman army under Pompey and were defeated by him. Arabs served with Cassius (53 B.C.) and Crassus against the Parthians. The Roman policy of winning over Arabs as confederates and auxiliaries against their own kindred in the Arabian-Syrian desert and against the Parthians was continued and extended by the Eastern Roman Emperors. The Arabian-Syrian border-land was under the rule of the Ḥassānids (q.v.) as phylarchs, as was the border-land of the Euphrates in Southern Babylonia (al-Ḥira) which remained under the rule of the Lakhmids (q.v.) until 602 A.D.

In the meantime Arabs had even infiltrated in the 4th century A.D. into Southern Arabia apparently in connection with camel-breeding and traffic on the "incense" road. They are mentioned in the Sabaeans inscriptions as Aʾrāb and form a notable part of the population, along with the ancestral sedentary population. Their importance is emphasised by the mention of these Aʾrāb in the title and style of the Sabaeans. But this political position did not prevent their kindred in North-West Arabia from entering into warlike disputes with the South Arabian kings. King Amr al-Ḥṣāy b. ʾAmr besieged Nāḍrān, which belonged to the king Šhammar Yūrīq, and it may have been this Amr al-Ḥṣāy who put an end to the prevailing influence of South Arabia in the region of ʾAṣir and Southern Hijāz.

At the beginning of the fourth century, the aforementioned Amr al-Ḥṣāy b. ʾAmr, who succeeded in gaining power over the tribes of Asad and Nizār and called himself "king of all the Arabs", put a detachment of Arab cavalry at the disposal of the Romans. This fact is clearly stated in the Nabataean inscription of al-Namāra dated 328 A.D.

From the end of the fourth century A.D. for about a hundred years the princes of the family of Dadjīšma, the leaders of the tribe of Bānū Śalīḥ, were vassals of the Byzantine Empire on the Syrian border, and held territories there which were gradually yielded to the Ḥassānids in the second half of the fifth century A.D. Unfortunately we do not learn very much about them from Arabic sources.

About the middle of the 4th century A.D., the tribe of Kinda (q.v.), which after a long struggle with Ḥḍrammūt, to which it was inferior, had to leave the Yaman, and migrated to the country of Māʾād, where it settled at Ghamr Dih Kinda in the south-western corner of Najdī, two days journey from Makka. Although the leaders of Kinda, as kings of the tribes of Rabīʿa and Mūṣrā, may have possessed a certain influence on the Bedouin tribes in Najdī from the time when they settled there, the real kingdom of Kinda, governing a coalition of Arabian tribes in close connection with the Ḥimyarite Power in the Yaman, actually begins with Ḥūdīr ʿĀkil al-Mūrār. Yaman tradition says that he was made king of Māʾād, when Tubbāʿ ibn Kazīb invaded al-ʿIrāq, but possibly the attacks, directed against Persia or its vassals in al-Ḥira, were made by the Kindites supported by the Ḥimyarites. It is further said that Ḥūdīr made military expeditions with the tribes of Rabīʿa to al-Ḥārṣayn and at the head of the Banū Bakr attacked the frontiers of the Lakhmids, depriving them of their possessions in the country of Bakr, so that Ḥūdīr is called "King of the Arabs in Najdī and of the border-lands of al-ʿIrāq". His dominion probably comprised most of Central Arabia including al-Yamāma, and he died after a long and successful reign, when he was buried at Baʿīt ʿĀkil on the road between Makka and al-Bāṣra south of the Wādī al-Rumma. After his death about 478 A.D., the tribe of Rabīʿa denied Ḥur al-Maḥṣūr, son of Ḥūdīr, the dominion of his father; we find the tribe of Rabīʿa now under the guidance of Kulayb Wāḥ, leader of the Banū Taghib, and at war with the Ḥimyarites who supported Ḥur b. Ḥūdīr. Kulayb as well as Ḥur were killed in these struggles about the last decade of the fifth century (c. 490 A.D.). With al-Ḥārīth ibn ʾAmr the dynasty of Kinda attained its greatest power. He is known to the Byzantine historians as Arethas, chief of the Saracens, and concluded an alliance with the Romans, directed against Persia and the Lakhmids of al-Ḥira. In the struggles and expeditions against the latter, the tribes of Bakr and Taghib played the most important rôle (about 503 A.D.).

At any rate al-Ḥārīth succeeded in uniting the tribes of the Najdī into a great kingdom and made invasions into Roman as well as Persian territory. The statement that al-Ḥārīth subdued Syria and the Ḥassānids kings may be an exaggeration. The peace of 502 A.D. put an end to the war against the Romans, and in the following year (503 A.D.) al-Ḥārīth's troops attacked al-Ḥira, doubtless with the consent and help of the Romans. Al-Ḥārīth became master of all the Arabs in al-ʿIrāq (503-506 A.D.), and the Lakhmids al-Mundhir, who got no assistance at all from his suzerain, the Persia king Kūbād, submitted to al-Ḥārīth and married his daughter Hind. However, the domination of the Lakhmid country was not complete; according to a South Arabian tradition, by an agreement between Kūbād and al-Ḥārīth, the Euphrates or the canal al-Ṣārā near the Tigris not far from Baghdad was fixed as the northern boundary of al-Ḥārīth's territory, and it is said, that, after King Ardashīr had restored al-Mundhir to power in al-Ḥira, al-Ḥārīth kept what was on the other side of "the river of al-Sawād" until 527-28 A.D. So the Kindite interregnum in al-Ḥira may have lasted some time between the years 525 to 528 A.D., when the Persian Empire was weakened by the Mazdakite movement. It seems, that al-Ḥārīth for some period even ruled
over al-‘Urak as far as ‘Umân, possibly as a cfoe of the Persian king Kubâbâ. After the fall of the Mas- dakites al-Hârij had to flee; he lost all his property and 48 members of his family were put to death by al-Mundhir. He nevertheless could again approach the Romans and was even appointed as a phylarch of the Arabs, on the side of East-Roman Empire. In 528 A.D., the date of his death, he is mentioned in this position by Byzantine sources. With his death the second climax of the Kindite power in Arabia came to an end. Al-Hârij had divided his dominion, comprising all Najd, great parts of al- Hûjâ, al-Bâhrayn and al-Yâmama, between his sons, who had been placed as chiefs over the tribes of Ma‘add. His eldest son Hudjir, who had a certain supremacy over the whole kingdom of Kinda, was killed in a rebellion of the tribe of Asad. Between Sharabih and Salama, ruling the tribes of Rabî‘a and Tamîl and possessing the eastern half of the kingdom of Kinda, a discord arose concerning the division of power after their father’s death, and Sharabih was killed in the battle of al-Kulâb (a well between al-Kûfa and al-Asa) a few years after 530 A.D.; it is highly probable that this dissension was caused or nourished by the intrigues of al- Mundhir, whom the Banu Taghibb as well as the Bakr joined after the expulsion of the victorious Salama. Ma‘diskirb, the chief of the Kays‘-Ayâlân, went mad, or fell in the battle of Uwârâ, and the fifth son of Hudjir, Abdallâh, who ruled over the Rabî‘a tribe of Abd al-Raysî in al-Bâhrayn, is not mentioned further. So the kingdom of the family of Hudjir ‘Akil al-Murâk broke down, and the Kinda, or considerable parts of them, migrated to Hadramût, where they settled about 543 A.D. according to a Sabaean inscription at the dam of Marib. Hudjir’s son, the famous poet Imrân‘-al-Kaysî, tried in vain to regain the power of his father with the help of the Byzantine Emperor, and died in Anjâra perhaps before the year 554 A.D. A cousin of Imrân‘-al-Kaysî, Kays ibu Salama, chief of the Kinda and Ma‘add, is possibly identical with Kaisos (Kâsûs), who received from the Emperor the governorship of Palestine and defeated the Lakhmid al-Mundhir b. al-Nâmân, who died in 554 A.D.

The disputes and struggles between the nomad tribes were settled under the well known “Ayyâm al-‘Arab”, and an expedition to Khaybar in 567 A.D. is referred to in the Arabic inscription of Harrân (dated 568 A.D.). That there existed “kings” of individual tribes along with those mentioned here is proved by a Nabataean inscription found in ‘Umm al-Djâmil and dating from about 250 A.D., in which a king of Tanûkh is mentioned.


(A. GROHMANN)

(ii) THE EXPANSION OF THE ARABS: GENERAL AND THE "FERTILE CRESCENT"

If the expansion of the Arabs is regarded as a continuous process certain permanent features can be detected: the expansion consists usually in the emigration of large or small nomadic groups, rarely in that of groups with permanent habitations; it may be military, by means of service in foreign armies or in their own army which has set out for conquest or through the founding of trading colonies. Apart from this last case, the extent of emigration depends partly on particular coincidences, partly on a recurrent, but inexact, factor, the increase in the pressure of population in Arabia. This is brought about by the decline of cultivation (in South Arabia also of industry) and of the caravan trade (in Islamic times also of the pilgrim traffic); there is a corresponding increase in the nomadic population. The expansion was preceded by the immigration into the central parts of the peninsula, which had been sparsely occupied by an earlier population. It was facilitated by the taming of the camel in the second half of the second millennium b.c. Nor is it likely that the occupation of South Arabia took place earlier, to judge from the philological ethnological and archeological evidence. The forerunners of these immigrants into South Arabia were presumably traders who followed the ancient trade routes into the land of incense and myrrh. A little later the Arabs began to expand in the North, at first in the direction of Sinai and Transjordan. The evidence of the inscriptions shows that in 833 they were present in the north of the Syrian desert, shortly afterwards on both edges of the Fertile Crescent; they were camel-breeders, oasis-dwellers traders. This formed the chief objective of the Arab expansion. It did not, however, remain the only one, as the emigration of the Sabaeans into Ethiopia (about 400?) shows. It depended on the strength of the various states of the Fertile Crescent: whether this immigration could be canalized in the form of colonisation and, in the borderlands of overseas nomads, of oasis, nomadic life, or whether it led to the flooding of the cultivated land by nomads. In the 1st century B.C. the nomads (Scenites) on the near side of the Euphrates crossed the border of the arable land as far as the line Apamea-Thapsacus, while in the Dâmira they roved as far as the border of the arable
land to the south of the Khabur and the Singjar. We cannot here examine exceptional developments, like that of the trading state of the Nabataeans which expanded in the same century, in the north to the Hawran, in the south to N.-W. Arabia.

The incorporation of the Syrian part of the Nabataean kingdom in 105 A.D., and the abandonment of the Roman sphere of interest in N.-W. Arabia some sixty years later, shook the security of these countries. It is, however, impossible to discern what were the main consequences of the incursions of the "Saracens" in the west and of the Tayy3 settled in the central mountain ridges of North Arabia (al-Djabal). Different is the case of the entry of two tribes into the steppe lying between the Lower Euphrates and the sandy desert, which was perhaps originated by Ardashir I, the first Sasanid (d. 241). They were the Tanukh and Asad (2), who came from East Arabia; and they were followed by Nizar from Middle and Western Arabia. The Nizar, with the exception of iyad, were absorbed by the population of the Euphrates frontiers; the Tanukh and the Asad, on the other hand, continued their wanderings, the Tanukh, for the most part, to Northern Syria and the Asad to the south of the Hawran. Since the 4th century these countries saw also the arrival of tribes from North of Syria. In the meantime, the recession in the incense trade (from the 3rd century?) and its extinction (at the latest in the 5th century) had led to the bedouinisation of part of the population of South Arabia. Groups of such tribes, taking part in military expeditions of the Himyarite kings, reached the district of Najran and also Central Arabia (e.g. Kinda). All through the 4th century we can observe its advancement into the north, speeded forward by the campaigns of the kings of Kinda; its path lay along the northerly Arid = Tuwayq to the steppe on the lower Euphrates (Bakr, Tamim), from Bisha to the Wadil al-Ruma (Amir), from the country north of Medina in the direction of Palmyra (Bahrain, Kalb). The Taghib, dwelling formerly on the lower Euphrates, moved upstream and settled at the beginning of Islam in the Dijazir to the north of the Singjar.

The expansion at the beginning of the Islam came about in the first place through enlistment in the armies and auxiliary troops which were sent by Medina to the Euphrates, to Transjordania and to Southern Palestine and after that conquered al-`irak, Syria and al-Dijazir; later through participation in the campaigns which led, across the Persian Gulf or from the garrison cities of Kufa and Basra, to Iran, from Damascus to Egypt, North Africa and Spain. It occurred further through the displacement of tribes from Transjordania to Palestine (in the north Amila and Dijasm, in the south Lakhm); the emigration of parts of Badi and Dhuayna from the Hijaz to Egypt; through continuous infiltration of families and groups into the garrison towns and the Dijazir; and through resettlement of the people of Kufa and Basra in Khurasan. With the enrolment of 400 families of the Sulaym and other West Arabian Kaysties as colonists for Lower Egypt, followed spontaneously by three times their number, the first period of expansion in Islamic times ends. The curtain between the Fertile Crescent and Arabia falls again.

It took a considerable time before the loss which the population of Arabia incurred by the emigration during and after the campaigns of conquests was made good again. The first new movement led from the Dijabal towards the north-east: before the middle of the 9th century the Asad (1) began to advance along the pilgrims' road of Kafna, and Tayyi4 followed close on their heels. In the second half of the 9th century, quarrels under the Buwayhids allowed the Asad to penetrate into the cultivated land; a part of them wandered on to Khuzistan, where already before Islam a small Arab island (Tamm) had been formed. In the meanwhile the campaigns of the Karmania of East Arabia into `irak (311-25/923-37), Syria and Egypt (353-68/964-78), had proclaimed new waves of migration to the north: Khafsja ('Uqayl) moved out of East Arabia into the steppe on the lower Euphrates, followed in the 11th century by Muntash (also of 'Uqayl). Their place in East Arabia was filled by tribes which immigrated from `Umman; part of these too later moved to `irak. Some Tayyi settled in southern Transjordania, and subsequently acquired the overlordship over the older immigrants of the same tribe in Palestine. The stream of tribes from South Palestine to Egypt, which began in early Islamic times, began again in the middle of the 11th century (originated by orders of the government), until in the late Middle Ages it was brought to a halt by a movement in the opposite direction. Since the end of the 12th century there is a trickle of Djashir from Northern Hijaz into Sinai to Egypt and particularly to Transjordania, until in the 17th century this source dries up. They are followed by Badi. Finally since the end of the 12th century groups of the pariah tribe of Hutaym penetrate into the same districts from the territory east of Khaybar. Meanwhile a new expansion had begun in the Dijabal. Around 1200 the Ghaziyya (Tayyi5) appeared in the north between Transjordania and `irak, the Banu `Amir (also of Tayyi6) in the south between Medina and the Kasim. Since the 15th century Ghaziyya camped on the Euphrates, but did not cross it for good till around 1800. The Banu Laml penetrated at the end of the 15th century to the northern frontier of the Hijaz, but were repelled by the Ottomans, and following their ancient route turned in the middle of the 16th century to the east, and on to the lower Tigis and Khuzistan.

The last great emigration, that of Shammar and Anaza, commenced in the same district. At the end of the 17th century the Shammar came from the Dijabal to the frontier of `irak. Anaza (whose territory had been till that time from Mada'in Salib to the Kasim) penetrated at the same time, accompanied by the Banu Shahr, as far as Transjordania. In the 18th century Anaza, coming from S.-W. and S.-E., occupied the Syrian desert. Into the midst of this movement burst the campaigns of the Wahhabis. In the nineties the Shammar-Djabr left their homeland occupied by the Wahhabis and went to the Euphrates. At the beginning of 1802 they crossed it with the agreement of the government and soon pushed on into the Dijazir up to the edge of the mountains of Asia Minor. Other parts of Anaza reached the Syrian Desert together with the troops of the Wahhabis or in the course of flight from their tax-collectors.

As the result of the progress of agriculture in North Arabia since 1911 and the exploitation of the oil resources in the last two decades, the expansion of the Arabs has ended for the moment. Some features of the expansion must still be mentioned, which it was not possible to fit into this article: the settlement on the Iranian coast of the
Persian Gulf (which had pre-Islamic antecedents); the foundation of trading colonies on the coasts and the islands of the Indian Ocean from the early to the late Middle Ages: Malabar, Madagascar, East Africa (Peta-Kiwa, with antecedents in the ancient South Arabian period); the more recent colonial policy of Oman; the continuous emigration from Ḥadramawt, which in the 19th century was principally, but not exclusively, directed towards Indonesia (mercuries in Ḥaydarpād); and infiltration into Upper Egypt across the Red Sea. (W. CASKEL)

(iii) The Expansion of the Arabs: Iran in Early Islamic Times

The Arab conquest of Iran brought a part of the Arab people to that country. There appear to be two separate developments in settlement. (1) The immigration from the opposite Arab coast to the south coast of Iran along the Persian Gulf. The Arabs also spread in a south-easterly direction along the coast from the mouth of the Euphrates and Tigris. Apparently Arab settlements could be found here already in pre-Islamic times (see A. Christensen: *L'Iran sous les Sassanides*, 87, 128). The number of Arabs increased considerably here in early Islamic times; there is, for example, explicit mention as settlers of the ʿAbd al-Kays from the coast of ʿUmān (al-Baladhuri, 386, 391; al-ʿldayhī, 142; Ibn al-ʿAḍhr (Būlāk), ii, 49). From then on Arab settlements remained along the coast and at some places inland (e.g. Māhān, in the district of Bardistān, 985 A.D.: al-Maḥḍī, iii, 462) until at least the times of the Mongols (B. Spuler: *Die Mongolen in Iran*, Leipzig 1955, 142, 149 f., 164). It seems reasonable to suppose that there is a connection between those settlements and the ones of today, in view of the continued migration of Arabs across the Persian Gulf and from Baṣra. (2) There was a second influx of Arab settlers into Iran from Mesopotamia. In the 7th century Arab colonies were formed in several towns such as Khāshān, Hamadān and Isfahān; Kūm became a predominantly Arab (and Shiʿi) town, and remained so for a considerable time (al-Baladhuri, 314, 403, 410, 446; Nārshakhālī (Schefer), 59). Ibn al-ʿAḍhr (Būlāk), v, 15; E. G. Browne, *Account of a rare ms. hist. of Isfahān*, Hertford 1901, 27 [offprint from *JRAS*, 1901]; B. Spuler: *Iran* [see *Bibl.*] 179). The number of Arab settlers in ʿAdharbayjān (al-Baladhuri, 328, 332; al-Tabarī, i, 2805 f.; Ibn Ḥawkalī, 353; al-Yaḥṣībī, Taʾrīkh, ii, 446; Aghānī, xi, 59) was apparently much smaller. Khūrsān, however, remained the main goal throughout all these migrations. The actual settlement was partly made by large groups: there are reports of 25,000 from Baṣra and an equal number from Kūfah, who arrived in 52/672; a further batch reached the country in 683. On the basis of this number of men capable of bearing arms (50,000) and in view of the strictness of recruiting, J. Wellhausen (cf. *Bibl.*) estimates the number of Arab settlers in the beginning of the 8th century at 200,000. They did not live only in the towns—where in some cases quarters were put at their disposal after the conquest—but were scattered all over the country, as for example in the oasis of Marw, where they acquired possessions and adapted themselves to the *dhikbāns* way of living. The geographical contours of Khūrsān suited the Arabs very well: they could easily travel across the large plains and the steppes, although they were somewhat more awkward than the natives both at crossing rivers and in the mountains (cf. Barthold, *Turkestan*, 182).

The main body of Arabs in Khūrsān had come from Baṣra. Of the tribes settled there, the ʿAbdāl (especially in the 8th century) and Kaysīs (cf. articles on these). The bloody battle between these began in connexion with the great civil war for the Caliphate in 683; a static war raged outside Harāt for one year, 64/684-5 between Bakr and Tāmil (al-Tabarī, ii, 490-6), which eventually came to an end due to internal dissensions among the Tāmil. Inspeck of the fact that a neutral Kurayshite became governor in 74/693-4, fighting continued until 81/700 (al-Tabarī, ii, 859-62). The attitude of the governor often made the difference between victory and defeat, and his attitude, in turn, depended to a great extent on the party divisions in the west (Syria and Mesopotamia). In 85-6/704-5, the ascendancy of the Azd and Bakr was temporarily checked by a change of governor in the country. Kutayba b. Muslim, the conqueror of Transoxania, who was not linked to either of the powerful groups by descent, tried to remain neutral. It was thanks to him that the Arabs had the chance of spreading to Samarqand, Buhārā and Khārīzam, often moving into specially cleared quarters (al-Baladhuri, 410, 421 f.; al-Tabarī, ii, 156; Ibn al-ʿAḍhr (Būlāk), iii, 194; Nārshakhālī, 52). After his death the nēr-zone resumed power under Yazīd II, until the Tāmil took over in 720. The misrule of the latter and of the Kays brought Umayyad rule in Khūrsān into such disrepute that even the open-minded governor Naṣr b. Suyyār could not find a way to settle the disputes of the opposing groups after 744. The ʿAbbāsid revolution, caused largely by the behaviour of the Arabs, passed them by. Its victory in 748-50 brought about new conditions for the Arabs in the east. A few of the Arabs had, of course, entered into friendly relations with the Iranians soon after the conquest of Khūrsān. Some of the *marzbāns* and *dhikbāns* had come quickly to terms with the Arab rule and the Arabs frequently took part in the cultural life of the Iranians (especially the celebrations of the *mawṣūl* and the *mihragdīn*, as similarly, they had also done in Egypt on the occasion of Coptic festivities). There were mixed marriages (mentioned expressly only where more prominent persons were concerned, yet even more likely to have taken place among the ordinary people) and the descendants of such unions in Iran were undoubtedly inclined to attach themselves to the Islamicised Iranians. In addition, there were cases of Arabs (as, for instance, Mūsā b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Khāzim in Tirmādḥ) who quarrelled with the government and joined forces politically with the natives. Furthermore, since the time of ʿUmar II
717-20, there was a growing religious consciousness among some Arabs (such as Hārith b. Suraydī) which demanded—with increasing insistence—equal treatment for the Iranian Muslims (cf. Wellhausen, *Das arab. Reich*, 280). Hence the many attempts to come to a reasonable solution of the question of the personal and land taxes where converted Iranians were concerned. In any case, one has the impression that the tribal feeling was more and more superseded by a new, predominantly religious, grouping from round about 720 onwards, when a new process of assimilation began which became important for the general feeling of pan-Arab unity. From this time onwards, political events can no longer be explained as deriving their main spring from tribal feuds.

Because of this, Umayyad politics, which had been built up on the tribal structure, were doomed, and the future belonged to the ‘Abbāsīd movement (and also to that of the ‘Alids connected with the former in the beginning) which worked on a different basis.

The collaboration between the Arabs, who often took a leading part in the ‘Abbāsīd movement, on the one hand, and the Iranians on the other, went smoothly—at least until the fall of the Umayyads (nor was there much friction on a national basis subsequently). Hence the victory of the years 746-50: at that time, however, the greater part of Arabs in Abū Musā’s army spoke Persian (al-Ṭabarī, *iii*, 51, 64 f.).

There were, however, Arabs, who took no part in this process of assimilation. The greater part of these were pushed out of Khūrāsān in the course of the ‘Abbāsīd campaign. The remaining settlers, towards whom the Iranians showed no more animosity, were politically (i.e. as Arabs) of little importance. Tribal warfare now ceased completely, although some tribes are still mentioned in the 10th century (cf. the authorities quoted below). Assimilation continued, however, without interruption so that many Arabs eventually merged completely with the Iranians: more quickly, certainly, where they lived in isolation on their estates (as for instance in the oasis of Marw).

One must also take into account a further distribution of the Arab element all over the country during the ‘Abbāsīd period, and further immigration from the west. Consequently there were places which had a partly Arab population as late as the 11th and 12th century, though the gradual decrease in their numbers is already recognisable in the 10th century. Detailed statements regarding this are rather rare: compare for Isfahān: al-Ya‘qūbī, *Buldān*, 274, for various places in Khūrāsān, ibid., 294; al-Iṣṭakhri 322/323, Ibn Hawkal, 499; al-Makdisī, 292, 303; for Kāshān: *Hudād al-‘Ālam*, 133, and ibid., 104, 108, 216 (Dūrūdān); al-Ṭabīḥī, *Tria opuscula* (van Vloten), 40; al-Ḍāhīnī, *ix*, 102, xvii, 69; al-Dūwaynī, ii, 46 (read maṇṣūgī-‘Arab’); S. A. Volin, *K istorii sredneasianskich arabov*, (in the *Trudy vostok sossis assotsiatsii arabeskion*), Moscow and Leningrad 1941, 124; B. Spuler, *Iran*, 250. The family histories in Ibn al-Balkhī, *Fars-nāma*, xix f. = 116 f., and Kummi, *Ṭarīkh-i Kummi* (Tihrānī), 266-305 (family of al-Aṣghārī) are most illuminating for the gradual assimilation of Arab families of civil servants into the Persian people.


**APPENDIX: ARABS IN CENTRAL ASIA AT THE PRESENT DAY**

The origin of the Arabs living at the present day in Central Asia, and apparently also in Afghanistan Türkistān (where they speak Persian: *The Imperial Gazetteer of India*, V, Oxford 1908, 68; without definite mention of places) can not (or not yet) be fixed with certainty. According to their own tradition, they were brought there by Timūr, and they mention the Andkhuy (g.v.) district in Afghanistan and the nearby Akča (in the province of Mazār-i Sharīf) as the site of their original settlement, and Karghi, Bukhārā and Hīsār as places through which they had passed. There is, however, no mention of Timūr re-settling Arabs, in the sources concerning his life, nor can his son-in-law, Mir Haydar, who is frequently mentioned in the oral tradition, be identified. On the other hand there is proof that inhabitants of Marw were transplanted to Bukhārā, and those of Balkh, Shaburghān and Andkhuy into the Zarafshān valley in the year 1513 (‘Ubayd Allāh, *Zubdat al-‘Āthār*, in the *Zap. Vostochnago Oddeleniya*, XV, 201 f.). We know, furthermore, that migration of “Arabs” was still possible in the first half of the 16th century between (Persian) ‘Irāk on the one side, and the areas of Bukhārā, Samarqand and the valley of the Kaghka Daryā on the other (*‘Abd Allāh b. Muhammad al-Marwarī: *Tarassul*, quoted by Volin 121 f.; cf. also H. R. Roemer, *Staatsschreiben der Timuridenzeit*, Wiesbaden 1952, 94 f., 177, with facsimile 388-393 [without the factual part of the document]).

Thus it appears that the Arabs living in Central Asia today are not the immediate descendants of the immigrants of early Islamic times [see above iii], although one must allow for the possibility of an association with these settlers, who had already been Iranised in the 11th and 12th centuries. In the 16th century, the Central Asian Arabs were under a mir hasār who collected taxes for the government; they were generally known as nomads (a’rab) (in addition to the above mentioned document cf. also an inskā collection of Samarqand of ca. 1530, published by Volin 117-20). In the 17th and 18th centuries there is no information concerning these Arabs, but there is mention of them in the beginning of the 19th century, especially in various travel reports [quoted by Volin]. Here we must distinguish two concepts:

(1) A close group marked by strict endogamy, who are, however, in their physical appearance hardly different from their Iranian neighbours; they call themselves “Arabs” but accepted the language of the country they live in. There is a group of Tajik and a group of Uzbek-speaking “Arabs” in the Samarqand area. Travellers mention similar groups of “Arabs” in Turkmenistan, Khiva, Farghāna and mountain Tajikistan. In the 19th century their number was assessed at between 50 and 60,000; Vinnikov (see *Bibl.*), 9, sticks to these numbers (in spite of the result of the census) in 1926. In the 19th century these “Arabs” were still under a mir hasār, but by this time he no longer exercised any fiscal function. The figure mentioned in a Soviet census of 1926 was 28,978, that of 1939, 24,793. According to this it would appear that these groups of “Arabs” who already spoke the language of their area, were absorbed more and more into their Uzbek or Tajik surroundings. Their economic situation is also like that of their neighbours. As
survivals of the matriarchal system, however, we still find the institution of the "avunculate" (a special connection between the nephew and his maternal uncle and the marriage of first cousins), in which at least one third of these "Arabs" lived before the revolution. (Compare M. O. Kosvesn, *Ammutulat* in Sovetskaya Etnografiya, 1948, no. i).

(2) From these self-styled "Arabs" (obviously in a historical sense), we must distinguish groups which still speak Arabic. According to the above mentioned documents, it appears that this distinction goes back as far as the 16th century. This would mean that the settlement of these Arabs must have taken place some generations earlier, otherwise there could have been (in the case of nomads) no possibility of a partial linguistic assimilation. The Soviet census of 1926 gives the figure 4,553 for these Arabs, who can be divided into the dialectally different tribes of Sa'nund and Sa'bîn. They live largely in Uzbekistan (2,170) and in Tadjikistan (2,274). In 1939, Arab speaking inhabitants of Uzbekistan numbered about 1,750. It would appear that the Russian census of 1897, mentioning 1,696 Arabs, had only the Arab speaking ones in mind; yet some doubt about this figure must remain, in view of the numbers mentioned in later years. Apparently this group, too, is in the process of being assimilated by its surroundings.

The language of these Arabs has developed from a Mesopotamian dialect but has (like Maltese) developed into an independent branch of Arabic, and has split in two. The Central Asian Arabic language developed ٓ and ٰ even in pure Arabic words, on the other hand it lost the ٛ, ٜ and partly the ٜ. ٛ often disappeared, and ٜ often became ٖ; the ٖ usually became ٗ, the w in the personal suffix ٚ (ٚ:). Stress vacillates; assimilation, inversion, and elision are frequent. The 2nd and 3rd person fem. pl. retain their endings (as in the bedouin dialects). One of the two dialects developed the prefix ٌ in the imperfect tense (this would correspond to Iranian, or to Syrian and Egyptian Arabic?). A *durativus praecessus* developed under the influence of Turkish in the Caucasian languages (e.g. Old Georgian), the direct object is taken up again by a personal suffix in the verb (cf. also the Syrian development). "Kâna" is often used as an auxiliary verb (originally with a plural perfect meaning). The infinitive ends regularly in the diminutive -ٖ (ٖ:). The converse of the nouns is almost completely absent; plurals end in -ٕٖ (ٖ: this also frequently in the case of masculine nouns), while broken plurals are rare. Arabic numerals have been replaced by Tadjik ones almost completely. Status *Construcit* is retained, but word combinations of the Indo-Germanic type are frequent (*Hijab mihibb, "wood-seller"). Usual word order: subject, object, predicate. Vocabulary largely Semitic, leaning to Iranic and occasionally to peninsular Arabic.


(iv) **EXPANSION OF THE ARABS IN EGYPT**

At the end of the year 18/639, an Arab army appeared on the Syro-Egyptian frontier and commenced the conquest of Egypt. On 20 Rabî' II 20/9 April 641, a treaty was signed which wrested Egyptian territory or, more precisely the autochthonous population, from Byzantine domination. Alexandria still held out, and only surrendered eighteen months later. Viewed as a whole, the operations give the impression of an advance carried out with no doubt with enthusiasm, but also of a carefully planned offensive. Certain papyri of this period assume particular importance. We possess requisition plans for the billeting and provisioning of Arab troops, and we learn that the expenses incurred by the villages were remitted from the taxes for the following year. From information supplied by the same documents, we see advancing into the country a well-equipped army: armoured cavalry and infantry, accompanied by a flotilla for operations in Upper Egypt. Teams of blacksmiths and armourers were formed for the repair of weapons. This information is based on Greek texts, some of which are indeed accompanied by an Arabic translation, but if the initiation of similar measures was the duty of the Coptic civil administrators, it is a fact that the Arab military leaders were fully aware of them. All this indicates training and discipline, and we may suppose that Bedouin elements did not form the major part of the Arab army. 'Amr b. al-As relied in the main on a first contingent of Yemenite origin, nearly all from the 'Akk tribe, and it is apparent from the names of the districts of Fustat that the majority of the groups were Yemenite. On the other hand, contingents of the 'Dhūdham and Lakhm tribes, who had formed part of the population of the Ghassânid Kingdom and had remained neutral at the battle of the Yarmûk, had joined the army of Egypt. The largest figure recorded of the numbers of the Arab warriors is 15,000 men; this seems to be a maximum figure, but not an impossible one.

After the conquest the Arabs remained in their tribal groups: in this connexion, the names of the districts of Fustat are again revealing. It may be questioned whether, in the beginning, the Arabs thought of anything but exploitation of the country by the military, who formed a de facto aristocracy which did not admit to its ranks any native of the country or mix with the inhabitants since it was forbidden to acquire land. The army of occupation was distributed between Fustat, Alexandria, and various posts scattered along the Mediterranean coast, on the desert frontiers of the Delta, and on the Nubian borders. We lack any critical basis on which to form an estimate of the numbers of these garrisons, which were heavily reinforced, since in 43/663 12,000 men were needed in Alexandria alone. With a view to increasing their cohesion, these elements were organised in tribes. The members of each tribe were divided into sections of seven or ten.
under the control of a syndic, who received their pay, and also administered orphans' pensions under the supervision of the ḫāli. Every morning an official visited the tribes and registered new births.

In 109/727, the Comptroller of Finance in Egypt installed an important part of the Kays tribe in the region of Bilbais: the figure 3,000, which we are given, seems to include women and children. These Kaysites who, as camel-drivers, participated in the traffic on the Fuṣṭāt–Kulzum route, were probably liable to military service, since they were registered on the pay-rolls. These reinforcements had to some extent necessitated by the first revolt of the Copts, which occurred in 107-725. When the Christian historian of the Alexandrian patriarchate is describing this, he writes "One tribe was situated in the eastern desert of Egypt, between Bilbais and Kulzum on the coast; these were Muslims, who were known as Arabs". This mode of expression seems to postulate that the indigenous Muslims, doubtless a minority of the whole population, were at that time more numerous than the Arabs.

These Arabs preserved for more than two centuries the memory of their tribe of origin, and in the majority of the funeral steles, in the cemeteries at Aswān and Fuṣṭāt, the name of the deceased is habitually followed by the ethnic appellation indicating the tribe. It was the Arab title of nobility, and Colectic converts were, in the beginning, second-class Muslims. Some of the latter aspired further, and a judicial scandal which took place in 194-5/810-2 proves that the Arab tribes were still strong enough to appeal to Baghdād against the judgement of a ḫāli of dubious integrity which conferred on Copts the status of pure-bred Arabs. We observe that in the course of the 3rd/9th century surnames relating to tribes give way gradually to surnames of geographical significance; here, too the funeral steles are documents of the greatest value, and furnish us with toponymic surnames.

The Muslims of Fuṣṭāt, at the beginning of the 3rd/9th century, must have been mainly autochthonous elements, installed in all types of sedentary employment, in government service or in trade; the Arabs, occupied in suppressing revolts in the Delta in the course of the preceding century, were then struck off the military rolls as a result of the influx of Khurāsānīs, and later of Turks, and had probably resumed in the country side the principal occupation of their ancestors, the raising of live-stock. At all events, from then on they are not mentioned in the towns. Descendants of former soldiers, moreover, acquired land: we find the proof of this in the fact that the government claimed from them the ḥārādī, or land tax. They thus became mingled with the indigenous population, which, at the beginning of the 3rd/9th century, was mainly Muslim; on the other hand, the Arabic language was used to an increasing extent by the Copts. The majority of the army, of Turkish stock, could not have made any distinction between the truly autochthonous elements and the descendants of Arab immigrants.

Finally, in 219/834, groups of the Lakhm and Djudhām tribes rebelled in the Delta: they were easily dispersed, and no further mention is made of their rights. The Arabs re-appear, even frequently, in the history of Egypt: they remained organised in tribes, some of which retained their nomad habits. They were mobilised as reserve troops in times of crisis, for example at the time of the landing by the Crusaders at Damietta. Later governments were obliged periodically to exercise their authority against them, either to collect taxes, or to suppress banditry. In general, these interventions were bloody affairs, and were virtually punitive expeditions.

The most significant events were set in train by the temporary migration, in the 5th/11th century, of the Banū Hīlāl and the Banū Sulaym before their destructive onslaught on North Africa. It should not be forgotten that a group of Bedouin from the Arabian Peninsula tried to resist the advance of French troops in Upper Egypt in 1799.

Recent censuses have been vague on the extreme: it is estimated that the Bedouin scattered among the deserts of Egypt number about 50,000.


(v) Expansion of the Arabs in North Africa

It is extremely difficult to enumerate the Arab elements which, from the year 270/679 onwards, entered North Africa. We are only accept with the usual reservations the first number of 20,000, representing the fighting men from the Hijāz, furnished by the tribes and grouped round their chiefs, reinforced by contingents taken from the army of Egypt. The first expeditions were nothing more than long-distance raids, without any intention of settling in the country. This ambition appears with ʿUqba b. Nāfī, who founded al-Kayrawān [q.v.] in 50/667. The death of this chief and the occupation of al-Kayrawān by the Berbers led to the despatch of fresh contingents. From then on, every serious failure on the part of the invaders, every Berber rising, every new phase in the arduous task of conquest, occasioned the arrival of reinforcements. Under the Umayyads, elements derived from the ʿgrānd, detached from the Syrian garrisons, and constituting regiments which already had an individual character, took the place of the fighting men recruited in Arabia. Under the ʿAbbasīds, the Khurāsān militia joined forces with the Syrians, or relieved them. All these elements, living in groups as in the East, were distributed among the towns of the conquered territory. As is well known, their haughtiness as conquerors, their demands and their lack of discipline were a source of the greatest embarrassment to the governors of Ifriqiya, and the Aghlabid amirs, obliged to subdue them with great bloodshed, found them employment in Sicily.

Along with the fighting men intended to effect the first occupation of the country, the Arab world sent civilian elements. Apart from the governors and their entourage, kinmen and clients, there were men of a religious character, who, from the time of the caliphate of ʿUmār b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (99-101/717-20), undertook the methodical conversion of the Berbers. There were also merchants hoping to prosper in fresh territory reputedly rich in resources.

These Arab immigrants constituted exclusively urban elements. The towns, where they formed a considerable proportion of the population, were centres of arabisation. By virtue of the prestige enjoyed by the conquerors, through the education given in the Kūrānic schools and the mosques, and through economic relations and mutual contact in
the markets, the Arabic language spread simultaneously with Islam in the cities and their environs. Al-Kayrawān played an important part in this process, but the other garrisons of Ifrikiya and its western marches were also able to spread their influence over a limited area.

The Arab immigration of which the Hilālī invasion was the first phase was very different from the Muslim conquest and its consequences, both as regards those who took part in it and their role in the history of Barbary. The initial cause of this disaster was as follows:—in the middle of the 8th/12th century, the amir al-Mu'izz of the Banū Zirī [see ZIRIDS] branch of the Ṣanḥādja, which governed Ifrikiya in the name of the Fātimid caliph al-Muḥtaṣir, broke with his suzerain in Cairo, and the latter, on the advice of his minister al-Yazīdī, despatched against the rebel kingdom the Arab nomads then encamped east of the Nile, recognising in advance their title to any towns and rural districts which they could conquer.

The Banū Hilāl [see HILAL], who formed the first wave of this “westward movement” (taghrib), and also the Banū Sulaym, who came on the scene later, were connected through their common ancestor Manṣūr b. ʿAyāṣ with the powerful line of Muḍār. Both had previously dwelt in Naqlīd, and groups of the two families continued to live there. Brought late within the pale of Islam, they had migrated in considerable numbers to Upper Mesopotamia and the Syrian desert. Their independent nature revealed itself immediately after the death of the Prophet. The Umayyads, and the ʿAbbāsids even more, had to punish their plundering activities conducted in particular at the expense of Meccan pilgrims. In the 8th/12th century they took part in the Carmathian revolt. The Fātimid caliph al-ʿAzīz crushed the movement (368/978) and forced the Arabs who had supported it to transfer themselves to Upper Egypt. It was from there that they set out to conquer Ifrikiya.

At the moment when their first bands, which could have numbered barely a million, reached the ṢirĪd kingdom of al-Kayrawān and caused its downfall, the most powerful of the Banū Hilāl were the Ruyyāh, who occupied the plains of Tunisia. Further east, the kingdom of the Ḥamūdīdīs (q.v.) and the Zāb (q.v.) received the Athbājdī. This Arab expansion, whose limits in the 6th/12th century are described by Idrīṣī, caused the exodus of Ḥamūdīdīs from the Kāfāʾa to al-Bijayya and drove the Zanātā nomads towards the plains of Orān. The arrival of fresh bands led subsequently to an extension of the territory and to alterations in the distribution of the Arabs. The most important of these waves of immigrants was, starting from the end of the 12th century, that of the Banū Sulaym, who came from Tripolitania. At first allied to the Armenian adventurer Karakūṯū, then to the Banū Ṣanʿāniya who attempted to revive Almoravid power, they placed themselves at the service of the Ḥafṣīdīs, the Almoravid governors of Ifrikiya, who assured the fortunes of this great tribe. Thus Ifrikiya, the first domain of the Banū Hilāl, remained, with the Sulaym, the region where the Arabs were the most numerous and most powerful. But no part of North Africa escaped what was considered by Ibn Khālidūn to be an irreparable disaster. The quest by new arrivals for lands as yet unoccupied and for sedentary populations to exploit, the repulse of the weak by the strong, the advance of certain tribes, such as the Maʾyīl of Southern Morocco, from the western boundaries of the desert, were the quasi-normal causes of their “westward movement”.

To these must be added the mass transfers effected by the Maghribī rulers within their own territories of Arab contingents on whom collaboration they rashly counted. For example the transfer in 583/1187 of the tribes of Ifrikiya by the Almohad al-Mansūr who, wishing to use them in Spain, granted them the sub-atlantic plains of Morocco which were then uninhabited. The whole economy of Barbary was overthrown by this expansion. With their North African territory, where they lived during the summer, these pastoral nomads combined the corresponding Saharan territories, where they migrated in autumn with their families and where they found new pasturages for their camels. At the two extremities of the new migration, they possessed a source of income: by right of protection they claimed taxes in kind from the people of the oases, cultivators of date-palms; on the sedentary population of the north they levied imposts which the rulers had assigned to them in the form of ḥālāt (q.v.), or as part of the tax (dīḥāya) for whose collection they were responsible.

Intimately associated with Berber life, these eastern Bedouin naturally played a large part in the propagation of the Arabic language, and it has been thought possible still to recognise in dialect characteristics which seem to mark the difference between the contributions of the great tribes, Hilāl, Sulaym, and Maʾyīl. Simultaneously, however, with arabisation of the Berbers, one must take into account the berberisation of the Arabs, the progressive tendency towards a sedentary form of existence, and the adoption of the way of life of the autochtones by groups of immigrants who had become irremediably impoverished.

(i) PRELIMINARY REMARKS

Although the Peninsula may not be the original cradle of the Arab people, they have lived there for thousands of years and regard it in a very special sense as their homeland. For students of Islam, Western Arabia occupies a unique position as the land in which the Prophet Muhammad was born, lived, and died. It was there that the inspiration of Allah descended upon the Prophet, and to this Holy Land come many thousands of Muslims every year from all parts of the Islamic world to make the pilgrimage to the Ka’ba, the House of Allah in Mecca (Makkah), and to visit the Prophet’s tomb in Medina (al-Madina al-Munawwara).

The Peninsula has the shape of a rough quadrilateral with a length of c. 2200 km. from north-west to south-east and a breadth of c. 1200 km. The symmetry of the quadrilateral is marred by the bulge of Oman (‘Umán) on the eastern side reaching out close to the Iranian coast. On the west, south, and east the Peninsula is clearly defined by the Red Sea (al-Bahr al-Abmar), the Gulf of Aden (Khal’dijī ʿAdan), the Arabian Sea (Bahr al-ʿArab), the Gulf of Oman, and the Persian Gulf (al-Khal’dijī al-Fārisī). In the north, the Arabs themselves have often disagreed as to where Arabia ends and Syria (in the broad sense) begins. A vast steppe unrolls northwards from the Great Nafud with no natural feature suitable as a limit for the Peninsula. For the purposes of this article the Peninsula is considered as extending only to the borders separating Saudi Arabia and Kuwayt from Jordan and ʿTrāk, even though these borders represent little more than artificial political concepts. This definition places the northernmost point of the Peninsula at ʿUnāzā, a low mesa in the desert farther north than either Jerusalem or ‘Ammān. From ʿUnāzā the borders between Saudi Arabia and Jordan, not yet fully agreed upon, reach the sea near the head of the Gulf of al-ʿAḵaba, while the borders between Saudi Arabia and Kuwayt on the one hand and ʿTrāk on the other run to the head of the Persian Gulf south of al-ʿAṣṣara. Along these eastern borders lie two small neutral zones, in one of which Saudi Arabia and ‘Trāk and in the other Saudi Arabia and Kuwayt share undivided half interests.

It is impossible to make a reasonably reliable estimate of the size of Arabia’s population. All figures found in reference works are highly suspect, as none is based on proper statistics or sufficient familiarity with the whole Peninsula. In view of the extensive areas inhabited solely by scattered nomads and the relatively light density of population in most of the settled areas, one may doubt whether the total approaches 10,000,000, and it may well fall several millions short of this figure. The most densely populated country is the Yaman (al-Yaman). In Saudi Arabia the main concentrations are in a few cities of al-Ḥijjāz, the well watered mountains and plains of Ṭasīr and its Tihāma, some of the valleys of Najd, and the eastern oases of al-Ḥasā and al-ʿAtāf. Ḥaḍramawt and Oman both contain many towns and Bedouin tribes.

Present state of knowledge. The inhabitants of Arabia have naturally always known much about the land, but each man’s knowledge is restricted to a certain region, being detailed and particularistic rather than general and comprehensive. No single work in Arabic gives a full and accurate description of Arabia. The best volume in the language is still ʿIṣṭāṭ Diʿāzrat al-ʿArab by al-Hamdānī (d. 334/945-46), which, though rich in information, fails to provide a coherent panoramic view of the whole Peninsula. The serious scientific exploration of Arabia began with Carsten Niebuhr and the Danish expedition of 1762. While travellers of different nationalities pressed on with the penetration of the interior during the 19th century, British officers of the Indian Government undertook technical surveys of the surrounding seas and stretches of the coast. Technical surveying in the interior had to wait for the 20th century, when it began with an investigation of the southern border of the Yaman and preliminary studies for the Ḥijjāz Railway. In recent years oil companies have surveyed large parts of Eastern Arabia, using the highly refined methods of modern geological and geophysical exploration, besides engaging in extensive reconnaissance in other regions.

By 1935/1955 travellers—both Western and Arab—had visited virtually all of the remoter places, so that none of the old major mysteries regarding the surface of the land had been left unsolved. Travellers’ reports, however, are often incomplete and sometimes inaccurate, and much remains to be done in checking and correlating those now available. A number of important reports remain unpublished or buried in archives.

Recent years have also seen the introduction of aerial photography as an indispensable procedure in mapmaking. By 1954 a good part of the Peninsula had been photographed for cartographic purposes, and some of the results had already been transferred to maps. Aerial photographs, however, are of maximum value only if supported by ground control, i.e., the establishment of fixed points on the ground whose relationship to the photographs is precisely determined. For much of Arabia such control is still lacking.

The general outlines and main features of the map of Arabia have now been delineated with a fair degree—and in a few instances a high degree—of reliability, but years of study lie ahead before all the details can be filled in. Surveys done in the earlier days, such as those of the Persian Gulf, are now being redone in the interests of greater thoroughness and accuracy. Errors of the past, many of which have become established on maps, are being corrected, but the process is long drawn out.

Arabian governments are now making available information about their countries in a growing body of official publications, and modern Arab authors keep producing books and articles dealing with different parts of the Peninsula. Interest in such diverse things as oil and South Arabian antiquities has called forth a flood of material by Western authors, part of which is sound but much of which is superficial, misleading, or flagrantly contradictory to fact. Arabic sources likewise are often unreliable, so that the student of Arabia must constantly be on the lookout for pitfalls along his path.

(ii) PHYSICAL STRUCTURE

AND PRINCIPAL GEOGRAPHICAL FEATURES

Lying between Asia and Africa, Arabia is of such size and individuality of character as almost to justify its classification as a sub-continent. Usually considered an appendage of Asia, it also joins Africa through Sinai, which, though politically a part of Egypt, is closer to Arabia in both physical environment and the nature of its human life. Before the development of rift valleys provided a bed for the Red Sea, Western Arabia formed a part of the African land mass, and the southern half of Western Arabia still has a greater affinity in many ways with
Somalia-Ethiopia than with Northern Arabia or the rest of Asia. Northern Arabia, on the other hand, merges imperceptibly with Arab Asia through the Syrian steppe, and the Oman bulge contains a mountainous area closely resembling the ranges of Iran.

Geomorphologically the Peninsula consists of two main provinces: the ancient Arabian Shield of igneous and metamorphic rocks in the west, and the more recent sedimentary areas sloping away from the Shield to the north-east, east, and south-east into the vast basin consisting of Mesopotamia, the Persian Gulf, and the eastern part of al-Rub' al-Khali. The Arabian Shield is actually only the eastern part of the Arabian-Nubian Shield, an immense mass of basement rocks—greenstones, schists, granite, gneiss, &c.—which have thrust upwards to form bare and forbidding mountains, with the whole mass split into two by the rift valleys running southwards from the Dead Sea and along the course of the Red Sea. The older igneous rocks of the Arabian part represent primarily plutonic activity of the more remote past, while more recent volcanoes have blanketed the surrounding ground with fields of lava (harrān, pl. hāsrān) often imposing in extent. Regions of igneous and metamorphic rocks may be rich in minerals and precious stones, but only insignificant quantities of these have so far been found in Arabia.

To the north and south the eastern limit of the Arabian Shield lies not far inland from the Red Sea. Between these two extremities the limit sweeps around in a rough bulge reaching as far east as the vicinity of al-Dawādīmi, less than 200 km. west of the western wall of Tuwayq. The geomorphologically confused mountains of the Yaman, though composed of similar rocks, are physiographically highly different from the remainder of the Shield. Volcanic areas occur in the Yaman as well as in the mountains fringing the southern coast and those of the Oman bulge.

Valleys drop sharply westwards to the coast plain of Tihamā from the high mountains paralleling the Red Sea. The gentler eastward slope to the Persian Gulf is interrupted by cuestas in Najd such as Tuwayq and al-'Aramā, whose steep escarpments face westwards and whose backs then resume the downward trend. From the highlands of Hadramawt and Zufar the slope southwards to the Gulf of Aden and the Arabian Sea is short, while a longer slope runs northwards to al-Rub' al-Khali. The Oman bulge has a short descent north-eastwards to the Gulf of Oman and a much longer descent south-westwards to the same sand sea, though the mountains here, unlike those elsewhere near the coast, are steep on both sides, forming a hogback range.

The sedimentary province consists predominantly of limestone, along with an abundance of sandstone and shale. These rocks are products of sediments left behind by seas that in the distant past spread out as far west as the Shield. The sedimentary deposits reach a depth of over several kilometers in the vicinity of the Persian Gulf. Organic matter from the plants and animals that lived in the old seas is the source of the enormous accumulations of petroleum discovered in Eastern Arabia during the 20th century.

Islands. The islands, islets, and coral reefs (sha'bān, pl. sha'bān) off the Arabian coast increase in number as one proceeds southwards down the Red Sea. The Farasān Bank parallels the coast for nearly 500 km., its southern part including the Farasān (q.v.) Archipelago, where the largest islands on the eastern side of the Red Sea are found. Kamarān (q.v.) Island lies close to the coast of the Yaman. West of Kamarān the volcanic peak of Diabal al-Tayr in the fairway of the sea is reported to have been in eruption as late as the early 19th century. Also in the fairway is al-Zukur, the highest island in the Red Sea (nearly 700 m.). The island of Perim (q.v.) (Mayyūn) in the straits of Bab al-Mandab, the entrance to the Red Sea, stands nearer Arabia than Africa.

The island of Sukūṭrā (q.v.), c. 110 km. long and nearly 400 km. distant from the mainland on the southern side of the entrance to the Gulf of Aden, must for both political and ethnographic reasons be regarded as belonging to the Peninsula. The Kuria Muria Islands stand off the mainland in a large bay east of Ra's Nāw. The Arabic name for the group, Khūrīyā Mūrib (q.v.), is seldom used today, the more familiar names being al-Hallānīyya, al-Hāsikīyya, and al-Sawdā', which belong to individual islands. Separated from Oman by a narrow channel is Maṭrā, the only island of considerable size lying along the whole southern coast. The Arabian side of the Gulf of Oman is also almost entirely devoid of islands worthy of the name; one encounters only rocky islets standing alone, such as al-Fahl north-west of Muscat, or in clusters, such as al-Daymānīyyat a little farther towards the west.

The mountains of Oman end abruptly at the Strait of Hormuz, the entrance to the Persian Gulf, and some of the peaks detached from the main range form inospital islands, the northern tip of one of which is Ra's Musandam. Abu Mina, an island in the Persian Gulf north-west of the port of al-Shārika, has deposits of iron oxide which are worked commercially. Close to the southernmost shore of the Gulf are a number of sandy islands, the largest of which is Mūkayyāhī (shown on most charts as Aūbāl al-Ayyād, the name of its northern part). In the western half of the embayment between the Trucial Coast and the Kātār Peninsula are islands presumed to be salt domes rising above the sea, among which are Šr Banī Yās (q.v.), Dālamā, Zarakkuh, Dās, and Ḥālīl. The main island of Bahrain (al-Bahrayn) has a scattering of attendant islets and a dependency of fair size, Hawār, which almost touches Kātar. Tarāt, Aūbā 'All, and other islands hug the coast of Saudi Arabia, while al-'Arabiyya (q.v.) and al-Fārisiyā (q.v.) lie out near the middle of the Gulf.

The Great Pearl Banks (hayr, pl. hayardā) stretch along nearly the entire length of the Arabian side of the Persian Gulf, with the richer banks in the central portion. The term gha'b is not used for a reef in this Gulf, its place being taken by jafāt (pl. jafātāt), nadjūm, and bu'ā. A hidd (pl. huddāt) is a sand bank, a bāta (pl. bātāt) is a low sandy islet which may be covered at high tide, and a kassār is a projecting rock. Rukkā is the common word for a shoal, while an area of deep water—15 fathoms (bāt, pl. abudd or bādān, the Arab fathom being a little less than the English fathom of 6 feet) or more—is called a gushāba (pl. gushābā). The Persian Gulf is a shallow sea, with few depths greater than 90 m., in contrast to the Red Sea, the depth of which in places is in excess of 2,000 m.

Bays and Coasts. The coasts of the Peninsula on the three sides facing the sea are relatively unmarked by major bendings or indentations; no other great land mass on the surface of the globe provides such a paucity of shelter for ships. The Red Sea has few bays on the Arabian side, but many narrow inlets of the type called garm, which penetrate
some distance inland and then broaden out into lagoons in which small sailing vessels can anchor. The one good natural harbour along the southern coast is Aden. Between Ra’s Fartak and Ra’s al-Hadd there are four large bays, here called qubbah (cf. the use of this term in the Persian Gulf mentioned above), but all are so open to the sea that they give no protection. Muscat on the Gulf of Oman offers a small-encircled bay large enough for steamers of medium size. Excellent harbours exist in the cliff-walled inlets in the vicinity of Musandam, but they are so hot and inaccessible from the interior that good use has never been made of them. The Persian Gulf has a proportionally larger number of bays, here called dawha, but their waters are almost without exception extremely shallow. Inlets in the Arabian shores of the Persian Gulf go by the name of akwar, a term also used here for a submarine valley. One of the best examples of these inlets is Khawr al-Udayd, which pierces the coast on the eastern side of the base of the Katar Peninsula.

Mountains, Plateaux, and Plains. The chain or chains of mountains paralleling the coast of the Gulf of al-Akbara and the Red Sea are known collectively as al-Sarat [q.v.], though use of this name is not particularly widespread. In many places a lowland range lies close to the coast, and the higher range is separated from it by a plateau from a higher range farther inland. The average height of al-Sarat is considerably below 2,000 m. Between the region of Madyan and Mecca only the famous crags of Radwâ [q.v.] west of Medina and a few other mountains reach noteworthy heights. Southeast of Mecca several peaks go up to over 2,500 m., and thence the chain rises to its greatest heights in certain parts of the Arabian Shield, near its eastern edge. (Hâdîr Shusayb west of Shantɔ3, c. 3,760 m.). The more precipitous western slopes are generally the higher, but many bold features are also met with along the inner eastern slopes. The range of Ḥaḍm east of Mecca, the historic boundary between al-Hijaz and Nadjd, appears to have lost this distinction in the popular mind, though the dividing line is considered to be southern Al-Aṣîr and northern Najd. Al-Sarat passes across al-Sarat, called al-akaba in Al-Aṣîr and nabat in the Yemen, are few and far between, and are usually difficult of transit. Notable gaps in the chain are those leading through to Medina and Mecca.

Interspersed among the mountains and occurring frequently along their eastern slopes are plateaux, among the most fertile of which are those in Al Aṣîr and those surrounding Šantɔ3 and Dhammar in the Yemen. The plateaux are often capped with a bed of lava, and in places the lava has spilled down the western slopes to reach the verge of the Red Sea.

The highlands of the Yemen present a steep face towards the south, the eastern stretch of which is Al-Kawr, called after the indigenous tribe of Al-Kawr al-Awaâlîk in the east. Northeast of Al-Kawr al-Awaâlîk is the highly dissected limestone plateau of Al-Djurjw which is split in twain by the eastward-trending channel of Wâdi Ḥadrâmade. The southern part of Al-Djurjw reaches heights of nearly 2,000 m., while the higher elevations of the northern part do not greatly exceed 1,000 m. The cliffs along the edge of Al-Djurjw are often awe-inspiring in their sheerness.

Farther east in the region of Zufâr are the mountains of the tribe of Al-Karâ with peaks well over 1,500 m. in height. The growth of trees and grasses on the range is so thick that the residents often call it the Black Mountain. North-eastwards of Ra’s Nawâ the mountains paralleling the coast begin to dwindle in size and number, and the coast from Ra’s Šawkîma to Ra’s al-Hadd has generally lowlying country behind it.

Mountains reappear again overlooking the Arabian shore of the Gulf of Oman, along which the range of Al-Hadjjar runs from Ra’s al-Hadd to Ra’s Musandam. The towering peaks of Al-Hadjjar are in the central portion, in the vicinity of Dîjbal al-Akhâdar, the highest exceeding 3,000 m. by a bare margin. Northwest of Dîjbal al-Akhâdar the mountains called Al-Kawr form a part of the main range, while Dîjbal Haft almost seems to form a hogbacked ridge in the open country west of the northern half of the range.

In the interior the range of Al-Tûbayy lies in the borderland between Jordan and Saudi Arabia. Just south of the Great Najfûd the parallel ranges of Al Adja [q.v.] and Salmâ are together known as Dîjbal Shammâr. The hills of Al-Nîr lie in the central bulge of the Arabian Shield, near its eastern edge.

East of the Shield a series of roughly parallel cuestas curve around from north to south, following the contour of the crystalline bulge. The most striking of these is Tûwayy [q.v.], the backbone of Najfûd, with a length of c. 1,000 km. from Khajîm Dîjra to Khajîm Musâtir, where the sands of Al-Rubûl al-Khâlî encompass its southern end. Just east of the sands of Al-Dahnâ is the low rocky plateau of Al-Šummân (classical Al-Šammân [q.v.]).

Mesas, buttes, and ridges often rise singly or in groups above the plateaus and plains. The Bedouins use the term djabal for rocky hillocks as well as massive mountains, and other terms in common use are dîl (pl. dîlah or dîlûn, a general synonym for djabal, not necessarily a rib-shaped hill), hazm (usually lower than a djabal), aabrâ (pl. burbâm, whence the name of the great oil field of Kuwayt, al-Burûkân), and burkâ (pl. burk), the last two being applied to hills whose sides are mottled with patches of sand. The promontories jutting out from the inland escarpments are called shusmun (pl. shusmûm), the word for nose.

Within the northern border of Arabia lies the southernmost portion of Al-Hamâd, a stony plain stretching on northwards into the steppe, and south-east thereof is Al-Hadjjara, another stony plain. Among the major hâdâbâ—plains with a mantle of gravel—are Al-Dibdiba in the north-eastern corner of the Peninsula and Abu Bahr and Raydû south of the southern end of Al-Dahnâ. The plain of Al-Dijlada south-west of Raydû is completely ringed about by the sands of Al-Rubûl al-Khâlî. Other plains are found along the southern and eastern edges of Al-Rubûl al-Khâlî, all sloping towards the basin occupied by the sands.

The coast plains in the west and south are confined within a fairly narrow corridor nearly everywhere by the mountains crowding down towards the sea. Thîhama [q.v.], the general name for the coast plain along the Red Sea, is sometimes subdivided into Thîhâmât al-Hîjîîâr, Thîhâmât Al-Aṣîr, and Thîhâmât Al-Yaman. On the Gulf of Oman no more than faint traces of plains exist between Ra’s al-Hadd and Muscat, but between Muscat and Shînâq the plain begins to broaden out into Al-Bâînîa [q.v.], one of the great date-producing districts of Arabia. Salt pans are particularly common along the southern shore of the Persian Gulf, and much of the low ground in this region is covered with sand.

Sandy Deserts. Dunes may be star-shaped, dome-shaped, or crescent-shaped (the crescentic or
barchane dune = mufrawwi, pl. mabdwi). Dunes bare of vegetation are called *ucus (sing. *uruk, pl. *uruk* or more complex arrangements underlying which an orderly pattern can often be discerned. Wide expanses of ground are covered with relatively thin sheets of drift sand. Barchane dunes occur in sizes ranging from c. 1 m. to c. 200 m. in height, and the largest are several km. or more in length. Almost all of the dunes consist of pure sand, with no core of rock or other substances. The colour and composition of the sand itself vary from place to place, with the predominant colour in the interior approaching red.

A sandy area is generally called a *nafūd* (pl. pauc. *nafūd*, pl. abund. *mfäd*) in the north and a *ramla* (pl. *rimäf*) in the south. The term *irk* may be applied to a whole area containing a number of *urarh*, e.g., *Irk* al-Mañhūr embraces seven major veils. As frequently happens with the Arabs, these common nouns are transformed into proper names applied to the most noteworthy examples of their categories: the northern desert known to Westerners as the Great Nafūd is called by the Arabs simply al-Nafūd, the southern desert known to Westerners as al-Rub₆ al-Khāli is ordinarily referred to simply as al-Ramla, while al-Urayk is a sandy area south of Kātar.

Almost all of the principal sandy deserts lie in the sedimentary province, where they curve around the central bulge of the crystalline Shield in the same fashion as the coasts, along the western bases of which many of them lie. The two largest are the Great Nafūd [q.v.], with an area estimated at c. 70,000 km², and al-Rub₆ al-Khāli [q.v.], with an area estimated at over 500,000 km², making the latter the largest continuous body of sand in the world. These two are connected by the long thin arc of al-Dahna₃ [q.v.] lying east of Ṭuwayk and al-'Arama. A similar arc runs west of Ṭuwayk between the two main sandy deserts, but its continuity is broken in several places. This lesser arc begins with *Irk* al-Manhūr, which leaves the Great Nafūd south of the point of departure of al-Dahna₃ and merges into three parallel fingers of sand, which from east to west are Nafūd al-Ṭuwayrat, Nafūd al-Sirr, and al-Šukayyikā. The southern extension of al-Ṭuwayrat is named Nafūd al-Balidin after the towns of the district of al-Wasm lining its southwestern edge. Almost connected with al-Sirr is Nafūd Kunayfīdha, the south-eastern end of which nestles under the western wall of Ṭuwayk. South of Kunayfīdha occurs a major interruption in the arc, after which the sands reappear in *Irk* al-Dabī, which ends north of Wādaʾ al-Dawāṣir. The principal direction in which the sands migrate is southwards; in other words, they are slowly but steadily forsaking the Great Nafūd and working their way along the two arcs towards al-Rub₆ al-Khāli.

Although on the map al-Rub₆ al-Khāli appears to have two long arms extending northwards, the western of these, al-Dalāfīra, is regarded by the Arabs as constituting a separate desert cut off from al-Rub₆ al-Khāli by the low ground of al-Djawb (Diwāb Yabrīn). The eastern of the two arms, also regarded as a separate region, penetrates deep into the hinterland of the Trucial Coast.

Ramlat al-Sab₄atayn south of the south-western corner of al-Rub₆ al-Khāli lies outside the system just described. Perhaps the largest accumulation of sand on the Arabian Shield is *Irk* Subay in the southern part of the central bulge.

Various geographical features associated with drainage and water resources are discussed in the following section.

(iii) CLIMATE, DRAINAGE, AND WATER RESOURCES

The Tropic of Cancer bisects Arabia, passing between Medina and Mecca, between the districts of al-Khāṣr and al-Afūd, and between Muscat and Raʾs al-Hadd, so that most of the land enjoys a generally temperate climate. Even in the south, where the tip of the Peninsula approaches 12° N. lat., much of the country is sufficiently elevated to avoid the rigours of tropical heat. Only the lowlands along parts of the Red Sea, the Gulf of Aden, and the Arabian Sea have a semitropical rather than a temperate environment.

Meteorological records, though improved in recent years, are still too scanty to provide a completely detailed picture of Arabian weather. The summer heat (ḥayās) is intense throughout the Peninsula, reaching over 50° C. in the hottest places. The dryness of much of the interior makes the heat tolerable there, but along the coasts and in some of the southern highlands the humidity in summer is high and debilitating. Fogs and dews are common in the humid regions, but over Inner Arabia the sun shines the year round, obscured only by an occasional sandstorm or even rarer shower. Although not the happiest on earth, the Arabian climate has often been damned more violently than it deserves. Many days in fall and spring are fresh or mild. The winters are invigoratingly cool, with bitter cold occurring only at the higher altitudes. In the desert are still too scanty to provide a completely detailed picture of Arabian weather. The summer heat (ḥayās) is intense throughout the Peninsula, reaching over 50° C. in the hottest places. The dryness of much of the interior makes the heat tolerable there, but along the coasts and in some of the southern highlands the humidity in summer is high and debilitating. Fogs and dews are common in the humid regions, but over Inner Arabia the sun shines the year round, obscured only by an occasional sandstorm or even rarer shower. Although not the happiest on earth, the Arabian climate has often been damned more violently than it deserves. Many days in fall and spring are fresh or mild. The winters are invigoratingly cool, with bitter cold occurring only at the higher altitudes. In the desert are
their alluvial fans on the coast plains. In the dry zone rainwater from the higher areas occasionally comes down in spate through the stream channels (\textit{wadd}, pl. \textit{wid\textacute{y}n}, or \textit{\textasciitilde{g}h\textacute{a}b}, pl. \textit{\textasciitilde{g}h\textacute{a}b\textasciitilde{h}}), which otherwise contain only a few pools or none at all. These flash floods (\textit{say\textacute{l}}, pl. \textit{\textasciitilde{s}u\textasciitilde{y}ul}) sometimes cause great damage, and much of their precious water may flow away unused. Other floods come in sheets over flat surfaces such as gravel plains or the fans at channel mouths. Part of the water that seeps underground is recovered by man through wells and springs.

Although the courses of some valleys can be traced for considerable distances, bodies of sand lying athwart them in places tend to prevent through drainage. A characteristic feature of the Arabian drainage system is the local enclosed basin, varying in size from very large to very small. Wādī al-Sīrān is not a true wādī but a depression c. 300 km. long and 50–70 km. broad into which many wādīs on both sides empty their \textit{say\textacute{l}s}. Types of smaller basins are the \textit{kh\textacute{b}ara\textasciitilde{t}}, a hollow with an impervious bottom holding water for a while after rain, and the \textit{ray\textasciitilde{da}} (called \textit{\textasciitilde{ray\textasciitilde{d}}a} in the north), whose bottom does not hold water, so that wild vegetation may be fairly abundant there. Another type of basin is the salt pan or saline flat (\textit{\textasciitilde{s}ab\textasciitilde{k}ha\textasciitilde{h}}, \textit{\textasciitilde{s}ab\textasciitilde{k}ha\textasciitilde{h}}) which occurs with great frequency along the coasts and also in the interior, where it is fully enclosed.

The eastern tributaries of Wādī al-Ḥamād, which runs down to the Red Sea, originate in Ḥarrat Ḫaybar. A short distance farther east are the headwaters of Wādī al-Rumāh (al-Rumma in al-Ḥamādān), which through its extension al-Bāṭīn runs to the Persian Gulf basin in the vicinity of al-Ḥamrā, though the connecting link between al-Rumāh and al-Bāṭīn is choked with sands of al-Dāhnā. The small area in Ḥarrat Ḫaybar between the sources of al-Ḥamrā and those of al-Rumāh is the one place in the whole Peninsula from which an easy slope to the seas on both sides can clearly be discerned.

Descending from the eastern slope of al-Sārāt, the three large valleys of Ranya, Bīḍha (\textit{\textasciitilde{q}ar\textasciitilde{r}}), and Tālūhīf converge on the upper reaches of Wādī al-Ḍawāsir (\textit{\textasciitilde{q}ar\textasciitilde{r}}), which receives their waters in times of exceptional floods only to lose them again as it fans out against the sands of al-Rūb‘al-Khāli after piercing through the wādān in al-Ḥamādān and Nādirān (\textit{\textasciitilde{q}ar\textasciitilde{r}}) are valleys coursing eastwards to the sands which lie south of the southern end of Ṭuwayq. From the highlands of the Ṭuwayq the valley of al-Khārid (\textit{\textasciitilde{q}ar\textasciitilde{r}}) flows down into the basin of al-Ḍiawīl (\textit{\textasciitilde{q}ar\textasciitilde{r}}) (Ḍiawīl Ibd Nāṣir), the home of the ancient Mineans.

The mountains of the Ṭuwayq send water southwards towards the coast in the vicinity of Abyān through Tubān, Bānā, and other valleys. Water from Bānā is used for an extensive development of agriculture at Abyān. The southern outliers of al-Ḍiawīl give rise to Wādī Mayfa‘ā and Wādī Ḥaḍjar. Ḥaḍjar is the one truly perennial river in Arabia, but its total length probably does not exceed 100 km. Its water, part of which comes from the hot springs of al-Ṣīdāra in the uplands, supports vegetation in the area of Mayfa‘ā at the river delta (not to be confused with Wādī Mayfa‘ā to the west).

Wādī Ḥaḍjamawi (\textit{\textasciitilde{q}ar\textasciitilde{r}}), the principal artery of a great drainage system, is fed by valleys coming from both the southern and the northern parts of al-Ḍiawīl, those from the south being far more thickly settled than those from the north. Just beyond the town of Tarīm the Valley of Ḥaḍjamawi assumes the name of al-Masla, which it bears for the remainder of its course to the sea.

Sānā‘il, one of the valleys flung out by the range of al-Ḥaḍjar towards the Gulf of Oman, provides passage for the main road from the coast to Inner Oman. The chief valleys of al-Bāṭīnah are named after the tribes inhabiting their banks, al-Ma‘āwil and others. Going up Wādī al-Ḍiawīl and Wādī al-Ḥaḍjar, one comes to passes leading over the mountains to the Trucial Coast.

In the region east of al-Dāhnā between al-Bāṭīn and al-Sāhba‘ the insufficiency of surface water has militated against the formation of true wādīs of any size. Wādī al-Miṣyāḥ northwest of al-Ḫaṭṭīf is a basin rather than a stream channel, deriving its name from the numerous wells and springs found within its confines. Other large basins are al-Fārūk south of Wādī al-Miṣyāḥ and al-Shāk southwest of the city of Kuways.

In the far north a series of valleys known as al-Widāyān (Widāyān ‘Anaza) runs north-eastwards towards the Euphrates; among these are Tubāl, ‘Ar‘ār, and al-Khurr. In Najd a number of valleys between al-Rumah and Wādī al-Dawāsir cut through Ṭuwayq; al-Ṭā‘ik (\textit{\textasciitilde{q}ar\textasciitilde{r}}) is the northernmost of these. Wādī Ḥanifa (\textit{\textasciitilde{q}ar\textasciitilde{r}}), rising on the crest of Ṭuwayq rather than making a gap in the escarpment, twists down to the basin of al-Khārid where several important valleys empty into al-Sāhba‘ (\textit{\textasciitilde{q}ar\textasciitilde{r}}), the course of which can be traced across al-Dāhnā and al-Dīfūra into the Persian Gulf basin. The valley of Birk cleaves through the wall of Ṭuwayq via a picturesque gorge and turns northwards under the name of al-Ṣā‘ikīm to follow a course towards al-Sāhba‘.

Arabia contains no large permanent lakes. Deep pools occur in places, with the most unusual ones being those in the districts of al-Khārid and al-Ḩalaj. In oases such as al-Ḫaṣā‘ big ponds may be formed by the run-off from irrigation. Dry lakes in the north may be filled with water over an area of 10 or more km$^2$ after a rain.

The thousands of wells (\textit{bi‘r}, pron. \textit{bir}, pl. \textit{abydār}, or \textit{kalib}, pl. \textit{kulbān}) in the desert, some of them even in the central portions of al-Rūb‘al-Khāli, make possible the nomadic life of the Bedouins. The deepest is reported to descend c. 170 m. into the earth, and depths in excess of 70 m. are not unusual. The wells may be steyned or unsteyned; they may be frequently visited or seldom seen by man. Other watering places are spots in the sand or in valley bottoms where exiguous water is secured by digging down a meter or more. Blowing sand rapidly fills these shallow holes, so that finding them may tax even the navigational skill of Bedouins bred in the wild. The water in some of the desert wells is too salty for humans (such a well is called a \textit{khuwār}, pl. \textit{khuwān}), but camels drink it and furnish milk to sustain their masters.

Among most of the flowing springs (\textit{‘ayn}, pl. \textit{‘aydān}) oasis settlements or towns have grown up. Other communities draw their water only from dug wells, while sometimes tanks and cisterns are used to catch rainwaters. The larger oases consist of several or more villages or towns grouped close together, each with its own belt of date groves. The oasis name may apply to the whole group, which may cover tens or hundreds of square kilometers, rather than to any single community within its confines, e.g., al-Ḫaṣā‘ with its chief towns al-Huflūf and al-Mubarraz, and Bīḍha with al-Rawshān and Nimrān.
Various methods of irrigation are used wherever there is sufficient water. Terracing is much practised in the south with water being led from enclosure to enclosure. In some regions an old system of underground aqueducts (faladi, pl. al-faladi) similar to the bandi can be found. In Iran this is common, while in others it is not known. In large oases such as al-Hasa and in Tihamah the rules governing the distribution of water for irrigation are elaborate and firmly fixed by custom. The building of dams, once an art in which the Arabs excelled, has been neglected in more recent times, but now, with a growing population and higher standards of life demanding an expansion of agriculture, it is being revived.

(iv) Political Divisions

Political divisions in Arabia are often ill defined. Few international boundaries have been agreed upon by the parties concerned, and none has been properly demarcated throughout its full length. A rapid survey of the main political divisions as they existed in 1374/1954-5 will furnish examples of the truth of these statements.

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia occupies the whole northern half of the Peninsula—with the exception of the small states of Kuwayt, Bahrayn, and Kaṭar, and parts of Oman—and a good share of the southern half as well. Stretching from the Red Sea to the Persian Gulf, it incorporates the large regions of al-Hiqāya (q.v.), Asir (q.v.), and Nadīd (q.v.), and also most if not all of al-Rubā’i al-Khali. Saudi Arabia and the Yemen agreed in 1354/1936 upon a boundary running from the Red Sea coast to a point short of al-Rubā’i al-Khali, but no serious attempt has since been made to extend the line southwards from this point over a gap between 100 and 200 km, in breadth. No land boundaries have been fixed between Saudi Arabia and any of the following states, all of which may be assumed to have territories abutting on the Kingdom: the Aden Protectorate, the Sultanate of Muscat, the Imamate of Oman, the Amirate of Abū Ḫābid, and the territories of the Imamate and the Sultanate; those of the Imam reach the crests of the main mountain range of al-Ḥaḍjar throughout much of its length, and a few of his governors (wāli) are established on the seaward slopes. The Imam, whose theocratic realm is a continuation of the Kharijite state founded in Oman c. 1336-37, has his capital at Masqat, and his two principal lieutenants reside at Tanūf in Inner Oman and al-Ḵabīl in the district of al-Sharkīya. Of all the major rulers in Arabia, the Imam, who maintains no formal diplomatic relations with any other power, is the most self-sufficient and the least known to the outside world. [See further ṬUMAH.]

The Trucial Coast (Sāhil al-Makhtūt) is the southern shore of the Persian Gulf running south-westwards and then westwards for an undefined distance towards Kaṭar. When the Arabs living there in the early 19th century were preying vigorously on shipping in the Gulf, the region was known as the Pirate Coast; after the British forcibly stopped the marauding and imposed a maritime truce on the rulers of the ports, it came to be called the Trucial Coast. The Trucial States, all of which are in special treaty relations with the British Government, are regarded as being under that government’s protection, though without having the formal status of protectorates. [See further BĀHAR FĀRIS.]

The Sultanate of Muscat claims a part of the oasis of al-Buraymī, but Saudi Arabia challenges this claim on the basis of its own connexions with the place. Saudi Arabia likewise challenges the claim of the Trucial State Abū Ḫābid to al-Dīwā’ī, but Saudi Arabia claims an outlet to the Persian Gulf on the coast between Abū Ḫābid and Kaṭar, but the British Government, which by treaty controls the foreign relations of these two states, disputes this claim. In 1373/1954 the two parties agreed to submit the dispute to arbitration.

The Kaṭar (q.v.) Peninsula, jutting northwards into the Persian Gulf about halfway between its mouth and its head, is the seat of an Amirate under the rule of Al Ġībānī, a dynasty of recent origin, with its capital in the port of al-Dāwḥa. The boundary
between the Amirate and Saudi Arabia in the vicinity of the base of the peninsula has not been agreed upon, and the Amir of Bahrayn claims a piece of territory around al-Zubara in the north-western part of the peninsula.

The archipelago of Bahrayn [q.v.] between Kaťar and the Saudi Arabian mainland constitutes an Amirate under the rule of Āl Khalifa, a family from Nadjd which established itself in the islands in 1297/1293 and has ruled there ever since, with its capital in the port of al-Manama on the main island. British interests in the Persian Gulf come under the supervision of a Political Resident with headquarters in al-Manama. Also subject to his administration are the Kuria Muria islands, which belong to Great Britain.

On the Arabian mainland at the head of the Persian Gulf is the small roughly triangular Amirate of Kuwait, partially separated from Saudi Arabia by a neutral zone and bounded on the north and west by Irāk. Āl Śabḥā, a family related to Āl Khalifa of Bahrayn, has ruled Kuwait for over two centuries [see Kuwayt].

Kaťar, Bahrayn, and Kuwait have all granted the British Government by treaty the right to conduct their foreign affairs and have agreed not to enter into relations with other powers without the consent of that government. Questions dealing with water boundaries and the appurtenance of a number of islands in the Persian Gulf remain to be settled between Bahrayn and Kuwait on one hand and Saudi Arabia on the other.

(v) Flora and Fauna

Throughout most of the Peninsula a sharp contrast exists between the utilised stretches of desert and the green patches of cultivation in the oases. In places, particularly along the margins of the Peninsula where rain falls more frequently or where stream channels bring sufficient water down from the highlands, cultivation is more widespread, sometimes climbing the heights in skilfully built terraces and sometimes carpeting the narrow plains between the mountains and the sea. Arabia, however, boasts no endless prairies or pampas tamed by the plough, no endless prairies or pampas tamed by the plough, and sometimes going for months without resort to water—wells—the forage supports the camels, whose milk supports their masters. The most sought after plants for forage are the annuals (wābb, pron. ‘ārāf)—grassess, wild flowers, and herbs which spring up green after a rain, especially in the rabi', the season of plenty following the first and best rains (masīm). The sands provide favorable soil for the growth of such annuals and so are reckoned by the nomads as among the most attractive types of desert terrain. Perennial shrubs and bushes (ḥādir) eaten by camels are nasī, ḥāddā, and sabāt (pron. sabāt), as well as others too numerous to mention. From time to time camels hanker after bushes of the category called hamā, a prime source of the salt needed by their system. Among the many plants falling in this category are ḍarah, ṭimāth, ‘arād, ushrum, sāmā, ḍhub, ḍhādā, and bādā (not bād as in classical Arabic). Dry bushes are also essential to the Bedouins for firewood (ḥālab), among the best for this purpose being ‘āthew (ghādā), and rīm. Burning with a fragrant scent, these woods help to make the ceremony of brewing coffee for a guest at the open door of the tent one of the chief pleasures of life. The Bedouin likes truffles (fāk) and eats other desert plants, though by preference and philosophy there is little of the vegetarian in his being. Twigs of the arakh (pron. ṭāk) are in common use as a toothbrush (miswāh), and senna (sanā) is chewed as a purgative.

Vegetation would be more abundant in the deserts were it not for the migrating dunes, some of which move 20 m. in a year. In many places, however, bushes have taken root and fixed the sand, a hummock of which is built up around each bush. An area of such hummocks may extend for many kilometers, making very rough country known as 'afḍa. Less difficult types of sandy terrain with vegetation are called marbakh or dīkākā (pl. dīkāk, cf. class.…
Among animals the camel occupies a place analogous to that of the date palm among plants. The vast majority of Bedouins in Arabia depend on the camel above all other material possessions. The tribes which herd sheep rather than camels range over the steppes north of Arabia, close to the great rivers of Mesopotamia, and do not pass beyond the territory of Kuwait in their southward migrations. Milk is the camel's most precious product, but its meat, hide, and wool are also put to good use, its dung (dimm) is collected to be burned as fuel, and the tail of a dead camel makes a strong rope. Camels are sometimes harnessed for ploughing or drawing water from well, and the nomads sell part of their stock to secure money for clothing and other necessities. In time of great thirst a Bedouin may slaughter a camel to drink the water stored in its stomach (kareb) and the urine in its bladder (mibwad).

The general term for camels is ibl (q.v.) (often pronounced bii), with bawab being common in the south. A riding camel is a ghali (pl. djiyaya); the plural rikab is used for both those that are ridden and those that are not. The most highly desired camels are the thoroughbreds (aslahi), whose pedigree has been controlled and recorded over a number of generations. Many of these are from the breeds of Oman ('Umniiyya), among which the Bawatin of al-Batin are particularly well known, though these have the disadvantage of wanting to drink every day and of not being adapted to rough country. The camels of the south tend to be smaller and lighter in color than those raised in the mountains of the Yaman. Among the multitudinous names in the special vocabulary reserved for camels are ones descriptive of beasts which graze on certain plants, e.g. hawwarim (tem. sing. haraïm) from the karm bush, and awarik (tem. sing. arika) from the arak tree. Along with camels, most of the nomads keep sheep and goats (ghasam), though not in great flocks like those of the northern steppes. Sheep and goats are valued for their milk, fleece, and skins. Sheep are in demand as the pièce de résistance of the Arab banquet; even royalty can offer nothing more appetising than a young lamb (jali, pl. tulyan) basted in a pot with saam and served on a platter heaped high with rice. Ssam, clarified butter for cooking and greasing made from the milk of the ewe (mudda) or the goat (sana), is considered superior to djeblab from the milk of the she-camel (naba) or wadak from the fat of camels, sheep, or cattle. The Arabian horse, the ancestor of the Western thoroughbred and once the pride of the Peninsula, is a disappearing strain. Few Bedouins now own horses, and the export of stock to India, Egypt, and the West, formerly an important part of the economy, has dwindled away to insignificance. An occasional man of rank still maintains a stud, but even this is likely to be neglected. The speed of the motor car has captured the Arab's fancy; cars are now used in place of horses for hunting and as cavalry in some of the Arabian military forces.

Fine breeds of donkeys are raised, particularly the large white ones of Bahrain and al-Jahl. Donkeys are used for riding, drawing water, and as pack animals in the mountains, where their surefootedness makes them more reliable than camels. Cattle, which in most places are not numerous, are usually of the small humped variety, except in Sukutu, where the humpless kind is found.

The gazelle (ṣabbi), which in days past used to speed across the plains in great herds, is rapidly being thinned out by rifles in the hands of hunters hurtling by in trucks or cars. The three common types are the ri'm (pron. rim), the 'īri (cf. class. ya'yur), and the idm; the term ghail is used only for the newly born kid. The swift greyhound (salih) of the Bedouins can on rare occasions outrun even the gazelle. Of the oryx (uwaydayhi in the south, baḥar sækē in the north), a larger antelope, small numbers survive in the remoter parts of al-Rubā' al-Khattī but none or almost none is now left in the Great Nafūd. The ibex or mountain goat (wadi' or baddan) also seeks refuge in distant retreats on higher cliffs. Other large wild beasts are the hyena (dab'), jackal (nawir), wolf (dinhū, pl. dinhi), and cheetah (nilm). The lion has long been extinct in Arabia. In the mountains of the south baboons are common, often chattering along in troops; they are fond of raiding the millet fields. Smaller animals are the fox (qalb or ṣal' or ṣalū), the ratel (sarbān), class. sarbānī, the coy or hyrax (wabī), and the hare (arnab). The hedgehog (kunūfūd) with its short quills is much commoner than the unrelated long-quilled porcupine (nis). The jerboa (jarbā', cf. class. yarbū) hops about the desert on its long hind legs, resembling a miniature kangaroo; its cousin the djarwād (cf. class. djarwād), on the other hand, runs on all fours.

Snakes live in the sands and rocks, though seldom seen because of their nocturnal habits. Some are poisonous, including the horned viper, as well as a species of Arabian cobra (= Egyptian asp) and a large snake called the ya'aym (cf. class. aym), which the Bedouins say has the power of flying or leaping over a considerable distance. According to one report, perhaps the most deadly of all is the bathn, a small innocent-looking snake living in the sands. The striped seaweasakes of the Persian Gulf are poisonous, but they rarely if ever bite human beings. The two large lizards are the dab and the Arabian or desert monitor (wara), the first of which is eaten by all the Bedouins with relish, while the second is ordinarily shunned. Among the smaller lizards of the sands are the fierce-looking thayyit and the slippery sand-swimming skink (dammūsa).

The ostrich appears to have become extinct in Arabia during the past few years. Fragments of ostrich eggs are often found in the desert, and the word sa'am and other terms relating to ostriches occur frequently in place names. Trained falcons, often called simply ju'yar, are much used in the chase, their chief game among other birds being the lesser bustard (kuhabār). Species of the sand grouse such as the kalī and the ghalf are too fast for trained falcons, though they can be overtaken by the wild variety. The presence of wild falcons is attested to by the number of high places called mashuru = nesting-place of the falcon (kuhabār). Among the larger birds of the desert are the eagle, the vulture (nasr), and the owl, while the flamingo, the egret, and the pelican are found along the coasts. Smaller birds are commoner in the cultivated regions, among them being the cuckoo, the thrush, the swallow, the wagtail, the Syrian nightingale (baubul), and the hoopoe (khubud). The bifasciated lark (amm sālim) is ubiquitous in the desert, and the curlew (darad) nearly so. The pigeons of the Great Mosque in Mecca are famous throughout Islam.

The seas embracing the Peninsula are rich in fish, many of which, such as the king mackerel (kandad) and the grouper (kamar) of the Persian Gulf, are tasty and nutritious, but are not eaten as much by...
the Arabs as might be expected. Whales occasionally enter the Persian Gulf from the Indian Ocean. Both sharks and sardines are caught in great numbers off the southern coast, and the Persian Gulf produces delicious shrimps.

The most disastrous plague visited upon Arabia by living creatures is that of the locusts (djarad). The solitary mitigating aspect of a locust invasion is that a number of the invaders themselves are eaten by the people they afflict. Minor plagues by comparison are those of flies, camel ticks, and similar vermin, which are no worse in Arabia than in many other countries, even though the Bedouin may describe his life as all rami wa-kabni (sand and lace). A more agreeable insect, even in spite of its sting, is the bee, kept for its honey.


Works dealing primarily with the Hijáj: Ibrahim Rifát, Muḥír al-Ḥaramayn, Cairo 1934; Muḥ. al-Bání al-Batnámi, al-Ríhá al-Ḥidáisyíya, Cairo 1389; Kháy al-Dín al-Zikrít, Má Raʿay, Cairo 1932; Shaḵkí Arslán, al-Īrisámdát al-Lífí, Cairo 1930; idem, al-Kudús àl-Masárdí, al-Mádina, Damascus 1933; Muḥ. Usáyun Haykal, Fi Mansíl al-Wáky, Cairo 1936.

Works dealing with ʿAsir: Sharaf al-Barakáti, al-Ríhá al-Yamáníyya, Cairo 1930; Fuʿād Hamzá, Fi Bilád ʿAsír, Cairo 1951; Muḥ. ʿUmar Rafí, Ruḥub ʿAsír, Cairo 1937.


Travellers during the first quarter of the 20th century: H. Burckhardt, in ZGBer.,


(vi) Ethnography

In the study of the ethnography of the Peninsula an array of formidable problems remain unsolved. Who were the first inhabitants? Did they arise from the soil or did they come from abroad? If immigrants, what was their original home? What was the environment in which they lived—did it differ greatly from the Arabia of today? What intrusive elements intermingled with the earliest dwellers as time went by? Who were the first people to deserve the name of Arab, and where did they come from?

A measure of progress has been made in the attempt to elicit answers to these and similar questions, but far more work must be done before any of the more likely hypotheses can achieve the status of historical fact. Much more needs to be known about the geology and geography of the Peninsula, many promising archaeological sites need to be excavated, and an exhaustive investigation must be made of the various segments of the present population and their history. Moreover, the solution of Arabian problems may well depend to a considerable degree on the success of work relating to other areas. The problem of the identity of the Arabs, for example, dovetails inextricably into the broader problem of the identity of the Semites, the host of people speaking languages of the family to which Arabic belongs.

Space does not permit a review of the numerous hypotheses receiving serious consideration with respect to the early history of man in Arabia. Suffice it to say that available evidence indicates that the highlanders of the Yaman may form the least adulterated large group anywhere in the world now representing what anthropologists call the Mediterranean race. East of the territory of these highlanders a Veddooid strain is said to appear, particularly among the tribe of Mahra and other tribes in the south speaking their own Semitic languages, which are distinct from Arabic. This Veddooid strain and other data suggest an ancient connection with lands farther east, perhaps India or Ceylon. The Bedouin of the north, to most Westerners the classic Arab type, is also basically Mediterranean, though not quite as characteristically so as the mountaineer of the Yaman. All along the southern coasts and with less frequency in the interior, other strains occur, sometimes in easily recognisable forms and at other times lying so far below the surface as almost to defy identification.

The unraveling of these mysteries is the concern of the archaeologist and the anthropologist [cf. also
BADW]. More important for the student of Islam is the concept the Arab—especially the Muslim Arab—has had, and in many cases still has, of his ethnographical development, a concept so prevalent and tenaciously held that it merits the careful consideration of the anthropologist as well.

The seeds of the Arab's own concept go far back into his past; how far can not be determined because of the relative lateness of the sources available, though the basic particulars of the concept had developed before the appearance of Islam. In weighing data pertaining to pre-Islamic times, however, one must use caution, bearing in mind the fact that most of the existing sources were recorded not only long after the event but also subsequent to the introduction of Islam with its new ways of looking at many aspects of life, so that the complete genuineness of these data may often be open to question. Furthermore, various refinements of the Arab concept were still being made in the time of the Prophet, and other refinements came even later. Finally, Islam with its doctrine of the brotherhood of Muslims and the equality of Arab and non-Arab presented a fundamental challenge to the validity of the Arab concept as a guiding principle for the life of the community.

Arab genealogists have worked out an elaborate and ingenious system for the illustration and application of the Arab concept. Although this system has weaknesses—obscurities in the early stages, obvious gaps, unexplained riddles, inconsistencies, and contradictions—on the whole it hangs together well. Most important, its primary theses—the core of the Arab concept—have been by no means the exclusive property of scholars; they have belonged to the people, and their influence on the politics and social life of Arabia has been penetrating and pervasive.

According to the Arab concept, the Arabs constitute a race, not simply a community of people speaking the same language. This race is made up of innumerable men and women each descending in a direct line from one or the other of two ancestors, who probably were not closely related (the connection between these two eponyms is one of the major unresolved aspects of the system). Greater homogeneity could have been attained only by insisting on the descent of all Arabs from a single ancestor. That the Arabs recognized in their clear and undisputed tradition the divinity of their origin is a significant fact, and its effect on the history of the Arabs and Islam has been far-reaching.

The system of the genealogists begins with a nod at those whom the Arabs regarded as the original inhabitants of the Peninsula, tribes such as ʿAd, Ṭaymūd, Iram, Dūrhum, Tasm, and Dājdīs [qq.v.], all of which are believed to have disappeared before the beginning of Islam. Some of these, such as ʿAd and Iram, may well have been entirely legendary, while the historicity of others, such as Ṭaymūd, is not in doubt. Nothing certain is known about the identity of these tribes, though they are generally reckoned to have been Arabs, the Lost Arabs (al-ʿarab al-bāʾida). Sometimes they are even called the True Arabs (al-ʿarab al-ṣāliḥa), though this has little meaning, as in the Arab concept they are mainly a historical curiosity and an example of the terrible fate visited on people who heeded not their prophets. Although in later times there were men who claimed descent from these ancients or even tribes reputed to have sprung from them, the conclusion of the genealogist Ibn Hazm (d. 456/1064) was that "on the face of the earth there is no one whose descent from them is verified" (ed. Lévi-Provençal, 8).

Disposing of the autochthons in this fashion, the Arab concept concentrates on the two great ancestors—Kahtān and ʿAdnān [qq.v.]—and the two great divisions of the Arab race they fathered. As all men go back to Adam, these two must have been at least remotely related. The question of a closer relationship depends on whether Kahtān was a descendant of Ismāʿīl, who was recognized as an ancestor of ʿAdnān. One opinion commonly held opposes such a descent for Kahtān, whose presumed line from Noah's son Sem (Ṣām b. Nūḥ) is separately traced. Kahtān's offspring are generally denominated the True Arabs (al-ʿarab al-ṣāliḥa or al-ṣalāḥi) and ʿAdnān's the Arabised Arabs (al-ʿarab al-mutaʿariba or al-mustaʿriba), though the uncertainty of this classification is revealed by the existence of various other versions, one of which brackets the Lost Arabs with Kahtān as the True Arabs, while another reserves the title of True Arabs for the Lost Arabs, designating the people of Kahtān as mutaʿariba and those of ʿAdnān as mustaʿriba. In any event, Kahtān clearly comes out closer than ʿAdnān to genuine Arabness.

The descendents of Kahtān are the Southern Arabs, Kaḫbāṭ IL-yāmān, whose origin is traditionally assigned to the south-western corner of the Peninsula, while the descendents of ʿAdnān are the Northern Arabs, held to have made their first appearance in the northern half of the Peninsula. Whether this traditional division has a basis in truth is open to question. Certain data, for example, suggest that Sabaʾ came from the north into the Yaman, though in the scheme of the Arab genealogists Sabaʾ is the great-grandson of Kahtān and the father of Ḥimyar and Kaḥlān, the eponyms of the two main branches of the Southern Arabs.

The peoples of the ancient South Arabian states—Sabaeans, Minaeans [qq.v.], and others—were regarded as descendents of Ḥimyar, so that Ḥimyar in Arabic became the comprehensive term embracing the civilisation of these states. Few of those recognised without qualification as descendents of Ḥimyar played an important role during the Islamic period, the centre of the stage having by then been occupied by the sons of Kaḥlān, among whom were numbered Ṭayyīʾ, Madhabid, Hamdān, and al-Azd. Among the subdivisions of al-Azd were al-Aws and al-Khaẓraj, residents of Medina who rose to fame in Islam as the Prophet's Ansār. Lakhm, Qashqū, Kinda, and other tribes of Kaḥlān became solidly established in the north and centre long before the beginning of Islam, so that a tribal map of Arabia in the 6th and early 7th centuries reveals a curious patchwork in which the ranges of many Arabs of Southern descent lie north of those belonging to Arabs of Northern descent.

ʿAdnān, the putative progenitor of the Northern Arabs, appears to have been even more of a misty figure than Kahtān, so that the Northern Arabs in popular practice often trace their descent back no further than ʿAdnān's son Maʿadd or even his grandson Nizār. Muʿād and Rabīʾa, sons of Nizār, were the eponyms of the two main branches of the Northern Arabs, the descendents of a third son, Iyād, having largely sunk out of sight by the time of Islam. Kaṭrā'āṭ, one of the two major divisions of Muʿād, was of such importance that the term Kaṭrā'āṭ was often used for all Northern Arabs. This division embraced Hawāzīn and Sulaym, and Hawāzīn alone included such notable tribes as Thaqīf and the whole group of ʿAmīr b. Ṣaṣān.
DIAZIRAT AL-'ARAB

(Kushayr, 'Ukayl, Diya'd, Kilab, and Hildl).

Khindif, the other major division of Mudar, numbered in its ranks Hudhayl and Tamim and abov all Kinana, the tribe of which Kuraysh formed a subdivision. Although the Northern Arabs by origin lacked the same identification with Arabdom that their Southern cousins enjoyed, the fact that the Seal of the Prophets came from the Northern tribe of Kuraysh has redeemed their prestige under Islam in ample measure.

From Rabia's sprang the tribes of 'Anaaza, 'Abd al-Kays, al-Namir, Taghlib, and the strong group of Bakr b. Wadi, one of whose members was Hanifa. Well before Islam the original groups of Mudar and Rabia dissolved, early folk of Mudar moving to the territory on the Euphrates called after them Diyar Mudar and early folk of Rabia to the territory on the Tigris called Diyar Rabia. Many of their offshoots, however, remained behind in the Peninsula: Hudhayl in the vicinity of al-Ta'tif; Sulaym in the mountains between Mecca and Medina; Tamim and Hanifa and various members of 'Amir b. 'Ashara in the center; and 'Abd al-Kays in the east.

An attitude of hostility between Kabtian and 'Adnan, which went far back into the past, was enhanced by the rivalry that developed between the Anjar of Medina and Kuraysh of Mecca, so that it became a factor of extraordinary significance in the history of the early Islamic dynasties, the effect of which extended as far afield as Spain. The struggle between South and North finally faded away into an affair of dwindling consequence with the eclipse of the Arab element in the Islamic world. Only in one section of the Peninsula—'Umran—has the ancient hostility endured down to the present as a vital force. For centuries the Northerners were known in 'Umran as Nizaris, and the Southerners as Yamaneh. As the result of a civil war there in the early 18th century, the Northerners came to be called Ghafirs and the Southerners Hinawi, a distinction which still carries weight.

A major anomaly in the system appears in the case of Kufta. A number of tribes—Bahra, Diyarha, Bal, Tanukh, Kalb, and others—recognized a common ancestor named Kufta, but agreement was lacking as to whether he was a Southerner or a Northerner. Some said he was a son of 'Adnan, while others said he was a grandson or later descendant of Himyar. The genealogists also resorted to the device of declaring that all the Arabs were descended from three men—Kabtian, 'Adnan, and Kufta—but without the suggestion that Kufta represented a third element, neither Southerner nor Northerner. In the conflicts between the Southerners and the Northerners during the early period of Islam, the tribes of Kufta tended to side with the Southerners; genealogy was used for political purposes, the attribution to Kufta of a descent from Kabtian through Himyar prevailed, and the tribe of Kalb of Kufta advanced to the fore as champions of the Southern Arabs in the days of the Umayyads.

In studying the history of Arabia from 'Abbadsid times to the present, one encounters great difficulty in determining the links between the tribes of a thousand years ago and the tribes of today. Oppenheim, Brunich, and Caskel in their work Die Beduinen have made the most ambitious attempt so far with respect to the tribes of northern and central Arabia, but much remains to be done in spite of the laudable degree of success they have achieved. Information on the tribes during the time when the government of Islam was in or near Arabia is fairly abundant, and the same is true of the last two centuries or so, but for hundreds of years in between their story remains for the most part concealed from view. Great migrations took place of which only trifling records have been recovered. Elements broke off from one tribe to join another, or whole tribes reshuffled themselves into new groupings. Popular tradition among the Bedouins has preserved some recollection of the changes, but this tradition is often far from trustworthy. In the 4th/10th century al-Hamdani remarked on the tendency of tribes bearing a given name to associate themselves with stronger or more renowned tribes of the same name, and this tendency still holds true. In the time of the Caliph Abu Bakr the appearance of the false prophet Musaylima among Hanifa brought this tribe into disrepute; descendants of Hanifa in Najd today prefer to name as their ancestor Rabia, from whom Hanifa sprang, but so many other tribes have been named Rabia and popular knowledge of the traditional genealogical system is so scant that the result is often complete confusion. The modern tribe of al-Dawasir has a tradition that its ancestor was named Umara; the ordinary Dawasir today glibly identifies him as 'Umar b. al-Khattab without knowing who 'Umar b. al-Khattab was. The modern tribe of Banu Ghafir in al-Batinah of 'Umran provides an example of the often unstable status of the tribes; although the Northern Arabs of 'Umran are now called Ghafirs after this tribe, the tribe itself is notorious for the way in which it has shifted its allegiance back and forth between the Northerners and the Southerners.

Some of the great tribes of the present, such as Tamim in the center and Hamdan in the southwest, apparently represent in a generally faithful manner the ancient entities which bore these names, though many members of each have in the course of time broken away and lost their identity, while outsiders have attached themselves to this tribe or that and become completely absorbed into the community. The modern tribe of Kabtian may be the residue of one or more segments of the original nation of Southern Arabs, or the connexion may be even more tenuous than this, despite the fact that the Bedouins of Arabia still associate this tribe with the father of all Southerners. To follow the vicissitudes of the tribe of Kuraysh since the beginning of Islam, one would have to investigate—among other things—the history and current status of the many thousands of real and reputed sayyids and sharifs scattered not only throughout Arabia, but from one end of the Islamic world to the other.

Members of one modern tribe may tenaciously insist on their homogeneity in descent from a single ancestor, while members of another tribe readily admit that they are a confluence of diverse elements. The tribes of al-Udjman and Al Murra, which migrated from the vicinity of Najran to Eastern Arabia about two centuries ago, maintain that they share a common descent from Hamdan of the Southern Arabs through Yam. Their physical characteristics, their speech, and other facets of their life and history lend credence to this claim. On the other hand, large tribes such as 'Utaybah and Mu'tayr in Inner Arabia are closely knit composites of the original components of which probably first coalesced not more than five or six centuries ago. These confederations may be transitory, e.g., the confederation of Nu'aym in 'Umran appears at present to be in the process of breaking down into its two
main constituents, Al Bu Khurayban and Al Bu Shamis, with the old name of Nucaym... Cairo 1356; Ibn Licbun, Ta'rikh, Mecca 1357; al-Suwaydl, Sabd'ik al-Dhahab, Baghdad 1280; Mahmud al-Alusi, Bulugh

Despite all the genealogical vagaries and uncertainties, it is impressive how much importance is attached by most of the Arabs of Arabia to purity of descent. Mankind is divided into those whose race is universally recognised as purely Arab (asil) and those of a lower category whose blood is mixed or impure (ghayr asil). The Bedouin who knows his immediate forebears through no more than six or eight generations is still profoundly convinced of his own nobility; his membership in a tribe of acknowledged purity of descent is sufficient guarantee that the line further back is without taint. Purity of blood is preserved by strict rules governing marriage, which among the Bedouins at least are seldom violated. The distinction between pure and impure, strongest among the Bedouins, is carried over to a considerable extent into the oases and towns, particularly those away from the coasts, where many of the townspeople keep alive their sense of affiliation with one tribe or another. Other townspeople are grouped together in Nadid under the appellation of Bani Khadr, a generic term for those whose origin can not be traced back to a specific tribe.

In the desert a few nomadic tribes by general consent bear the stigma of non-Arab descent. Among these is the tribe of al-Sulaba (q.e.) in the north, the physical characteristics of whose members, as well as the popular traditions regarding them, suggest an origin hidden in an unusual aura of mystery, though there is no foundation for the oft-repeated legend that they are the offspring of wandering Crusaders. Others of this category in the north are Hutyam and al-Shararat. The tribe of al-'Awakmin in the east has succeeded in rising somewhat above its inferior status as a result of its prowess in battle during the past forty years in the ranks of King 'Abd al-'Aziz of Saudi Arabia.

Along the coasts, in the seaports, and in towns not far inland are found the greatest infusions of foreign blood. The so-called Javanese and Bukharan colonies (made up respectively of settlers from Indonesia and Central Asia) are among the largest. Certain foreign elements exist in the so-called Takarina, who come halfway across Africa, often on foot, to make a pilgrimage; some of these stay on to eke out a living in the Holy Land, where their huts stand in the outskirts of Midda.

Racial matters in Arabia are often intermingled with religious considerations. Descendants of the Prophet, who usually bear the title of sharif in al-Hijaz and sayyid in the Yaman and Hadramawt, sometimes form a privileged caste in the community, while at other times they lead the life of simple nomads in the desert. The numerous sayyids of Hadramawt, who enjoy exceptional prestige, all claim descent from a small group of families who emigrated from 'Irak to Hadramawt in the first half of the 4th/10th century. In 'Umán the title sayyid is popularly accorded to the Sultan of Muscat, who does not claim descent from the Prophet, and in Nadid the incidence of sharifs is remarkably low. In Eastern Arabia most of the sayyids are found among the Shites, a fact which prompts the Sunni Bedouins to question the authenticity of their descent. The Jews, whose history in Arabia goes back well into the pre-Islamic period, may have been in the beginning Israelites who moved southwards or Arabs converted to the Judaic religion or a combination of the two. Once fairly numerous in the south-west, almost all of the Jews have departed within the last few years for Israel.

Slavery as an institution sanctioned by Islam flourished in the Peninsula until very recent times, though now it appears to be slowly dying out. The great majority of the slaves came from Central Africa, and Negro blood is found even in villages of al-Aflaj in the heart of Arabia. Like other Islamic lands, Arabia has remained uncursed by a colour bar, and emancipated slaves have on occasion attained positions of influence in society. Another Negro element exists in the so-called Takarina, who come halfway across Africa, often on foot, to make a pilgrimage; some of these stay on to eke out a living in the Holy Land, where their huts stand in the outskirts of Midda.

Although migrations of persons and tribes from place to place within the Peninsula and from the Peninsula to the fertile lands farther north have been common throughout the centuries, only a relatively small proportion of the Arabs of Arabia have shown a fondness for crossing the seas to settle in foreign lands. Chief among these have been the people of 'Umán, who since ancient times have moved down along the coast of East Africa and into southern islands such as Zanzibar, and the people of Hadramawt, many of whom have more recently established themselves in the Indonesian Archipelago, the Malay Peninsula, and India, where they have been influential in the domains of the Nişan of Haydarabâd. Arabs of Eastern Arabia have moved across the Persian Gulf to occupy much of the Iranian coast, and seafarers from the Yaman have founded tiny colonies in such distant spots as Cardiff in Wales.

Arabia before the First Millennium B.C. — The Arabian Peninsula has as yet no history earlier than the first millennium B.C., though future investigations will certainly bring many new facts to light. Excavations have been few and limited in extent, and even the surface in many regions has not been scrutinised by trained searchers.

Scattered finds indicate that the Peninsula was inhabited in both Palaeolithic and Neolithic times, but nothing is known about who the people were or where they came from. The problem of the site of the original home of the Semites is still a matter of speculation. The Semitic nomads who began filtering into the Fertile Crescent from the adjacent deserts in the fourth millennium B.C. relied chiefly on the donkey, a beast not as well adapted as the camel to wide ranging in waterless tracts.

The cuneiform inscriptions of Mesopotamia contain numerous references to Magan, Meluhkah, and Dilmun, places which may have lain in Arabia, though much of the geography of the time remains vague. The Egyptian records relating to Punt are similarly imprecise. Egypt's connections with Sinai and the Red Sea are very ancient, and the availability of frankincense in Southern Arabia led to indirect or even direct intercourse at an early period.

A development of vast importance in the later history of Arabia and the Islamic world occurred, probably in the early second millennium B.C., with the devising of a system of alphabetic writing from which later Semitic alphabets, including South Arabian and North Arabic, derived. Tribal migrations about which little is yet known took place inside Arabia; in this millennium many of the "sons of Kahtân" may have gone south to their new homes.

The last centuries of this millennium were a time of change, with the Iron Age beginning in the Near East and the Semitic Aramaeans entering the Fertile Crescent in strength. The domestication of the camel appears to have been achieved during this period in Arabia, the first contribution of the Peninsula to the material progress of mankind.

Arabia during the First Millennium B.C. — The tenth chapter of Genesis, believed to belong to about the 10th century B.C., mentions Joktan and Hadaraveth, who may be identified with Kahtân and Ḥadramawt. The camel-owning inhabitants of Northern Arabia who paid tribute to the masters of Mesopotamia.

In recent years knowledge of the ancient civilisation of Southern Arabia has expanded tremendously. So many new inscriptions and other traces are coming to hand that current conclusions must often be regarded as tentative. An intensive review of the chronology is in progress, with the general tendency favoring a downward revision of dates. Available information suggests that organised states came into being in Southern Arabia during the second half of the first millennium B.C.

The four chief states—Saba', of the Sabaeans, Ma'īn of the Mineans, Katabān, and Ḥadramawt—thrived on agriculture and commerce. The Mārib dam in Saba' was the most imposing structure in an elaborate system of irrigation. For centuries the Southern Arabian merchants monopolised the frankincense trade and controlled traffic between India and the West, sending their goods by overland routes which traversed Arabia from south to north. Colonies were established in Northern Arabia, and evidence of business activity has been found in Egypt, the Aegean, and the Persian Gulf region. Strong Graeco-Roman influence on Southern Arabia can be traced in vestiges of the ancient culture that is shown by archaeological discoveries. Southern Arabsians migrated to Abyssinia, to which they gave their name, and their influence reached along the eastern coast of Africa.

Many impressive buildings in Southern Arabia were temples dedicated to pagan deities. The earlier rulers of Saba', who bore the title of Mukarris, combined the functions of prince and priest; later they gave way to the more secular rule of kings. [For details see al-Yaman.]
alphabet derived from South Arabic. Thamûd, mentioned as a tribe in an Assyrian inscription of the 8th century B.C., held Egra (al-Ḥiğr or Madā'in Ṣālih) just north of Dedan. The recent finding of widely dispersed Thamûdic inscriptions has raised new questions regarding the spread of this derivative of the South Arabic script and those who used it. After the Persian capture of Babylon in B.C. 539, a short-lived satrapy called Arabaṭa was created in Northern Arabia. Darius I (regn. 522-485), who sought to stimulate trade via the Persian Gulf, sent out Scylax of Caryanda, who sailed from India to the northern end of the Red Sea. The world’s knowledge of Arabia increased through Alexander’s expeditions and the reconnaissance of the Persian Gulf carried out by Nearchus the Cretan. Alexander died in 323 just as he was planning the circumnavigation of the Peninsula and the subjugation of its peoples. Not long afterwards the Greek naturalist Theophrastus wrote an account of Southern Arabia and its products. The Ptolemies of Egypt, who often pursued a forward policy in the Red Sea, threatened the trade monopoly held by the Arabs, while the Seleucids of Syria promoted the use of the northern routes from India. The establishment of the Parthian state in the mid-3rd century B.C. weakened the Seleucids, but Antiochus III was still strong enough to conduct an expedition in 205-204 against Gerrha on the Arabian shore of the Persian Gulf.

Late in the millennium the Nabataeans, a people of Arab stock with their capital at Petra, began playing a considerable role in the affairs of Syria, and Arabs appeared as rulers in various places in the Fertile Crescent, such as Charax Spasinii at the head of the Persian Gulf. Arab vassal chiefs enjoyed a large measure of autonomy under Parthian rule, and the immigration of Arabs into Mesopotamia went steadily on.

Towards the end of the 2nd century B.C. Eudoxus of Cyzicus sailed from Egypt to India, and in time Westerners learned the secret of using the south-west and north-east monsoons for voyaging across open water. The growing competition of the West seriously undermined the commercial dominance of the Southern Arabians, in whose homeland radical changes were taking place. An important event near the close of the 2nd century, later taken as the starting point of the “Sabean era”, has been plausibly connected with the assumption of royal power in Saba by the mountain tribe of Ḥamdān. Both the kingdoms of Ma‘in and Kataban came to an end in the 1st century B.C., and the Katabanian capital Timna in Bayḥân was destroyed. Rome, which had made a client state of Petra in B.C. 60, coveted the wealth of Arabia Felix. Augustus sent the Prefect of Egypt, Aelius Gallus, supported by Nabataean forces from Petra, on a long march in B.C. 24 towards the incense country, but the expedition, finding the deserts inhospitable and its Arab allies treacherous, did not get beyond Saba. [For details see AL-YAMAN.]

Arabia during the First Six Christian Centuries. — About A.D. 50 an unknown author wrote in Greek the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea, an invaluable account of trade in the Red Sea and along the southern coast of Arabia. The King of Ḥadramawt in his capital Ṣabwa controlled the whole territory from Bayḥân in the west to Zufār in the east, while the “King of Saba’ and of Dḥū Raydān” (a recently assumed title) sat in Ṣafar in the mountains of the Yamān, where the power of Ḥimyar was growing. In A.D. 105 or 106 the Roman province of Arabia was created in the old Nabataean domain, stretching from Ayla (al-ʾAraba) in the south to al-ʾNamāra in the northeast, with its capital first at Petra and later at Bostra. Merchants were encouraged to trade via the Red Sea through the port of Ayla, and Bedouin raids were warded off by the building of a limes along the desert borders. Roman knowledge of the Peninsula in the mid-2nd century was summarized by the geographer Claudius Ptolemy. Ardashīr I, the first Sasanid (d. A.D. 224), is said to have founded a city in Eastern Arabia and to have induced the tribe of al-Azd to settle in Ṭūmān. Sasanid authority on one flank of Northern Arabia and Roman authority on the other were challenged by the Arab rulers of Palmyra, but the Roman Emperor Aurelian defeated Queen Zenobia and captured her desert stronghold in 272.

Something of the old glory of Saba and Dḥū Raydān was regained by Shāmmar (or Shāmīr) Yuharigh, who signified his triumphs about the end of the 3rd century by adding the names of Ḥadramawt and Yamanat to his royal title. His reign was followed by a relapse into weakness, during which Ḡagrān on the northern border was besieged by the Lakhmids Marb (šāmīr) al-Kṣ-ṣiyṣ, extravagantly described as “King of all the Arabs” in the oldest North Arabic inscription known (al-Namāra 382). Later Kings of Saba’ made their title even longer by appending “and of their Arabs in the mountains and the lowlands”.

One of the most obscure periods in Arabian history fell in the 4th and 5th centuries. The decline and impoverishment of the Roman Empire affected the Peninsula, where urban civilization waned and the simpler ways of nomadism attracted more adherents. Christianity with its promise of a better life in the hereafter made headway in Arabia as elsewhere. The Arabs proved particularly susceptible to the doctrines of Nestorianism, coming from Mesopotamia, and Monophysitism, coming from Egypt and Abyssinia. The Abyssinians occupied the Yaman for a brief period in the 4th century, with ʾĀṣad, the first Christian King of Aksum, proclaiming himself ruler of Ḥimyar, Raydān, Saba, etc. Shāpūr II (regn. 310-79), called Dḥū Ḭaktāf by the Arabs, subjugated Eastern Arabia; the Sasanid yoke was later removed, only to be reimposed shortly before the dawn of Islam. Judaism also made a successful appeal in Arabia, among its converts being the King of Saba’ in the early 5th century, Abkarīb ʾĀṣad, known to Arab tradition as Tubbāʾ ʿĀṣad Kāmīl, and one of its centres being the oasis of Yaḥrib (later Medina).

Both the Sasanids and the Byzantine successors of Rome found it necessary to protect their territories from the unruly folk of Arabia by relying on buffer states ruled by Arab princes, the Lakhmids [q.v.] standing guard on the edge of Mesopotamia and the Ghassânids [q.v.] shielding Syria. The two client states, like their suzerains, often came into conflict. In the first half of the 6th century al-Ḥūṣrī b. Diabal b. Diabal, the greatest of the Ghassânids, proved stronger than al-Mundhir b. Maʿṣ al-Samā, the most famous of the Lakhmids. In the late 5th century the chief of the Southern Arab tribe of Kinda [q.v.], Huqūr Akil al-Murar, assumed the leadership of a confederacy of tribes in Central Arabia, but this loosely knit Kingdom of Kinda lasted only about half a century before it was overthrown by al-Mundhir the Lakhmid.

In the 6th century Southern Arabia lay open to
attack by the Christian Kings of Aksum and the Sasanid Khusraw I Anushirwan (regn. A.D. 531-79). Persecution of the Christians of Najdun by the Judaizing Arab Dhu Nuwas [q.v.] led to a new Abyssinian occupation of the Yaman c. 521. The Abyssinian Abraha [q.v.] as ruler of the Yaman carried out the last repair of the dam of Marib before its final abandonment, marched into the heart of Najdun on a campaign against the Arabs of Ma‘add, clients of the Lakhmids, and, according to Islamic tradition, undertook an unsuccessful expedition against Mecca in the Year of the Elephant (c. 570). Under Khusraw the Persians evicted the Abyssinians, and the Yaman was Persian territory at the rise of Islam.

Mecca, a town of some antiquity on the main route paralleling the Red Sea, achieved greater prominence and prosperity in the late 6th century, aided by foreign domination of the Yaman and chaotic conditions along the northern routes resulting from the long drawn out wars between Persia and Byzantium. The Meccan merchants of Kuraysh showed astuteness and industry in profiting from their participation in international trade.

The last centuries of this period gave birth to the form of Arabic now called classical, the dialectal sources and the exact process of the development of which remain uncertain. Used by the poets of the dijâhilyya, many of whom were Bedouins and some Christians or Jews by faith, this language became the instrument of expression for the supreme masterpiece of Islam, the Kur‘ân, and the great works of Arabic literature in succeeding ages (see ‘ARABIYYA).

2. — Islamic Middle Ages

Muhammad and the Rise of Islam (A.D. c. 570-632). — About A.D. 570 Muhammad [q.v.] b. ‘Abd Allâh of Kuraysh was born in Mecca, then a principal centre of pagan worship. Only traditional accounts survive of Muhammad’s early years, during which he became well acquainted with the tribal structure of both urban and nomadic life and saw something of the world outside Arabia while accompanying merchant caravans to Syria. About 610 he received his first revelation; two or three years later he began preaching in public, after which the nature of Islam was elaborated upon in a series of revelations during the rest of his career as God’s Messenger and Prophet.

The men in authority in Mecca did not welcome Muhammad’s message. A small body of Muslims went into exile in Christian Abyssinia; later the whole Muslim community migrated northwards from Mecca to Yathrib, an event taken afterwards as having marked the beginning of the Islamic era (A. H. 1/A. D. 622). During the ten years Muhammad maintained his capital at Medina, he erected a state guided in all its functions by the precepts of Islam. Two revolutionary concepts emerged which transformed the face of Arabia. The Kur‘ân, as emphasised by the divine revelations of which it consisted, was Arabic, a standard under which all Arabs could unite. Arabia had never before known an entity larger than relatively petty states or independent tribes and tribal federations, usually at loggerheads with each other if not openly at war. At the same time, the Kur‘ân and Islam were not limited to the Arabs: the Kur‘ân is a revelation to all men, and under Islam the noblest man is the most Godfearing, not the one of highest lineage. This universal appeal opened the way for Islam to go far beyond the borders of Arabia.

Muhammad’s efforts during the Medinan period were devoted in large measure to settling affairs with Mecca, which was finally incorporated in the Islamic state in 6/630. Before this a fair number of tribes had been won over to Islam, but the great flood of applications to join Islam from tribes all over the Peninsula did not come until 9/630-1, the Year of the Delegations. Muhammad died in 11/632, before there had been time to anchor the Kur‘ânic religion in the hearts of all who had taken the name of Muslim. Neither had there been time to carry Islam abroad, though a halting attempt had been made in that direction, and the moment was indeed ripe for shattering the fragile shells of Byzantine and Sasanid defences in the Fertile Crescent.

The First Three Caliphs (2/632-636). — Soon after Abu Bakr (regn. 11/632-4) succeeded Muhammad as head of the Islamic state, many tribes reasserted their independence, with prophets in several cases preaching doctrines contrary to Islam. Abu Bakr reacted vigorously, dispatching Muslim columns to Central Arabia, Bahrayn, ‘Umân, and the Yaman. When ‘Abd-Ramawt, which held out the longest, was subdued, the Arabian Peninsula for the first and last time in history was effectively united throughout its length and breadth.

The other great achievement of Abu Bakr’s brief rule was the inauguration of the grand programme of Muslim conquests outside Arabia. After invading ‘Irak Khâlid b. al-Walid marched across the Syrian Desert in 13/634 to participate in a victory over the Byzantines.

The conquests started by Abu Bakr were carried forward with verve during the rule of ‘Umar (13-23/634-44). ‘Irak was taken from the Sasanids, and Arabs from both the Northern and the Southern tribes peopled the newly founded military settlements of al-‘Asrâ and al-Kûfâ. After a decisive victory over the Byzantines at al-Yarmûk and the capture of Jerusalem, ‘Umar came to visit this holy city, the first journey of a Caliph beyond the confines of Arabia. Islam next advanced into Egypt, the House of Umayya, wealth and luxury abounded in Medina and Mecca, into which poured booty from the lands recently subdued. ‘Uthmân had no ear for the voice of Abu Dhâr decrying the decay of the stern and frugal virtues of earlier Islam. Even more dangerous to the future of Arabia and Islam was the rift developing between the most powerful figures in the state, which led to the murder of ‘Uthmân in Medina.

The Struggle over the Caliphate (35/636-692). — The rift in high circles widened into a chasm when ‘Ali, Muhammad’s son-in-law and cousin, came to the fore as Caliph on the death of ‘Uthmân. Muhammad’s wife ‘A‘šâ and his Companions al-Zubây and Tâhâ rose in opposition to ‘Ali, who left Medina to march against them in 56/656. In the Battle of the Camel, ‘Ali overthrew his rivals and won ‘Irâk, only to find himself faced with a more formidable adversary in ‘Uthmân’s Umayyad kinsman Mu‘âwiya, the governor of Syria. When ‘Ali fixed his capital at al-Kûfâ in order to marshal strength against Mu‘âwiya, Medina lost
the preeminence it had held since the Prophet's migration. All's tactics against Mu'awiyah so exacerbated the extremists among his own followers that they turned against him as the Khararidi. Despite the crushing victory All gained over these seceders, at al-

Nahrawan in 38/659, their party survived, Arabia long providing a fertile field for its propaganda. Mu'awiyah was proclaimed rival Caliph in Jerusalem, and his forces clashed with All's in Western Arabia, from Medina to Najd and the Yemen. When a Khararidi assassinated All in 40/661, the 'Aldids set up his son al-Hasan as Caliph in al-Kufa, but he soon renounced his claims in favor of Mu'awiyah, who thus temporarily reunited the community of Islam.

For the rest of Mu'awiyah's life no serious rising took place against the new Syrian Caliphate, but resentment was stirred up by his advocacy of hereditary succession. After the accession of Yazid b. Mu'awiyah (regn. 60-67/680-3), All's second son al-Hasayn left Mecca to rally support in Irak, only to fall a martyr at Karbalâ in 61/680. His death cleared the field for a stronger candidate, 'Abd Allah b. al-Zubayr, the foremost representative of the sons of the Prophet's Companions. Yazid's army defeated the rebellious Medinans in the battle of Harrat Wâkim and laid siege to Mecca, Ibn al-Zubayr's stronghold, where the Ka'ba caught fire, but Yazid's death brought a pause in the hostilities. Ibn al-Zubayr won recognition as Caliph in nearly every quarter of Islam; in fact, had he proceeded to Syria immediately, he might well have destroyed the Umayyad power forever. While Ibn al-Zubayr lingered on in Mecca, 'Abd al-Malik (regn. 65/865-705) of the Marwandid branch of the Umayyads gradually regained ground outside Arabia. The Khararidi, who had at first leagued themselves with Ibn al-Zubayr, turned against him, the Khararidi Na'dida b. Amir of Banu Hanifa making himself master of much of Arabia, only to be overthrown by another Khararidi, Abu Fudayk. 'Abd al-Malik gave al-Hadidâdi b. Yusuf command of an army which captured Mecca in 73/692 after a long siege. Ibn al-Zubayr fell in the struggle, leaving the Holy Land of Islam in the hands of the Umayyads. Another Umayyad army marched to Eastern Arabia and put an end to Abu Fudayk.

Arabia under the Umayyads (75-132/692-750). — The Umayyads of Syria regularly appointed governors for Medina and Mecca, and exercised a measure of control, often shadowy, over other parts of Arabia. Powerful Umayyad governors of al-Hasa such as al-Hadidâdi and Yazid b. al-Muhallab made their word law in the Persian Gulf and along its Arabian shore.

The Umayyad Caliphs honoured the sanctity of the Holy Cities in Arabia and lavished large sums on their shrines, even while favouring at times the claim of Jerusalem, which was easier of access, to an equal or higher rank. During much of this period Western Arabia was at peace, enjoying a prosperity such as it was not to know among the dissensions of later ages. The Umayyads developed the irrigation system, and many personages of Islam lived in their days of retirement on estates near Medina, Mecca, or al-

Ta'if. The Holy Cities became renowned not only for Islamic learning but also for indulgent living, poetry, and singing.

The intense rivalry in Umayyad politics between the Northern Arabs and the Southern Arabs had its repercussions in Arabia, where Kalb, the principal tribe among the Southerners, owned land in Wâdî al-Kurâ near Medina.

Towards the end of the Umayyad period an alliance of Khararidi was formed under the leadership of 'Abd Allâh b. Yahya 'Alî b. al-Hâk of Kinda and Abu Hamza of al-Azid. Abu Hamza took Mecca, won a victory at Kudayd in 130/747, and then entered Medina, while 'Alî b. al-Hâk supported him from their base in Hadramawt and the Yemen. Despite the waning might of the Umayyads, Marwan II summoned sufficient strength to overcome these Khararidi chiefs, but only after they had contributed to his final undoing. Mecca was also used by the 'Abbasids as a centre for their plot aiming at the supersession of the Syrian Caliphs.

Arabia under the Early 'Abbasids (73-266/750-879). — The 'Abbasid transfer of the Caliphate to Irak enhanced the importance of the Persian Gulf as a seaway for trade reaching out to China and East Africa. Wares bound to and from the 'Abbasid capital passed through al-Hasa, where the Gulf itself Siraf on the Persian side in the 3rd/9th century became the busiest port. 'Abbasid authority in Arabia kept its strength for not much over a century, during which time governors were sent to the Holy cities and the Yemen, and on occasion to the central and eastern regions. The earlier Caliphs, notably al-Mahdi and Hârûn, and their wives, notably Zubayda, were diligent in making the pilgrimage and encouraging their subjects to do so by improving communications and the amenities of the route.

A sect of the Khararidi known as the Ibadiyya set up its own Imamate in Uman under al-Diulanda b. Mas'ud of al-Azid, but an 'Abbasid expedition under Khâzim b. Khuzayma defeated and killed al-Diulanda in 134/752. Soon afterwards this Imamate was revived to endure with few interruptions for the next four centuries. Uman, however, was an out of the way region, and the Khararidi on the whole gave the 'Abbasids little trouble. [Cf. 'Imam.]

Taking the place of the Khararidi as a thorn in the Caliphs' flesh were the 'Alids [q.v.], both Hasanids and Husaynids. Through skilful propaganda the 'Abbasids in their campaign against the Umayyads had forestalled the 'Alids and usurped the leadership they regarded as rightfully theirs. For this the 'Alids never forgave them, and one after another they contested the 'Abbasid title to rule. Even though the 'Alids themselves came from a Meccan ancestor close to the Prophet, the 'Alids almost invariably found ready followers in Arabia; in the Holy Cities their rallying cry inspired the hope of regaining the place lost to Damascus and Baghdad.

The first 'Alid pretender in Arabia was the Hasanid Muhammad al-Nafs al-Zakiyya, who appeared as the Mahdi in Medina and had his claim to the Caliphate certified by no less a scholar than Malik b. Anas, but all to no avail when he fell in 145/762 before the troops of al-Mansûr.

A major split took place among the 'Alids following the death of their sixth Imam, Diya'ar al-Sâ'dîk, c. 148/765. The main body, giving loyalty to Diya'ar's son Mûsâ al-Kâsim and five of his descendants, came to be known as the Twelvers. Others, the Seveners, advocated the cause of Ismâ'îl b. Diya'ar and his son Muhammad, for which they worked, often in secret, in the movement of Ismâ'îlism. As time went by the Ismâ'îlis in particular tended to attract to their side the discontented and oppressed elements of society, enemies of the ruling classes.
Another Hasanid pretender, al-Husayn b. 'Ali, met a martyr's death fighting against an 'Abbasid army at Fakhkhar, a son of Mecca in 260/876. The 'Aliid cause, however, made progress in the Yemen, where it received the support of the great jurist al-Shafi'i, who finally won a pardon after being delivered as a prisoner to Hārūn's presence.

The end of the 2nd century H. saw a new upsurge of 'Aliid strength in Western Arabia: in Mecca the Ḥusaynid al-Husayn al-اعتماد put forward Muḥammad al-Dīdūkhi, a son of Dīdūkhi, while the Hasanid Muḥammad b. Sulaymān established himself in Medina. These pretenders did not hold their ground against the 'Abbasids, but greater success was achieved by Ibrāhīm al-Diāzzār, a grandson of Dīdūkhi, in the Yemen. Yielding to the tide of pro-'Aliid sentiment, the Abbasid Caliph al-Ḥārūn al-Rāšid designated 'Ali b. Rūjām, the eighth Imam of the Twelve, as his heir apparent and substituted 'Ali green for 'Abbasid black as the royal colour, but this change evaporated with 'Ali's death in 203/818.

To cope with the 'Aliid threat in the Yemen, al-Ḥārūn appointed as his governor there one Muḥammad, who claimed descent from Muṣṭawiyā's lieutenant Ziyād b. Abīl. Refounding the city of Zābīd in 204/820 and carving out a domain for himself, Muḥammad established the dynasty of the Ziyādīs. 

Although not a strong Caliph, al-Wāḥidī (regn. 227-233/842-847) executed a vigorous policy in Arabia. When Bedouins of Sulaym made the region unsafe with their depredations, al-Wāḥidī dispatched the Turkish general Būghā the Elder to bring the culprits to heel. For the next two years Būghā campaigned against other tribes, climaxing his operations in 232/847 with a hard won victory over Numayr at Baṭn al-Sīr deep in the interior, after which a man of Udhāq in Najdī was appointed governor of al-Yamāmah, Eastern Arabia, and the pilgrim route to Mecca.

Following the death of al-Muṭawakkil in 247/861, the career of the 'Abbasids both at home and in Arabia took a turn for the worse. The dynasty of the Ya'fūrids [q.v.], claiming descent from the ancient Tūbakīs of Ḥīmyar, arose in the highlands of the Yemen with Ṣan'ā' as capital. Ḥaḍramawt secured its independence, and local rulers set themselves up in the east, where 'Ali b. Muḥammad—either a genuine Husaynid, as he gave himself out to be, or a member of 'Abd al-Kays—began an agitation among the nomadic tribes. Another Hasanid revolt in Mecca, inaugurated by Ismā'īl b. Yūsuf al-Ukhaydīr, led to the establishment under Ismā'īl's brother Muḥammad of a new state in al-Yamāmah, where these Ukhaydīrs maintained themselves until submerged by the onrush of Ḥaḍramawtianism.

Another blow was dealt the 'Abbasid empire by the recallcitrant governor of Egypt, Ahmad b. Tālūn, who by occupying Syria broke down the control once exercised over the tribes of the Syrian Desert. The most direct menace to the empire, however, came from the agitator in Eastern Arabia, 'Ali b. Muḥammad, who transferred his activities to Southern ʿIrāq, where he stirred up the Zanj, the negro slaves laboring in the salt marshes, in a massive insurrection (255-70/863-83) extending as far as the Holy Cities. Ismā'īlīs and Karmatians in Arabia (266-507/879-1177). — At this juncture in 'Abbasid affairs the rapidly spreading movement of Ismā'īlism (see ISMĀ'ĪLIYYA) took full advantage of its opportunities. Ismā'īlī missionaries carried out a well laid plan of penetration, with the Persian Gulf coast and the Yaman as the principal foci for their activity in Arabia. As these two parts of Arabia remained relatively isolated from each other, the connexion between later developments in them was slight.

Ismā'īlism was first introduced into the Yemen by Ibn Ḥawshab (Muṣṭur al-Yaman) and 'Ali b. al-而不 in 266/879-80. Collaborating closely, these two won many followers, and 'Ali occupied both Ṣan'ā' and Zābīd for brief periods. The Ziyādīs and the Ya'fūrids fought the Ismā'īlīs, and a new opponent arose against them in 280/893 with the arrival in the Yemen of the first Zaydī Imam, al-Hādī Yāḥyā, a grandson of the Hasanid al-Kāsim al-Rassī (d. 246/860), who had fashioned legal foundations for a Zaydi government closer to Sunnism than to the extreme Shi'ism of the Ismā'īlīs. The two Ismā'īlī leaders eventually fell out, and by 303/915 both were dead, but their doctrines did not die with them.

Ismā'īlism appeared c. 286/899 in Eastern Arabia, where under Abū Saʿīd al-Ḥasan al-Dīnāhabī and his son Abū Tāhir Sulaymān a strong state was organised. The name Karmatian, the origin and meaning of which are still in doubt, remains the popular designation for this particular aspect of Ismā'īlism, though its application is not restricted to this region. The 'Abbasids were too feeble to prevent these Karmatians from sacking al-ʿAsrār and al-Kūfah, and in 317/930 they entered Mecca and carried off the Black Stone to their new capital al-ʿAṣrār (al-Ḥassa). With the conquest of ʿUmān soon thereafter the Karmatians held the greater part of Arabia. These disturbances prompted the Husaynid Aḥmad b. Ḥasā', the most famous ancestor of the sayyids of Southern Arabia, to leave al-ʿAsrār on a migration ending in Ḥaḍramawt, where Idābīs from ʿUmān then held the upper hand.

New threats to the 'Abbasids came from the Buyids of Iran and the Ikhshīdīs of Egypt, who reached out at times to Mecca, though neither got a lasting foothold there. The Buyids, who by taking Baghdad in 334/945 assumed de facto authority over the 'Abbasid realm, also brought ʿUmān within their sphere.

Abū Tāhir died in 332/944, and the Karmatians at the behest of the Ismā'īlīs'affixed the North Africa restored the Black Stone to Mecca in 339/950-1. Under al-Ḥasan al-ʿAṣam, a nephew of Abū Tāhir, the Karmatians joined the Fātimids in a pincer movement on Syria and Egypt, the former exerting pressure from the east as the latter advanced from the west. However, after the Fātimids occupied Egypt in 358/969, the Karmatians broke with them and sided with the Buyids in resisting their designs on Syria. Damascus was captured by al-Ḥasan in 360/971, but he was repulsed on two expeditions against Egypt before reaching the newly founded Fatimid city of Cairo.

Following the death of al-Ḥasan, the Karmatian government was placed in the hands of a Council of six sayyids. The Fātimids won a military victory over the Karmatians, but had to pay a large sum to induce them to return to al-ʿAṣrār. The Karmatians lost ʿUmān in 375/985-6, were checked by the Buyids in ʿIrāq and defeated in their own territory by a chief of al-Muntafik, who plundered al-Ṣaʿīf. [ Cf. also KARMATIANS.]}
About the mid-4th/10th century the Sharifate of Mecca [for which see MARK A], destined to last a thousand years, was established by a family of Hasanids known as the Mūsāwīds. The most prominent member of this family was Abū al-Futūh al-Ḥasan, who in 402/1011-2 tried to make himself Caliph, only to be thwarted by the Fātimids, liege lords of the sharifs. Contemporary with the early sharifs. This line, which lasted until the 9th/16th century, came later to be known as the House of Muḥannā. An offshoot of Ismaʿīlism was the Druze movement, which had its origins during the reign of the Fātimid al-Ḥākim. The Druze al-Muṣṭan̄aṣ was sent a letter to the Karmāṭian sayyādis of Eastern Arabia, proposing that they combine forces on the basis that they shared a common doctrine, but nothing concrete came of this.

Early in the 5th/11th century the Maʿnids [q.v.] came to power in Aden and Ḥaḍramawt, and the Ziyādīds in the Yaman gave way before the Nāḍīḥīds [q.v.], originally their own Abyssinian slaves. Ismaʿīlism in the Yaman enjoyed a revival under the Šulaḥyīds [q.v.], rulers sprung from the tribe of Yām who held Ṣanʿaʾ as nominal vassals of the Fātimids, while the Šaydī Imams kept their base at Ṣaʿdā. In 443/1051 Ṣāṣir-i Ḧisrawi visited al-Abūṣ, where he found the Council of Six still in control. The details of his eyewitness account of the Karmāṭian state in its later days are unfortunately not supported by corroborating testimony. The Shiʿism of the Buyids, Karmāṭians, and Fātimids aroused a Sunnite reaction championed by the Šalḍiqū Turk, whose leader Ṣughbīrīt took Baghdād in 447/1055. A Šalḍiqū of Kirmān, Ẓarūʿ al-ʿArsīn, brought that Umān under his sway. About this time Ṣirāfī was yielding its place as the chief port of the Persian Gulf to the island of Kaʿīs, the rulers of which made themselves also lords of Ṣumān, where in the mid-5th/11th century a break came in the line of Ṣabīṭ Imams. For the next three and a half centuries records survive of only one Imam.

The Šulaḥyīds of the Yaman seized Aden from the Maʿnids and also expanded northwards, the authority of the Mūṣawwī sharifs over Mecca having faded away. In 455/1063 the Šulaḥyīd ʿAlī b. Muḥammad installed an agnate branch of sharifs, the Ḥašǧimīds, in Mecca. Under Malik Ẓahḥā in Baghdād the Šalḍiqūs reached the zenith of their power, and thanks to him the shadowy ʿAbbasīd of the day had lip service paid to him in the Holy Cities as the lipservice paid to him in the Holy Cities as the Ḥaḍramawt. The party favoring ʿAlī al-Ḥakamī, and soon afterwards the ʿAlī al-Ḥakamī, and soon afterwards the ʿAlī aqīl, occupied Ṣanʿaʾ and Zabīd, and made his influence felt as far north as Khaybar and Yanbuʿ.

Like the Šulaḥyīds, the Nāḍīḥīds also produced a queen to rule during the dynasty’s declining years, ʿAlamīn, originally a slave girl, whose death in 545/1150 was followed about a decade later by the ephemeral sway of the ʿAḥmadīs [q.v.], who called themselves Himyarītics and were accused of being Khawārīdī.

The Fātimids of Egypt succumbed to the Ayyūbīds in 557/1161, and a plot to restore them was nipped in the bud in 562/1167 by Ṣalāḥī, who executed the poet and historian Qimārī b. ʿAlī al-Ḥakamī of the Yaman. The center of the Mustaʿlian party was transferred from Egypt to the Yaman, where it stayed until the 10th/16th century, when it shifted to India, after which a split divided the party into the Dāʿūdīs of India and the Sulaymānīs of Southern Arabia [see Bahrān]. Extensive secular dominion in Arabia eluded the grasp of the Ismaʿīlīs until the reign of the Sulaymānī Makramīs [q.v.] of Ṣanʿaʾ in the 12th/18th century.

Arabia in the Later Middle Ages (567-end of 9th Century/1171-end of 15th Century). — The advent of the Ayyūbīds meant the triumph of Sunnism over Shiʿism in Arabia as well as in Egypt. Ṣalāḥī, recognized as sovereign in Mecca, sent his brother Turān Ẓahḥā to depose the third and last ʿAḥmadī and occupy the Yaman in 567/1173. During the half century or so of Ayyūbīd rule there members of collateral branches of the dynasty sat on this southern throne. Ḥaḍramawt was conquered, but did not become an integral part of the Ayyūbīd domains. Closer home the Ayyūbīds had their hands full with the Crusaders from the West, one of the boldest of whom, René of Châlignon, raided Taymā, sent his men cruising against the Muslims in the Red Sea, and even thought of attacking Medina.

About 598/1200 the Hasanid Kātāda b. Idrīṣ moved from Yanbuʿ to Mecca, where he founded the dynasty of all the later sharifs. Endevoring to build a strong independent state in al-Ḥaḍr, he found the rivalries of the day too great to overcome. Kātāda died in 617/1220-1, and soon afterwards al-Malik al-Muṣṭaʿd Yūsūf, the last Ayyūbīd in the Yaman, took Mecca and appointed the founder of the Rasūlīds, who claimed descent from the Ḥašṣānīds, his governor there.
On the other side of the Peninsula the Salghurid Atabeg of Fars, Abū Bakr b. Sa'd, the patron of the poet Sa'd of Shahraz, annexed islands in the Persian Gulf and set foot on the mainland at al-Ḳāṭif and al-Ḥasā. The local dynasty of the 'Uyunīds gave way before the Salghurid pressure and that of the tribe of 'Amīr of ʿUkayl, which supplied a new dynasty in the ʿUṣfūrids [q.v.].

Succeeding the Ayyūbids, the Rasūlīds [q.v.] reigned in Taʿizz and Zubīd from 625 to 850/1228-1446 as the most illustrious house in mediaeval Yemen. Islamic architecture reached one of its higher points, and scholars received the stimulus of royal approbation, some of the Rasūlīd Sultans themselves being authors of note. Embassies came to the court from China and other distant lands.

ʿUmar b. ʿAll (regn. 626-8/1229-50) ruled from Mecca to Ḥadramawt, and after Hūlāgū executed the last ʿAbbāsīd in Baghdad in 656/1258. ʿUmar's son ʿIṣāf styled himself Caliph of Islam, but full enjoyment of such rank lay beyond the capabilities of the Rasūlīd state.

Baybars, the first great Mamlūk Sultan of Egypt, assumed nominal overlordship of the Holy Cities, leaving Meccan affairs in charge of the sharīf Abū Numayy I Muhammad (regn. 652-701/1254-1301), who strengthened the foundations of Karānī rule. Bedouins of Al Mira and other tribes roamed through the Syrian Desert, exacting large fees from pilgrim caravans and penetrating into Najd on their raids. In Damascus the religious reformer Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328) laid the theological basis for the Wahhabi movement of the 12th/18th century.

About the beginning of the 8th/14th century the port of Hormuz on the Persian mainland at the entrance to the Persian Gulf was moved to a nearby island, after which it grew apace and in time surpassed its rival the island of Kays in attracting to it newcomers driven by the Portuguese out of Hormuz in 1011/1602. In the Yaman the Salghurids, annexed the Red Sea coast, and under Afonso de Albuquerque the invaders seized Arabian ports on the Gulf of ʿUmnān and the great mart of Hormuz. Pedro, Afonso's nephew, toured the Persian Gulf in 920/1514, but Afonso died the following year without having achieved his ambitions of reducing Aden and launching an expedition against Mecca.

About 912/1506-7 a new line of Zaydi Imams was inaugurated by Shajar al-Dīn Yāḥyā, and from then onwards the Zaydis tended to fix their capital, if possible, at San'a. Coffee appears to have been introduced into the Yaman from Abyssinia about this time, and the use of ʿādī and tobacco spread among the people.

Badr Abū Tuwayrīḥī of Al ʿAṣāfīrī (regn. 922-76/1516-68), whose authority in his palmier days reached from the Red Sea to Ḥadramawt, was more willing to offer fealty to the Ottoman Sultan. Before Badr died he lost all his territories and suffered long imprisonment at the hands of his Ḥadramī enemies.

Salīm I, the Ottoman conqueror of Egypt in 923/1517, assumed the high title of Servant of the Holy Cities, and the reign of Sulaymān the Magnificent (926-74/1520-66) fenced other regions within the empire. The Portuguese in alliance with the King of Hormuz attacked Bahrayn, where Mūkrīn, the uncle and successor of Adjwād the Djabrid, lost his life defending the island in 927/1521. Reacting to the aggressive policy of the Portuguese, the Turks bestirred themselves in the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea. Sulaymān at Baghdad in 941/1534 received the homage of the Arab chiefs of al-Ḳāṭif and Bahrayn, and later his troops pressed up into the mountains of the Yaman. Aden and Muscat were occupied briefly, and an Ottoman governor was installed in al-Ḥasā.

For a period of some sixty years after c. 968/1560 there were no Ibadī Imams in ʿUmnān, where the secular Nabhānīds [q.v.] princes in their mountain fastnesses watched the climax of their power.

The slow receding of the Ottoman tide from the highwater mark reached under Sulaymān was observable in Arabia as elsewhere. The diversion of trade from the overland routes to the sea routes round Africa contributed to the serious economic depression which beset the Near East during the early modern age. Besides the Austrians and other foes in Europe, the Turks had to face the Salghurids, the strongest of whom, Shāh ʿAbbās I, pursued an expansionist policy in the Persian Gulf, where he subjected Bahrayn in 1011/1602. In the Yaman the Zaydi Imams kept alive resistance to the Turks, and al-Muʿawwiyād Muhammad succeeded in expelling them completely in 1045/1635.

The formation of the East India Company in 1609 was the prelude to a burst of activity by English traders in the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf. Allaying themselves with the Persians, the newcomers drove the Portuguese out of Hormuz in 1031/1622. Once the Portuguese monopoly had been broken, the English found themselves involved in competition with the Dutch, who secured commercial...
preeminence during the second half of the 11th/12th century.

After the election of Nāṣir b. Murshid of the Ya'rubids of al-'Azd c. 1034/1624 as Iḥāḍī Ḫīlām, this Ḫīlāmīs remained in his family for more than a century. The Ya'rubids in their early days drove the Portuguese out of Muscat and all other prias de terre, and in their later days extended their authority overseas to Mombasa, Pemba, and Kilwa in East Africa.

Ḥusayn b. ʿAll, the third and last ʿAṣḥa of the House of Ḫarṣa, under whom al-Ḥasra in the early 11th/17th century had become virtually independent of Ottoman rule, incited ʿĀl Ḥumayd of the tribe of Banū ʿHulal to overthrow the Ottoman governor of al-Ḥasra in 1074/1663-4. These Bedouin chiefs kept the oases and grazing grounds of Eastern Arabia subject to their will until the Wahhabs advanced to the Persian Gulf in the early 19th century H.

In Ḥadramawt the Zaydis of the Yaman encouraged the spread of their version of Islam at the expense of Shāfiʿīs. In 1070/1660 Ahmad b. al-Ḥasan, a nephew of the reigning Zaydi Imam, led into the main valley of Ḫadramawt a terrifying force known as the Night Flood (sayl al-layl) which undermined the position of the House of Ḫarṣ, but Zaydism failed to secure a permanent triumph over Shāfiʿism in this region.

In the 12th/18th century a new era began in Arabia with the spread of the reforming movement inspired by Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb of Naḍjd. In a sense this also marked the beginning of the modern history of the whole Near East. Placing the unity of God above all else and demanding that the popular faith be cleansed of innovations, Ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb's call reverberated throughout the Islamic world from West Africa to the East Indies and moved the spirits of the modernists of the Salafiyya in Muslim countries closer than Arabia to the encroaching lands of the West. As an Arab movement opposed to the remote and vitiated rule of the Ottomans, Wahhābīs [q.v.] influenced the nationalistic tendencies developing among the Arabs in the 19th and 20th centuries. Within Arabia political unity supplanted petty particularism, and orderly Islamic government functioned as it seldom had before.

Soon after first preaching in public in 1153/1741, Ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb concluded a basic alliance with Muḥammad b. Saʿūd, ruler of the insignificant town of al-Dirās. When Muḥammad died, his son ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz carried on, and by 1202/1788 all Naḍjd had accepted the doctrines and sway of the reformers, who had withstood three expeditions directed against them by the Ḫumaydīī Makramids of Naḍjrān, then a power in their corner of Arabia. [Cf. also Saʿīdis.]

In 1156/1743 the Yaʿrubids of this tribe occupied al-Shihr and fourteen years later acquired full possession of al-Mukallā.

Proving resilient in recovering from disastrous blows struck by Muḥammad ʿAll's forces, the Saʿūdī state rebuilt its strength under Turki b. ʿAbd Allāh, who fixed his capital at al-Ryād, and later his son Faysal, though al-Ḥidžāz was not occupied again. Civil war between Faysal's sons after his death in 1328/1865 caused a second decline in Saʿūdī fortunes, facilitating the reimposition of Ottoman sovereignty over part of Eastern Arabia and the rise of al-правля (q.v.) of Háš to dominance in Naḍjd, where al-prayl itself was made subject. The Ottomans also reestablished themselves in the highlands of the Yaman with headquarters at Saʿūdī, but they failed to crush the resistance of the Zaydi Imams. The opening of the Suez Canal in 1869, making communications between Istanbul and Ḫiddā easier and faster, helped the Turks to exercise more control in al-Ḥidżāz.

The rapidly expanding puritan state of Naḍjd came into conflict with the ʿAbdīs of Mecca in a war lasting fifteen years (1205-1220/1791-1806), with the Saʿūdīs occupying Mecca for the first time in 1218/1803. Shortly after the death of Ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb (1206/1792) Saʿūdī authority flowed eastwards to the Persian Gulf, along which it extended to ʿUmān. In the south the reformers reached the Yaman and Ḫadramawt, while in the north their forces threatened to overrun Syria and Iraq. The Ottoman government, unable itself to dam the flood, turned in desperation to the new Viceroy of Egypt, Muḥammad ʿAll.

In the 13th/19th century foreign intervention in Arabia, both Muslim and Western, became more effective and extensive than ever before. Muḥammad ʿAll annihilated the first Saʿūdī state when his army captured al-Dirāsiyya in 1233/1818. The British, at first welcoming and then fearing the advent of the Egyptians, carried out military actions against the Persian Gulf Arabs and in Inner ʿUmān and occupied Aden in 1254/1839, after which their influence gradually advanced along the southern and eastern coasts and penetrated into the hinterland.

Saʿūd b. ʿUtān, the most famous ruler of Al Bu Ṣaʿūd (regn. 1221-1273/1806-1856), wielded little or no authority in Inner ʿUmān, where he was hard pressed by the Saʿūdīs, to whom he often paid tribute. In the latter part of his reign he devoted most of his attention to his East African possessions, but five years after his death the British established Zanzibar as a Sultanate independent of Muscat. The only Ibaḍī Imam elected during the century, ʿAzzān b. ʿĀṣār, failed to win recognition by the British and was overthrown in 1287/1869 after two years of rule. The Sultans who followed him depended upon British support for the maintenance of their position in Muscat in the face of the hostile Ibaḍī tribes of the interior.

During the century internecine warfare was common in Ḫadramawt, where much power rested in the hands of mercenaries imported from the mountains behind Aden, particularly of the tribe Yāfī. In 1283/1867 the Kuftūyta of this tribe occupied al-Shihr and fourteen years later acquired full possession of al-Mukallā.

Proving resilient in recovering from disastrous blows struck by Muḥammad ʿAll's forces, the Saʿūdī state rebuilt its strength under Turki b. ʿAbd Allāh, who fixed his capital at al-Ryād, and later his son Faysal, though al-Ḥidżāz was not occupied again. Civil war between Faysal's sons after his death in 1282/1865 caused another decline in Saʿūdī fortunes, facilitating the reimposition of Ottoman sovereignty over part of Eastern Arabia and the rise of al-правля (q.v.) of Háš to dominance in Naḍjd, where al-prayl itself was made subject. The Ottomans also reestablished themselves in the highlands of the Yaman with headquarters at Saʿūdī, but they failed to crush the resistance of the Zaydi Imams. The opening of the Suez Canal in 1869, making communications between Istanbul and Ḫiddā easier and faster, helped the Turks to exercise more control in al-Ḥidżāz.

Al Saʿūd, thrice crushed to earth, rose once more under the leadership of Faysal's grandson ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, who took al-Ḥidżāz from its Ṭaḥlīlī ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, though al-Ḥidżāz was not occupied again before finally overcoming Al Ṭaḥlīlī in the north. In 1331/1913 he drove the Turks out of al-Ḥasra and then lent the British sympathetic support during the First World War. Although the Ḫidžāz Railway from Damascus to Medina had been inaugurated in
In 1331/1913 a new Ibadhi Imam was elected in Inner 'Umam in opposition to the Sultan of Muscat. Two years later the British intervened to forestall the capture of Muscat by the Imam's army. Through British mediation a treaty was concluded at al-Sib in 1339/1920 providing that the people of Yaxnan.

Abd al-Qadir Al Su'ud when war broke out between the


20th century: General: Amin Muhammad Sa'di, Al Thawra Al-'Arabiyya, Cairo 1952; idem, Al-Dhahabiyya, Cairo 1953-60; Salam al-Bakri, Ta'rikh Hadramawt al-Siyasi, Cairo 1354-5.
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Killed in a abortive insurrection in 1367/1948, Imam Yahya was succeeded by his son Ahmad. Dying in 1372/1953, ‘Abd al-'Aziz was succeeded by his son Sa'di. Thus passed from the scene two men who did far more than simply bequeath the names to the realms they wrought and guided for half a century.
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Modern authorities: Pre-Islamic period:

ARABA. I. — The Turkish word araba (arba, abra), meaning “wagon” or “cart”, is as old as the 14th cent. A.D., but it does not look like a pure Turkish word; neither does it have an obvious Arabic or Persian etymology. In Osmanli the usual spelling was saraba with an ’an’ and although Sâmt Fraghî in his Kâmasî-i-Turki (Istanbul 1823-58) and E. de Zambaur, Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie, Hanover 1927. (G. RENTZ)

ARABA. II. — Like the word araba the expression arabbâ in its various forms is not a pure Arabic or Persian word. It is found in the language of the invading tribes of the 8th century. At the time of our knowledge this word has only an oriental connotation. It has been suggested that the expression is to be explained as a corruption of *śarība* and that in this sense it means “a ballista, a missile weapon”. This explanation is not, however, convincing, since it is in fact older than the development of the ballista in the West. In its meaning as “a ballista, a missile weapon” it is found in the Arabic expression araba and also in the Persian expression *sharība*.
ARABA

Series, i, fol. 336 v., l. 7), where the phrase darbud-
garl (“culverin carts” in Beveridge's translation) occurs. There is at present no direct evidence of the date of the transition from 'arr'da to araba, but the guess may be hazarded that the word was adopted as a technical term in the Mongol army during the invasion of Persia early in the 13th cent. and that the change took place there. It had certainly taken place before the 14th cent., since there is no trace of 'arr'da in Turkish at that date.

'Araba' occurs in both the Italian and the German sections of the Codex Cumanicus (early 14th cent., with a late 13th cent. substratum); on the other hand there is no trace of either word in such 12th cent. authorities as Kâşghârî's Dîvân Lugâtât al-Turk or the Kudathâkû Bilûj. It is interesting to note that araba, in one form or another, occurs in practically every modern Turkish dialect, except apparently Yakut and Cuvâş, which corroborates the general belief that these dialects had broken away from "common Turkish" before the 13th cent., and establishes the less generally accepted fact that the other peripheral dialects in Siberia, Chinese Turkestan and Europe had not yet broken away by that date.

(G. L. M. Clauson)

II. — It appears that the plains and steppes of Central Asia, inhabited by the Turco-Mongols, were the centre where, about the beginning of the Christian era, a type of vehicle with two wheels and with shafts (carts), earlier developed in China, was furnished with a yoke of modern type relying on traction by the shoulders (A. G. Haudricourt and M. Jean-Brunhes Delamarre, L’homme et la charre, Paris 1955, 173 ff.). From there the use of this vehicle spread in both directions, towards China and towards Europe. These carts play an important part in the history of the peoples of the Steppes, particularly in the period of the Mongol empire.

The word 'araba appears in the 8th/14th century in the Codex Cumanicus, where it is glossed by currus, and in Ibn Batštîna. The latter describes, in the Crimea, a vehicle called by the inhabitants 'araba, which had four wheels, carried a surf, was pulled by two or more horses, by oxen or by camels, and controlled by a driver mounted on one of the animals. He travelled from Sarà to Khârizm on an 'araba pulled by camels (ii, 362-2; 385; 451 etc.; iii, 1 ff.). This is therefore a different vehicle, at least in the first case, from those of Central Asia, and is of a type (wagon) which probably had a pole (with old-fashioned yoke; traction by the neck), invented in the Danube region of Europe or in the Ukraine in pre-historic era, and perpetuated among the Tatars of the same region under the same name (P. S. Pallas, Bemerkungen auf einer Reise in die südlichen Staatlherrschaften des russischen Reichs . . ., Leipzig, 1799-1801, 1, 144 s. and pl. 6). In the 14th century also, 'araba was used in its present day form, where the word is so common that a locomotive is termed "fire 'araba" (ot araba) (K. K. Yudainî, K'irîz sülûgû, tr. A. Taymaç, Ankara 1945, 39).

The word has infiltrated into the Slav and Balkan languages: Rumanian (âraba); Russian arab; Ukrainian karba; Bulgarian, Serbian araba (K. Lokotsch, Etymologisches Wörterbuch der europ. Sprachen, Ursprungs, Heidelberg 1927, no. 90). The word has also been borrowed by Iranian: Persian aràfe, Tâdîjk araba.

In Ottoman Turkish, the word, usually written 'araba in Arabic characters, is the generic term for all types of carriage. In Ottoman Istanbul, people always went about the town on horseback. This was also the normal mode of travel for the sultans when they left their residences. When they were indisposed, however, and on various other occasions they travelled by 'araba. Suleyman the Magnificent, an invalid at the time of his departure for his last campaign, passed through Istanbul on horseback, but had to transfer to an 'araba in the plain of Dâvid Pâša and never left this vehicle (with four wheels and a pole), the driver remaining seated on one of the two horses even during the sultan’s conferences with his viziers (Hammer-Purgstall, ii, 439; illustration based on a MS, in the article Cumhuriyet quoted in the bibl.). The 'arabus of the sultans, princes and important personages were highly decorated (ibid., v, 413; cf. the vehicle of the sultan’s wife depicted in F. Taeschner, Alt-Stambuler Hof- und Volksleben, ein Türkisches Miniaturenalbum aus dem 17. Jhdt., Hanover 1925, pl. 28). They were especially used in royal marriages processes. In 1048/1638, the wedding of 'araba-makers at Istanbul numbered 40 members and possessed 13 shops (Ewliye Celebi, I, 628; tr. Hammer, I, 231).
In the 18th century, the drivers' corporation at Istanbul was organised on regular lines. The profession of vehicle was at its height at the beginning of the 18th century during the "tulip epoch" (lale dewri) (Ahmed Refik, Lale dewri, Istanbul 1331, 47). Later the sumptuary laws restricted this luxury, and the vogue of the 'araba declined (Ahmed Refik, Hicri on ikinci asrarda Istanbul hayati, Istanbul 1930, 175, no. 210).

Apart from these luxury vehicles, the rural type of 'araba drawn by oxen (of 'arabasi) circulated in the streets of the capital. This was a disgrace for a high personage to ride in one, and the Grand Vizier 'Ali Pasha (1102-3/1692-9) was summoned 'Arabadji because he inflicted this ignominious treatment on his political enemies, a treatment to which he himself was in the end subjected (Hammer-Purgstall, vi, 566 ff.).

To the beginning of the 19th century, the right to use 'arabas in Istanbul was restricted to very important functionaries (Sheykh ül-Islam, Grand Vizier; Djeddet, Ta'rirh, x, Istanbul 1309, 185 ff.). At this period the importation of European carriages was in its initial stages. The number of vehicles increased, and they were increasingly adapted to conform to European fashions. In 1852 Théophile Gautier wrote: "Paris and Vienna send the masterpieces of their coach-builders to Constantinople, from whose streets the taikhas with their brightly-painted and gilded coachwork, the typical 'arabas (carriages with shafts used by ladies for their drives in company and properly called kÂNû) pulled by huge grey oxen, will soon completely disappear" (Constantinople, Paris 1853, 318). But in 1863 Emmanuel Scherer, living at Hamidiyye, a suburb of Istanbul, built coupes, victorias, omnibuses and every kind of carriage to order (Tashir-i Eflar, no. 193, 3 Dhu 'l-Hijjah 1280/26 April 1864). Standing-places for 'arabas were provided at many points. Their number, combined with the narrowness of the streets, caused congestion. The Tashir-i Eflar of 19 November 1909 complains about this, and demands that the constitutional régime should no longer tolerate the inconvenience caused by the arrogance of the pashas and the beys.

'Arabas made their appearance in Turkish literature with the exile to Keğhan of 1zzet Molla in 1238/1823; his celebrated poem Mi'ahet-keğhan was composed in the 'araba which conveyed him there, the author conversing with his reflection in the mirrors which decorated its interior (Gibb, Ottoman Poetry, iv, 308, 314). In his novel 'Araba savurdu (1895), Redjâzade Mahmûd Ekrem describes a snob with a passionate love of carriages. To-day the rural four-wheeled vehicles are divided into yayl "with (double) springs", and yarım yayl "semi-sprung", that is to say with a single spring for each axle-tree (cf. same Arabeo, iii, Ankara 1949, 194-6); they are framed by wooden uprights, covered by a semi-circular tilt; as they are not provided with seats, a mattress is used to sit on. Freight vehicles (yâk 'arabas) are often unsprung (but some are "semi-sprung"); this category in particular is subject to decoration in various styles. The tâlika (sometimes written ỉtiHa by false Arabic etymology, but in fact from the Slav word, see, etc., itself derived from the Mongol ściHûn) provided greater amenities for the comfort of passengers. This carriage, widely used in the 19th century and still in use, especially on the Asiatic coast of the Bosphorus, is a sort of open fiacre; it has no door, but a footboard, surmounted by a small platform; the equally commodious "long carriage" (uzun 'araba), a sort of benched carriage, is also open, with a door to the rear, and is equipped with curtains and two benches placed lengthwise inside.

Bibliography: See the article 'Adala above.

In addition, Arabalâr (in the supplement to the journal Cumhuriyet, 17 şubat 1955 = Asrîlar Boyunca Istanbul, 97-100); M. Rodinson, Araba, in JA (printing) (M. Rodinson)

'ARABA, (Wâdi 'ARABA), is the Southern extension of the Jordan fault, which includes the deep depression of the Dead Sea. The term 'Araba in the Old Testament refers also to the Jordan Valley. From approximately three to five miles in width, the Wâdi 'Araba extends for about 110 miles between the south end of the Dead Sea and the north end of the Gulf of Akaba, which is the east arm of the Red Sea. Along much of its length are numerous ancient copper mining and smelting sites. They were probably worked by the Kenites and were intensively exploited in King Solomon's times. There are also extensive haematite deposits in the Wâdi 'Araba.

The route of the Exodus led in part through the Wâdi 'Araba. The few springs in the Wâdi 'Araba attracted settlements as early as Middle Bronze I (21st-19th centuries B.C.), Iron II (10th-6th centuries B.C.) and particularly in Nabataean, Roman and Byzantine times. Near the north shore of the Gulf of Akaba, at the south end of the Wâdi 'Araba, is Tell el-Kheleyife, which has been identified with Solomon's port-city and industrial center of Ezion-geber: Elath. The Nabataean to Byzantine site of Ayla [q.v.] is situated near the east side of this shore, with the modern village of 'Akaba [q.v.] immediately east of it, and the modern Israeli town of Elath is located on the west side of the shore.

Bibliography: A. Musil, Arabia Petraea, ii; N. Glick; The Other Side of the Jordan; idem, The River Jordan; idem, Explorations in Eastern Palestine, i-IV. (N. Glick)

ARABESQUE. For a long time this term was used in literature devoted to art to designate several kinds of typical Islamic ornament: geometric, vegetal, calligraphic and even figural. In the first edition of the EI, E. Herzfeld still took into account this wider interpretation of the arabesque, which however was already antiquated since the time when A. Riegl had defined in his Stilfragen its distinctive character as being a particular, and exclusively Islamic, form of denaturalised vegetal ornament consisting of shoots or spitz or bifurcated leaves on inorganic tendrils. The leaves may be flat or curved, pointed or round or rolled, smooth or rough, feathered or pierced, but never isolated and always joined to the stalk for which it serves as an adjunct or a terminal. The stalk itself may be undulating, spiral or interlaced, with its leaf or issuing again from it, but always intimately connected with it. To quote Herzfeld's definition: stalk and leaf are completely grown into each other, the leaves forming additions growing from the main stalk.

The principles which regulate the arabesque are reciprocal repetition, the formation of palmette or calice forms by pairs of split leaves, the insertion of geometric interlacings, medallions or cartouche compartments. In every instance, two aesthetic rules are scrupulously observed: the rhythmical alternation of movement always rendered with harmonious effect, and the desire to fill the entire surface with ornament. By its balanced and serene...
Fig. 1. Mosque of 'Amr in Fustat ca. 800 (after E. Herzfeld, Der Wandschmuck der Bauten von Samarra, fig. 49a)

Fig. 2. Mosque of 'Ukba in al-Kayrawan (after G. Marçais, Coupole et Plafonds de la Grande Mosquée de Kairouan, Paris 1925)

Fig. 3. From a Qur'an, Granada 13th century (in the Islamische Abteilung, Berlin Museum)

Fig. 4. Wood-carving, Egypt 13th century (after Bourgoin, Précis de l’Art arabe, Paris 1892, iii, pl. 88)
convolution, the arabesque avoids the dynamic excitement, the restless whirling and violent twisting of the Nordic ornament with which it otherwise has much in common. The effect of contrast is obtained by differences in density, the stalk sometimes nearly disappearing beneath an abundance of foliage, at other times vigorously dominating the pattern.

The denaturalised vegetal ornament conforming to the rules described above is termed "arabesque" is preserved in _al-aurique_, a term commonly used by Spanish authors to designate the genuine arabesque as understood by Riegl.

The arabesque may be combined with every kind of geometric decoration. In epigraphy, it may form a background to the calligraphy, or the letters may terminate in arabesques, or letters and arabesque may be interwoven. Animals may be drawn in the form of arabesques, which may also be combined...
with human figures; the animals and the human figures may then be rendered more, or less, recognizable. Sometimes, an Islamic 'arabesque' decoration occurs in which masks and protomes of animals are combined with an arabesque scheme. It seems unnecessary to emphasise that the arabesque never has any symbolic significance but is merely one ornament from a large stock which includes other vegetal forms such as palmettes, rosettes and naturalistic flowers, and abstract forms such as cloud-bands. At certain periods, however, it played a predominant role.

The arabesque has its prototype in certain acanthus, vine leaf and cornucopia forms of late antiquity which tend to progress in undulations or with bifurcations. It is not yet completely developed in the Umayyad period, acquires its typical shape in the 9th century under the 'Abbâsids and in Islamic Spain and appears fully developed in the 11th century under the Saljûqs, Fâṭimids and Moors. From then on it occurs throughout the Islamic world in countless variations, so that it is impossible to classify the various forms according to a chronological order or according to national or dynastic predilections. Persian, Turkish and Indian artists understood the language of the arabesque quite as well as Arabic-speaking artists, and through the centuries they competed one against the other in creating ever more varieties and combinations. Its use is not restricted to any one material, but is used in architectural decoration as well as carved or painted decoration, in pottery and glass and metal-work, and above all in book illumination.

In Hispanic-Mauresque art of the 12th century and later the arabesque predominates almost to the exclusion of other ornamental forms, and from Islamic Spain it found its way in the late 13th century to the Christian countries. Known as moreisque it became fashionable in the first half of the 16th century and was introduced into Italy by Francesco Pellegrino, into France by the unknown master G. J., and into Germany by Hans Holbein and Peter Flettner. Like them, other artists tried to imitate, with more or less understanding, the particular character of the arabesque, principally in their pattern-books for jewellers and armourers (e.g. the Livre de moreisques, Paris 1546).

[See also ornament].

**Bibliography:** A. Riegl, Stillfragen, Berlin 1893; E. Kühnel, Die Arabeske, Wiesbaden 1949.

**'ARABFAKH,** Shihâb al-Dîn Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Kâdir, chronicler of 16th century Muslim Ethiopia. He personally took part in the war between the imâm Ahmad b. Ibrâhîm, lord of Harar, and the Negus Lebna Dengel; but, when he wrote his chronicle, he had already left Ethiopia for Djizân in Arabia. His (Harari) surname 'Arab-Fakhth, "the Arab doctor", can be explained either as the sobriquet of an Ethiopian who was particularly well-versed in the Arabic language and îshâ, or as the local laqab of an Arab who emigrated at first to Ethiopia (and who later returned to his native country). His chronicle bears the title (in the colophon) of Twâfi al-Zâmân, but it is given in the MSS. as Fûtâh al-Habâbha ("Conquests of Ethiopia"). The narrative closes with the events of the year 1537; but the colophon describes the work as the "First Part". A second part, however, has never been found, and it is quite possible that the author was never able to complete his work as planned.

The Fûtâh al-Habâbha, of which we possess only a few MSS., all recent, is also quoted and to a large extent summarised in the (Arabic) Chronicle of Gujarat (Zâfar al-Wâdth bi-Mawâfat wa-Sâdha) by al-Ulugh-Khânî, also an Arab writer, who emigrated to Muslim India during the second half of the 16th century.


**'ARABI PASHA** [see 'URABI PASHA].

**ARABIAN NIGHTS** [see ALF LAYLA WA-LAYLA].

**ARABIC WRITING** [see KHIATT].

**'ARABISTAN, 'the Arab country', a term much in use until recently to denote the Persian province of Khâbištân; the latter name was revived during the reign of Riḍâ Shâh Pahlawi. Further particular see ANZIYSTAN. Following Persian usage, 'Arabîstân denotes occasionally the Arabian peninsula. In Ottoman administrative documents from the 16th century it is occasionally applied to the Arabic-speaking provinces of the Empire, more especially to Syria.**

**'ARABIYYA. ARABIC LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE.**

**A. The Arabic Language (al−'Arabiyya).**

(i) Pre-classical Arabic.

(1) The position of Arabic among the Semitic languages;
(2) Old Arabic ("Proto-Arabic");
(3) Early Arabic (3rd-6th centuries A.D.).

(ii) The Literary Language.

(1) Classical Arabic;
(2) Early Middle Arabic;
(3) Middle Arabic;
(4) Modern Arabic.

(iii) The Vernaculars.

(1) General survey;
(2) The Eastern dialects;
(3) The Western Dialects.

**B. Arabic Literature.**

Al−'arabiyya, sc. lîwâ, also lîsân al−'arab, is:

(1) The Arabic language in all its forms. This use is pre-Islamic, as is shown by the appearance of lîsân *darbâhî in third-century Hebrew sources, arabica lingua in St. Jerome's Prae/atio in Danielem; this probably is also the sense of lîsân *arâbî (mubin) in Kur'ân, xvi, 103 (103); xxvi, 193; xlv, 12 (11).

(2) Technically, the Classical Arabic language (C. Ar.) of early poetry, Kur'ân, etc., and the Literary Arabic of Islamic literature. This may be distinguished from *arabiyya in the wider sense as al−'arabiyya al−fasâhî or al−'arabiyya al−fasâhâ, from fasâha "to be clear, pure" (cf. Assyr. fisû "pure, bright", Aram. fassâh "bright, radiant"); it means "clear", i.e. "(universally intelligible) Arabic, not "pure Arabic", as is shown by aʃâbab (al−kalâmâ) "to speak clearly" (LA, iii, 377), cf. also aʃâba "to speak clearly, intelligibly" and "to use correct Arabic".

Cl. Ar. is the chief literary dialect of Arabic, though not the only written one (cf. Old Arabic and some modern colloquials, notably Maltese). The other forms of Arabic known to us belong to three distinct stages: 1) Old Arabic, also called Proto-Arabic (though this term would better be reserved for the hypothetical common ancestor of all Arabic dialects), German altnordarabisch. 2) The Early Dialects (lîgâhâ).

3) The Colloquials (medieval lîgâhâ al−šâmîm, modern al−lîgâh al−šâmîyâ or al−darâji, or lakâdijâ).

(i) Pre-classical Arabic

(1) The Position of Arabic among the Semitic Languages

Arabic belongs to the Semitic language family, which is part of a wider Hamito-Semitic family
including, inter alia, also Ancient Egyptian. Within that family, it belongs to the South-Semitic or South-West-Semitic branch, which includes two further sub-groups: (a) South-Arabian (comprising ancient Sabaeans, Mineans, Katabanians, Hadramitic, etc. in Yaman and Southern Hadramawt and modern Mehrib, Shihhouri etc. in Northern Hadramawt and the language of the island of Socotra); contrary to a widespread assumption, ancient South-Arabian is a language-group quite different from Arabic; (b) South-Semitic or Ethiopian, comprising ancient Ethiopian or Ge'ez, modern Tigre, Tigrinaya, Amharic, Harari, Gurage, etc.; it is not yet quite clear whether Ethiopian originally derived from some form of South-Arabian (cf. E. Ullendorff, Sem. Languages of Ethiopia, 1955).

The common traits of the S.-Sem. branch (partly obscured in the modern forms) are: almost complete preservation of the proto-Sem. system, except for  for becoming  and  coalescing with  (Arabic  is proto-Sem. 4); plural of nouns formed by internal vowel changes;  and  patterns in the verb. S.-Ar. and Eth., however, have some features in common with Accadian which Arabic does not share (W. Leslau, in JAOS, 1944, 53-8).

On the other hand Arabic shares with North-West Semitic (Hebrew, Ugaritic, Aramaic) certain traits not found in S.-Ar. and Eth.: the pl. masc. suffix -  the internal passive (W. Christian, in WZKM, 1927, 283; for S.-Ar. see M. Höfler, Altsüdarab. Gramm., 82), and the prefix diminutive (F. Praetorius, in ZDMG, 1923, 524-9), see also I. al-Yasin, Lexical Relation between Ugaritic and Arabic, 1952. Some forms of Arabic had closer connection with N.W.-Sem.: Old Arabic had, like Hebrew, a definite article  with doubling of the following consonant (as in ); names like (3rd cent. B.C.) and (3rd cent. A.D.) show that  had the construct  in all cases, as in Hebrew. Among the Early Dialects, the forms, rel. pron.  corresponds to poetical Hebrew ž, while the  of other Western dialects has its equivalent in older Aramaic: the W. dialects also sounded  as 6, like Canaanite and W.-Syriac, and changed  to 4, like Hebrew. The Eastern dialects, on the other hand, had i-prefixes with the a-imperfect, like Canaanite and W.-Syriac (cf. C. Rabin, in Journal of Semitic Studies, 1950, 22-6).

Arabic as a whole thus stands between S.-Sem. and N.W.-Sem., having contacts with both. There existed perhaps dialects intermediate between N.W.-Sem. and Arabic: this has been claimed for the local dialect which influenced the Hebrew book of Job (cf. B. Moritz, in ZATW 1926, 81-93; Foster, in Am. Journ. of Sem. Lang., 1932, 21-45).

(a) Old Arabic (“Proto-Arabic”)

The oldest record of Arabic are some 40 proper names in Assyrian accounts of fighting against the Arbi (Arabu, Arbii, cf. O'Callaghan, Aram Naka-ram, 95) during the years 853-626 B.C., collected by T. Weiss-rosmarin, in JSOR, 1932, 1-37, and F. Hommel, Ethnologie u. Geogr. d. alten Orientalen, 1926, 578-89. Almost all can be identified as Arabic: the view of Landsberger and Bauer (in ZA, 1927, 97-8) that the Arbi were Aramaeans has as little foundation as that of B. Moritz (Or. Studies . Paul Haupt, 1926, 184-211) that the Aramnu mentioned in texts of the same period were Akkadu. The Gambulu were closely allied with the Arbi (Assurbanipal’s Rassam Prism iii, 65); among their chiefs (Sargon’s Annals 254-5) were Hamdanu, Zabidu, and Ḥaza‘ilu, as well as some bearing Aramaic names. Most had Assyrian names, however, showing that some of these tribes had undergone the influence of the higher culture.

Assyrian influence also marks the earliest texts written in Arabs, in the 8th-7th cent. B.C., in a North-Arabian script close to the Dedanite, but in the Accadian language, except for the mixed form ybl, which is Accadian ybl “he carried” with West-Semitic y-prefix. These include two short inscriptions found at Ur (Burrows, in JAOS 1937, 792-806) and some seal cylinders (W. F. Albright, in Bull. Am. School of Arch. in Syria 1939, 39-45). Albright identified the group from which these texts originated as the Chaldeans.

The Dedanite inscriptions at al-Ula are probably only slightly later (H. Grimme, Buch u. Schrift, iv, 19-28; id., in OLZ, 1932, 753-8). At the same locality, but later, are the Libyanite inscriptions. The latest are 150 A.D., and show Early Arabic features. About this time (see, however, Boneschi, in RS0, 1951, 1-15) “Mas‘ud king of Libyan” put up inscriptions in archaic Nabataean Aramaic.


Grave inscriptions in Libyamic script exist in al-Ḥasā (G. Ryckmans, in Mus., 1937, 239; Cornwell, in GJ, 1946, 434; Winnett, Bull. Am. School for Or. Res., no. 192, 4-6; S. Smith (in BSOS 1954, 44) they think they emanate from the people of Ḥira.

Thamudic is represented by graffiti in northern Hijāz, Sinai, Transjordan, southern Palestine (3,000 in A. v.d. Branden, Inscriptions thomaudennes, 1924-1927, 524 in Harding & Littmann, Some Th. Insocr. from ... Jordan, 1952), and EGYPT (Kensdale, in Mus., 1952, 283-90). For grammar see v. d. Branden, op. cit.; E. Littmann, Thamād u. Ṣafā, 1943; id., in ZDMG 1950, 168-80. The latest Thamudic texts occur in conjunction with Early Ar.: one line on the stèle of Ḥegār of 267 A.D. (in Nabataean script), some graffiti on the temple of Shamsina, and some graffiti on the temple of Kalāb in 300 A.D., next to the oldest graffiti in Arabic script. The language hardly changed during the 600 years of its use; this suggests some literary tradition.

Ṣafātene or Safalic graffiti are found in the Ṣafā, Hara, and Legā east of Damascus (for texts outside that area, see E. Littmann, in Mélanges Dunand, 1939, 661-72; G. Ryckmans, ib., 507-20). Around al-Namār there are some graffiti intermediate between Safetene and Thamūdic. Historical allusions provide dates as far as the 3rd cent. A.D. (G. Ryckmans, in Comptes Rend. Ac. Insocr., 1942, 127-36; M. Rodinson, in Sumer, 1946, 137-55), according to Winnett (in JAOS, 1933, 41) even until 614 A.D. One Thamūdic text may be Christian (E. Littmann, in MW, 1950, 16-8; against this v. d. Branden, in Mus., 1950, 47-53).


Since graffiti mostly consist of names, our knowledge of all these idioms is scanty. It is probable that the method of elucidating them by reference to the Arabic lexicom makes them appear more similar to C. Ar. than they really were. The transliteration of the Arab names shows that *ṣān* was sounded weakly, *ḏim* was like Accadian *g*, *ḥāl* like *k*, *ḥāl* like *t*, and *ḏāl* like *p*. Greek transliterations of names from the Safatene area show a vowel-system reminiscent of Hebrew or Colloquial Arabic, e.g. *qetodu = Usyad*. Spellings like *bny = ʿn* and *ngy = ʿn* suggest that all defective verbs ended in -iya, as in Hebrew.

While all these peoples wrote their own languages in varieties of a script closely related to Old S.-Arabian, the Nabataeans (100 B.C.-4th cent. A.D.) and the Palmyrenians (1st-3rd cent. A.D.) used local varieties of Imperial Aramaic (the *lingua franca* of the Syrian-Arabian empire) and Aramaic script, but their names show that the Nabataeans were wholly Arab, and at Palmyra there was an important Arab element (cf. Goldmann, *Palmyr. Personennamen*, 1937). In Palmyrenian, Arabic words are few (J. Cantineau, *Gr. du Palm. épigr.*, 1935, 150-1; even fewer in F. Rosenthal, *Sprache d. palmyr. Inschr.*, 1937, 94-6). Nabataean has many Aramaisms; their number increases sharply in later texts (Cantineau, *op. cit.*, ii, 171-80; id., *AIEO*, 1934, 77-97; see also F. Rosenthal, *Aramaistische Forschung*, 1939, 89-92).

This Arabic substrate—which was probably different in various regions—includes Thamudic *ṣād* "legitimate heir"; in contrast to the epigraphic Old Arabic dialects it had the *al-* article (Ṣhy ḫawm against Safat. Ṣhy ḫawm, name of a god; Ṭhrw = kgrā; long a was sounded o as in the Early Western Dialects.

A source of Old Arabic hardly tapped is the study of the personal names, thousands of which are known. These show a striking continuity from the *ṣān* names preserved in texts in Accadian (cf. under Arbi above), Hebrew (J. A. Montgomery, *Arabia and the Bible*, 1934; idem, in *Haverford Symposium on Archeol. and Bible*, 1938, 188-201), and Greek and Latin (A. Sprenger, *Alte Geogr. Arabiens*, 1875; Glaser, *Skirt*, etc., 1889-90; A. Muesl, *Topographische Itinerarii*, ii, Appendix 3; cf. also the material of S. Al-Munadidi as a work of Ismaʿil b. ṬAmr al-Mukri, Cairo 1946. The Djurhum, of course, belong to the *ʿArab al-ʿariba* [q.v.] or al-bāʿida, from whom, according to the Arab historians, the *ʿArab al-mustaʿriba* tribes, the tribes making up the bulk of the population in the 6th cent. A.D., took over the country and the language. More specifically we learn that the Tayyī adopted the language of the Saḥār (Yākūt, i, 127). We must ask (1) whether the *ʿArab tribes were identical with the known speakers of Old Arabic, i.e. what language the mustaʿriba tribes spoke before they adopted Arabic. To neither question have we any answer. The matter is further bound up with the cleavage between Eastern and Western Early dialects: on the whole the latter appear to have been somewhat closer to Old Arabic, but it is likely that the real successor of Old Arabic were the ʿKūṭaʾa tribes, spoken over the same area as the former, our knowledge of which is practically nil; on the other hand we possess practically no epigraphic material from those areas where either the Eastern or the Western dialects were spoken, and the speech of those regions during the Old Arab period may have been quite different from the Old Arab dialects perpetuated by inscriptions.


Another valuable source for reconstructing the phonetic history of Arabic is the geographical names preserved in texts in Accadian (cf. under Arbi above), Hebrew (J. A. Montgomery, *Arabia and the Bible*, 1934; idem, in *Haverford Symposium on Archeol. and Bible*, 1938, 188-201), and Greek and Latin (A. Sprenger, *Alte Geogr. Arabiens*, 1875; Glasser, *Skirt*, etc., 1889-90; A. Muesl, *Topographische Itinerarii*, ii, Appendix 3; cf. also the material of S. Al-Munadidi as a work of Ismaʿil b. ṬAmr al-Mukri, Cairo 1946. The Djurhum, of course, belong to the *ʿArab al-ʿariba* [q.v.] or al-bāʿida, from whom, according to the Arab historians, the *ʿArab al-mustaʿriba* tribes, the tribes making up the bulk of the population in the 6th cent. A.D., took over the country and the language. More specifically we learn that the Tayyī adopted the language of the Saḥār (Yākūt, i, 127). We must ask (1) whether the *ʿArab tribes were identical with the known speakers of Old Arabic, i.e. what language the mustaʿriba tribes spoke before they adopted Arabic. To neither question have we any answer. The matter is further bound up with the cleavage between Eastern and Western Early dialects: on the whole the latter appear to have been somewhat closer to Old Arabic, but it is likely that the real successor of Old Arabic were the ʿKūṭaʾa tribes, spoken over the same area as the former, our knowledge of which is practically nil; on the other hand we possess practically no epigraphic material from those areas where either the Eastern or the Western dialects were spoken, and the speech of those regions during the Old Arab period may have been quite different from the Old Arab dialects perpetuated by inscriptions.

(3) Early Arabic (3rd-6th centuries A.D.)

Following precedents in the nomenclature of English and German, we may give this name to the period from the 3rd to the 6th cent. A.D. when over a large part of Arabia dialects quite distinct from Old Arabic, but approaching C. Ar. were spoken, and during which C. Ar. itself must have evolved.

Outside evidence for this period is scarce, but we possess a number of quotations in contemporary Jewish sources (partly coll. by A. Cohen, in *JQR*, 1912/13, 221-33), including even sentences, e.g. *mab'ad li-dammatika* "make room for thy throng" (Midrash Rabba on Canticles, iv, 1).

This is the period during which hundreds of Aramaic loan-words entered the language through Christian and Jewish contacts (cf. F. Frank, *Fremdspr. im Arab.*, 1886); their phonological study throws some light on the Arabic of the period.

Thus there is an older layer where Araj. *gād = ʿn* and a younger one where it = ʿn, due no doubt to a sound-change in Arabic (D. H. Müller, *Acts VII Or. Cong.*, 1888, 229-48; Brockemiel, *Grundr. Vergl. Gr.*, i, 129-30). Other words penetrated during this period from South-Arabian (H. Grimm, in *ZA*, 1912, 138-68; cf. also F. Krenkow, in *WZKM*, 1931, 127-8) and Ethiopic (Nödeke, *Neue Beiträge*, 31-66; but see Rabbi, *Ancient West-Arabian*, 109, on šābū and mizākūd)—owing to our restricted knowledge of S.-Ar., the two sources cannot always be clearly distinguished. Some Persian loan-words, found in the Kurān and poetry, entered during this period, though the great influx of Persian words took place in the first Islamic centuries (A. Siddiqi, *Studien über d. pers. Fremdspr.*., 1919). Greek words entered mainly via Aramaic, Latin words via Greek and Aramaic: thus *kınfār* < *š̄āmātār* < Lat. *tensarius*; *māndil* < *Syri. most₂ndil* (with typical late Gk. soundchange) < Lat. *mantele*. Some military terms, e.g. *sāl < strata* or *hār < castra* (cf., however, Palest. *Jew. Aram. ḫāṣrā* may have come directly from Latin.
Bibliography: Djawallkl, Muʿarrab (Sachau), 1867; Noldeke, Neue Beiträge, 23-30; A. Jeffery, Foreign Vocabulary of the Qurʾān, 1938; A. Salonen, Alle Substrat- und Kulturwörter im Arab., 1950 (= St. Or. Soc. Or. Fennica, xvii, 2).

It must be assumed that these words originally entered some specific dialect area in contact with the culture in question and then spread into Cl. Ar. We hear of foreign words used only at Medina (Rabin, op. cit., 96; Fück, Arabiya, 10). Arabic philological literature preserves much material about the Early Dialects of Najd (Tamilm, Asad, Bakr, Ṭayyiʿ, Ḥijāz and the highland area of the South-west (Hudhayl, Ahd, Yaman), very little about those of other areas. The information seems to have been gathered during the 2nd-3rd Islamic centuries—when these dialects were probably rapidly disintegrating—partly from tribesmen in the ʿamārāʾ; it is distorted by the scholastic approach and by the use made of it for elucidating difficulties in texts which had nothing to do with the dialects cited. Interest in the dialects for their own sake developed only late, and many data are preserved only in late works whose sources we cannot check.

A sharp cleavage clearly emerges between an Eastern group centred on the Persian Gulf, and a Western one, including besides the south-western and ʿHijāz dialects also that of Ṭayyiʿ. Within the latter the characteristic features are most clearly marked in Yaman and Ṭayyiʿ, while Hudhayl and ʿHijāz show evidence of Eastern influence. The differences are in rhythm (vowel-elisions and assimilations in the East), phonetics (e.g. West distinguished ʿ—sounded ʿ—sounded ʿ; ḥamsa was strongly sounded in East and even became ʿayn, but was completely elided in the West), grammar (e.g. Eastern allāḏhī: Western dāʾ, dāʾ; E. passive ʿīlā: W. ʿīlā; E. imper. ruddūl: W. urdūl), syntax (e.g. the “ʿHijāzī md”; E. dāʿa(ʿ)i, r-rīḍālū: W. dāʿa(ʿ) r-rīḍālū) and vocabulary.

It cannot be determined whether this cleavage had but recently developed or was old-inherited; the possibility must be taken into account that the inhabitants of Arabia had come from different parts of the Semitic world and that the common “Arabic” features were produced by mutual influence or by a common substrate after their settlement in Arabia.


To the Early Arabic period belong two inscriptions in Nabataean characters but practically pure Arabic language: One is at Ḥirāʾ (Arabic al-Ḥirāʾ, now Madāʾin Ṣāliḥ), northern Ḥijāz, dated 267 A.D. (M. Lidzbarski, in ZA, 1909, 194-7; Jaussen & Savignac, in Rev. Biblique, 1908, 241-50; Chabot, in Comptes Rend. Acad. Inscri., 1908, 269-72; L. Cantineau, Nabāmah, ii, 38), with a line in Thamudic; the other, the inscription of Imraʾ al-Kays “king of all Arabs” at al-Namāra, dated 328 A.D. (R. Dussaud, in Rev. Archéol., 1902, 469-2; id., Mission ... Syrie Moyenne, 314; M. Lidzbarski, Ephemeres, ii, 34; (Repr. Epigr. Sém., no. 483; Cantineau, ii, 49). M. Hartmann (OLZ 1906, 573; Arab. Frage, 1908, 510, now also Dussaud, Penetration etc., 64 sqq.) thought Imraʾ al-Kays to have been a king of al-Ḥira, but the language of the inscription is shown to be a Western dialect by the pronouns fyem. sg. demonstr. and dāʾar relat. and (ii) The literary language

(1) Classical Arabic

The oldest texts in Arabic script are three graffito on the wall of the temple of Ramm in Sinai, dating from ca. 300 A.D. (H. Grimme, Rev. Bibl., 1935, 270; 1936, 90-5). Christian inscriptions, accompanied by Greek versions, are at Zabad, dated 512 A.D. (E. Sachau, in Mith. Fr. Ak. W., 1881, 169-90; id., in ZDMG, 1882, 345-52), and at Hārrān in the Legādā dated 568 A.D. (Schroeder, in ZDMG, 1884, 34; Dussaud, Mission ... Syrie Moyenne, 324; Cantineau, Nabāmah, ii, 50; on both inscr. E. Littmann, in RSO 1911, 193-8). The text of an inscription on the church of Hind at al-Ḥira, about 560 A.D., is recorded by Muslim historians (al-Bakri, 364; G. Rothstein, Lahāiden, 1809, 24). An undated graffito is at Umm al-Dīmāl (E. Littmann, in ZS, 1929, 197-204). All four inscriptions in N. Abbott, Rise of the North-Arabian Script, 1939, plate I.

The Christian character of the dated inscriptions suggests that the Arabic script was invented by Christian missionaries, as were so many Eastern alphabets. Abbott (op. cit. 5) localises its invention, with much probability, at Hīra or Anbār.

It is probable that at least partial Bible translations into Arabic existed before Islam. Stylistic reminiscences of the Old and New Testaments are found in the Kurʿān (W. Rudolph, Abhängigkeit d. K. v. Judentum u. Christentum, 1922; T. Andrae, Ursprung d. Islams u. d. Christentum, 1926; A. Mingana, Bull. J. Rylands Library, 1927, 77-89; Ahrens, in ZDMG, 1930, 15-68, 148-90). A. Baumstark claimed pre-Islamic date for the text of some Arabic Bible MSS (Islamica, 1931, 569-75; BZ 1929/30, 359-9; OC, 1934, 55-66; against this Graf, Gesch. d. d. Christ. Litt., i, 142-6). There also is a fragment of the Psalms in Arabic in Greek characters (Violet, in OLZ, 1901, 384-403). Examination of this and of two of Baumstark’s texts (B. Levin, Griech.-Arab. Evang. Uebers., 1938) shows a language slightly deviating from Cl. Ar. towards the colloquial. This is typical for Chr.-Arab. literature (Graf, Sprachbeizruh d. Alteren Chr.-Arab. Liter., 1905), for early papyri and for the language of scientific writing; it may be early colloquial influence, but also a Cl. Ar. not yet standardised by grammarians.

The Arabian Jews are less likely to have participated in the literary formation of Cl. Ar., since
at that period written translations of the O.T. were not being made by Jews (though a Jewish translation is mentioned by Bukhārī iii, 98). The Jewish tradition in Umayyya, as Ibn Sīdī (J. W. Hirschberg, Jüd. u. Chr. Lehren im vor- u. frühislam. Arabien, 1939) and in the Kurān (cf., e.g., Torrey, Jewish Foundations of Islam, 1933; A. Katsh, Judaism in Islam, 1954), show all signs of oral transmission. Jews, however, used Cl. Ar. before Islam, as e.g. Samaw'al ibn 'Abīdīya (cf. also I. Guldī, Arabische antikis., 1921, 145-6; Hirschberg, Dīwān al-S. b. Ḍā'im, 1937, Intro.), and are said to have taught the Muslims to write at Medina (Baladhurī, Fatīḥa, 473).

Wellhausen (Reste arab. Heidentums, 1927, 232) plausibly suggested that Cl. Ar. was developed by Christians at al-Hīra. Muslim tradition names among the first persons who wrote Arabic Žayyād b. ʿAmrī (ca. 500 A.D.) and his son, the poet ʿAdī, both Christians of Hīra (Aghānī, ii, 100-2). ʿAdī's language was not considered fully ʿajīb, which may be taken as meaning that Cl. Ar. was still in course of evolution. Al-Mufaddal (apud al-Marzubānī, Muwaṣṣilāt, Cairo 1343, 73) says that ʿAdī drew on many tribal dialects, a procedure alleged by other scholars to account for the excellence of the Kuraysh dialect. This statement gains in substance if we recall that nowadays the poetry of Arabic is often couched in bedouin dialects, and that the oldest genuine bits of poetry, those connected with the War of ʿBāṣūs, come from the Euphrates region. The court of Hīra remained a centre for bedouin poets: this helped in developing and unifying the language of poetry; its written use at Al-Hīra also furthered its standardisation.

As to the origins of that poetical language itself, earlier Muslim tradition sought it in various tribes, while later scholars, no doubt for theological reasons, identified it with the dialect of Kuraysh. This view was accepted by Grimm (Mohammed, 1904, 23), ʿĀṣa Ḥusayn (Al-ʿAdāb al-Dīhāšī, 1927), and Dhorme (Langues et écritures sémit., 1930, 53). Most western scholars agree in seeking its home among the bedouins of Najd—as did in practice the Muslim philologists of the 2nd-4th centuries, who would only accept Najdī bedouins as authoritative informants. Some believe it to have been originally the language of one definite tribe, others a compromise between various dialects; others again think it acquired some purely artificial character, both in phonetics (it lacks the contractions在一起) and in syntax, where it keeps alive constructions lost in early prose (Bloch, Vers und Sprache im Allarab., 1946). It is beyond doubt, however, that in the late 6th cent. A.D. it was a purely literary dialect, distinct from all spoken idioms and super-tribal. It is today often referred to as the "poetical koine". Its conti-

Please note that the text is quite long and contains a mix of Arabic and English words. It discusses the development of the Arabic language and its usage in early Islamic poetry and literature. The text also includes references to various scholars and their works, which are cited throughout the text.
Already in Pre-Islamic Arabia, the ko'ine had to be learnt, and the men who preserved and taught it, the ṭālīk, were ready when the need arose for non-Arabs to acquire it under the Umayyads and Abbasids. Abu ‘l-Aswad ad-Du’ali and Qhall b. Ahmad belonged to that class, but they were soon joined by men who had inherited the habits of thinking taught in the Hellenistic Schools of Rhetoric, and who systematised the traditional lore of the ṭawḍūt and applied the science thus created not only to poetry but also to the Kur’ān, harmonising wherever the texts “deviated” from the rules. Before turning into the Literary Arabic of the Islamic period, Cl. Ar. thus underwent a process of sifting and systematisation, with subsequent refurbishing of the old sources, poetry and Kur’ān, according to the new stricter standards.


The history of the European study of Arabic is at first one of increasingly effective utilisation of the Arab philologists’ work. The first grammars, by Postel (1538) and Erpenius (1613), were based on late school manuals. The first systematically to use older and more advanced Arabic works was S. de Sacy (1810). C. P. Caspari (1848) was based on Zamakhshari; in the 3rd edition of W. Wright’s translation (1896 and reprints) this base is much enlarged. D. Vernier (1892-2) utilized Sibawayh; M. S. Howell (1880-1911) digested all Arab grammarians. In lexicography, the evolution goes from Raphelengius (1613) and Giggeius (1632, based on the Kāmis of al-Fluzu‘abādī), via Gollus (1653, based on the Sa‘ād of al-Djawharī) to E. W. Lane’s gigantic translation and rearrangement of IA (1883-93; parts 6-8, ed. by S. Lane Poole, are less useful) and the practical dictionaries of Belot and Hava, based on LA.

In its second stage, European scholarship attempted to improve on the achievements of the Arabs by direct reference to texts and independent analysis. In grammar, the process begins with H. L. Fleischer’s notes on S. de Sacy (Kleinere Schriften ii, iii, 1868-8); further of special importance Th. Nöldeke, Zur Gramm. des klassischen Arabisch, SBAr. Wien, 1897, ii; H. Reckendorf, Synchronistische Verhältnisse d. Arab., 1895-8; id., Arabische Syntax, 1921; C. Brockelmann, Grundr. d. vergl. Gramm. ii, 1913; M. Gaudemet-Drombynes and R. Blachère, Gramm. de l’Arabe Classique, 1937. In lexicography, the principal fault of the Arab works is that—apart from some specialist vocabularies and al-Fayyūmī’s Miṣḥāb al-Munir—they largely neglect the post-classical accretions to the language. Texts were utilised already by G. W. Freytag (1830-7) and A. de Biberstein-Kazimierczki (1860). In spite of the Supplement of R. Dozy (1881), the Additions of E. Fagnan (1923), the glossaries added to the Leiden Ṭabarli edn. (1901) and vols. iv, v, viii of the BA, etc., the vocabulary of medieval Arabic is still far from fully recorded. I. Krachkovsky, Neustadt and Shusser (1947), and H. Wehr (1952) deal with modern Arabic. Yet even for Cl. Ar. there is still much work to be done. Some gaps are closed by glossaries with editions of poems, e.g. that of A. Müllner to Nöldeke’s Delectus etc. (1890), A. A. Bevan to C. J. Lyall’s edn. of the Muḥammadīyyāt (ii, 1924), and those added by Ch. Lyall to ‘Abid and ‘Amir b. Ṭawwāl (1913) and F. Krenkow to Ṭawwāl and Ṭirimmalla (1927). The Hebrew University of...
Jerusalem has prepared a card-index concordance to Pre-Islamic poetry. Publication is planned at Cairo of the lexicon of A. Fischer; the edition by J. Kraemer of Nöldeke's 
Belegwörterbuch (incorporating collections by Bevan and others) began in 1952. No scientific dictionary exists as yet for the Kur'ān, those by F. Dieterici (1881) and Penrice (1873) being unsatisfactory.

(C. Rabin)

Arabic poetry began in Rabl a with Muhalhil; then shifted to Kays where the two Nabighas and Zuhayr flourished, and finally reached Tamilm where it remained till the days of Islam (al-Mushir, II, 476, 477). Light on the subject may be sought in the many attempts at explaining the tradition "The Kur'ān was revealed in seven ahruf (tongues or languages)". According to Ibn 'Abbās those were the seven dialects of Upper Hawāzīn and Lower Tamilm. This may be taken to mean that these seven dialects, being the clearest and the most eloquent, contributed largely to the formation of the literary language [al-Suyūtī, al-Itha 'ān, Cairo 1935, 47]. Al-Ṭabarī raises the question as to whether the Kur'ān was revealed in all or some only of the Arab dialects, and uses the tradition referred to above to argue that the Kur'ān was revealed in some only (seven) as the Arab dialects were too numerous to count. (Tafsīr, Cairo 1323, I, 13).

The second stage in the development and spread of literary Arabic begins with the rise of Islam. The new religion chose to make its challenge to the poetically-minded Arabs through a literary composition. The new Holy Book, by its excellence, proved to the Arabs as miraculous as the turning of a stick into a snake, or the healing of the sick was to former peoples. The whole revolution in the life, belief and practical philosophy of the Arabs was embodied in the chapters of this new Book. From the beginning of its revelation it was being learnt by heart by the Muslims and recorded in writing by the special scribes employed by the Prophet (al-Djāshshiyārī, al-Wuzarā' wa 'l-Kuttāb, ed. Saḫkā and others, Cairo 1938).

The general practice was that a Muslim would learn a few verses (ten for example) and would not exceed them until he knew their meaning and followed their precepts in practical life [al-Ṭabarī, Dīmās al-Bayān, I, 27, 28]. It was not long before a group of companions (e.g. Ibn 'Abbās, Ibn Mas'ūd, 'Ikrīma, and 'All) became specialists in the interpretation of the Kur'ānic text. Thus a new branch of literary and linguistic learning started which became later an important factor in the standardisation of literary Arabic. But there was another important aspect of Kur'ānic reading which had some bearing on the development of literary Arabic, namely the variants which caused concern to many a faithful believer.

The danger of this variation in the reading of the Kur'ānic text was removed only by the preparation of standard copies at the command of the third Caliph, 'Uthmān (see Kur'ān).

Thus the first and foremost Islamic literary work in the Arabic language became the most authentic model for literary usage. Wherever the Islamic faith went in its rapid spread, it carried with it this religious and literary constitution. Every believer learnt part -or all, of it by heart, and was influenced in his literary activities by its diction and modes of expression.

Many of the variant readings of the Kur'ān, however, were preserved to us through the Kirdāt literature and have proved valuable in the reconstruction of Arabic dialects.

The Kur'ān had, yet, another aspect in which it influenced the course of the literary language, namely its miraculous unsurpassable excellence. The literary Arab celebrities admitted impotence before its challenge, and Muslims down the ages looked up to it as their literary guide and linguistic authority.

The study of the secrets of Kur'ānic eloquence (ṣīdā) has given Arabic literary criticism a special approach and a wealth of material (see M. Khāla-
During the Prophet’s life-time and some time after, poetical activities among the Arabs gave way to the propagation of the new faith by word and by sword. Some devout Muslims found better occupation in learning the Qur’an and pondering on the beauty of its style, others joined the invading Muslim armies in Syria, Irak and Persia. The art of public speaking, for a period, took the place of the art of poetry. The literary language now was turning more and more into a language of religious guidance, moral uplifting and legislation for the new order.

New shades of meaning and literary usages began to develop within the framework of the pre-Islamic literary language. “The Arabs in their dīkhāsiyya days”, says Ibn Fāris, “had inherited from their ancestors a heritage of dialects, literature, rituals and sacrificial practices. But when Islam came, the Arab tribes mingled and intermarried, and their linguistic usages were shifted from one usage to another, because of matters added, commandments imposed, and rules established”. (Examples of these changes are given by as-Suyūṭī, Ibn Khallawayh, al-Thaūlībī and Ibn Durayd, see, al-Musḥīr, 1, 294, 295, 296, 298, 301, 302).

Thus the second stage in the development of the Arabic literary language has brought in new important factors, religious and social, and introduced many necessary linguistic changes. But that was not all. The scene was considerably widening and shifting. The Arabs were no longer contained in their Peninsula, but were spreading out with the rapidly sweeping conquests of Islam. Wherever they went they carried with them not only their new Arabic Holy Book with its polished and appealing language, but they carried also their tribal linguistic characteristics, and their traditionally inherited literature (poetry, proverbs, narratives, and oratorical speeches) which they stored in their memories.

These conquests were an important factor in the process of Arab linguistic unification. Several of the big invading armies were composed of mixtures of tribes, many of whom were accompanied by their women and children. Thus a good deal of intermixing and intermarriage between the tribes took place in the conquered cities. Newly established settlements—all of them from north as well as from South-Arabia, and from Hijāz as well as from Najd.

The Arabs were now passing from the tribal stage to the stage of cities and countries. Their social units were no longer tribal, but urban, as in Basra or Kūfah, and regional, as in Syria or Egypt. This new regrouping of the Arabs must have reduced considerably the differences of the dialects, and reinforced the unifying processes already begun in pre-Islamic times.

With these conquests, Arabic was now spreading to new non-Arab territories. Its fortunes in the different units of the vast Islamic empire were varied. In some countries like Syria and Egypt it became—and is still at the present time—the national language of the country. In others like Persia it remained for a few centuries the language of culture, politics, administration, and later of the Church, while Coptic was the vehicle for daily intercourse among the population. Yet the adoption of classical Arabic as a state language, and of colloquial Arabic as a conversational medium among the Egyptians was accomplished within a century after the conquest. Authorities state that Coptic disappeared almost completely after that period from most parts of Egypt, and could only be found among the scholars who specialised in studying it (A. Amin, Fādir al-Islām, 259). When Islam entered North Africa it found three languages there; Latin, which was the language of administration and culture; a mixed language composed of Greek, Latin and Semitic elements which was bequeathed by Carthage; and Berber in the interior of the country. Arabic became the dominant language in the cities through the spread of the new religion and the arrival of wave after wave of Arab settlers. The Berber language, however, resisted the spread of Arabic in its strongholds in the interior.

These conquests, then acted as carriers of Arabic both as a literary and as a colloquial language in many different lands. As many Arabs migrated to these new territories, taking their language with them, so did great numbers of non-Arabs migrate in the opposite direction; many as slaves and clients (mawāld), and they settled in the big Arab centres of Mecca, Medina, al-Asṣāra and al-Kūfah. They naturally adopted Arabic as their medium of intercourse, and some of them mastered literary Arabic and became famous writers and poets. Some of the Persian mawāld found in the two capitals of Hijāz a fertile soil for their music and singing. Thus a movement of interaction between Arabs and non-Arabs was taking place all through the Islamic empire during the 1st/7th century. This movement produced a great civilisation which became known as Arab-Islamic civilisation. The contribution of the conquered races to this civilisation consisted in culture, learning, and administration, while the purely Arabian contribution lay in the linguistic and the religious fields. The ancient Aramaic and Iranian cultures, under the aegis of the Caliphate, were woven into a new pattern and expressed through the medium of the Arabic tongue. Arabic thus invigorated by new elements of ideas and images, was enriched with fresh conceptions of excellence and eloquence, and enriched even with a new vocabulary. Persian, in particular, was responsible for the introduction

al-Isamiyya, Cairo 1952, Vol. II). The spread and establishment of Arabic in some countries as a national language was aided by various factors. In Syria Arab elements had already settled, Arabic poetry had been welcomed at the Ghassānids’ courts, and many of the inhabitants spoke Aramaic, a kindred language. In Irak, too, Arab tribes had already settled from pre-Islamic times, and an Arab state had established itself in al-Hira. In those regions of Irak where Persian was prevalent, the long-established neighbourhood of facts and Persians paved the way for the conquering language. Some Persian kings—such as Bahram Gūr—are said to have been brought up in the Arabic courts and to have composed Arabic poetry. H. C. Woolner (in Language in History and Politics) states that Persian was influenced in the seventh century A.D. by a strong Aramaic current which prepared the way for the spread of Arabic. Another form of that influence came through Syriac which occupied an important position as a cultural medium in Persia.

In Egypt, Greek had been, since Ptolemaic times, the language of culture, politics, administration, and later of the Church, while Coptic was the vehicle for daily intercourse among the population. Yet the adoption of classical Arabic as a state language, and of colloquial Arabic as a conversational medium among the Egyptians was accomplished within a century after the conquest. Authorities state that Coptic disappeared almost completely after that period from most parts of Egypt, and could only be found among the scholars who specialised in studying it (A. Amin, Fādir al-Islām, 259). When Islam entered North Africa it found three languages there; Latin, which was the language of administration and culture; a mixed language composed of Greek, Latin and Semitic elements which was bequeathed by Carthage; and Berber in the interior of the country. Arabic became the dominant language in the cities through the spread of the new religion and the arrival of wave after wave of Arab settlers. The Berber language, however, resisted the spread of Arabic in its strongholds in the interior.

These conquests, then acted as carriers of Arabic both as a literary and as a colloquial language in many different lands. As many Arabs migrated to these new territories, taking their language with them, so did great numbers of non-Arabs migrate in the opposite direction; many as slaves and clients (mawāld), and they settled in the big Arab centres of Mecca, Medina, al-Asṣāra and al-Kūfah. They naturally adopted Arabic as their medium of intercourse, and some of them mastered literary Arabic and became famous writers and poets. Some of the Persian mawāld found in the two capitals of Hijāz a fertile soil for their music and singing. Thus a movement of interaction between Arabs and non-Arabs was taking place all through the Islamic empire during the 1st/7th century. This movement produced a great civilisation which became known as Arab-Islamic civilisation. The contribution of the conquered races to this civilisation consisted in culture, learning, and administration, while the purely Arabian contribution lay in the linguistic and the religious fields. The ancient Aramaic and Iranian cultures, under the aegis of the Caliphate, were woven into a new pattern and expressed through the medium of the Arabic tongue. Arabic thus invigorated by new elements of ideas and images, was enriched with fresh conceptions of excellence and eloquence, and enriched even with a new vocabulary. Persian, in particular, was responsible for the introduction
of new terms in the fields of luxury, ornaments, handicrafts, fine arts, government administration, and public registers (A. Amin, *Fadgr al-Islam*, Section iii): (M. Khalfallah)

(3) Middle Arabic

The creation of an Arabic Empire stretching at the height of its power from the Pyrenees and the Atlantic to the shores of the Sûr Daryâ and the Indus had far-reaching consequences on the development of the Arabic language. Arabic, hitherto spoken in Arabia proper and its immediate neighbourhood, went with the Muslim armies to the farthest ends of the far-flung empire. Life in camp and on expedition brought men of different tribes into close contact and the vicinity of the tribal quarters (khâlîfah) in the great cities soon led to a levelling of their dialects. In addition to these dialects, some forms of interdialectal speech were in existence, notably the language of oratory used by the tribal spokesman (khâlîfah) in his harangues, and the poetical language, both of which had been cultivated in pre-Islamic days and were now enriched by the language of the Kur'an. The poetical language was characterized by certain peculiarities of metre and rhyme, vocabulary and phraseology, figures of speech and imagery inherited from the ancient bards, but otherwise it was presumably still close to the language of everyday conversation; verses were still improvised on the spur of the moment, nor did their understanding require any sort of education on the part of their hearers.

It is only in the latter half of the first century that we find new linguistic traits in the love-poetry of the Hijâz. These poems, whose surroundings gave them leisure to reflect upon their emotional experiences, felt the conventions of bedouin poetry inadequate for their purposes and began to use the conversational style of the new aristocracy, which was modified by the Hijâzî dialect as well as by the exigencies of settled city-life (see Paul Schwarz, *Der Diewan des 'Umar b. abi Rabî'a*, iv, 1909, 94-172).

In the new provinces—except perhaps Syria—the Arabs were considerably outnumbered by the indigenous population who continued to use their mother-tongues, but had in their dealings with government to adapt themselves to the idiom of the conquerors, though at the beginning they used some sort of makeshift language. Then there were those non-Muslims who had been taken prisoner and were brought into the houses and harems of their Arab masters. They quickly adopted Arabic and as a rule embraced Islam. Many of them or their descendants were freed from bondage and played as freedmen (masâ'îlî) an important rôle in the economic life of the empire, especially in the cities where they formed the bulk of the population. They spoke Arabic with many alterations, due partly to the influence of the language of their forebears, partly to the dialect of their Arab patrons and neighbours, and last but not least to the rapid changes in their economic and social environment. These widely differing idioms were the forerunners of the Middle-Arabic local dialects, which were spoken by the lower classes in the towns of the various provinces. They were characterised by a simplified pronunciation, the glottal stop was dropped; ū, voiced in bedouin speech became voiceless; emphatic and non-emphatic sounds and also ādâ and ātâ were confused; in the areas where Aramaic was formerly dominant, the interdental spirants were replaced by the corresponding occlusives. But the most telling feature of Middle Arabic was the weakening and loss of the short final vowels and along with it the abandonment of the desinential inflection (khâb), which had momentous consequences for the structure of the language (J. Cantineau, *Bulletin de la société linguistique*, 1952, 112). The old system of inflexion fell into disuse; cases, status, moods were no longer distinguished. Their functions had to be taken over by word order, periphrastic expressions, and other means common in languages of an analytical type. Middle-Arabic was also adopted by the Christianizers of Palestine, Syria, and Mesopotamia and by the oriental Jews, and from the 2nd/8th century onwards used by them for literary purposes, whilst with the Arab Muslims the classical language remained the proper medium for literary activities.

In this appreciation of the language of the Kur'an and of the ancient Arabic poetry they were followed by the masâ'îlî, who from the first tried to conform to the higher standards of Arabic and were already in the 1st/7th century contributing to Arabic poetry (e.g. Ziyâd al-A'dâm). By the end of the 1st/7th century the masâ'îlî felt the necessity for some sort of training in the classical language, thus giving an impetus to the beginnings of grammatical studies, whilst the Arabs grew apprehensive of unidiomatic speech and realized the necessity for preserving the purity of their language.

Once taken up by the masâ'îlî, the classical language survived the downfall of the Umayyad dynasty and continued to be the medium of Islamic culture throughout the Muslim world, not only in those provinces where Arabic was dominant or gaining ground but even in countries where it was never to gain a firm footing. In the schools of Basra and Kûfâ the rules of the “arabiyya” were standardised according to the idioms of those bedouins who were credited with the purest language. This standard language was used at court and in good society, and to master it was one of the first accomplishments of a man of letters or learning. Its application to literary purposes shows a great variety of types. All narratives referring to Arabic and bedouin life (e.g. the amâhîl al-'Arab, asyânâm al-'Arab, but also the maqâšîd and the siâr) preserved to some extent the uncouth originality and artless naïveté of the old language. In the literature of hadîth (traditions) and fiqh (jurisprudence) the social and economic changes left their marks on the vocabulary, phraseology, and even morphology. Of a quite different type is the language of the secular prose-writers of the early 'Abbâsid period (e.g. Ibn al-Mu'âkîf). Here the changes in Muslim society brought about by the ascendancy of the non-Arab races, the pre-Islamic heritage and the revival of Oriental Hellenism, took full effect. It is polished, lucid, flexible and well adapted to the expression of thought in a precise manner; its vocabulary, though lacking the exuberant abundance of the bedouin language (as witnessed e.g. by the urdfîsâ-poesy), is rich and expressive, and its grammatical structure free from the cumbersome overgrowth of nominal and verbal forms so conspicuous in the bedouin language. The same simplicity and smoothness is found also in the verses of the so-called “modern” (maqâshîd) poets of the same period (e.g. Abu l-'Arîb, ‘Abî ‘Arîb, although in poetry as a rule the imitation of the old patterns has always been closest.

On the language of everyday life and the dialects spoken by the different strata of Muslim society during this period very little is known. How complicated the linguistic situation had grown by the
end of the 2nd/8th century we can gather from occasional remarks of al-Djahiz (165-255) not only about the direct language of true bedouins, its gradual corruption through the vicinity of towns and intercourse with the peasantry, about the patois of the lower orders, the cant of peddlars, the argot of beggars, the technical terms of trades and professions, but also about mispronunciation and faulty speech on the one hand and euphemism and mannerism on the other.

These divergent tendencies soon affected the written language. The translators and scientists who made the legacy of Greek philosophy, medicine, mathematics, and other sciences accessible to the Muslim world, enriched the vocabulary considerably by innumerable technical terms. But they were often Christians (e.g. Hunayn b. Isbák) or Jews, and had neither a good grounding in Arabic grammar nor any aptitude for literary perfection and accomplished style. Their translations, therefore, show as a rule some Middle Arabic features (see G. Bergsträsser, Hunain b. Isbák und seine Schule, Leiden 1913, 28-53).

The decline of the Abbásid power and the ascendency of the Turkish soldiery in the course of the 3rd/9th century led to a general lowering of the standards of education; even the court-language no longer preserved its former purity but was marred by vulgarisms. About the year 300/912 the classical language ceased to be used in the conversation of good society, in the law-courts and colleges, and froze into a literary idiom; to stick to the rules of the ʻɪrāb was considered a sign of pedantry and affectation. At the same time the former enthusiasm for the bedouins began to wane, and their language—the dialects of which had in the meantime undergone many changes—was no longer looked upon as the best representative of Arabic speech. The classical language was spoken only on solemn occasions, otherwise its use was restricted to the domain of literature. Here its application was mainly a problem of style. Henceforward the term 'arabiyya meant an unalterable system of words, phrases, grammatical forms and syntactical structures, which was strictly regulated by the rules of grammarians and lexicographers and could not—at least theoretically—be improved upon. In applying this artistic language to his theme—which in its turn he had to select from a limited number of topics (maʿānd)—an author had a choice between different styles, differing in the employment of rhyme, rhythm, figures of speech and other embellishments. But once he had chosen his theme and its style he was committed to the traditional patterns (see G. E. von Grunebaum, The Aesthetic Foundation of Arabic Literature, Comparative Literature, 1953, 323-40). It is for this reason that a writer had not only to possess a thorough knowledge of the intricacies of Arabic grammar and lexicography, but also to study and learn by heart the best pieces of classical prose and poetry (though the question as to what authors were of classical rank was often hotly debated). In these circumstances the 'arabiyya was bound to become a learned medium and its study was cultivated by Arabs and non-Arabs alike. The non-Arab races contributed even more of the best prose-writers (e.g. al-Khâṣṣâlam and Badîʾ al-Zamân) and philologists (e.g. Abû Hilâl al-ʻAskârî). The high literary language was the privilege of an élite and required sometimes a commentary either by the author (e.g. Abu ʻl-Âlâ al-Mâṣârî) or by his admirers (e.g. al-Muṭânâbbî) in order that it might be understood by the hearers. Occasionally vulgarisms were used for artistic purposes (in muwâsâhât, mawgâl) and even the argot of the beggars and swindlers was made use of by Abû Dulaf in his al-Kâṣîda al-Sâsâniyya; but on the whole the vocabulary of high literature was choice and exquisite.

These high standards, however, were required in high poetry and ornate prose only. In the other branches of literature there is a great variety in language and style. Often it is only the preface which is written in refined prose and in choice wording, whilst the bulk of the book betrays the Middle-Arabic character of the author’s speech. In books written for practical purposes the technical terms of the subject had to be used. If the author had no proper knowledge of the grammar, faulty speech was unavoidable; the worst example is perhaps the Kitâb ʻArâjâb al-Ḥind by Buzurg b. Shâhirîyâr al-Râmîmurzî written after 347/953 (Le Livre des Merveilles de l’Inde, éd. par P. A. van der Lith et L. M. Devic, Leiden 1883-6). It is full of vulgarisms (see de Goeje’s remarks in van der Lith’s edition, 205), some of which are common in Middle-Arabic whilst others are probably due to the author’s non-Arab mother-tongue and his profession.

These disrupting tendencies were fostered by the disintegration of the Abbásid empire. Already in 375/985 al-Mâkdisî could in his description of the Muslim world attempt to characterise each country by the peculiarities of its language. It appears from his account that in his days in all Arabic-speaking countries the conversational language of the upper classes had suffered considerably under the inroads of local dialects and that the most correct Arabic was heard in the Eastern (Iranian) countries where much attention was paid to the study of grammar.

Already in the days of al-Mâkdisî the increasing independence of the Sâmânid dynasty led to the revival of New-Persian literature, which had momentous consequences on the position of Arabic as the Islamic language in the Eastern regions. Outside the Arabic-speaking world, Arabic was in the dominions of the Sâljuqs gradually superseded by New-Persian not only as the language of court, society, diplomacy and administration, but also in poetry, belles-lettres and other branches of secular—and later on even religious—literature. At the same time the rise of independent dynasties in the Arabic-speaking countries gave a new impetus to the development of the dialects spoken in their dominions and increased the already existing tension between literary language and colloquial. Thus the picture of the Arabic language as reflected in the literature of the Sâljuq period (5th/11th-7th/13th centuries) is of a bewildering complexity. There are masterpieces of ornate prose, written in a faultless style like the Mašâmâl of al-ʻIṣârî (d. 516/1122), which could be appreciated only by a small group of connoisseurs. In high poetry the imitation of the time-honoured patterns continued, but some poets succeeded in modernising the poetical diction by adapting it to the conversational style of their contemporaries, e.g. Bahâʾ al-Dîn Zâhâyr (d. 656/1253). Others even made use of the local dialects, e.g. Ibn Kûzmân (d. 555/1160) and Ibn Dîtânil (c. 693/1294). Usâmâ b. Munkât (d. 584/1191) composed verses in the conventional fashion, but his famous memoirs are written in an unpretentious style which savours of the dialect of Syria. Some grammarians grew lenient in admitting expressions which were formerly excluded from correct speech,
whilst others, like Ibn Yā'ish (d. 643/1245) (see G. Jahn in the preface to his edition, i, 10-12) wrote in a slovenly style, without regard for the rules of grammar they were expounding. In ordinary prose, offences against grammar are rather the rule than the exception, as witnessed by the works of Yākūt (d. 626/1229) (see Wüstenfeld in vol. v, 58-65 of his edition) and al-Kazwīnī (d. 682/1283) (see Wüstenfeld in vol. ii, ix of his edition). Works written outside the Arab-speaking countries sometimes betray the fact that their authors had not a full command over the language; Persian (and later Turkish) writers e.g. Ibn al-Mudjādīwī (d. 690/1291) (see Lb'fgren, Arab. Texte zur Kennniss der Stadt Aden im Mittelalter, ii, 2, 21) were apt to disregard the differences of gender, the concord of gender and number, and the rules concerning the article. There are further works of a popular character, such as the epic romances (e.g. the Strät Amdur, Strät Bani H̱ilḏ, the Maghribī legends (e.g. by Abu 'l-Hasan al-Bakrī, c. 693/1294) and the mystic poems of the religious orders; they were destined for the edification and entertainment of the middle and lower classes and were therefore written in a rather vulgar language and style. Similar vulgarisms are found in the writings of the Druses (see de Sacy, Chrétomathie Arabe ii, 236, n. 9, etc.) and the religious poetry of the Vaṭāsids (see R. Frank, Schleich 'Adl, 107 ff.). Naturally the writers of other denominations, as e.g. the Christians, the Jews (see J. Friedlaender, Der Sprachgebrauch der Maimonides, i, Frankfurt a.M. 1902) and the Samaritans (see Abu 'l-Fath, Annales Samaritani, ed. E. Vilmor 1865) had no part in the literary traditions of the Arabs, though men like Maimonides were otherwise deeply imbued with Islamic culture. But many more inquiries into the language of individual authors will have to be made before the development of literary Arabic in these centuries can be elucidated. For these studies a perusal of autographs or at least of contemporary manuscripts will be necessary, for our editions are as likely as not "corrected" by oriental printers (see August Müller in the preface to his Ibn Abu Usaybi'ā, Königsberg 1884, VII-VIII) or European editors (see S. L. Skoss in the preface to his edition of al-Fāsī, Diqām al-Abfās, i, 1936, CXL-CXIII).

After the devastation of the Asiatic countries caused by the invasions of the Mongols, there began a new period in the history of literary Arabic. Egypt rose into prominence and became under the Māmilūs (648-923/1250-1517) the centre of Islamic culture and of Arabic literature. The literary language during these centuries was post-classical. Prose-writers like Ibn Abl Usaybi'ā (d. 668/1270; see August Müller, Uber Text und Sprachgebrauch in Ibn abî Usaybi'as Geschichte der Ärste, Sitt.-Ber. Bayr. Ak. d. Wiss. 1884, 853-977) represent the colloquial as it was then spoken in good society. Ibn Yāš (c. 930/1524; see P. Kahle in the preface to his edition, vol. iv, 1931, 26-8) and Ibn Tūlūn (c. 955/1548; see R. Hartmann, Das Tübinger Fragment der Chronik des Ibn Tūlūn, 1926, 103) are even more influenced by the local dialect, especially in vocabulary. Others, such as the Amr Bektāsh al-Fāhīfī (c. 741/1341; see K. V. Zetterstén, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Māmilūskensurah, Leiden 1919, 1-33) shaped their style on their native Turkish, as did other scholar-poets of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. In poetry the dialect was sometimes utilised e.g. by Ibn Sūdān (d. 868/1464) in his humorous and satirical poems.

The great changes which took place in the world from the end of the 9th/10th century deeply affected literary Arabic. After the capture of Granada in 897/1492 and the expulsion of the Moors the Arabic language vanished from the Iberian peninsula. In the Maghrib, where the classical language had always stood in sharp contrast to the local dialects, there sprang from the latter a new poetical language, the so-called malṭūt, which since the 10th/11th century has enjoyed an ever-increasing popularity in Morocco. The other Arabic-speaking countries were sooner or later conquered by the Ottoman Sultans who were not primarily concerned with the cultivation of the Arabic language and literature. Even in Egypt, hitherto the mainstay of Arabic culture, literary activity sank to its lowest ebb. Literary Arabic was the prerogative of an elite. The dialect was occasionally utilised for literary purposes (e.g. by al-Shirbīnī, c. 1098/1687, in his Hass al-kabīrī). Already in the 10th/11th century poems were composed in the vernacular (see M. U. Bouriant, Chansons populaires arabes, Paris 1893, and Fuad Hasanain Ali, Ägyptische Volkslieder, i, 1939). In Syria, the Maronite archbishop of Aleppo, Germanus Farḥāt (q.v.) (d. 1453/1732) did much to revive the study of Arabic grammar, lexicology and rhetoric amongst his countrymen. Outside the Arabic countries Arabic continued to be used by scholars, more especially in theology, juridical and legal subjects; though its sphere comprised by now parts of North and East Africa, Zanzibar, Malaya, and the Indonesien Archipelago, yet it was less influential than in the preceding period. This period of stagnation and decay lasted till the beginning of the 13th/14th century.

Bibliography: References are already given in the article. Many observations on the classical and postclassical usage are found in the prefaces to editions of Arabic texts, in grammars and dictionaries and especially in H. L. Fleischer, Kleine Schriften, i-iii, Leipzig 1885-8; Th. Nöldeke, Zur Grammatik des klassischen Arabisch, Wien 1896; see also J. Fück, Arabiya, Unter- suchungen zur arabischen Sprach- und Stilgeschichte, Berlin 1950 (Arabic translation by Abūd al-Fāhīm al-Nadjīdī, Cairo 1951; French translation by C. Denizeau, 1955).

Modern written Arabic

The intrusion of Europe into the range of vision of the Arab world begins with Napoleon's expedition to Egypt in 1798. The adoption of innumerable elements of Western civilisation had far-reaching effects on the written language. This began already with Muḥammad ʿAll's programme of reform which set out deliberately to take over Western achievements and was focussed on France, which everywhere remained the model until after the first World War. As a result of the sending of student missions to study in France, the formation of schools on European lines and the foundation of an Arabic press, and, above all, of the translation of numerous European books, the necessity of finding expressions for a host of foreign ideas was felt first in Egypt and then too in other countries—foreign ideas for which at first only foreign words were available. Even the works of early translators in Egypt, of whom the most notable was al-Ṭahāwī (1801-1873; cf. Brockelman, II 481, II 731, W. Braune in MSOS XXVI 2, 119-125; J. Heyworth-Dunne in BSOS IX 961-7, X 399-415) already contain, side by side with numerous foreign words taken over indiscriminately, pure Arabic neologisms to express Western concepts.
But a real counter-movement against the excessive use of foreign words did not begin until the second half of the 19th century. The question of how to meet the ever-growing need for new expressions in Arabic became one of the major problems of intellectual life. The impact of Europe in itself awoke among the Arabs, after an interval of centuries, reconsideration of their own linguistic and literary tradition. The revival of the old philological learning was facilitated by the printing of many old literary works and especially of native dictionaries and grammars. The dogma that the 'Arabiyya as the oldest literary form of the language was better and more "correct" than any later forms and that it must therefore be the highest authority for linguistic correctness at the present day too became the guiding idea for the whole language movement, even if there were voices in opposition. Thus the old purism was revived again, and with it the tendency artificially to control the development of the language, with recourse wherever possible to the old model language. This movement started in the Syrian-Lebanese area. Outstanding among the earlier language critics was Ibrāhīm al-Yāḍī (1847-1906; Brockelmann, S II 766), who criticised the language of the Journalists and Writers of the modern age in Lūgāt al-Dīrādī (published in book form, Cairo 1319). The inevitable modernisation and expansion of the vocabulary of the 'Arabiyya ought, according to the wishes of the purists, to be carried out by drawing to the greatest possible extent on the wealth of words, roots and forms in the 'Arabiyya. The question of how to proceed in detail and how far European words should be employed has been actively discussed again and again. In innumerable essays in nearly all periodicals and in many separate publications right up to the present moment, immense quantities of neologisms have been proposed, although it must be said that only a small percentage pass into general usage. Extending far beyond the circle of professional philologists, this movement has also affected large circles of the general educated public. The struggle with technical terms (mustālabāt) is a difficult problem for every specialist in any technical or scientific branch and gives many of them the impetus themselves to become linguistically creative and to publish their own technical terms. The literature on this subject written in Arabic is very vast and scattered, and cannot be treated here more than generally. There are large collections of the terminology for many special fields (Ahmed 'Īsā, Mu'āammad Asmā' al-Nabātī, Cairo 1930; Ahmad 'Alī, Mu'āammad al-Hayyāūnī, Cairo 1932; Mustafā al-Shihābī, Mu'āammad al-Islāmī al-Zirā'iyya, Damascus 1943; M. Asfārī, English-Arabic Dictionary of Medicine, Biology and Allied Sciences, 6 vols., Cairo 1929—only mention one a few). But such works do not confine themselves to listing expressions which are already in current use; they also introduce suggestions of their own; they cannot therefore be considered as descriptive scientific material but are contributions to the establishment of terminology. The idea of co-ordinating these efforts and of establishing language academies for the standardisation of vocabulary dates from the 60's of the last century (cf. Braune I.c. 133). After several unsuccessful attempts, a scientific academy (al-Majālat al-'Imār al-'Arabī) was founded in Damascus in 1919, which also devoted itself to the reform of the language and published many contributions to the language problem in its review, which first appeared in 1921. In 1932 the Egyptian Royal Academy of the Arabic Language (now Majālat al-Lūgāt al-'Arabiyya) came into existence. Apart from the study of the old language and literature its main concern is the regulation and expansion of the modern vocabulary. In its review (Majālat al-Lūgāt al-'Arabiyya, Vol. I-VII, 1934-1953) and since 1942 in a sequence of special publications, the use of a great many mustālabāt has been recommended, so far without the anticipated and desired effect being achieved. The official principles on which the Academy works can also be gathered from the minutes of meetings (Maḥādir, since 1936). Even in Irāq, where formerly the review Lugāt al-'Arab (Vol. I-IX, 1921-1931) of P. Anastase al-Karmali was the leading organ of the purist trend, an Academy was formed in 1947 (al-Majālat al-'Imār al-'Arabī) which, inter alia, is also concerned with the problems of terminology. The real difficulty, however, with all these official attempts at creating standard terminologies for technical and scientific fields lies not so much in coining new expressions, as in securing their general use among the specialists concerned. Although the possibility of popularising newly-coined technical terms in specialist circles has often been overestimated, the practical effect of the purist movement on actual language usage cannot be denied. In many individual cases one can observe how artificially created words have quickly entered into the general stock of words of journalists and writers. The efforts of the purists however are concentrated almost entirely on the isolated word, that is, on the extrinsic elements of the language.

Turning to the linguistic facts, the striking feature is the infiltration of English and French phraseology, translated into Arabic (so-called loan translation or "calques") and the change in the inner form. In particular the language of daily communication (press and radio) and of writers with little or no classical education has a distinct European touch. Phraseology and style are far more difficult to check than terminology. This development is therefore inevitable, and must be accepted as a fact. In the field of belles lettres, on the other hand, we find in many cases a strong attachment to tradition. Authors with a classical education are still today able to keep close to the ideal of the 'Arabiyya in their style; they sometimes make use of uncommon words and phrases of the old literature and especially of the Korān as artistic stylistic devices. But no-one can completely escape the influence of European phraseology.

Grammar, on the other hand, which can be defined in rules and which is much more subject to conscious control, gives quite a different picture. The written language has remained untouched by the sound-change, and the morphology has remained constant from the earliest times till the present day; the same is true of the syntax at least in its basic features. Here the conservative attachment to the 'Arabiyya has proved itself astonishingly effective.

In vocabulary a considerable basic stock has remained alive since the earliest times. Post-classical words, including those from the later Middle Ages, form a further element of the modern vocabulary. A host of generally accepted expressions are available from the literature, and especially of the Korān as artistic stylistic devices. But no-one can completely escape the influence of European phraseology.
behind the other > railway train); words of the 'Arabiyya still in use have been given a new additional meaning (e.g. barak = lightning > telegraph); sometimes the change of meaning is made by analogy with the foreign word, which served as model (e.g. sunduk = box > cash-box, cash office, after the French “caisse”). Moreover a large number of completely new nouns formed from old roots with the help of the Arabic nominal forms (most frequent: maf'al, -a, mif'al, -a, fa'al, -a) have passed into general usage (e.g. maf'al = museum, mif'al = jet-plane); likewise verbal nouns and participial forms are used for new expressions (e.g. iṣṭiḍ'a = broadcasting, muhaarrik = motor). The nisba-ending is widely employed in the formation of new words (e.g. iṣṭiṭrāki = socialist, iṣṭiṭrābiyya = socialism); by the expansion of its use many new adjectives have been derived from nouns, and with them European compounds can easily be reproduced (e.g. al-barid al-dīwān = airmail); genuine compound forms are still confined to those with the negation lā (e.g. lā-silik = wireless). Until the first World War the majority of foreign words were borrowed from French, others from Italian. English became an influence after the first World War, especially in Egypt and Iraq. The decrease of foreign words in Arabic is a considerable achievement of purist efforts. Words of Turkish origin have disappeared almost entirely in the last decades. We may consider as loan-words such as correspond to an Arabic nominal form or can easily be assimilated to it, and for which broken plurals are formed (e.g. bank-bunuk, jīm-al-fām, dāhur-dahāṭira) and such as are assimilated through the addition of the ending -iyah which serves as abstract ending (dimārābiyya = democracy).

The numerous accepted new words are still not sufficient. Very specialised scientific and technical details to the present day still cannot be expressed in Arabic in a form understood by all concerned. The anarchy in the field of specialised terminology even within one country is far from being at an end. The situation is aggravated by the fact that Greek and Latin technical terms which so often help specialists towards an international understanding even on complicated matters, are translated into Arabic. There are often several terms in circulation for the same thing; on the other hand cases occur where the same term means different things to different authors. Nevertheless the standardisation of technical terminology which is the basic problem of present-day Arabic has undoubtedly made considerable progress and thus we can also expect further favourable developments in the future.

The fact that there exists a basically uniform written language in all Arabic countries from Iraq to Morocco is of great value, ideal and practical, to the Arabic peoples. It is the symbol of their old cultural unity and their political union in the present day. Thus we can conclude that there is no reason to anticipate that the written language will anywhere be replaced by a local dialect and forced out of practical use.

first (see below, section II) comprising the Eastern dialects, east of a line running approximately from Sollum to Chad, the second being formed by the Maghribi dialects, situated geographically west of the above line.

The dialect of the Hijāz, and more particularly that of the Kuraysh of Mecca, is known to have been one of the pre-Islamic Arabic dialects; it was elevated to the status of a literary language, not, however, without some interference with the pre-Islamic poetic koine. But the old dialects remained none the less alive, not only in their own country, but also outside the Arabian Peninsula, because they were spread abroad by the Arabs in the territories which they conquered. Organised in their traditional groups, the Arab conquerors preserved for some time their own tongue, but dialectal peculiarities tended to become less marked as the result of the blending of tribes within the fighting units. It was this sort of koine, rather military in character, which constituted the language of the conquered or newly-founded towns, but a contrary development soon occurred, with the appearance of indigenous elements and elements from the linguistic substratum, which resulted in an ever greater differentiation between the urban dialects, although on the whole the dialects of the large cities of the Arab world still displayed common characteristics. It is therefore possible, in order to rely on a sociological rather than a geographical criterion, to distinguish on the one hand the dialects of the urban and settled populations (because the role of the large cities had aided the rapid spread of the urban dialects in concentric circles), and on the other the Bedouin dialects. The latter were the dialects of more or less homogeneous and nomadic tribes which had emigrated from the Arabian peninsula either before or after the conquests. In general, the boundaries between the two major groups defined above are not fixed absolutely, and it is even possible to discern the existence of an intermediate group of dialects which display both urban and Bedouin characteristics. The criteria which enable one to distinguish between urban and Bedouin dialects are set forth in sections II and III below, but it should be noted here that, in general, the Bedouin dialects exhibit more conservative tendencies, and greater homogeneity within the framework of the tribe. The urban dialects display pronounced evolutive tendencies; they have introduced morphological and syntactical innovations and, further, differentiated dialects quite often appear within the same urban area, not only between the following of different religions (Muslims, Jews and Christians for example), but also between the social classes and even between the sexes and different generations.

If Classical Arabic is compared, in the most general terms, with present-day dialectal Arabic, the main point to be noted is the early abandonment, by spoken Arabic, of case endings and the inflexions of the verb. Perhaps less characteristic, in the phonetic sphere, are the loss of the phoneme represented by ء and the tendency of short vowels in open syllables to disappear; further, short internal vowels, even in stressed syllables, have become weakened in the most developed dialects. Morphologically, in addition to the disappearance of terminations, one notes the almost complete disappearance of the passive with vowel change, the decreased use of the dual and the feminine plural. On the other hand the phonetic system is richer than that of classical Arabic and the vowel range greater; a present indicative a, in a number of dialects spoken by settled populations, was derived from the imperfect by means of various preverbs; the syntax, less synthetic, used an analytical construction simultaneously with the relationship of annexation (i'dā), Finally, as regards vocabulary, the basic vocabulary is also found in classical Arabic, with losses due to the disuse of a large number of special terms (notably those relative to Bedouin life, in the case of the settled populations), but also with gains due to loan words from foreign languages which continued to coexist with Arabic.

**DIALECTAL LITERATURE**

The religious prestige of classical Arabic naturally prevented dialectal Arabic from playing the part of a literary language, at least among Muslims; further, with the exception of a certain number of proverb and poems (see especially ZADJAL) dialectal literature is fundamentally oral; it consists of songs and poems, which treat of the same themes—epic, religious, lyric, satiric, eulogistic, erotic etc.—as classical Arabic, of tales, legends and even epics. When, exceptionally, a dialectal work of importance has been set down in writing, it has never preserved its original form, but has been transformed into more or less correct literary Arabic, which deprives us of documentary evidence which would otherwise be of great interest. The most typical example is that of the Thousand and One Nights (see ALF LAYLA WA-LAYLA). For the attempts made in recent years to create a dialectal literature, and for the use of colloquial Arabic in novels and plays, see *Arabic Literature* below.

Christian Arabic literature should not be overlooked (see G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlich-Arabischen Literatur* and *Der Sprachgebrauch der altesten christlich-arabischen Literatur*, Leipzig 1905), nor that, in Roman script, which developed, but without great originality, at Malta, nor the Judæo-Arabic writings. On these last, which until the present time form a vast branch of literature, see the article *Tunisia*, and E. Vassel, *La littérature populaire des Israélites tunisiens*, in *RT*, 1904; G. Veja, *Un recueil de textes historiques juido-marocains*, Paris 1951; M. Steinschneider, *Arabische Literatur der Juden*, Frankfort 1902.

No complete work has yet been devoted to dialectal literature, but the reader is referred to the references given in Ch. Pellat, *Langue et littérature arabes*, Paris 1952, 54. For North Africa, H. Basset, *Essais sur la littérature des Berbères*, Paris 1920, deals with a subject which is closely connected with Arabic dialectal literature.

**Sources:** — The works of modern Orientalists, who often give texts in dialectal Arabic and help to give a fixed form to popular literature, are enumerated in sections II and III below, which are specially devoted to the modern dialects. For a more detailed study, apart from the references of the Arab philologists and the glossaries quoted in the article AL-ANDALUS, special reference should be made to the transcriptions of Arabic texts in Coptic or Greek script (see especially the ancient psalm fragment given by Violet in *OLZ*, 1901), to the early Egyptian papyri and to the Sicilian documents edited by S. Cusa (*I diplomi greci ed arabi di Sicilia, I*, Palermo 1860).

(2) The Eastern dialects

**THE ARABIAN AND NORTH ARABIAN DIALECTS**

The geographical area covered by these dialects extends from Egypt to Syria in the case of the
former, and in the case of the latter, comprises on the one hand the Arabian Peninsula, and on the other the Syrian desert and \( \mathfrak{r} \)āğā. The non-Arab languages represented are as follows: in Egypt, the Siwa Berber group. In Syria-Lebanon, the Aramaic dialect of Ma\( \mathfrak{h} \)dāl, Dżubba\( \mathfrak{d} \)īn and Baš\( \mathfrak{h} \)a; the language of the Circassians living in villages in various parts of Syria: Ku\( \mathfrak{n} \)aytīra, \( \mathfrak{A} \)līn Zātī, Tell A\( \mathfrak{m} \)ārī, Khānāsīr, Man\( \mathfrak{b} \)ījdī, and in Jordan D\( \mathfrak{j} \)ā\( \mathfrak{r} \)ūsh; the Armenian (or Turkish) of about 200,000 Armenians (principal centres Beirut, Aleppo); the language of about 230,000 Kurds living in the region of Hassettchā, Dīyarbā\( \mathfrak{k} \)s, Di\( \mathfrak{b} \)āb A\( \mathfrak{k} \)rād and certain cities, notably Beirut and Damascus. In \( \mathfrak{i} \)rāk, these Kurds constitute a quarter of the population; in addition, there is the neo-Syriac of the Māwṣīl plain. In Arabia, Kumāzār (peninsula of Masandām, in \( \mathfrak{u} \)mān), a Persian dialect; the modern South Arabian languages, between the Hadramawt and \( \mathfrak{u} \)mān: Mahrī, Kārwāl, Harsuṣ, and Butaḥarī. In Israel, modern Hebrew.

Egyptian Arabic (nomad dialects) has penetrated into the republic of Sudan among the Nilotic and Kushitic languages, and then, with Maghārib influences, among the Negro-African languages in the region of Lake Chad. Yemenite Arabic is used as the second language in Africa among the Somalis. The Arabic of \( \mathfrak{u} \)mān has found its way to Zanzibar. In Turkmeniştān, Khazarīstān, Tādjiḵištān traces have been found of Arabic nomadic dialects. Finally, in America, there is the Syro-Lebanese diaspora. The eastern dialects. In Egypt, Cairo usage is well-known, that of Alexandria less well, that of the fāllākhs very little, and that of the nomads and the whole of Upper Egypt hardly at all. In Palestine, a tripartite division must be carefully observed between sedentary urban-dwellers, the sedentary rural population (fāllākhs), and nomads. In Syria-Lebanon, the dialects of the sedentary urban and rural populations are indeed distinguishable, but their differences are less marked; they contrast with the nomad dialects; the dialects of the large towns (Beirut, Damascus, Aleppo, Jerusalem) are curiously similar to one another. The Mountain region of Lebanon, divided into separate districts, introduces local variations, the anti-Lebanon still more. In \( \mathfrak{i} \)rāk, the urban and rural dialects have been submerged by the dialects of the North Arabian nomads; this has resulted in blending and compromise in varying degree between the two types of dialect, even in the large towns. Only assiduous linguistic research can show what remains of the dialects of the sedentary populations. In general, nomad dialects are linguistically dominant; thus \( \mathfrak{i} \)rāk remains within the sphere of the North Arabian dialects. A study of the dialects of the Jews of the Middle East and \( \mathfrak{a} \)l-fāl\( \mathfrak{d} \)ğī Darwīsh, (fahlāhs), the rural population plays for the theatre, and in the Lebanon (Fīnīānīs, Shmūnī; see J. Lecert, Littérature dièalctale et renaissance arabe moderne, in BEOD, ii, 1932, 179-258; iii, 1933, 43-175).

The eastern dialects have not received equal treatment as regards actual publications. A concise bibliography will be given here, within the limits of the general line (for convenience, \( \mathfrak{i} \)rāk will be included here):

At least six works deal primarily with the Arabic of Cairo; the following will suffice: W. Spitta-Bey, Grammatik des arabischen Vulgarädialectes von Ägypten, Leipzig 1880, xv-519 pp. in 8vo. (Texts 441-516; K. Völlers, Lehrbuch der ägypto-arabischen Umgangs-sprache, mit Übungen und einem Glossar, Cairo 1890. xi-231 pp. small 8vo. (English ed. by F. R. Burkit, Cambridge 1895; C. A. Nallino, L'arabo parlato in Egitto, grammatica, dialoghi e raccolta di circa 6,000 vocaboli, Milan 1900, xxviii-386 pp. small 8vo., 2 ed. Milan 1913; D. C. Phillott and A. Powell, Manual of Egyptian Arabic, Cairo 1926, xxxiv-521 pp. small 8vo., in addition: Spito-Bey, Arabic-English Dictionary of the Modern Arabic of Egypt, 3rd ed., Cairo 1929, xvi-518 pp. in 8vo. (arranged in purely alphabetical order). For Upper Egypt there are only the Contes arabes -----, published by H. Dulac, JA, 8th series, v, 5-38 (in Arabic characters with translation but without transcription); the Chansons populaires, collected by G. Masspero (Ann. Serv. Ant. Égypte, xiv, 97-291) are inadequate for a linguistic inquiry. For the nomads of Lower Egypt a number of the Lieder der libyschen Wüste von M. Hartmann, Leipzig 1899; it should be used with caution.


For linguistic geography, we are indebted to G. Bergsträsser's Sprachatlas von Syrien und Palästina (incl. the Lebanon and Jordan), ZDPV, xxxviii, 169-223, 42 maps. This Sprachatlas is an excellent beginning. J. Cantineau has added his Remarques sur les parlers de sédentaires Syro-Libanais-Palestiniens, BSL, no. 118, 80-8, in which he proposes a classification; his article on Le Parler des Dras de la montagne Libanaise, AIEO, Algiers, iv, 157-84, in which he shows that a dialect of the sedentary population of the Lebanon is involved; his profound study of Ḥawrān, Les parlers arabes du Hārān, Notions générales, Grammaire, Paris 1945, x-475 pp. in 8vo. (Publ. SL, iii), and an Atlas of 60 maps, ibid. 1940. Haim Blanc has studied the dialects of the Druzes in northern Galilee and on Mt. Carmel in his Studies in North Palestinian Arabic, Jerusalem 1953, 139 pp. in small 8vo. (Or. Notes and St. Isr. Or. Soc., No. 4), phonological and phonetic survey 22-78; texts 79-108.

For Syria-Lebanon, Palestine, the following should be mentioned: (1) General descriptive works: A. Barthélémy, Dictionnaire Arabe-Français, 5 fasc., Paris 1935-54 (the last two published by H. Fleisch), 943 pp. in large 8vo. (deals exhaustively with the vocabulary of Aleppo (1900), and gives the elements

The western dialects bear a certain family likeness, and the same can be said for the eastern dialects. For the purposes of this comparison the more conservative nomad dialects (this does not exclude the facts of their own evolution), which are much less well-known, will be disregarded. We are concerned with the dialects of the settled populations of east and west. We will consider first the elements which link them (and also those which distinguish them): cf. G. S. Colin, *L’arabe vulgaire,* 150th anniversary of ELO (Paris 1948), pp. 100-1.

**Pronetically:** 1) The disappearance of the velarised lateral-interdental phoneme represented by the old ƙ, replaced in general by ʔ (emphatic); dh (emphatic) among thefellahs of P. and at T.* 2) The development of the three interdental fricatives (ʔh, tʔ, dʔ emphatic) into dental occlusives (ʔ, t then ts in M. and Alg., ʔ emphatic except among thefellahs of P. and at T. 3) The tendency of the short vowels to disappear in open syllables, particularly when they are not stressed (especially i, u). 4) The tendency to reduce the diphthongs ay, aw to the simple sounds a, û (even i, u in Oc.), except in a large part of the Lebanon.

**Morphologically:** 1) The disappearance of the old inflexional vowels (i'rād); as a result the dialect becomes less synthetic, and makes greater use of grammatical instruments. Word order assumes importance in denoting relationship (construct state), the subject and the complement of the direct object. 2) The dual retrogressively becoming a survival without influence as such as regards grammatical concord. 3) The peripheral expression of relationship (determinative complement of the noun), in place of the construct state, for various reasons: Eg. beta'; P., S.-L. tabā'; (M. dīyā, Tl. tādī, T. mīdī). 4) The use of an indeclinable simplified relative pronoun: elī (similarly di, edī in M. and in several Arabic dialects (W. Marçais, *Tiemen,* 175). 5) The formation of a new interrogative pronoun for things: Eg. ʔēdī; P., S.-L. ʔaw, ʔawdī; (M. ʔağdī, Tl. ʔağī; T. ʔağī, ʔağīna). 6) The special form for the feminine plural of personal pronouns and verbs. 7) The abandonment of the passive formed by change of vowels: batala “he has killed”, kūtila “he has been killed” (except in Oman). 8) A form indicating duration: Eg. ʔammāli, ʔamm; P., S.-L. ʔam (M. ʔām, verb expressing duration or habitual action). 9) The formation of an indicative by means of various auxiliary words prefixed to the old imperfect. 10) The conjugation of the imperfect of doubled verbs with the intercalation of a phoneme ay (ʔ), e.g.: L. madda'ay or madda'. 11) The reduction of the number of types of broken plurals and still more of the types of infinitive (masdar).

The Eastern and Western dialects, over and above these common characteristics, give respectively a certain impression of unity, in so far as evolutionary tendencies have culminated, in each of the two groups, in different results. They can only be contrasted when, on both sides, the different result is identically constant. For example the method of
forming the first persons of the imperfect of the verb. The Eastern dialects have formed an indicative imperf. with b- being contrasted in general with the subjunctive-imperfect (without b-): L. bīrā ṣīḥbūb "he wishes to write". This indicative has in the 1st pers. s. a preformative b-: L. bēktob "I write", mnnktob "we write", whereas the Western dialects have a preformative n- and, secondarily, by analogical normalisation, a distinctive plural form in -u e.g.: T nisīkh "I write", nisīkūb "we write"; this is an excellent and characteristic example of contrast between the Eastern and the Western dialects; but it is not absolute: a preformative n- of the 1st pers. s. impf. is found in the Najjdū (Socin, Diwan, Part iii, 133c and 194b) and is confirmed in the Ḥadramawt (de Landberg, Arabica, iii, 55). The loss of short vowels in open syllables, largely complete in the Western dialects, is a much less reliable indication: in fact in the Lebanon at Kfarṛibida, all short vowels in open unstressed syllables disappear; at Palmyra, there is a fairly general appearance of i and u, even when stressed, if they occur in an open syllable (this is one of the dialects called "differential" by J. Cantineau, Études, in AIEO, ii, 49).

The dialects also reveal a certain individuality, by comparison with the Western dialects, by virtue of the presence of grammatical characteristics which are lacking in the latter. Note for instance, in Eg., P., S.-L.: 1) In the vocalisation of the simple verb, the retention of vowel contrasts reduced to a pattern kātāl byāšul or byāšul and kātāl byāšūl (in Eg. the pattern is not quite so clear). 2) The formation of the plural of the demonstrative pronouns in a similar manner: the addition to the singular of the old demonstrative form of the plural, or (in Eg. the fatal byiḳtel betel byiḳtal.

3) The frequent use of the j pattern is not quite so clear). 2) The formation of the

Hiḍzā: only the *Mekkanische Sprichwörter und Redensarten* of Snouck-Hurgronje, The Hague 1886.


J. Cantineau, *Remarques (BSL, no. 118)* has indicated (p. 81-2) the main general characteristics which enable a distinction to be drawn between the dialects of the settled populations of the East and the dialects of the Arab nomads. The sole effective criterion is the unvoiced pronunciation of ُعَ (irrespective of what might otherwise be the articulation-point): all the dialects of the settled populations, and only the dialects of the settled populations have this pronunciation; the voiced pronunciation of ُعَ is the mark of a nomad dialect (as it is in the case of the western dialects).

We owe our present knowledge of the classification of the dialects of the Arabian nomads to J. Cantineau in his *Études*, in *AIEO*, iii, 222 ff. The brief summary which follows is based on him:

As regards the North-Arabian dialects, he distinguishes: dialects A (‘Anaza), dialects B (Shammer), dialects C (Syro-Mesopotamian); ‘Anaza dialects: Ḥānine, Ṭālā, Sāba’a, Weld, ‘Ali, etc.; Shammer dialects: ‘Abde, Khrose, Rmāl, etc.; are linguistically akin to the Shammer dialects, group Be: in ‘Irāk probably the Ṭayyi’, in Syria and Jordan: ‘Amūr, ‘Irād, Sārqiyya, Sārbi, in part the Banū Ḫalīd of Jordan and the Banū Ṣākḥar; Syro-Mesopotamian dialects: the population of the town of Regga and the tribes: Ḥadīln, Mawāl, N‘em of Dīlān, Faḍīl (these last two forming a sub-group), which fall into the category of lesser nomads called Ḷawṣiya or ra‘y. The case of the Dīf dialect is a separate question; the dialect of ar-Rass (Kāsim) is to some extent a Baṣra dialect. It is difficult to demarcate, even approximately, the southern limit of the North Arabian dialects; their existence is definitely confirmed in Kāsim, al-Ḥāṣ, and probably in the ‘Ārid, the Woshm and the Sdeir. Of the dialects of the Hiḍzā very little is known, and nothing of those of ‘Aṣr. The dialects of the Ḥadramawt and the Daḥṣā, known through Landberg’s texts, seem to be related, distantly it is true, to the dialect of the North Arabian nomads, and it is possible that the dialects of the nomads of the Rub‘ al-Ḵālī are connected with the same group. On the other hand, through the efforts of C. Reinhardt, E. Rossi, H. Burchardt, and S. D. Goitein, we know that the dialects of ‘Umān and the Yemen are of a completely different type.

Bibliography: In the body of the article.


(3) The Western Dialects

The Arabic language is widely used in North Africa, but is by no means the only language in use. Berber is extensively used [see BERRERS], and the Berber language, though losing ground in some instances, can for the most part be considered to be in an extremely flourishing state and not on the retreat.

The elimination of the old autochthonous language naturally has taken place in those cases and in those countries in which the tide of Arabic spread without meeting any obstacles: first of all, in the towns which the Arab conquerors rebuilt, colonised and founded, and their environs; then in Cyrenaica and above all in Tunisia, which were reached by the first and largest waves; finally in those regions of the Maghrib, probably Zenata, where the old pastoral life prepared the way for Bedouin Arabism: the Sahara, the Saharan fringe, the high plains of Algeria and Constantine, the valleys of the Tell, and practically the whole of Orania. This Arabic tide surrounded but did not submerge the settled centres of the Saharan oases, and similarly the mountainous regions in the interior and on the coast, which were difficult of access. In Morocco, arabisation followed the Atlantic seaboard, reached the Fes and Taza corridor, flooded the Ṣharb, and left almost intact the riparian massifs of the Mediterranean and the interior, the Berber mountains. —The area in which Arabic is dominant in the Maghrib is thus immense. Nearly fifteen million people there speak it. They are to be found in widely-differing regions, and following very dissimilar ways of life: all town-dwellers, nearly all the agriculturalists and semi-pastoral peoples of the plains, plateaux and steppes, a large number of villagers, several groups of the settled population of the oases, and hill peoples arabised by the neighbouring towns. This geographic dispersion (which, unlike that of the Berber dialects, is still in progress) and the diversity of these modes of existence are the result both of the complex configuration of the country and of the historical circumstances of its arabisation. These two aspects will not be dealt with here. It will be sufficient to emphasise that, given physical and human conditions such as these, it is not surprising to discover great dialectal variations in spoken Arabic; variations so great that it seems difficult to define the Arabic dialects as a whole by common, specific characteristics; and that it is perhaps rash to employ the term ‘Maghribi Arabic’. It will never...
theless be employed, if only for the convenience of this exposé.

C. Brockelmann, at a time when few documents on the various Arabic idioms spoken in North Africa were in our possession, said in his Grundriss that the Maghribi dialects were mainly of the Bedouin type. He doubtless based this on the accentuation of the verb in the 1st form, which he considered as the primitive form in all Semitic languages: fa'ala, fa'ala, fa'ala culminating in /a/ as opposed to /a/ originating perhaps from the old analogical influence of tef'il, masdar of the 2nd form, a characteristic of all forms of the imperfect of the verb which is general throughout Middle East dialects. This morpheme /n/- is, to the exclusion of all others, that of all the dialects, without exception, of Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Mauritania, the Sahara, Fezzan, Tripolitania, Cyrenaica and Malta. Egypt seems indeed to form the eastern limit of its use. Ch. Kuentz, during recent years, has precisely defined the extreme limits (dialects of Alexandria and of certain settled populations of the Delta). The substitution of u- for /n/-, already reported by Ibn Khalid in the Hilīl popular songs which he collected, is recorded by Ibn Kūzmān for Almoravid Andalusia, and recurs in mediaeval Norman Sicily. It can be considered as a morphological innovation proper to the Muslim West. It consists in the creation of a personal sign of the singular, clearly on the analogy of the signs of the plural: na'sal from na'salı, na'salı. The purely Maghribi creation (all the dialects give evidence of this, including Maltese) of a verbal derived form fdal, originating perhaps from the old forms IX-XI, must also be accounted an innovation. It expresses a resultative meaning: kādī “he has become black”, bāyād “he has become white”, “he has become one-eyed”, ḥrāk “he has become rough-skinned”, ḫwāl “he has become tall”, ṣmān “he has become fat”, ṣhāl “he has become compliant”, ṣyān “he has become handsome”, etc. The presence of a long vowel /a/ between the 2nd and 3rd radical, creates a phonetic problem of conjugation which the dialects answer in different ways (L. Brunot, Sur le thème verbal fdal en dialecte marocain, in Mélanges W. Marçais, Paris-Maisonneuve 1950, 55-62).—On the analogy of the derived forms with a reflexive and middle-passive significance, with a prefix f- (V fdal originating from II f'sal, VI t'a'al from III f'sal), Maghribi has formed, like certain eastern dialects, a tf'al (which recalls the very old čhpe'čal as opposed to the 1st form f'al; it uses it by preference, often to the detriment of f'sal; then, carrying this further still, it arrives at a combination of tf'al and n'al and produces ntf'al and ntf'al, for instance intef'al “he is wounded”, ln'hrāk “he is burnt”.)—The old system, for forming nouns of action corresponding to verbs of the basic form, resorted freely to the subtle interplay of contrasts of vocable quality: fšÌ, fššÌ, fššÌ, fššÌ etc. It is the decay of the short vowel system, fairly general in the Maghrib (and the syllabic upheavals which accompany it), which has doubtless induced the dialects to display a preference, in the case of short vowels, for nominal forms with long vowels. Among them, there is one which recognises an unusual prolongation, which can be held to be specifically Maghribi (Malta also uses it): namely, fššÌ. Formerly a masdar form of limited application (verbs denoting a noise, a cry), to-day it constitutes the most frequently used masdar of verbs of action, especially those denoting material operations: šhr “act of dancing”, šhšl “act of washing”, šlšk “act of cooking”, šlšk “act of playing”, etc. This form fššÌ perhaps owes its success to the analogical influence of šfšÌ, masdar of the 2nd form, a characteristic of...
verbs of action, and of transitive action. Just as in the case of this masdar f*-U the case of the analogical extension of the plural f*il seems to be an entirely Maghribi peculiarity. It is, as elsewhere, a plural form f*il of nouns with a weak radical, kahou "coffee" pl. kháther, ma*ud "sense, allusion" pl. m*äni. It is widely extended to nouns with sound, not defective, roots, such as obe ra "needle" pl. abäri, bas'a "large bowl" pl. bas'iri, mechla "comb" pl. meglä, etc.

The establishment of syntactic connexions has caused the appearance of a certain number of dialectal innovations. The most noteworthy of these in the Maghríbi include: (1) the creation of a true indefinite article to express the state of the undefined noun (cl. raq'ilt). The numeral "one" is used for this purpose: wahek, made indeclinable (sometimes contracted to wa²Á, wa³Á, ka) is then followed by the noun, defined either by the definite article el-, wahek-er-rajel "a man", wahek-el-mra "a woman", wahek-ed-däg "a house", or by a determinative complement, wahek-bäb-ed-där "a house door", wahek-säbbi "a friend of mine". Where it is prevalent, that is to say in the dialects of Morocco, Algeria and the Algero-Tunisian borders, the use of wahek, the article, does not exclude the use of wahek, the pronoun, which remains indeclinable, wahek-räjel "someone, a man", wahek-mra "someone, a woman", the only construction possible in central and northern Tunisia and in Libya. (2) The tendency to eliminate the direct annexation of the determinative complement to the noun (classical i²ála), of the type rিল-el-urad "the perfume of roses", and to substitute for it an indirect annexation, which makes use of a copulative particle, of the type er-riha mä-il-el-urad. This phenomenon is found in the dialects of the Near East (Brockelmann, Grundriss, ii, 238, 161), but there are some particles of annexation peculiar to those of the Maghrib: ë, ë, ñyd in Morocco and Algeria, mä-il or mä-il in Algeria and Tunisia, ë (derived from mä-il) in Malta, ñen in Fezzan. The presence of mä-il, from the cl. mä-il "goods" is already attested in the dialects of the Maghrib, and as far as Fezzan to mark a sense of completion, result or finality in the imperfect of the verb. In the Moroccan dialect ë (or ëa) appears, preceding verbs in the same tense, in order to mark actual action in the present; the Moroccan ëa is perhaps the same preverb which occurs in the semi-flexible form ka-ku (derived from kîn-kîn) with a clearly analogical meaning, in Algeria (eastern Kabylia). In addition to these preverbs, the Maghrib, Morocco and Libya use in their own right a presentative of the verbal idea which combines the imperative of the verb "to see", ril, with the same prefixes, in the sense of "I am here, thou art here", etc., or "here I am, thou art" etc., ril, ë, ë, ë, (or ril) ëna ëkum, ëkum, to express the reality of a state or action, in the present or past, both before a verb (in the perfect or imperfect), ëna ël "here I am, I have come", ëk ëbbi, "there is, is crying", and in a nominal clause, ëk ñrila it is thou who art ill", ëkum l-ëmm "there are below". A negative sense is formed in a completely analogous way: mä-nil-mägä and mä-nil-"I am not", mä-nil-"thou art not", mä-nil-"he is not" etc., more often used in nominal clauses than in verbal: mä-nil-"I am not ill". (4) The revival of particles: it is a general linguistic fact, that the originality of the Maghribi dialects consists in the creation of a sign -säg (or -säh), deriving from the cl. jayy-shay, which is in use from one end of North Africa to the other (säg in Malta, säd in northern Constantine), in order to form, in combination with nouns or prepositions, adverbs and conjunctions: bäg "from what" and "in order that, in such a way that", läg "towards which, with what object", kisäg "how", lsäg "on which" and "why", master "of what size, how much"; the word haj, hj is used as a preposition "like, resembling" and as a conjunction "when, granted that". (5) Recourse to the expression ma-xil, mà-xil mà-", conjugated or indeclinable, to render the sense "still, not yet", xid being used in Malta and elsewhere.

More than phonetic, morphological or syntactic differences, there are points of vocabulary which place the Arabic dialects of the Maghrib in the clearest, if not the deepest, contrast to those of the Middle East. Without making a systematic inquiry to determine the origin, Arabic or non-Arabic, of the Maghribi dialectal terms, the commonest will be mentioned here. The word kâmin (with an agglutinate article) has the sense of "head of a corporation" only in the Maghrib; for "pears" anqâs or anqâs (lanjâs, lanâs), formerly Andalusian, is spreading everywhere; berrad is the usual term for "teapot", and berrâda for "water-jug", "bucket, bucket" is always bessal or bessâla from Senegal to Libya, as well as in Malta, ñedî making an appearance at Fezzan; bâkîr is the only term for "fig blossom" in Morocco and Algeria; it was formerly Andalusian; Tunisian and Maltese have bitkar, baýtar with the same meaning; bakkâk everywhere means "dumb"; the "stork" is commonly belârej (belârâmî, berrârej), from the Greek mlâsî, the word for "tea" is tây, nây, tâây in Mauritanian, Moroccan and Algerian, et-ey in Tunisia, kâhi, kâhy only appearing in southern Tunisia and Libya; "individual, person, pedestrian" is very commonly târâs, apparently derived from the cl. târâs "valet d'armes, shield-bearer"; truffles are called târâs; terma is the usual word for "rump, buttocks"; "tail" is everywhere called tâbârî, a Berber word which is found as far as Libya, where jhar "stones" is preferred; for "to find", jhab is used together with, depending on the region, ëk, ëg or sâ, with different shades of meaning ("to discover" or "to find what one is looking for"); jarra (or jerra) is the word for "trace"; the Pan-Maghribi word for "frog" is jfran, where the Berber argl is not found as well; jfrân is one of the most characteristic terms of the Maghrib, Mauritania and Tripolitania, in the sense of "draught (of liquid)"; for "orange" tjîn, letjînâ is used in Morocco and Algeria, burdân appearing in Tunisia; t̜hēllîk (t̜hēllîk, t̜hālîk) reappears, in varying forms, throughout North Africa, in the sense of "rag" or "piece of cloth"; "to open" the whole of the Maghrib uses jêll (which with the same prefixes, "I am open", jēll being reserved for a rarer and more literary usage; jēllâb is the name of the "black cosmetic", from the Greek xâlókia; for "fish" the word sâmâh, which is completely unknown, gives way to bâl; khdem, properly "to serve", is the usual word for "to work" and sometimes "to do (in general)"; khdâm, without any morphological indication of gender, denotes a "negress"; for "knife" the whole Maghrib uses t̜hâmî, formerly Andalusian; "to come upon, tobefall" is usually expressed by bhîd; for "reflect", khammem is used; degâ is the name of "rural dwellings" or even of "peasants' huts", and has a rival in mishâ, originally "winter dwelling" (shâhâ); ñdîb signifies, not "wolf", but "jackal";
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nágb is the usual adjective for "unstable, rotten"; 
ársh "soft, tender", opposed to áfyrash "coarse, rough", 
follows the declension of nouns denoting colours and deformities; sarbiyya "carpet", which is kúrub (Kúrun, lxxxvii, 16), has continued to exist in this sense throughout the Maghrib; to express "to hurry, to hasten", the verb zrb is used; zúu (zúu, júu, júf), properly "pair", serves for the numeral "two", either supplanting thún, or existing in competition with it—formerly an Andalusian usage, which predominates in the Saharan and eastern Maghrib, as well as at Malta; súla is the current term for "beast of burden";ásár signifies "blond"; 
swú to "scream, to shout"; "cock" is expressed everywhere, including Malta, by sérúd,úkh being heard only in Orania and Fezzan; from the Greek ύδαςγες "sponge" is derived a dialectal shémi (or sfúns) which means exclusively "fritter", "sponge" being nekáni or jíjífla; "hot" is shkén and shkwn; súkl means "to extricate oneself" and sélélk "to extricate"; the cl. súllum always appears in the recast form sélúm "ladder"; "to beg" is nearly everywhere sákú-sású; súwéék has the particular sense of "to 
swell with water"; shárek is the word for "lip" and shúgún that for moustache"; "axe" is sháhur and "knife" shúrá; sálk is the proper verb for "to fall (talking of rain)"; the word for shoes is sáb Aub (formerly the Andalusian andalusí); everywhere in the Maghrib the "minaret of a mosque" is called súmú; "to be cooked, ripe" is táb-táib and "to cook, make ripe", sáyyébek; sár, in addition to its universal meaning of "end, extremity", in the Maghrib also means "piece"; társh is fairly general in the sense of "tribe"; the word for "he-goat" is átrú, and that for "lamb" is sálú, to denote "fire" the euphemism súfýa "tranquillity, peace", is used, from the root shká, the sense "to deceive" is well-known; Maghribi derives from it a 2nd form "to cause resentment, irritation" and a 3rd form "to be vexed, irritated"; from ghdnú "chant" derives the Maghribi ghnúwa "song", with y of the 3rd radical, while the eastern dialects only recognise ghnáwa, with w; "scurry" is expressed throughout the Maghrib by sárrás, which means "bald" in Malta; for "chicken", fyllú is used, and for "toxotise" tbrúín, tbrúrán, of Berber origin; from Berber is also borrowed the word for "butterfly" tárúfló, tárúflafla and its variants; to "urinate (of a horse, donkey)" is júg; bádd means "to suffice", bádum (gdam) "heil"; the word for "dried meat" is bdsdh with doubling of the medial radical; garyuma is the usual word for "throat"; "to belch" is sárrás; one of the most characteristic Maghribi words is that for the "lock of hair which is allowed to grow long", gultáya; "to cough" is kkbh; side by side with assud there occurs, sometimes with a marked difference of meaning, ahbel "black"; "fags" are called hárms and "tig-

ners" kram; "cliff, escarpment" is kháf; dán means "they", never "milk"; "sheet" is màf or màfí; the form màshúsh "apricots" is recast as màshmàsh; to express "late, last-born", the word in use is màshúsh, taken from Berber; for the Pan-Arab kalàr "power" is often substituted nsjám; kdrár is a common verb for "to speak"; "widow" is hajálà; ssúkh (súsh), known in its proper sense of "face", also has a particular meaning, namely "shot (of a fire-arm)"; welá-vellà means "to return", but also "to become, happen to be", etc.

Thus marked differences of vocabulary separate the Maghribi dialects from those of the Near East, either as regards the actual words employed, or their form, or in a semantic sense. Equally important and equally numerous variations, if not more so, occur among the Maghribi dialects themselves, from end to end of the vast area in which they are spoken. The terms expressing the advverb of time "now" differ according to region: 1) dàbà, without doubt an Andalusian contribution, is known in the whole of Morocco (except the South), and, in Algeria, among the Jewish dialects of Tlemcen and Algiers. 2) From the cl. gáday-waki derive numerous forms, délúb, délúbb, drúb, drág, ókí, délùweh, etc. (with or without an emphatic r), which are in use in Mauretania, Southern Morocco, the whole of Algeria—
cities, villages and countryside—and which are also known in the East. 3) álún is the term of polished speech; it is also that of the Bedouin dialects of Algeria. 4) es-sáa (es-sa) is the form used in Malta. 5) taw, tawna belong to the eastern zone of the Maghrib, from eastern Algeria as far as Libya. "Much" is barsha in Tunisia, bsdÌ̇ in Algeria and Morocco, bela in southern Morocco, yásr among the Bedouin of Algeria, Tunisia and Libya, where it is a declining adjective, not an advverb.—"Enough,

that is enough", is káfî in Mauretania, lehî, yess, báylà, báylak from Morocco to Tunisia, but bess in Malta and Libya.—"There is no more", is always expressed by means of the verb kán in a personal form or as a participle; kàn, kick, mà-kàn-ó is, these are the forms usually spoken in Algeria and Morocco; but in Tunisia the forms thémmá, mà-thémá-ó, prevail, and in the south of Tunisia and in Libya bá-mó-ó-ó—"Nothing" can everywhere be rendered as shéy; it is, in fact, so rendered in Algeria and Tunisia, by freely strengthening the negation with hálta, hál-leh; but this is only replaced in Tunisia and Libya by kán-bá-barà "(nothing else) than benefaction"; in Morocco and as far as Libya, wò-là is used, properly "and if".—The exclamations "good, very good" is expressed by meszyn in Morocco and up to Tlemcen, mlh (amlh) in Algeria, fayyébek in Tunisia, hâbi in Fezzan.—To express "what, what is it?", wáyh is the Pan-Maghrib form, but Maltese recognises more particularly ghî, Moroccan and Mauritanian ásh, Fezzanese shen or esh, Tlemcenian asem.—The equivalent of "how much?" is kem in Malta, Mauritania and in the majority of the Bedouin-type dialects; it has lost ground to sî-hâl, sâk-hâl (cl. sà-yà-yà-yà-hâl), an Andalusian contribution which penetrated the urban dialects of western Morocco, and then won the countryside and the rural and pastoral regions; eastern Con-

stantine, Tunisia, and Libya prefer baddâgh, baddâgh.—"Eggs", doubtless because they represent an idea which lies under the interdict of language, are designated by various words; dhés in Libya, dàm in Tunisia, northern Constantine and the villages of Algeria, bid in rural and pastoral Algeria and Morocco, amlâh-jâf in Algiers, Tlemcen, Fez, Tangier. —Apart from the word màf, which is understood

naturally nearly everywhere and is used freely in Bedouin regions, there exists naw which means "rain" in the majority of pastoral and rural areas, except in the western Sahara, where skâb seems to predominate; the word used in the towns and villages, and especially in Malta, is skáb, properly "winter".—"Grocer" is afâr in Tunisia and Libya, hâsnnî in Algeria and Constantine, hadrî among the rural populations of Orana; in Morocco it is baâbâl, which was formerly Andalusian.—The verbs meaning "to sit down" are kâd in Tunisia and the Algerian villages, gâd in Tlemcen, Constantine, jamá in the Oranian countryside, gles in the towns of Morocco, gâmes
in Fezzan.—“To send” is sifot (sdfot, zifof, sdfed, etc.) in Morocco and a considerable part of Orania, dai in Algeria, sedyeb in the South, dezz in Tunisia and Libya, rsel representing a term of educated speech.—

For “to lift, remove”, rfd is the verb of the west, Moroccan, Oranian and Algerian, and of part of Constantine; kass is the word of eastern Constantine and Tunisia, rfd that of Suf, Tripolitania and Fezzan.—“To do” is a vague idea expressed by a word of eastern Constantine, that of Suf, Tripolitania and Tunisia, rfd in the urban dialects; sâmi (and its metathesis wâsi) as well as ‘adel, sammel prevail in the western Maghrib, ibâ-yi the extent into the north-west of Orania, khâmen in northern Constantine.

Whatever the difference between the dialects of the Maghrib, they remain closely akin to one another and are in varying degrees peculiarly Arabic. From the Arabic system proceeds the vast majority of the sounds of the language, the grammatical forms, the lexicographical material and the methods of presenting ideas. The dialectal variations found in the Maghrib seem, in general, scarcely more palpable than those which appear in the dialects of the Middle East. They can, to some extent, be attributed to influences alien to Arabic: 1) that of the Berber substratum which deeply penetrated new strengths in certain regions and in certain fields of expression (those concerning the things of the material life, especially rural); but there are also areas where the memory of Berber has almost entirely disappeared from the language; 2) that of the languages of the coloured races in the northern zones bordering on the Negro lands; 3) that of the Romance language: Latin, often transmitted through the medium of Andalusian, and also of Spanish and Italian;—

4) that of Turkish, particularly in Algeria and Tunisia;—5) finally, that of French, an influence which is still exerted to-day.

The part played by inherited or loan elements, however, does not seem to be the only reason to put forward to explain the original and moiret character of Maghrib. There is the diversity of the Arabic dialects, which were already differentiated when they were imported by the conqueror at various periods during the process of establishing himself in the Maghrib. There is also, and perhaps this is the most important differentiating factor, the caprice of innovations, spontaneous or conditioned, which have come into being and have spread in different directions, sometimes propagating themselves throughout vast geographical groups, sometimes confining themselves in districts divided into rigid compartments.


The rise of the new school contemporaneously with the spread of the Arabic language through a long chain of predecessors, who perfected its artistic devices utilised by them. The hypothesis (put forward by al-Bahblîl, v. Bibl.) of an earlier production of lengthy homogenous odes, reconstructed fragments of which supplied the model for the āṣida, is purely speculative and improbable. The rise of the new school contemporaneously with the kingdom of Kinda [q.v.] in N.E. Arabia, and its relations with the princes of Ḥira and Qassān, suggest the possibility of a stimulus from the Fertile Crescent, but nothing has been adduced in evidence for this supposition. In any case, it seems reasonably certain that the āṣida constituted a new departure in Arabic poetic art, consisting of the combination of a number of existing themes of Arabic poetry into a subjectively related pattern, and that (prefiguring a characteristic often to be seen in later Arabic literature) such a pattern, once established, became normative for future generations of poets and by reason of its combination of different types of information) itself knows nothing earlier than the rise of the āṣida-poets. Its main theme is boasting of the poet’s camel or horse, more especially (iii) by comparing it with a beast of the chase, developed into a finely-executed tableau of animal life in the desert. The main theme is similarly elaborated by the introduction of idealised pictures of beduin hospitality or drinking, thunderstorms, war and battle scenes, and satire of rivals. The whole poem runs from 60 to 100 lines in length, being composed throughout in the same metre ending in the same rhyming syllable [see further Ǧaṣīda].

The āṣida, the distinctive artistic production of this poetic literature, is essentially an art-form, which has little in common with the forms of artistic poetry in other literatures. Its main theme is boasting or panegyric, led up to by a journey theme. The latter is elaborated: (i) by an elegiac-erotic prelude (nasīb), recalling a former attachment to a woman of another tribe, leading to or connected with the journey-theme; (ii) by description and praise of the poet’s camel or horse, more especially (iii) by comparing it with a beast of the chase, developed into a finely-executed tableau of animal life in the desert. The main theme is similarly elaborated by the introduction of idealised pictures of beduin hospitality or drinking, thunderstorms, war and battle scenes, and satire of rivals. The whole poem runs from 60 to 100 lines in length, being composed throughout in the same metre ending in the same rhyming syllable [see further Ǧaṣīda].

The pre-history of the āṣida, i.e. the origins of Arabic poetry in general, are lost in obscurity and apparently irrecoverable. The Arabic philological tradition (which constitutes almost the only source of information) itself knows nothing earlier than the rise of the āṣida-poets. It can scarcely be doubted that the poets of this school stood on the shoulders of a long chain of predecessors, who perfected its diverse metrical systems [see ʿArūḍ] and who laid the foundations of the special literary idiom (ʿArabiyya [see above, ARABIC LANGUAGE, ii (1)]) and of the artistic devices utilised by them. The hypothesis (put forward by al-Bahblîl, v. Bibl.) of an earlier production of lengthy homogenous odes, reconstructed fragments of which supplied the model for the āṣida, is purely speculative and improbable. The rise of the new school contemporaneously with the kingdom of Kinda [q.v.] in N.E. Arabia, and its relations with the princes of Ḥira and Qassān, suggest the possibility of a stimulus from the Fertile Crescent, but nothing has been adduced in evidence for this supposition. In any case, it seems reasonably certain that the āṣida constituted a new departure in Arabic poetic art, consisting of the combination of a number of existing themes of Arabic poetry into a subjectively related pattern, and that (prefiguring a characteristic often to be seen in later Arabic literature) such a pattern, once established, became normative for future generations of poets and by reason of its combination of different
subjects furnished the supreme test by which their poetic powers were judged.

The ḥāsid poets also illustrated certain linguistic and aesthetic features which were to dominate all later Arabic poetry. The chief of these is verbal concision, in which all the resources of morphology, suggestion and allusion are utilised to present a sharply focussed picture in the smallest compass of words. Metaphors are limited to a few traditional images, mainly relating to war and feasting; similes, on the other hand, are extensively used to give imaginative depth to a descriptive passage; for similar reasons, situations of time or place are often indirectly indicated by pictorial imagery, and a particular situation may be universalised by adding a phrase cast in a proverbial mould. The most fully developed sections are usually those devoted to descriptions of animals, which are vivid and realistic; by contrast, the ṣasib briefly indicates the site of a former encampment in stereotyped terms and rarely describes the woman whom it recalls, although passages of erotic description occasionally occur as separate themes. Throughout, the poet appeals to the hearer's eye, and the imaginative response is determined by the completeness and precision of the concrete visual image; hence the importance attached by critics to the single line as evidence of poetic skill. This imaginative interplay between artist and hearer had the further effect that the range of visual images so presented was circumscribed by the communal basis and pattern of tribal life and its popular sentiments. Pre-Islamic poetry (or at least almost all of it that has survived) is tied to a limited number of themes treated in conformity with the prevailing aesthetic standards and moral values. Thus the content of the literary product was not only known in advance, but dictated to the extent that anything more than a slight deviation from what was expected was disapproved, and the whole emotional response was determined by the form. Form therefore acquired an absolute value; the content was merely the substrate by which the superior excellence of form was realised. The pursuit of formal perfection was, however, limited by the range and sobriety of the poet's imagination. Excessive elaboration of any theme is in general avoided, except for a limited range of accepted exaggerations in boasting and panegyric, particularly in the theme of hospitality. Finally, it was a major function of the poets to preserve the collective memory of the past, so giving an element of continuity and meaning to the otherwise fleeting and insubstantial realities of the present; and in the two main themes of eulogy and satire they pressed home the moral antitheses and sanctions by which this collective existence was regulated and sustained. Thus the ḥāsid-poets, with relatively few exceptions, express, and even prescribe, a high standard of tribal morality, and noticeably avoid any reference to the bumbler and ruder features of beduin life and environment. [See further under ʿAbd b. Al-ʿAbras, Abū Dhuṭayb, Amr b. Kūṭajmūm, Ṣantara, Al-ʿAsīḥa, Al-Ḥārith b. Hilliza, Imrūʾ Al-Kays, Labīd, Muʿal- Ṭūṣ, Umayya, Ṭūṣ, Zuhayr.]

In addition to ḥāsids, a considerable body of shorter poems and fragments has been transmitted, representing the more ordinary output of occasional verse on single subjects. All of these, however, date from the age of the ḥāsid-poets and, having presumably been influenced in technique by them, cannot be regarded as representative of the poetry of an earlier period. Partial exceptions are offered by war-poems in the ṣaḥāz metre, and by the elegy [see Ṣaḥīḥīyya], which in a few surviving examples presents some primitive features; but the later elegy approached more closely the general type of art-poetry, while retaining the characteristics required by its special function. Of the other subjects of occasional verse, the commonest is praise or boasting of courage (ḥamāsa [q.v.]), a special branch of which is formed by the poems of solitary brigands and outlaws (ṣūdat [see al-Shanfara and Tāmbata Ṣarrāfīn]).

Peculiar significance attached to the ṣaḥīr (ḥāṣīr [q.v.]), in which there still survived the primitive conception of the poet (ḥāṣīr [q.v.]) as the mouthpiece of supernatural forces (see I. Goldziher, Abhandlungen zur arab. Philologie, i, 1896, 1-121). It seems that the concentration of the aesthetic sensibilities of the Arabs on the apt use of words endowed the words themselves with mystical and magical power. Poetry was a source of pride and rivalry; and the poet who, by skilful ordering of vivid imagery in taut, richly-nuanced phrases, could play upon the emotions of his hearers, was not merely lauded as an artist but venerated as the protector and guarantor of the honour of the tribe and a potent weapon against its enemies. Tribal contests were fought out as much, or more, in the taunts of their respective poets (maʿāṣīk̇ara) as on the field of battle, and so deeply rooted was the custom that even Muhammad, though in general hostile to the influence of the poets, himself conformed to it at Madina (see Diwān of Ḥassān b. Ṭabbīt [Hirschfeld], comm. on no. XXII). The sensitiveness of the Arabs to satire (noted by al-Džāḥīt, Ḥayānawī, i, 359) did not prevent its almost universal employment against chiefs and men of note, but few of these poems have survived.

A remarkable feature is the total absence of love-poetry (apart from the conventional ṣasib); wine-songs (ḥamārīyya [q.v.]) as such are also rare, but their existence is attested by examples contemporary with the rise of Islam [see Abū Mihgān]; and there are no independent examples of hunting-poems (pardīyya [q.v.]). In the urban settlements also there were poets, whose productions differed from those of the desert poets both in texture and content, but little of these have survived except some of the drinking-songs and religious poetry of ʿAdī b. Zayd of Ḥira, and the religious poems doubtfully ascribed to Umayya b. Abī ʿl-Salt of Ṭallīf.

Transmission and authenticity. There is no certain evidence for the fixation and transmission of any pre-Islamic poetry in written form prior to the 1st century A.H. (reference by al-Farazdāk to a written text of Labīd: Diwān (Sawī), 721), although the use of Arabic script for literary purposes before the rise of Islam cannot be totally excluded [see Kitāba]. Arabic tradition represents the transmission and survival of such poems as survived as due to the existence of professional "reciters" (nawār, pl. nuwād), either of the production of particular poets or of some general body of poetry, and its fixation in written form as due to the efforts of the philologists of the 2nd/8th century to collect what could be saved of the dwindling repertoire of pre-Islamic poetry. Thus the date of written fixation was by 200 to 300 years later than the date of production. The fact itself lays the poetry so collected open to question, firstly as to the reliability of the text as finally established, and secondly (and more seriously) as to its authentic attribution to the original poet—the more so since
many Arabic philologists freely charged one another
with forgery in this field. (See, on the latter point in
particular, D. S. Margoliouth in JRAS, 1925, 417-449; and on the question in general, Tāhā Ḥusayn,īi, 1.
On historico-critical and logical grounds the argument admits of no conclusion, and it
will seldom be possible to prove the authenticity of any specific poem with complete certainty. On
literary and stylistic grounds on the other hand
it is no less certain that the commonly accepted
nucleus of poems ascribed to the pre-Islamic ḏāṣīd-
poets (allowing for verbal modifications or rear-
grangement by successive generations of ṭawwīs) is a
faithful reproduction of their poetic output and
 technique, which lies behind but is yet markedly
distinct from the poetic production of the 1st/7th
century.

(ii) Prose. The absence of any written Arabic
prose literature in pre-Islamic Arabic is even less
open to doubt (in spite of occasional arguments to
the contrary, e.g. Z. Mubarak, La Pros e arabe,
Paris 1931). Parallel, however, to the cultivation of
the art of poetry, there existed several forms of
artistic speech which were distinguished from
ordinary speech by the conscious application of
aesthetic principles to their selection and polishing.

One of these was the compression of a complete
visual observation or social experience into a brief
proverbial phrase [see MATHAL], using the same
technique of concision (ḥijāz) as was applied in
poetry. Judicial decisions and maxims also were
probably couched in the same style. Casual
references occur to the existence of “written sheets”
(sawhā, sing. šāfīha) containing proverbial phrases or
hikam (cf. I. Goldziher, Muh. Stud., ii, 204-5), and it
is probable that judicial maxims also were once
committed to writing.

In oratory, the leading principle, in contrast to
ḥijāz, was elaborate expansion or “adornment” of
the theme, by processes resembling in some respects
those employed in poetry, together with the
balancing of phrase with phrase, often emphasised
by parallelism in structure, assonance, and especially
end-rhyme (ṣaḍīr [q.v.]). The authenticity of the
pre-Islamic discourses quoted by later anthologists
is almost certainly to be rejected; probably only
fragments as were preserved by al-Dāhīz in
al-Baydān wa ’l-Tabyīn and a ’l-Tabyīn
are to be regarded with any confidence and accepted as evidence of style. As
regards the language of oratory, there is good
reason to assume that distinguished orators who
employed much the same idiom as that of the poets,
but more freely adapted to local usage. The original
language of the proverbs (except those which
perhaps originate from poetic quotation) is more uncertain; partly by reason of its special content, but also
possibly in regard to the form of some legal enactments.
For its literary art in general, therefore, the
Kurʾān discards most of the methods of conscious
artistic decoration common to the literal or
aesthetic productions of its time. Form is subordi-
nated to content, and in forcing the literary idiom
into the expression of new ranges of thought it
depends for its effectiveness rather on the suggestive
modulation of the syntactical phrase [see further
KURʾĀN]. In this highly personal art, the Kurʾān
found few imitators in later Arabic prose literature,
partly by reason of its special content, but also
because the growing standardisation of literary
usage limited the freedom of prose writers to handle
syntactical structure with the same measure of
originality. The Kurʾān thus stands by itself as a
production unique in Arabic, having neither fore-
runners nor successors in its own style; and its
literary heritage is to be found mainly in the pervasive
influence of its ideas, language and rhythms in later
artistic contexts.

During the 1st/7th century, however, the flexi-
bility imparted to the ’arabiyya idiom by the
Kurʾān made it an instrument ready to hand for
the multifarious new tasks about to be imposed on
it as a result of the Arab conquests and the new
needs of administration. Although the traditions of
pre-Islamic oratory still dominated among the tribal
and Ḥarbī orators, the later ones of the Kurʾān is
now to be seen in a new style of oratory developed,
probably, out of the formal ḥuṭba pronounced by the caliphs and their governors (cf., e.g., a ḥuṭba
of ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-Ḥāfīz, Bayān, iii, 80), in which more
emphasis was laid on the content and less on external
adornment, ṣaḍīr in particular being avoided. It was
in all probability this style which furnished the models for the first literary art of Arabic written prose, at the hands of the scribes of the Umayyad caliphs and governors, of which, however, there are few authentic examples until the papyrus documents of the period of Sulaymān and the chancery records of 'Umar II at the end of the 1st century (between 715 and 720 A.D.).

(b) First-Century Poetry

The Arabic poetry of the 1st/7th century closely reflects the social and economic changes resulting from the Islamic movement and the Arab conquests, the military settlements of the Arabs outside Arabia, the growth of luxury and a money economy, the rise of an imperial government and the imposition of its authority over the tribesmen, and the emergence of religious and political parties and tribal factions. The results of these changes are most clearly seen in the transformation of the occasional poem, and the cultivation of particular themes or types by individuals or schools. The old satire (ḥidīṣ) loses its aura of supernatural influence and develops either into a string of indecencies or a theatrical display of mutual taunting by poets of rival groups (see below). The ḥamāsa poem becomes the vehicle of religious exaltation and defiance among the Khāridjīs (q.v.). The most remarkable new development is the rise of the independent love-poem (ghasal [q.v.]) in the wealthy and luxurious cities of the Hidjāz, using a simplified linguistic structure influenced by ḥidīṣī conversational style, and, through its close association with the rise of a new musical profession (see mawlawī), metrically adapted to the needs of singing. This ghazal was of two kinds: one, connected more especially with Mecca (see ʿUMAR B. ABI RABI), realistic, urbane, and gay; the other, connected especially with Madīna (see ḍamālī and ʿumrah), depicting an idealising and hopeless love, with beduin protagonist. New themes of politico-religious poetry were inspired by the disasters and aspirations of the ʿĀlīd shiʿa (see AL-ḤOMAYYĪ and AL-KAMAYYĪ), and the ṣafīzī poem, a simple iambic verse formerly used especially to rouse the ardour of combatants, was made into an instrument for displays of linguistic virtuosity in lengthy and consciously archaising kasidas by a school of beduin poets (see AL-ʿĀRABĪ [I]).

All these give evidence of the new vigour and plasticity which had been imparted to the literary arts of the Arabs by the Islamic movement and its political and social consequences. Poetry, without losing any of its artistic qualities, becomes less formal and more functional; style and content complement and harmonise with one another. The kasida also, revived after a short intermission during the conquests, was shaken out of the rigid mould and obligatory canons of style which had circumscribed it in the old tribal society. During the 1st century it was cultivated almost exclusively by a group of beduin extraction in al-ʿIrāk and Mesopotamia, represented especially by al-ʾAṣrāfī, al-Ḥakīmī, al-Maṣrūqī, and ʿAbd al-Ṣamad al-Gābīrī, and the authentic representative of the schools of ʿAmr b. Kuṭḥūm and al-Nābiḥī stands closest to the spirit of pre-Islamic poetry, both in his tribal odes and his panegyrics of the Umayyad caliphs. For the poets of al-ʿIrāk, on the other hand, the kasida, while preserving the traditional external structure, changes both in inner content and in function. Al-ʿArabīzdīk in his boasting odes may celebrate the renown of his ancestors, but for him, as for ʿAṣrī, beduin life is poor and brutish, and the kasida an instrument to gain riches from the powerful and wealthy at the price of often hypocritical adulation, no longer phrased in terms of tribal virtues, but of political and religious controversy. Alternatively inter-tribal mulākha is overlaid by a flood of personal taunts in slanging matches on parallel themes (nabūdī [q.v.]), of considerable ingenuity and virtuosity, for the detelection of the tribesmen of Kūfa and Baṣra. Both of these developments went far towards changing the original art-form of the kasida into an artificial convention, and in language also the poets sought the suffrages of the rising philological schools in al-ʿIrāk by conscious exhibitions of luxuriant and sonorous vocabulary. This is still further developed in the special art of Dhu ʿl-Rumma, devoted mainly to descriptions of desert scenery and life, emotionalised by a ghazal theme.

The outstanding difference between the pre-Islamic poetry and that of the Umayyad age in general is, however, psychological. The passions of the pre-Islamic age were strong, but moved within narrow limits; and the poets held them to a high moral plane. Those of the Umayyad age were multiple and conflicting, and the poets shared in the general psychological instability and conflict of principles and parties. The emotional foundation of the ghazal is self-evident; but emotion enters also into the traditional themes, bringing them closer to the popular taste and giving them a sharper and coarser tone, which lowers the ethical plane, in spite of a copious sprinkling of Kurʿānic phraseology and pious sentiment. The political role also of much of this poetry required the poets to play to the gallery and pander to the debased taste and love of excitement of the masses, especially in their nabūdī. As regards the authenticity and transmission of Umayyad poetry, it is evident from the relatively complete state of the diwāns, as compared with those of the pre-Islamic poets, that they were written down either during the poet’s lifetime or immediately afterwards. Specific references are found to a written corpus of the poetry of al-Farazdāk, kept by a secretary (Aḥbānī, xix, 22), and also to that of Dhu ʿl-Rumma (al-Dhābīz, Hawiyyānī, i, 41), and to a written text of the nabūdī (ed. Bevan, 430).


(II) Second-Century Literature

(i) Poetry. The Arabic literature of the 2nd/8th century is sharply distinguished from that of the 1st/7th century by two main features. It was, with few exceptions, the literature of an urban society, concentrated for the most part in al-ʿIrāk; and the majority of its producers were half-Arabs or non-Arabs, converts or descendants of converts from the original Aramaean and Persian population. The resulting changes and developments in literary production are more marked in prose than in verse production, but are clearly to be seen also in the poetry of this period.

In contrast to the new prose literature, however, the transition to the early ʿAbbāsīd age made no
violent breach in the tradition of Arabic poetry. Metrical systems and technique evolved within the older framework, and structural innovations met with little or no success [see Abu 'l-'Atā'īyya]. The permissible metres and deviations were ingeniously systematised by al-Khalil b. Ahmad (d. 175/791) and strictly adhered to. In language also the poets are as precise and meticulous in their pursuit of 'arabiyya as their predecessors, but begin to aim at smoothness and simplicity in place of the sonority of the beduin poets. These changes are masked to a certain extent by the continued cultivation of the kasida, which now, however, even more than in the Umayyad age, acquired a ceremonial function. The poet who presented himself at the court of the caliphs or of lesser authorities was required to demonstrate his qualities by his kasidas and was rewarded accordingly. Since it was by their patronage that the poet gained his livelihood, he was compelled to conform to their expectations, especially when the reward was not infrequently proportioned to the length of his ode. To these factors must be added the natural conservatism of the Arab, which tended to restrict the poet to conventional forms, and of the poets themselves, for whom (as for their critics in the rising philological schools) poetry was the guarantor of the pure tradition of Arabic linguistic art, and the kasida the highest proof of the poet's mastery of it. Internally, in spite of the conventionality of its form and matter, the kasida shows a development away from the old beduin themes, and both panegyric and satire are handled with considerable diversity and originality, while at the same time the newer types of poetic production affect to some extent the traditional modes of expression.

It is, however, in these newer types that the social changes and currents in the new age found their fullest expression. The first impulses came from the ghazal poetry of the Hijāz and its musical accompaniment, both directly and through Syria, where they were combined with the (probably native Syrian) tradition of wine-songs by the Umayyad caliph al-Walīd II (d. 126/744), with whom tradition connects the first representatives of the new school in al-ʿIrāq [see Muyīʾ b. ʿIyās]. Their witty, uninhibited, and often scandalous verses met with a delighted reception in the new secular and pleasure seeking society of Baṣra and Taḥmābd, and were even, set to music, enjoyed in the private entertainments in caliph's palaces. The general intellectual effervescence resulting from the contact of Islamic society with Persian and Aramaean culture stimulated, both by attraction and by repulsion, a wide range of emotional attitudes and r-actions, which were freely exposed in verse, and at the same time created a social atmosphere which, in spite of the opposition of the nascent legal and theological schools, encouraged freedom of thought and expression. Together with the new trends of urban poetry, several of the movements of the Umayyad age (notably Shīʿism) still continued to furnish themes for poetic elaboration, and the old ʿIrākī tradition of religious and moral verse was revived by the Muʿtazzīl Bighr b. al-Muʿtāmar, Abu ʿl-ʿAtāḥīyya, and others. Two other lesser poets also were originators of new literary genres: ʿAbd al-Hāmid b. al-Amsrī (d. c. 192/807), the inventor of the court-ghazal, short poems on themes of chivalrous love; and Abān b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd (d. c. 200/815), who first used the rhymed raddiṣa couplet (musaddaqiṣ) for verse romances and didactic poems. In sum, therefore, the output of Arabic poetry in this century was enormous, and characterised for the most part by an originality, achieved not so much by breaking with new lines as by fusing new elements with the traditional themes in such a way that the effect is almost that of a wholly new art.

Yet, for all this, the poetry of the 2nd century prefigures, if it does not itself illustrate, the decline of the true poetic art and the growth of artificiality in Arabic poetry. The freshness and sincerity of the Hijāzī ghazal were not compensated for by wit and cynicism; and the pursuit of wit led to a straining after verbal brilliance and originality in metaphor. This was the origin of the so-called badīʾī [q.v.], the embellishment of verse by tropes and antitheses and ingenious exploitation of Arabic morphology. The earliest exponent of this "new style"—not as yet exaggerated or formalised—was the blind poet Baḥṣahr b. Burd (d. 168/784), of Iranian extraction, and the first major Arabic poet of non-Arab origin. The elaboration of the traditional kasida with badīʾī devices is generally ascribed to one of the poets of the next generation, Muslim b. al-Walīd, who was in consequence highly esteemed by some critics and condemned by others as "the first who corrupted poetry". There is, in contrast, little trace of these artifices in the works of his greater contemporary Abu Nuwas (d.c. 198/803), who in poetic genius, fecundity, manysidedness and command of language has few rivals in Arabic literature. Witty, gay, cynical and foul-mouthed, he was at his best in his incomparable wine-songs, most virulent and coarsest in satire and ghazal, versatile in panegyric, and a linguistic virtuoso in the beduin style of hunting-poems (tardiyya), the fashion for which he revived. On the other hand, Abu Nuwas and the other poets of the latter half of the century exemplify a new development which was soon to affect all Arabic poetry, not generally to its advantage. Hitherto the poets had learned their art exclusively by association with, their predecessors. With the rise of the philological schools, particularly at Baṣra, they began to perfect their training by systematic instruction from and association with the philologists. The common ground of this association has already been noted above, but its effect was to imbue the poets themselves (exclusive of the purely popular poets) with a more or less philological approach to their art and the acceptance of philological criteria of poetic merit. To this, probably, is due, more than to any other cause, the increasing formalisation of Arabic poetry in later centuries, and its degeneration, in the hands of the less gifted, to an almost mechanical recapitulation of well-worn themes with a surface decoration of badīʾī.

Transmission. Paradoxically, the situation in regard to the texts of the early ʿAbbāsīd poets is often much worse than to those of the Umayyad poets, since the philologists (who did not regard them as reliable authorities for linguistic usage) made no efforts to collect their diwāns. Some have never been collected, and such diwāns as survive in later MSS (including that of Abu Nuwas) are far from reliable. The authorship of single verses and even of whole poems is sometimes in question, and later collectors of badīʾī figures have caused much confusion by lack of care in citation and attribution (see I. Kratchkowsky, Abu ʿl-Faraj al-Walīd, Petrograd 1914, Introduction, 68-96).

(ii) Prose. As already mentioned [I (a) (ii) above, ad fin.], the first essays in Arabic prose were made by the kutubb, the chancery secretaries of the...
Umayyad caliphs, in a style based on that of the official Khulās. In the earliest known literary productions those of 'Abd al-Hamīd b. Yabyūs (d. 132/750), however, in which the matter called for a logical expansion of general principles in complex detail, the adaptation of Arabic syntax to these unfamiliar demands could be met only by ingenious experiment. As in other literatures, flexibility in prose style was first acquired by the processes of translation, in this instance from the Partho-Latin court-language of Sāsānīd Persia, initiated by 'Abd al-Hamīd’s disciple Ibn al-Mukaffā (d. 139/757). In their existing forms, the extant works of Ibn al-Mukaffā have probably undergone some rehandling in subsequent decades; but it is clear that he posed the problem which was gradually solved by his successors: that of creating a smooth and palatable prose style which was capable of expressing systematic thought, within the limits of the available vocabulary. The function of this literature was didactic and ceremonial; it laid down rules of conduct for princes, court officers, secretaries and administrators of all kinds, and supplied the general knowledge required for the performance of their duties, in the form of manuals, anecdotes and romances, the whole being comprised under the general head of adāb [q.v.]. Their agreeable literary style and diverting contents procured a wide popularity for these works in the new urban society, and for several decades the translations from and imitations of Persian literature held a dominant place in Arabic prose literature.

In the meantime, native forms of Arabic prose were being developed. The primitive narrative arts were organised into conscious literary styles, such as the ḥaṣaṣ, the combination of a number of hadiths into a connected story (exemplified in the Šir āt al-Nabī of Ibn Isḥāk (d. 151/768), the kisāṣ [q.v.] or anecdote, and ḥabbar [q.v.] or narration, particularly in the romances of beduin lovers (waḥšāḥ) and of the “battle-days” (ayyām al-ʻarab [see I (a) (ii) above]). In contrast to these narrative genres, which preserved in a greater or less degree their original Arabic structure, the rapid expansion of intellectual energies in Basra and Kūfah, especially in the schools of philology and law, was creating, with the help of Greek logic, a new argumentative prose which was far more flexible and close-knit than either the new narrative forms or the translations of the secretaries. At the same time, the philologists, consciously opposing the increasing degeneration and impoverishment of Arabic in the mixed society of the Ḥirāk cities, and with the support of Islamic religious circles, set themselves to define the correct modalities of Arabic speech and to preserve both the extensive vocabulary (lugha) and the pure idiomatic usage (ṣaḥāṣa) of the peninsula. Thus, in opposition both to the jurists and to the secretaries, for whom the Arabic language was primarily an instrument, they reasserted—in a new context—the old Arabian insistence on the importance of form, and thereby contributed to maintain the concept of the ʻarabīyya as a standardised and unchanging artistic structure, which remained unaffected by the varieties and evolution of spoken Arabic. Closely related to these activities, and also in conscious opposition to the secretarial school, was their activity in searching for and preserving the memorials of the old Arabic culture, such as poems, proverbs and tribal traditions, to serve (in conjunction with the Kurān and all the materials relating to the Islamic movement) as the basis of the “Arabic humanities”. Except for technical monographs, mainly on philological subjects—the most important of which are the dictionary, K. al-ʻAyn, of al-Ṣāmī (d. 179/795), the grammar, al-Kindī, of his pupil Šābawayh (d. 180/796), and the monographs of Abū Ubaydah (d. 210/825) and al-ʿAṣmā’ī (d. 216/831)—few original literary works, in the strict sense, had been produced in philological circles by the end of the century, and it was only in the 3rd/9th century that the Arabic humanities came into full fruition.

Much the same may be said of the associated field of historical studies [see TARIKH], in which, except for the rather conscious adaptation of the ayyām-technique in the Šīrāz of Ibn Isḥāk, the activities of historical students were devoted mainly to the compilation of source-materials in the form of monographs on particular episodes of Arab or Islamic history [see ABU MIKHNAF, AL-MADAMA’I, AL-WĀ‘IDH] or on tribal genealogies [see MIḤĀM B. MUHAMMAD AL-KALBĪ].

The legal schools, on the other hand, had already attained the stage of producing major works, both expository and controversial [see FIQH]. The lead was taken by the Ḥanafī school of al-İrāk with Abū Yūsuf (d. 182/798) and Muhammad al-Ṣāhībānī (d. 285/904), while the school of al-Madina produced the first important corpus of legal hadith in al-Muwatta’ī of Malik b. Anas (d. 179/795). As early as the next generation, al-Ṣāḥibī was able to set out and defend in a series of tractates (al-Umm) the principles which were henceforth to govern legal reasoning in Sunnī Islam.

Finally, in regard to Kurānīc studies, the practice of oral transmission still predominated, and the first collected work on exegesis appears to have been made by the above-mentioned Abū Ubaydah. Bibliography (in addition to works cited at the end of § I): Ch. Pellat, Le Milieu Basrien et la Formation de Gābih, Paris 1952; Aḥmad ʿAlmān, Duha ‘l-Islām, i, Cairo 1933; A. F. Rifa‘ī, ‘Asr al-Maāmūn, ii, Cairo 1927; Ṭabā Ḥusayn, Ḥadīth al-ʿArba‘id, i, ii, Cairo 1925, 1926; J. Schacht, Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence, Oxford 1930.

(III) Third to Fifth Centuries

(i) Prose

By the opening of the 3rd/9th century, the philological, historical, legal and Kurānīc studies just described had laid the foundations for an Arabic-Islamic prose literature, which could challenge the predominance hitherto enjoyed by the secretarial school in the field of polite letters (adāb). The problem that remained to be solved was that of mobilisation, or how to bring these studies out of their scholastic or technical isolation into a positive relation with the public interests and social issues of the day. This problem was illuminated, rather than solved, by the genius of al-Djāhīsī (d. 255/865), who brought them to bear on all aspects of contemporary life in a series of tractates and epistles, written in a sonorous and witty style, of unequalled linguistic vigour and variety, but too individual to serve as a stylistic model for general literature. The final solution was found by his later contemporaries, who blended the clarity of the secretarial style with the traditional art-language and the argumentative prose of the philological and legal schools into a medium capable of expressing all varieties of factual, imaginative and abstract subjects with great refine-
ment and precision, though at some cost to the workmanship and vigour of the ancient idiom cultivated by the philologists. One of the first results of this "modernised" prose medium, with its superior flexibility and adaptation to social changes, was to restrict and ultimately to displace poetry from its former social function, and to relegate it more and more to a purely aesthetic role in social and literary life.

The success achieved by the writings of al-Dzhažiz and his successors was not due solely, however, to their command of the Arabic sciences and a more flexible linguistic instrument. The schools of Basra, with their rationalising tendencies, had already been attracted (especially in the theological groups of the Mu'tazila [q.v.]) by the surviving elements of Hellenistic culture in Western Asia. Early in the 3rd/9th century the revival of Hellenistic learning received a strong impulse from the establishment by al-Ma'mūn (198-215/813-33) of the bayt al-hikma [q.v.] for the translation of Greek philosophical and scientific works. During the whole period treated in this section, the dominant feature of Arabic culture is the fruitful interaction of the Arabic and Greek traditions which is already illustrated in the writings of al-Dzhažiz, and was subsequently displayed in almost all branches of Arabic literature, both secular and religious. These internal developments were further expanded and accelerated by the vast extension of literary activities, which, hitherto all but confined to al-'Irak, began in the 3rd century to be cultivated in a large number of centres, from Samarkand to Kayrawān and al-Andalus. The material foundation of this expansion was the rapid economic development of the Islamic empire, which was itself greatly expanded by the introduction of paper (warāš [q.v.]) manufacture from the Far East in the second half of the 2nd century.

The range and extent of these new literary movements rapidly overwhelmed the Sānānī tradition of the Khurāsān, in spite of their rearguard movement of resistance [see al-'Otbyy] and denigration of the Arabs and their culture. A recontrivance was effected by Ibn Kūtayba (d. 276/889-90), who in a long series of works furnished the secretaries with compendia and extracts from all branches of Arabic learning, but incorporated in them also such elements of the Persian historical and courtly traditions as had established themselves at the court and could be harmonised with the Arabic-Islamic humanities. Henceforward, adab, in the strict sense, was confined to treatises and other literary works based on this widened Arabic-Islamic tradition, including both the Persian and the Hellenistic components.

Simultaneously, the widening of general intellectual interests was displayed in the cultivation of a great variety of specialist disciplines, the cumulative productions of which constitute the climax of the mediaeval Islamic culture, and for this reason cannot be entirely excluded from any general survey of Arabic literature. In the 3rd century the Hellenistic contribution was greatly expanded by the many translations of Greek works made by Kūtāb b. Lūqā (fl. 220/835), Ḥunayn b. Isḥāḳ (d. 260/873), his son Isḥāḳ b. Ḥunayn (d. 295/901), and other translators. Already before the middle of the century, the first independent Arabic works on philosophy were being written by Ya'qūb al-Kindī (d. 236/850), to be followed in the next century by the Turk Abū Naṣr al-Fārābī (d. 339/950) and the Persian Abū ʾAll Ibn Ṣinā (d. 428/1037), to mention only the most prominent names [see ʾAlṣafā]. In mathematics by Muḥammad b. Maḥān al-Kūhī-arīmī (fl. 230/844), and in Astronomy by al-Farghānī, Abū Maʿṣhar al-Balbī (d. 272/885), and al-Battānī (d. 317/929) [see Tāfghīm]; and in medicine by Ibn Māsawayh (d. 243/859) and Muḥammad b. Zakariyyā al-Rāzī (d.c. 311/923) [see Ṭibb]. Although the technical literature of the sciences cannot be dealt with here, yet the importance of these studies, and of other popular works on Hellenistic origin (such as Sirr al-Asrār, attributed to Yāḥyā b. al-Bīṭīrīk, c. 200/815), in determining or at least influencing the intellectual climate of the period must not be underrated. In geography, in particular, they not only directly inspired the "revision" of Ptolemy's geography by the above-mentioned al-Kūhī-arīmī, but also indirectly contributed to the first road-book, by the postmaster Ibn Khurradābībī (fl. 230/844), and in conjunction both with the older philological interest in the place-names of Arabia and with Indian materials [see Sindhind] and old Persian concepts, stimulated the intellectual curiosity which produced the rich geographical literature of the following century [see al-Qāhiryya].

The opposition to these hellenising tendencies was led by those 'orthodox' students of theology and law who rejected the rationalist principles of the Mu'tazila. The search for Prophetic Traditions (hadīth [q.v.]), which had developed in the 2nd century as a weapon against the pragmatic tendencies of the local schools of Law, was vigorously cultivated in the 3rd by the orthodox everywhere, partly (as in the famous "Six Books" of the Bukharī, Muslim, al-Tirmidhī, Abū Dā'ūd, Ibn Mādīja, and al-Nasrābādī) in order to consolidate the dominant place which it had gained in the juristic sciences, but partly also (as in the more comprehensive Musnad of Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, d. 241/855) against the critical attitudes of the Mu'tazila. So potent a force did the hadīth prove to be, with its appeal to simple piety and veneration for the Prophet, that in the next century the Shi'a also, both among the Iṣmā'īlīs (Da'ā'īn al-Islām of the kāf al-e-Nu'mān b. Muḥammad, d. 363/974) and in Iṣmā'īlī circles (the "Four Books" of al-Kulīnī, d. 328/939, and others [see Ghīṭl]), aimed to rival the achievement of the Sunnīs by the collection and attribution of hadīth to the Iṣmā'īlīs. Nevertheless, although the schools of law, thanks to the early standardisation of their methodology, seem to have been little affected by the hellenistic revival and continued to produce an extensive literature of their own, both theology and popular religion could not but be coloured by their environment. Orthodox theologians, in the schools of al-Ash'ārī (d. 342/953) and al-Māturīdī (d. 333/944), reconciled Greek physics with the data of the Kurān and the hadīth by a skilful dialectic [see Kālām], which by the end of the 4th century had established itself as the universal scholastic theology of Sunni Islam; while Shi'i theology, especially in the Iṣmā'īlī schools, was still more strongly influenced by the neoplatonism expounded, together with the Greek sciences in general, in the popular encyclopaedia of the 4th/10th century called the Epistles of the Sincere Brethren [see Nūgawān ʾal-Safā]. The literature of theological polemics also, as well as that on "comparative religion" (i.e. on the differences between the Muslim and the non-Muslim religions), is clearly aware of the general positions of
Greek philosophy and prepared on occasion to
discuss them in detail. The most celebrated work
in these fields is the incisive K. al-Fasl by the
Andalusian Zāhirī Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064), equally
noted for his delicate anatomy of love under the
title of The Dove's Neckring.

While popular religion was less affected by theo-
logical problems as such, it had from the first been
influenced by the older religious movements in
Western Asia and North Africa. By the 3rd century
most of these accretions had been pruned away,
except for gnosticism and Syrian mysticism (itself
incorporating many Stoic and Neoplatonic elements),
which were exercising an increasingly profound
influence upon ascetic and pious circles, and trans-
forming piety and asceticism into mystical sūfism [see ṬAṢAWWUF]. Already in the 3rd and 4th cen-
turies a new ǧīfā literature was fully developed,
ranging from systematic treatises (beginning with
al-Muḥâsibī, d. 213/857) and rasāʾīl (al-Djunayd,
d. 297/910) to collections of aphorisms, symbolist
poetry [see al-ḤA LLADĪ], and stanzas by Dhu 'l-Nūn
(d. 245/859) and al-Niffār (d. 354/965).

The total result of these specialist literary activities
was immensely to expand the range of mediaeval
Arabic as a linguistic instrument. Not only in the
technical vocabulary of the various sciences, but
also as a medium for expressing fine shades of philo-
osophical and psychological analysis, it had
developed capacities far beyond the old classical
language. But this must not be taken to imply that
the range of literary adāb, or even its expressiveness,
was widened in an equal degree. Much of this tech-
nical and analytical vocabulary was probably unlike
in earlier centuries, just as the range of genres and
topics is also different, though it might be [see above].

Nevertheless, the adāb works demonstrate very
clearly the marginal position of the purely Helle-
nistic elements and of the special sciences dependent
on them (as distinguished from the generalized
influence of Hellenistic culture) in relation to the
main body of Arabic and Islamic elements in the
mediaeval Islamic culture. A few adābā’i show in
their writings an interest in metaphysical and scien-
tific disciplines, e.g. Ahmad b. al-Ṭayyib al-Sarakhsī
(d. 286/899), Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawhīdī (d. 414/1023)
and Abū ʿAlī Miskawayh (d. 421/1030) [see also ṢUJJA’]. But such works are on the whole excep-
tional. The mainstream of Arabic letters after Ibn
Kūtayba runs through miscellaneous topics drawn
from Arab poetry and history, politics and rhetoric,
and collections of anecdotes, and popular ethics.
Illustrated by such writers as Ibn Abī ʿl-Dūnayr
(d. 281/894), Ibn al-Muṭṭaṣim (d. 296/908), the Ana-
lusian Ibn ʿAbd Rabbīhī (d. 328/939), Abū Bakr al-
Ṣūrī (d. 339/949), Abu ʿl-Faraj al-Maṣhāhī (d. 356/
967), author of the K. al-ʿAḡrā’ī, al-Muḥassen al-
Tanūkhī (d. 384/994), collector of "table-talk" and
anecdotal literature, and Abū Maṣṣūr al-Thaʾlīsī (d.
429/1038) [see below]. The huge output and
popularity of such works show how sharply, on
the whole, the social and intellectual interests of
literary circles were circumscribed, and the con-
sequent limitation of the concept of adāb. On a
more technical level of adāb, but essentially of
the same kind, were the "sessions" (māḏ̣āʾī) and
"dictations" (dāmūlī) of the professional philologists
(e.g. al-Mubarrad, d. 285/908, Thaʾlīsī, d. 291/904,
Ibn Durayd, d. 321/934, al-Kāhī, d. 356/967), in
distinction from their pedagogical works on philology
proper, which included the first major
dictionaries of the classical language by Ibn Durayd,
al-Dja’farma (d. 393/1002) and Ibn Fāris (d. 395/1004-5). 1

This intense absorption in literary and linguistic
production was bound to produce in due course a
considerable volume of technical literary crit-
icism. Although as late as the K. al-ʾAḡrā’ī criticism
seems to consist mostly of subjective judgments
on the relative merits of given poets or verses, the
first steps towards a more systematic criticism had
already been taken by al-Djāhībī and, from a different
angle, by Ibn al-Muṭṭaṣim, who in his K. al-
Rāḍī classified the figures of speech employed in the "new"
poetry. Kūdāma b. ʾAṭīfār (d. 310/922) introduced
the practice of classifying poetic "beauties" and
"faults", and by the end of the 4th/10th century the
K. al-Ṣinṭāʿ alayn of Abū Hilāl al-ʾAskarī (d. 395/955)
offers a complete critical analysis of poetry and prose
in terms of structure, rhetorical devices, and figures
of speech. The significant feature of most of this
discussion was the insistence upon form rather than
matter as the decisive criterion of quality; the
declared assumption is that little if anything new can
be originated in poetry, and that the only difference
between one poet and another lies in his manner of
expression. The balance was to some extent
dressed by ʿAbd al-Ṭāhir al-Djurdjānī (d. 396/978), who supplemented the excessively formal
analysis of his predecessors by a system of logical
and psychological analysis which demanded an at
least equal consideration for the "ideas" expressed.
Additional point was given to the argument on
literary aesthetics by its bearing on the doctrine of
the incomparability (ʾi’didz) of the Kurʾān; inevitably,
in spite of protests in theological circles and by
al-Djurdjānī, the prevailing concentration of literary
criticism upon form tended to emphasize unduly its
supreme verbal qualities in terms of the current
stylistic theories.

A further consequence, equally inevitable, was
that rhetorical and literary prose began to be
affected by the same theories and to display the
same pursuit of verbal elaboration. The virtuosity of
the adāb was displayed in "Paragraphs" (fusul) describing
scenes, persons, emotions, events, and
objects, or in Epistles (rasāʾīl) addressed to friends
or colleagues on a variety of occasions. Ibn al-
Muṭṭaṣim seems to have been, if not the inventor, at
least the populariser of this art, which in the 4th
century swept over the whole field of Arabic letters.
The secretarial class fell victim to it almost at once;
in the intense competition for office every refinement
of literary style was eagerly exploited. The technique
of secretarial correspondence was elaborated into
an art (insikha’i [q.v.]), based upon admired models
of elegant, florid, insinuating or pungent writing,
and it was not long before rhyming prose (saqāt),
which the best stylists had hitherto used only as
occasional ornament, became inexpressible from
official style. By the middle of the 4th century the
vizier Abu ʿl-Faṣārī b. al-ʾAmlī (d. 359/969) was
composing his correspondence in saqāt; with
his disciple and successor Ibn ʿAbbād, known as "the
Ṣāḥīb" (d. 385/995), its use had become a maâla.
Contemporary littérateurs, the most celebrated of
whom are Abu Bakr al-ʾAṭārīzī (d. 383/993) and
al-Hamadhānī, known by the sobriquet of Badī`
al-Zamān (d. 398/1007), developed the new style
more freely and flexibly in their rasāʾīl, which often
resemble a kind of unscanned verse rather than
prose. From then onwards every writer with a
reputation to make or to maintain had perforce to
follow their example; and industrious compilers like al-Thaqafî, in his Yatimat al-Dahr, and Abū Ishāq al-Hūrî of Kayrawān (d. 453/1061), in his Zahr al-ma‘ārîf, were quick to compose anthologies and treasures of the most successful verses and ḥusnâ and the most approved metaphorical descriptions and imagery. The additional premium which this placed on wit and agility produced, it is true, not a few masterpieces of artistic invention by those who possessed a natural gift for this style, but excised in return a heavy price. The enforced cult of rhyming prose not only contorted the style of men of natural but more ponderous genius like Abu ‘l-‘Alâ al-Ma‘ârîf (d. 449/1057), but by rewarding artificiality it contributed to turning Arabic writers still further away from the solid ground of real life and living issues and to sap the vitality of Arabic literature.

For the moment, however, the revival of ṣadāq coincided with a search for new or original methods of presenting literary themes. Bâdi‘ al-Zaman found a new setting (or revived a Hellenistic genre) in the popular theme of the witty vagabond, and created the dramatic anecdote or makâma [q.v.]. About 416/1025 the Andalusian Ibn Shu‘ayb in al-Tawâbi‘ wa l-Zawâbi‘ imagined a series of interviews with the dinmîs who had inspired the great poets of the past. Eight years later Abu ’l-‘Alâ al-Ma‘ârîf wrote his Risâlat al-Chufûran, in which, more daringly, he imagined a visit to heaven and hell to interview the poets themselves. These extravaganzas, however, were less appreciated by literary taste in their respective regions than the wittily allusive risâla of Ibn Zayyûn of Cordova (d. 463/1070), satirising his rival Ibn ʿAbdûn, and the letters in tightly-knit and decapitated sâdîq of Kāfûn and Baw娘ghir, prince of Tabaristan (d. 403/1012), collected under the title of Kamûl al-Balâgha. Even the makâmat of al-Hamadhâni seem to have found few imitators until the end of the 5th century, when they were revived by al-Ḥarîrî of Baṣra (d. 516/1122), with the same motif as that of his predecessor, but with a refinement of philological subtlety and wit equalling the most ingenious of the rasâ‘î and a striking poetic gift in addition. It is something of a paradox that with all their formal perfection and qualities of erudition and virtuosity, al-Ḥarîrî’s makâmat, like those of al-Hamadhâni, are firmly rooted in the common life of the Islamic city, and portray its manners and its humour so realistically as to constitute one of the most precious social documents of the Islamic Middle Ages.

Historical composition, though properly distinct from ṣadâq, was to some extent affected by the same influences. At the beginning of the 3rd/9th century, the continued association of history with religious studies is seen in the histories of Mecca by Muhammad b. Djarir al-Jabarî (d. 310/923), as a complement to his Commentary on the Kur‘ân, and the ‘Ali’s letters and speeches known as Nahj al-Balâgha [see al-Shânîf al-Râzî].

The elaboration of literary praise also, in time, invaded the field of historical writing, but only, it seems, in the composition of eulogistic dynastic annals. The example was set by Ibrâhim al-Ṣâhibî (d. 384/994) in his lost work al-Tâdîfî on the history of the Buwayhids, and was followed by al-Utbi (d. 427/1035) in its counterpart al-Yamînî on the history of the early Ghurânawids. It may be more than coincidence that these works are contemporary with the revival of the old Persian historical tradition and the Persian epic. At all events, no other examples of this style seem to be known until the later Sâldîq period (see § IV below).

(ii) Poetry

It has been pointed out at the beginning of the preceding section that from the 3rd century onwards poetry was displaced from its former social function by the new prose literature. Partly this was due to the adaptation of the artistic tradition of the ‘arabiyya to produce a vigorous prose style, which deprived poetry of its previous aesthetic monopoly. But to a far greater extent it was the result of the wide expansion of intellectual interests, with which the poets were unable to keep pace. As at the end of the pre-Islamic age, they were prisoners of their own conventions, broadened out and diversified as these conventions had been during the 1st and 2nd centuries. To a certain extent also they were the prisoners of their society. In his private verse the poet was no doubt free to amuse
himself as he pleased, but the doctrine which finally prevailed was that his major function was to "im-mortalise" his patron by his panegyric kāšīdīs: a curious and remarkable revival of the tribal function of the pre-Islamic poet.

From the literary-historical angle, one of the most interesting features of 3rd century poetry is the effort made, but without substantial success, to break through these conventions in different ways. ʿAbū Tammām al-Ṭayyib (d. 354/965), a self-taught Syrian, tried to revive the weighty sonority of beduin poetry and to marry it to the bādiʿ ornamentation of the poets of al-ʿIrāq; at the same time he attempted to make his verse the vehicle of a more complex structure of thought. His poetry is in consequence often strained and overloaded, or alternatively relaxed to an excessive degree, although it has found warm admirers in both mediaeval and modern times. His fellow-townman and disciple, al-Buhturi (d. 284/897), with a more natural gift, remained closer to the ʿIrāqī tradition in his smoother and more polished verse. In al-ʿIrāq, on the other hand, Ibn al-Rūmī (d. 283/896) attempted to create a new introspective and analytical poetry, in which each poem develops a single theme in an organic unity, and which has sometimes, but doubtfully, been genetically linked with his "Greek" origin. The originality of this poetry (though marred by an excessive sense of grievance) was appreciated, but not imitated; and the more typical and influential representative of ʿIrāqī modernism was the ʿAbbāsīd prince Ibn al-Muʿtazz (d. 296/908), who freely adapted traditional themes and metres to poetical rasālīd and descriptive verse, corresponding to the prose jāwīl. His innovations in technique and ingenuity (including a historical poem in 450 raddawīs completed the reign of his cousin, the caliph al-Muʿtaḍid) rest, however, on the established conventions of Arabic poetry; they revise, rather than reform, its characteristic methods and outlook.

From the 4th/10th century on, such pieces of natural description, epistles, poems on social occasions and the like constitute, together with epigrams and ceremonial versification or kāšīdās, the stock-in-trade of all minor poets in every part of the Muslim world, and in varying degrees of excellence. By now the use of bādiʿī had become so universal in poetry as to be a natural constituent of the finished poetic imagination; in the ghazal or wine-song it might be allowed to play only a minor part, but no poem with any pretensions could be composed without it. It required, however, the genius of a greater poet to blend in just proportions the Arabian kāšīā and the intellectual ingenuity of the ʿIrāqī school. This was accomplished by Abu ʿl-Ṭayyib al-Mutanabbi (d. 354/965), of Kūfīan origin and an admirer of Ibn al-Rūmī and Ibn al-Muʿtazz, but Syrian in his poetical apprenticeship, and the brightest ornament of the "Circle of Sayf al-Dawla". For skill in construction, felicity of language, and mastery of the lapidary phrase, al-Mutanabbi has no equal among the later bādiʿ poets, although his chief rival in Aleppo, the ʿAbdādīd prince Abū Firas (d. 357/968) may have surpassed him in the direct emotional appeal of his best poems. A greater rival was his contemporary Ibn Zaydūn (d. 463/1071), the panegyrist of al-Mansūr b. Abī ʿAmar, follower of al-Mutanabbi. With these may be mentioned, of later date, the Sicilian Ibn ʿHamdīl (d. 527/1132), and among the many minor poets the ʿAbdādīd prince al-Muʿtamīd (d. 488/1095). During the 5th/11th century, however, a new strophic type of poetry, of local inspiration, began to be cultivated in Spanish-Arab literary circles, but did not reach its full development until the following century (see § IV below).


(IV) Sixth to Twelfth Centuries

The beginning of the 6th/12th century witnessed the triumph of the two forces which were henceforth to dominate the intellectual life of the Arab countries: scholasticism and šīʿīsm. Both of these movements were associated in the Sunnī revival under the Saljūqs [q.v.] which, beginning in Khorāsān in the middle of the 5th century, spread to ʿIrāq under the Saljūq sultans, and to Syria and Egypt under its Zankīd and Ayyūbid offspring. In the West a similar movement, led by the Berber Muḥammad b. Tūmārī (d. 524/1130) on his return from Baghdād, was associated with the Muwaḥḥīd (Almohad) régime in the 6th century, and their parallel development in the two halves of the Arab world was maintained by multiple contacts and interactions.
The chief material factor in the spread of scholas-
ticism was the gradual concentration of all literary
education in the madrasas [q.v.], the new type of
organised college introduced by the vizier Niẓām
al-Mulk [q.v.]; d. 485/1092] into Bağhād for the
training of ʿulāma’ and administrators, and thence
spread over the entire Muslim world. The formal-
isation of education involved also the formalisa-
tion of the disciplines taught, and contributed
powerfully to the substitution of book-learning and
encyclopaedic compilation for original composition.
This tendency is already visible in the first generation
of leading scholars at the Niẓāmīyya madrasa:
the philologist al-Tibrīzī (d. 502/1109), a pupil of
Abū ‘l-ʿAlā al-Maʿarrī, whose production was
confined to schoolworks and commentaries, as also
was that of his successor al-Dīwālīkī (d. 539/1145);
and in the Shāfiʿī theologians al-Dīwānīyī ʿImām al-
Ḥāfīmīy (d. 428/1038) and his pupil Abū Ḥamīd
al-Ghazālī (d. 505/1111), whose earlier works were
devoted to methodology and the scholastic defence
of orthodoxy against Hellenistic philosophy and
Islamic heresy. In their footsteps followed the
immense majority of Sunni theologians and jurists
of the later generations, producing a vast literature
of scholastical summaries (ḥadīṣa [q.v.]; pl. ṣaḥih) the
most esteemed being those of the Ḥanafī Abū Ḥafs
al-Naṣafī (d. 537/1142), ʿAbd al-Dīn al-Ṭālī (d. 576/1180),
and Muḥ. b. Yūsuf al-Sanʿūsī (d. 892/1486)—
works on ḥadīṣ (especially the supplement to the
“Six Books” by Ibn al-Haythamī (d. 807/1405) and
the comprehensive Kanz al-ʿUmādī of the Indian
Ṣāḥīb al-Muttaqī (d. 975/1569)—school textbooks of
law and collections of precedents, as well as handbooks
on special branches of it [see Fikr]—commentaries
on the Kurʿān or on particular sections of it [see
Tafsīr] or on the kiraṣī [q.v.]—and on all of these
and similar works a ponderous structure of commen-
tary (shark) and super-commentary (kāshīya). The
Shīʿa, in turn, on the basis of the 4th and 5th
centuries worked, producing similar theological and
dogmatic compends (especially by al-Mutahhar al-
Ḥāfī, d. 726/1326, and Muḥammad Bākīr al-Majlīsī,
d. 1110/1700), textbooks of law, and Kurʿān-
commentaries.

The exceptions to this increasing stratification
and narrowing down of scholastic thought are few
but important. The outstanding original religious
thinker and reformer, the Ḥanbalī Ibn Ṭābiyya (d. 728/1328), and his pupil Ibn Ṭābiyya al-Dīwānīyī (d. 751/1350) engaged in a vigorous polemic against both the inertia of the schools and the šūfī cults,
but with little success until the revival of his teaching
by Muḥammad b. Ṣaḥib al-Wahhāb (d. 1206/1791)
in Central Arabia. In India, an important and
little-studied school of religious philosophy, founded
at Dīwānī by Muḥammad al-Dīwānīyī (d. 1052/1642),
remained active for several generations, and
influenced the work of the religious reformer (Shīʿa)
Walt Allāḥ al-Dīhlawī (d. 1176/1762). In law, original
contributions were made to the study of legal
principles by the Shīʿa Tāpjī al-Dīn al-Ṣubkī (d. 771/
1370) and the Ḥanafī Ibn Ṣaḥījam al-Mislī (d. 970/
1563). In philosophy also, fresh minds were occasionally
brought to the study of the confused schools of thikār,
as, for example, by the Andalūsi Abū Ḥayyān
(who, amongst other works, composed grammars of
Turkish, Persian, and Ethiopic; d. 745/1344) and his
Egyptian pupil Ibn Ḥishām (d. 761/1360).

The effects of scholasticism were not, however,
confined to the religious and philological sciences.
It affected every branch of literary composition,
considerable output of works on military tactics and the handling of weapons, the management of horses, and the killing in general.

Even in al-Andalus prose literature was largely a belated reflection of eastern models, as in the "Fürstenspiegel" of Ibn Abi Ranaša al-Turtushi (d. 525/1131), the reworking by Ibn Tufayl (d. 581/1185) of Ibn Sina's philosophical romance Bāyān ibn Yāhān, and Ibn Hūdha'y's treatise on horsemanship Tawḥīd al-Anfus. Granada, however, produced in the versatile Lišān al-Dīn Ibn al-Khāṭīb (d. 776/1374) one of the last all-round masters of Arabic literary art.

In the field of belles lettres in general, the cult of sadīqit reached its culmination in the 6th/12th century. Rhyming prose fūsūl were pressed into the service of ethics in the Astād al-Dhahab of the philologist al-Zamakhshārī (d. 538/1143). Secretarial prose received a fresh impulse from the rich and flexible inĝād of al-Kātib al-Fāḍil (d. 596/1199), secretary of the last Fātimid caliphs and of Saladin; and the examples of historical composition in sadīqit set by al-Sabī and al-'Utbī were followed and even surpassed by the loquacious virtuosity of Imād al-Dīn, known as al-Kātib al-Isfahānī (d. 597/1200), in his histories of the Saljuqs and of Saladin. In the next generation, the arts of versification and euphuism were reduced to text-book form by the Khārīzimīn al-Sakkākī (d. 626/1229) in his Miḥād al-Ulūm, probably the most frequently and widely abstracted, glossed and commented on of all secular works in Arabic literature. But the cult of sadīqit itself suffered some decline in the following centuries, except in secretarial inĝād, in works imitated from or modelled on the makhdūm, and in the introductions and dedications of books of every kind. It is on the whole sparingly used in the new type of homiletic adāb popularised by the Ḥanbalite preacher Ibn al-Djawiṣi (d. 597/1200), and even in the numerous later anthologies, florilegia, and similar works of literary compilation. Its reintroduction into such works seems to date from the Rayḥān al-Attābī of the Egyptian stylist Sāhīb al-Fāṭimah (d. 1059/1649) and its continuation by Ibn Ma'sūm (d. 1104/1692), and it continued thereafter to impose a veneer of literary artistry upon utilitarian works of various kinds.

The Hellenistic element in Arabic-Islamic culture remained active for several centuries, not only in the special fields of medicine, the sciences and philosophy, but also in combination with the branches of madrasa learning. Medical works based on independent study continued indeed to be written down to the time of Dā'ud al-Anṭākī (himself the compiler of one of the most celebrated florilegia of poetry and adāb, extracted from an earlier work by al-Sarrājī (d. 500/1106); d. 1008/1599). Mathematics, after the Persian encyclopaedist Jawz al-Dīn al-Mā'rūf (d. 672/1273), became increasingly confined to astronomy. Philosophy, also cultivated in the East by Tūsī and the more orthodox encyclopaedist Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209), but thereafter passing into Sufistic metaphysics, flowered brilliantly for a time in Muslim Spain with Ibn Bāḏajda (d. 533/1143), Ibn Tufayl, and the great Abu'l-Walīd Ibn Rūḍh (Averroes, d. 595/1198), before yielding likewise to Sufism, with Ibn 'Abī-Šarīf [see below] and Ibn Sabīn (d. 668/1269). Scientific geography, which attained one of its peaks in the work-map and descriptive text compiled by the shāfi'i al-Idrīsī for Roger II of Sicily in 548/1154, still survived to the time of Abu'l-Fīdā', sultan of Hamāh (d. 732/1331), but was already giving way to the elective literary art of cosmography, exemplified by Zakariyā' al-Kawānī (d. 681/1283), Shams al-Dīn al-Dimashkī (d. 727/1327) and Sirāj al-Dīn Ibn al-Wardī (d. 850/1446). Natural science was cultivated chiefly in the field of medical botany (notably by al-Ghāfikī, d. 560/1165, and Ibn al-Baytār, d. 646/1248), and was included, along with a variety of literary materials, in the zoological dictionary entered in the encyclopaedic tendency, exemplified not only by Tūsī and al-Rāzī, but also by many lesser compilers. Encyclopaedism, it might be said, was one outlet for scholarship which found itself, consciously or unconsciously, cramped by the prevailing emphasis on religious studies and philology. It took many forms. The simplest and most compact was the alphabetical arrangement of data in a given field or fields, as in the dictionary of niṣbas (Kitāb al-Ansāb) compiled by Tājī al-Dīn al-Samānī (d. after 551/1156), on the basis of which the Greek Yākuṭ compiled his geographical dictionary (K. al-Buldān). The field which offered the widest scope for this treatment was that of biography, whether general (beginning with the Waḥīyāt al-As'im of Ibn Khalīlān, d. 911/1505), or by a number of writers, or by the biographers of the different schools, notably by Tājī al-Dīn al-Subkī (Shāfi`ī, d. 772/1370), Ibn Kuṭlubughā (Ḥanafī, d. 879/1474), and Ibn Fāhān (Mālikī, d. 799/1397; supplemented by Ahmad Bābā of Timbuktu, d. 1036/1626); of jurists of the different schools, notably by Tājī al-Dīn al-Subkī (Shāfi`ī, d. 772/1370), Ibn Kuṭlubughā (Ḥanafī, d. 879/1474), and Ibn Fāhān (Mālikī, d. 799/1397; supplemented by Ahmad Bābā of Timbuktu, d. 1036/1626); of Qur`ān-readers by Ibn al-Djazārī (d. 833/1429-30); of the companions of the Prophet by 'Īzz al-Dīn Ibn al-Ṭajīr (d. 650/1253) and Ibn Hādjār al-Ashkalānī (d. 857/1450); of philosophers by Ibn al-'Uṣaybi`a (d. 668/1270); of philologists by al-Kīṭī and by Tājī al-Dīn al-S̄uyūṭī (d. 911/1505); of the masters of the various schools of Justice, by Ibn al-Khatīb; of the ijtihād of the jurists of the different schools, notably by Tājī al-Dīn al-Subkī (Shāfi`ī, d. 772/1370), Ibn Kuṭlubughā (Ḥanafī, d. 879/1474), and Ibn Fāhān (Mālikī, d. 799/1397; supplemented by Ahmad Bābā of Timbuktu, d. 1036/1626); and of the companions of the Prophet by Ibn al-Djazārī (d. 833/1429-30); of the companions of the Prophet by 'Īzz al-Dīn Ibn al-Ṭajīr (d. 650/1253) and Ibn Hādjār al-Ashkalānī (d. 857/1450); of traditionists by Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahābī (d. 748/1348); and many others. The already established practice of compiling dictionaries of scholars and eminent men and women associated with a particular city or region was continued on an extensive, and sometimes massive, scale, e.g. for Damascus by Ibn 'Aṣākir (d. 571/1176), for Aleppo by Kamāl al-Dīn Ibn al-Adīm (d. 660/1262), for Egypt by Taḥī al-Dīn al-Māzritī (d. 845/1442), for al-Andalus by Ibn Basīkuwāl (d. 578/1183) and Ibn al-Abbār (d. 658/1260), for Granada by Ibn al-Khāṭīb, for the Ottoman empire by Tashkūrūzāda (d. 968/1560), in addition to many other biographical works less systematically arranged. A novel principle, introduced by Ibn Hādjār al-Ashkalānī, was to organise biographical dictionaries by centuries; his dictionary of notabilities of the 8th century (al-Durar al-Kāmīna) was followed for the 9th by al-Sakhāwī (d. 902/1497), for the 10th by Naḍimm al-Dīn al-Qhāṭī (d. 1061/1651) (supplemented with special reference to South Arabia and Gūḏqārīt by Ibn aydārī, d. 1038/1628), for the 11th by al-Muhbīb (d. 1112/1699), and for the 12th by al-Lāhāf (d. 1206/1791). A concise summary for the first millennium, in order of years, was compiled by Ibn al-Imām al-Ḥanbālī (d. 1089/1678). Here too may be mentioned the bibliographical encyclopaedia (K. al-Zunan) made by the Turkish scholar Kāṭīb Āḥādīt Khalīf (d. 1068/1658), and the
elaborate dictionary of technical terms (Išḍāḥāt al-Funun) written in 1158/1745 by the Indian Muham-
mad Ṭabīb al-Tahanawī. A second direction taken by encyclopaedism was to combine several branches of learning in a single work. Al-Nuwayrī (d. 779/1377), the Syrian Ibn Ḥāfiz al-Ḥamawi (d. 837/1434), and of the lyrical poets Bahu al-Dīn Zuhayr “of Egypt” (d. 656/1258). A panegyric on the Prophet, known as al-Burda, composed in elabo-
rate bādi‘ by the Egyptian al-Būṣīrī (d. 694/1296),
became and has remained one of the classics of religious poetry. The poetic art found more congenial expression in newer patterns of strophic poetry, related to the East to the popular mawdī and dubaytī,
and already partially exploited by al-Ḥārīfī. In al-
Andalus the more complex strophic art of the
muwaṣṣahāt [q.v.] was given finished form by the
blind poet al-Tufīlī (d. 523/1129) and Ibn Baṣīr
(d. 540/1145-6). Although it owed something to
popular poetry in its origin, the muwaṣṣahāt, as a
developed literary form, retained only in its final
line (ṣuḥūf) a trace of its provincial source and was
cultivated as a courtly art in Spain, becoming a
highly ornate lyric with musical accompaniment. In
this function it was transplanted to the East by
Ibn Sanā‘ al-Mulk (d. 608/1211), and continued to
flourish there for a time, but as a formalised art
which lacked the freshness and apparent spontaneity
of the earlier Andalusian poets. [For the muwaṣṣahāt
in sūfī poetry, see below.] Of the more genuinely
popular poetry using the vulgar speech very little
has survived, except for the nagālī of the
Andalusian Ibn Kuzmān (d. 555/1160), the
satirical Haṣṣ al-Kuḥāfī of the Egyptian al-Shiribīnī
(c. 1088/1678), and the ǧ̣īr malḥūn of the Maghrib
and of the Yaman. An isolated attempt made by the
oculist and wit Ibn Dānīyāl (d. 710/1310) to give a
place in literature to the popular shadow-play
seems to have met with no success. On the other
hand, the popular romances celebrating the epics
of the Banū Hilāl in Arabia and Africa and the Banū
Kilāb against the Greeks, and the exploits of various
heroic or legendary figures (Antar, Śiddī Bātṭāl, the
Yamanite Sayf b. Ǧāhī Yazen, and the Mamlūk
sultan Baybars) reached in centuries the climax of their development, together with the
miscellaneous collections of popular tales, drawn
from all ages and strata, out of which the All Layla
wa-Layla finally emerged in a more or less estab-
lished form about the 9th/15th century.

The literary output of the sūfī movement in Arabic
was at first small in bulk compared to the scholastic
literature described above, but of much greater
significance in the cultural development of Islam.
The 6th century opened with the epoch-making
reconciliation of Ḥasanī with orthodoxy in Ḥīḍāyat
ʿUḥūm al-Dīn of Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī, and the
equally orthodox homilies and writings of the
Hanbalite ʿAbd al-Kādir al-Dījīl (or Gīlānī) (d. 561/
1166). The sūfī khanāb or sānūya everywhere took
its place alongside the madrasa in the Sunni reviva-
list movement, and received the same patronage
from the governing classes. It was not long, however,
before the sūfī movement began to develop its own
systems of theology and metaphysics. The “oriental”
platonist and illuminationist (tawḥīdī) doctrines were
restated by Shihāb al-Dīn Yahyā al-Suhrawardī
(executed by order of Saladin in 587/1191, and hence
known as al-maktul, in opposition to the Aristotelian school; but another Suhrawardi, Shihab al-Din Tumar (d. 632/1234) issued a more orthodox exposition of ṣūfī mysticism in Ṣamārī al-Maʿārī. Both works had a deep and lasting influence in the East, but much less in the Arab world. Here the new monistic mysticism (mabdat al-teyżji) was founded, on a basis of neoplatonism and Moroccan sufism, by the Murcian Muhyl al-Din Ibn al-Bagtini, known as al-Shabb al-Maktul, in opposition to the Aristotelian school; but another Suhrawardi, Shihab al-Din Ibn al-Arabi (d. in Damascus 658/1260), carried to Anatolia by this pupil al-Konawl (d. 672/1273), and spread still more widely by the order of the Sufis in the Maghrib. The term "modern Arabic literature" implies a development differing from, and a degree of change greater than, a simple revival of literary activity, whether within the narrower circle of the philosophical arts or in the wider humanistic range of the 3rd and following centuries. Such minor local revivals had occurred from time to time, as, for example, in Aleppo under the influence of the Maronite archbishop Djamansh Farhat (1670-1732), and in Baghdaḍ in the first half of the 12th/18th century (see al-Alusi, Aṣṣan al-Asfar, Baghdad 134/1930). In the 13th/19th century also, the rise of a new literature was preluded by a sustained movement for the revival of classical Arabic and an output of literary works directly or indirectly inspired by classical models. The first object of the leaders of this movement was to rescue the Arabic language from its degeneration in the preceding centuries and to restore the heritage of classical literary art; in its purest form it is represented by Nāṣif al-Yaṣṣarī (1803-1871) among the Syrians, by Naṣīf al-Ḥarīrī (d. 1874) and ʿAll Pasha Mubarak (1824-193) in Egypt, and by Māḥmūd Shukrī al-Alusi (1827-1923) in Suṭrā. All of these, and many others, were consciously ambitious to revive the classical traditions, both in their pedagogical work, and in their original productions, e.g. ʿAll Yāṣṣarī's maḥṣūm (Maḥṣūm al-Bahrāyin) in the manner of al-Ḥarīrī, ʿAll Pasha's al-Ḫāliṣ al-Tauṣīṣīyya in continuation of al-Makrī, and al-Alusi's adab collection Butūṣ al-ʿArab. Alongside these, but also fundamentally sharing their aims, was another group of writers who were led by circumstances or personal choice into closer contact with the literature and the ideas of the western world. The first major impulse in this direction was given by the needs of the military academies set up by the viceroy of Egypt, Muḥammad ʿAlī, for translations of technical works from the French, together with the establishment of a printing press in Egypt in 1828, and others soon afterwards in Syria. The chief of the Egyptian translators was Rīfāʿa Bey Rāfīʿ al-Taḥtāwī (d. 1873), whose original works included a vivid narrative of his experiences in France as awmām of the Egyptian educational mission, and many later educational handbooks. It is questionable how widely the large body of translated technical works of this period circulated, or how far they affected the outlook of men of letters; but it seems clear that for Rīfāʿa Bey and others like him the western materials which they used in their literary works were simply adjuncts embedded in the framework of the established Islamic categories or (in the case of their translations from French literature) supplements to them. The literary productions of the contemporary Lebanese scholars who were in contact with the western educational missions in Syria, and in particular Butrus al-Bustānī (1819-83), Ahmad Fāris al-Ṣāhīyāk (1803-87), and Nāṣif’s son Isḥāq al-Yaṣṣarī (1847-1906), as also of the
Tunisian Muḥammad Bayram (1840-89), were to a large extent similarly motivated; but along with this all these men were also among the creators of the new Arabic periodical press and experimenting in the formation of a modern journalistic medium.

The development of the new periodical press in Egypt, at first largely under Syrian direction but soon followed by a vigorous native Egyptian production, provided the real forçng-bed of modern Arabic literature. During the last decades of the 19th century and the first decade of the 20th, the press was the theatre in which (except for poetry) literary reputations were made and literary Arabic was adapted to modern social themes and currents of ideas. This did not exclude the widest diversification in literary styles: the strict but vigorous classicism of Muḥammad ʿAbdūh (1849-1905), the modernised ʿubādātī of Muḥammad al-Muwaylīḥī (1868-1930), the elegant neoclassicism of Muṣṭafā Ῥūfī al-Manfūlī (1876-1924), the functional prose of Dījdī Zaydān (1861-1914), Yaʿqūb Šarrūf (1852-1927) and Kāsim Amin (1865-1908), the fiery rhetoric of Wāli al-Dīn Yakūn (1873-1921) and Muṣṭafā Kāmil (1874-1908), the satirical colloquialism of Yaʿqūb Šānnūrī “Abū Naḍūrā” (1839-1922) and ʿAbd Allāh Nādir (1844-96). At the same time the Syrian press transported to America was producing a type of literary essay and Whittmanesque “prose poems” which entirely discarded the classical traditions and even sought to remodel the linguistic structure in part; its leading figures were Dījdīrān Ḫalīl Dījdīrān (1883-1931) and Amlīn al-Rayhānī (1877-1940).

This stylistic experiment in the press in the treatment of modern themes was reinforced by a very extensive output of translations of European works of literature, often by the same hands. Of the translations so made few have much claim to literary distinction, except those made by al-Manfūlī and perhaps one or two others. But the activity in translation played a vital part in the development of modern Arabic literature. “It may be said that, just as the world, the 19th century and the 20th, the 19th century and the 20th, or an al-Diḥāṣ would have been impossible without the translators of the ʿAbbāsid period, so without the translators of the 19th century modern Arabic literature could never have been called into existence” (Kratchkowsky). The translated works served not only as exercises in expanding the range of Arabic literary expression, but also as models. Not a few translators themselves tried their hands at original works of a similar kind, and many others were stimulated to original composition by them. In the former group, the most interesting are the attempts to develop a dramatic literature. The earliest of these were made by the Syrian Māḏūn al-Nakkiḥī (1817-55), inspired by Molière; he was followed by Naḍīb al-Māḥdūd (1667-99), in the style of Corneille, Hugo, A. Dumas and Shakespeare, and more successfully, by the Egyptian Muḥammad Uḥmān Dījdīrān (1828-98), who adapted Molière to Egyptian settings and speech, besides producing a remarkable adaptation in literary Arabic of Pari et Virginie. In spite of this, however, it cannot be said that the Arabic drama achieved much success in the 19th century. On the other hand, some progress was made with the novel, particularly in the series of historical novels written in the manner of Scott by Dījdīrān Zaydān and the psychological novel ʿUrūshālīm al-Dījdīda by Farāb Anṭān (1874-1922). Many other original compositions also depend largely on European materials, e.g. the politico-social writings of ʿAbd al-Rāḥmān al-Kuwwābī (1849-1903), while the literature of the nascent Egyptian feminist movement, illustrated by ʿAṣīfa al-Taymrūtīyya (1840-1902), Malāk Ḥīfīn Nāṣīf (1886-1918), and Kāsim Amin, betrays its original inspiration even though adapted to its own social and literary environment.

In the sphere of poetry, on the other hand, the continuing classical tradition far outweighed any literary influences from the west down to 1914. With the rise of nationalism, however, new themes, provided first by Muḥammad Sāmil al-Bārdūlī (1839-1904), then with more classical polish by Ahmad Ṣawākī (1868-1932) and more depth of social feeling by Muḥammad Ḥāfīz Ibrāhīm (1871-1932). But neither the new themes, whether patriotic or social or individual, nor the techniques of western poetry affected to any marked extent the long-established structure, genres, and modes of expression of Arabic poetry (in the hands, at least, of its most competent artists). The only outstanding exceptions are found in ʿIrāq, where the native Arabic poetic tradition had remained more vigorous and less cramped by artifice than in Syria and Egypt in the previous centuries. In more unconventional forms and freer language Diḏlim Sidīk al-Zahāwī (1867-1936), and with more classical restraint Maṭrūf al-Ruṣāfī (1875-1945), both achieved an authentic expression of current ideas and aspiration. An isolated attempt to acclimatise Greek poetry in Arabic was made by Sulaymān al-Bustānī (1856-1925) with his translation of the Iliad (1904); in itself not unsuccessful as a translation, it nevertheless failed to make much impression.

(b) Since 1914

In contrast to the preceding period, which was on the whole a period of experiment and imitation in modern Arabic prose, the decades since 1914 have seen the beginnings of a new and original Arabic literature which to a much greater extent reflects the social and intellectual interests of the Arab peoples. A leading part in this development was taken by the "liberal" group of Egyptian writers, inspired by Muḥammad ʿAbdūh, who were associated with the journal al-Diḏīda (issued from 1907, edited by Ahmad Luṭfī al-Sayyīd) and its successor al-Siyāsā (from 1922, edited by Muḥ. Ḥusayn Haykal); but the movement itself soon extended widely beyond this circle. The principal types of production were at first the short story (followed by the novel) and the literary essay; later on these were followed by the literary drama.

The first major work of the new school was Zaynāb, a novel of Egyptian village life, published anonymously in 1914 by M. H. Haykal (b. 1885). In spite of its merits, the technical weaknesses of the work threw a sharp light on the deficiencies of literary Arabic at that time for the adequate presentation of the novel of manners. During the decade 1920-30 these were largely surmounted by a growing output of realistic short stories of contemporary life, beginning with the sketches (Ma Tardhu' l-ʿUyun) of the talented Muḥammad Taṣmūr (1891-1921), and continued with increasing skill and success by his brother Muḥammad Taṣmūr (b. 1894) and by several others (ʿĪsā ʿUbayd, Shihāṭa ʿUbayd, Tāhir Lāshīn, etc.). The most brilliant stylist in this field was Ibrāhīm ʿAbd al-Kādir al-Māzīn (1890-1949), who eventually produced also the first successful novel of manners (Ibrāhīm al-Kātib, 1931). From 1930 the output of novels slowly increased, among the more notable of the earlier works being ʿAwadat
al-Rāḥ (by Tawfīk al-Ḥakīm, 1933), Sāra (by ʿAbbās Māḥmūd al-ʿAkkād, 1938), and Niḍāʾ al-Maḍākhīl (by Māḥmūd Tāymūr, 1939). The historical novel had already been recreated by Māḥmūd Farīd ʿAbū Ḥabdīlī with Iḥnāt al-Maḍākhīl (1926). The psychological novel also was successfully attempted on a smaller scale by Tāḥā Ḥusayn (b. 1889), who in his autobiographical work al-ʿAyūṣm (1926) endowed modern Egyptian literature with one of its masterpieces in content and literary style. Innumerable short stories have been produced also in Lebanon, Syria, ʿĪrāq and America, with the variations in subject, style and technique which one would expect. The output of novels, on the other hand, has been more fluctuating, and is still relatively small in proportion to the total literary production.

The literary essay envisaged a different purpose. It aimed not only at the critical evaluation of both classical Arabic and modern western literature (extending sometimes even to classical Greek and Latin literature) and social criticism in general, but also at the valorisation of the Arabic cultural tradition, in the widest sense, in the circumstances of the modern world. The rapid increase in daily, weekly and monthly journals after 1920 provided endless opportunities for the publication of such essays, and the representation of all points of view. The collected essays of many writers were subsequently reissued as separate works, whose very profusion makes it difficult and invidious to single out individual names. It must suffice to mention, from among the older generation of writers, Tāḥā Ḥusayn and al-ʿAkkād as particularly influential thinkers and critics on the modernist wing; Shawkī Ṣāḥḥīṣ Rīḍā (the editor of the reformist religious journal al-Maḍākhīl, 1865-1935) and Farīd Wajḍīl as equally influential in conservative and religious circles; Mūsāṭā Ṣāḥīlī al-Raḥīfī (1880-1937), who carried neo-classicism to the verge of preciosity; in Syria, the classicist Māḥmūd Bey Kūrd ʿAll (president of the Arab Academy of Damascus, 1876-1952); and of the Syro-Americans Mīḥāṭāʾl Nūḥ Kūrdī (b. 1889). The ephemeral production there gradually arose a more developed literature of literary and social criticism, with a dominantly academic bias, but also borrowing in some hands (e.g. Tawfīk al-Ḥakīm) the technique of the novel, and even other literary media, as in the scientific travel narrative al-Sīnābīl al-ʿAṣīrī by Ḥusayn Fawīl (1928). Another noteworthy later development was the application of these newer literary methods to the early history of Islam, exemplified by M. H. Ḥaykal, Tāḥā Ḥusayn, and al-ʿAkkād, and in dramatic form, somewhat earlier, by Tawfīk al-Ḥakīm.

The technical advance made in the presentation of the realistic narrative and novel was reflected also in dramatic literature. With few exceptions, the lead was taken by Egyptian authors, beginning again with Māḥmūd Tāymūr, and continued more especially by Tawfīk al-Ḥakīm, who, after some experiments in literary drama on themes drawn from Islamic literature (Aḥl al-ʿAkhī, Māḥmūd, Shākrāsālād), has shown himself a major dramatist on modern social themes. Together with these may be mentioned the experiments made by the poet Ahmad Ṣāhwālī to create a literary genre of "classical tragedy", based on traditional Arab themes, followed more recently by Māḥmūd Tāymūr.

Among the technical problems confronted by the Arab literary drama, and to a lesser degree by the short story and novel, the question of language constitutes a peculiar difficulty. In the purely literary drama and in historical plays generally the use of the written language needs no justifying; but in the contemporary realistic drama this involves a degree of artificiality which tends to destroy the theatrical effect. Whereas, however, the popular theatre has always flourished on plays in the colloquial language, the attempts made to produce a more developed drama in colloquial speech have neither been markedly successful on the stage nor met with much approbation in literary circles. Even in the short story the introduction of colloquial speech in dialogue (attempted in their earlier works by Māḥmūd Tāymūr and Tawfīk al-Ḥakīm) was felt to involve a stylistic dislocation, and has not been commonly practised. Even less consideration has been given to more ambitious attempts to produce literary works in the colloquial throughout, chiefly by Lebanese writers and poets. A definite solution of this problem is not yet in sight, but for the time being a working compromise is provided by the use of a simplified form of the literary language for dialogue both on the stage and in the novel.

At the same time, and in the opposite direction, one consequence of the vogue of the literary essay has been to mobilise more effectively the resources of classical Arabic, and to facilitate the development of a neo-classical style in the novel and general literature since 1940. With the richer and more flexible range of vocabulary and construction thus made available, together with the more technical concentration of meaning in modern Arabic (in contrast to the conceptual looseness of the older literary language), the contemporary writer has at his disposal an instrument which can express with grace and precision all normal aspects of contemporary Arab life and thought. Beyond this range, however, neo-classical Arabic is still deficient in both the fine nuances and the contextual associations which are the product only of long use and habit. For this reason, the attempt (first made by Bīṣr Fāris, in his play Māʾraš al-Tarīḵ, 1938) to create a symbolist or impressionist style in modern Arabic must be considered premature.

This applies even more especially to the poetical production of recent years. Since 1914, the situation of prose and poetry have been reversed. Whereas in prose-writing Arabic authors, after the period of translation and imitation, moved on to original compositions, Arabic poetry has moved towards the freedom of western poetry and the imitation of its techniques. On the one hand, the intensity of political aspirations and frustrations could not fail to inspire many poets in the Arab countries (particular mention may be made of the Tunisian Abū ʿIṣām al-Ṣāḥīlī, 1909-34), who have applied traditional themes and imagery to modern situations with great effect, most of the younger poets have, in the last few years, turned to the creation of a psychological poetry in new strophic and rhythmical forms, and wrestling with the traditional linguistic structure and its associations. The Syro-American poets were the first to challenge the traditional formalism, and have been followed particularly by the Lebanese poets in Brazil (Rāṣīl Sāliḥ al-Khūrī and Fawāz Māṭīf, 1899-1930), in North America (Iyās Abū ʿAṣ, 1903-1930), and in Lebanon itself (Iyās Abū Ṣāḥīla, 1903-47, and others). The leader of the "new school" in Egypt was Abū Zāk Shāhīd (1892-1953), whose magazine Apollos for a short time (1932-3) provided a forum for the younger poets, in competition with the older "modernising" school represented by the Lebanese Khalīl Maṭrān.
(1871-1949), and with greater freedom by al-‘Aţḵād, which, though no less contemporary in subject and psychological approach, made a less violent breach with the formal and linguistic traditions of Arabic poetry. Much the same may be said also of the contemporary poetry of ‘Irāk, within the framework of its own tradition.


(H. A. R. Gibb)

**Appendix—Arabic Literature in Spain**

**General bibliography:** Apart from the general histories of Arabic literature (see above, B), which devote one or more chapters to Muslim Spain, the work of A. González Palencia, Historia de la literatura arábigo-española, Barcelona, Madrid, etc., 1928, 2nd. ed. 1945 (a recast edition, with an extensive bibliography) is the only comprehensive work which exists on Arabic literature in Al-Andalus. A brief general account will be found in: Elias Térés Sadaba, La Literatura Arábigo-española, apud E. M. Pareja, Islamología, ii, Madrid 1954, 979 ff. Apart from a few monographs on authors (see under the names of these authors) and fewer still, on periods, specialists have been primarily concerned with the production of short studies (such as are to be found in the journal al-Andalus in particular); the following, however, should be mentioned; for poetry: E. García Gómez, Poemas árabe-andaluces, Madrid 1930, 1940, 1943; idem, Poema arábigo-andaluz, breve síntesis histórica, Madrid 1952; for history and geography: F. Pons Boigues, Ensayo biobibliográfico sobre los historiadores y geógrafos arábigo-españoles, Madrid 1898; in addition: E. Lévi-Provençal, La Civilización árabe en España, V eu générale, Cairo 1938, 1948 (Spanish translation, Buenos-Aires-Mexico 1953); Dozy, Recherches sur l’histoire et la litt. de l’Espagne pendant le moyen âge, Leiden 1849, 1860, 1881.

1. —Down to the Almoravids (92-485/711-1092).

When the conquerors set foot on Spanish soil, at the end of the 1st/beginning of the 8th century, Arabic literature was still only represented, in the East, by the Kur’ān and the religious sciences, as in their infancy, and by a lively poetic muse. It is therefore probable that the Arab warriors, who were poets to a greater or lesser degree, respected the old tradition, but probably confined their literary activity to the composition of a few poems designed to extol their tribe, celebrate their military exploits, lament their dead, or bewail their exile from their homeland, in the same way as their fellow-Muslims sent to conquer other parts of the world (cf. C. A. Nallino, Letteratura = Scrivi, vi, 51, 110-4; French trans., 81-2, 170-7). None of this has been preserved; a late notation states however that in ancient times, “the inhabitants of al-Andalus sang in the style of Christians or of Arab cameleers” (apud E. García Gómez, Poesía, 30-1). Nevertheless, the foundation of the Umayyad amirate brought about the establishment of close contact with the East, which did not fail to send religious notabilities to catechise Spain, and the rapid Islamisation of a considerable part of the indigenous population required the development of juridico-religious studies. From 909 onwards, the substitution, encouraged by the Umayyads for political motives, of Malikism for the madhhab of al-Awza‘ī (see al-Andalus, vii), soon bore fruit in the formation of a school of jurists who, to a varying
but not inconsiderable degree, contributed to the propagation of the Muwatta* of Malik. In his defence of Muslim Spain, Ibn Hazm (see Al-Andalus 1954/1) cites in the first place ʻIsā b. Dinār (m. 121/837), Ibn Habīb (180-238/866-952), al-ʻUtbī (m. 255/870), Ibn ʻAbī Ṭālib (d. 70), Ibn Bāṣāmīn (m. 253/867), Ibn ʻAbī Ṭalib b. Muzayn (m. 258/872), Malik b. ʻAll al-Kātanī (m. 268/882); these studies were pursued with enthusiasm by the successors of these pioneers, Muḥ. b. ʻUmar b. Lbūba (225-314/840-926), Muḥ. b. ʻAbd al-Malik b. Ayman (252-330/866-941), Kāsim b. ʻAbdād (247-340/861-951), ʻAbdād b. Saʻīd (284-350/996-1064) and especially the great ʻAbd al-Ṣāliḥ, traditionist and man of letters Ibn ʻAbd al-Barr (368-457/978-1070). The attempt made by Bākī b. Māḥhad (201-76/817-925) on his return from the East (his meeting there with Ibn Ḥanbal is worth special mention), to introduce into Spain the Shāfiʿī madhab, had little effect, but this traditionist is the author of a collection of ʻadāsīs presented in the combined form of a muṣannaf and a maṣānad, of a work on the Companions of the Prophet, and above all of a commentary on the Kurʾān which Ibn Hazm considers to be superior to that of al-Tabari. Zahirism, on the other hand, was introduced by ʻAbd Allah b. ʻAbd Rabbih, to every extent it self was not unknown; among its supporters were Ḫalf Ghaffār (3rd/9th century), Yaḥyā b. ʻAbd al-Salāma (313/927), and Muḥ. b. Ḥudayr (d. 320/932). Finally, philosophy appeared on the scene with the mystic Ibn Maṣarra (d. 319/931) and his school (see Asín Palacios, Abenmasarra y su escuela, Madrid 1914).

The disciplines connected with the religious sciences developed on parallel lines. From the end of the 2nd/8th century, the first oriental works on grammar were introduced into Spain and a course of instruction was devoted to them, but it appears that philological and lexicographical studies received a powerful stimulus as a result of the arrival at Cordova, in the reign of ʻAbd al-Rahmān III, of the work of Dioscorides. After Ibn Ḥudūjī, who has already been mentioned, and Muḥ. b. ʻAbd al-Hādī al-Maghīrī (d. 457/1064), Abu ʻl-ʻRāsīm Khalāf b. ʻAbbās al-Zahrāwī (325-404/936-1013), known to Europe in the Middle Ages as Abulcasis, and Ibn Wāfīd (388-464/988-1074) were the first of a series of great physicians and botanists who achieved fame during the era which followed.

As a result of the beneficent influence of al-Ḥakam II, a school of mathematicians and astronomers arose under the leadership of Maslama al-Maghīrī (d. about 398/1007) and continued under Ibn al-Sām (370-426/980-1034) of Granada, while in the following century there flourished at Toledo al-Zarkallī and at Saragossa, the Hāfiz kings themselves. Finally, the study of medicine and botany received a powerful stimulus as a result of the arrival at Cordova, in the reign of ʻAbd al-Rahmān III, of the work of Dioscorides. After Ibn Ḥudūjī, who has already been mentioned, and Muḥ. b. ʻAbd al-Hādī al-Maghīrī (d. 457/1064), Abu ʻl-ʻRāsīm Khalāf b. ʻAbbās al-Zahrāwī (325-404/936-1013), known to Europe in the Middle Ages as Abulcasis, and Ibn Wāfīd (388-464/988-1074) were the first of a series of great physicians and botanists who achieved fame during the era which followed.

According to customary practice when dealing with Arabic literature, it has been necessary up to this point to give an account of disciplines and genres which the historian of most other literatures would certainly disregard, and it has been made to make a rapid list of works which for the most part bear the characteristic imprint of Islam and which differ little from similar works written in the East. The same consideration obtains when one embarks on a study of the first literary works proper, whether in prose or verse. It is nevertheless astonishing that it was not until the 4th/10th century that there appeared in Spain an adab work written by an Andalusian, the famous ʻIṣāb of Ibn ʻAbd Rabbih (d. 328/940), the contents of which are still specifically oriental; it is equally remarkable that this genre had no great success in Spain and that Ibn ʻAbd Rabbih had few imitators during the first period with which we are dealing. Yet for more than a century, the country had been "ṣrajelec", from the time of the arrival at Cordova, at the beginning of the amirate of ʻAbd al-Rahmān II, of the celebrated ʻIrāqī singer Zirīyāb (173-243/789-857), who brought to Spain the fashions of the Abbāsid court (see E. Lévi-Provençal, Civilisation, 69 ff.). Baghdad was indeed still a model to be imitated, but an event of the utmost importance had occurred, of a kind which gave to the Arabic literature of Spain an orientation slightly different from that which obtained in the East. In fact, from the 3rd/9th century, a strong tradition of tribes which populated the Peninsula had,
after a long period of mutual ignorance, been gradually drawn closer together and had finally achieved a sort of fusion eminently favourable to the production of an original literature.

Our information on the Arabic poetry written during the early centuries of Muslim domination is very scanty, and the loss of the oldest collections—especially the K. al-Huday‘iK of Ahmad b. Fa‘araj (d. 344/956)—deprives us of essential documentation. Perhaps Yahyâ al-Ghâsâlî (d. 251/864), who was sent by ‘Abd al-Rahmân II on an embassy to Constantinople (see E. Lévi-Provençal, Islam d’Occident, 81 ff.), wrote poetry of merit; it is known that he favoured a minor epic form, by his use of the urjâsâ, and this form was also employed by Tammâm b. ʿAmir (184-283/801-90) and Ibn ʿAbd Rabbih. It is not the epic, however, but the muwashshâhât (q.v.) which is the most typical Spanish form. From the end of the 3rd/9th century dates the creation, attributed to a poet of Cabra named Muqaddam b. Muʿâfâ (d. at the beginning of the 4th/10th century) of this new verse-form; its fundamental characteristics were the arrangement in strophes, an arrangement virtually unknown to the Arab lyric, and the addition of an envoy (khârij a) not in Arabic, but in Romance, as has recently been revealed by S. M. Stern (Les vers finals en espagnol dans les muwashshâhât hispano-lusitaniens . . . in in And., 1948, 299-346): we have here a unique example of the combination of the two languages and the two systems. As long as there are manuscript collections of muwashshâhât still unpublished (see S. M. Stern, in Arabica, 1955/2), it would be premature to draw up a list which, if not exhaustive, would at least be fairly comprehensive, of authors of poems of this type; in any case, some of them are later than the period under review.

The importance attributed in recent years to the khârij a can be explained on the one hand by the attraction of a novelty and, on the other, by the renewed controversy on the relationship between Spanish poetry and that of the troubadours, but it must be admitted that the muwashshâhât, however much appreciated by the Andalusians, by no means Orientalists, constituted no more than a minor literary category which could in no way supersede the other poetic forms esteemed in the Muslim Orient, and the necessary concomitant of the establishment of the western caliphate was an original poetic form which neither showed clearly signs of indigenous influence, nor followed too closely oriental forms.

Nevertheless, oriental works were well known in Spain, from the pre-Islamic kâsidas—studied as relics of a bygone age but not imitated—to the dithyrambs of "modern" and neo-classical poets, in particular al-Mutanabbi—who was the subject of a Mu‘ašīm (332/441/945-1049), al-ʿAlâm al-Ḥantamârî (410/76/1019-83), and Ibn ʿAšr— and it was these works which inspired Andalusian poets when Cordova, the metropolis of the Muslim West, possessed all the conditions favourable to the production of poetry of a characteristic flavour. As was to be expected, this poetry passed through various phases; somewhat official to begin with, it later became progressively independent and free, and finally blossomed in the 5th/11th century with increased a richness.

Without going so far as to claim that the Umayyad caliphs were the centre of literary circles, one may legitimately affirm that they regularly played their part as patrons of letters by promoting Arab culture—notably by creating libraries, including the celebra ted library of al-Ḥakam II—and by granting pensions to poets commissioned to sing their praises and to give, through their compositions, the custo mary luster to the various solemn functions of official life; the waṣâir of al-Ḥakam II and Highâm II, al-Muṣâafî, (d. 372/982) is the perfect example of such poets (see E. García Gómez, La Poesie politique sous le califat de Cordoue, in REI, 1949, 5-11).

Although this type of poet did not hesitate on occasion to embark on other kinds of poetry than the political, it was under al-Mansûr—who had ordered the burning of those books on philosophy, astronomy and other sciences which were considered to be contrary to the interests of Islam—that truly urban poetry came into being with Ibn Darrâj al-Ḵastalî (347-421/958-1030), Sa‘îd of Baghdad (d. 418/1026), al-Ramâdâl (d. 403 or 413/1013 or 1022). Moreover, from the end of the period of the caliphate, a literary group was established which, aristocratic in origin, but revolutionary in its ideas, was hostile to the muwashshâhât genre which was considered too popular, stoutly defended arabism without however submitting wholly to oriental influence, and proclaimed that the production of good literature depends on the genius of the authors and not on erudition or imitation. The leader of this school was Ibn al-}elseify (384-1034), who developed his ideas in a prose work of undoubted originality, the Risâlât al-Ta‘awwî‘a wa ‘l-Zawâwî‘î (see García Gómez, Ibn Hazm de Cordoba y El Collar de la Paloma, Madrid 1952, 6 ff.; his natural heir was Ibn Ḥazm who, although he did not give evidence of superior poetic talent, was none the less the author of a charming analysis of ‘Ulûhîte love, the Tawq al-Ḥamâma which, unique in its kind, belonged henceforth to universal literature.

The momentous events which led to the fall of the caliphate and the establishment of the kingdoms of the ta‘ifas (Ta‘awwî‘î andaloues, en arabe classique, au XIe siècle, Paris 1937, 2nd ed. 1953, by H. Pérès who, while seeking to bring out its documentary value, has at the same time painted an overall picture of the poetry of this period. Although it is possible to distinguish at each of the courts which came into being a kind of specialisation in some branch of knowledge, poetry dominates all literary activities; everywhere it reigns supreme, it opens all doors and "an extempore poem can be worth a thousand lines of a bygone age but not imitated—to the dithyrambs of “modern” and neo-classical poets, in particular al-Mutanabbi—who was the subject of a Mu‘ašīm (332/441/953-1049), al-ʿAlâm al-Ḥantamârî (410/76/1019-83), and Ibn ʿAšr—and it was these works which inspired Andalusian poets when Cordova, the metropolis of the Muslim West, possessed all the conditions favourable to the production of poetry of a characteristic flavour. As was to be expected, this poetry passed through various phases; somewhat official to begin with, it later became progressively independent and free, and finally blossomed in the 5th/11th century with increased a richness.

Without going so far as to claim that the Umayyad caliphs were the centre of literary circles, one may legitimately affirm that they regularly played their part as patrons of letters by promoting Arab culture—notably by creating libraries, including the celebrated library of al-Ḥakam II—and by granting pensions to poets commissioned to sing their praises and to give, through their compositions, the customary luster to the various solemn functions of official life; the waṣâir of al-Ḥakam II and Highâm II, al-Muṣâafî, (d. 372/982) is the perfect example of such poets (see E. García Gómez, La Poesie politique sous le califat de Cordoue, in REI, 1949, 5-11).

Although this type of poet did not hesitate on occasion to embark on other kinds of poetry than the political, it was under al-Mansûr—who had ordered the burning of those books on philosophy, astronomy and other sciences which were considered to be contrary to the interests of Islam—that truly urban poetry came into being with Ibn Darrâj al-Ḵastalî (347-421/958-1030), Sa‘îd of Baghdad (d. 418/1026), al-Ramâdâl (d. 403 or 413/1013 or 1022). Moreover, from the end of the period of the caliphate, a literary group was established which, aristocratic in origin, but revolutionary in its ideas, was hostile to the muwashshâhât genre which was considered too popular, stoutly defended arabism without however submitting wholly to oriental influence, and proclaimed that the production of good literature depends on the genius of the authors and not on erudition or imitation. The leader of this school was Ibn al-elseify (384-1034), who developed his ideas in a prose work of undoubted originality, the Risâlât al-Ta‘awwî‘î wa ‘l-Zawâwî‘î (see García Gómez, Ibn Hazm de Cordoba y El Collar de la Paloma, Madrid 1952, 6 ff.; his natural heir was Ibn Ḥazm who, although he did not give evidence of superior poetic talent, was none the less the author of a charming analysis of ‘Ulûhîte love, the Tawq al-Ḥamâma which, unique in its kind, belonged henceforth to universal literature.

The momentous events which led to the fall of the caliphate and the establishment of the kingdoms of the ta‘ifas (Ta‘awwî‘î andaloues, en arabe classique, au XIe siècle, Paris 1937, 2nd ed. 1953, by H. Pérès who, while seeking to bring out its documentary value, has at the same time painted an overall picture of the poetry of this period. Although it is possible to distinguish at each of the courts which came into being a kind of specialisation in some branch of knowledge, poetry dominates all literary activities; everywhere it reigns supreme, it opens all doors and "an extempore poem can be worth a thousand
Spanish poets like Ibn ʿAmmar (d. 477/1084) and Ibn al-Labbān (d. 509/1113) but even the Sicilian poet Ibn Hamdis (447/1057-1132) (see S. Khalis, La vie littéraire à Séville au XIe siècle, Sorbonne thesis 1953, unpublished); at Almeria, al-Muʿtaṣim (d. 484/1091) received Ibn ʿSharaf (444-534/1052-1139), while at Granada flourished the celebrated Abū ʿIshāk al-ʿIlībī (d. 454/1069), and at Badajoz Ibn ʿAbdūn (d. 529/1134).

From the Almoravids to the end of the period of Arab domination (488-897/1092-1149)

The Almoravid conquest, which here and there brought the careers of these poets to an abrupt close, for a time reassembled the fragments of al-Andalus. It was unfavourable to the development of poetry, because the new rulers lacked the refinement and the taste of the reyes de taifas, and showed less interest in literature than in religion. While a wholly conventional type of poetry flourished at court, only Valencia maintained the tradition of the preceding century with the “landscape-painters” Ibn Khafādīya (450-533/1058-1138) and Ibn al-Zaqqāk (d. 529/1135), who did not despise, respectively, erotic poems and bacchic songs. Under the Almohads, the only names of any note are those of al-Ruṣāfī (d. 572/1177) and Ibn Sahl (d. 649/1251); later, up to the fall of Granada, Līsān al-Dīn Ibn al-Khāṭīb (713-76/1313-74) and Ibn Zamrūk (733-963/1333-93) merely maintained the tradition. Their contemporaries did not fail to note the decline of poetry and, thinking that the time had come to gather together the legacy of the past in order to save it from oblivion, they compiled anthologies: Ibn Bassām (d. 542/1147) his Dāhkārān, al-Fātīḥ b. Khākān (d. 599/1198) his Kalā‘ūd al-ʿIḥrān and Maḥmūd al-Άjuṣ uṣūl al-Maghrib, while Ibn Saʿdī al-Maghribī (d. 672/1272), in extracting from his Mughrib the K. Rāyāt al-Mubārāz, seemed to be writing "the last testament of Arabo-Andalusian poetry" (García Gómez, Poesía, 86).

If, however, noble or classical poetry shone with but a feeble lustre, the muwashshāhāt, which the most aristocratic poets had continued to produce in the preceding century (see Arabic, 1055/2), again flourished with singular brilliance through the efforts of al-ʿAmāh al-Tāṭīlī (d. 520/1126), Ibn Bāḥī (d. 540/1145) and many others. In addition, the zabīdāt [q.v.], whose origin is attributed, perhaps erroneously to the 3rd/9th century, came truly to life with “one of the highest poetic peaks of the entire Middle Ages” (García Gómez, Poesía, 81), Ibn Kuzmān (555/1159), and a host of popular poets mastered this form and kept it alive until the end of the period of Arab domination.

Prose literature, which had made such a promising beginning with Ibn ʿṢuḥayd and Ibn Ḥāzm, again became orientalised with the Sirāj al-Muʿāṣa of al-Tūṭīlī (451-520/1059-1120), the encyclopedia of Ibn ʿṢhūyīn al-Balāwī (576-660/1180-1267), and the several imitations of the Maḥmūdīyā of al-Ḥarīrī which found their most prolific commentator in Spain in the person of al-Shārīḥī (d. 619/1222).

While particularly unfavourable to poetry and literature properly so-called, the Almoravid conquest was, on the other hand, an advantage to the sciences, both religious and profane, which developed to a considerable degree from then on. Space will not be devoted here to the religious disciplines which, though they had innumerable devotees, produced few noteworthy works apart from the Tuhfah of Ibn ʿAṣīm (760-825/1359-1426), or to philosophy or lexicography, because, apart from Ibn al-Sīd al-

Baṭāyawi (508-80/1114-85), the masters of these sciences, Ibn Mālik (605-72/1208-74) and Abū ʿIyān (595-74/1157-1344), preferred to go and give the fruits of their knowledge to the peoples of the East.

As regards history, the biographical genre achieved great success, with the bābīyāt ʿIyān (478-544/1085-1149), Ibn Bayhaq (539-578/1140-103), al-Dābībī (d. 599/1198-1260), Ibn al-ʿUbayrī (626-708/1229-308); to the dynastic chronicles was added a great work by Ibn Saʿdī al-Maghribī, a continuation of the Maḥkām of al-Hijārī (500-49/1106-55), the Mughrib, which made extensive use of earlier historians including once Līsān al-Dīn Ibn al-Khāṭīb. In the sphere of geography, the greatest name is, of course, al-Idrīsī (493-534/1100-69), while the Maghrībīs, and especially Andalusians, applied themselves successfully to the genre of narratives of travel: Abū ʿAḥmad al-Gharnāṭī (473-565/1080-1169), Ibn Dushman (560-614/1145-1217), al-Qadīf (7th/13th century). The 6th/12th and the 7th/13th centuries were for Andalusia the golden age of science: mathematics, astronomy, medicine, pharmacology, botany. There is no need to repeat here the names of those who achieved fame in these sciences (see above, B, from the 6th to the 12th century); the names of the principal philosophers and mystics of the period under review will also be found in that section.

For ajamīādī literature, see ajamīāt. On the question of the possible influence of the Arabic poetry of Spain on European works of the Middle Ages, see muwashshāhāt and zājīyāt.


ARABIYYA. Qa¡arát, island in the Persian Gulf in Lat. 27° 46’ N, Long. 50° 10’ E, about 50 miles from the Saudi Arabian mainland and 60 miles from that of Iran. It is one of a five-island group—the others being Harqar, Al-Farsiyya, Karan, and Kurayn—on the Arabian side of the Gulf. Al-Arabiyya is less than a mile square and is normally uninhabited, but it is claimed by three of the Gulf states: Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and Iran. (W. E. Mulligan)

ARABKIR, (taken to mean 'Arabgir, i.e. 'conquest of the Arabs'), in modern Turkish orthography Arapkir, in Armenian Arabkér, in the Byzantine sources Arabicakes, a town in eastern Anatolia, 19°'s north, 38° 30’ east, about 70 km. north of Malatya, situated on the Arapkir Su, a tributary of the Karasu, which later becomes the northern Euphrates, 1,200 m. above sea-level. Capital of a bādi’ in the wilāyat of Malatya, with 6,684 inhabitants (1945); the bādi’ itself has 23,612 inhabitants.

The town is situated on a hill in a lowland which is surrounded by steeply rising walls of basalt. Because of the altitude, the climate of the town is harsh. Extensive orchards which surround the town are worthy of special mention. The town, as we find it at present, dates back only to the beginning of the 19th century, and is consequently of a modern appearance. Until then, the town had been situated at a place half an hour further to the north, which is still called Eskiègihar ('old city') and still shows traces of buildings.

The town is not mentioned by any of the older Arabic geographers; it is, however, mentioned several times in the Saldjuk Chronicle of Ibn Bbl (written 680/1281, ed. Houtsma, Leiden 1902). In the 11th century, the town was occupied by the Saldjûks; in the 13th century, it came under Ottoman rule. As the centre of a sanjak, the town belonged to the eydlet of Sivas, but it changed its orientation several times; since 1216/1278, it has belonged to the eydlet of Ma’mûrat al-Azîz (Kharput).

During the 19th century, the town began to flourish. Ainsworth gave the number of inhabitants as 8,000 (amongst them 6,000 Armenians) in the year 1839, whilst the British Consul General, J. Brant, who travelled a few years earlier, mentioned 6,000 houses (4,500 inhabited by Turks, 1,200 by Armenians), from which one might assume a higher total of inhabitants. Taylors mentions 35,000 inhabitants in the year 1868 and Cuinet 20,000 towards 1890 (n,000 Muslims, 8,500 Gregorian Armenians). A considerable part of them, particularly Armenian families, made its living by weaving (cotton goods from English yarn). Every year, emigrants come down from the mountains of Arapkîr and Kharput to try and make their fortune in Istanbul, Diyarbakr, Damascus, Aleppo and the sea-ports. In former days one used to find a servant from Arapkîr in most houses in Aleppo.

In the First World War 1914-18, the town suffered greatly, most of the houses and their famous gardens were destroyed, and trade died down. In post-war years, it recovered and began to flourish again.

ARAB SHAHIDS [see KH'ARIZM].

ARAB SHA', translation of the Aristotelian term smùbèglùgos, accident is defined as that which cannot subsist by itself but only in a substance (dòaækar [q.v.]) of which it is both the opposite and the complement. Thus, anything that is asserted of a subject is an accident, by which term the Muslim philosophers understand the Aristotelian categories (màkùlda, [q.v.]) except that of the substantive. The theologians (mutakallimûn) held different views on the subject (e.g., some believed that there can be substances without qualities and vice versa etc.) which cannot be described here (see e.g. al-Ash'ari, Ma’ásild âl-Islâmîyyin, vol. ii). Some held the doctrine of àkîlî (states) [q.v.] which they described as qualities which are neither existent nor non-existent. An important tenet held by the majority of the mutakallimûn was the thesis that an accident cannot subsist in another accident.

In another sense 'arad is the opposite of màhiyya (quiddity) or dhâl (essence) [q.v.] and denotes an attribute which is not a constituent element of an essence. Two kinds of 'arad are distinguished: (a) that which, though it is not a part of an essence, is its necessary concomitant ('arad lâkîs) e.g., laughing with regard to man smùbèglùgos kàvî' àvîvî in Aristotle, Met., iv, 1; (b) that which is found in some members of a species but not in others ('arad lâkîh or ta’dîl) e.g. writing with regard to man (simply smùbèglùgos, in Aristotle. An essential attribute, on the other hand, is e.g. rationality in relation to man.

Discussions on 'arad will be found in Muslim works on logic. For the views of the mutakallimûn see màkùlda al-Islâmîyyin of al-Ash'ari, ed. C. Ritter, ii; Dict. of Technical Terms, s.v.; S. Pines, Beiträge zur islamischen Atomenlehre, etc. (F. Rahman)

AR-'ÁF, pl. of 'afr, "elevated place", "crest". In an eschatological judgement scene in Ka'bân, vii, 46 a dividing wall is spoken of which separates the dwellers in Paradise from the dwellers in Hell, and men, "who are on the a'ráf and recognise each by his marks" (v. 48: "those of the a'ráf "). The interpretation of this passage is disputed. Bell}

The interpretation of this passage is disputed. Bell
“(Presiding) over the recognition are men, who recognise...”. According to T. Andrae the “Men on the elevated places” are probably the dwellers in the highest degrees of Paradise, “who are able to look down both on Hell and on Paradise”. Perhaps the reference is in particular to the messengers of God, who come into action again at the Last Judgement in order to separate the good from the bad. According to the traditional explanation “those of the elevated places” are to be supplied as subject of the sentence at the end of v. 46 (lam yadakhuluha) and in v. 47. According to this they would be — at any rate provisionally — neither in Paradise nor in Hell, but in an intermediate place or condition. As a result of this explanation al-‘arafa was given the meaning “Limbo” (see BARAZGE).

Bibliography: Tabari, Tafsir, Cairo 1321, vii, 126-9; R. Bell, The Men of the ‘Arâf (MW, 1932, 43-8); Tor Andrae, Der Ursprung des Islams und das Christentum, Uppsala 1926, 77 f. (R. Paret)

‘ARÂFA, or ‘ARÂFAT, plain about 21 km. (13 miles) east of Mecca, on the road to Tâhir, bounded on the north by a mountain-ridge of the same name. The plain is the site of the central ceremonies of the annual Pilgrimage to Mecca; these are focussed on a conical granite hill in its N.E. corner, under 200 feet in height, and detached from the main ridge; this hill also is called ‘Arâfa, but more commonly Djiabal al-Râhman (Hill of Mercy). On its eastern flank, broad stone steps (constructed by order of Djiâmâl al-Dhî al-Djâwâd, vizier of the atâbek Zakî) lead to the top, which is surmounted by a minaret; on the sixth step there is a platform containing the pulpit from which the ritual kubba, the Pilgrimage address, is delivered on the afternoon of the “Day of ‘Arâfa” (9 Dhu ‘l-Hijja). On the top there stood formerly a kubba named after Umm Salama (Ibn Djubayr 173), which was destroyed by the Wahhâbîs. The hill is also said to have been called Ilâ, but this name is more probably to be regarded as that of a shrine or perhaps of the deity worshipped on the spot in the pre-Islamic period (Wellhausen, Rösle arabi, Heiden- thumsber, 82-3).

The plain of ‘Arâfât (about 4 miles in breadth from E. to W. and 7-8 miles in length) lies outside the haram or sacred territory of Mecca; the pilgrim coming from Mecca emerges through a defile called Ma‘zamayn and passes the pillars which delimit the haram; to the east of these is a depression called ‘Urana, at the further edge of which is a mosque called by the names of Ibrâhîm or Namira or ‘Arâfa. The ma‘wâbî or place of assembly extends immediately to the east of this mosque and sowthowards from the Djiabal al-Râhman, and is bounded on the east by the mountain-chain of Tâhir. In the early centuries of Islam, a number of wells were dug in the plain and several plantations and dwellinghouses are mentioned. The aqueduct built by order of Zubayda to bring water from the region of Tâhir to Mecca also runs at the base of the ridge of ‘Arâfa. The plain is now covered with rough herbage and normally unpopulated, and is filled with life only on the “Day of ‘Arâfa”, when the pilgrims pitch their camp for the celebration of the prescribed kubba or festival assembly. This begins after the midday kubba and prayer and lasts until just after sunset. For further details of the ceremonies see the art. KUBBA.

The origin of the name ‘Arâfa is unknown. The legendary explanation is that Adam and Eve, separated after their expulsion from Paradise, met again at this spot and recognised each other (la’ârâfa). Arabic writers mention also other etymologies of a similar kind.

Bibliography: Aza‘raj and Fâsî apud F. Wüstenfeld, Chroniken der Stadt Mecca, i, 418-9; ii, 89, etc.; Makdisî 77; Bakrî, Mu‘jam mâs‘ûla‘-dîjam, s.v.; Yâkût, s.v.; Ibn Djubayr (Wright-de Goeje), 168-176; Ibn Batûtâ (Paris), i, 397-9; Burckhardt, Travels in Arabia, ii, 186; ‘All Bey, Travels, i, 67 f.; R. F. Burton, Pilgrimage to el-Medineh and Meccah, 2nd ed., ii, 244 f.; Snouck Hurgronje, Het Mekkaansche Festa, 141 f.; al-Batanûnî, al-Rûba‘i al-Hidjasiyya, 186 fL; Ibrâhîm Rifâ‘at, Mir‘al al-Haramayn, i, 335 f.; Gaudfroy-Demombynes, Le Pèlerinage à la Mekke (Paris 1923), 240-253; E. Rutter, Holy Cities of Arabia (London 1928), i, 156-153. Pictures of the hill and of the plain during the Pilgrimage ceremonies in ‘All Bey, Burckhardt, Rifât Bey, and Snouck Hurgronje, Bilder aus Mecca, xili-xvi.

ARAGHUN [see supplement].

AL-‘ARÂFISH [“the trellises of grape vines”], in French and Spanish orthography Larache, town on the Moroccan seaboard situated on the Atlantic coast, about 44 m. S.-W. of Tangier and 83 m. N.-W. of Fas. It is situated on the first Spanish occupation coast, the history of Larache is only known with any certainty from the time that the Portuguese set foot in 1415, the Portuguese launched a successful attack against the town, but the results of this victory were short-lived. The occupation of...
Azilal and Tangier by King Alfonso V of Portugal in 1471 led to the evacuation of Larache, which the peace treaty included in the zone of Portuguese influence and which remained depopulated for twenty years. In 1489, King John II of Portugal took advantage of this circumstance to consolidate his position in northern Morocco and to constitute a more direct threat to Fás and Al-Ḳāṣr al-Ḳibr, by erecting a fort named la Graciosa on the right bank of the Lukkos a little below the confluence of that river with the Wādī Mkhāzēn. Besieged by the Moroccans, decimated by marsh-fever, ill-supplied and ill-reinforced because the river was barely navigable, the Portuguese garrison, after a long resistance, was obliged to accept an honourable surrender, which enabled it to retire unmolested. Al-‘Arā’ish was restored by Mawlay al-Nāṣir, son of the Wātḥāṣid Sultan Muhammad al-Shaykh. Leo Africanus, who gives an account of the town at the beginning of the 16th century, informs us that large numbers of eels were caught there, that a plentiful supply of game was to be found there, and that on the banks of the Lukkos there were woods abounding in wild animals. The inhabitants made charcoal which they sent to Azilal and Tangier. But they lived in fear of the Portuguese, who continually raided the area and who attacked the port itself in 1504 (there was also an unsuccessful attack by the Spanish from Cadiz in 1546). This insecurity did not prevent the development of a certain amount of maritime trade due to the fact that al-‘Arā’ish was then the only port in northern Morocco not occupied by the Christians, and that it was one of the channels through which passed the trade of Fás, to which it was relatively near. The Portuguese maintained a commercial agent there (feitor); Genoese merchants visited it regularly, and a castle situated at the entrance to the harbour became known as “Genoese Castle”. From then on, Larache became a pirates' lair, and piracy increased after the evacuation of Azilal by the Portuguese in 1550. The havoc wrought by the pirates on the Spanish coast led Philip III to occupy Larache in 1610, following an agreement with the Sa’dīd Sultan Mawlay Muhammad al-Shaykh. The town was retaken by the Moroccans in 1669 during the reign of the ‘Alawid Sultan Mawlay Ismā’īl, and was repopulated by the Djiabila and the tribes of the Rif. From that date until 1771, the operations of the European powers against Larache were confined to bombardments or to more or less successful attacks from the sea. In 1765, the French Admiral Du Chaffault suffered a heavy defeat there. In 1860, during the Spanish-Moroccan war, Larache was bombarded by a Spanish squadron. During the “Moroccan crisis”, Spanish troops landed at Larache on 8 June 1911, and the town remained within the Spanish zone of influence until the proclamation of the independence of Morocco in 1956.

Opposite Larache, on the other bank of the Wādī Lukkos, on the Shammish hill, there stand the ruins of the public town of Lixus or Lixos, where many excavations have been made.


**AL-ARAK**, to-day Santa María de Alarcos, a small citadel in the district of Calatrava la Vieja, situated about seven miles S.W. of Ciudad Real, on the summit of a mountain whose spurs descend to the Rio Guadiana. In the undulating plain which lies at its feet, between Poblete and Guadiana, was fought the famous battle between Ya’kūb al-Manṣūr and the Castilians, which ended in the rout of Alfonso VIII (see the article אֲרוֹק אֱמָסְו) for details of events immediately prior to the battle).

We have little information of the details of the actual battle, because we only have at our disposal on the Muslim side accounts which are rather fanciful. The Christian sources are more objective, although briefer. It seems that the Castilians launched a surprise attack on the Almohad advance guard, commanded by the Vizier Abū Yahyā, grandson of Abū Ḥāṣim Umar Inti [q.v.], but only achieved a partial success. Ya’kūb, with his own force, attacked the flank of the Christians who, as the struggle became prolonged, were forced, exhausted by the heat and by thirst, to take refuge in the castle of Alarcos or to flee with their King in the direction of Toledo. Moreover the Castilian Pedro Fernández de Castro, a personal enemy of Alfonso VIII, contributed with his own squad of cavalry to the success of the Almohad ruler, on whom he lavished advice. Don Diego Lopez de Haro, the great alférez of Castile, took refuge with the royal standard in the castle, but was soon forced to surrender.

The Muslim chroniclers, on the subject of this battle, have absurdly exaggerated the numbers of the troops on either side, that of the Christian dead and that of the prisoners taken in the castle. At all events, the army of Alfonso VII suffered heavy losses and experienced such a severe blow that, in the years following, despite the aid of the King of Aragon, it did not dare to risk a further engagement with Ya’kūb when the latter penetrated into its territory. The battle of Alarcos took place under the most favourable conditions for the Almohads. Alfonso VIII was at war with Leo and Navarre. Accustomed to easy and fruitful raids into Andalusia, where his troops did not meet with serious resistance, he completely underestimated the strength of the Muslim forces and the strategic ability of Ya’kūb al-Manṣūr.

**Bibliography:** To the references given by E. Lévi-Provençal in *La Péninsule sibérique d’après
**ARAKAN**, The most westerly Division of Lower Burma, lying between the Arakan Yoma range and the Bay of Bengal. Until 1199/1784, Arakan was an independent kingdom, and thereafter formed part of Burma, lying between the Arakan Yoma range and Burma, which wrote at the courts of Kings Thirithudamma and Sandathudamma, were under the patronage of such Muslim officers and officials at the court. Descendants of these Muslim soldiers still live in the Ramf and Akyab areas, and are called Kaman (Pers. *kāmān*—a bow). (Bíśeswar Bhattacharya, *Bengal Past and Present* No. 65, 1927, 139-44)

The Arakanese connexion with Muslim Bengal found expression in the assumption of Muslim titles by the Buddhist kings and in the issue of coins on which appear those titles, or the *kalima*, in the Persian script.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arakanese title</th>
<th>Regnal years</th>
<th>Muslim title</th>
<th>Coinage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naramiekhla</td>
<td>833/1430—837-8/1434</td>
<td>ṢAli Khān</td>
<td>Tributary of sultan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meng Khari</td>
<td>837-8/1434—863-4/1459</td>
<td>Kalima Shāh</td>
<td><em>kalima</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basawpyu</td>
<td>863-4/1459—887/1482</td>
<td>Ilyās Shāh Sultan</td>
<td><em>kalima &amp; title</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasabadi</td>
<td>929-30/1523—931-2/1525</td>
<td>ṢAli Shāh</td>
<td><em>kalima &amp; title</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatasa</td>
<td>931-2/1525—937-8/1531</td>
<td>Zabuk Shāh</td>
<td>title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minbin</td>
<td>937-8/1531—960-6/1553</td>
<td>Sikandar Shāh</td>
<td>title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minpalaung</td>
<td>978-9/1571—1001-02/1593</td>
<td>Salim Shāh</td>
<td>title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minyarazgyi</td>
<td>1001-02/1593—1021/1612</td>
<td>Husayn Shāh</td>
<td>title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minhkamaung</td>
<td>1021/1612—1031-2/1622</td>
<td>Salim Shāh</td>
<td>Persian lettering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirthudammaha</td>
<td>1031-2/1622—1047-8/1638</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandathudammaha</td>
<td>1062-3/1652—1096-7/1685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arakanese fleets and taking Cittagong in 1076/1666. (The Portuguese had been won over the previous year, and the Mughals were accompanied by Kamal, son of Prince Mangat Rai, the governor of Cittagong who had fled to Dhākā in 1048/1638).

This ended the Arakanese ascendency in Eastern Bengal, though slave raiding continued far into the 19th century. Moreover, in 1903/1692 Muslim soldiers of fortune, combining with the many captive Bengalis, rose in the capital and for twenty years had the mastery in Arakan. The Bengali Muslim poets Dawlat Kāḏī and Sayyid al-Awwal, who wrote at the courts of Kings Thirithudamma and Sandathudamma, were under the patronage of such Muslim officers and officials at the court. Descendants of these Muslim soldiers still live in the Ramf and Akyab areas, and are called Kaman (Pers. *kāmān*—a bow). (Bíśeswar Bhattacharya, *Bengal Past and Present* No. 65, 1927, 139-44)

The Arakanese connexion with Muslim Bengal found expression in the assumption of Muslim titles by the Buddhist kings and in the issue of coins on which appear those titles, or the *kalima*, in the Persian script.

It is clear that the Arakanese coins are modelled upon those of Bengal. Thus in Bengal the use of the *kalima* begins about the time when Naramiekhla was restored by the sultan to the Arakan throne, and in both countries a clumsy Kūfic is used. (See Phayre, *Coins of Arakan, of Pegu, and of Burma*, in *International Numismata Orientalia*, 1883; M. S. Collis, *Jour. Burma Research Soc.* 1925/i, 34-52; J. W. Laidley, *J.A.S.B.* 1846 pl. IV no. 12; H. F. Blochman, *J.A.S.B.* 1873/i, 209-309).


ARAL, a large, slightly salty lake in west Turkistan, 46° 45’ to 43° 43’ N and 76° to 79° 27’ E, with a surface area of (1942) 66,458 sq.km.; of this 2345 sq.km. are islands. (The largest islands are the Tokmak Aţa in front of the mouth of the Āmū Daryā, Ostrav Vozroždeniya, “Island of the Resurrection”, formerly Nicholas Island, discovered in 1848, 216 sq.km.; Barsa Kelmez, “arrival without
return", 133 sq.km.; and finally Kug Aral, in the north, eastward in front of the Kara Tup peninsula, 273 sq.km. The maximum length from NE to SW is 428 km., the breadth at 45° N 284 sq.km. The average depth of the lake is 16 m., in the middle it is up to 20-25 m., in the west up to 68 m. The lake has today in the N, E and S numerous bays, and, particularly in the SE, rocky islands offshore. Only the western shore, which borders on the Ûst Ûrït place, partly with cliffs up to 650 m. high, has no bays. The east bank is flat and sandy.

In prehistoric times (diluvium and ice ages) the level of Lake Aral stood some 4 m. above the present waterline; hence the lake had (particularly in the bays in the NE and NW) a considerably larger extension and was besides (through the Ûzboï [cf. Âmû âdarï]) connected with the Caspian Sea and through this, at the time, with the Ocean. Since the production of the present geological conditions it has no longer any outlet. (Cf. Brockhaus-Efron, Entsiklopedïesïchi Sloanor, ii, 10-12, and Bol' shaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, xx, 326.)

In the historical times also the water-level fluctuated by several meters, and the banks altered because of this, especially in the E and NE; but there is no evidence of significant changes at this time. In fact the description of the delta of the Amu Darya by al-Makdisi, 288: two days from Mizidëkhkhan to the Kerder, one day and four sarbars to Parategin (B(F)aratigin) and a further day to the bank of the lake, corresponds as well with modern conditions as Ibn Hawk珪's account (ed. Kramers, 512). He says that the place Dih-i Naw = Arabic al-Karya al-Hadîthah = Turkish Yedî Kent (al-Ma'âdî: Naw Karda?), identical with the present ruins of Dian-kent, some 22 km. SW of the modern Kazalinsk (ill. in S. A. Tolstov, Auf den Spuren der all-choresischen Kultur, Berlin 1953, 254; further details, ibid., 266) is two days distant from the bank of the lake (both 10th century accounts, Barthold, Turkistan, 178). In the 19th-20th centuries the level fell and rose alternately: 1860-80 it fell, then the waterline rose till 1915 by 2 m.; within the period 1874 to 1931 it fluctuated by 3.1 m. Accordingly its height above sea-level is given variously as 49 m. (as an average: Bol' shaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, 52 m. (Leimbach), and as its highest point in 1931: as 54 m. This change also correspondingly the estimation of its depth. The lake, whose salt content (1.03-1.08%) is considerably lower than that of the Ocean, scarcely ever freezes up completely. Mostly only the bays in the north turn solid, or the whole northern part (as far as the Barsa Kelmez island). To this northern part (some 5500 sq.km.) the Kazaks have given the special name Kîliî Tehîz ("small sea"); so the main southern part is called Ulu Tehïz ("great sea").

The Âmû âdarï [q.v.] concerning the possible change of its course and the Sir âdarï run into the Aral Sea. Of the Sir âdarï al-Ûmarî (1301-48) claims in his Masâlik al-âdarî (translated by W. von Tiesenhausen, Materialy otnosyaschësya k istorii Zolotoy Ordï, i, 1884, 215, transl., 237), following the account of the merchant Badr al-Dîn al-Rûmî, that it changed its direction three travelling-days below Dian, and Hâfiz-i Abrû (1442-5), who disputes the existence of the Aral Sea, makes it join the Âmû âdarï. Finally in the Bâbur-nâmâ the great conqueror of India (d. 1530) reports that the Sir âdarï subsides into the sands in the west. One should not attach much weight to these accounts, of which that of Hâfiz-i Abrû may be regarded as legendary and that of al-Ômarî conveys nothing conclusive; Abu 'l-Ûghâl too knows nothing of the Sir âdarï at one time not reaching the Aral Sea [cf. also Sir âdarï].

It is uncertain whether the Aral Sea was known to classical antiquity. A. Hermann does not refer the reports about the ÔÇêçKará çíçmûç (palus Oxiana) to the Aral Sea; on the other hand he sees in the palus Oxia of Ammianus Marcellinus, xxiii, 6, 59 the Aral Sea (Pauly-Wissowa, xviii/2, 1942, 2004-5). Also the quite general accounts of the Chinese and the çíçmûç of the Byzantine ambassador Zemarchos, 568 A.D. (Menander Protector, Corp. Script. Hist. Byz., xviii, 238 f.; C. Müller, Fragm. Hist. Græc., iv, 229) cannot be interpreted with any certainty.

In Islamic times Ibn Rusta, 92, is the first to describe the lake, without naming it. He gives its circumference as 80 sarbars; al-Istakhri, 304, makes it 100, the Hûdûd al-Âlam, 53, 300 sarbars. Whether the earlier report in Ibn Khurraðâribîbî, 173, about the lake of Kerder (for this form instead of Kûrdar cf. A. Zeki Velidi Togan in Türkiye t Me'amûsa, ii, 340) can be referred to the Aral Sea, is questionable. At that time the Öghuz (Cûuzz) and the Peñeg nomadised round the lake, except on the southern bank (Kâriîzâm) and particularly in the E and NE; but there is no evidence of a settlement in the N.E.

The Aral Sea was called by al-Istakhri, the Hûdûd, and the later geographers, Buñhayrat Khâriizâm and rightly described as a closed salty lake, which lay to the right on the journey from Gurgandj (Old Urgandj) to the Peñeg (so Gardizi, reproduced in W. Barthold, Oãçêçî o komandirovok v Sredînyu Asiyû, 1897, 95) and so had no connexion with the Sir Kâmiyî (see Âmû âdarî). On the other hand al-Masûdî (Tambîh, 65; in more general terms also in Murûtûdî, i, 211) says that the "Lake of Djurdjâniya" is connected with the Caspian Sea. Djurdjûnî (d. 861/1467-7), following the Dihân-nâmâ (from the beginning of the 13th century), calls it also "Lake of Djand" after the city on the lower reaches of the Sir âdarï. Finally, Hîfîz-i Abrû claims (in 820/1417) that the lake has vanished (and furnishes thus new proof of the fact that one must by no means blindly trust isolated accounts by Islamic geographers of the Middle Ages).

Between the 13th and 16th century no report about the Aral Sea has been handed down. Abu 'l-Ôghâl Bahâdûr Khân speaks in the Shâhârat al-Ârûf (Desmaisons), 338, for the first time of Aral ("island") as the place where the Âmû âdarî runs into the lake. After this "island" (which in the 18th century formed a separate state with the capital Kungrât [q.v.]) and was not re-united with Khîwa until the reign of Muhammad Rahîm Khân, 1806-26) the lake later received the name of Aral Tefizî, "Aral Sea", among the Kazaks. Following this the Russians call it Aral'skoe More "Aral Sea" (first occurrence in 1697). Previously the Russian work Kniga bol'shogo terrëta (finished in 1626) called it Sîne More, "Blue Sea"—it does in fact have a deep blue colour. This name appeared in 1697 also on the Dutch map in Witsen, Noord- en Oost-Tartaryë, 1687, while J. N. de l'Isle, in 1723, uses the modern name (Barthold, Aral, 77 f.).

The Russians erected first in 1847 a fortress Râmskî (the name probably derives from Rahim) on the right bank of the lower Sir âdarï, 60-65 km. from its mouth. Already from 1819 several expeditions had more closely explored the lake and furnished descriptions (1819 N. N. Murâv'ëv; 1820-1 A. F. Negri and A. K. Baron Meyendorff; 1825-6 F. W. R. Berg; 1833-5 G. von Helmersen; 1839 V. A. Count.
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Perovskiy; 1840 M. M. 2em£uznikov; 1840-1 Antov;
1841 I. P. Blaramberg and D. I. Romanov; 1842-2
Danilevskiy; 1843 Schulz and Lemm; then in 1848
A. I. Butakov and A. I. Maksheyev). Between 1853
and 1883 the Russians kept a flotilla on the Aral
Sea, which was stationed in the beginning in Aral'sk,
then in Kazalinsk (on the lower Sîr Daryâ). It was
disbanded after the Aral Sea had become a Russian
inland lake with the conquest of the Khânate of
Khiwa in 1873. Since 1893 the lake is reached by
the railway line Orenburg-Tashkent at the NE
corner near Aral'sk. Otherwise the lake is still to-day
situated inconveniently for traffic.—During the civil
war of 1918-21 a flotilla was formed again on the
Aral Sea. Since the reorganisation of territories in
1924 and 1936 the southern part of the lake belongs
to the autonomous republic of Karakalpakia in the
framework of the Uzbek SSR, the northern part
to Kazâstân. The lake is of importance for the
surrounding population and altogether for the USSR
principally because of its fishing industry.

Bibliography: Brockhaus-Efron, Entsiklopedia-
český Slovar; ii, 12-4; Bol'shaya Sovejshaya En-
tsiklopediya, ii, 609-11 (with coloured map);
A. I. Maksheyev, Oprosanie Aral'skago Morya, Zap.
Russk. Geogr. Ob-va, 1853; W. Leimbach, Die
Siedlung, Stuttgart 1950, 120-2 (with map),
285 f., as well as the general works about the waters-
ways in the USSR mentioned there, 495, nos. 123-5;
T. Shabad, Geography of the USSR, New York
1951, index; W. Barthold, Nachrichten über den
Aral-See etc., Leipzig 1910; idem, in EJ, s.v.;
ide, Turkestan, index; R. Roesler, Die Aralsee-
frage, SBS, Wien, 1873, 173-260; L. S. Borg,
Aral'skoe More, St. Petersburg 1908 and in
general the Nauchnye zavetâty Aral'skoy Eksped-
ditsii, 1902-14, Tashkent, 1902-15 (= Entsiklo-
yia Turkestanskago oldâla Imp. Russ. Geogr. Ob-va,
iii, iv, v, viii, xi, xii). A. Woelkow, Der Aralsee
und sein Gebiet, Petersmanns Mitteilungen, 1909,
82-6; idem (Woelkow), Le Turkestan russe, Paris
Cf. also Bibl. to Âmû Daryâ, Khârizm, Khiva,
sîr Daryâ. (B. Spuler)

ARAR [see HARAR] ARARAT [see MEBAL AL-HARÎTH] ARAS [see RAASS]

ABBAN, site of ruins in Mesopotamia, on the
Western bank of the Khabûr, to the South of the
Diabûl 'Abîd al-'Azîz, situated under 36° 10' N. Lat.
and 46° 50' E. Long. (Greenw.).
The remains of the old town are hidden under
several hills, after one of which the site is
also called Tell Âdjabûa. It was here that H. A.
Layard found several winged bulls with human
heads, products of the genuinely Mesopotamian
civilization which is closely related to that of
ancient Babyilonia. 'Arbân is probably identical
with the Gar (Shal-dikana of the cuneiform in-
scriptions. During the later Roman period the
town, then called Arabana, possessed considerable
military importance as the principal station on
the line of frontier against the Parthians. In the
Arab period 'Arbân played an important part as
the centre of the Khabûr district and as place of
storage for the cotton cultivated in the Khabûr
canyon. Geographers (cf. e.g. Yâkut s.v. 'Arbân) and
historians refer it frequently to as a flourishing town.
The date of its destruction is unknown; possibly it
took place during the Mongol invasion under Timur.

Bibliography: K. Ritter, Erdkunde xi, 271;
H. A. Layard, Nimîveh und Babylon (German
transl. by Zenker), 208 ff. M. von Oppenheim,
Vom Mûslîm um persischen Golf (Berlin 1900)
i, 19-21; id., in Z. G. Erdkunde cxxvi (1900), 69
ff.; Streck, in the Zeitschr. f. Assyriologie xxvii,
190; Le Strange, 97. (M. Streck)

ARBUÑA, the name by which the Arab historians
designated the town of Narbonne. Reached by the
early Muslim expeditions, it was taken in 967/75
under 'Abd al-'Azîz b. Mûsâ b. Nusayr, was probably
then lost or abandoned, and was retaken in 1007/19
by al-Sawwî b. Malik al-Khawandî. In 1177/74, two
years after the battle of Poitiers [see BâkaT AL-GUHAD],
the Duke of Provence concluded a treaty with
the governor of Narbonne, Yâusî b. 'Abîd al-Rahmân,
whereby the latter was allowed to occupy a certain
number of places in the valley of the Rhône, in order
to protect Provence against the attempts of Charles
Martel and to procure a new invasion route to the
north; Charles Martel reacted at once, took Avignon
in 119/737 and invested Narbonne, but without
success. It was not until 142/759 that the town,
after a long siege, was finally taken from the Muslims
by Pepin the Short. In 177/793, 'Abîd al-Malik b.
Mughîr advanced as far as Narbonne, set fire to
the outskirts, defeated the Duke of Toulouse not
far from the city, and withdrew with considerable
booty; another expedition, which was unsuccessful,
took place in 226/840. Narbonne and its region still
maintained relations with the Umayyad court, Jewish
merchants being particularly active in this respect.

Mus., i (see index), gives the main facts and
e numerates (8, n. 2, 30-1 and 34, n. 1) the sources
and studies, amongst which should be noted:
Cedera, Narbona, Gerona y Barcelona bajo la influ-
nación musulmana in Est. hist. ar. esp. (viii);
M. Reinaud, Invasions des Sarrazins en France,
Paris 1836 (Eng. tr. by H. K. Sherwani in Islamic
Culture, iv/1930, 100 ff., 397 ff., 388 ff.,
v/1931, 71 ff., 472 ff., 651 ff.); A. Molinié and
H. Zotenberg, Invasions des Sarrazins dans le
Languedoc d'après les historiens musulmans in
Devic and Vaissette, Histoire générale du Languedoc,
i, Toulouse 1875. There is also the Chromicum Freg-
garii, the Chronicum Moissiacense, the Chronic
Fontannelisii, and other Latin chronicles (cf. Ch.
Pellat, Les Sarrazins en Avignon, in En Terre d'Islam,
1944/iv, 178-90). (Ed.)

ARCHIDONA [see URBUJUBHNA]

ARCHITECTURE

I. EARLY MUSLIM ARCHITECTURE

(1) The Time of the Prophet

Arabia, at the rise of Islam, does not appear to
have possessed anything worthy of the name of
architecture. Only a small proportion of the popu-
lation was settled, and these lived in dwellings which
were scarcely more than hovels. Those who lived in
mud-brick houses were called ahl al-madar, and the
Bedawin, from their tents of camel’s-hair cloth,
ahîl al-wabar.

The sanctuary at Mecca, in the time of Muhammad,
merely consisted of a small roofless enclosure, oblong
in shape, formed by four walls a little higher than
a man, built of rough stones laid dry. Within this
enclosure was the sacred well of Zamzam. This
little sanctuary, known as the Ka'bâ, lay at the
bottom of a valley surrounded by the houses of
Mecca, which came close up to it, and we are expressly
told that when 'Umar wanted to surround it by an
open space, large enough to contain the Faithful, he
had to demolish many houses (al-Baladhuri, *Fussâh*, 46).

The Ka'ba, being in a bad state, was demolished and reconstructed by the Kuraysh, when Muhammad was in his thirty-fifth year, i.e. in A.D. 608. The Kuraysh took the wood of a ship which had been wrecked, and employed a carpenter and builder named Bâkûm, who had been on the ship, to help them in the rebuilding. Azra'î (Wüstenfeld's ed., *Chroniken der Stadt Meba*, i, 110, last line—112, l. 12) says that the new Ka'ba was built with a course of stone alternating with a course of wood up to the roof, there being sixteen courses of stone and fifteen of wood. The door, which had previously been at ground level, was now placed with its sill four cubits and a span from the ground. The root rested on six pillars (ṣawârî, pl. of ṣâriya) arranged in two rows of three each. Total height of structure—18 cubits. Azra'î says that on the ceiling, walls and columns were pictures (ṣawar) of the Prophets, trees and angels. (Cf. Creswell, in *Archaeologia*, 94, Oxford 1951, 97-102).

This curious style of architecture, of alternate courses of stone and wood, resembles the style practised in Abyssinia in early times (see Krencker, in the Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaft, ii, 168-94) and probably an Abyssinian form of Habakkuk, that is to say the “carpenter and builder” employed was most probably an Abyssinian (see my *Ka'ba in A.D. 608*, in *Archaeologia*, XCIV (1951), 97-102).

When Muhammad migrated to Medina he built a house for himself and his family. It consisted of an enclosure about 100 cubits square of mud brick, with a portico on the south side made of palm trunks used as columns to support a roof of palm leaves and mud. Against the outer side of the east wall were built small huts (ḥudârâ) for the Prophet's wives. All opened into the courtyard. We have the description (preserved in Ibn Sa'd, *Tabâbâlî*, i, 180) of these huts, due to a man named 'Abd Allâh b. Yazîd who saw them just before they were demolished by order of al-Walîd: “There were four houses of mud brick, with apartments partitioned off by palm branches, and five houses made of palm branches plastered with mud and not divided into rooms. Over the doors were curtains of black hair-cloth. Each curtain measured 3 × 3 cubits. One could reach the roof with the hand”.

Such was the house of the leader of the community at Medina. Nor did Muhammad wish to alter these conditions; he was entirely without architectural ambitions, and Ibn Sa'd records the following saying of his: “The most unprofitable thing that eath up the wealth of a Believer is building” (*Tabâbâlî*, i, 181, ll. 7-8; also VIII, 120, l. 1). At this time Taif was the only town in the Hijâz that possessed a wall. When Medina was attacked in 5/627 it had no wall, so Muhammad had a ditch dug to defend it; the idea is said to have been due to a Persian slave named Salâmân, and it created a great sensation for nobody had ever heard of such a thing before. The word *khandaq* given to it is Persian. Medina was first surrounded by a wall in 63/662-3; (Mas'ûdî, *Tanbîh*, 305, l. 4).

(2) The Patriarchal and Umayyad Caliphates

The men who formed the Arab armies of conquest were mainly Bedouin, but even those who came from permanent settlements, such as Mecca and Medina, knew nothing of art or architecture. They soon found themselves in totally different cultural environments, one of which had been under Hellenic influence for a thousand years, the other under Persian influence for even longer.

And not only were the cultural conditions different, the material conditions were different also. Syria was a country of splendid building materials. Syrian limestone was the best of its kind, resisting weathering and taking a beautiful amber tint on exposure, and cedar wood was plentiful, for the Lebanon had not yet been draped. So the seventh century invaders found themselves in a country of splendid buildings — churches of cut stone, some of ashlar in courses 90 cm. high, with arcades on marble columns, gable roofs of cedar wood and large surfaces decorated with coloured glass mosaics on a glistening gold background.

In the other cultural sphere they met with buildings of brick, sometimes only of mud brick, sometimes vaulted and sometimes with flat roofs of palm trunks, palm leaves and mud.

In these early days, the Muslims, when they conquered a town in Syria, usually took one of the churches and used it as a mosque, or merely divided one of the churches if the town had surrendered without resistance. At Hims, for example, they took a fourth part of the Church of St. John. How was a church converted into a mosque? One can easily guess. In Syria the *kibla* (direction of Mecca) is due south, whereas churches are turned towards the east. Under these circumstances it was only necessary to close the western entrance (or three entrances), pierce new entrances in the north wall and pray across the aisles. That is this is exactly what happened can be verified in the Great Mosque of Hamâ where the west front of the *Kanîsât al-Usmâ* (Great Church) which was converted into a mosque in 15/636-7, now forms the west end of the sanctuary. Its three western doors have been converted into windows and it is now entered from the north.

At Jerusalem they made use of the remains of the basilical hall of Herod, ruined by the army of Titus, which ran along the south side of the Temple Enclosure. This primitive mosque was seen by Arculf about A.D. 670 (Geyer, *Itinera Hierosolymitana*, i, 145). In Persia, at Persepolis and Kazwin, they appear to have taken *apadânas*, or hypostyle audience-halls of the Persian kings, with flat roofs resting on columns with double bull-headed capitals.

But the situation was different in ‘Irâq, for here the Arabs founded new towns (which they did not do in Syria) so pre-existing buildings could not be employed, and they had to construct some sort of place for themselves. What manner of buildings were the first mosques of the earliest towns in Islam?

The following is a list of those Umayyad Friday mosques the essential features of which are known from literary or archaeological evidence:

1. — Basra, reconstructed in 45/665.
2. — Kûfa, reconstructed in 50/667.
3. — Damascus, construction begun in 87/706.
6. — Aleppo, built under Walîd I or Sulaymân, 86/705-99/717.
7. — Fustâṭ, reconstructed 92/710-93/712.
10. — Kašr al-Ḥayr al-Sharî (identified by Sauvaget as Rusafa, the residence of Hîslâm) built in 110/728.
11. — Ḥarrān, built in 126/744-133/750.
12. — Hamat, reconstructed, date uncertain.
13. — Dar'a, date uncertain (?)

At Baṣra, founded about 14/635, the first mosque (according to al-Baladhuri, Futuḥ, 341, 342 and 345) was simply marked out (ṣāyla) and the people prayed there without any building. According to another version, also given by al-Baladhuri (346 and 350), it was enclosed by a fence of reeds. At Kūfa, founded in 17/638, the first mosque was equally primitive. Its boundaries were fixed by a man who threw an arrow towards the kibla, then another towards the north, another to the west and a fourth to the east (al-Baladhuri, 275-6; al-Tabari, i, 248', ll. 12-23). A square with each side two arrow-casts in length was thus obtained. This area was not enclosed by walls but by a ditch only, and the sole architectural feature was a covered colonnade (ṣāyla), 200 cubits long, which ran the whole length of the south side.

The columns were of marble, taken from some buildings of the Lakhmid Princes at Bīra, about 4 miles away. This ṣāyla was open on all sides so that, in the words of al-Tabarī (i, 2494), a man praying in it could see the convent known as Dayr Hind and the gate of the town known as Bāb Diṣṭr. On the ṣāyla side and only separated from the praying place by a narrow street was built a dwelling for Sa'd the Commander-in-Chief.

The first mosque in Egypt, the Mosque of ʿAmar, built at Fustat in the winter of 641/2, was equally primitive. It measured 50 × 30 cubits and had two doors on each side except on the ṣāyla side. (Makrizī, ʿAṣr, ii, 247). The roof was very low and probably consisted of palm trunks resting on palm-trunk columns as in Muhammad's house at Madīna.

The first mosques to be worthy of the name of architecture were the second Great Mosques at Baṣra (45/665) and Kūfa (50/669). Regarding the latter al-Ṭabarī (i, 2492) says that Ziyād b. Abīhi summoned "Masons of the Days of Ignorance" (i.e. non-Muslims). Then a man who had been one of the builders of Khusrāw, came forward and described how columns of stone from Djabal Ahwaz could be used to carry a roof 30 cubits high. Ibn Dijābārī, who saw this mosque, says (de Goeje's ed., 211) that "the ṣāyla side has five aisles whereas the rest have two only; the aisles are supported on columns like masts, ... extremely high and not surmounted by arches" (Fig. 1). It is obvious that the roofing system resembled that of an apadāna, or Hall of Columns of the Achaemenian kings, exactly as was the case in the first Great Mosque at Baqīdād.

The Dome of the Rock at Jerusalem, the oldest existing monument of Muslim architecture, was built by the Caliph ʿAbd al-Malik and completed in 72/691. It is an annular building and consists in its simplest analysis of wooden dome 20.44 m. in diameter, set on a high drum, pierced with sixteen windows and resting on four piers and twelve columns, placed in a circle and so arranged that three columns alternate with each pier. This circle of supports is placed in the centre of a large octagon averaging 20.60 m. a side, formed by eight walls 9½ m. high (excluding the parapet which adds 2.60 m.) each pierced in their upper half by five windows (Plate IIIA and Fig. 2).

There is a door 2.60 m. wide and 4.30 high in each of the four sides which face the four cardinal points, and on these sides the central window above the door is consequently much reduced. The space between the circle and the octagon being too great to be conveniently spanned by single beams, an intermediate octagon, consisting of arches borne by eight piers and sixteen columns, so arranged that two columns alternate with each pier, has been placed between the two to provide the necessary support for the roof (Plate IVa). The two concentric ambulatories thus formed were of course used for the ṣuwar and ceremonial circumambulation of the sacred object, the Rock.

The exterior was always panelled with marble for half its height, as it is to-day, but the upper part was originally covered with glass mosaic (fusayfisū) like the inner arcades. This was replaced by the present coating of façyence by Sultan Sulaymān in 959/1552. The vaults of the four entrance porches were also decorated with mosaic, but it has only been preserved in the eastern porch. The lintels of the four doorways are decorated on their under side with sheet metal, either copper or bronze, worked en repoussé and exhibiting a variety of designs, chiefly vine leaves, bunches of grapes and acanthus. The raised parts of the design are gilt, the background of the central part is painted black and the outer border bright green. The inner side of the outer wall is panelled with marble from top to bottom, likewise all the piers. The tie beams of the arches of the octagonal arcades are decorated beneath with a bronze sheeting like the door soffits (Plate III b-c), but their inner faces are treated like a Corinthian entablature. The arcades above are covered with glass mosaic on both faces and their soffits also (Plate IVb, V and VI). The arcades of the central circle are also decorated with glass mosaic on their outer faces, but their soffits and inner faces have been given a coating of marble at some unknown date, but before A.D. 1340. The drum above is also decorated with mosaic.

The ceiling of the outer ambulatory is probably the work of Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad in 718/1318 like the present lining of the dome. The ceiling of the inner ambulatory dates from the end of the 18th century. The original dome, until it fell in 407/1016-7, was covered with sheets of lead, over which were placed 10,210 plates of brass gilt (Ibn ʿAbd Rabībīh, al-Ṭabīh, iii, 369). The harmony of its proportions and the richness of its decoration make the Dome of the Rock one of the most beautiful buildings in the world.

The Great Mosque of Damascus. Al-Walīd began the construction of the Great Mosque of Damascus immediately after his accession in 86/705. A curious situation had prevailed here since the conquest. A great sanctuary of a Syrian god existed here, consisting of a temenos, or sacred enclosure, measuring 100 m. from N. to S. and 150 m. from E. to W., set in an outer enclosure over 300 m. square. At each corner of the inner enclosure, which had pilastered walls nearly 13 m. high, resting on a coating of marble of at least 4 m., was a square tower, and all round the interior ran a double colonnade. There were four axial entrances and in the centre, or a little to the west of it, was the temple, its entrance facing east. In the 4th century Christianity became the state religion and Theodosius (A.D. 379-95) converted the temple into a church (Malalas, Chronographia, 344-5). After the Arab conquest the temenos was divided between Muslims and Christians. Ibn Shākilī says that they both "entered by the same doorway, placed on the south side where is now the great mihrāb. Then the Christians turned to the west towards their church (i.e. the converted temple), and the Muslims to the right to reach their mosque".
Where? Opposite the traditional “mihrāb of the Companions of the Prophet”, i.e. under that part of the interior colonnade which was to the east of the entrance. As for the corner towers, Ibn al-Fākhīn (p. 108) says: “The minarets (mi‘rāḥānā) which are in the Damascus Mosque were originally watch-towers in the Greek days ... when al-Walid turned the whole area into a mosque, he left these in their old condition”. Al-Mas‘ūdī (Maṣūdī, iv, 90-91)

then built the sanctuary with three aisles running parallel to the south wall and cut through its centre by a transept about 8 m. higher. The arcades are in two tiers, the lower of large arches being 10.35 m. high, the upper, in which two small arches correspond to each one below, is nearly 5 m. high. Similar arcades form porticoes on the three sides of the court. The aisles of the sanctuary have gable roofs covered with sheets of lead, and so has the transept, but

Fig. 1. Plan of Great Mosque of Kūfā.

says: “Then came Christianity and it became a Church; then came Islam and it became a mosque. al-Walid built it solidly and the sawdāmā (the four corner towers) were not changed, they serve for the call to prayer at the present day”.

This state of affairs lasted until al-Walid, after bargaining with the Christians, demolished everything except the outer walls and the corner towers and built the present mosque. He first of all reduced the interior of the enclosure into a rectangle by building the long rooms to east and west, leaving a vestibule in front of the east and west entrances. He

the porticoes on the three sides of the court have roofs which slope slightly inwards (Plate VII a–d). Over the transept was a wooden dome, very high and conspicuous.

The decoration consisted of marble panelling (some parts of the original panelling exist next the east entrance) above which ran a golden karma or vine-scroll frieze, and above that was glass mosaic (fasayfīsā) right up to the ceiling. A considerable amount has survived the three fires of 1069, 1401, and 1893, and may still be seen under the west portico, where the famous panorama of the Baradā
(the river of Damascus) is over 34 m. in length and nearly 7 m. high (Plate VIII a). When intact the surface of the fassayfisā must have been greater than in any other building in existence! There were also six marble window-grilles (Plate VIII b) which constitute the earliest geometrical designs in Islam.

The Great Mosque of Damascus was rightly regarded by mediaeval Muslims as one of the Seven Wonders of the World.

Another building due to al-Walid is the audience hall and hammām, known to-day as Kuşayr ‘Amra, in Transjordan. It consists of an audience hall about 10 m. square, with two slightly pointed transverse arches supporting three tunnel-vaults (Plate IX and Fig. 3). There is a vaulted recess on the side opposite the entrance, with a small vaulted room on either side of it. A door on the east side gives access to the hammām, which consists of three small rooms covered by a tunnel vault, a cross vault and a dome. The latter was the calidarium, and under the floor are hypocausts exactly as in a Roman bath. But most remarkable of all are the paintings which cover the walls (Plate X), mostly scenes from daily life, a hunting scene and figures symbolising History, Poetry and Philosophy with the words in Greek above their heads. The dome of the calidarium was painted to represent the vault of heaven, with the Great Bear, the Little Bear, the signs of the Zodiac, etc. But most important of all was the painting of the enemies of Islam defeated by the Umayyads, with their names written above them in Greek and Arabic: Kayyar (the Byzantine Emperor), Rōdorik (the Visigothic King of Spain), Chosroes, Negus (the King of Abyssinia), and two more the names of which have been obliterated. Painting, contrary to the popular idea, is not forbidden by any passage in the Qurʾān, and hostility to it only took proper theological form towards the end of the 8th century A.D. (see my Lawfulness of Painting in Early Islam, in Ars Islamica, XI-XII, 159-66).

The Umayyad Caliphs were great builders of palaces. Their external fortified appearance, although built in the heart of their Empire, hundreds of miles from the nearest frontier, is to be explained by the route taken by the armies of the conquest. They passed a long series of Roman frontier forts, the castra of the Roman limes, which ran from the Gulf of ʿAğaba to Damascus and thence to Palmyra. The most important of these (for which see Brunnow and von Domaszewski, Die Provincia Arabia) are:

![Fig. 2. Dome of the Rock.](image1)

![Fig. 3. Kuşayr ‘Amra, plan.](image2)
Udhrub built by Trajan
Da'mjanlyya probably Trajanic
Ladidjun probably Trajanic
Bshayr inscription of Diocletian (A.D. 284-304)
Dumayr A.D. 162.

Some of these frontier forts were lived in by Umayyad princes. For example, Walid II sometimes lived at Azra'āl, which was rebuilt in 634-1236-7, but which in his day (A.D. 744) was a Roman fort of Diocletian and Maximian. When he was attacked by conspirators he fled north to the Kasr al-Bakhra', which is the Arabic name of a Roman fort about 15 miles S.-W. of Palmyra.

The record of this was twofold. It not only gave the Umayyad Caliphs the necessary knowledge when they wanted to build frontier forts on the Byzantine frontier, e.g. Massilla in 83/4702-3, al-Muhakkak, Katarghāsh, Mūrā, Būkā and Bağhras, all in 105/724 (see al-Baladhuri, 165-7), but it affected the design of their palaces. Here is a list of them:

5. — Hishām's palace at Khirbat al-Mafjadi, 4 miles N. of Jericho.

All these palaces, although built in the midst of Muslim territory, look externally like forts, for they are stone enclosures with round flanking towers. Nos. 1-5 are approximately 70 m. square externally, Nos. 1-5 are twice as large, 70 x 140 m. and No. 6 is four times as large, i.e. 145 m. square. Why this fortified appearance when it was not necessary? It would seem that having been in the habit of occupying forts belonging to the Roman times, they came to look upon a rectangular enclosure flanked by towers as a necessary feature of a princely residence.

When Hishām about 727 A.D. built his palace, known to-day as Kasr al-Hayr al-Gharbī, he chose a site on a small mound about 40 miles to the west of Palmyra, where there was a monastery built by the Gessānid Arethas (= al-Kārīb) under Justinian in A.D. 559. He incorporated the tower of this monastery, which had a door protected by a màchicoulis (of one opening only) high above it, so that it formed a tall watch-tower at the north-west corner of his 70 m. square kasr. This is how the màchicoulis first passed into Muslim architecture.

Kasr al-Hayr al-Gharbī has been admirably excavated by M. Daniel Schlumberger, (see Syria, XX, 195-238 and 324-73). The entrance was found to consist of two great stone door-posts and a lintel decorated with vine ornament, which must have been taken from Palmyra. He has also brought to light masses of stucco ornament, wall paneling, window grilles and frames, and human figures, part of which has been skilfully assembled and put together in the Museum at Damascus. Two large fresco paintings were also discovered, one representing the Caliph on horseback hunting with bow and arrow and using stirrups, which is almost the oldest known record of their use.

Two years later Hishām built another palace, known to-day as Kasr al-Hayr al-Sharqī, together with a small walled city provided with a mosque of three aisles, cut through the centre by a transept of greater height, exactly as at Damascus (Plate XIIa and Fig. 4).

As for the Palace Enclosure it averages nearly 67 m. a side internally and 71 m. externally with walls of stone flanked by 12 round towers, of which the total height must have been at least 14 m. There is only one entrance in the centre of the west side; it is defended by a màchicoulis as are the four gates of the Madīna alongside. The walls are decorated with a string-course of brickwork at the level of the rampart walk and each tower was crowned by a room with a brick dome. The tops of the pair which flank the entrance are decorated with arched panels of stucco, acanthus leaves and also apparently vine leaves and grapes (Plate XI). The interior consisted of an open court, which must have measured about 37 x 45 m., surrounded by two tiers of rooms, the lower tunnel vaulted, the upper with flat wooden ceilings. It awaits excavation.

Another palace of Hishām at Khirbat al-Mafjadi, 4 miles north of Jericho, has also been excavated in recent years. It consists of a palace enclosure about 70 m. square with its own mosque, a large forecourt, a tank with a little open octagonal pavilion in the centre, another mosque with axes (two) on the qibla side only, and to north a very large kasr consisting of nine domed bays arranged three by three, with a small annex on the north side containing the most beautiful floor mosaic ever discovered in Palestine. It consists of a fine tree executed in three shades of green, with two gazelles grazing on the left and a lion pouncing on another on the right. In Muslim palaces the staircases are generally narrow and inconspicuously tucked away, but here there are fine broad staircases which led to the upper floor. Here again masses of stucco ornament have been recovered and put together in the Palestine Museum at Jerusalem. It consists of panels decorated with geometrical ornament, window grilles, human heads and dancing girls (see the Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities, V, VI, VIII and X-XIII).

These three palaces each had an enclosure which is Kasr al-Hayr al-Sharqī is about 11/2 km. wide and 7 km. long, with walls of stone to the height of a metre and a half and above that at least 2 m. more of mud brick. There are half-round buttresses at intervals, first on one side of the wall and then on the other alternately. Traces of a similar wall exist at Mafjadi. Such an enclosure was called a hāyr, and here is the proof. Ya'qūbi (Buldān, p. 263) describing the foundation of Sāmārrā by the Caliph al-Mu'tasim in A.D. 836 says: "And wherever these streets of al-Hayr touched land granted to other people, he would order the wall [of al-Hayr] to be built farther back. Behind the wall were wild animals, gazelles, wild ass, deer, hares and ostriches, kept in by an enclosing wall in a fine broad open tract". And Miskawayhī (Margoliouth's text, i, 159) under the year 315/925-6, says: "This year there was a rising of the disbandied cavalry, who went out to the Oratory, plundered the palace called al-Thurayyā (the palace of the Pleiades at Baghādīd), and slaughtered the game in the Hayr".

Mshātā, about 4 miles from Zlza and about 20 miles south of 'Ammān, is the largest of all the Umayyad palaces, measuring about 145 m. each way, but it was never finished. The outer walls with their half round towers are of well dressed limestone, but all the walls of the interior are of red bricks resting of three or four courses of cut stone. The bricks are of two sizes, 21 cm. square and 28 cm. sq., and 6½ cm. thick.
The entrance is in the centre of the south side. Internally it is divided into three tracts running from north to south, the central one being 57 m. in width and the lateral ones about 42 m. The buildings intended to occupy the lateral tracts have never been begun, and even those projected for the central tract have never been finished. Of the latter, however, the group at the north end must have been very nearly finished, and the plan of the group at the south end can be clearly seen, for a great stone grid is visible formed by the stone foundation course (Fig. 5).

The part immediately behind the gateway was obviously intended to be an entrance hall 17.40 m. long, leading into a court 17.14 m. broad and 13 m. deep; these two elements were flanked by other rooms and courts. This group may be called the Gateway Block. Beyond the court just mentioned is an enormous central court, just over 57 m. sq. on the north side of which is a triple-arched entrance (the
arches have fallen) leading into a great basilical hall, 21.60 m. deep, ending in a triple apse (Plate XII b-c and Fig. 6). This basilical hall, which presumably was the Throne Room, is flanked by two symmetrical complexes composed as follows: on either side of an oblong court, placed perpendicular to the basilical hall, is another court at right angles to it, flanked on each side by a pair of vaulted chambers. These rooms were intended to have a marble panelling, for great block of a fine green stone (looking like marble, but really a calc-schist), a vine leaf and a bunch of grapes. The wall-surface is divided into twenty upright and twenty inverted triangles by a cornice-like moulding, which runs up and down zig-zag fashion from the socle to the entablature. The triangles are about 2.85 m. in height and 2.50 in width at the base. Exactly in the centre of each is a rosette, those in the upright triangles being lobed hexagons, those in the inverted triangles straight-sided octagons. The kernels of all the rosettes vary. The surface of the upright triangles is decorated with extraordinary richness in high relief, vine tendrils, bunches of grapes, birds which pluck at the fruit, etc. In the lower part of some of the triangles is a chalice, out of which two animals drink (Plate XIII). On the right hand side of the façade there are neither animals nor birds and the ornament is on a much smaller scale, in fact the differences are sufficient to justify the suggestion that it was executed by a different school of craftsmen.

Summary: The monuments of Umayyad architecture are really splendid structures of cut stone with arcades resting on marble columns and richly decorated internally with marble panelling and

Fig. 5. Mshattā, plan.
The mosques are nearly always covered with a gable roof (ḏamalun). The minarets were tall square towers, derived from the church towers of pre-Muslim Syria, and the triple-aisled sanctuaries were due to the same influence. Umayyad monuments exhibit a mixture of influences, Syria occupying the first place and Persia the second, and Egyptian influence is definitely demonstrable at the end of this period in Mshatta. Umayyad architecture employed the following devices: the semi-circular, the horse-shoe and the pointed arch, flat arches or lintels with a semi-circular relieving arch above, joggled voussoirs, tunnel-vaults in stone and brick, wooden domes and stone domes on true spherical-triangle pendentives. The squinch does not appear to have been employed. But we know from descriptions of early authors that a type of mosque prevailed in ʿIrāk and Persia quite different from the Syrian type. It was square in plan, had walls of brick (sometimes of mud brick) and its flat timber roof rested directly on the columns 4 m. thick, the inner about 17 m. high including the crenellations and about 5 m. thick; the towers, of which there were 28 between each gate, rose about 2 1/4 m. higher. There were four equidistant gateways. al-Khaṭīb says that “each was composed of two gateways, one in front of the other, separated by a ḍiḥliz and a raḥaba opening on the ḵāṣṣ between the two walls. When one entered by the ḵurāṣān Gate one first turned to the left in an oblong passage (ḏiḥliz ḵāṣṣ) with a vault of brick, 20 cubits wide and 30 long, the entrance of which was in the width and the exit in the length and passed out into a raḥaba ... 40 cubits wide leading to the second gateway. At the far end of this court was the second gateway which was that of the city ... The four gates were constructed on the same model”. It is clear from the words of al-Khaṭīb—“when one entered by the ʿArūsān Gate, one first turned to the left, etc.” that the outer gateway was a bent entrance. Al-Khaṭīb continues: “The second or inner gate, which was that the city ... gave access without the intermediary of arches. Here we have a direct link between the ancient Persian audience-hall (apaddānā) and the flat-roofed portico (ḫāṭār) of more recent Persian palaces.

(3) The ʿAbbāsid Caliphate

The effect of the foundation of Bagdad was as far reaching as the transfer of the capital of the Roman Empire from Rome to Constantinople. The whole centre of gravity of the Empire was changed; hitherto its capital had been in territory which since the time of Alexander had been in the sphere of Hellenistic culture. The transfer resulted in the weakening of this influence and its replacement by the cultural influences of Sasanian Persia, to which sphere ʿIrāk belonged. This made itself felt in the design of the new city, for which we possess such detailed accounts in al-Yaṣṣūbī and al-Khaṭīb that its form can be reconstructed, although no trace of the Bagdad of al-Mansūr has survived. The foundation took place in A.D. 762 and everything was finished in 766.

It was a circular city with an outer and inner wall, and a ḥāṣṣ or interwallum, about 35.40 m. wide between. The outer wall was about 14 m. high and to an oblong corridor, vaulted with bricks and gypsum (ḏiṣṣ) 20 cubits long and 12 wide. Above the vault was an audience hall ..., covered by a gigantic dome 50 cubits high” (Fig. 7).

The Muslim historians insist that the circular form of the city was a feature that had never been known before, but such is far from being the case, for many earlier examples are known, e.g. the Hittite city of Sinjerli, Abra, Ḍagbatana, Parthian Ctesiphon and Takht-i Sulaymān, Dārābjiird in Fārs and also Fīrdūshād.

A mosque was built in the centre of the new city. According to al-Khaṭīb it was 200 cubits (roughly 100 m.) square and had a roof supported by wooden columns. There were 17 ailes from right to left, and the side aisles were two deep, the sanctuary was probably five deep as at Kūfa and Wāṣīt. It was rebuilt by Hārūn al-Raḥīm with burnt bricks and teak-wood, in 193/808-9.

The palace of al-Mansūr measured 400 cubits each way. It was on the ḵibla side of the mosque and in contact (mulāṣṣ) with it, as was the practice in early Islam, e.g. at Damascus about 30 A.H., at Baṣra in 45 A.H., at Kāraywān in 50 A.H., at Wāṣīt in 83 or 84 A.H., at Merv in 132-8 A.H., and (if we count
Fig. 7. Baghdâd, tâkât
the Dar al-Imara as a palace) in the mosque of Ibn Tulun at Cairo, in 265 A.H.

Palace and Mosque have long since disappeared but fortunately a fairly well preserved Abbasid palace of this period has survived, viz: Ukhaydir, on the Wadi Ubayd about 30 miles west of Karbalā'.

It consists of a fortified rectangular enclosure measuring 175 × 169 m. with a gateway in the centre of each side. There are four round corner towers and ten intermediate half-round towers, not counting the peculiar gateway towers, on each side (Plate XIV a-b). Within the great enclosure and in contact with its northern face, is the Palace proper, measuring 111 m. from north to south and 82 from east to west. It also is provided with half round towers. Its main entrance forms one with the northern entrance of the main enclosure. The masonry is composed of roughly shaped slabs of limestone set in gyspum mortar. The walls with the parapet must have been about 19 m. high. The palace proper consists of a great court of honour, with a liwān for the Hall of Public Audience and a square room behind it, presumably a hall of private audience. On either side are other vaulted rooms. A great vaulted corridor about 3 1/2 m. wide runs completely round this group of rooms and the court of honour, and on the east and west sides of it are four isolated and self-contained sets of vaulted chambers, each with its own courtyard, which I regard as four bayts for the four lawful wives of the Muslim prince for whom it was built, as at Mshattā (Fig. 8).

In these bayts the side next the great corridor is bounded by a blind arcade of five arches, the central arch being occupied by the door. On the far side was a portico 2.80 m. deep of five arches resting on four round-piers, and covered by a tunnel vault. The north and south sides are occupied by a triple-arched façade. These arches form a portico, behind which are three parallel tunnel-vaulted rooms. A passage leads from the courtyard to a room 17.60 m. long and 3 1/4 wide, placed transversely behind the three tunnel-vaulted rooms. It is covered by two lengths of tunnel-vault with a space open to the sky between. It must have been intended to contain a fire, for the vault next the outer wall is pierced by a pair of terra-cotta pipes, so it must have been a kitchen.

The palace was also provided with a mosque 24.20 m. wide and 15.15 deep, with a portico one aisle deep on the east, south and west sides, but without one on the north.

Ukhaydir was probably begun by Isā b. Mūsā, uncle of the Caliph al-Mansur, in 161/778. At about this time the Aqṣā Mosque at Jerusalem was partly rebuilt by the Caliph al-Maḥdī. Recent research enables us to affirm that it then consisted of a central aisle 11.50 wide with seven aisles to right and seven to left about 6.25 m. in width, all covered by gable roofs and all perpendicular to the kibla wall. There was a great wooden dome at the end of the central aisle. On the north side was a large central door with seven smaller ones to right and left, and ten "unornamented" ones on the east side (Fig. 9).

Fig. 9. The Aqṣā Mosque in A.D. 780.

There can be no doubt that this mosque had a great influence on the Great Mosque of Cordova built by 'Abd al-Rahmān I in 170/786-7. It was added to on three occasions but this earliest part still exists; as at Jerusalem the aisles, of which there are eleven, run perpendicular to the back wall, they are all covered by parallel gable roofs, and the central one is wider than the rest. The influence of Syria in Spain at this time is not surprising for Spain was full of Syrian refugees. The arcades each consist of twelve arches with twelve more above, an ingenious device whereby a height of ceiling of about 9.80 m. was obtained with columns which, with their capitals and bases, only measure 3.80 m. (Plate XIV c and XV a).

Another building of this period, of great importance for the history of architecture, is the Cistern of Ramla in Palestine, for it consists of a subterranean excavation 8 m. deep divided into six aisles by five arcades of four arches each, all of which are pointed and appear to be struck from two centres, varying from one seventh to one fifth of the span apart (Plate XV b and Fig. 10). And there can be
no doubt about the date for on the plaster of the vault is a Kufic inscription of Dhu 'l-Ilidjdia 172/May 789. It is therefore centuries earlier than the earliest pointed arches in Europe.

In 212/827 ʿAbd Allah b. Tahir, the Governor of Egypt, ordered the Mosque of ʿAmr at Fustāṭ to be doubled in size by the addition to the west of its exact area in the same shape. Makrizi (Khitat, ii, 253) says that the part added included the great mibrāb and all that is to the west of it. The number of doors was now thirteen: five on the N.-E., three on the N.-W., four on the S.-W., and one for the kha(i)b on the kibla side. This is the last recorded extention of the mosque, and its significance is of far reaching importance for it follows that no part of the present structure lying to the right of a line drawn through its centre can possibly be older than 212 A.H. The Mosque then measured internally (as it does to-day) 109 m. on the S.-E. side, 105.28 on the N.-W., 120.55 on the N.-E. and 117.28 on the S.W. As a result of a number of trial trenches made between 1926 and 1933, we now know from the foundations that there were 7 arcades running from right to left on the kibla side and the same number on the side opposite, and four on the S.-W. side. On the N.-E. side the arcades ran perpendicular to the wall. The outer walls were about 10.50 m. high without their cresting, about which we know nothing. There were seventy-eight windows of very interesting construction. The span was about 2.70 m. There were engaged colonnettes at the inner and outer corners and a pair of dwarf marble columns placed on either side in the opening. A transverse beam resting on the latter reduced the span to about 1.90 m. The springing of the arch began about 1.40 m. above the sill, and the rise was about 1.40. Those arches which have survived are considerably stilted and very slightly pointed, and the broken edge of a stucco grille is visible along their intrados. A beam ran across the opening at the springing of the arch, and nailed to its inner side was a strip of carved woodwork which continued along the face of the wall. The decoration consists of a flowing acanthus frieze in which four-leaved whorls alternate with five-lobed leaves (Fig. 11). This is of fundamental importance, for it is derived from the Hellenistic art of Syria and it shows that the ʿAbbāsid art of ʿIrāq, which we find fifty years later in the Mosque of Ibn Tulun, had not yet reached Egypt.

The Great Mosque of Kayrawān is another famous mosque, founded in the early days of Islam, of which no part (excepting the minaret only) is earlier than the IXth century A.D. The oldest part of the present mosque dates from the rebuilding carried out by the Aghlabid Ziyādat Allah in 321/836.

The measurements of the mosque are as follows: N. 65.60 m., S. 70.28, E. 121.80, W. 120.50. The sanctuary consisted of sixteen arcades of seven arches each, running perpendicular to the kibla wall, but without reaching it, for a transverse arcade runs at a distance of about 6 m. from it and it is against this arcade that the sixteen arcades abut. The side aisles are 3.30 m. in width against 5.40 for the central aisle, which must have measured 6.60 m. originally, for its width has been subsequently reduced by two arcades built in contact with the old ones, without any bond or liaison of any sort. The columns now have their own impost blocks instead of each pair being tied together by a common impost block, and the arches of the "lining arcade" are pointed horse-shoe arches instead of round horse-shoe arches like all the rest (Plate XVI). There is no doubt that they are the work of Ibrahīm II. Ahmad, 261-89 A.H. (see below). The whole was covered by a flat roof of uniform height, even over the central aisle, for the latter was only raised during the extensive works of Ibrāhīm II. There were no riwāks on the three sides of qabs until the time...
of Ibrahim III. The outer walls were of stone, strengthened at intervals by buttresses. This same year 221/836 was marked by an event of great importance — the foundation of Sâma-râ. The palace was built on the edge of the plateau, which is about 17 m. above the alluvial valley of the Tigris. In the valley itself is a great basin, 127 m. square, from which a great flight of steps, 60 m. broad, gently ascended to the terrace in front of the Bâb al-‘Amma. The latter consists of a great triple-arched façade, about 12 m. high, with three parallel tunnel-vaulted rooms behind it (Plate XVIIa). This is the best preserved part of the whole palace; nearly everywhere else the walls either only rise a metre or two or have been exposed by excavation. Behind the Bâb al-‘Amma were six transverse halls, then a square court. To the north one reached the rooms of the Caliph, on the south was the Harim. But going directly forward led to an oblong Court of Honour, with the triple entrance of the Throne Room beyond it. The latter consisted of four T-shaped halls arranged in a cruciform fashion. Each one resembled a three-aisled basilica so as to obtain light from the clerestory. Between the arms of the cross are smaller rooms with marble dados, also a mosque for the Caliph with a mihrâb. Beyond this again is the Great Esplanade, a great court or garden, 180 m. wide and 350 m. deep, intersected by little canals. Beyond again was the polo-ground, and the distance from the great basin to the race-course must have been nearly 1400 m.

The decoration consisted of dados, generally of moulded stucco, except in the Throne-Room group where they are of marble slabs. The upper part of the walls in the Harim were decorated with fresco-paintings, which included living forms and foliage. All woodwork was of teak, carved and painted. The Great Mosque of this period has not survived, as it was entirely rebuilt in 234-7 H. Before describing it we must speak of the Great Mosque of Sûsâ in Tunisia built in 236/850-1.

The mosque proper, excluding its annexes, is a perfectly regular rectangle built of stone in courses about 1/2 m. high and measuring internally 49.39 m. deep and 55.16 wide. The sahn, which measures 41 × 221/4 m., is surrounded by low arcades of slightly horse-shoe form, resting on squat T-shaped piers. There are eleven arches to north and south and six to east and west, and the height of the façade is about 67/4 m. It is perfectly plain except for a spall-face moulding, immediately above which is a fine inscription frieze in simple undecorated Kufic, the maximum height of the characters being 28 cm. The band on which they are carved curves forward slightly to compensate for foreshortening and thus help the observer at ground level. This is the earliest known example of this treatment, which passed into Egypt with the Fâtimids and appears in the Mosque of al-Hâkim, 380-402/990-1013. The three rows vary in depth from 4.08-4.27 m. and each is covered by a tunnel-vault (Plate XVIIa).

The sanctuary consists of thirteen aisles formed by twelve arcades of six arches each running towards the kibla wall. Each aisle is divided into six bays by other arcades running from east to west. All these arches, which rest on squat cruciform piers, are of horse-shoe form. The first three bays going south are covered by tunnel-vaults, with one exception, the third bay in the central aisle, which is covered by a dome on an octagonal drum with slightly incurved faces. The next three bays going south are covered by cross-vaults at a slightly higher level. Here again the third bay in the central aisle is covered by a dome on squinches. It is obvious that the mosque has been extended towards the south, that the first three bays are the original part and that the first dome marks the bay in front of the original mihrâb (Plate XVIIIb), which has been removed together with the original back wall. Before that the depth of the mosque must have been 44 m. The date of the original work is given by the great Kufic inscription as 236/850-1.

The Great Mosque of Sâma-râ was rebuilt by Mutawakkil; the work was begun in 234/849-9 and finished in Ramâdân 237/Feb.-March, 852. It is the largest mosque ever built, for its outer walls form an immense rectangle of kiln-baked bricks measuring roughly 240 m. deep internally by 156 m. wide (proportion approximately as 3:2); its area therefore is nearly 38,000 sq.m. Only the enclosing walls have been preserved; they are 2.65 m. thick, strengthened by half round towers averaging 3.60 m. in diameter with a projection of 2.15 m., and the curtain walls between them average 15 m. in length. There are four corner towers, twelve intermediate towers to east and west and eight to north and south making forty-four in all. There were sixteen rectangular doorways spanned by beams with a relieving arch above.

The towers are perfectly plain, but each curtain. wall is decorated with a frieze of six recessed squares with bevelled edges; in each square is a shallow saucer about a metre in diameter and 25 cms. deep. The total height of the walls is now about 10.50. In spite of its simplicity the whole effect is truly monumental (Plate XVIIb).

The south wall is pierced by twenty-four windows placed on the axis of the twenty-five aisles of the sanctuary, except the central one, for there was no room above the mihrâb. There were two more windows on each side making 28 in all. Externally they are narrow rectangular openings, but internally they are splayed and covered by scalloped arches of five lobes resting on little engaged columns, the whole being set in a sunk rectangular frame. Herzfeld's excavations showed that the roof rested directly on octagonal piers of brick, with marble colonnettes at the four corners, making a support 2.07 m. square. The clear height within was 10.35. There were no arches.

The mosque proper was surrounded by an outer enclosure, or ziyyâda, on the east, north and west sides, and air photographs show that the great rectangle thus formed stood in a still greater enclosure measuring 376 × 444 m.

The minaret, the famous Malwiyya, stands free at a distance of 271/4 m. from the north wall of the mosque. There is a square socle, 33 m. a side and about 3 m. high, on which rests a spiral tower with a ramp about 2.30 m. wide, which winds round in an anti-clockwise direction until it has made five complete turns. The rise for each turn is 6.10 m., but as the length of each turn is less than the previous one it follows that the slope inevitably becomes steeper and steeper. At the summit of this spiral part is a cylindrical storey, decorated with eight recesses, each set in a shallow frame (Plate XVIIIc). The southern niche frames a doorway at which the ramp ends; it opens on to a steep staircase, at first straight then spiral, leading to the top platform which is 50 m. above the socle. From eight holes to be seen Herzfeld concluded that there was probably a little pavilion on wooden columns here.
A few years later, between A.D. 860 and 861, another immense mosque was built by the same Caliph at the north of Sāmarrā. It measures internally 213 m. from north to south and 135 from east to west. Here the outer walls are of mud brick about 1.60 m. thick strengthened by half-round buttresses, but the roof rested on arcades of burnt brick running from north to south; it was apparently only about 8 m. high. The sanctuary is divided into seventeen aisles by sixteen arcades of five arches each with an average span of 3.13 m. The two outer arcades are carried right through to the north end of the mosque, forming side riwāfs 14 m. in depth. The northern riwāf resembles the southern one, except that it is only three arches deep. On the north side and about 9.60 m. from the mosque is a miniature Malwiyya on a socle about 11.20 m. square, above which is the much damaged spiral part which barely makes three turns.

Ten years later important works were carried out in the Great Mosque of Kayrawān by Abū Ibrāhīm Ahmad, who reduced the width of the central aisle by about 1.20 m. by constructing two new arcades in contact with the old ones. The arches of these arcades are pointed horse-shoe arches instead of round horse-shoe arches in contact with. He also built three free-standing arches and one wall-arch of the same type to carry a fluted dome in front of the mihrāb. They rise to a height of 9.15 m., and the square thus formed is terminated above by a cornice, its top edge being 10.83 m. from the ground. On it rests the octagonal zone of transition, 2.15 m. in height, which is formed by eight semi-circular arches springing from colonnettes resting on little corbels inserted in the cornice just mentioned. The drum is composed of eight arched windows and sixteen arched panels arranged in pairs between the windows. The dome, which is 5.80 m. in diameter, has twenty-four ribs, each springing from a little corbel. Between the ribs are concave segments, 30 cm. deep at the base and diminishing to nothing at the apex. The whole composition is charming. Externally the dome resembles a cantaloup melon, with 24 convex ribs (corresponding to the 24 concave segments) which taper to nothing at the apex (Plate XIX a and XX). Abū Ibrāhīm's work was carried out in 248/862-3. He also lined the mihrāb with a series of very beautiful carved marble panels assembled in four tiers of seven panels each; total height 2.72 m. He also decorated the face of the mihrāb and the wall surrounding it with lustre tiles about 21 cm. square (Plate XIX b). The marble panels and the tiles had been imported by him from Irāq, and the latter constitute the oldest examples of lustre pottery of certain date.

The Mosque of Ibn Tūlūn

In 263 A.H. Ahmad b. Tūlūn decided to build a new mosque on an outcrop of rock called Dżabal Yashkur. The scheme of the mosque can be seen from the plan (Fig. 12) and the general view (Plate XXI) taken from the kibla side which was occupied by a private apartment of the amir, the Dār al-Imāra. This outer siyāda is roughly 19 m. broad and its outer walls are lower than those of the mosque proper. The whole forms a great rectangle almost exactly square, measuring 162 m. in depth and 162.46 in width, constructed of red bricks, measuring roughly 18 x 8 x 4 cm., coated with a very hard stucco in which the ornament is cut. No wooden ties are used anywhere, except at the tops of the piers.

It results from careful measurements that the unit employed for setting out the mosque was the Nilo-metric cubit of 54.04 cm., for the principal dimensions are almost exact multiples of it.

The scheme of the façade of the mosque proper is as follows. It would seem that the architect set out his design by bisecting the façade as regards its height and then took this median line for the level of the window sills. Then the plain lower part was pierced by seven rectangular doorways, and the upper part by thirty-one pointed-arched windows, with their sills from 5.70 to 5.86 m. above the floor. The window-arches rest on stumpy engaged colonnettes of brick exactly as in that part of the Mosque of 'Amr which dates from 212 A.H. The walls are 10.03 m. in height up to the roof level, above which is a row of pierced circles in squares and then a curious open work cresting, making a total height of 13.03 m. above the sills of the doorways (Plate XXII a). The latter are perfectly plain except for the carved wooden soffits, of which four original ones remain. In addition to the seventeen large and two small doors leading from the siyādas into the mosque proper there are four in the kibla wall, one of which leads into the room behind the mihrāb. This must be the door mentioned by Makrizī (ii, 269, l. 22 ff.) which enabled Ibn Tūlūn to go directly from the Dār al-Imāra to the masjīda next the mihrāb and the minbar, as was the practice during the first three centuries of Islam.

The sahn is roughly 92 m. square with thirteen pointed arches on each side (Plate XXIII b). The sanctuary is formed by five arcades of seventeen arches each, and the riwāf opposite by two arcades. These seven arcades are carried right through to the side walls. The arcades of the lateral riwāfs, however, are not against the outer arcades of the sanctuary and N.-W. riwāf and consequently consist of thirteen arches only. The arches rest on piers 2.46 m. wide and 1.27 m. deep, with engaged brick columns at the corners. They are placed about 4.60 m. apart. Dove-tailed wooden plates are used round the tops of these piers to strengthen them. The pier-capitals are derived from late Corinthian capitals, the two tiers of acanthus being replaced by conventionalized Sāmarrā vine leaves (Plate XXIII a).

The soffits of the arches are decorated with bands of stucco ornament, of which about ten are fairly well preserved (Plate XXIV). All consist of a very broad central strip between narrow double borders. The central strip in every case consists of a geometrical frame-work, the interstices of which are filled with various elements belonging to style B of Sāmarrā (Fig. 13). In addition to this a continuous border of ornament, 46 cm. wide, runs round the arches on both faces, turns at right angles at the springing, runs across the top of the pier, and then turns again at right angles to run round the next arch. A frieze of stucco ornament runs along just above the band of ornament running round the arches. About 20 cm. above this ran the famous Kūfic inscription carved on wood, of which a fair amount still remains, running along about 30 cm. below the beams of the ceiling. Calculation shows that this frieze, which must have been over 2 km. long, may have contained about one seventeenth part of the Kurān.
Fig. 12. Mosque of Ibn Tulun, plan.

The windows, in the shadow of the aisles, stand out against the sky like delicate lacework and form one of the most beautiful features of the mosque. There are 128 in all. Each consists of a pointed arch springing from a pair of engaged dwarf columns with stucco capitals, and a border of stucco ornament runs round each, turns at right angles at the springing and runs along horizontally to the next window (Plate XXIII b-c). Unfortunately only three, or at most four, of the window-grilles are original. These are mainly composed of compass work, i.e. intersecting circles and segments of circles; two have been set out by a method similar to that employed for one of the marble grilles in the Great Mosque at Damascus (Plate VIII b), the third on a network of equilateral triangles (Fig. 14).

The pendentives of the present wooden dome in front of the mihrab, on stylistic grounds, are undoubtedly the work of Ladjin in 696 A.H., and the dome is much later. I very much doubt if there was a dome here originally. The present minaret is likewise the work of Ladjin, the original one (seen by Mukaddasî) was probably fairly similar to the Malwiya of Samarra.

The statement of al-Kūdâlī, quoted by Ibn Duqmaq and Makrizî, that the Mosque of Ibn Tulun was built after the style (‘alâ bindâ) of the Mosque of Samarrâ (unless it refers to the general impression produced by the minaret) is certainly not correct, for its plan does not in the least resemble either of the two mosques of Samarrâ, except that all three are surrounded by tâyâdas. It differs from
Fig. 13. Mosque of Ibn Tulun, analysis of soffits of arches (see Plate XXIV).

Fig. 14. Mosque of Ibn Tulun, analysis of window-grille (see Plate XXIIIc).
the Great Mosque of Sāmrār in the number of its aisles 5, 2, 2, 2 instead of 9, 4, 4, 3. As for the Mosque of Abu Dulaf, its aisles run perpendicular to the kibla wall instead of parallel to it. Neither does its scheme of the façade recall either of the mosques of Sāmrār for it has no bastions. The sole feature of the façade that recalls Sāmrār is the row of circles in squares below the creasing. Its windows in no way resemble those of the Great Mosque, which are few in number, have lobed arches internally and are treated externally like arrow-slits, but they do resemble those of the mosque of Azm of 212 A.H., except that they lack the transverse beam and carved wooden frieze. In other words, Ibn Tūlūn’s façade is derived from that of the Mosque of ʿAzm of 212/827 and, as no such façade is known elsewhere, must be regarded as Egyptian.

As regards the ornament, everybody now agrees that it is derived from Sāmrār, but whereas at Sāmrār the three styles, A, B and C, occur separately in the mosque of Ibn Tūlūn they are combined and mixed. By its ornament and in certain other respects the mosque may be regarded as a foreign, ṣīrāṣī building planted down on the soil of Egypt, and large numbers of ʿirākī craftsmen must have been employed for its decoration in wood and stucco. Its ornament and that of the Days al-Suryānī in the Wādī Natrūn are the two most westerly examples of the art of the ʿAbbāsīd Empire, which prevailed over a large area from Bahrāyn and Nihāpūr to Samarqand.

Summary: Under the ʿAbbāsīd the Hellenistic influences of Syria were replaced by the surviving influences of Sāsānian Persia, which profoundly modified the art and architecture, and this gave birth to the art of Sāmrār, the influence of which extended to Egypt under Ibn Tūlūn, to Nihāpūr and Bahrāyn. In palace and mosque there was a real difference between that of the Umayyads and ʿAbbāsīds, partly due to the adoption of Persian ideas of royalty which almost deified the king. Hence elaborate throne-rooms, generally domed, for private audience, preceded by a vaulted ʿhusn (or four radiating ʿibāds) for public audience. The ʿbaṣīts were also different, following the type of Kaṣr-i Shīrīn and not the Syrian type of Mshattā and Kaṣr al-Tūb. The scale was immense and axial planning was a marked feature. But all are built of brick and a great part of that basest of materials — mud brick — hidden by thick coats of stucco. A new type of pointed arch appears, the four-centred arch. The earliest existing squinches in Islam date from this period. An important innovation was the introduction of lustre tiles, the earliest examples being those brought to Kayrāwān from ʿIrāk in 248 A.H. Bands of inscription were usually made to stand out on a blue background. But the widespread influence of ʿAbbāsīd art did not extend to Spain, where Umayyad art, brought-thither by Syrian refugees, was still full of life.

Bibliography: A. Dirr, Artislāmī yevakh, in Sbornik Matervolov dyva opisanii mestnostey i plemen Kukoska, xxix, Tiflis 1908. See also ARWĀN, ANDI, DĀGHISTĀN, LAK.

(Ḥ. Carrère d’Encausse)
a. The Dome of the Rock. General view from the south-west.


a. THE DOME OF THE ROCK. Inner ambulatory, ring of dome-bearing supports on right.

b. THE DOME OF THE ROCK. Decoration on flanks of piers which strengthen the inner corners of the octagonal arcade. To right: soffit.
THE DOME OF THE ROCK. Mosaic decoration of inner face of octagonal arcade.
The Dome of the Rock. Mosaic decoration on soffits of arches of octagonal arcade.

a. THE GREAT MOSQUE OF DAMASCUS. Part of mosaic panel under western mi'mâr.

b. THE GREAT MOSQUE OF DAMASCUS. Marble window grille.


b. Kusayr 'Amra. Painting of the Enemies of Islam (after A. Musil)
a. Kasr al-Hayr al-Sharki. Royal enclosure from the S.-W.


b. Mshattā. The main building.

c. Mshattā. The triple-apsed Throne Room.
Mshatta. Decoration of tower of façade.
a. UKHAYDIR. From the north-east.

b. UKHAYDIR. Walled-up entrance in centre of east side.

c. CORDOVA, THE GREAT MOSQUE. View of sanctuary from campanile.
a. Cordova, the Great Mosque. Interior looking west.

a. Kayrawān, the Great Mosque. From the minaret.

b. Kayrawān, the Great Mosque. Interior of sanctuary, looking east.

a. Sūsa, the Great Mosque. From the Kish nearby.

b. Sūsa, the Great Mosque. Part under first dome.

a. Kairawān, the Great Mosque. The miḥrāb and its surroundings.

b. Kairawan, the Great Mosque. Marble panelling of miḥrāb

CAIRO, THE MOSQUE OF IBN TULUN. General view.
a. CAIRO, THE MOSQUE OF IBN TULUN. Façade.

b. CAIRO, THE MOSQUE OF IBN TULUN. Arcades of south-west side of sahn.
a. CAIRO, THE MOSQUE OF IBN TULUN. The sanctuary.

b. CAIRO, THE MOSQUE OF IBN TULUN. One of the original windows and Kufic inscription on wood below ceiling.

c. CAIRO, THE MOSQUE OF IBN TULUN. One of the original windows.
CAIRO, THE MOSQUE OF IBN TÜLÜN. Decoration of soffits of arches.
Sa'dar 'Ali attacked Maratha Tanjore, while his son-in-law Husayn Dust Khan, (Candâ Şâhib) took Trichinopoly by a trick. This aggression brought the Marathas down upon Ørkât in 1155/1740. The Nawâwb was killed at the Damalcherry pass, Ørkât sacked, and Chandâ Şâhib carried off prisoner to Satara. Sa'dar 'Ali succeeded to power but was murdered in 1155/1742. The şabâddar of the Dakhan thereupon appointed an outsider, Anwâr al-Din, a move represented by the many Nawâyâts who held subordinate posts in the province.

Their hostility allowed Dupleix, governor of Pondicherry, to intervene. In 1161/1748 Dupleix assisted the release of Candâ Şâhib, the Nawâyât candidate for Ørkât. Next year French troops under Candâ Şâhib slew Anwâr al-Din at Ambur, and in 1164/1750 when the şabâddar of the Dakhan was killed, Candâ Şâhib was proclaimed Nawâwb of Ørkât.

In the next eleven years Ørkât was a pawn in the Anglo-French struggle, now taken and held by Clive, now lost to Lally. The war ended with the British protégé, Muhammad 'Ali, established as Nawâwb. His troops twice surrendered Ørkât to Hâdâr 'Ali of Maysûr, he became deeply involved in debts, but his line continued till 1272/1855, when the estate escheated to the Company on failure of male heirs (The administration of the province of Ørkât had passed to the British in 1216/1801).

The palace and fort, and the fortifications of the town, elaborately constructed on European lines by Muhammad 'Ali, are now in ruins. There are numerous mosques, a fine tomb of Sa'dat Allâh Khan, and the shrine of Tipû Mustân Awlîyâ, after whom Tipû Sultan of Maysûr (Mysore) was named. (L. B. Bowring, Haidar Ali and Tipû Sultan, 117-18 n.).

Bibliography: M. Wilks, Historical Sketches of the South of India; Sewell, op. cit., i, 165; ii, 198-9; Imperial Gazetteer of India, v, 419, 1908; Cambridge History of India, v, ch. viii and bibl.; C. K. Aiyar, Jour. of Indian Hist., 1930, 3. K. Aiyangar, Jour. of Indian Hist., 1930, 173-217; S. M. H. Naïmûr, Sources of the History of the Nawabs of the Carnatic, 4 vols., 1934-44; C. S. Srinivasasachar, A History of Gingee. (J. B. Harrison)

ARD, earth, land. For the terrestrial globe, see MUKÂT AL-ARD. For land law, see İKTÂ, RAJTÂ, KHÂLÎSA, KHALÎSA, IKTÂ, MAHLUL, MATRÎJK, MAWÂT, MISÂHÂ, MUŞÂSÂMA, MUŞÂTA', MULK, SOYUĞÂLÎM, TIMAH, ŞÎŞEH, WÂFÎ, ZÎŞÎMÊT. 'ARD, [see ISTİRÂ].

'ARD HÂL, petition. In the Ottoman Empire of the 18th century, the writing of petitions was the prerogative of the 'Arz-âlîdîs (Arzhalis). Admission to their number was regulated by the 3rd-fillâh (a contract, the qualifications required being personal respectability, proficiency in calligraphy, and a knowledge of şartîa and bûmûns. Petitions were considered by the Cavugh-bashî on behalf of the Grand Vizier, and answers to them were drafted by the two Tezkirêdivî, (known as Tezkirê-i emvel and -fohatî).


(II. L. Lewis.)

ARDABB [see KAYL].

ARDABIL [Turkish Erdebl]. A district and a town in eastern Adharbaydijân. The town is located at 48° 17' E. long. (Greenw.) and 38° 13' N. lat. The distance to Tabriz is 210 km. by road, and it is 40 km. to the Soviet frontier. The altitude of the town is 4,500 ft. above sea level, and it is situated on a circular plateau surrounded by mountains. The district (Oarîbîstânî), of which the town is the capital, comprises four counties (ba'shak), capital county, Namîn, Astûrâ, and Garmî.

There are few trees around the town and irrigation is necessary for cultivation. Some 20 m. west of the town is Mt. Savalân (Sablân of Arabic geographers) 15,784 ft. at the summit, with perennial snow. The climate of the town and capital county is cold in winter (average monthly temp. below freezing) and the town is assigned to the cold districts (sardîstân). The other three counties, however, are reckoned in the warm districts (garmîstân). The river Balîşhî or Bâlîşhî (or châyô), a tributary of the Karâf, flows through the southern part of the town. In the vicinity of the town are warm springs which have attracted visitors throughout history.

The eymology of the name is uncertain, but Minorsky in J. A., 217 (1930), 68, proposes a meaning "willows of the sacred law". The pre-Islamic history of Ardabil is unknown, for we find the name only in Islamic times. Sam'ânî vocables the name as Ardibil, while the Buhûd al-Şâm writes Ardawî. In Armenian we find Arvâvet (Ghevond) and later Artavel. Firdawsi and Yâkût say the town was founded by Përoz the Sasanian king (457-484 A.D.), hence it was called Bâdân Përoz or Bâdân Fayrûz. Kazwînî in his Nuzhat al-Şâlîb attributes its founding to a much earlier monarch.

It is uncertain whether the mint mark ATRA, on Sasanian and pre-reform 'Umâyyad coins (Adharbâyджân?) refers to Ardabil, but it was the residence of the marzîbîn at the time of the Arab conquest of Adharbâyджân, according to al-Balâdhurî. The city was taken by treaty, and under the caliph 'All his governor al-Âsh'ârî made Ardabil his capital. It probably did not remain the capital continuously throughout the 'Umâyyad period; for example in 112/730 the Khazars captured it. Marâşagh may have been a second capital of Adharbâyджân, for the seat of authority seems to have shifted between it and Ardabil.

The district of Ardabil suffered from the uprising of Bâbâk (q.v.). Ardabil was in the domain of the independent Sâdjuq governors at the beginning of the 10th century A.D., and the district suffered from internecine struggles of local rulers, as well as from the invasions of the Rûs in the first half of the 10th century. We find dirhems with the name Ardabîl on them for the first time in 286/899.

The town of Ardabil was captured and destroyed by the Mongols in 647/1250. It lost its former importance until the rise of the Şafawids Shaykh Şaft al-Dîn had made Ardabil the centre of his Şâlî order at the end of the 13th century. In 1490 Isma'îl, his descendant, returned from exile in Gilân to Ardabil where he started the Şafawid dynasty, and shortly thereafter he became shâh in Tabriz. Ardabil became a Şafawid shrine and Şâh 4Abbâs especially enriched the mausoleum and mosque of Shaykh Şaft by gifts, among them Chinese porcelains and rugs. The city was held by the Ottomans for a short time at the end of Şafawid rule, but Nâdîr Shâh retook it and was crowned shâh in the nearby Mughân steppe in 1736. During the Ottoman occupation a survey of population and land was made for the city and province; a copy of this is preserved.
in the Başvekalet Arşivi [q.v.] in Istanbul. In the time of Napoleon Gen. Gardanne fortified the city and built ramparts, and ʿAbbās Mīrzā established court there.

European visitors who visited the town and briefly described it were Pietro della Valle (1619), Adam Olearius (1637, with a pictorial map of the town), J. B. Tavernier, Corinelle Le Brun (1703), and James Morier (1821). Much of the library of the shrine of Shaykh Ṣaḥīf, as well as art objects, were carried to St. Petersburg by the Russians after 1827. Morier (Second Journey) estimated the population of the town at 4,000; now it is ca. 23,000. Historical structures include the shrine of Shaykh Ṣaḥīf, the maqṣūd-i ġūmā (built in 1382) and the mausoleum of Shaykh Dībirān (father of Shaykh Ṣaḥīf) 6 km. to the north of Ardabil.


ARDAHĀN. town in the remote north-east of Turkey, 41° 8' north, 42° 42' east, on the KuTucay, which becomes the Kura, 1,800 m. above sea-level. At one time capital of a sandqūd in the syāylet of Kars. By the Treaty of San Stefano in 1878, the town, its surrounding district and Kars were ceded to Russia. On Feb. 23rd 1921, it was ceded back by Georgia; it has since remained Turkish, and is the capital of a kādā in the wilāyet of Kars. In 1945, the town had 6,182 inhabitants, and the kādā 49,699.

Bibliography: Hājjīdī, Khālīfā (Kāṭīb Celebī). 

ARDKHĀN (dialect Erdekūn), town in Persia situated 32° 18' N. Lat. and 53° 30' E. Long. (Greenew.) on the present route from Nāṭīn to Yazd. It is located on the edge of the desert. To the north is the district of Koūdā, and to the south the Mahbūd. It is located at a height of 3280 ft. above sea level. The identification with Ptolemy's * ApTa£ep?;7 is not certain. Muslim tradition has certain knowledge only of Khusraw I Anusharwan (531-79) was born here. On the early (4th/ioth century) mosque here cf. A. Gabriel, Die Erforschung Persiens, Vienna 1952, 58 (von Poser), 188 (Buhse), 304 (Baier); Stahl in Peterman's Geogr. Mitteil., Supplement 118 (1985), 29.

Another Ardakan, in Fārs, 30° 16' N. Lat., 51° 50' E. Long. (Greenew.) is a Kāšānī tribal centre.

ARDALĀN. This name was formerly used for the ill-defined province of Persian Kurdistan, the major part of which at present is the district (gahrīstān) of Sanandaj (formerly Senna). For the geography see KURDISTĀN (Persian).

Usually the name refers to the Banū Ardālān who were rulers of much of Kurdistan from the 14th to the 17th centuries. The origin of this extended family is unknown, but according to a reference to the Sharaf-nāma, Bāhā was a descendant of the Marwānids of Diyar Bakr, who lived in the Gūrān in Ardālān. Another source (B. Nikitine, Les Valis) says Ardālān was a descendant of Ardāshīr the first Sāsānīan king. Several histories of the rulers of Ardālān were written in Persian in the 19th century which are primarily biographies of the rulers (Storey, 309, 1300). The rulers received the title wāli from the Safawī shahs, but sometimes they declared their allegiance to the Ottomans.

One of the most illustrious of the rulers was Amān Allāh Khān who ruled at the beginning of the 10th century, and his son married the daughter of Fath ʿAli Shāh. Nāṣr al-Dīn Shāh appointed a ʿAbbāsī prince as governor of Kurdistan and the rule of the Ardālān family came to an end. (See KURDISTĀN, SENNA.)


ARDASHĪR, old Persian: ʿArtaḵāh, Greek Αρταξιήρ, well-known name of Persian kings. Muslim tradition has certain knowledge only of the later Sāsānīan kings of that name,viz. Ardāshīr I (226-241), Ardāshīr II (379-383) and Ardāshīr III (628-639). (See SĀSĀNĪSAN.)

Bibliography: A. Christensen, L’Empire des Sasanides (Introd., ii, 2: Littératures arabe et persane, and index, s.v. Ardashīr).

ARDASHĪR KHRURĀ [see FERDĀŠĀ].

ARDIBEHĪSHT [see TA’RĪKH].

ARDISTĀN (dialect Ardūs), a town in Persia located on the edge of the desert east of the present road from Nāṭīn to Yazd, at a height of 3575 ft. and 33° 22' N. Lat., 52° 24' E. Long. (Greenew.) It was a well known town in the Middle Ages. Arabic and Persian histories say a fire temple was erected by Ardashīr the first Sāsānīd (226-42 A.D.) and Khusrāw I Anūṣ ḫrāwān (531-79) was born here. On the early (4th/ioth century) mosque here cf. A. Godard, in Athar-e Iran, 1936, 285; Zawara, NE and near Ardistān, has an old mosque and pre-Islamic ruins. The population of the district of 50 villages (1930) was ca. 27,000.

expeditions (especially with Maslama b. Abd al-Malik, against the Byzantines), but, thwarted by jealousy, he satirised the Governor of Mecca, Muhammad b. Hisham, the maternal uncle of the Caliph Hisham, and went so far as to compose, in order to discredit him, erotic verse regarding his mother Dijayda. His behaviour led to his being molested, placed in the pillory and thrown into prison, where he died, probably about 120/738.

Bibliography: His diwan was recently printed in Baghdåd (1956) with an Introduction. See also Ibn Kutayba, Sihr, 365-6; idem, Ma’adir; Cairo 1335/1915, 86; Dûhât, Hayyând, index; Aghânî, i, 147-60 and index; Baghdådî, Khâtâma, i, 99; Yûkût, s.v. al-‘Arдж; Brockelmann, i, 49; Tâhâ Husayn, Hadîth al-‘Arджû, ii, 72-81; O. Rescher, Abris, i, 146-7; C. A. Nallino, Scrutì, vi (= Letteratura, 61; French trans. 97-8); G. F. Gabrielli, Un poema minore omayyade: al-‘Arдж, in Studi Orient. su onore di G. Levi Della Vida, 361-70, with bibl. (Cf. Pellat)

ARDJîSH. A small and ancient town situated on the north-eastern bank of Lake Van, which in the Middle Ages was still called the Lake of Ardjîsh. Its existence seems to be vouched for since the Urartean period, and more explicitly by the Graeco-Roman geographers. It was occupied for a time by the Arabs during the time of Mu’tamid, but remained an integral part of the Armenian principalities up to the 8th century A.D.; from 772 onwards, it was incorporated in the Kaysite emirate of Akhlat (q.v.). In the 10th century A.D., it belonged to the Marwânids, but about 1025 it was taken by the Byzantines, who proceeded to annex southern Armenia. In 1054, it was retaken by the Saldjukid sultan Tughgil Beg (q.v.), and, when the Saldjukid empire was divided up at the end of the 11th/12th century, it was incorporated in the principality of the Shâhs of Armenia of Akhlat and, at the beginning of the 12th/third century, in that of their Ayyûbid successors. Pillaged repeatedly in the 13th century by the Georgians and the Mongols, it was nevertheless of sufficient importance for the Ilkhanid mawṣûr ‘All Shâh to fortify it at the beginning of the 8th/14th century (it does not appear to have been fortified before). Later, it suffered from the devastations of Timûr and during the disorders associated with the Perso-Ottoman wars. It was still the chief town of an Ottoman district in the 17th century; but the growth of Van, and the northward movement of the lake waters, acted to its detriment. The last inhabitants left the town about the middle of the 19th century, and to-day the ruins are mainly under water. A small modern township has sprung up half an hour's journey to the north.

Bibliography: See Armenia and Akhlat. To the Arabic sources (al-Baladhurl, Ibn al-Azraq al-Fârîqî studied in TRk., 1902, 785-812; Ibn al-Ashîr, etc.), should be added the Armenian sources used in R. Grousset, Histoire d’Arménie, Paris 1948, and F. Nève, Histoire des Guerres de Tamerlan d’après Thomas de Medzoph, Brussels 1860, in Persian, Hadîd Allâh Mustawfî, Nuzha, and, in Turkish, the Dîhidnûmûna of Hâjidî Khallîfa and the Travels of Ewiîyâ Celebi, vol. iv, cf. also M. Canard, Les Hâmidûndîs, i, 188 and 473 ff.; E. Honigman, Die Ostgrenze des byzantinischen Reiches, Brussels 1935; and Besim Darkot, article Ercis in IA, which gives the references to the earlier modern works (Hübschman, Markwart).

ARDJÎS-DAGH [see ERGHANI].

ARGAN (Berb.), argan-tree (argania spinosa or argania sideroxyloï), a tree of the family Sapotaceae which grows on the southern coast of Morocco. A shrub with hard, tough wood, it produces a stone whose kernel, when ground, yields a much-valued oil; the oil-cakes are given to cattle. The word is also known to some of the Arabic-speaking peoples of Morocco, but they look upon it as a loan-word.


ARGHĀN [see ERGHANI].

ARGHŪN, name of a Mongol dynasty claiming descent from Hulâghû. (Raverty, Notes on Afghani- stan, 510, refuses to accept this claim). The Argûhs rose to prominence towards the end of the 13th century when Sulînân Husayn Bâykarâr of Harât appointed Dâh ‘l-Nûn Beg Arghûn governor of Kandahâr. He soon began to assume an independent attitude and resisted all attempts of the ruler of Harât to coerce him. As early as 884/1479 he occupied the highlands of Pîghûn, Shâl and Mustang which now form part of Balûcûstân. In 890/1485 his two sons, Shâh Beg and Musûmûd, returned from the highlands of Pîghûn, Shâl and Mustang which now form part of Balûcûstân. In 902/1497 he espoused the cause of Bâdi’ al-Zamân, the rebel son of Husayn Bâykarâr, and gave him his daughter in marriage. He was killed at the battle of Marûcîk, in 913/1507, during the invasion of Khuvarûn by Shaybânî Khân the Uzbeg leader. He was succeeded by his eldest son, Shâh Beg, who was forced to acknowledge the overlordship of Shaybânî Khân in order to maintain his position at Kandahâr. After the defeat and death of the redoutable Uzbeg leader at Marw, in 1510, he was threatened by Bâbûr who had established himself at Kâbûi and by Shâh Ismîl’l Safawî who had annexed Harât. He was saved for a time by Shâh Ismîl’l wars against the Ottomans and by Bâbûr’s attempt to recover Sâmârkand. Realising that his expulsion from Kandahâr was merely a matter of time, he sought to establish his power in the Balûc country and Sind. In Sind, Dâm Nanda had been succeeded by his son Dâm Fîrûz whose hold over the country was weakened by faction fights. In 926/1520 Shâh Beg entered Sind, defeated Dâm Fîrûz’s army and sacked Thatta, the capital of Southern Sind. A treaty was made by which upper Sind was surrendered to Shâh Beg while lower Sind was to remain under the Sammâs. This agreement was almost immediately repudiated by the Sammâs as a result of which they were once more defeated. Shâh Beg now dethroned Dâm Fîrûz and founded the Arghûn dynasty of Sind. After the complete loss of Kandahâr to Bâbûr, in 928/1522, Shâh Beg made Bakîr at the Indus his capital. He died in 930/1524 and was succeeded by his son, Shâh Husayn, who had the khwâja read in Bâbûr’s name, and immediately, probably by arrangement with Bâbûr, proceeded to attack the Langâh kingdom of
A man of wide learning, Arif distinguished himself as physician and poet, but is primarily known for his work as a historian. He was in fact the author of a résumé of the Annals of al-Tabari, which he continued down to his own times; the section relating to the Orient has been published by M. J. Dë Goeje (Arif, Tabari continuatus, Leiden 1897), while R. Dozy added to his edition of the Bayan of Ibn al-Idhär (Leiden 1848-51) the fragments relating to Spain (from 291 to 320), which constitute the principal source for the reign of 'Abd al-Rahmân III (cf. E. Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. Mus., iii, 506 and index). Arif probably also wrote a work on obstetrics (K. Khalk al-Djamân wa Tadbir al-Habâlat wa 'Masu'd, a MS. of which has been preserved; see H. Derenbourg-H. J. Renaud, Ms. ar. de l’Escorial, ii/2, Paris 1914, 41-2, No. 833) dedicated to al-Hasam II, and a K. 'Uyun al-Adwa‘iya. The K. al-Awâm, of which he is certainly the author, has clearly been merged in the text of the Demonstrations of bishop Rabî’ b. Zayd (= Recemundo), in a composite text which R. Dozy published under the title of Le Calendrier de Cordoue de l’année 961, Leiden 1873 (a new edition by Ch. Pellat will appear shortly).

Bibliography: Marrâkkushi, al-Dhâyli wa ‘Tahmûla (part of this has been edited by F. Krenkow in Hespéris, 1930, 2-3); A. A. Vasiliev, Vitmaniya i Arabi, ii/2, 43 ff. (French ed. H. Grégoire and M. Canard, ii, Brussels 1950, 48 ff. with a bibliography); Pons Boigues, Ensaya, 88-99; E. Lévi-Provençal, Xe Siècle, 107; González Palencia, Literatura, index; Brockelmann, i, 134, 236, s, i, 217; Steinschneider, Hebr. Übersetzungen, § 428; idem, in, Zeit. für Mth. und Physik, 1866, 235 ff.; R. Dozy, in ZDMG, xx, Préface de Cal. de Cordoue; idem, Intro. to the ed. of Bayan, 45-63; Leclerc, Hist. de la méd. ar., i, 432; Sarton, i, 680. (Ch. Pellat)
al-ʿArid has been the great stronghold of the faith. In the myriad campaigns conducted by ʿAl Ṣurūd the people of al-ʿArid, both townsmen and nomads, have almost invariably been in the front rank. One of the main reasons the reformation began in al-ʿArid in the 12th/13th century was that this district had a highly renowned religious scholars.


(Gr. Rentz)

ʿArif, “one who knows”, a term applied to the holders of certain military or civil offices, based on competence in customary matters, “ʿarif, as opposed to knowledge of the law, which characterises the ʿṣīlīm. There may have existed in some cases de facto ʿurafaʾ in Arabia already prior to and at the time of Muḥammad (al-Ṣāḥīf, Umm, iv, 81) is said to have condemned them (Ibn Ḥanbal, vi, 133; Ibn al-ʿAṣifī, Nihāya, iii, 86; al-Sarāḥshī, Sharḥ al-Siyar al-Kabīr, i, 98; al-Baghārī, al-Taʾrifīh al-Kabīr, ii, 341). But such traditions are obviously influenced by later conditions.

During the periods of the caliphs of al-Madīnā and of the Umayyads, the ʿarifs collected taxes from the tribes and handed them over to the musādākh who was appointed by the caliph (al-Ṣāḥīf, Umm, ii, 61, 72, 74; Ḥaqqāl, iii, 56, xi, 248). No details are available concerning their appointment, except that they were chosen among the tribe concerned, though not among its chiefs.

From the time of ʿUmar I onwards there are frequent references to the office of ʿarif in connection with the military organisation of the empire and the āmūrā. Sayf b. ʿUmar claims that the armies of Kūfā were divided after the battle of Ḏaibāsīyya into numerous units (ʿirāfāʾ), with an ʿarif over each unit (al-Ṭabarī, i, 424); but most of the details concerning the functions of the ʿarifs apply to the period of Muʿawiyīya only. Each ʿarif was assigned to an ʿirāfāʾ and was responsible for the distribution of the stipend (ṣafāʾ) among its members, for which purpose he had to keep a register (dhīwān) of the payees and their families. He was furthermore responsible for security inside his own ʿirāfāʾ, and probably also had other responsibilities, such as collecting blood-money and arbitrating in disputes among the members of the ʿirāfāʾ.

The governor of the misr (or the ʿābīb al-ʿawrāʾ) was the sole authority with the power to appoint and dismiss ʿurafaʾ and it was not necessary for him to seek the approval of the caliph or of the clan; he was, however, probably obliged to choose influential persons (cf. the authorities quoted in Ṣāliḥ al-ʿAṣīrī, al-Tanṣimātida, etc., 97-100).

The military office of ʿarif continued throughout the Middle Ages; the rather scanty evidence indicates that its scope varied. At the time of al-Rashīd, for instance, the ʿarif was responsible for ten to fifteen men (al-Baladhūrī, Fawāʾid, 196), while in Spain, at the time of al-Ḥāfaẓī, he is mentioned as a commander of a hundred horsemen (Aḥḥāṣ al-Muṣṭafī, 129-30). (In the ʿIrākī and Syrian armies of the present day the ʿarif is in charge of ten men). We also hear of ʿurafaʾ of the ʿayyārān [g.v.], when it was desired to organise these into official military units (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 179; al-Maṣʿūdī, Murādī, vi, 452).

Among the civil offices whose incumbents bore the name of ʿarif we hear, in the first two centuries of the Hijra, of a special official responsible for the interests of orphans and illegitimate children. An ʿarif of dhimmīs is also occasionally mentioned. But the most frequent use of the title of ʿarif in the mediaeval Arabic-speaking Orient is to denote the head of a guild, although the term was used concurrently (or in varying hierarchical relationships) with others, such as naṣīb, raʾs or simply ḍākhīṣ, fell into disuse during the Ottoman period and in the west was usually replaced by ʿāimin [g.v.]. We find instances of ʿarif in this sense, it seems, from Umayyad times, in direct relationship with the ḩāddī, prior to the appearance of the office of muḥāṣṣib (according to Wāḥid Aḥḥāṣ al-Kudūdī, ii, 347, referring to the time of the ḩāddī Ṣumayrīy, who died about 870/900). But it is mainly from the 6th/ 7th century onwards that references to ʿarifāʾ, now in the rôle of assistants to the muḥāṣṣib, occur frequently in works designed for the use of the latter.

It is impossible to discuss the position of the head of a trade-guild in detail except in the general study of the organisation of the guilds which will appear in the article Şīm. The basic problem, in assessing the position of the ʿarif or the ʿāimin, is to know to what extent this individual, situated midway between the administrator and the guilds, was the representative of an autonomous corporation comparable to those of the mediaeval Christian west at the time of the communes, or the agent of authority supervising a guild governed from above, like the colleges of the late Empire and Byzantium. His actual position must have varied according to the relative strength of the forces concerned. In general, the ʿarif or ʿāimin figures mainly as an assistant of the muḥāṣṣib as regards the regulation, internal jurisdiction and financial obligations of the guild; he could not however discharge his duties unless he was regarded with a certain minimum of confidence by the leaders of the guild, from amongst whom he himself was chosen and who often, by acclamation, accepted or proposed him. In practice he also to a certain extent represented the guild in its dealings with authority. He organised the participation of his guild in certain festivals. He was often duplicated by a ḍhāliṣ, and exercised his powers of arbitration and jurisdiction, in the large centres, assisted by a small customary tribunal subordinate to the muḥāṣṣib. It sometimes happened that there was also an ʿāmin al-ʿumānī. The ʿāimin kept a register of the members of the guild, and admitted new members, in accordance with various initiatory rites. His function was of an eminently temporary nature. This organisation has, of course, been undermined to-day by the progress of trade-unionism on the European pattern.

Bibliography: In addition to the references quoted in the article, see Dozy, Suppl., s.v.; I. Goldziher, Abhandlungen zur Arab. Philologie, i, 21; Dī. Ẓaydān, Taʾrifīh al-Tamaddun al-Islāmī, i, 148; P. Hitti, History of the Arabs, London 1946, 328; IA, s.v. (by M. F. Köprülü); Rāshīd Barrawī, Ḥalāl Misr al-Iḥtīṣādīyya, Cairo 1948, 190-4; A. A. Duri, Taʾrifīh al-ʿIrākī al-Iḥtīṣādī, Baghdad 1953; ʿAlī, A. A., al-Tanṣimāt al-Iṭṭimāʿīyya wa l-Iḥtīṣādīyya li ʿArbaʿa, Baghdad 1953, 97-100.

For matters relating more particularly to the ʿarif and ʿāimin as technical terms of the guilds, the essential sources are the Syro-Egyptian works on hisba (Shayzārī, ed. ʿArīnī, 1946, analysed by Bernhauer, who calls him Nabrawī, in JA, 1886,
ARIF HIKMET BEY (1201-1275/1786-1859)

Arif Hikmet Bey enjoyed great fame during his lifetime, and Namik Kemal wrote that he was, with Tahir Selam, the most notable poet of the era of Mahmud II.

Bibliography: On the life of Arif Hikmet, there are numerous references in the historical and biographical works written in the second half of the 19th century; see in addition: Fatima 'Aliyye, Djeuwet Paza we samani, Istanbul 1332, passim. On his poetry: the Introduction to his Divan, written by Mehemet Ziver (Istanbul 1827); Gibb, Ottoman Poetry, iv, 350 ff.; Ibn Haldun, Mumad Kemal, Son asir turk sairleri, Istanbul 1937, iv, 620 ff., IA, s.v. (article by Fevziye Abdullah). (R. MANTRAN)

AL-ARISH, or 'the Arish of Egypt', the Rhinocorura of the ancients, town on the Mediterranean coast situated in a fertile oasis surrounded by sand, on the frontier between Palestine and Egypt. The name is found as early as the first centuries of our era in the form of Laris. According to the ordinary view, which is presupposed also in the well-known anecdote about 'Amar b. al-'ᾲṣā's expedition to Egypt, the town belonged to Egypt. The inhabitants, according to al-Yaḳūbī, belonged to the Djiđham. Ibn Hawlā speaks of two principal mosques in the town and refers to its wealth of fruit. It was at al-'Arīsh that King Baldwin I died in 1131, and al-Yaḳūbī states that the town contained a great market and many inns, and that merchants had their agents there. Al-'Arīsh was occupied by Napoleon in 1799; in the following year a treaty was concluded in the town, by which the French were forced to evacuate Egypt.

Bibliography: Butler, The Arab conquest of Egypt, 190-6; Ibn Hawkal, 95; Mūkaddasī, 54, 193; al-Yaḳūbī, 330; Yaḳūt iii, 601; Wilhelmus Tyrens, 509; Musil, Arabia Petraea, 2, Edom i, 228 ff., 304-5; J. Maspero and G. Wiet, Matériaux pour servir à la géographie de l’Égypte, 125; Capitaine Bouchard, La chute d’al-Arish, ed. and ann. by G. Wiet, Cairo 1945; Makrizī, Khiṭār, IFAO ed., iv, 24-7. (F. BUHIS*)

ARİSTOTELİS OR ARİSTOCİ, i.e., Aristotle, the 4th century B.C. Greek philosopher, the study of whose works became permanently established in the Greek philosophical schools from the first century B.C. onwards.

I. The commentators Nicolaus of Damascus (sec. I B.C.) Alexander of Aphrodisias (± A.D. 200), Themistius (sec. IV), John Philoponus and Simplicus (sec. VI) show the way in which Aristotle was understood in such late Greek teaching. With very few exceptions (cf. below), most of the writings of Aristotle eventually became known to the Arabs in translation, and a great number of the commentaries (which are partly familiar to us in the Greek original, partly only preserved in Arabic versions or even in Hebrew versions from the Arabic) were also thoroughly studied by Arabic teachers of philosophy and by Islamic philosophical writers. The oriental tradition of Aristotle reading follows his late Greek interpreters without a gap, and the medieval Western tradition depends as much on the Islamic study of Aristotle (particularly in the huge sections of Al-Fārābī, Ibn Sīnā and I. Rushdī made available to the Schoolmen) as on the late Greek and Byzantine expositions of his thought. A. is without reservation considered by most Arabic philosophers as the outstanding and unique representative of philosophy from al-Kindī (cf. Rastūl I, 103, 17 Abū Rida) to Ibn Rushdī's unqualified praise (Comm. Magnum in Arist. De anima III, 2, 433 Crawford): Aristotle is 'exemplar quod natura inventit ad demonstrandum...
ultimam perfectionem humanam*. A. is often referred to as 'the philosopher'. He is by implication 'the teacher', al-Fārābī being described as the second (al-muṭallī al-thāni). Since a full survey of Muslim Aristotelianism would virtually constitute a complete history of Islamic philosophical thought, it must be sufficient to point out the main facts and name the instruments of study at present available. In agreement with the Greek commentators Aristotle is understood as a dogmatic philosopher and as the author of a closed system. He is, moreover (again in a way not unknown to the Greek neo-Platonic teachers), supposed to have thought with Plato in all the essential tenets of his thought or, at least, to be complementary to him. The Arabs could even go as far as to credit Aristotle himself with neo-Platonic metaphysical ideas, and it is hence not altogether surprising that extracts from a lost Greek paraphrase of Plotinus and a rearrangement of a number of chapters of Proclus's *Elements of Theology* could pass as Aristotle's *Theology and Aristotle's Book of the Pure Good or Liber De Causis* respectively.

The Arabs eventually became acquainted with almost all the more important lecture-courses of Aristotle, with the exception of the *Politics*, the *Eudemian Ethics* and *Magna Moralia*. They had no translation of the *Dialogues*, which had become less popular in post-Hellenistic times. Their knowledge of Aristotle thus went far beyond the few logical writings known to the early Latin Middle Ages in Boethius's translation, and comprehended the whole late Greek syllabus (cf. also the interesting passage *Comm.*, in *Arist. Graec. inc. viii.ii. iv*). Surveys of the treatises and the ancient commentaries known are to be found in Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist*, 248-52, Flügel (347-52 in the Egyptian edition) and Ibn al-Kīfī, *Tarīkh al-Huknām*, 34-42 Lippert. It is odd that Ibn al-Kīfī op. cit., 42-8 (cf. Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'ā, *Uyun al-Anbā' fī Ṭabāhāl al-Āshbāb* 1 67 ff.) has preserved an otherwise lost but originally Greek list of Aristotle's writings ascribed to a Ptolemy, cf. A. Baumstark, *Syrisch-Arabische Biographien des Aristoteles*, Leipzig 1900, 61 ff. and P. Moraux, *Les listes anciennes des ouvrages d'Aristole*, Louvain 1951, 289 ff.

Aristotle's lecture courses did not become known to the Arabs in their entirety at once, but in stages. The first texts translated of which we are informed are, in conformity with the syllabus followed in the Syrian monastic schools and by Greek patristic writers, limited to formal logic, i.e. Porphyr's *Isagoge, Categories, De Interpretatione* and part of the *Prior Analytics*. The first translator of Aristotle whose work is known (although still unedited) is Muḥammad Ibn ʿAbdalāh, the son of the famous Ibn al-Mukaffaʾ (cf. P. Kraus, *ISO* 1933). The *Topics* and the *Posterior Analytics* and *Rhetoric* and *Poetic* (which belong to the logical writings in late Greek tradition) were soon added but it was not before the foundation of the *bays al-sikma* during the reign of al-Maʿṣūm that non-logical writings by Aristotle were made accessible as well. Details about the history of the early translations are scarce, but 'ancient' versions of the books *On the Heavens*, the *Meteorology*, the main zoological writings, the greater part of the *Metaphysics*, the *Sophistic Elenchi* and (most probably) the *Prior Analytics* have survived until the present day; whilst the so called *Theology of Aristotle* (cf. above) was also translated at this early stage. Al-Kindī's understanding of Aristotle is based on these translations (cf. M. Guidi-R. Walzer, *Studi su al-Kindī I*, Uno scritto introduttivo allo studio di Aristotele, Rome 1940).

Humayn b. Ishāk and his son Ishāk and other associates of this renowned centre of translations of philosophical, medical and generally scientific Greek works produced a great number of partially improved and partially first translations of Aristotle. The translators sometimes worked from the Greek original, sometimes from older or recent intermediate Syriac translations. The better ones were eager to establish a Greek text before they started upon their task. We eventually find a well established tradition of Aristotle reading in the 10th century, in Bābylon, upheld by Christian Arabic philosophers such as Abū Bishr Mattā and Yahyā b. Ḍalī and others who considered themselves, probably correctly, as late descendants of the Greek philosophical school of Alexandria. The syllabus which they followed was partly based on earlier translations and partly on translations of their own (made from older or recent Syriac translations), since most of the representatives of this school were no longer able to read Greek. Al-Fārābī's acquaintance with Aristotle presupposes the achievement of this circle (his treatise *On Aristotle's Philosophy* will be published by Muḥsin Mahdī), and all the subsequent Islamic philosophers equally base themselves on the same corpus of translations which had eventually emerged (after an activity of almost 200 years) in Bābylon and spread from there all over the Islamic world, from Persia to Spain. The work of these translators seems to have surpassed even Ibn Rushd in accuracy and knowledge of textual variants. These Arabic versions of Aristotle are certainly not without importance for the establishment of the original Greek text, and they deserve the same attention as a Greek papyrus or an early Greek MS. or the variants recorded in Greek commentators. They help us moreover to get a more common sense view of the history of texts in general.

The Greek commentators became known to the Arabs together with the text of Aristotle. We meet their influence in different forms: Full texts comprising the lemmata of the Aristotelian groundwork, terse paraphrases by Themistius and his like, shorter surveys of the argument of individual treatises, and marginal notes in manuscripts which quote sentences and views taken from the larger works. Not many of the translations of these Greek commentaries have survived, since they were not used by the Arab successors of the Greek Aristotelian scholars who wrote commentaries and monographs in their own name. Of these, again, not very many have come down to us in the original text. Not one of Al-Fārābī's commentaries on Aristotelian treatises has yet been traced in any library. Ibn Bābja's elaborate summaries of works of Aristotle are still unedited. A certain number of Ibn Rushd's shorter and more elaborate commentaries are also known, whilst more survive only in Hebrew and Latin translations.

A list of the works of Aristotle (mentioning the more important spurious ones as well) which are at present available for study is following.

RNAJOTALIS
(without the marginal notes) by A. Badawi, Mantufr
Aristu, 1-55, 307 f., 673 ff. Ibn Rushd's Middle Commentary is available (together with a critical
text of the groundwork) in an edition by M. Bouyges,
Bibliotheca Arabica Scholasticorum, tom. IV, Beirut
1932.


Topics: First editions of Abû Ughmân ad-Dimashqî and 'Ibrahim b. 'Abd Allah's translations and later scholars, marginal comments published by A. Badawi, op. cit., 407-733.


2 Fragments of lost works


3 Books attributed to Aristotle in Arabic tradition.

De pomo (Kitâb al-Tuffâha): J. Kraemer, Das arabische Original des 'Liber de pomo' (Köprülü 1608), Studi Orientali in onore di G. Levi della Vida, Rome


Liber de causis, based on Proclus' Elements of Theology, ed. O. Bardenhewer, Freiburg i. Br. 1882 (with German translation); new edition by A. Badawi, Islāmica 19, Cairo 1955.


ARITHMETIC [see HISĀR]
ARKUSH — ARMENIA

... stones prove its antiquity. Arcos declared for ʿAbd al-Rahmān I when the latter undertook his campaign against Yūsuf al-Fihār; it was subsequently sacked by ʿAbd al-Wāḥīd al-Miḵnāš, leader of the most important and most dangerous Berber revolt against the first Umayyad amīr. During the Arab–Turkish conflict at the end of the 3rd/9th century in the region of Seville, the rebel castillos of Arcos, Jerez and Medina Sidonia were assaulted by the troops of the amīr ʿAbd Allāh, Yūsuf b. Tāshāfīn, stopped at Arcos on his way to Zallākka. The Almohad caliph Yaʿqūb al-Mansūr, in his campaign of 586/1190 against Portugal, concentrated his troops at Arcos de la Frontera; from there he dispatched his cousin al-Sayyid Yaʿqūb b. Abī Ḥaṣṣ against Silves, while he himself proceeded to lay siege to Torres Novas and Tomar. Ferdinand III took possession of Arcos in 648/1250, after having captured Granada; its Muslim inhabitants rose in revolt in 659/1261, and it was reduced to submission by Alfonso the Learned in 666/1264. In 739/1339, when the Marinid amīr Abu ʿl-Ḥasan undertook his Andalusian campaign, which resulted in his defeat at the battle of the Salado or Tarifa, the Andalusian Councils routed the troops of prince Abū Mālik a short distance from Arcos, and put him to death on the banks of the Barbate, which marked the frontier between the two countries. Up to 856/1452, the Moors of Granada encroached on the territory of Arcos, which for two centuries was a frontier town, kept constantly on a war footing and thus deserving its name of Arcos de la Frontera.

Bibliography: Idristi, Arabic text 174, trans. 308; E. Lévi-Provençal, La Péninsule thérifique, Arabic text 14, trans. 20; Dic. geog. de España, 1957, ii, 637; A. Huici, Las Grandes batallas de la Reconquista, 336. (A. Huici Miranda)

ARMAN [see ARMENIA].

ARMENIA, Armenia, a country of Hither Asia.

I. Geographical Outline.

Armenia is the central and most elevated part of Hither Asia. Encompassed between two mountain chains, the Pontic chain to the north and the chain of the Taurus to the south, it lies between Asia Minor to the west of the Euphrates, Ādābarbāyqān and the region south-west of the Caspian (on a level with the confluence of the Kurr [Kura] and the Araxes) to the east, the Pontic regions to the north-west, the Caucasian (from which the line of the Russian frontier and the Kurr separates it) to the north, and the plain of Mesopotamia to the south (area of the Upper Tigris). To the south of Lake Van, Gordjāk (the ancient Gordyene, now Bohtan) and the land of the Hakkari Kurds (the region of Dīlamanerk and Amadiye) form geographically a part of Armenia, although they have not always been subject to the Armenians. Armenia thus embraces almost the whole of the territory extending between long. 37° and 49° East and lat. 37.5° and 41.5° North. Its area can be estimated at about 300,000 sq. kms.

The geological framework of the land consists of mountains having an archean core and covered with sedimentary strata and tertiary deposits, but vast volcanic masses and lava flows of more recent date have modified its structure. High plains extend between the mountain ranges and vary in altitude from 800 to 2,000 metres (Erzėrûm: 1,880 m.; Kars: 1,800 m.; Mōg in the Murād Sû: 1,400 m.; Erzindjān: 1,300 m.; Erivan: 890 m.). The eruptions have produced a whole series of volcanic cones which are among the highest peaks in the land: Ararat (5,195 m.) to the south of the Araxes; the Sipān (4,176 m.), already known to al-Baladîhurl (ed. De Goeje, 196, Cf. Zeitschr. für arm. Philol., ii, 67, 162; Le Strange, 183); the Bingöl dāg (3,060 m.) to the south of Erzerûm; the Khorīdāg (3,550 m.), the Ala-dāg (3,320 m.), and the Alaghūz (4,180 m.) which forms to the north an almost completely isolated massifs.

Armenia is the cradle of great rivers: the Euphrates, the Tigris, the Araxes and the Kurr (Kura). The Euphrates is formed through the confluence of two branches, the northern branch or Kara Sû (Ar. Furât) and the southern branch or Murād Sû (Ar. Arsans) which come from the Armenian plateau; the Tigris is born in the border range of the South called the Armenian Taurus. While the system of the Tigris and the Euphrates irrigates the lands inclined towards the Persian Gulf, the Araxes (Ar. al-Rass, [q.v.]) which comes from the Bingöl dāg, waters the lands turned towards the Caspian Sea and, before flowing into it, joins the Kurr which, with its parallel prolongation, the river Rion, a tributary of the Black Sea, separates the Caucasian sharply from Armenia. The Euphrates and the Araxes cut deeply into the Armenian plateau and these breaches facilitate the drainage of water with the result that Armenia has but a small number of lakes, Lake Van (1,590 m.) called in Arabic the lake of Khīlät and Ardījāh [q.v.] and the Gōk Čāy [q.v.] or Sevanga (2,000 m.) mentioned already in 1340 by al-Mustawfī, and several smaller lakes.

The orographical and hydrographical systems of Armenia are such that the land is divided into a number of basins separated the one from the other by high mountains, a fact that helps to bring about the feudal disunion in which the Armenians have always lived.

The climate of Armenia is very severe. The winter lasts regularly for eight months on the plateau, the short and very hot summer rarely exceeds two months; it is very dry and crops have need of artificial irrigation. The region of the plains along the Araxes enjoys, however, a more favourable climate. The snow-line in the mountains of the South lies at 3,300 m., but rises to 4,000 m. in eastern Armenia.

II. History.

I. — Armenia before Islam.

Armenia is thought to have been inhabited towards the 17th century B.C. by an Asiatic people, the Hurrites, who were neither of Semitic nor of Indo-European origin; this people was organised in the first half of the second millennium by a conquering Indo-European aristocracy and later became subject to the Hittite empire and thence, after to the Assyrians. In the 9th century B.C. a people closely related to the Hurrites, the Urartians, also called Kūhlīd, established there the powerful kingdom of Urartu (the biblical Ararat), of which Lake Van formed the centre. This kingdom, which had to fight against the Assyrians, attained its apogee in the 8th century, but was destroyed towards the middle of the 7th century by the Cimmerians and Scythian wave that flowed over Hither Asia. During and after these changes an Indo-European people of the Thraco-Phrygian family, a branch, probably, of the Phrygians whose state had just been destroyed by the Cimmerians, came from the West and conquered Urartu. These new inhabitants were called Armenians by the Achaemenid Persians (Greek: ʾArrēmwn), a name of
which the meaning and origin are still unexplained, and the region became known in the course of time as Armenia. The Armenians, however, call themselves Haik (from the name of the hero who led the Armenian people to the conquest) and refer to their land as Hayastan.

The Armenians, save in the time of Tigranes II (Tigranes the Great), have never played a dominant rôle in Hither Asia. The reasons for this were, to a large degree, the feudal régime favoured by the geographical nature of the country and itself a source of internal divisions, and also the proximity of powerful empires. From the time of their settlement in Armenia the Armenians were vassals of the Medes and then of the Achaemenid Persians who placed the land under the control of satraps. These latter, taking advantage of the troubles caused by the death of Alexander the Great, became veritable kings who afterwards recognised the suzerainty of the Seleucids. When Antiochus III was defeated by the Romans at Magnesia (189 B.C.), the two "strategi" who governed Armenia made themselves independent, took the title of king and formed two kingdoms, the one, Artaxias, in Great Armenia or Armenia proper and the other, Zariadris, in Little Armenia (Sophe-Arzane). Great Armenia fell afterwards under the suzerainty of the Arsacids. In the first century B.C. a descendant of Artaxias, Tigranes the Great, threw off the Parthian yoke, dethroned the king of Sophene and united all Armenia under his sceptre; having achieved Armenian unity, he established at the expense of the Parthians and the Seleucids a vast Armenian empire and played an important political rôle. After him, however, Armenia was reduced more and more to the role of a buffer state between the two empires, the Arsacid Parthian and the Roman, each of which desired to impose a king of its choice, internal troubles furnishing a perpetual pretext for intervention and encroachments. In general, from the year 11 A.D. down to the fall of the Arsacids in 224, it was, for the greater part of the time, cadets of the Arsacid family who ruled in Armenia, now supporting their relatives in their wars against Rome, and now accepting the Roman protectorate. When the Arsacid Parthians were replaced by the Sâsdâns, Armenia, continuing under the rule of Arsacid kings and embracing Christianity at the close of the 3rd century, became once more a new apple of discord between the two empires which in the end reached an agreement to share the weak vassal state. By a partition which took place about 390 Persia received the eastern portion, four-fifths of Armenia, over which Khosraw III reigned with Dwln (Ar. Dabil) as capital, while Rome kept the western part where Arshak III ruled at Erzindjian. After the death of Arshak the Romans (Byzantines) entrusted to a council (consul) the administration of the land. The Persian part of the country or Persarmenia retained its national princes until 428-9 and was thereafter administered by a Persian marashân residing at Dwln. According to the Armenian historian Sebeos, the most important native source for the period extending from the 5th to the middle of the 7th century, the Persian domination never succeeded in implanting itself solidly in Armenia, all the more since the Sâsdâns persecuted Armenian Christianity. The Armenian lords (the nakharar) availed themselves of every opportunity to shake off the detested yoke of the fire-worshippers and in their quarrels with the Persian marashâns invoked frequently the aid of their co-religionists in Byzantine Armenia, a proce-
According to the evidence of the Arab historians and geographers (see especially al-Ya'qubi, 194; al-Baladghuri, 197-8; al-Tabarí, i, 2674-5, 2806-7; Ibn al-Aṣfir, ii, 65-6), the greatest invasion of Armenia, the one which for the first time reduced the country to effective Arab control, occurred during the caliphate of ʿUthmān towards the end of 24/645-6. Muʿāwiyah, the governor of Syria, charged the same general Ḥabīb b. Maslama, who had already distinguished himself in the battles of Syria and Mesopotamia, with the conquest of Armenia. The general marched first against Theodosiopolis (Armen. Karin, Ar. Kâlıkâla, now Erzerûm), the capital of Byzantine Armenia and took the town after a short siege. He inflicted a heavy defeat on a great Byzantine army which, reinforced by Khazar and Alan auxiliary troops, had moved forward to stop him on the Euphrates. He turned next towards the south-east in the direction of Lake Van and received the submission of the local princes of Akhlat (q.v.) and Moks. Ardîsh on the north-eastern shore of Lake Van also yielded to the Arab troops. Ḥabīb then marched to besiege Dvin, the centre of Persarmenia, which likewise capitulated after a few days. He concluded a treaty of peace and guarantee with the town of Tiflis, but returned for the recognition of Arab suzerainty and the payment of a capitation tax (díżya). At the same time, Salmân b. Rabīʿa with his army of Irākī troops, subjugated Arrān (Albania) and conquered its capital Barjīlaʿa.

The Armenian tradition differs from the Arab tradition in the matter of dates as well as in various details. On one point alone, the direction given to the great Arab invasion, is there complete agreement in Sebeos and al-Baladghuri, as a comparison of the routes indicated in each of these authors reveals.

According to the Armenian historians, an army entered Armenia in 642, penetrated to the region of Airarat, conquered the capital Dvin and then left the country by the same route, carrying off 35,000 prisoners. In the next year the Muslims made, from Ardîsh on the north-eastern shore of Lake Van also yielded to the Arab troops. Ḥabīb then marched to besiege Dvin, the centre of Persarmenia, which likewise capitulated after a few days. He concluded a treaty of peace and guarantee with the town of Tiflis, but returned for the recognition of Arab suzerainty and the payment of a capitation tax (díżya). At the same time, Salmân b. Rabīʿa with his army of Irākī troops, subjugated Arrān (Albania) and conquered its capital Barjīlaʿa.
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The Armenians opposed this demand. According to the Armenian historians, an army entered Armenia in 642, penetrated to the region of Airarat, conquered the capital Dvin and then left the country by the same route, carrying off 35,000 prisoners. In the next year the Muslims made, from Ardîsh on the north-eastern shore of Lake Van also yielded to the Arab troops. Ḥabīb then marched to besiege Dvin, the centre of Persarmenia, which likewise capitulated after a few days. He concluded a treaty of peace and guarantee with the town of Tiflis, but returned for the recognition of Arab suzerainty and the payment of a capitation tax (díżya). At the same time, Salmân b. Rabīʿa with his army of Irākī troops, subjugated Arrān (Albania) and conquered its capital Barjīlaʿa. The Armenians opposed this demand. According to the Armenian historians, an army entered Armenia in 642, penetrated to the region of Airarat, conquered the capital Dvin and then left the country by the same route, carrying off 35,000 prisoners. In the next year the Muslims made, from Ardîsh on the north-eastern shore of Lake Van also yielded to the Arab troops. Ḥabīb then marched to besiege Dvin, the centre of Persarmenia, which likewise capitulated after a few days. He concluded a treaty of peace and guarantee with the town of Tiflis, but returned for the recognition of Arab suzerainty and the payment of a capitation tax (díżya). At the same time, Salmân b. Rabīʿa with his army of Irākī troops, subjugated Arrān (Albania) and conquered its capital Barjīlaʿa.
The first century of Arab domination in Armenia was, despite the destructive wars, an era of national and literary efflorescence for the country. And yet Muslim rule, in the time of the Umayyads and still less in the time of the 'Abbāsids, under whom the hand of the Arab governors weighed heavily on Armenia, was not able to implant itself solidly in the land. Disturbances and rebellions were therefore frequent. The greatest and most dangerous insurrection against the Arab yoke occurred in the reign of al-Mutawakkil. The Caliph sent his most skilful general, the Turk Bughā the Elder, with a strong army which, after sanguinary and desperate battles in the year 237-8/851-2, succeeded in overcoming the rebellion. The entire nobility was then carried off into captivity. Al-Mutawakkil renounced his hostile policy only when he had need of his troops to fight the Byzantines and in order to prevent a new uprising fomented by the latter. He therefore freed the captive nakhkārār and recognised (247/861-2) as the chief prince of Armenia the Bagratid Ashōt (Ar. ʿAġūt) who had already rendered to the Arab cause most important services. During the twenty-five years of his rule as the prince of princes Ashōt won the affection of all his subjects as well as that of the local lords to such a degree that, on the request of these latter, the Caliph al-Muʿtaʾṣīdīd conferred on him in 273/886-7 the title of king. He received the same distinction from the emperor, who concluded with him at the same time a treaty of alliance. The relations of Ashōt with the Caliph were never troubled; he paid his tribute regularly, but administered and governed his possessions in his own fashion; the native princes likewise acquired during his reign an almost independent status.

After the death of Ashōt (862-90) there reigned his eldest son, Smbat I (Ar. ʿSambât), a man indeed of heroic character, but one who was in no wise capable of withstanding his external foes, the Shaybānids of Diyar Bakr and the Sājdīs of ʿAḏẖarābāḏyān. He was unsuccessful in his conflict with the Shaybānids. Nevertheless, a little later in 286/899 the intervention of the Caliph al-Muʿṭadīdīd brought to an end the Shaybānīdomination and delivered the Armenian provinces from these invaders. The Sājdī Afrāhīn, however, in his thrust towards the west and the north menaced Armenia unceasingly. The situation of Smbat became still more difficult in the time of the astute Yusuf, the brother and successor of Ashōt (d. 288/901). Yusuf understood that above all else he must draw to his side the Ardzruni family which had become, since the reign of Ashōt I, the most powerful princely house next to that of the Bagratids. About 900 he even conferred the royal crown on the head of this family, Gagik, the lord of Vaspurakan, a distinction that the royal crown on the head of this family, Gagik, the lord of Vaspurakan, a distinction that the means of the Caliph al-Muʿṭadīdīd renewed in 304/916 and 306/919. Yusuf, from the year 910, ravaged Armenia in the course of his expeditions and at length, in the fortress of Kapoīt, besieged Smbat, now abandoned by all the princes. In 913 (according to Adontz in 911) the king of Armenia surrendered to his adversary, who, after having inflicted on him a year of imprisonment, had him put to death by cruel tortures (914; according to Adontz 912). Anarchy ensued in Armenia after the fall of Smbat I. His vigorous son, Ashōt II, the "Iron King" (915-29), succeeded in recovering the throne with the support of Byzantine arms; he was at first thwarted by Yusuf who raised against him one of his cousins, but Yusuf, seeing that Ashōt was getting the better of his foes, granted him recognition and sent him a royal crown (about 917). After the capture of Yusuf, who had risen in revolt, by the troops of the Caliph in 919, his successor Subūk (Subuk) allied himself with Ashōt II in order to drive out the Caliph's forces and bestowed on him the title of Ṣāḥḥān Ṣāḥḥāh, a title which recognised as belonging to Ashōt suzerainty over the principalities of Vaspurakan, Iberia, Georgia and other regions. Ashōt II raised the Bagratid power to its apogee and ruled over the greatest part of central and northern Armenia where Smbat had already considerably enlarged the territory of this family. His reign ended in tranquillity after a reconciliation of the Armenian princes and the nominal recognition of his supremacy by his rivals, notably the Ardzruni. Dvin, however, remained in the hands of Yusuf's lieutenant.

In southern Armenia the Ardzruni (see above) ruled over a less extensive territory (Vaspurakan, with Van as the capital). Apart from these two great kingdoms there still existed a series of smaller principalities which for the most part recognised only nominally the suzerainty of the Bagratids. Moreover, in the south, in the region of the Apahunik and Lake Van, there were several Arab emirates, independent but isolated from the Caliphate. The history of Armenia is not therefore conterminous with that of the Bagratids.

Throughout the entire reign of Ashōt II and for much of the reign of his successor Abas (929-53) the war between Byzantium and the Arabs continued without interruption and was at times fought out in Armenia. The Greeks operated in northern Armenia as well as in southern Armenia against the Armeno-Arab emirates of Lake Van which, according to the Byzantine sources, were compelled to submit to the emperor Romanus Lecapenus (919-45). The last Sājdī amirs of ʿAḏẖarābāḏyān retained hardly any influence in Armenia. The Ḥamdānīs, who were the masters of Diyar Bakr, bordering on Armenia, and were in constant war against the Byzantines, succeeded for a time in exacting from all Armenia (according to the historians Ibn Ẓāfir and Ibn al-ʿArāk) a recognition of their sovereignty and established a more effective dominion over the Armeno-Arab emirates in the region of Lake Van. These emirates later recognized the suzerainty of Bāḏr, the founder of the Marwānī dynasty [q.v.] of Diyar Bakr, and of his successors.

After the Ḥamdānīs, it was the Musāfīrīds [q.v.] of ʿAḏẖarābāḏyān who exacted from the princes of Armenia a recognition of their suzerainty, imposed tribute on them (see Ibn Hawqāl, 354, for the year 955-6) and became the masters of Dvin. Ashōt III (952-77) transferred the official capital of the Bagratid kingdom to the little fortress of Anl [q.v.] which he and his successor Smbat II, by erecting there magnificent buildings, transformed into a pearl of the Orient. It is during his reign that the territory of Kars was raised to the rank of a kingdom for the benefit of a prince of the Bagratid house and that Byzantium, moreover, in 968 annexed the region of Taron, the fief of another Bagratid.
Smbat II (977–89) and his brother Gagik I (990–1020) ruled with vigour and success but, in consequence ... as far as the Armenian–Byzantine borders. Although this thrust was possibly not, as is sometimes alleged, the cause of the defeat of the Seljukid dynasty by Byzantium in 1064 after the Seljukid invasion; it is plain in part the success of the Seljukids in Armenia. 

Thereafter the greater part of Armenia was drawn to Constantinople and was obliged to cede the Caliph, but converted to Islam, like the celebrated amir 'Ali al-Arman who died in 863, not long after he had been named governor of Armenia and Azerbaijan. Armenians were also to be found in Egypt in the army of the Tulunids. It is above all in Byzantine territory, however, that the immigration was important and contributed, in the second part of the 11th century, to the repopulation of the lands in Cilicia and northern Syria reconquered by Byzantium and evacuated by the Muslim inhabitants. The geographer Mu'addas (BG4 iii, 189) states that in his time the Amanus was peopled with Armenians. Asophik tells us that under the pontificate of Khalk I (972–92) there were Armenian bishops at Antioch and Tarsus. During the course of the 11th century the role of the Armenians in the defense of these regions (Cappadocia, Commagene, northern Syria and even Mesopotamia, e.g., at Edessa) was considerable; numerous Armenian officers acted as governors of towns for Byzantium and, profiting from the troubles caused by the first Seljuk invasions, founded Armenian principalities (see ARMENIA). During the same period Armenians were to be found with the Fatimids of Egypt. Following the Armenian Badr al-Djamali [q.v.] who, after being a slave, had become commander of the Egyptian troops in Syria and then rose to the rank of wazir at Cairo (1073/94), there entered into Egypt, first, the Armenians with whom he had already surrounded himself, and later all those whom he summoned there and who took service in the army and were appointed in the administration. These Armenians furnished to the Fatimid Caliphate a number of wazirs, of whom one, Bahram [q.v.] remained a Christian. The introduction into Egypt of an important Armenian population led to the creation of numerous Armenian monasteries and churches and also of an Armenian catholicosate. The Armenians were regarded with favour by some of the Fatimid Caliphs. See on this subject M. Canard, Un vizir chrétien à l’époque fatimite, in AIEO, Algiers, xii (1954) and Notes sur les Arméniens en Égypte à l’époque fatimite. Ibid., xiii (1955). Cf. J. Laurent, Byzance et les Turcs Seldjoucides dans l’Asie Occidentale jusqu’en 1081, in Annales de l’Est, 28th year, fasc. 2, Paris, 1931 (1939). (M. Canard).

II(b). The Armenians under the Turks and the Mongols.

While these last events were taking place, the Turkomans, before long led by the Seljukid dynasty, were conquering Muslim Iran as far as the Armenian–Byzantine borders. Although this thrust was probably not, as is sometimes alleged, the cause of
the first losses of Armenian territory to Byzantium (J.A., 1954, 275-9 and 1956, 129-34) it
nevertheless constituted a tragedy in the middle of the 5th/11th century. After a
period of Turkomän ravages, the battle of Manaz-gird (1071) [see Malazerd] marked the end of
Byzantine supremacy, and the Turkomans settled in Armenia, Cappadocia and throughout most of
Asia Minor. The Armenian territories on the borders of Ağharbâyqân were incorporated in the Saldjûkîk empire, while those in the centre and west took shape as
different principalities: that of Akhlat [q.v.], founded by a Saldjûkî officer and vassal, Sukanmân
al-Kutbî, who assumed the ambitious title of Shâh-i Arman; that of Anî [q.v.], assigned by the Saldjûkîs
to a branch of the former Kurdish dynasty of Arrân, the Shâddâdîs (V. Minorsky, Studies in Caucasian
History, 1953, 79-106); and finally the autonomous
principalities of Asia Minor, where there remained an
ecclesiastical organisation, monasteries, some cultural
activity (cf. for example S. Der Nersessian, Armenia and the Byzantine Empire, Harvard 1947, 133),
and large Armenian towns, such as Erzindjan and
Erzerum. The only dramatic events which occurred
were due to special causes. There was first of all,
about 1280, the massacre of the Armenians of
Djabal Sassûn, as a result of the disorders among
the almost autonomous Turkomans and Kurds of
that region, and especially, the massacre of part of
the Christian population of Edessa, at the time of the
recapture of the city from the Franks by Zangi in
1144 and Nûr al-Dîn in 1146.

Fundamentally, in fact, it was not for religious but
political reasons that the Armenians at different
times suffered at the hands of their Muslim masters.
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were still to be fought on Armenian soil, and part of the Armenians of Adzhbarbaydjan were later deported as military security measure to Isfahan and elsewhere. Semi-autonomous seigniories survived, with varying fortunes, in the mountains of Karabagh, to the north of Adzhbarbaydjan, but came to an end in the 18th century.

**Bibliography:** (in addition to the general works): the general sources, in all languages, for the history of the Near East from the 11th to the 15th centuries will be briefly mentioned here; a study of these will be found, with regard to the period of the Crusades, in *Syrie du Nord* mentioned below. Special attention will be drawn here to the not inconsiderable number of 12th and 13th century Armenian historians, especially Matthew of Edessa and the anonymous “Royal Historian” used in the works of Alishan mentioned below (an edition of the text has been prepared by Skinner), and to the historians of Great Armenia at the time of the Mongol conquest; in connexion with the latter, the *History of the Nations of the Archers*, for long attributed to Malachi the Monk, has been restored by its editor-translators R. P. Blake and R. N. Frye (*Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, xii, 1949) to its real author Gregory of Akanc. For the last two centuries of the Middle Ages, only one noteworthy Armenian chronicle exists, that of Thomas of Medzoph, part of which has been made accessible in French by F. Nève, *Exposé des guerres de Tamerlan* etc., Brussels 1880; for the Safavid period, Arakel of Tabriz, trans. by M. F. Brosset, *Collection d’Auteurs arméniens*, i.


II(c) Ottoman Armenia.

The Ottomans conquered western Armenia in the last decade of the 14th century, under Bayezid I, and eastern Armenia in the following two centuries under Mehmed II and Selim I. They eventually became masters of the whole of Armenia, Great and Little (separated *grosso modo* by the upper reaches of the Euphrates), except the Khirate of Erivan (or rather Erevan), in Persian and Turkish Revan, a region containing the patriarchal seat of Echmiadzin (in Turkish *Ul Kilsa*) and relics of the ancient capitals of the Kings of Armenia. This region, situated in Transcausia on the middle Araxes, for long disputed by Turks and Persians, was ceded by the treaty of Türkmen-Çay (1 February 1828) to the Russians, who have since created from it the Soviet Federal Republic of Armenia. In the south of this region is situated Mt. Ararat (in Turkish *Agri Dagh*, in Armenian Masis), on which western expeditions periodically seek and claim to discover the wreckage of Noah’s Ark. It is the point where the Turkish, Persian and Russian frontiers meet.

The province of Kar on the other hand, ceded to the Russians in 1878, was recovered by Turkey in 1918.

Ottoman administrative terminology—especially with regard to the provinces of reforms promised to the European Powers—adopted the term *wilâyât-i sülle* “the six provinces (sülle, populated by Armenians)” : *van*, *Van*, *Bitlis* (alternating with *Mug*), *Erzerum*, *Harput*, *Sivas* and *Diyarbekir*. No account was taken by this convention of the *sandjakh* of Marash, forming part of the former *wilâyât* of Aleppo, or of the former *wilâyât* of Adana (*Cilicia* or Little Armenia in the strict sense of the term).

Turkish domination did not result in the assimilation of the Armenians, who were preserved by the difference of religion. Many Armenians, especially among the men and the Catholics, adopted Turkish as their second, or even as their first language.

After the capture of Constantinople an important change occurred in the life of the Armenian community. Up to 1453 it had at its head three patriarchs *or katoghikos* (katholikos): (1) the patriarch of Echmiadzin, restored to this monastery since 1441; (2) the patriarch of Sis (now Kozan) in Cilicia, who had resided in this town since 1292 and did not recognise (1); (3) the patriarch of Aghtamar, (a small island in the Lake Van), since 1113. The Armenian bishop of Jerusalem also bore the title and ornaments of a patriarch.

After the conquest of Byzantium, Mehmed II, true to his political views, summoned to Istanbul the Armenian bishop of Brusa, Joachim, and made him a patriarch with the same prerogatives the patriarch of the Greek Orthodox Church. In this way the Armenian “nation” (Turkish *miillet*) was formed. A council of the clergy and a council of the laity assisted the patriarch who was elected from the “prelates” superior to the ordinary bishops and called markhassa, properly “saint priest” (from the Syriac *marhassa*; the etymology through the Turko-Arabic *murabkhâsa* must be rejected). The residence of the patriarch of Constantinople is in the Kum Kapu quarter.

From then on on a better footing, the Armenians succeeded in occupying an important position in Turkey, notably as bankers (*sârrâd*, properly “money-changers”). Ubicini (*Lettres sur la Turquie*, 1734, ii, 311-14) gives interesting details about the position of genuine strength which they had achieved in their dealings with the provincial pashas and the Ottoman government in general. They were also merchants (oft cloth merchants) and active caravan leaders who maintained connections between Istanbul, Moldavia, Poland (*Lemberg, Łwów*), Nuremberg, Bruges and Antwerp. As artisans they were architects, house-painters, manufacturers of silk stuffs and gunpowder, and printers (Armenian printing-press at Istanbul in 1679). Like the Jews they were exempt from military service until the revolution of the Young Turks.

The most important events in the history of Ottoman Armenia are:

1) The religious schism, which resulted in the formation of a (Uniate) Catholic Community and internal persecution (Protestant propaganda played a less important part);

2) The revolutionary activity;

3) The repression and massacres.

Roman propaganda had been sporadically effective in Armenia since the 17th century. It was resumed by the ecclesiastical council of Florence (1438-45) and, in 1587, by the famous Pope Sixtus Quintus, among the Armenians of Syria, but found its greatest driving force in Mechitar (born at Sivas in 1675, died Venice 1749). Converted to Catholicism by the Jesuits, he
succeeded in founding a remarkable order which bore his name. The Republic of Venice ceded in 1717 to the Mechitarists the small island of Saint-Lazare, near Lido, where their monastery was installed in an old leper hospital. After the death of Mechitar a schism occurred, and a certain number of clergy retired to Trieste and then to Vienna (1810). There was also a subsidiary branch of the order at Padua which, transferred to Paris, continued to exist there for twenty years. The Mechitarists possessed rich libraries (numerous oriental MSS.), and printing-presses; from these they published historical and philological works which gave a place to Turkish as well as Armenian studies.

Even during the lifetime of Mechitar the overzealousness of Catholic propaganda, which was gaining ground in the richest and most enlightened section of the Armenian community, provoked a lively reaction among the patriarchs of the Gregorian persuasion. The latter were supported by the Ottoman government, which regarded with disfavour these “Frankish plots”.

There were martyrs among the Armenian Catholics who refused to abjure their faith, as in the case of Der Gomidas or Don Cosme and two of his followers (1707). He was the grandfather of Cosme Comidas of Carugnano, an interpreter at the Spanish embassy and author of a Turkish grammar in Italian (Rome, 1794). The Catholics suffered further persecutions in 1759, and even during the reign of the reforming Sultan Mahmoud II, in 1815 and 1828. They found allies, on the other hand, in the French ambassadors and the Jesuits. Thus the imprudent M. de Ferriol secured from the Porte the banishment of the patriarch Avedis, who was hostile to the Catholics, after which the latter was abducted and incarcerated in the Bastille. He died in 1712 at Paris in the house of Francois Pétis de la Croix. The Jesuits at the same period secured the closure of the Armenian printing-press.

In 1830 General Guilleminot, who also was a French ambassador, secured for the Catholics a separate ecclesiastical organisation, and in 1866 Mgr. Hassan, already patriarchal vicar of Constantinople, assumed the title of Catholic-Armenian Patriarch of Cilicia for all the Ottoman empire.

To what cause are the Armenian revolts to be attributed? Certainly not to utilitarian considerations. “The Armenians”, wrote the impartial Ubicini (op. cit. ii, 347), “are of all the nations subject to the Porte, the one which has most interests in common with the Turks and is the most directly interested in preserving them”. See also Victor Béard, La Politique du Sultan (Abdulhamid II), 1897, 149. In the official texts, and when compared with the Greeks and Macedonians, the Armenians were termed millet-i sîdîka, “the loyal nation”.

The causes of Armenian discontent were as follows:

1) The vexatious and troublesome behaviour of, and the acts of brigandage committed by, the Kurdish and Circassian immigrants.

2) The negligence, exactions and extortions of Ottoman officials.

3) Russian incitement, especially from 1912 onwards.

4) A keen love of independence in a generally courageous people which pride itself on being one of the most ancient known, and which still looks back nostalgically to the short periods during which it succeeded in maintaining its autonomy. Certain districts even succeeded in remaining virtually independent; for example the unconquerable mountainers of Zeytun (now Suleymanli, in the present wilâyet of Maraş), Haçin (now Saimbeyli, in the present wilâyet of Seyhan) and Sasun (Kabilcoz, in the present wilâyet of Siirt).

5) The activities of the revolutionary committees, sometimes particularly audacious, as in the case of the armed attack in broad daylight by 24 Armenians, and the siege of the Ottoman Bank at Galata (26 August 1896). The extremist or terrorist revolutionary parties were called Tashnakdsyun. There existed a more moderate committee, the Hincak, formed in 1867 at Paris by Avedis Nazarbek, an Armenian from the Caucasus.

All these factors served as reason or excuse for a violent campaign of repression which took the form of mass deportations or massacres. With the connivance or at the instance of the authorities there occurred, among a people who were by nature kindly and even chivalrous, a long and contagious outburst of religious fanaticism and racial hatred. The calvary of the Armenians in Turkey began with the Erzerum affair (25 February 1890), went through numerous crises, notably in 1895-6 and in 1909 (Adana), and reached its culmination during the First World War, in 1915, during the systematic suppression of the Armenians organised by the government of the Young Turks.

Armeno-Turkish war of 1920. — After the collapse in 1917 of the Bolshevised Russian front, which in Turkey passed to the west of Trebizond and Erzincan, it was in the main the Armenian corps formed by the government of Transcaucasia which had to contain the Turkish counter-thrust. It was defeated and driven from Turkish territory (Turkey concluded the treaty of Batum with the Armenian Republic on 4 June 1918). In 1920 Mustafa Kemal Pasha, in order to put an end to a state of undeclared war, appointed General Kâzım Karabekir Pasha, commanding the 15th army corps, to the command of the north-east front. The troops of the “United Armenian Republic” of Tashnakdsyun allegiance, were again defeated, and the treaty of Alexandroupolis (to Turkish Gümrü, now Leninakan) of 2 December 1920 confirmed the gains won by the Turks, the most important of which was the recovery of Karș.

Bibliography: As far as is known, no works specially devoted to Turkish Armenia exist in any western language (the works in Armenian are not accessible to me). Such information as exists, often bearing the imprint of a strongly partisan bias, is to be gleaned here and there in the general works on Turkey. The following should be mentioned: Amédée Jaubert, Voy. en Arm. et en Perse, 1821; Comte de Cholet, Arm., Kurdistân et Mésopotamie, 1892; André Mandelstamm, La Soc. des Nations et les Puissances devant le problème armén., 1895; Aghasi, Zeitoun depuis les orig. jusqu'à l'intervention de 1895, translation by Archag Tchobinekian, preface by Victor Béard, 1897—There is a copious bibliography on the massacres. The following only will be mentioned: Le traitement des Armén. dans l'Emp. Ott. (1915-1916), extracts from the “Blue Book” with a preface by Viscount Bryce, 1916; René Pinon, La suppression des Armén., 1916, Les massacres d'Arménie; témoignages des victimes, preface by G. Clemenceau, 1896; Khûštrî-i Şâd-i esbaḥ Kâmil pașa, Istanbul 1339/1911, 2nd ed, 84 ff.; Sâ'id paşkanîn Kâmil pașa Khûshtrîînâ Demâblîrî, Istanbul 1327/1909, 78 ff. (J. Deny)
III. Division, Administration, Population, Commerce, Natural Products and Industry.

Division.

Since the size of Armenia, in its territorial delimitation, has varied much in the course of the centuries, the regions into which the lands designated under this name were divided have not always been the same. In ancient times the Armenians (see the Geogr. of the Pseudo-Moses Xorenatsi, 606) separated the land into two unequal sections: Mez-Haik (Armenia major) and Pokr-Haik (Armenia minor).

Great Armenia, i.e., Armenia proper, extended from the Eurphrates in the west to the neighbourhood of the Kur in the east and was divided into 15 provinces; Little Armenia ran from the Eurphrates to the sources of the Hays. The Arabs also were acquainted with this twofold division (see, e.g., Yakuti, i, 220, 13).

Yet, in contradistinction to the Armenians, the Romans and the Byzantines, they extended the name Arminiya to the whole of the land situated between the Kur and the Caspian, i.e., to Djurzan (Georgia, Iberia), Arran (Albania) and the mountainous regions of the Caucasus as far as the pass of Darband (Bab al-Abwab), the reason being that the history of this country, especially in the struggle against the Muslims, reveals itself as closely linked with that of Armenia. By Arminiya al-Kubra, “Great Armenia”, the Arabs (see Yakuti, ibid.) understood particularly the districts which have Khiilat (Akhlat, q.v.) as their centre, whereas they applied the name Arminiya al-Sughra, “Little Armenia”, to the region of Tiflis (i.e., to Georgia).

Ibn Hawkal (ed. De Goeje, 255) was acquainted with yet another division of Armenia proper (excluding Albania and Iberia) into Inner (Arminiya dakhila) and Outer (Arminiya kharidja); to the former belonged the districts of Dabil (Dvin), Nashawa (Nakhchawan) and Kalkala, later Arzan al-Rum (Karvin) and to the latter the region of Lake Van (Berki, Aghlat, Ardzikh, Wastan, etc.).

Apart from this division there existed also another of ancient date which was adopted by the Byzantines (partition of Justinian in 536) and which, with the changes introduced by Maurice (591), remained in force until the Arab invasion. This system (Armenia prima, secunda, tertia, quarta) was also taken over by the Umayyads and the Abbasids times onward, was also obliged, in place of the various kinds of taxes (dizya, kharadji, etc.: capitation tax, land tax, etc.) the system of nakharar, and lords (Arm. ishkhdn, Greek agogomi, Ar., barth, patrikios) who, after the Arab invasion, retained all their possessions and enjoyed within their domains a certain independence. Each of these lords, from ‘Abbāsid times onward, was also obliged, in case of war, to furnish a contingent of troops without receiving any indemnity.

Armenia was, among the provinces of the empire of the Caliphs, a land taxed only moderately. In place of the various kinds of taxes (dizya, kharadji, etc.: capitation tax, land tax, etc.) the system of nakharar was applied from the beginning of the 9th century, i.e., the Armenian princes had to pay a fixed sum. The list of contributions given by Ibn Khuldun, which relates to the period of greatest prosperity for the Caliphate, mentions: "Armenia" (taken in the broad sense of the Arabs) the sum of 13 million dirhems, i.e., more than 15½ million gold francs, as the revenue of the years 1587-775-86; in addition to this there were also the revenues in kind (carpets, mules, etc.). Kudama gives as the average figure for taxes during the years 204-37819-52 no more than 9 million dirhems only. The treaties, in respect to taxation, were scrupulously kept by the Umayyads and the ‘Abbāsids and were violated only by Yūsuf b. Abi ‘l-Sa’d. See, in regard to financial matters, A. von Kremer, Kulturgesch. des Orients, i, 343, 358, 368, 377; Ghazarian, op. cit., 203 ff.; Thöpschbian, op. cit. (1904), ii, 132 ff. The Arab monetary system was also introduced into Armenia; under the Umayyads, coins were already being struck there (see Thöpschbian, ii, 127 ff.).

According to Yakuti (i, 222, 12) there were in Armenia not less than 18,000 localities great and small, of which 1,000 were situated on the Araxes alone (according to Ibn al-Faqlū in). In Arab mediaeval times the most important towns of Armenia proper were: Dabil (Dvin) which, as the residence of the...
Muslim government, filled the rôle of a capital throughout the period of the Caliphs — while it had a large population at this time, it became, in the modern period, nothing more than an insignificant village; in addition, Kâlkâlû, later called Arzan al-Rûm (Erzerûm), Arzindân (Erzindân), Malázgîrd (Mânzakert, Mantzîkert), Badîlis (Bîlîts), Âkhlî (Hûlî), Ardjîsh, Naghawâ (arm. Nakchcavân), Anî and Kârş (see the separate articles).

The native Armenians formed, in the time of the Caliphs, the main part of the population; but there were strong Arab colonies at Dâblî, Kâlkallû, and likewise at Bardhâ'a in Arrân and Tîffîs in Djûrzân, which were the chief bases of Arab power. Outside these great towns there existed also more extensive settlements of Arab tribes, notably to the south-west in the region of Almîn (Arzan in the Arzananen); the old district of Bagûnays (Arm. Apânumik) with its capital Malázgîrd was controlled by a branch of the famous tribe, the Kays, who also held a number of places on the northern shore of Lake Van. The growth of the Bagratid dominion was "like a thorn in the flesh" to these Muslim colonies, since it hindered the consolidation and extension of their own power (see especially, on these colonies, Thôpschîan, op. cit., 1904, ii. 125 ff.; Markwârt, Sweden, 501 ff.; and, on their situation in the 10th century, M. Cânard, Histoire de la dynastie des Hamadânides, 471-87).

After the Russo-Persian and Russo-Turkish wars of the 19th century, Turkey, Russia and Persia shared possession of the Armenian territory and, until the war of 1914-18, there existed a Persian, a Russian and a Turkish Armenia.

(1) Persian Armenia: the smallest of the three sections, with an area of about 15,000 sq. km.; it embraces only a few districts and forms, as it were, an appendix to Russian Armenia; politically, it is joined to the province of ÎÊharbâygûn. To the west it touches the Turkish wilîyet of Van, while to the north, facing Russia, the Araxes serves as the frontier over a distance of about 175 km. from the eastern foot of Ararat as far as Urkabût (Ordûbâdh). The chief town is Kayhîn. In addition, Mîhâ, Çors and Marand should be mentioned. In general Persian Armenia corresponds to the eastern part of the old Armenian province of Vaspûrûkan (Ar. Basfuradên). There exists, moreover, an Armenian population at İșfâhân, resulting from the deportation of the inhabitants of Djûlûsî [q.v.] by Bayâzîd 2nd in 1605.

(2) Russian Armenia: the territory of the independent Armenian republic (28 May 1918), the republic itself was reduced, by the treaty of Batum (4 June 1918) to Erivan and the region of Lake Sevan, the Turks and the Azerbaijandis sharing between themselves the remainder of Russian Armenia. There now ensued the collapse of the Turks on other fronts and the armistice of Mudros (30 October 1918). At the beginning of 1919 Armenian forces recaptured Alexandropol (Leninakan) and, in addition, Maku, Çors, Karsh and Marand. The government, on its part, reconquered the territories of Erivan and Lake Sevan, but the Kara-Bâgh and Nakhtcîhevân are attached to the centre of the Armenians, Nakhtcîhevân (Nakhcîhevân) [q.v.] which, like Erivan, has played a pre-eminent rôle in Armenian history, and Alexandropol (the ancient Gumri), an important frontier fortress until 1878 and thereafter a town given over to the silk industry; in the government of Eliavetpol, Eli-avetpol (the ancient Gandja, [q.v.]), Shûhâ situated in the region of Kara-Bâgh and formerly the capital of a separate Kânate, and the frontier town of Ordûbâdh (Urdûbâdh) on the Araxes.

(3) Turkish Armenia: the greater part of the Armenian territory, far superior in size to the Russian and Persian sections taken together, had been for 500 years in the hands of the Turks and included the wilîyet of Bitîs, Erzerûm, Mâmûret al-Äzîz (now Elaziç, i.e., Karpútî), Van and, although only in part, Diyârbekir, with a total area of about 186,500 sq.km. The most important towns were Sîvâs, Erzerûm, Van, Erzindân, Bitîs, Karpútî, Mûh and Bâyrâzîd [q.q.v.].

Save in Persian Armenia, the war of 1914 brought about important changes in this situation. In 1917, after the retreat of the Russian troops from the Caucasian front, the regime which was then created in Armenia and itself formed part of the provisional government of Transcaucasia (Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan), undertook the task of defending the front against the Turks; but could not prevent the latter from regaining Erzindân and Erzerûm (February-March 1918), and then Kârş (25 April) after the peace of Brest-Litovsk which granted to the Turks possession of Turkish Armenia, together with Kârş and Ardâhân, previously in Russian hands since 1878. After the dissolution of the Transcaucasian government and the formation of an independent Armenian republic (28 May 1918), the Turkish possession of Turkish Armenia, together with Kârş and Ardâhân, was confirmed by the treaty of Batum (4 June 1918) to Erivan and the region of Lake Sevan, the Turks and the Azerbaijandis sharing between themselves the remainder of Russian Armenia. There now ensued the collapse of the Turks on other fronts and the armistice of Mudros (30 October 1918). At the beginning of 1919 Armenian forces recaptured Alexandropol (Leninakan) and, in addition, Maku, Çors, Kars and Marand. The government, on its part, reconquered the territories of Erivan and Lake Sevan, but the Kara-Bâgh and Nakhtcîhevân are attached to...
Soviet Socialist Republic of Azerbaijan under the designation of autonomous Region of Nagorny Karabakh (mountainous Karabagh) and autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic of Nakhitchivan, while the districts, formerly included in Russian Armenia, of Akhalkhalaki, Akhalcalik (Akhaltitskhe) and Baştım, this latter in the form of the autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic of Adjara, are part of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Georgia. The principal towns in the Republic of Armenia are Erivan, Leninakan (formerly Alexandropol), Kirovakan (the old Elizavetpol) and Alaverdy.

The former Turkish Armenia, which can no longer bear this name, since it is now empty of Armenians as a result of the deportations and massacres of 1915-18, has been increased by the addition of Kar, Ardahān and Iğdır.

Population.

Owing to the invasion of Turkish and Turcoman tribes on the one hand and, on the other, to the advance of the Kurds (in the south) the composition of the population had undergone, ever since the second half of the mediaeval period, a transformation so profound that the Armenians properly so called constituted, over the whole extent of their ancient homeland, no more than a quarter of the total inhabitants. According to the statistics of L. Selenoy and N. Sediltz (Petermann's Geogr. Mit., 1896, 195.), out of the 3,470,000 people to be found in the provinces of Transcaucasia enumerated above 897,000 (27%) were Armenians; in the purely Armenian districts, out of 2,000,000 inhabitants, the Armenians numbered 760,000 (more than a third). The government of Erivan, however, had a population of which 56% was Armenian. In the whole of Transcaucasia the towns were more strongly peopled by Armenians than the countryside (notably Tiflis: 48%); but, in regard to the total number of inhabitants (4,782,000), the Armenians (960,000) constituted only 20% of the population.

The five vilayets of Turkish Armenia had 2,624,000 inhabitants, of whom 1,828,000 were Muslims, 633,000 were Armenians, and 179,000 were Greeks; in the sanjak of Mugh, however, and also in that of Van the Armenians possessed the numerical superiority (almost twofold).

The total population of Russian and Turkish Armenia, according to the estimates given above, amounted to about 4,642,000, of whom 1,400,000 were Armenians. In Russian Armenia the Caucasian peoples were more numerous, while in Turkish Armenia it was the Kurds, Turks and other racial elements (Greeks, Jews, Gypsies, Circassians, Nestorian Christians to the south-east of Lake Van, nomad Tatar tribes) who had the majority.

In Persian Armenia there were, in 1891, 42,000 Armenians, only half of them to be found in Ardharbaydjan (see above concerning Iṣafān).

Such was the estimate of the Armenian population given by Streck, for a period anterior to 1914, in the first edition of the Encyclopaedia of Islam. He noted that as a result of massacres and of emigration the number of Armenians on Turkish soil was constantly diminishing. The settlement of Armenians in foreign lands and their dissemination throughout the world had continued, although in varying degree (see above for the emigration into Byzantine territory, and then into Syria and Egypt). Cf. on this subject Ritter, Erdkunde, x. 594-611; R. Wagner, Reise nach dem Ararat, 239-50. The total number of Armenians living in the Old World amounted to between 2 and 2⅔ millions.

According to the figures given by Pasdermadjian Histoire de l’Arménie, Paris 1949, 444, the total number of Armenians in the world in 1914 was approximately 4,100,000, of whom 2,100,000 lived in the Ottoman empire, 1,700,000 in the Russian empire, 100,000 in Persia and 200,000 in the rest of the world. In Russian Armenia proper they numbered 1,300,000 (including Kar, Nakhitchevan, the Kara-Bagh and Akhalkhalaki) and, in Turkish Armenia (with Cilicia), 1,400,000. They represented in Russian Armenia the majority of the population, 1,300,000 out of 2,100,000.

Here, on the other hand, are the figures of the Armenian population in the world and in the Soviet Union for 1926 and 1939, according to W. Leimbach, Die Sowjetunion, Natur, Volk und Wirtschaft, Stuttgart 1950. In 1926 the total number of Armenians in the world amounted to 2,225,000 (the difference from the figure given for 1914 being explained to a certain degree by the losses due to the war, to the massacres and to the sufferings endured during the deportations); of these, two thirds were in the Soviet Union, while one third remained in the Near East (150,000 in Syria, 100,000 in Persia, approximately 100,000 in Turkey, Palestine, Egypt and Greece, with a further 100,000 in America). The Soviet Union held 1,658,000 Armenians, of whom 1,340,000 were in Transcaucasia and 162,000 in Ciscaucasia. Of those to be found in Transcaucasia 744,000 lived in the Soviet Socialist Republic of Armenia (29,900 sq.km.) and constituted there 83% of the total inhabitants (831,290), i.e., the half of the Armenian population of the Soviet Union and one third of the entire Armenian population in the world. 312,000 dwelt in Georgia, 112,000 in the autonomous Region of Nagorny Karabakh (89% of the total population there) and 173,000 in the rest of the Republic of Azerbaijan.

According to the census of 1939 the Armenians of the Soviet Union numbered 2,152,000; in the Republic of Armenia they were 1,100,000 out of a total population of 1,281,599; they constituted 90% of the total population of the autonomous Region of Nagorny Karabakh, but, in the remainder of the Republic of Azerbaijan, only 19% of the total population. In Georgia they numbered 450,000. The Armenian population of the Soviet Union, taken as a whole, had increased by 37% between 1926 and 1939.

In Syria and the Lebanon there were in 1914 about 5,000 Armenians; in 1939 they numbered approximately 80,000 in the Lebanon, and more than 100,000 in Syria. In 1939, after the reunion of the sanjak of Alexandretta with Turkey, 25,000 Armenians left the country. When, in 1945, the Soviet government issued its appeal to the Armenians, inviting them to return to Soviet Armenia, this invitation concerned, in Syria, about 200,000 Armenians who lived especially at Aleppo and Beirut (Aleppo: 100,000 out of a total of 260,000; Beirut: 50,000 out of 160,000). In Persia, between 1926 and 1939, the Armenian population had risen from 50,000 to 150,000; approximately 53,000 expressed the wish to emigrate to Soviet Armenia and the Armenians of Persia formed a great part of the 60,000 to 100,000 Persians who, from Syria, the Lebanon, Persia and Egypt, went to Soviet Armenia after this appeal. Of the 27,000 Armenians who dwelt in Greece, 18,000 emigrated to Soviet Armenia in the period down to 1947.
In 1945 (see H. Field, *Contribution to the anthropology of the Caucasus*, Cambridge, Mass. 1953, 5) the population of Soviet Armenia amounted to 1,500,000, with a figure of 200,000 for the capital, Erivan. Today (see F. Rendot, *Les Chrétien d’Orient*, Paris 1955, 191 and 196) the Republic of Armenia approaches a total of 1,500,000 inhabitants and there are almost as many Armenians in the rest of the Soviet Union. Erivan numbers 300,000 inhabitants and has formulated plans for 450,000. 400,000 to 500,000 Armenians are to be found in the Near East, 100,000 in the countries where 'popular democracy' prevails, 200,000 to 300,000 in North America, 20,000 in France and important nuclei in South America, India, Palestine and Greece.

The Armenian question had been given a definite form. Various Armenian groups in Brazil, the United States, etc. have presented to the U.N.O. demands which seek to bring about the restoration to the Armenians of the former Turkish Armenia with the frontiers fixed by President Wilson and the Armenian question continues to be an obstacle to the improvement of relations between the Soviet Union and Turkey.

**Commerce.**

As a land of transit between the Pontus and Mesopotamia and as a frontier territory between Byzantium and the Muslim empire, Armenia played an important economic rôle in the mediæval period. The numerous merchants and the caravans that crossed it contributed to the development of a native industry which was favoured, like the flow of commerce, by the richness of the country in natural products. The commercial importance of Armenia arose also from the existence of numerous transit routes which cut across the land and of which the Arab geographers have described the most important. The Arabs attached to the support which these routes furnished to their military interests a greater weight than to their commercial usefulness. For this reason they linked together the principal routes at Dablil, the bulwark of the Arab domination. The maintenance and security of the routes was a duty which fell to the Muslim governor. Even today Erzerûm, a point of junction for all the great routes, is a place of high strategic importance and, as it were, the key to Asia Minor.

Armenia communicated with Byzantium through Trebizond (Tarabazanda), the main entrepôt for Byzantine merchandise (above all, precious materials). The great fairs held there several times a year were visited by merchants from the entire Muslim world; the traffic ran ordinarily from Trebizond to Dablil and Kâlıkalâ (Erzerûm). In Persia, Rayy was the most important market for the Armenian merchants (see Ibn al-Fakih, ed. De Goeje, ii, 67 and 217). See in particular, on the commerce and industry of Armenia in the mediæval period, Thöpschian in the *Mitt. des Sem. für orient. Sprache*, 1904, ii, 142-53. On the caravans, see Aramians, *Les tapis d’dragons et leur origine arménienne*, in *Syria*, ix (1928) and, by the same author, *Les tapa arméniens*, in *Revue des Ét. arm.*, i/2 (1928). On Armenian textiles in general, see R. B. Serjeant, *Material for a History of Islamic Textiles up to the Mongol Conquest*, in *Ars Islamica*, x (1943), 91 ff.

**Natural Products and Industry.**

Armenia was considered to be one of the most fertile provinces of the Caliphate. It produced so great a yield of cereals that some of it was exported abroad, e.g., to Baghdad (see al-Tahtari, iii, 272, 273). The lakes and rivers, which were full of fish, also favoured the export trade; Lake Van provided enormous quantities of a certain kind of herring (*Ar. tarihik*) which, from mediæval times, was sent out in salted form even to the Indies (according to al-Kazwînî, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii, 352). This salted fish is encountered even today as a food much sought after throughout the whole of Armenia, Ağharbâyqân, the Caucasus and Asia Minor.

Armenia is rich, above all, in minerals; copper, silver, lead, iron, arsenic, alum, mercury and sulphur are especially to be found there; gold, too, is not lacking. Very little is known concerning the exploitation of these products by the Arabs; the only Arab author who has furnished us with information on the natural products of Armenia is Ibn al-Fakih. According to the Armenian writer Leontius, silver mines were discovered at the close of the 8th century A.D.; these mines correspond no doubt to the silver (and lead) mines which are exploited at Gümüşhâne (now Gümüşhane = House of Silver, halfway between Trebizond and Erzerûm (see, on this subject, Ritter, *Erdkunde*, x, 272 and Wagner, *Reise nach Persien*, i, 172 ff. and cf. also the article *Gümüşhâne*). There were important mines, too, at Bayburt and Arghâna (q.v.). The great and ancient copper mine of Kedabeg with its offshoot at Kalakent (between Elizabetopol-Gandja and the lake of Gökçay) had been much developed before 1914 (see Lehmann-Haupt, *Armenien einst und Jetzt*, i, 122 ff.). Today there are important copper foundries at Alaverdy, Zangezur and Erivan. It was, however, the salt mines which, in the past, were the richest in Armenia, their products being exported to Syria and Egypt. The salt beds mentioned by the mediæval authors were probably to the north-east of Lake Van; there was also an extensive salt-bearing deposit at Kulp to the south of the Upper Araxes and east of Keghiszan (see Ritter, *op. cit.*, x, 270 ff. and Radde, *Vier Vorträge über den Kaukasus*, 47). Erivan today is an industrial town with workshops for the building of machinery and factories for preserves, tobacco, synthetic rubber, etc.

The industries for which Armenia was most renowned during the mediæval period were weaving, dyeing and embroidery. Dablil was the centre of this industrial activity; magnificent woolen cloths were made there, carpets and heavy materials of silk decorated with flowers and multi-coloured (*Ar. baqâyân*) which were also sold abroad. The *hirmis*, a kind of purple-bearing worm, was used for dyeing. Armenian carpets were long considered to be of the finest workmanship. Ardashî (Artaxata), some kilometres from Dablil, was so famous for its dye works that al-Baladhuri calls it “the town of the kermes” (*haryal al-hirmis*) (ed. De Goeje, 200; cf. *Zeitschr. für arm. Philol.*, ii, 67 and 217). See in particular, on the commerce and industry of Armenia in the mediæval period, Thöpschian in the *Mitt. des Sem. für orient. Sprache*, 1904, ii, 142-53. On the caravans, see Aramians, *Les tapis d’dragons et leur origine arménienne*, in *Syria*, ix (1928) and, by the same author, *Les tapa arméniens*, in *Revue des Ét. arm.*, i/2 (1928). On Armenian textiles in general, see R. B. Serjeant, *Material for a History of Islamic Textiles up to the Mongol Conquest*, in *Ars Islamica*, x (1943), 91 ff.


On the period of the Arab invasions and the Arab domination, see: Baldaihurst, Futûh, 193-212 (trans. Hitti and Murugotten, 2 vols., New York, 1916-24); Ţabart, (references indicated in the course of this article); Yaḵūb, 190-1 (the passages relative to Armenia in Baldaihurst and Yaḵūb have been translated into Russian by P. Zuze, Baku 1927, in Materials for the History of Aserbaydžân, fasc. iii and iv; the same author has translated the passages from Ibn al-Algîr.
which concern the Caucasus, Baku 1940). Pseudo-

Wakidi, Gesch. der Eroberung von Mesopotamien

und Armenien ... Hamburg 1847; B. Khala-

taeants, Textes arméniens relatifs à l’Arménie, Vienna

1910; for the first Arab invasions, H. Manadean,

Les invasions arabes en Arménie, in Byzantion,

xvii, 1946-8, French translation by H. Berberian

of a pamphlet of H. Manadean published in Erivan

in 1932 under the name Manr Hetazout'yunner
(Short Studies); M. Ghazarian, Armenien unter der

arab. Herrschaft bis zur Entstehung des Bagratiden-

eiches, in Zeitschr. für arm. Philol., ii, Marburg

1903. 140-235 H. Thondchian, Armenien vor und

during der Araberzeit, ibid. ii, 50-71; Vasmer,

Chronology of the Governors of Armenia under the


(German translation Vienna 1931); F. W. Brooks,

Byzantines and Arabs in the time of the Early


Dugibachean, Die Gründung des Bagratidenreiches

unter Aschot Bagratuni, Berlin 1893; A. Green,

La dynastie des Bagratides en Arménie (in Russian,

in the Journ. of the Russian Minist. of I.P., St.

Petersburg, 1893, CCXX, 51-139); J. Markwart,

Osteur. und ostas. Streifziege, Leipzig 1903, 117-88,

391-465; R. Khalateants (Chaltalian), Die Ent-

stehung der arm. Fürstenhäuser, in WZKM, xvii,

60-69. See also: J. Laurent, L’Arménie entre

Byzance et l’Islam depuis la conquête arabe jusqu’en

886, Paris 1919. On the 10th century and the

Byzantine reconquest, see in addition to the

already mentioned works of Grouset and Honig-

mann: S. Runciman, Romanus Lecapenus, Cam-

bridge 1929, 151 ff.; M. Canard, Hst. de la

dynastie des Hamdanides, i, 462 ff. and earlier;

G. Schlumberger, Un emperatore byz. au Xe siècle,

Nicéphore Phocas, Paris 1890; by the same author,

L’époque byz. à la fin du Xe siècle, i, 1896 (1925)

and ii, 1900 (Pt. I, John Trzimiesce; Pt. II,

Basil II); various articles by N. Adontz published

in Byzantion (Les Taronites en Arménie et A

Byzance, ix, 1934, 715 ff., x, 1935, 531 ff., xi,

1936, 21 ff. and 517, xiv, 1939, 407 ff.; Notes

arméno-byzantines, ix, 1934, 307 seq., x, 1935,

166 ff.; Tornik le Magiste, i, 1938, 143 ff.,

and in the Ann. de l’Inst. de Philol. et d’Hist.

Orient. Brussels, iii, 1935 (Alot de Fer); articles

by V. Laurent in Échos d’Orient, xxxvii, 1938 and

xxxviii, 1939; by H. Tarossian, Grigor Magistros

et ses rapports avec deux émirs musulmans ... in

REI, 1941-7; by Leroy-Mohringen on the rôle of

certain Armenians at Byzantium, in Byzantion, xi,

1936, 589 ff. and xiv, 1939, 147 ff.; by Akulian,

Einverleibung arm. Territorien durch Byzanz im

XI. Jahrhundert, 1922; by Z. Avalichvili, La

succession de David d’Ibérie, in Byzantion, viii,

1933, 177 ff. On the settlement of emigrant

Armenians in Byzantine territory, see, in addition

to the already mentioned articles by N. Adontz,

Grouset, op. cit., 488-9, 512, 522 and H. Grégoire,

Mélias le Magiste, in Byzantion, vii, 1931, 79 ff.

and, ibid. 203 ff., Nicéphore au col robie. Reference

should also be made to works which deal with

Byzantine history (see Krumbrach, Byz. Litte-
raturgesch., 2nd ed., 1688-9) and the publications

of Vasilev, Byzance et les Arabes; i, La dynastie

armorienne (820-67), French trans., Brussels, 1935
(Corp. brus. hist. byz.) and ii, La dynastie mac-

donienne (867-950). St. Petersburg 1924 (in Russian;

French ed. of Pt. ii only: Textes arabes, Brussels

1950). See also F. Dölger, Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oström. Reiches, Munich-

Berlin 1924-32; S. Der Nersessian, Armenia and

the Byz. Empire: A brief study of Armenian art

and civilization, Harvard University, 1945.

In addition, the chapters relating to Armenia in

the Syriac chronicles (Pa.-Denys of Tell-Mahre, Elias

of Nisibin, Michael the Syrian, Bar Hebraeus) and

in works concerning the history of Islam and of

the Caliphs, notably the Memoir of Defrémery on

the Sadjids (JA, 1848, 4th ser., vols. 9 and 10).

On persons of Armenian origin who figure in the

history and literature of the Arabs, I. Krâčkovsky

has written for the Encyclopædia of Armenia

(Erván) the articles Akhbâryan, Abb Šâhi Ḥ-,

Arman and Bâdâr al-Djamâl (see above for

Bahrâm).

The main source for the Sâdiqâdî period is the

history (989-1071) of Arıstâkâs of Lastîvert

(Arîsdaouâs of Lisîdvîr), Armenian ed., Venice,

1843, French trans., 1846. Kirakos (Gulagoz)

of Gandzâk (13th cent.) gives a contemporary

account of events for the period 1155-1265:

Armenian ed., Moscow 1858 and Venice 1865,

French trans. by Brosset, 1870-1. See also J.

Laurent, Byzance et les Turcs seldjoucides dans

l’Asie occidentale jusqu’en 1081, Paris 1913-4

and the bibliography given there; C. Cahen,

La campagne de Mantîzkert d’après les sources musul-

manes, in Byzantion, i, 1934, 615 ff.; and by

the same author, La première pénétration turque en

Asie Mineure, in Byzantion, xvii, 1948. For a more

ample bibliography, see the art. SALDÎQâDA.

The monk Malakâya composed a history of the

Mongol invasion: Armenian ed., St. Petersburg

1870, Russian trans. by Patkanean, ibid. 1871,

French trans. by Brosset, 1871. Thomas of

Medosîph wrote, in the 15th cent., a history of

Timur and his successors: Armenian ed. by

Chaharazian, Paris 1866.

The principal source on the sufferings of the

Armenians under Sâh ‘Abbâs i is Arâk’el of

Tabrîz, whose Histoire runs from 1602 to 1661:

Armenian ed., Amsterdam, 1669, French trans.

by Brosset.

On the history of the kingdom of Little Armenia,

in addition to the Gesch. der Kreuzzüge by F.

Wilken and B. Kugler, the modern histories of the

Crusades (Grouset, 3 vols., Paris 1934-6; Runci-

man, 3 vols., Cambridge 1951-5), the history of the

last Crusades by Atiya, London 1938 and the

history of Cyprus by Hill, Cambridge 1940, see

V. Langlois, Essais hist. et crit. sur la const, soc.

et pol. de l’Arménie sous les rois de la dynastie

couphénienne, in le Mém. de l’Ac. Impér. des Sc.

de St. Pétersbourg, 7th ser., iii (1860), 3; the

same author, in the Bull. de l’Ac. Impér. ... iv,

1861 and in the Mêlanges asiatiques; iv; E. Dula-


du royaume de Petite Arménie, in JA, 1861, xvii,

377-437 and xviii, 289-357; by the same author,

Le royaume de Petite Arménie, in ANC, Doc. arm.,

i, Paris 1869; and K. J. Basmadjian, Les Legis-

lions de Poilou au trône de la Petite Arménie, in JA,

10th ser., vi, 520 ff.

In regard to the information provided by the

mediaeval geographers, see BÂG, ed. de Goeje

and BAHG, ed. v. Mâk; Yâkût, I, 219-22 (cf.

Heer, Die Quellen in Yâkût’s Geogr. Werlbr.,

1896, 62-3); Abu ‘l-Fidâ’, Taβürîm, 387-8; Le Strange,

139-141, 139-41, 182-4; A. v. Bremmer, Kaiserurk.

gesch. des Ostens unter den Chalifen, i, 342-1, 358,

377; N. A. Karaulov, Renseignements fournis par

les écrivains arabes sur le Caucase, l’Arménie et
l’Adgobaydjan, in Stornik materiaulov dlya opisan-
nyia mestechno i plemen hanbaia, xxix, xxxi, xxxii and xxxviii, Tiflis 1908; Záhá (Jáhá), Trans-
into Russian of the passages in Yâgûl relating to the
Caucasus (ed. by the Inst. of Hist. Acad.
of Sciences of Azerbajdžán); and B. Kishaleantsa,
in the Armenian review, Hanedz Amsoorya (Vienna),
xxi, 27-8, 53-4, 112-3, 176-7, 252-3 and xxviii,
53-4, 367-8.

On the wars of the last century; see: V. Uscha-
hoff, Gesch. der Feldzüge des Generals Paskonich
in der asiat. Türkei während der Jahre 1828-9
(German ed., Leipzig 1838; cf. Ritter, Erdkunde 3,
444-23); and W. Potto, Der persische Krieg,
1826-8 (St. Petersbourg, 1837 ff.).

In regard to the Crimean war, see the works of
Rustow (1855 ff.), Bazanourt (German ed.,
Vienna 1856), Aitschokow (1857-60), Bogdano-
vitsch (in Russian, 1867), Kungfrake (London, 6th
Gotsch (1853, 3rd ed., 1857), Rothen (1888),
Kurz (1890), A. du Car (Paris 1892); and C. Rousset, Hist. de la guerre de Crimee,
Paris 1877 (also to be added: E. Tarlo, Krymskaya
voyna, a vols., Moscow 1924-5).

On the war of 1877-78, see Greene, The Russian
army and its campaigns in Turkey, 1877-1878,
London 1880; v. Jagwitz, Von Fernreis und
Adrianopol, Berlin 1880; and Kuroptafin, Kritische
Rücksicht auf die russisch-türkische Krieg (in
German, by Storck, Berlin 1884-7).

On the troubles in Armenia during the last
decade of the 19th century, see F. D. Greene, The
Armenian crisis and the rule of the Turk, London
1893; P. de Coursens, La rébellion arménienne,
Paris 1895; B. Lespius, Armenien und Europa,
Berlin 1896; G. Godet, Les souffrances de l’arménie,
Neuchâtel 1896. On the massacres, deportations
and emigration of the Armenians since 1915, see
the modern histories of Armenia cited above
(J. de Morgan, Nework Asian, Pasmardžjan);
Tchofian, Le peuple arménien, l’Arménie sous
le joug turc, Paris 1913; F. Nansen, L’Arménie
et le Proche-Orient, Paris 1928; Basmadjjan, Hist.
mod. des Arméniens, Paris 1924; Pasmardžjan,
Aprécée de l’hist. mod. de l’Arménie (espe-
nially from 1848 to 1920) in Vostan, Cahiers d’hist.
de civil. arm., i, Paris 1949-8; J. Missakian,
A searchlight on the Armenian question, 1878-1950,
Boston 1950; A. Nasrjan, Vérités historiques sur
l’Arménie, Paris 1955; W. Leimbach, Die Sovjet-
union, Stuttgart 1956 (passages devoted to Russian
Armenia); P. Rondot, Les Christens de l’Orient

Amongst other works, see also: A. J. Toyombe,
Les massacres arméniens, Paris 1921; The treatment
of Armenians in the Ottoman empire, British Blue
Book, London 1916; H. Barby, Au pays de l’épouvanne, l’Arménie marzigne, Paris 1917; J.
Lespinasse, le rapport secret ... sur les massacres
d’Arménie, Paris 1918; Anonymous, Témoignages
insultés sur les atrocités turques commises en Arménie,
Paris 1920; C. Jäckche, President Wilson als
Schiedsrichter zwischen der Türkei und Armenien,
in MSOS, Berlin, xxviii, 1935, ii, 75-80. See also:
A. Andonian, Le Memoires de Naim bey. Turk.
off. doc. relative to the deportations and the massacres
of Armenians. London 1920; and J. de Morgan,
Essais sur les nationalités (les Arméniens), Paris
1917.

On the history of the Armenian Church, see:
A. Ter Mikkelian, Die arm. Kirche und ihre Bezieh-

H. Gelzer, Der gegewendigede Zustand der arm.
Kirche, in Zf. Thol., 1893, XXVI, 163-77; the
same author, Die Anfänge der arm. Kirche, in
SD. d. sächs. Ges. d. Wiss., 1895, 209-74; St. Weber,
Die hähnel, Kirche in Armenien, Freiburg im Ü.,
1905; Ter Minassiantz, Die arm. Kirche in ihrem
Beziehungen zu den syrischen Kirchen, Leipzig 1904;
N. Ormanian, L’Eglise arménienne, son hist.,
sa doctr., son régime, sa discipline, sa légue,
sa littérature, son fœdern, Paris 1908; and the art.
Arménie, by L. Petit, in the Diction. de thologie
catholique, i, Pt. 2.

(3) Geography. Ethnology. Cartography: Otter,
Voy. en Turquie, Paris 1745; S. Seutin, Voyage
de Commandement à Bagdad en 1761, Paris, Year
VII (on the region of Handest); Hanway, Be-
schreib, seiner Reise von London durch Russland
und Persien, Hamburg 1754 (Engl. ed., London,
1773; also other editions); J. Morizot, A journey
through Persia, Armenie, etc., 1818; Dupée, Voyage en Perse, Paris 1819; W. Ouseley, Travels in various
countries of the East, London 1819-23, vol. iii;
R. Walpole, Travels in various countries of the
East, London 1820; A. Jaubert, Voyage en Arménie
e en Perse, Paris 1821; Ker Porter, Travels in Georgia, Persia, Armenie, London
1821-2; Relation du voyage de Memleth, in JRGs,
iii, London 1833; E. Smith and Dwight, Mis-
sionary Researches in Koordistan, Armenie, etc.,
London 1834; J. Brunt, Journey through a part
of Armenie, in JRGs, vi, London 1836; C. J. Rich,
Narrative of a residence in Koordistan, ibid., 1836;
E. Bore, Correspondence and memoirs of a voyage
in Orient, Paris 1837-40; Armstrong, Travels in
Russia and Turkey, London 1838; Wilbraham,
Travels in Transcaucasia, etc., London 1839;
F. Dubois de Montépêre, Voyage autour du
Caucase ... en Georgie, Armenie, etc., Paris 1839-43,
with an atlas; J. B. Prusse, Travels in Koordistan,
Mesopotamia, etc., London 1840; E. Schutz,
Memoire sur le lac de Van et ses environs, in JA,
3rd ser., ix, 306-333; H. Southgate, Narrative of a
journey through Armenia, Koordistan, London 1840;
J. Brunt, Notes of a journey through Armenia,
in JRGs, X, 1841; H. Suter, Notes of a journey
from Erzerum to Trebisond (ibid.); G. Fowler,
Three Years in Persia, with travelling
adventures in Koordistan, London 1841 (German
transl., Aix-la-Chapelle 1842); W. F. Ainsworth,
Travels and Research in Asia Minor, Mesopotamia,
Chaldæa and Armenia, London 1842; W. J.
Hamilton, Research in Asia Minor, Pontus and
Armenia, London 1842 (German ed. by A. Schon-
bourg with add. by H. Kiepfer, Leipzig 1843); Ch.
Texier, Description de l’Arménie, la Perse et la
Mesopotamie, Paris 1842; K. Koch, Wanderungen
im Orient, Weimar 1847-8; M. Wagner, Reise nach
dem Ararat und dem Hochland Armenien, Stutt-
gart 1848; A. Muravjev, Cours et Arménie
in Russian, (St. Petersbourg 1848); Broset,
Rapports sur un voyage archéologique en George et en
Arménie, ibid., 1851; M. Wagner, Reise nach
Persien und dem Lande der Karden, Leipzig 1852;
Curzon, Armenia, a year at Erzeroum, etc., London
1854; Hommaire de Hell, Voyage en Turquie et en
Perse, Paris 1854-60; K. Koch, Die kaukasische
In regard to the statistics of the population, for the period before 1814, see G. L. Selenoy and N. v. Seidlitz, Die Verbreitung der Armenier in der asiat. Türkei und in Trans-Kaukas, in Peterm. Mitt., 1896, and for more recent statistics, the works indicated on the subject in the course of this article; see also: R. Khermian, Les Arméniens, introdu. à l’anthropologie du Caucase, 1943.

For maps, see the atlases attached to the travel account of Monteith (1833) and Dubois (1836-9); Glascott, Map of Asia Minor and Armenia (about 1850); H. Kiepert, Karte von Georgien, Armenien und Kurdistan, 1:100,000, Berlin 1854; the same author, Karte von Armenien, Kurdistan und Aserbeidschan, 1:1,000,000, Berlin 1858; H. Kiepert, Spécialkarte des türk. Arm., 1:500,000, Berlin 1857; the same author, Carte générale des prov. europ. et asiat. de l’empire ottoman, 1:2,000,000, Berlin 1892; H. Kiepert, Karte von Kleinasien in 24 Blätter, 1:400,000, Berlin 1902-6. The best map is Lynch-Oswald’s Map of Armenia and adjacent countries, London 1901. See also the maps of Cuinet, La Turquie d’Asie, 1891-2 and of Müller-Simonis, op. cit., 1892; the map of Armenia in Hübschmann, Die allarm. Ortsnamen, in Indogerm. Forschungen, xvi, 1904 and his remarks (p. 109) on the Kartenbibliographie der Grundkarten der Welt. Philol., by F. Justi; the maps of Honigmann, Osteuropa; also see Murray’s Handy Classical Maps, Asia Minor; the maps in the tourist guides, Baedeker, Guide Bleu; the route map of Turkey (Türkiye Yol Haritası, 1:2,500,000); the maps (scale = 1:800,000), Türkiye, 1936 (sheets for Malaya, Sivas, Erzurum, Mosul); the map prepared by the National Geogr. Institute, Paris, 1:1,000,000, 1934 (sheet for Erzerum).

Armenian journals and reviews down to 1919 (Ararat, Hanpes Amsorpa, etc.). See also the Bulletin armenologique published by Père Mercie, in the Mélanges de l'Uni. Saint-Joseph, Beirut, 1947-8 and 1953, and the specialised reviews.

(M. CANARD)

ARMS [see SILAH].

ARMY [see DVAH, LASKHAR, ORDU etc.].

ARNAWULTUĞ, the Ottoman Turkish name for ALBANIA.

1.—Language. Allegedly descended from Pelasgian, Albanian is an Indo-European language of "satem" type like Armenian, Indo-Iranian and Slavonic. No literary records occur before 1496 A.D., but ancient Illyrian and ancient Epirese, on the basis of personal and place names, are held to be the prototypes of Geg (northern) and Tosk (southern) Albanian respectively. Illyrian manthus, manthia, "bramble", and grossa, "tile", are Albanian manaz, mansë and grersë respectively. Macedonian, Thracian and Daician were languages of Albanian type.

Known as shqip in Albania, ardhesh in the Albanian colonies, the Albanian language is spoken by some 1,500,000 in Albania, 700,000 in the adjoining Kosovo-Metohija area of Yugoslavia, and some 40,000 in Epirus. An archaic form of the language survives on the Greek islands of Hydra and Spetsa, and in Sicily and Calabria, brought there by Tosk exiles from the Turkish invasion. Impoverished by centuries of neglect, Albanian has a small native, but a large borrowed vocabulary. Thus the wheel, the cart and the plough are represented by borrowings from Greek; names of prepared dishes, garments, parts of the house, and Islamic terms have come in via Turkish.

The composite alphabet is: a, b, c (like ts), ç (like ch), d, dh (like th in this), e, ë (like French e in le), f, g, gj (like Turkish g before e, i, ð), h, ñ, j (like y in you), k, l (as in French), ll (as in English all), m, n, nj (as in canone), ò, õ (like Turkish: õ before e, ñ, ñ). (weak), rr (strong trill), s, š, ñ as in shop, t, òh (as in thin), u, v, x (as in adze), zh (as in judge), y (German ü), z, ù (as in pleasure). The vowels a, ë, l are Geg nasals.

Geg is the dialect of Tirane, the capital, and the North, including Kosovo-Metohija. Tosk has a considerable literature. Its main deviations are: replacement of the infinitive by subjunctive constructions, absence of nasal vowels, occasional conversion of n to r, and representation of us, wem as wa, var. There are small differences of vocabulary.

The noun has three genders and five cases. A noun is classified as animate or inanimatae, and has a number of case forms. In the singular, cases are: nominative, accusative, dative, ablative, genitive. In the plural, cases are: nominative, accusative, dative, genitive, vocative. Pronouns have the same cases as the noun.

The verb is a strong verb, with a conjugation pattern similar to the Indo-European verb. It has four tenses: present, imperfect, perfect, pluperfect. The verb is conjugated in the present tense by the addition of suffixes to the root.

There are three active theatres and a writers' union. The brief fascist regime (1939-1943) attracted a few writers with pro-Italian leanings; the present communist regime encourages writing on the partisan movement, the class struggle, work themes and peace. Textbooks are based on Russian models. There are three active theatres and a writers' union.

This activity is paralleled in Kosovo-Metohija, where the communist themes are Titosist.

2.—Literature. From the third century A.D. the Roman Church has maintained a bishopric at Scutari in N. Albania. This became the first cultural centre; evidence of this is Bishop John Buzuk's Matranga, descendant of the exiles, began a tradition of hymn-writing using folk-rhythms (1592), which was continued by Brancato (1675-1741) and the Calabrian Variobba (born 1725). The movement became secular with the folksongs and rhapsodies of De Rada (1813-1903), an ardent spokesman of Albanian liberation, and was continued well into the present century by Zef Schirò (1865-1937), Sicilian-born author of two allegorical epics and a collector of folksongs.

The work of De Rada was helpful in inspiring three Tosk patriots, the brothers Abdyl, Sami and Naim Frashëri, to form a league at Prizrend in 1878. Under the stimulus of the San Stefano settlement they sought Albanian autonomy and literary freedom. After several years of activity in Istanbul, where they were joined by the lexicographer and Bible translator Kristoforidhi (1827-1895), they were forced into exile. At Bucharest Abdyl the politician, Sami the educationist, and Naim, the Bektashi lyricist of Albanian nostalgia, formed a literary society and printed Albanian books from 1885 onward. Thimi Mitko and Spiro Dine, exiles in Egypt, collected folksongs from the local colony. In Sofia Midhat Frashëri, son of Abdyl, published an almanach, an anthology, a journal, and wrote didactic essays and short stories with a moral. Books printed in exile were smuggled into Albania by caravan.

The absence of a literary centre, and the want of a standard alphabet, hampered the movement, and Sami's difficult phonetic spelling was replaced by a digraphic one resembling that of A. Santori of Calabria and the linguist Dh. Camarda (1821-1882) of Sicily. After independence in November 1912 the various literary currents combined. A. Drenova (born 1872), the Tosk lyricist, Bubani, and L. Poradeci (born 1899) continued the Buchareste tradition, the last in an unorthodox style of his own; the Catholic North was represented by the nostalgic F. Shiroka (1847-1917), the linguist and historian A. Xanoni (1865-1913), N. Mjeda (1866-1937), the satirist Gj. Fishta (1891-1908), the folk-poet and elegist V. Prennushi (1885-1946), and the short-story writer E. Koliqi (born 1903). Fqoljon Postoli, and M. Grameno (1872-1931), the Tosk novelists, Kristo Floqë (born 1873), the dramatist, and F. Konitza (1875-1943) transferred their activity to Boston, U.S.A., where a literary society Vatra, and a journal Dielli ("The Sun") were founded in 1912.

The brief fascist regime (1939-1943) attracted a few writers with pro-Italian leanings; the present communist regime encourages writing on the partisan movement, the class struggle, work themes and peace. Textbooks are based on Russian models. There are three active theatres and a writers' union.

This activity is paralleled in Kosovo-Metohija, where the communist themes are Titosist.

3.—Geography. Albania (Shqipni, Shqipëri) lies on a N-S axis 20° E of Greenwich. With a total area of 21,097 square miles (54,748 sq. km.) it is bounded by Yugoslavia, Greece and the Adriatic. Lying between N Latitudes 39° 38' and 40° 41', its total length is 207 miles. It narrows to 50 miles at Peshkopf, and by Yugoslavia, Greece and the Adriatic. Lying between N Latitudes 39° 38' and 40° 41', its total length is 207 miles. It narrows to 50 miles at Peshkopf, and widens to 90 miles at the lake of Little Prespa. Its ten prefectures formerly had 39 subprefectures, now redrawn and renamed as 34 districts. Continuing the limestone formation of the Dinaric Alps, the terrain is highest in the E, reaching some 7,000 feet in places. Of the western lowlands, some below sea-
level, the largest is the fertile Myzeqja plain. The longest river, the Drin, rises in Lake Ohrid (Ochrida), and flows N-W and S-W to the Adriatic below Shengjin. The Mat, Ishem, Semeni-Devoll-Berat and the Vjosa flow in general N-W, but the Shkumbi, a torrent in winter, flows broadly E to W dividing the country into two roughly equal areas, Gjegjja and Toskerrija.

The mountain massif consists of three north-to-south barriers in Gjegjja, and four N-W to S-E parallel ranges in Toskerrija. The highest mountain is Tomorr near Berat (7,681 feet: 2336 metres). Denudation and deforestation have given the country a bare, rugged character. The lakes of Shkoder (Scutari), Ohri and Prespa are only partly in Albania; Terbuf in the central plain is a marsh, and Malik, below Korçë, has been drained.

Durrës (Durazzo) is the main port, with wharves and a shipyard; Valona has a fine natural harbour, and handles refined oil and bitumen; Saranda is a fishing port, and Shengjin handles ore. Chief towns in Albania: Terbuf in the central plain is a marsh, and Malik, below Korçë, has been drained.

According to the census of 1955 the population of Albania was 1,394,310 (in 1930 it was 1,003,097). Outside Albania there are Albanians in Yugoslavia (750,000 according to the Yugoslav census in 1948), in Greece (estimated between 30-60,000) and in Italy (estimated at 150-250,000). The number of Albanians by birth all over the world is estimated at 3 millions (see ed. S. Skendi, New York Cambridge 1957; S. Skendi, Albania, (Statistical, Historical, Political, etc.), New York and London 1957.
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4.—Population.

According to the census of 1955 the population of Albania was 1,394,310 (in 1930 it was 1,003,097). Outside Albania there are Albanians in Yugoslavia (750,000 according to the Yugoslav census in 1948), in Greece (estimated between 30-60,000) and in Italy (estimated at 150-250,000). The number of Albanians by birth all over the world is estimated at 3 millions (see ed. S. Skendi, New York 1956, 50). According to the 1930 census there were 45,000 Vlachs, 35,000 Slavs, 20,000 Turks and 15,000 Greeks in Albania. Approximately 20 percent of Albania's total population lived in towns in 1949-50. In the same year the larger towns were Tirana, the capital, with an estimated population of 80,000 (in 1930, 30,806), Shkoder 34,000, Korçë 24,000, Durrës 16,000, Elbasan 15,000, Vlora 15,000, Brat Mavrovo, Gjirokaster 12,000.

The Albanians are divided into two principal ethnic groups: The Gëgs to the North of the Shkumbi River and the Tosks to the South. The Turks called these two regions Gjallak and Toškallk. Not only in their dialects but also in the outlook and social behaviour the Gëgs differ from the Tosks. The Gëgs are considered as keeping national characteristics purer than the Tosks.

Generally speaking the barren mountains of Albania provided too little for an increasing population to subsist. Especially when an epidemic decimated livestock, the helpless people had no choice but to emigrate or to fall upon neighbouring plains. They usually went out as mercenaries, shepherds or agriculturists.

Toward the middle of the Albanians, under the pressure of the Serbs or as mercenaries of feudal seigneurs in Greece, migrated and settled in Epirus, Thessaly, Morea and even in the Aegean Islands. There most of the Albanians were gradually graecised, or migrated to Southern Italy under the pressure of the Ottomans later on. But about 1466 in Thessaly there were still Albanian districts in the towns as well as 24 Albanian katunes in Livadja (Lebadea) and 14 in Istifa (see my 1954. 146). Under the Ottomans these katunes had a special status and, later, are known as armatols.

When Iskender-beg died in 1468 a number of the Albanians involved in his struggle against the Ottomans either retired to the mountains or migrated to the kingdom of Naples. In 1478, 1481 and 1492 more Albanians migrated to Southern Italy and Sicily where they preserved their language and customs down to the present day.

In the 15th century the Ottoman government transferred some Albanian timar-holders (see TIMAR) of the feudal families (Mazeraki and Heykal) to Trebizond.

No large Turkish settlement is recorded in Albania except a small number of exiles from Konya, locally called Konici. There are also the Yürüks of Kojadiik on the mountains to the East of Dibra where they were stationed apparently to safeguard the Rumeli-Albania highway. The surguns (the deported), sent c. 1410 from such parts of Anatolia as Sarukhan, Kojla-ili, Djankik were also few in number (see S. Skendi, An English-Albanian Dictionary, London 1932; idem, A Short Albanian Grammar, London 1953; idem, An English-Albanian Dictionary, Cambridge 1957; S. Skendi, Albania, Statistical, Historical, Political, etc.), New York and London 1957.
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From the beginning the Ottoman government had to respect the tribal organisation and autonomy of these tribes. As they had actual control of the important mountain passes from Rumeli into Albania, the government charged them with the guardianship of these passes and in return for these services made them exempt from taxation. A regulation dated 1496 (Başbakanlık Archives, İstanbul, Taşpı Def. no. 26) reads as follows: “The nahiyye of Klemente (Klementi) consists of five villages. Their inhabitants of Christian faith pay one thousand aktas of xarida and one thousand aktas of ispenje to the Sandjakbeg and they are exempted from the aktas and the ispenje and other taxes, but they are made dorsendjii (guardians of the passes) on the route Scutari-Petrişan’s territory-Altun-ili as well as the route Medun-Kuća-Plava”. Later in the 17th century the Klementi caused troubles through their depredations in Rumeli and their co-operation with the rebellious tribes of Montenegro (Karađag). To the south of Drin lived the Mirditë tribe, 32,000 in number (in 1681) and all Roman Catholics. They were divided into five clans called bayraḳ, namely Oroghi, Fandi, Spashi, Kushneni, Dibri. Distinguished by their service to the Ottomans against the Venetians in 1696, the Hotëti were promoted to the first place among the clans. Their bayraḳ headed all the others. But today the Shalë tribe is the chief.

In tribal tradition the origin of the bayraḳ goes back to the Ottomans. In fact it was an Ottoman institution to give a bayraḳ or a sandjak to military chiefs as a symbol of authority. Each clan was under a bayraḳdär i.e. standard-bearer, who was a hereditary chief. The public affairs of the clan were decided in the council of the hereditary elders. In order to discuss general affairs the five clans had their annual meeting at Orosh. A bòluk-bash, appointed by the Ottoman governor, arranged all kinds of affairs between the administration and the clans. The “captains” of the five clans of Mirditë claimed to descend from Lekë Dukagjin who played an outstanding rôle in Iskender-beğ’s struggle against the Ottomans. Lekë Dukagjin is believed to have codified the customary law practiced among the tribes, which is called Lekë Dukagjin (A. Sh. K. Gjeçov, Kanuni i Lekë Dhubagjinit, Shkodër 1933).

These tribes used to send to the Ottoman army an auxiliary force composed of one man per household, an Ottoman practice which was also applied to the Yürük and the Kurds. When from the end of the 16th century onwards the empire came to need more troops for its lengthy wars the Albanian auxiliaries seemed to gain an increasing importance. They were used especially in the local wars against the Montenegrins. The Mirditë were regarded as the bravest soldiers in Rumeli. But at the same time H. Hecquard (1855) calls them “the greatest plunderers in the world”. In 1835 when the Tanşimati administration attempted to disarm them and enrol them in the regular army they rose up and infested the Zadrima (Zadrimë) area with the result that the next year the government gave up these attempts. Later the Mirditë chief Frenk Bib Doda played an important part in the Albanian independence movement (1908). The “Republic of Mirditë”, proclaimed under Yugoslav auspices in 1921, collapsed the next year.

Religion.

According to the Italian statistics of 1942 (see, Albania, ed. S. Skendi, 58) out of a total population of 1,128,143, 779,417 were Muslims, 232,320 Orthodox and 116,259 Catholics. The only significant Catholic group is located in the Shkodër (Scutari) district, while large Orthodox groups live in the districts of Gjirokastër (Argyrokastro), Korçë (Körice), Berat and Vlorë (Avlona). Muslims are spread all over the country, but mostly in the Central Albania.

Albania which became attached to the Patriarchate of Constantinople in 732 A.D., was split between Rome and Constantinople in 1054, the northern part coming under the jurisdiction of Rome. The Normans and the Angevins strengthened Catholicism in the country; Antivari was the seat of the Archbishop of Albania and Durazzo that of Macedonia.

Orthodox Albania was dependent directly on the Archbishopric of Ohrida. As the protectors of the Orthodox Church the Ottomans, even before their restoration of the Patriarchate of Constantinople in 1454, favoured Orthodoxy against Catholicism. However, for political reasons the Porte tolerated the Catholic church in Albania. The Albanian lords wavered between East and West according to the political conditions. The Orthodox Albanian immigrants to southern Italy had their own Uniate church recognising the Pope’s supremacy. According to the Ottoman year-book of 1893 there were, in the province of Yanya (Epirus and Albania south of the Devoll River), 223,885 Muslims, 126,053 Greeks, 139,517 Orthodox Albanians, 3,517 Jews and only 93 Roman Catholics. It must be added that a part of these Greeks were in origin Orthodox Albanians graecised through the Greek religious and educational institutions which were zealously founded beginning with the second half of the 18th century. After the independence of Albania an autocephalous Orthodox church of Albania was finally recognised by the Patriarchate (1917). The first converts to Islam were the Albanian feudal lords holding timârs from the Ottomans. Contrary to what is generally held conversion was not required as a condition for keeping their lands as timârs; allegiance to the Ottoman state was sufficient in order to receive timârs. Throughout the 15th century Christians were granted timârs. By the end of the 16th century, however, only one Christian timâr holder was left because of voluntary conversions. Elbasan, built by Mehemmed II in 870/1466, became a Muslim centre from the outset, as did Yeniçehir in Thessaly. It appears, however, that Islam had then only a few converts among the common people, ra’dây. At the beginning of the 16th century in four sandjaks of Albania (Elbasan, Ohri, Avlonya and Iskënderije) there were about three thousand Muslim ra’dây families. In Catholic sources written around 1622 it was estimated that only one thirtieth of the Albanian population was Muslim. During the 17th century the Venetians and Austrians attempted to foment an insurrection of the Catholic Albanians as well as the Orthodox Serbs who were feeling hostile to the government because of an increase in the džizyr. In 1634 at a meeting of church dignitaries at Kuçi it was decided to ask for aid from the Pope. Toward 1622 the first Franciscan missionaries appeared in Albania and Southern Serbia. Albanian Catholics and the Serbs co-operated with the Venetians in 1649 and with the Austrians in 1659-1690, which made the Porte decide to have recourse to retaliatory measures. To escape these, the Christian populations in the plains of Peć, Prizren, Djakovë and Kossovo, who were partly Albanian, migrated in mass or adopted Islam; but many of them became
crypto Christians, locally called lanunati (molyvi). The baptism and Islamisation of these plains went hand in hand in the 17th and 18th centuries.

Conversion to Islam received a new impetus under the Bushahls and Ali Pasha [q.v.] of Tepedelen. According to the contemporary witnesses, the latter forced a number of the villages to adopt Islam. It is believed to have been a Bektash himself and in his time Bektashism (see Bektashîya) made its greatest progress in Albania. Under King Zag its adherents were estimated at about 200,000. With its prosperous ßaktsin in Tiran, Ak diagnostics (the old centre of the Bektashîya), Berati, and on the Tomor mountain, as well as its central organisation in the capital, Bektashism assumed importance in Albania. During the Congress of Karat in 1921 the Bektashîya sought to establish a community of their own, separate from the Sunnîs. This was to be accomplished only under the Communist régime in 1945.

Islam played an essential part in Ottomanising the Albanians. Christian Albanian often referred to their Muslim compatriots as Turks. On the other hand Islam prevented the Albanians from being assimilated by their Greek or Slavic neighbours. It is asserted that under the venerated of Christ as well as Islam the primitive religious beliefs survived with the Albanians, especially in the highlands.

6. History.

The Illyrian origin of the Albanian people is generally admitted, but their ethnic relationships to the Thracians, Epirots and the Pelasgians are still subject to argument. The Illyrian tribes first came into contact with Greek culture, through the Greek colonies founded on the Albanian coastland, in the 7th century B.C. The principal one was Epidamnos near Durazzo (Durrës). The Illyrians formed their first independent political organization in the third century B.C. Conquered by the Romans in 167 B.C., they were subject to strong Roman influence for centuries. The Roman highway to the Orient, Via Egnatia, started at Dyrrachium (Durrës) and followed the Shkumbi valley. Ptolemy mentions, for the first time, the ßaktsin, among Illyrian tribes and their capital ßaktsin in (near Dorrës). In the 6th century the invasion of Albania by the Slavs put an end to the romanisation of the Albanians who retired to the mountains in northern Albania to live a pastoral life for half a millennium. In the 15th and 16th centuries the Albanian empire extended its rule over southern Albania, including Dyrrachium (Greek Dyrrachion), and toward the end of the 12th century the Serbs under Nemanja occupied northern Albania. The long coexistence with the agriculturist Slavs left a deep cultural imprint on the Albanian people. Finally, Emperor Basil II restored Byzantine rule in southern Albania, and conquered Dyrrachium (1055) which had been the capital of the Byzantine theme of Dyrrachion and Ohrida-Prizren, are seen to be mentioned more by the contemporary sources, 'AXASOU or 'Aßßåvî in Greek, Aromanian or Aromanian in Latin and Aromanian in Slavic sources.

The Ottomans first used the Greek form Arnavut and then its turcised versions Arnavut and Arnavut. Again from the 11th century on, Albania became a bridge-head for feudal Europe to attack the Byzantine empire. Dyrrachion was temporarily taken by the Normans in 1081 and 1185, and by the Venetians in 1204. Then, it came into the possession of the Despot of Epirus, Theodore Angelus (1215-1230). In 1272 Charles of Anjou occupied Dyrrachion as well as the rest of the Albanian coastland, and he called himself the "King of Albania". This started a long struggle between the Byzantines and the Angevins in Albania.

Anatoïlian Turks, as a result of their alliance with the Byzantine emperor, first came to know Albania in 1237/1238. During the Byzantine civil war the Albanian highlanders had increased their depredations in Albania, taken Timonor (Timoniri), and threatened the other Byzantine strongholds, Kanina, Belgrade (Berat) Kliura and Skaraper. In order to establish his control in Albania as well as in Epirus, Andronicus III entered that province with an army which included a Turkish auxiliary force. It was sent by his ally Umar Beg, ruler of Aydın, as far as the country as far as Durazzo (Dyrrachion). The rebels who retired into the mountains suffered great losses at the hands of the Turks. The Turks returned home through Thessaly and Boeotia (Chatziconstantinou).

Before long Stephan Dushan occupied Albania (Croya in 1343, Central Albania 1349-1360). This seems to have accelerated the migration of Albanians into Greece. Native Albanian feudal lords and soldiers joined Dushan in his conquests further south (L. von Thannlecz-C. JirecK, Zwei Erkunden... 85). The voyvodes whom we later find in Albania under the Ottomans settled there apparently with Dushan at this time. When in 1335 Dushan's empire collapsed, local feudal lords, Slav, Albanian or Byzantine in origin, appeared in all parts of Albania. Soon the Balhs (Balgis), in the north and the Thopias in the centre emerged as the most powerful of these lords. The Balhs possessed the coastline between Durazzo and Cattaro, and tried to secure control of a large area as far Prizren. They came into conflict with Twarke, king of Bosnia, as well as with the Serbs who sought to bring this region, Zeta, again under their control. Soon the Balbs, who had already settled themselves in Aviona, Belgrade and Kanina, threatened Carlo Thopias in Durazzo. He asked for help from the Ottoman Turks in 1287/1385, as their frontiers (frontier) units had appeared near Yannina already in 1283/1381. Balba II was defeated and killed by an Ottoman army at Suvra on the Vojso River in Myzeqen on 12 Sha'ban 787/18 September 1385. This is recorded in Ottoman chronicles as the expedition to "Karlil-îl", that is "the land of Karlil" (Carlo Thopias), and it is dated correctly as 1287/1385. The Albanian lords, including Balba's heirs, recognised the Sultan's overlordship. The Dukagin of Alessio notified the Ragusans of their peace with the Ottomans in 1289/1387. Alarmed by the Ottoman advance, Venice sent Daniel Cornero to Murad I to protect Thopias (Reneder) in the 15th century. When toward the middle of the 12th century the control of Byzantium was weakened in the provinces the Albanians came out from their mountain retreats. From this time on, the Albanians, who were then located between the lines of Skodra (Skodaret) and Durrës, were occupied by the Ottoman Turks, and the land of the Albanians was populated by Albanians. The Ottoman Turks then occupied the Greek form Arnavut and then its turcised versions Arnavut and Arnavut. Again from the 11th century on, Albania became
to Neghri, this expedition was made at the request of the "Lord of Skutari" (G. Stratsimirovic) who after Shahin's defeat was accused of a secret understanding with the enemy. After their victory at the Kossovo plain (791/1391) the Ottomans made Skoplje (Uskub) a strong frontier centre by settling there the Turks from Sarukhan under Pasha-Yigit (toward 793/1391). Then Shahin came back and drove out G. Stratsimirovic from Scutari, and St. Sergius (1393-1395) who had returned to the Venetians for protection. Venice for its part took Alessio, Durazzo (1393), Drivasto (1396), all given up by the native lords for a yearly pension. The Ottomans too tried to keep the local lords on their side by guaranteeing them their lands as timârs. Thus Dimitri Vonina (Gionima), Constantin Balsha, Gjergj Dukagjin as Turkish vassals all co-operated with Shahin against the Venetians.

The establishment of the Ottoman rule in Albania with its läbeer (see Tapu) and timâr [q.v.] system started first in the region of Premedzi (Premetë) and Korçë (Korbizë). The regular Ottoman administration with its subâkshì and kâdis in towns and sipâtës in villages is found there in the records going back to the time of Bayazid I (Basaqehat Archivo, Istanbul, Malıyë no. 231). This must have followed the Ottoman expeditions in Albania in 796/1394 and 799/1397. The Ottoman revolt of Akfahisar (Croya, Kroje) was granted tax exemption in the same period. Albanian forces under Coia Zaccaria, Dimitri Vonina, Gjergj Dukagjin and Dhushmani were present at the battle of Ankara in 804/1402. Upon the collapse of Bayazid's empire in 1402, many of these Albanian lords (Ivan Kastrioti, Coia Zaccaria, Niketa Thopia) recognised Venetian suzerainty. When in 1403 George Stratimirovic died, Venice, which had already taken Scutari, seized a part of his heritage—Dulcigno, Antivari and Budua (826/1423). In the south the Despot Carlo Tocco died in 832/1429 and Murad II, taking advantage of the conflict between his heirs, took Yannina (Muharram 834/October 1430). After that a new land and population survey of Albania was effected (Shab'an 835/Spring 1432) which meant the tightening of the Ottoman administrative control there. This survey may be regarded as the real starting-point of the long Albanian resistance during the subsequent decades. Moreover it demonstrates the real character of the rebellion. Firstly some of the villages in the mountainous Kurvelesh and Bzorshek areas refused to be registered. In a few places they even killed their Ottoman timâr-holders. Great feudal lords such as Ivan (Yuvan) Kastrioti in the north, Arianites (Araniti, Arnit) Comnenus in the Argirkaft region, had to return to Stephen, Drivasto. Antivari and Budua (826/1423) were declared against Venice during which the latter finally reached an agreement on Albanian affairs with their suzerain, Stephen Lazarevic of Serbia, against Venice, which finally had to return to Stephen, Drivasto. Antivari and Budua. But his son Balsha, supported by Stephen Lazarevic and Vuk Branković of Serbia embarked upon a long struggle against Venice. The latter finally reached an agreement on Albanian affairs with their suzerain, Emir Siileyman (19 Djumada I, 812/29 September 1415). Then Pasha-Yigit Conoi, Kastriot to submit to the Sultan's suzerainty (813/1410). In the South the Ottomans supported Albanian Spatas against the Toccos. Finally war was declared against Venice during which the Ottomans made the real conquest of Albania from Northern Epirus to Croya (Akapshas) and formed the province of Arvanid ili or Arnavud ili (818-20/1415-1417).

The conditions which the Ottoman conquest brought into the country can be fully ascertained with the help of the details contained in the timâr register of 835/1432 (Sâret-i defter-i Sânh-i Arvanid, ed. H. Inalcik, Ankara 1954). The names of various regions in the register frequently contains references to the chief feudal families who were vassals of the Ottoman, about 819/1416: Yuvan-ili (land of Kastrioti), Balsha-ili (east of Kavajë and south of Shkumbi), Gionoomayno-ili (North of Pekin), Pavlo-Kurtik-ili (the Jilema Valley), Kondo-Miholo-ili (area west of Elbasan), Zenebishi-ili (Zenebissi, Gjonokaster and its surroundings), Bogdan-Ripe-ili (north of Elbasan), Argjini-ili (Premetë). Besides these great families, many smaller Christian feudal kept their lands as timârs. Among them we may mention Dobrile (in Çartolos), Simos Kondo (in Kokinolitsari), Bobza Family (Gion and his sons Gjin and Andre in the Village of Bobza or Bugës), Kachi family (Matja). This kind of timârs constituted 16 per cent of all the timâr-holders in Arvanid ili. Conversion to Islam was not considered necessary for possession of timârs. One Metropolis in Belgrade (Borat) and through Peshapo in Kanina, Akçaahisar and Kartos were given their former villages as timârs. The Turkish population in the province consisted only of the military and religious personnel. The Turkish timâr-holders with their men did not exceed 800 in number. The whole sâbâksh was distributed among about 300 timâr-holders who lived in the villages or castles, namely, Argirkaft (Argyrocastro, Gjino-kastër), Kanina, Belgrade, Iskarapar, Bratujesh or Yenidje-kale and Akçaaahisar. Argirkaft (later on Argiri or Ergiri) became the seat of the sâbâksh-begi and in each county (ulidâyët) centre there was a subâksh and kâdi. The revolutionary step taken by the Ottoman state was that it considered almost all the agricultural lands as owned by the state, because only such a system would enable it to apply its timâr system. The peasants, therefore, must have had the feeling that they were under an impersonal central government as compared to their close dependence upon the feudal lords under the old régime.

In the north, the Ottomans supported first, Balsha III, and upon his death (824/1421), Stephan Lazarevic of Serbia, against Venice, which finally had to return to Stephen, Drivasto. Antivari and Budua (826/1423). In the south the Despot Carlo Tocco died in 832/1429 and Murad II, taking advantage of the conflict between his heirs, took Yannina (Muharram 834/October 1430). After that a new land and population survey of Albania was effected (Shab'an 835/Spring 1432) which meant the tightening of the Ottoman administrative control there. This survey may be regarded as the real starting-point of the long Albanian resistance during the subsequent decades. Moreover it demonstrates the real character of the rebellion. Firstly some of the villages in the mountainous Kurvelesh and Bzorshek areas refused to be registered. In a few places they even killed their Ottoman timâr-holders. Great feudal lords such as Ivan (Yuvan) Kastrioti in the north, Arianites (Araniti, Arnit) Comnenus in the Argirkaft region, had to give up considerable parts of their lands for distribution to the Ottoman sipâtës as timârs. First Araniti took up arms, killed many sipâtës in the autumn of 836/1432, and Thopia Zenebissi besieged Argirkaft. Alfonso V. of Naples, Venice and Hungary encouraged the rebels, who defeated 'Ali, son of Evreuax, governor of Albania, at the Bzorshek pass. Encouraged by these developments Christian lords in central and northern Albania joined the rebellion. Finally in 837/1434 all the forces of Rumeli under Sinan Beg, governor-general of Rumeli, combined to put an end to this dangerous rebellion which was giving hope to Hungary of a new Crusade. But Araniti managed to escape to the mountains. The additional records made after 836/1432 in the defter of Arvanid ili indicate that the rebellion did not affect the Ottoman control of the country to any considerable extent. A great majority of the Ottoman and Christian timâr-holders remained in possession of their timârs. It appears that mostly the highlanders co-operated with the feudal families who had matrimonial connections with their chieftains.

From 847/1443 onwards Iskender beg [q.v.], the son-in-law of Araniti, assumed the leadership of the rebellion; his unusual energy and boldness, and the international situation which obtained at the time, gave the movement a character of international
significance. Setting aside the legend that has grown up around his person, it must be emphasized that the origin and the motives of his rebellion were not different from those of the other Albanian lords. Appointed sâbık of Ağaçhisar (Croya) about 842/1438, he was dismissed in 1440. He wished to recover Croya and his father’s lands in their entirety and to possess them as a feudal lord, not as a timár-holder. It is true that he made an alliance with other feudal
families, Thopias, Balbašas, Dukagjin, Duqman, Lecca Zacarria and Araniti (The Alexis Meeting, 1st March 1444), but the idea of an Albania unified by a national leader is far from reality. He controlled only northern Albania while central and southern Albania always remained under Ottoman control. Sâbık and sandjak-begs, based on Argirkarsfi (Gjinokaster), Ohrda or Belgrade (Berat) tried to suppress him with local forces. He waged guerrilla warfare all the time. Many of the battles described by Marino Barilzio with such fantastic figures were nothing but local clashes. Iskender-beg’s own forces seem never to exceed 3,000. By the treaty of 26th March 1452 he became vassal of Alfonso V of Naples and surrendered Croya to the king’s men. Araniti, who had claims on southern Albania (Vagenelia, Valona, Kanina) followed his example. Araniti was authorised by the king to accept in his name oaths of allegiance by other Albanian lords. So Zenebissi and others also became Alfonso’s vassals. In return, the King agreed to grant a yearly pension varying between 300 and 1400 ducats to each of these vassals and to provide them a place to take refuge in case of danger. This simple change of masters was obviously determined by the fact that the Aragonese system appeared much more advantageous than the Ottoman regime to the Albanian feudalists. But as witnessed by a contemporary Aragonese document, “the common people had hardly any complaints against the Ottoman administration” (see C. Marinesco, Alphonse VIII., Mii. de l’école Romaine, in France, Paris 1923, 104). A timár register made in 872/1466-67 included Dibra, Dgëbri, Rjeka, Mat and Cermeinika (Başbakannlık Archivio, Istanbul, Mâliye no. 506). It is therefore seen that after Mehmed II’s [a.e.] expedition in 870/1466, the timár system was extended into these areas. Whatever his real motives may have been, Iskender-beg, who defied, in his mountains, Murad II (in 854/1450) and Mehmed II (in 870/1466 and 871/1467), was also glorified in his time as “Champion of Christ”, by the Pope, and as the Albanian National hero, by the nationalists in the 19th century.

During the Ottoman-Venetian war of 1465-1479 Albania became one of the main scenes of operation. Finally the Ottomans were able to take Croya, Drivasto, Alessio and Jabljak (Jabyak) in 1478, Scutari in 1479, and Durazzo in 1502. Alessio (Leshi), which the Ottomans lost during the war of 1499-1503, was retaken in 1509. After having failed in their attempts in 1538, the Ottomans finally took Antivari (Bar) and Dulcigno (Uëlçinj, Œlgün) in 1571, and thus completed their conquest of Albania. That appears to be up to the end of the 16th century Ottoman rule in Albania created a peaceful and prosperous era. Most of the old feudal families then adjusted themselves to the Ottoman régime, and even one of the Aranitis named Ali beg had a large timár around Kanina, Argirkarsfi and Belgrade toward 1506.

Until about 870/1466 Ottoman Albania was organised as a sandjak under the name of Arvanid (or Arnavud)-li. Its subdivisions were the ulayets of Argirkarsfi, Kilsura, Kanina, Belgrade, Timoringie, Iskarakar, Pavlo-Kurtik, Cartalos and Ağaçhisar. When in 1466 Mehmed II erected the fort of Elbasan, this region was set up as a new sandjak.

| Sandjaks | Communities | Population | Officials and solders** | Tax revenues
|----------|-------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------|
|          | Towns | Forts | Villages | Christian households | Muslim households | Jewish households | Sandjak-beg & džafti | Zaim | Timár-salāhid | Deçanes | Meşrit in ducats | in abăb (one Venetian ducat was worth 52-6 abăb in this period)
| Iskenderiye; its êdâf divisions: Iskenderiye, Podgoriçha, Bihor, Ipek, Prizrin, Karadaghi. | 5 6 855 | 23,355 | 371 | — | 1 4 8 | 137 | ? | 297 | 4,392,910
| Awlonya; its êdâf divisions: Belgrade, Iskarakar, Premedi, Bogonya, Dedepedra, Argirkarsfi, Awlonya. | 7 7 | 33,570 | 1,344* | 528* in Awlonya 25 in Belgrade | 1 7 65 479 | 654 | 346 and 107 Szâab | 6,907,830 in three êdâs Argirkarsfi, Awlonya and Belgrade
| Elbasan; its êdâf divisions: Elbasan, Cermenika, Ishbat, Diraç. | 3 4 250 | 8,916 | 526 | — | 1 3 2 | 103 | 1,031 | 400 | 1,260,087
| Ohrî; its êdâf divisions: Ohrî, Dibra, Ağaçhisar, Mat. | 4 6 849 | 32,648 | 623 | — | 1 4 8 | 388 | 655 | 193 | 2,947,949

* These figures are for the êdâs of Belgrade, Argirkarsfi and Awlonya only.
** We have not included in this list disdârs, ketâbudâs, khabîls, ûmâns, or shâykhâs, who were present almost in every town.
Moreover in the south the sandjaq of Awlonya (Avlona) and in the east that of Ohri were created and in 1479 the sandjaq of Iskenderie (Scutari) was founded in the north. The following is a list established on the basis of the surveys of 912/1506 and 926/1520. (Bus. Archives, Tapu no. 34 and 94), showing the administrative and military situation in the 16th century.

A comparison of the survey of 835/1431 with those of the 16th century reveal the fact that everywhere, in towns and villages, the population more than doubled during the intervening period and in consequence the tax revenues increased similarly. The following illustrates this for the principal towns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Towns</th>
<th>1431</th>
<th>The beginning of the 16th century</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christian households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argiriçari</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanina</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premedj</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klisura</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akçaçıbar</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(These figures do not include the military or the civil officials).

The Albanian towns, which numbered 19 in the four Albanian sandjaqs, were small local market-towns with populations varying between 1,000 and 4,000. Only Awlonya (Avlona) became a commercial centre of some importance (population 4 to 5 thousand). In order to further commerce, the government settled there a sizeable Jewish colony of the refugees from Spain (end of the 15th century). According to the Kanun-nâme of Awlonya (see Arvanid Defteri, 123) the port handled goods imported from Europe, and velvets, brocades, mohairs, cotton goods, carpets, spices and leather goods came from Bursa and Istanbul. Some of the citizens of Awlonya even had business associates in Europe. Quite a large amount of tar and salt, produced near the city, was bought by state agencies at fixed prices. The tax income from Awlonya for the sultan’s treasury alone amounted to about 32 thousand gold ducats a year. A garrison and a small fleet were stationed there permanently (for vols. 7 and 8).

The Ottoman towns did not radically change the taxat-
... everywhere took into their service these highlanders who were reputed to be the best mercenaries. They were organised in bôlyak of about 100 men under a bôlyak-bashi, who, as a perfect condottiere, arranged everything for his men with the hire. The part played by such bôlyak is well illustrated by the example of Mehmed Ali in Egypt. Many Albanians also joined the mountain bands in Rumeli, called Daghil ekghyas or Kirilais.

In the same period the lease system of the state-owned lands (mirt ardi mukdita'si) on the lowlands, coastal plains or inland basins, in Albania gave birth to the big land-owning class of 'a'yân [q.v.]. These absentee land-lords used every means to obtain more and more mukdita'si. Among them, the Buçhatli family in the North, in the land of Gëg, and Tepe-delenli 'Ali Paşa (see 'Ali Paşa teperdeleni) (1744-1821) in the south, in the area of Toçka, emerged as semi-independent despots. The first Buçhatli (in Turkish chroniclers Buçhatli or Buçcatti), Mehmed Paşa, built up his power by acquiring large mukdita'si and by making an alliance with the Malisors, the highlanders, and thus forced the Porte to confer him the governorship of Scutari (Ishkaodra, Shkodër) (1779). After his death (1796), the Porte's attempt to get back these mukdita'si caused his son Kars Mahibed Paşa [q.v.] to rebel. 'Ali Paşa, too, possessed about 200 estates (bôlyaks). The Porte at first did not challenge the increasing power and authority of the Buçhatlis and 'Ali Paşa, as they were rightly considered to check the domination of the local 'a'yân, and the rivalry between these two pagas seemed to counterbalance each other. 'Ali Paşa once tried to extend his control into the zone of the Buçhatlis and fought them. Through his sons, whom he managed to have appointed governors of Thessaly, Moera, Karli-il he actually formed a semi-independent state in Albania and Greece. In 1820, when the central government finally took action against him, he rebelled, and instigated the Greeks to revolt. The power of the last Buçhatli, named Mustafà Paşa, was destroyed only in 1832 by the reformed army of Mahmud II. The centralist policy of the Taşlimid of the Times caused troubles with the autonomous tribes in North Albania.

The "Albanian League for the Defence of the Rights of the Albanian Nation" had been set up at Prizren on June 13, 1898, only to influence the decisions of the Congress of Berlin; but it proved to have great significance for the birth of an Albanian state later on. Encouraged by the Ottoman government at the beginning, the League set up resistance to the Montenegrins and Greeks in order to keep the Albanian provinces united (the four Ottoman millet of Yanya, Ishkodra, Manastir and Kosova).

The league tended to further the idea of an autonomous Albania, the Porte sent an army and dispersed the League in 1875. But the great powers, especially Austria-Hungary and Italy, encouraged this autonomy movement with the purpose of extending their influence over Albania while Russia was supporting Montenegrò's territorial claims over Albania. On the other hand, by enlisting Albanians in his bodyguard and conferring special favours on them, 'Abd al-Hamid II was trying to win Albanian support. But the Albanian intellectuals, in cooperation with the Young Turks in Paris and elsewhere, were anticipating an autonomous Albania.

In 1908 the stand taken by the Albanians against 'Abd al-Hamîd at the Frizovik Meeting did actually help the Revolution to succeed. In the Ottoman Parliament the influential Albanian deputies, such as Ismâ'il Kemâl, Es'ad Toptani, Hasan Priftihina, joined in the İttihat ve Terakkip Party which sought decentralisation as against the centralistottomisation policy of the İttihat ve Terakkip Party. While the heated discussions on an Albanian educational system was going on (the Congress of Manastir, November 1906) an uprising broke out among the Albanian highlanders who resisted the Ottoman government attempt to collect their arms. Finally, at the end of September 1912, the new Ottoman government accepted the Albanian demands for an autonomous administration. But the Balkan War completely changed the situation in the Balkans. A short time after the declaration of war, in November 1912, Ismâ'il Kemâl declared the independence of Albania at Awlonya (Vlorë). The London Conference proclaimed Albania an autonomous principality under the guaranty of the six powers (25th July 1913); but the newly elected prince, William von Wied, had soon to leave the country (3rd September 1914). After the first world war Serbia laid claims to Shkodër and Durrës. Seeing their country dismembered, the Albanian leaders hastily convoked a congress at Lushnjé (21st January 1920) and demanded the independence of Albania. A national government was formed in Tirana, and an Albanian partisan army drove out the Italians from Vlore. Italy finally recognised the independence of Albania with the treaty of Tirana (3rd August 1920). The small Albanian state experienced a tumultuous parliamentary life during the first years of its existence (1921-4). The Muslim land-owning beys of the western and central plains came into conflict with the Popular Party (under its leader Fan Noli). A revolution forced Ahmet Zog, the Foreign Minister, to flee to Yugoslavia. With Yugoslav support he came back into power (24th December 1924). A constituent Assembly proclaimed Albania a Republic and named Ahmed Zog (Zogu) President. He then signed a series of treaties with Italy (12th May 1925; 27th November 1926; 22nd November 1927 and March 1936) putting the country practically under Italian protection. In September 1928 Zog was proclaimed the King of Albanians. He fled from Albania one day before the Italians invaded the country on April 6, 1939.

ARNAWUTLUK — *ARRADA
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ARNIT, Span. Arnedo, a small town in the 
province of Logroño, chief town of a partido judicial; 
it numbers about 10,000 inhabitants and is situated 
on the left bank of the Cidacos, a tributary of the 
Ebro, about 22 m. (35 km.) from the capital. Arnedo is 
a toponym of Iberian origin which is found in the 
provinces of Burgos, Albacete and Logroño, and 
which also occurs, in the last-named, in the diminu- 
tive form Arnedillo. In the middle of the 6th/12th 
century, Muslim Spain consisted, according to al-
Idrisi, of twenty-six clires (išâlim) or regions, among 
which figured that of Arnedo, with the towns of 
Calatayud, Daroca, Saragossa, Huesca and Tudela. 
The only Arabic work which describes it is the al-
Rawd al-Mi'âr; according to this, it is "an ancient 
town of al-Andalus, 30 m. from Tudela, surrounded 
by rich cultivated plains. It is a place of great 
strength, and ranks among the most important. 
From this fortress one looks down on to Christian 
territory". Arnedo, Tudela and Oñate were naturally siege 
and a measure of rather less than a quarter 
weight of approximately 35.3 milligrams (half a 
*arthab, or *arnada, its arrow itself instead of using it to propel a pro-
lance or field weapons. The word itself comes from 
the Classical Greek *aronos; but, strangely enough, 
*arnada, or *mandianik, were naturally siege 
*arrada, and in the fact that the *arrada discharges 
the principle of the 
*arrada. It is said that in mediaeval Greek 
manganikon or mangonels; in the case of the other, 
*arrada 
state, either in addition to their salary when in 
office, or as a pension on retirement, or as an indem-
nity for unemployment. This term does not appear in 
the historical sources before the 16th century, and 
corresponds, to begin with, to an indemnity for 
fodder of animals, paid to those who maintained 
cy of the state, either in addition to their salary when in 

211; E. Lévi-Provençal, La Péninsule ibérique, 
Arabic text 14, trans. 20; Ibn Hayzar, Djamhourat 
al-Ansab, 86, l. 47-8; Dick, geog., ii, 582; J. M. 
Lacarra, Esp. musul. contra Sancho Garcés, in 
Revue du Principe de Viana, 1940, i, 41-70. 
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AROR [see aror]

ARPA. 'Barley' in Turkish. The term arpa tanesi 
—*a barley grain*—was used under the Ottoman 
regime to denote both a weight and a measure: a 
weight of approximately 35.3 milligrams (half a 
*hamba), and a measure of rather less than a quarter 
of an inch, 6 equalling one *parmaq* (itself equivalent 
to 1/4 inches. 
(H. BOWEN)

ARPALIK, (literally, "barley money"), a term 
used in the Ottoman empire up to the beginning of the 
19th century to denote an allowance made to 
the principal civil, military and religious officers of 
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ARRADJÁN, town in Fars. According to the Arabic authors it was founded by the Sásání king, Kawād I (488, 496-531), who settled there the prisoners of war from Amid (Diýár-bakr) and Mayyā-fārik, and gave to the new settlement the official name Weh ἀμίδ-i Kawād = “Good (or Better) Amīd of Kawād”, run together and arabicised into Wāmkubād or usually simply Amīd-Kubād (Marquart proposed to read so in al-Ṭabarī, i, 887, 888)! Some Arabic writers have erroneously given to Arranjān the name Abar(š)ubāḏ, which was borne by a district and a town on the western frontier of Ahwāz (Ḵūzistān); see also Abarkubād. In any case, the name which is in common use, Arranjān, comes from an older town which existed before the new one founded by Kawād.I

In the Arabic mediaeval age Arranjān was a very frequently mentioned frontier-town of Fārs against Ahwāz, and down to the end of the 7th/13th century was the capital of the most eastern of the five provinces of Fārs; a part of the province of Arranjān belonged earlier not to Fārs but to Ḵūzistān (cf. Ibn Fakhūr, 199; al-Makdisī, 421). Arab geographers describe Arranjān as a large place with excellent bazaars, which manufactured much soap, grew great quantities of corn, possessed numerous date and olive plantations, and was considered to have one of the healthiest situations of the “hot land” (Garmstān). The rise of the Assassins portended its decline; for they seized possession of several strongholds on the neighbouring hills and from there made frequent plundering raids on the town and its adjacent district, and finally took it in the 7th/13th cent. Arranjān never recovered from the horrors of this conquest. The inhabitants emigrated mostly to the neighbouring town, Bībāhān, which succeeded Arranjān as capital of the province.

According to the Arab geographers Arranjān lay on the road leading from Shīrāz to ʿIrāq, 37 miles distant from Shīrāz and al-Ahwāz, and a day’s journey from the Persian Gulf; it was situated on the river Tāb, which here formed the boundary between Fārs and al-Ahwāz.

The ruins of Arranjān were discovered by C. de Bode on the river Tāb (modern Ab-i Kurdistān or Mārān) at 31 40’ N. Lat. and 50 20’ E. Long. (Greenw.). Mustawfi shows that the form Arghān or Arkhān for the town, was in popular use at the beginning of the 8th/14th century. The site of the ruins, according to Herzfeld, is a ride of two hours by horse east of the town of Bībāhān on a canal leading out of the Mārān River, and it forms an almost rectangular plain of ruin ca. 3930 × 2620 ft. near the Kūh-i Bībāhān. Cultivation has now effaced all structural remains, according to Stein. About two miles farther up the river remains of a bridge from the Middle Ages, and of a barrage below the bridge, still exist. The bridge was mentioned by Arab geographers.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Shaḥrī, Ḥamāsa, Haydarābād 1345, 283; Samʿānī, Ansāb, 244; Ibn al-Dīwjī, Munīṣām, Haydarābād 1359, x, 139-40; Yāḵūt, i, 193-5; Ibn al-ʿAṯīr, xi, 96-7; Ibn Khallikān, ed. 1299/1881, i, 83-5; Brockelmann, S I, 448;ʿAll Āl Ṭāhir, La Poésie arabe en Irak et en Perse sous les Šeldjoukides, Surbonne thesis 1954, index.

'ARRĀF. (a.; the abstract is, 'irāf) one of the names for a diviner. Literally “eminent in knowledge” or “a professional knower”; the European equivalent would be “wise woman” with a change of sex. There are several synonyms. Ṭabbī (physician); “I said to the 'arrāf of Yamāma, ‘Treat me, for if you cure me you are indeed a physician’; and “I will give the 'arrāf of Yamāma his due and the 'arrāf of Najḍ, if they cure me.” The two were respectively Rābān b. Jāda al-Asadal b. Ṭabāq. Kāhīn (diviner) [q.v.] is especially one who deduces his answer from the words, behaviour or circumstances of the enquirer or finds things which have been stolen or lost. It is said that the 'arrāf is somewhat less than the kāhīn. Of course, opinions differ on the precise meaning of these words; a proverb says that the 'arrāf takes what escaped the thief. Kūshān or Ḵīnūn, dowser. Ḥāst one who divines from the shape of the limbs or moles on the face. A tradition says that he who consults the 'arrāf or kāhīn is an unbeliever. Nevertheless the examples of their activity are Islamic. ‘Amr b. Al-ʿĀṣ was not a professional 'arrāf but was famous for his practical wisdom; from the names of two travellers, Ḥāṣira and Kāṭṭāl, he deduced that ʿUthmān had been first besieged and then killed (al-Ṭabarī, i, 3250). The Iḵ wand al-Ṣaʿāfī say that the kāhīn uses no tools, books or calculations but relies on his motherwit and interprets what he sees or hears. Zadīr is employed to describe this method of divination though it first meant drawing omens from birds or animals. Ibn Khaldūn sets out a theory of divination. “It is a property peculiar to the human soul. The soul is so constituted that it can divest itself of its fleshly integument and rise to a higher spiritual state. Men who belong to the rank of prophets through their natural disposition receive as it were a flash (of intuition), and this comes to them without effort on their part, without the aid of sensual means of perception, and without forcing the imagination; nor need they bring their bodies into play by uttered word or hurried movement. They need employ no artificial means. By divesting themselves of the flesh they put on the angelic state which is natural to them in less than the twinkling of an eye.”
ARRÁN. The name is usually applied in Islamic times to the district in Transcaucasia between the Kur (Kura) and Aras (Araks) Rivers. In pre-Islamic times, however, the term was used for all of eastern Transcaucasia (present Soviet Azerbaijan), i.e. Classical Albania (cf. article “Albania” in Pauly-Wissowa). By the 15th century A.D. the name Arrán was not in common parlance, for the territory was absorbed into Ádharbáyján.

The origin of the name Arrán, Georgian Ram, Greek 'Aξjβαλον, and Armenian Alwank (people), is unknown. (In some Classical authors one finds the form Arzian/Arayan, and in Arabic sources one can find al-Ran). Before 387 A.D. the land between the two rivers was considered part of Armenia, comprising the provinces of Ardzakh, Uti, and P'aitakaran. After the division of Armenia between the Greeks and Sassanians in 387 A.D., the first two provinces went to Albania/Arrán and the last to Persia. This is one reason for much confusion in the designation of Arrán, since the Armenians considered only the land north of the Kur River as Arrán.

By the 7th century A.D. the population of “greater” Arrán was thoroughly mixed, and one can hardly speak of a distinctive people. Istaqhrí, 192, and Ibn Hawkal, 349, however, mention al-rānīyya as a language still spoken in the city of Bardha'a in the 9th century A.D.

The Arabs, adopting the Roman system of designation of Armenia, extended the terminology, including all of eastern Transcaucasia under Armenia I (Ibn Khurradalzhib, 122; al-Baladhurí, 194). When the Arabs appeared in the country they found it divided among many small lords, some of whom held allegiance to the Khazars, especially after the fall of the Sassanians. Arrán had been part of the Armenian territories and during the Umayyad Caliphate was nominally under the rule of the princes of Armenia, who in turn were subject to the Arabs. Since it was on the Islamic frontier, subject to Khazar raids and rule, Arrán in fact enjoyed a great measure of independence.

The early Arab raids under Salmán b. Rab'á and Ḥábīb b. Maslama at the end of the caliphate of 'Umar and the early years of 'Uthmán brought the nominal submission of Baylakán, Bardha'a, Ḥabala, and Shammur, the principle towns of Arrán. Afterwards the Arabs warred constantly with the Khazars and local princes (cf. Baladhurí, 203; Tabarí, i, 1889-97). After the first civil war, and in the caliphate of Mu'tawiya Arab rule in Arrán was established, but the Khazars continued to raid south of the Caucasus Mountains. In the caliphate of 'Abd al-Malik the Christian church of Arrán, which had been joined to the Greek Orthodox church, was united with the Armenian church by the Armenian clergy with Arab aid and approval (cf. J. Muylders, La domination arabe en Arménie, Louvain 1927, 99). On the Umayyad governors of Armenia (including Arrán) cf. Baladhurí, 203-9. During the governorship of Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik, appointed by the Caliph Hishám in 107/725-6, large Arab garrisons were brought into Arrán, and Bardha'a served as head-quarters in operations against the Khazars. On the campaigns against the Khazars cf. D. M. Dunlop, The History of the Jewish Khazars, Princeton 1954, 60-87, and F. Gabrieli, Il Califato di Hishám, Alexandria 1935, 74-84. Under the governorship of Marwan b. Muhammad, last of the Umayyad caliphs, from 113-26/731-44, the Khazars were decisively defeated and Arab rule firmly established.

During Umayyad and 'Abbásid rule in Arrán local Armenian and Arránian dynasties continued a semi-independent existence subject to the Arabs. Taxes were paid in Islamic coins, and we find a mint with the appellation Arrán on 'Abbásid dirhams as early as 145/762. This mint was either in Bardha'a or Baylakán. By 207/822 we find coins bearing madinat Arrán, and after 226/840 the mint seems to have been abandoned.

The local ruler from the ancient house of Mihrán was called the baṛīš of Arrán by the Arabs, and the last of the family, Varaz Trdat, was assassinated in 821 or 822. Shortly after this the lord of Shakk, north of the Kur River, a certain Sahl b. Sunbát, extended his sway over all of Arrán declaring his independence of the caliphate. He became reconciled with the Arabs by delivering the rebel Bábak to them after Bábak had taken refuge with him. Later he, or his son and successor, was taken to Samarra about 854 when the new governor of Armenia Bugdá deported many of the local princes. At this period the lords of Shîrwan and Derbent interfered in Arrán, but the Sâjjids were the most powerful rulers in Arrán.

The Sâjjid governors of Armenia at the end of the 9th and early 10th centuries A.D. were especially harsh to the Christian population of Transcaucasia, but local dynasties continued to rule, especially north of the Kur River (cf. Ibn Hawkal, 348). Marzubân b. Muhammad b. Mu'âsir ruled over Arrán, as well as Ádharbáyján from 941-57 A.D., and most of the lords of Arrán were his vassals. It was under his rule, in 943, that the environs of Bardhâ'a were ravaged by the Russians. After this Arrán fell under the sway of the Shâddâdids of Gandja. The strongest member of the Shâddâdîd dynasty was Abu 'l-Aswâr Shâwûr b. Faḍl b. Muḥ. b. Shâddâd, who ruled from 444-459/1049-1067. In 472/1075 Alp Arslân sent one of his generals, Sawtegin, to rule Arrán displacing the Shâddâdîd dynasty. Turkish tribes, primarily Ghuzz, settled in Arrán and gradually Turkish replaced all other languages in common use.

In the Turkish period Baylakán seems to have replaced Bardhâ'a as the most important city of Arrán, but the former was destroyed by the Mongols in 1221. After this Gandja became the leading city of Arrán. Under the Mongol Angas was joined to Ádharbáyján and single governors ruled both provinces. The process of islamisation and turkisation was hastened after the Mongol invasions.

The land between the rivers came to be called Karabâgh. After the conquests of Timur, who did much building and repair of canals, Arrán only appears as a memory, and its affairs are part of the history of Ádharbáyján.

Bibliography: The religious history of the Arránians is told by Moses Kalankatucci in Armenian (Tiflis, 1912); for the contents see A. Manandian, Beiträge zur albanischen Geschichte Leipzig 1897, 48. On the pre-Islamic history cf. J. Marquart, Eränzahr, 117. For geography cf. Le Strange, 176-9, and Hishâm al-Šâlam, 398-403. On the early Islamic history of Arrán see...
ARRAN — ARSLAN B. SALJDJK


On the Shaddadids cf. his Studies in Caucasian History, London 1953. Many details of nomenclature and linguistics may be found in the article Ardan in IA by Zeki Veli Togan.

(R. N. Frye)

ARSENAL [see DAR AL-SHINĀ'].

ARSH [see DIVA].

'ARSH [see KURST].

'ARSH, the name given in Algerian legislation, during about the last hundred years, to some of the lands under collective ownership. This meaning of the word, which has various senses in the Maghribi dialects: "tribe" (for example, on the high plains of Constantine), "agnatic group" (for example, in the Tunisian Sahel), "federation" (for example, in Kabylia), only seems to be sought for from the time of the preparatory enquires for the Law of 16 June 1851.

A dispute has long existed in Algeria between those who support recognition of the collective ownership, or only usufruct, of these lands, and those who support recognition of their private character. This dispute overleives the conflict between the administrative theory, which tends to safeguard the patrimony of the tribes, and the expansion of private interests, which want the rapid conversion of these lands into movap property. Arguments have been borrowed, somewhat superficially, from ibad, which offered the theory of tenure subject to payment of the mudj,[5] or "collective, communal holding"; (2) 'azib, or "domain constituted into a pious endowment". According as one or other factor predominated, it seems that there was a certain alternation, characteristic of the social history of North Africa, between these different concepts and the realities that they correspond to.

At all events, the decree of the Senate of 22 April 1863 lays down, (article 1), that the tribes of Algeria "are the owners of the territories of which they enjoy the permanent or traditional usufruct, under what title soever". This patrimony, under the tutelage of the administration, is, however, liable to come under the private initiative through the medium of "partial inquiry". This legislation aroused lively opposition. With less clarity than the Moroccan law, but with greater resolution than the Tunisian law, it seems to have found a compromise solution to this long-standing and difficult problem of real estate and society.

Bibliography: Dr. Worms, Recherches sur la constitution de la propriété territoriale, 1846; M. Pouyenne, La propriété foncière en Algérie, 1805, 130 ff.; Mercier, La propriété foncière en Algérie; and especially F. Dulout, Des droits et actions sur la terre arch ou sabbba en Algérie, 1929. On the word, see Ph. Marçais, Textes arabes de Djadjelli, 1955, 27, n. 3.

ARSHGUL, a town, not now in existence, on the Algerian coast, within the Othmani border area.

ARSHEL [see DIVA].

ARSHN [see AZA].

ARSAN (r.), lion; also frequently appears as a Turkish proper-name.

ARSLAN b. SALDJK, the son, probably the elder son, of the ancestor and eponym of the Saljukid dynasties, Saljuk. His history is merged in that of the first contacts between the Oghuz led by his family and the Muslim state of Central Asia.

His personal name was Israil (cf. his brothers Mihkal and Musa, fore-names in which it is possible to see Jewish Khazar or Nestorian Central-Asian influence), with Arslan as a totemic name (cf. his famous nephews Tughril Muhammad and Caghri Dagh). The beginnings of his history are confused. During his lifetime the Saljukid family, which had settled at Djand, was converted to Islam and freed itself from the Kingdom of the Yabghu of the Oghuz; it is not disputed that his father, Saldjuk, then sent him to the aid of one of the last Sāmānids who was engaged in a struggle with the Karaghānids, as is affirmed by the tradition of the Malikhāna, a history of the family written under Alp Arslan about 1060; and it is generally thought that it is he who is mentioned, under the title of Yabghu, by the Ghaznavid historian Gardīzī, as assisting in 1003 the last Sāmānī attempt at resistance to the Karaghānids; but latterly this version has been contested by O. Pritsak, according to whom the title of Yabghu can only be understood to refer to the last Yabghū of the Oghuz Kingdom north of the...
It is true that manuscripts of the Arab and Persian chronicles frequently attach to individual Seldjoukids an appellation which can be read yahhū, but O. Pritsak has shown that side by side with this name payghū, it is probable that the word must be read thus in some cases; I think however that as far as Arslan Isra'īl is concerned, he could not have had two totemic names, and did in fact bear the title of yahhū, indicative of the revolt of his family against the pagan kingdom of the north, and it seems to me probable, although not certain, that he is, in agreement with the traditional account, the person mentioned by Gardizi.

The main features of his later history are less open to dispute. After the final collapse of the Sāmānids, he is found associated with the Karakhanid rebel at Bukhara, ʿAll Tegin, in whose service he was eventually joined by his nephews Jughril and Caghri. ʿAli Tegin, in whose service he was rebel at Bukhara, nids, he is found associated with the Karakhanid prince, and did in fact bear the title of the pagan kingdom of the north, and it seems to me probable, although not certain, that he is, in agreement with the traditional account, the person mentioned by Gardizi.

The main features of his later history are less open to dispute. After the final collapse of the Sāmānids, he is found associated with the Karakhanid rebel at Bukhara, ʿAll Tegin, in whose service he was eventually joined by his nephews Jughril and Caghri. ʿAli Tegin, in whose service he was rebel at Bukhara, nids, he is found associated with the Karakhanid prince, and did in fact bear the title of the pagan kingdom of the north, and it seems to me probable, although not certain, that he is, in agreement with the traditional account, the person mentioned by Gardizi.

The main features of his later history are less open to dispute. After the final collapse of the Sāmānids, he is found associated with the Karakhanid rebel at Bukhara, ʿAll Tegin, in whose service he was eventually joined by his nephews Jughril and Caghri. ʿAli Tegin, in whose service he was rebel at Bukhara, nids, he is found associated with the Karakhanid prince, and did in fact bear the title of the pagan kingdom of the north, and it seems to me probable, although not certain, that he is, in agreement with the traditional account, the person mentioned by Gardizi.
Michael VII, but he later appears principally as an officer in the service of the Great Saldıŋik Mawṣili. In 1077 he brought the Cuman Khan of Bahluy under the rule of Malikşîh; in 1079 Malikşîh placed him under the command of his brother Tutuşh in the Syrian campaign, and in 1084 under Ibn Djahr in the Diyar Bakr campaign; in 1085 he was sent to Khurāsān against the sultan’s brother, Tûkûsh. He received as an iqtâ’ Ḥalwân, a strategic point in southern Kurdistān. From 1085 onwards, however, he intrigued in Diyar Bakr with the Muslim, the Arab prince of Mawṣili and Aleppo, who was at variance with Malikşîh. The death of Muslim obliged him to re-enter the service of Tutuşh, who gave him Palestine (1086). The date of his death is not known; he left several sons, among whom were Şukmân and Iľghâzî.

After the death of Malikşîh, the Artûkîs, led by Tutuşh into Dijâlra, helped him to displace the throne with his nephews (1092-5); on the death of Tutuşh, they supported his son Rûdwan of Aleppo against another son, Duşkâ of Damascus; they later lost Palestine, and its reconquest by Egypt (1098) and subsequent occupation by the Crusaders finally prevented their return there. One of the two Artûkî leaders, Iľghâzî, then entered for a time the service of Muhammad, one of the sons of Malikşîh, whom he had supported against his brother Barkûk, and who made him governor of Īrāk, but the Turkomans from whom the family derived its strength remained in Diyar Bakr. In 1097, the nephew of Şukmân succeeded in occupying Mārdîn. Şukmân himself, who had taken possession of Sarûgî, was expelled from there by the Crusaders (1097), but, as a result of quarrels between the chiefs of Diyar Bakr, obtained possession of Hisn Kayfâ (1102), controlled numerous districts further north, and then inherited Mārdîn. He took part in the wars against the Franks, and in 1104 before Harrân captured Count Baldwin of Edessa. He died soon afterwards.

Muḥammad, who became sole sultan by the death of Barkûk, sent Iľghâzî back to Diyar Bakr, where in 1107 he had a hand in the defeat of Kârî Askân of Rûm, whom he had been supported by Muḥammad’s enemies, and in 1108 he took the place at Mārdîn of one of the sons of Şukmân (another son, Dâ’ûd, retained Hisn Kayfâ). Other chiefs, at Āmid, Aḫhlâz, Arzan etc., carved out seignories for themselves. Muḥammad tried to unite them for the Holy War against the Franks; he could not prevent the rupture, in the middle of the campaign, between Iľghâzî and Şukmân of Aḫhlâz, who, however, died (1110). From then on, relations between Iľghâzî and Muḥammad became strained; the former more and more avoided participation in the expeditions sent against the Franks by the Sultan, from which, having regard to the risks run, only Saldıŋik authority stood to gain. In 1114, Iľghâzî formed a Turkomân coalition against the governor of Mawṣili, Akszunkâr al-Barsûkî. He was victorious, but, apprehensive of retaliation by Muḥammad, fled to Syria, and reached an understanding not only with Tughtegin, the ṣabâbeg of Damascus, who was also disturbed at the Sultan’s Syrian ventures, but even with the Franks of Antioch; the latter, by crushing the Saldıŋik army (1115), saved Iľghâzî. In 1118, Muḥammad died, and Iľghâzî seized possession of the last Saldıŋikid post in Diyar Bakr, Mâyyafarîkîn. He was now a power to be reckoned with. Aleppo, threatened by the Franks and rent by anarchy, appealed to him, despite its leading men’s dislike of handing over power to him. Iľghâzî, secure as regards the Saldıŋikids, did not wish to see the power of the Franks increase. In agreement with Tughtegin, he answered the appeal (1118), and, in 1119, his Turkomans inflicted on the Franks of Antioch a resounding defeat. Their base, however, remained in Diyar Bakr, and, in face of the reaction of other Franks, Iľghâzî was disposed to make peace. He was also called into action against the Georgians; this time he was defeated (1121). Nevertheless his prestige was unimpaired at the time of his death in 1122.

From 1113 onwards, his nephew Balûk had been progressively building up, north-east of Diyar Bakr, astride the eastern Euphrates, a stable principality whose chief town, from about 1115, had been Khartpert. Moreover, as tutor of the Saldıŋikid of Malâyî, who was a minor, he achieved fame by crushing, with the aid of an alliance with the Dânishmandid Gümüşteğen, Ibn Mangûdjak of Erzînjân and the Byzantine governor of Trebizond, Gavras (1120), and later, in the service of Iľghâzî, by capturing Josselin of Edessa (1122), and, after the death of Iľghâzî, Baldwin of Jerusalem, who had come to protect the Franco-Armenians of the border regions of the Euphrates (1123). He was then able to take the place of another nephew of Iľghâzî at Aleppo but was killed while besieging Manbûtî in 1124. Aleppo then passed out of Artûkî hand.

In Diyar Bakr, where they remained firmly entrenched, Şams al-Dâwli Sulaymân, son of Iľghâzî, who had succeeded at Mâyyafarîkîn, also died at the end of 524/1129-30. Another son of Iľghâzî, Timurtash, already master of Mârdîn, succeeded him. Balûk’s principality had passed to Dâ’ûd, the son and successor, since 1104, of Sukmân at Hisn Kayfâ. From then on, the two branches maintained a separate existence for two centuries.

The period of expansion, however, was at an end. From 1127 Zenkî ruled at Mawṣîl, and from 1128 at Aleppo also; he built up a strong kingdom there. Timurtash acted as Zenkî’s vassal, by hostile action against Dâ’ûd, then (1144) against his son Kara Arslân, as well as against the prince of Amîn whom Zenkî and he besieged in 1133. Dâ’ûd had been active in the north, where he had also conducted an anti-Georgian expedition; he had absorbed the small seignories bordering on his own, especially to the east of Hisn Kayfâ. But he was subjected to relentless pressure from Zenkî, who conquered Buhtân, east of Diyar Bakr, and, on the accession of Kara Arslân, the districts lying between Hisn Kayfâ and Khartpert. Kara Arslân was forced to effect a rapprochement with the Franco-Armenians of Edessa against whom, like Timurtash, he had waged war from time to time; the capture of Edessa by Zenkî (1144) was a disaster for him too, but he was saved by his enemy’s death (1146). Not without difficulty Timurtash and Kara Arslân divided Diyar Bakr between them.

Zenkî’s dominions were divided between Nûr al-Dîn at Aleppo, and at Mawṣîl a line of other princes, brothers and nephews of Nûr al-Dîn, who increasingly brought them under his tutelage. His struggle against the Franks and his efforts in the Mawṣîl direction led him again to seek an alliance with the Artûkîs; he did not contend with them for Diyar Bakr and allowed them north of the Euphrates to take their share of the spoils of the Count of Edessa, but dragged them along in his wake in holy wars against the Franks or Byzantines. Nevertheless his relations with them were excellent, especially with Kara Arslân, and Alpî, the son and successor of...
Timurtash, sought to secure his position by obtaining the protection of the Shah-i Armin of Akhlat, whom he was obliged in return to aid against the Georgians. Kara Arslan himself, in 1163, attempted to take Amid from the Inalids and the Nisanids, but was prevented from doing so by a Danishmandid attack; but soon his son Muhammad, with Nur al-Din, went to the aid of the Danishmandids who were threatened by the expansionist policy of the Saljukids of Konya. The growing power of Nur al-Din had imperceptibly caused the Artukids to assume the rôle of vassals, when Nur al-Din died in 1174.

The history of the following years is mainly concerned with the resistance offered by the princes of Upper Mesopotamia to the ambitions of Salih al-Din who, master of Egypt, gradually took possession of the Syro-Djaziran heritage of Nur al-Din. The Artukids to begin with gave their united support to the Zenkids of Mawsil. Then Muhammad considered it more prudent to come to terms with Salih al-Din, who captured Amid, for long the object of the envious regard, and gave it to Muhammad as fief; from then on it became the family seat (1183). Muhammad’s death shortly afterwards, which left only young princes on the throne of Amid, Mardin, Akhlat and Mawill, together with the division of Muhammad’s dominions into two branches, Amid and Khartpert, increased their subjection to Salih al-Din; the latter directly established his authority in Diyar Bakr in 1185 by the occupation of Mayyafarikd.

The Artukids were from then on only remnants gradually whittled away by the successors of Salih al-Din of the Ayyubid dynasty, his brother al-Afdal and the latter’s descendants, who became masters of Akhlat in 1207 but were sometimes divided among themselves. Against the most powerful of them, al-Kamil of Egypt, the Artukids became for a time vassals of the Saljukids of Rûm, then expanding rapidly to the east, and then of the Ilch*arzmshah Djalal al-Din Manguberti, who had become master of Adharbaydjan and Akhlat; Saljukid vengeance caused them to lose the towns of eastern Syria. In 1226, and the vengeance of al-Kamil deprived them of Amid and Hisn Kayfa (1232-3). Al-Kamil quarrelled with the Saljukids Kaykubâd and was defeated, and as a result the Artukids of Khartpert, who had supported him, was dispossessed in his turn (1234). From then on only the Mardin branch remained; this continued to exist for nearly another two centuries. In 1260 its representative, al-Malik al-Sa’id, endured a lengthy siege by the Mongols; but his death saved the dynasty, for his son, al-Mu’azzam, submitted to Hulagu and thus, as a humble vassal, preserved the heritage of his ancestors.

The internal organisation and the civilisation of the Artukids principalities are too little known and, on the whole, too late to allow us to merit a general study on their own. Forming, with the exception of Khartpert, part of the Muslim world since the Arab conquests, the territories over which the Artukids reigned continued to be governed by the same people (for example the illustrious family of the Banû Nubata at Mayyafarikd) and according to the same principles (summarised in the ‘Ilk al-Farad of Muhammad b. Talha al-Karshi al-Adver, waste of Mardin in the 7th/13th century) which had existed formerly or still existed in the neighbouring principalities. The taxes recorded in one or two inscriptions are those obtaining everywhere, and it would be unwise to attach more than a passing significance to the anecdote which emphasises the lightness of the burdens borne by the rural elements subject to Timurtash compared with those subject to Zenki. The introduction of the Turcoman element had no effect on the traditional economic activity of the country, which was based on agriculture and stock-breeding, the iron and copper mines, and trade with ‘Irāk and Georgia. Culturally, although we do not know of any writer of note who lived in the entourage of the Artukids, the Arabic literary tradition was sufficiently alive among them for a Usma b. Munkif, for example, an exile from Syria, to have lived for several years at the court of Kara Arslan at Hisn Kayfa.

When all this has been said, we still have to see whether, by virtue of its origin or otherwise, the Artukid règeime had any particular characteristics. The first problem is that of Turcoman influence. The Turcomans remained until the end an important element in the life of Diyar Bakr, in the south perhaps more than in the north, where the Kurds were always dominant; and Diyar Bakr was one of the starting points for the vast Turcoman migration of Rustem, which embraced about 1185-90 the whole of eastern and central Asia Minor. It is known, on the other hand, that the few verses which constitute the earliest specimen of popular literature in the Turkish language in western Asia, emanated from Artukid territory. There is no doubt that the Artukid dynasty did not remain purely Turcoman. The use of the symbolic arrow, however, continued for some time, and the princes (but not more than the Zenkids, who were not of direct Turcoman origin) preserved in their style, alongside Arab and Persian names, specifically Turkish titles. There has been much discussion on the significance of the animal motifs on certain coins or in decorative work on buildings, which perhaps belong to a general group of Turkish traditional symbolic signs. None of this has much bearing on the actual organisation of the Artukid principalities. What perhaps has a greater bearing on this, if it must be attributed to an original tribal practice deriving from authority which was more family than individual, is the impossibility which faced the dynasty of avoiding apportionment, and the numerous and detrimental grants of apanages to "princes of the blood". All the same, it is hardly open to dispute that the continued existence of the dynasty at Mardin, and its replacement by the Ayyubid Kurds north of the Tigris, should be related to the redistribution of the population and consequently to the support given to the Artukids by the Turcomans despite the existence of numerous Turks in the Ayyubid army. This does not mean to say that the Artukids had had much quarrel with their Kurdish subjects, despite memories of the Marwânid; nevertheless one sees them pursuing on their eastern frontiers the same policy of reabsorbing the autonomous Kurdish states which had faced the dynasty of avoiding apportionment. As regards religious belief, the attitude of the Artukids seems in general to have been fairly tolerant. It is true that the introduction in the general trends towards orthodoxy which characterises the Saljukid and post-Saljukid period, and were among the most active builders of madrasas and mosques and executors of public works (bridges, khâns, etc.) and military defence works. Ilghazu, who was of necessity a diplomat, had avoided a complete break with
the Assassins; none of his successors had the appearance of a champion of orthodoxy comparable to that of Nūr al-Dīn, and one of them, at Kharpert, favoured the Persian mystic Shuwarwadī who, it is true, had at that time not yet been denounced as heterodox. The same tolerance, on the whole, characterised the relations of the Artūkīds with their Christian subjects. The latter complained, in the second half of the 6th/12th century in particular, of various tribulations; but popular disturbances sometimes among the Kurds, rather than any action by the government, seem to have been at the root of the matter. About 1180, Turkomans and Kurds massacred, on the borders north of Diyār Bakr, the Armenians of Djiabal Sassūn, but the latter constituted a quasi-autonomous group, intriguing frequently with the Shāh-i Armin, and the action of which they were the victims was therefore of a political rather than religious nature. Towards their ordinary Christian subjects, it has been admitted that the Artūkīds acted with correctness. There is no other explanation for the fact that the Armenian Catholicus resided for a period during the 12th century at Dzovk, in the province of Kharpert, and that the patriarch of the Monophysites constantly alternated his periods of residence at the Convent of Sūr Barajswa (itself momentarily subject to the Artūkīds, but normally a dependency of Edessa, and then of the princes of Malayta) with periods of residence at Āmid or at Mārdīn, where their election frequently took place with Artūkīd permission. Several bishoprics, especially Monophysite, always existed in Diyār Bakr, the Christian population remained numerous and, on the south-eastern frontier of the province, the district of Tūr-ʾAdbīl remained a great centre of monastic life until the 8th/14th century.

The strange character of Artūkīd coins, which, like those of the Dānishmandīs, for long resembled ancient Byzantine coins, is sometimes explained as a Christian influence. This does not seem to me to be a sufficient explanation. To speak of the impossibility of finding an artisan, the table of striking Muslim coins in an ancient Muslim country does not make sense; nor does the importance of trade with Byzantium carry greater weight, because it is impossible to believe that it had suddenly assumed greater importance than trade with neighbouring Muslim states, or that the copper pieces with which we are exclusively concerned could be used for any other purpose than local consumption. These arguments are admissible for the Dānishmandīs, but not for the Artūkīds, and the problem deserves to be reconsidered as a whole.

The history of the Artūkīds after the Mongol conquest, despite their disappearance from the larger political stage, should not cease to attract our interest as an example of an autonomous principality adapted itself to new circumstances; unfortunately very little is known about it. The Artūkīds played the role of loyal servants of the Ilkhāns; they gained, apart from the title of sultan, the advantage of being considered for a time as auxiliaries or delegates of Mongol authority, and of recovering more or less permanently a considerable part of Diyār Bakr (Āmid, in a state of decay, Mayyāfārīkīrī, perhaps Iṣʿirī) and in addition Khābūr, only Ḥiṣn Kayfā (Ayyūbīd) and Arzan (Sādīqīkīd) remaining autonomous. Moreover, like all the vassals of the Ilkhāns, the Artūkīds, in the second quarter of the 8th/14th century, as a result of the break-up of the Mongol state, found themselves once more free, and subsequently free to bow momentarily before one or other of the new powers created by this break-up. The little which is known of their "foreign policy" shows them trying to preserve their pre-eminence in the face of, on the one hand, the Ayyūbīds of Ḥiṣn Kayfā, against whom they waged in 735/1334 an unsuccessful war which cost them their possessions on the left bank of the Tigris, and on the other hand the Mongols, Turcomans and Mamlūks who contested Upper Mesopotamia with them. On the one hand they appear to have joined forces with the Turcomans against the Kurds of the north, supporters of the Ayyūbīds; there is, however, no further mention of any special link with their parent tribe, the Döger, now settled further to the west, on the borders of the Mamlūk state; on the other hand, with the formation of the two great rival Turcoman federations of the Aq Koyūnlu and the Kara Köyūnlu in Armenia and Upper Mesopotamia in the middle of the 8th/14th century, the Artūkīds seem at first to have supported the enemies of the latter (although it is not possible to affirm that they belonged strictly to the Aq Köyūnlu group); but, some time before the invasion of Timūr, a general rapprochement seems to have taken place between the Mongols (Djiālāʾīrīds) of Bagdad, the Kara Köyūnlu and the Mamlūks.

Whatever the position regarding these disputed questions, on another plane, that of economic and social life, the increase, by comparison with pre-Mongol times, of the nomad element compared with the settled element, and the consequent decline of agricultural life, are not open to dispute. Nevertheless some towns, among them Ḥiṣn Kayfā and Mārdīn, perhaps derived from the surrū of the 6th/12th century, remained a great centre of refuge. Building was definitely still going on at Mārdīn in the 8th/14th century, and Arab culture, represented, for example, by the poet Šayf al-Dīn al-Hill, still held an honoured position there. Christianity, favoured by the Mongols, but sometimes ill-treated by their descendants, retained for its part a certain vitality in Artūkīd territory; the Monophysite patriarch often resided at Mārdīn, and Daniel bār al-Khatṭāb is a theologian still held in respect there.

The invasion of Timūr caused fresh upheavals. Sulṭān al-Ẓāhir Ḫūš, suspected of maintaining a connexion with Egypt, could not save his principality from the ravages of one conqueror. He contended with the Ayyūbīds, zealous vassals of Timūr, and especially with the Aq Köyūnlu who, to begin with on behalf of Timūr, then, after his death, on their own account, sought to conquer the Artūkīd principality; in 809, al-Ẓāhir was killed making a vain attempt to save Āmid, and in 811/1409 his successor al-Ṣāliḥ decided to abandon Mārdīn to Kara Yāsuf, the leader of the Kara Köyūnlu. This represented the end of the dynasty and of the period of comparative autonomy of southern Diyār Bakr.

Bibliography: The sources are those for the general history of the Near East from the end of the 5th/11th to the beginning of the 9th/15th century. For the 12th-13th centuries see the introduction to my Systre du Nord à l’époque des Croisades, Paris 1940. (A special note should be made of the following: for the 11th century, the History of Aleppo of Kamāl al-Dīn Ibn al-ʿAdīm (ed. Sāmī Dahān, Damascus vol. 1, 1951, vol. 2, 1954, vol. 3 in preparation), the Mirʾāt al-Zamān of Sibṭ Ibn al-Djwaṣi (the portion relevant to this period has not been published), and, for the Bahrayn episcopate,
the annotator of Ibn al-Mukarrar (De Goeje, La fin des Karmatès, in J.A 1895); for the 12th century, the Syriac chronicle of Michael the Syrian, ed. and trans. by Chabot, iii, and above all, a unique extant chronicle originating from Artukid Dyār Bakr, the History of Michael the Syrian of Ibn al-Azraq al-Fārīqī (unpublished; analysis of the political events in my Dyār Bakr au temps des premiers Urtuqids, in J.A 1935); for the 13th century, before the Mongol intervention, the great histories of Ibn al-ʿAdīn (mentioned above), Ibn al-ʿAṣīr, Ibn Wāṣil (edition in course of preparation by Djamāl al-Dīn al-Shayvālī, Alexandria; vol. i, appeared in 1953), al-Dīzarī (Orientis 1915, 151), and especially the section relating to Dāṣir in the ʿArab of Ṭizz al-Dīn Ibn Shaddād (unpublished; analysis in my Dāṣir in XII th cent., in REI 1934), which constitute the Arab sources, and, in addition, in Persian, the History of the Saljūqs of Armanīs Mūsā of Ibn Bahr (facsimile edition by A. S. Erzi, Ankara 1956, critical edition by N. Lugul and A. S. Erzi, i, Ankara 1957; a Turkish version was edited by T. Hotamsa, Recess, iii, A. German translation by H. W. Duda is in the press) and, in Syriac, the Chronography of Gregory Abu l-Farajī Bar Hebraeus (ed. and trans. by Budge); for the Mongol, post-Mongol and Timūrī period, one must glean the fragments of information scattered among the standard chronicles of the Mamluks, the Ilḫansids and Timūr, and moreover especially in the History of the Ayyūbids (of Ḥīṣn Kayfā, unpublished, analyzed by the author in J.A 1953), and augment this by the ʿinābī works of the period, the continuation of the Syriac Ecclesiastical Chronicle of Bar-Hebraeus (ed. Abbeles and Lamy) and (for the period since Timūr) the anonymous Syriac work edited and translated by Behnisch (Bratislava 1839) and the Armenian history of Tamerlane by Thomas de Medrroz (ed. and trans. by Nâve); see also the dīnān of Sayf al-Dīn al-Hillī, and, perhaps, the Kīdāb-i Diyarbakrīyya of Abū Bakr Ṭibrānī (end of the 13th century), which is not accessible to me (see J. T. Rainaud, Monumentum Hicenas, ii, 30, and P. Casanova, Invenia re de la collection Princesse Ismaïl, 1896. For coins (not a few unpublished coins exist in private collections), the İstanbul and British Museum catalogues, and S. Lane Poole, The Coins of the Urūqīs, in Marsden Numismatic Chronicle, 1875; B. Butak, Resimi türk paraları, İstanbul 1947-50.

The only comprehensive works are those, necessarily brief, by Mukh. Háli Yınanq (Diyarbakir) and id. trslls (Arikūr, ed.); I.A. My Dyār Bakr etc. mentioned above, one of my early works, is only of value for political events; see also my Première Pénétration turque en Asie-Minor (Byzantium 1948) and my Syrie du Nord mentioned above; the histories of the Crusades of Grousset and Runciman; the valuable commentaries on inscriptions by Van Berchem in Abb. G. W. Göttingen 1897, and in Strzygowski, Amida 1910; H. Derenbourg, Osama b. Mounbidh, i, 1886; Faruk Sümer, Dügeleri Day, in Tikeyih Mecmuaası 1953. For the 14th century, see my Contribution à l'histoire du Dyār Bakr au XIVe s., in J.A, 1955; on Daniel bar al-Khāṭīb, Vau, in Rev. Or. 383 (1950).

ARTVIN, town in the far north-east of Turkey, 41° 10' north, 41° 50' east, situated on the Çoruh. It was ceded to Russia by the Treaty of San Stefano in 1878 together with Kars and Ardahan, and ceded back by Georgia on Feb. 23rd, 1921. Since then it has been the centre of the kādā and the capital of the wilāyēt of Çoruh. In 1945, there were 30,810 inhabitants in the town itself and 16,966 in the kādā.

[Fn. Taeschner]

ʿARŪBA (see Taʾrīkh).

ʿARUD. i. ʿIlm al-ʿArūd is the technical term for ancient Arabic metrics. ʿIlm al-ʿArūd and ʿIlm al-gīr are occasionally used synonymously in the sense of "science of versification", and in this extended sense ʿIlm al-ʿArūd embraces not only the Science of Metre, but also the Science of Rhyme. Usually, however, the rules governing rhyme (ʿIlm al-Kuṭūfī, sg. Kuṭūfī) are treated separately, and ʿIlm al-ʿArūd is confined to the strict sense. As such, Arabic philologists define it in the following manner: Al-ʿArūd ʿilm bi-ṣaybā yuʿraḍ biḥa ṣāḥib aswān al-šarʿ wa-faṣīdah ʿArūd is the science of the rules by means of which one distinguishes correct metrics from faulty ones in ancient poetry.

There is no generally accepted etymology for this sense of the term ʿArūd. Some Arabic grammarians maintain that it acquired the meaning of metrics because the verse is constructed on its analogy (yuʿraḍ ʿalayhi); others say that the term was used because al-Ḥallī developed it in Mecca, and this city is also called al-ʿArūd. Georg Jacob (Studien in arabischem Dichtern, 180) has suggested a curious explanation by pointing to the passage in the Dīnān of the Hadhaylītes (65, 16), where the poem is compared to an obstructive female camel (ʿarūd) which the poet tames. The most plausible explanation still remains the one based on the concrete meaning which ʿArūd has as part of a tent, and the transferred sense which it acquired in metrics, as the last foot of the first hemistich: originally it describes "the transverse pole or piece of wood which is in the middle of a tent, and which is its main support and hence the middle portion (or foot) of a verse" (Lane). Since the last foot of the first hemistich in the centre of the line (baṣṭ al-ghīr) is as important for its structure as the centre pole is for that of the tent (baṣṭ al-ḥār), one may readily assume that ʿArūd then came to be the general term for the science of metric structure.

There are few works on metrics by Arab philologists, and their contents are of little value. This fact is all the more surprising if one bears in mind how many works of lasting value have been written by prominent Muslim scholars on grammar and lexigraphy. The Kīdāb al-ʿArūd, which al-Ḥallī, the founder of the science of metrics, is said to have written, has not survived, nor have any of the works on the subject written by the older grammarians. The earliest monographs which we have concerning ʿIlm al-ʿArūd are those of the 4th century A.H. There are sections on metrics in some of the larger ʿAdab works; the oldest and best known of these can be found in the ʿIbād al-ʿArūd (Ed. Cairo, 1305, III, 146 ff.) of Ibn ʿAbd Rabbih (died 328/940). The following list gives the names o
those Arab philologists whose works on metrics are preserved in manuscripts (—mere commentators are omitted). They are arranged in centuries, reckoning from the Hijra, and details are given only in the case of the better known works; references to Brockelmann are, however, given in every case.

Just as the ancient Indians and Greeks developed their own form of metric poetry, so did the ancient Arabs. Ancient Arabic poems were already written and recited in the known metres a hundred years before Islam, and they retained their form more or less unchanged in the succeeding centuries. The usual ancient Arabic poem, the so-called Kasida, is comparatively short and simple in its structure. It consists of 50 to 100 monorhyming lines (rarely of more), and there is no strophic division in ancient Arabic poetry. Each line (bayt, pl. abây) consists of two clearly distinct halves (mîsârā', pl. masârî'); the name for the first hemistich being al-μâdr, that for the second al-μadjus. Only these more obvious attributes of the line were recognised and named during the ist century A.H. Al-Khalil Ibn Ahmad al-Farahidi (died ca. 175 A.H. in Basra) was the first to investigate the inner, rhythmical structure of Arabic verse; he distinguished between different metres, gave them the names by which we still know them, and divided them up into their subordinate metric elements. The written description and analysis of observations made by ear presented, however, very serious difficulties.

In all languages the choice and position of words in prose is solely governed by generally accepted syntactic rules and by the desire of the speaker to express his thoughts as clearly as possible. In poetry, however, when it is based on rhythm, the choice of words and their sequence within the line is not so uncontrolled. The rhythm of the verse and the metres in which it finds its external expression are
created by the following factors: 1) the observance of a definite order in the sequence of syllables within the line, and 2) the regular recurrence of accent, indicated either by stress or some other means. The rhythm of a line in poetry is as completely tied to the phonetic properties of the language in which it is written as are the syllables of the words in the prose of the language concerned. This is, above all, a matter of the duration of the syllables and the stress with which they are pronounced. Syllables have a measurable length in all languages, but whereas in some (e.g. in the Germanic languages) there is no fixed and definite proportion of length of syllables (for, although there are admittedly some syllables in these languages which are always long and others which are always short, there are many which have no fixed quantity), there, on the other hand, other languages (such as ancient Greek) where the quantity of every syllable in every word is absolutely fixed. In these, there is a strict distinction between long and short syllables in prose, too; the ratio of their length is roughly 2:1. The position is similar with regard to the element of stress: whilst in every language there is one syllable in a word which is somehow raised above the others, the strength of this accent is, however, something which differs widely in the individual languages.

Thus, for example, ancient Greek uses musical pitch, whereby individual syllables are distinguished only by a higher tone, whilst in the Germanic languages they are distinguished by an expiratory stress which renders them more emphatic in comparison with the other syllables. The rhythmic structure of the verse has in all languages to adapt itself to these qualities of the syllables. If the quantity of the syllables is definitely fixed, then the rhythm of the verse is attained largely by regularly recurring sequences of short and long syllables, forming metrical 'feet', which last the same length of time. One then speaks of 'quantitative' verse. If, on the other hand, stress, rather than any fixed quantity, is the characteristic by means of which definite syllables are distinguished from their neighbours, then the rhythm of the verse and the structure of its metre, will both be largely produced by the alternation of accented and unaccented syllables. In this case we speak of 'accentual' verse.

From the prose of the Korân, and the poetry of the ancient poets, as it has come down to us, we know that in the ancient Arabic language the quantity of the syllables was definitely fixed. From certain grammatical facts one may assume that an expiratory accent was also present, though only slightly developed. A priori one can therefore assume that the rhythm in ancient Arabic verse (as in ancient Greek verse) found its expression in 'quantitative' metrics. The theoretical treatment of this problem, however, was at that time a far more difficult one for the Arabic philologist than for the Greek prosodist. The latter used the term 'syllable', made a clear distinction between short and long syllables, and chose the short syllable, the χρόνος περιστάσεως, as the basic unit for measuring the duration of the verse. They also had a term and a graphic sign for the pitch by which one syllable in every word was distinguished. Arabic philologists, by contrast, did not possess the concept of syllable, let alone the refinement of the 'short syllable'. Al-Khallî, too, did not know the words 'syllable' and 'stress', yet his ear surely perceived what we call syllables and stresses, for his graphic paraphrase—which we can understand if we try hard—does give us a clear picture of the rhythm in ancient Arabic verse.

Primarily, Al-Khallî made good use of the peculiarities of Arabic script, in which the face of each word is a guide to the quantity of its syllables: one individual 'moving' consonant (bayn mutaharrik), i.e. a consonant with a vowel sign (e.g. ٔ), corresponds to what we call a short syllable, and two consonants, of which the first is 'moving' and the second 'quiescent' (sahîn) (e.g. ٔ), correspond to what we call a long syllable. There are only a few fixed spellings which fail to comply with this rule (e.g. ٔ, ٔ = ٔ , ٔ = ٔ , ٔ = ٔ , ٔ = ٔ , ٔ = ٔ ). Thanks to this peculiarity of the Arabic script, Al-Khallî was able to take the face of the verse as a basis for his treatment of Arabic metres. In order to be independent of the changing shape of the letters, graphic symbols were introduced, namely the symbol ٔ for the 'quiescent' and the symbol ٔ for the 'moving' consonant (e.g. ٔ = ٔ = ٔ = ٔ).

Both al-Ḥarîrî and 'Ibn Khallîkân report that Al-Khallî had noticed the different rhythms produced by the hammering in different copper-workshops in the bazaar in Başra, and that this gave him the idea of developing a science of metre, in other words, of determining the rhythm in the structure of the ancient poems. This late report agrees with the earlier one by Al-Djahîzî, who states that Al-Khallî was the first to distinguish between different metres, that is to say, that he was the first who in listening had distinguished different rhythmic structures in the ancient verses, and that he was the first to analyse this rhythm, by dissecting it into its metric elements. His theory was supplemented in its details by later Arabic prosodists, but these additions made no difference to the basic conception. Even today, the 16 Arabic metres are still given in the very order in which Al-Khallî gives them, because it is only in this order that they can be united in the graphic presentation of the five metric circles (dawai'a, sg. āšara).

According to him, every metre comes into being by the repetition of 8 rhythmic feet which recur in definite distribution and sequence in all metres. The term applied to these feet is ٔ, pl. ٔ ("part"). In accordance with the common practice of Arabic grammarians, he represents each of these 8 "parts" by a mnemonic word, derived from the root ٔ. Of these eight mnemonics, 2 consist of five consonants each, namely: fašûlun, and fâšûlun, 6 of seven consonants each, namely mafâšûlun, mufâšûlun, mufâšûlun, mafâšûlun, mufâšûlun, mafâšûlun, mafâšûlun. The following table of the 5 metric circles will clarify how the 16 metres are made up of these 8 feet. For the sake of clarity, the circles are opened out and given as straight lines, and only one hemistich is given in the rhythmical mnemonic words for each metre (see Circle 1-5, p. 670).
The order of the 5 circles is based on an arithmetical principle. They are arranged according to the number of consonants in the mnemonic words of the metres which compose them. The three metres Tawil, Basît and Madîd, whose hemistichic consist of 24 consonants each, form the first circle; the two metres Mutâbârîb and Mutâdarîk, whose hemistiches consist of only 20 consonants each, form the last circle. The remaining metres, whose hemistiches consist of 21 consonants each, are divided among the three circles in the middle. The order of the metres within the circles is also a formal one: the Adîjazî of a metre are first written around the periphery of a circle, thus the three mafázîlan mafázîlan mafázîlan of the Hazâdî are inscribed around the periphery of circle 3. If one reads the same circle again, but starting at a different point, one automatically gets the mnemonic words of another metre: thus if, for instance, in circle 3 one does not begin with mafâzî (as in Hazâdî), but only with the -tân of mafázîlan, one obtains the metric scheme of Rasîdâz, and if one advances still further and does not begin reading till the -tân, one obtains the scheme of Ramal. The possibility of dividing the Adîjazî of a circle in various ways, and of reaching different metric schemes by doing so, is only due to Al-Khâlli having purposely constructed his circles so that the mnemonic words united in each circle not only produce the same total number of consonants, but coincide completely in their ‘moving’ and ‘quiescent’ consonants as well, if they are written in a certain relationship to one another.

The same relative coincidence is also found between the metres contained in the remaining 4 circles. Al-Khâlli’s object in arranging the metres in this purely formal system of the 5 circles has not been handed down to us either by himself, or by any of the later prosodists. It is quite certain, however, that this merely external superimposition of ‘moving’ and ‘quiescent’ consonants in the mnemonics is not meant to imply a rhythmic development of one metre out of another.

The 8 Adîjazî, which, as we have seen, recur again and again in different distributions in the 16 metres, can be further split into their metric components. For Al-Khâlli, however, the metric component means something different than for the occidental prosodist. It is not the smallest indivisible unit of sound, but the smallest independent word occurring in the language. Accordingly, he distinguished two pairs of metric components which he apparently regarded as such because none of the 4 words concerned (each with its particular sequence of ‘moving’ and ‘quiescent’ consonants), could be derived from any of the other 3, whilst all 8 feet could be formed by combinations from these 4 words. He took the terms for these two pairs of components from two important parts of the tent, and he distinguished between:

A: The two Asbâb (sg. sabab “cord”) which consist of two consonants each, namely

1) sabab khâfi = 2 consonants, the first ‘moving’, the second ‘quiescent’, as in words like حَفَّ
2) sabab shâkil = 2 consonants, both ‘moving’, e.g. words like شَكِيل

B: The two Awtâd (sg. watât “peg”) which consist of three consonants each, namely

1) watât madjma = 3 consonants, the first two ‘moving’, the last ‘quiescent’, as in words like مَدِجَمَث
2) *watid mafrūk* = 3 consonants, the first and third moving, the middle one ‘quiescent’, e.g. words like ə̊-

In this manner, each of the 8 feet can be reduced to its metric components as follows; thus *mafād-ilun* = $B_1 + A_1 + A_1$ or *muta- ja-ilun* = $A_1 + A_1 + B_1$. Each of the 16 metres given in the circles can therefore be scanned on this basis, e.g. *Wāfīr* = *muta*\(^{ja}a\)luna* muta*\(^{ja}a\)luna* *muta*\(^{ja}a\)luna* = $B_1 + A_2 + A_1$, $B_1 + A_2 + A_1$, $B_1 + A_2$ + $A_1$ or *Sarī* = *muta*\(^{ja}d\)lun* *muta*\(^{ja}d\)lun* *muta*\(^{ja}d\)lun* = $A_1 + A_1 + B_1$, $A_1 + A_1 + B_1$, $A_1 + A_1 + B_2$.

Since it is thus possible to reduce all the metres to their basic components, one might assume this metric system to be complete. The fact remains, however, that the 16 metres never actually appear in the form in which they are given in the 5 circles, but nearly always deviate from this ideal form—at times to a considerable extent. In other words, the sequence of ‘moving’ and ‘quiescent’ consonants in ancient Arabic poems does not correspond to the sequence determined by the circles. Therefore one can no longer split the metric forms used by the poets into the 8 ideal feet, nor yet divide these into their two metric elements, because that method of scanning is based completely on the sequence of ‘moving’ and ‘quiescent’ consonants in the ideal metres of the circles. This fact was, of course, known to Al-Khallal just as well as it is to us, and in fact his circles are just a kind of rhythmic *Usul*, which expresses the normal metrical sequence of their ‘moving’ and ‘quiescent’ consonants, there are also mnemonics denoting the forms actually occurring in ancient poetry and are called *awzin al-gār* (= metres).

The smallest of the deviations is the shortening of the metre. This is immediately visible, because then the metre no longer has its full (ādām) number of *aḍżi*\(^{a}\). According to the degree of shortening, there are three possibilities. The line is either

a) *madja*\(^{a}\), if there is one *dja*\(^{a}\) missing in each of the two hemistiches (i.e., in *Hasād*, *Kāmil* or *Radīd* the foot is repeated only twice and not three times); or

b) *maštād*, when a complete half (*ṣdāt*) is absent (as, for instance, when the *Radīd* is reduced to one hemistich); or

c) *manāhīd*, when the line, on rare occasions, is “weakened to exhaustion” i.e. (as for instance in *Munāsirī*) when it is reduced to a third of its size.

All these deviations only concern the external shape of a metre and not its rhythmical structure, which does find its expression in the sequence of ‘moving’ and ‘quiescent’ consonants.

The very numerous cases in which this particular sequence in the ancient poems differs from that prescribed by the circles have been covered by a special set of rules. This forms a necessary supplement to the circles, because the deviations would be arbitrary—and thus the circles would lose their authoritative character as *Usul*—if there were no such rules. Just as one is amazed at the regularity of the first part of the system—the five circles and their normal metres—so one is confused by the second part with its casuistry and its complications. This, however, is inherent in its very nature. Neither Al-Khallal nor the later prosodists use the term ‘syllable’, and we can therefore not expect any general rules (e.g. concerning the reduction of long syllables to short, the omission of short syllables etc.). In effect, they were obliged to mention in each individual case whether and to what extent the ‘moving’ and ‘quiescent’ consonants in ancient poetry showed a plus or a minus as compared with the ideal scheme of the circles. This had to be done in every metre and every one of its feet in both halves of the line, and in order to denote them clearly, individual terms had to be created to cover each one of these numerous differences. A certain order and clarity emerges from this baffling list thanks to the fact that all deviations fall into two classes, which perform different functions and appear in different parts of the line.

The last foot of the first hemistich (*al-zīhāf*; pl. *dīrīd* and the last foot of the second hemistich (*al-zarb; pl. *durbūb*), that is to say, the ends of the two halves of the line, suffer most from deviations. The terms for these two vulnerable parts of the verse are definite, the terms for the other feet vary and are usually given the collective name *al-hājim* (‘stuffing’). By analogy, one also distinguishes two groups of deviations, the *zihāf* and the ‘Ilal. The *zihāf* (‘relaxations’) are, as the name suggests, smaller deviations which occur only in the *dīrīd* parts of the line in which the characteristic rhythm runs strongly, and their effect is a small quantitative change in the weak *Asbāb*-syllables. As accidental deviations, the *zihāf* have no regular or definite place, they just occur occasionally in the feet. By contrast, there are the ‘Ilal (‘diseases’, ‘defects’) which appear only in the last feet of the two halves of the lines, and there, as their name suggests, they cause considerable change as compared to the normal feet. They alter the rhythmic end of the line considerably, and are thus clearly distinct from the *dīrīd* feet. As rhythmically determined deviations, the ‘Ilal do not just appear occasionally but have to appear regularly, always in the same form, and in the same position in all the lines of the poem. A further difference between the two groups of deviations is the fact that the *zihāf* fall only on the *Sabab* (and there on its second consonant), whilst the ‘Ilal alter the *watid* in each of the last feet of the two hemistiches as well as in their *Sababs*.

By applying the definite *zihāf* and ‘Ilal rules, and taking the normal form of the feet of each metre as a point of departure, one arrives at the forms actually occurring in the *Kāsidas*. Just as the normal feet are denoted by their 8 mnemonic words, *faʿalun, maṭaflun*, etc.), which express the normal sequence of their ‘moving’ and ‘quiescent’ consonants, there are also mnemonics denoting the forms which have undergone alteration because of *zihāf* and ‘Ilal, and these indicate the changed sequence of consonants. Thus, for instance, *muṣṭalāʿīm*, when its *Sin* is lost, should become *muṣṭalāʿīn*. If, however, as in this case, the resulting form is not one linguistically possible in Arabic, then the same sequence of consonants (i.e., the same sequence of ‘longs’ and ‘shorts’) is expressed by an equivalent word which is linguistically acceptable, in this case, for instance, by *maṭaʿalim*. By contrast with the *Uṣāl* forms of the feet, these modifications are known as the *Furūʿ* forms of the feet. In the following, the *Furūʿ* will be added in brackets, if their form
differs from that of the Usul. Space here does not permit a detailed list of all Ẓiyafād and Ṭāl (cf. for the details the Arabic compendia of the ʿIlm al-ʿArūḍ). A few examples will be given, however, in order to illustrate the theoretical exposition, and to show how peculiar and complicated this particular part of the system is.

As already stated, the Ẓiyafād appear when the Sabab in a line does not possess its full normal form, but shows a change in the second consonant. Then, however, one does not simply speak of a Ẓiyafād, because this would be ambiguous. In order to describe the Ẓiyafād accurately, one must state which consonant of a foot is affected, and whether that is a 'moving' or a 'quiescent' consonant. For example, one can divide the so-called 8 'simple Ẓiyafād' into two groups, according to whether a sabab ḥaṣīf or a sabab ḥabīl is affected. Even then, one must denote the eight cases by individual terms. 1) We have a ḥaṣīf, if the second consonant of a foot is missing, e.g., the sin in ١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ = ١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩, or the alif in ١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩; we have a ṭaʾālīf, if the 4th consonant is missing, e.g., the ẓā of ١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ = ١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩; a ḥabīl, if the 5th consonant is concerned, e.g., the nun in ١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ or the ẓā in ١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩; and a ṭaʾālīf, when the 7th consonant is missing, e.g., the nun of ١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ = ١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩. 2) In the sabab ḥabīl, there can either be only the vowel of the second consonant missing (then one speaks of an ḍāʾālīf, in the case of the ṣaḥā in the case of the muḍāfālātun [ = muḍāfālātun] or both this consonant and its vowel (then one speaks of a waḥās, if the la of muḍāfālātun [ = muḍāfālātun] is missing, and of an ṣaḥā in the case of the la of muḍāfālātun [ = muḍāfālātun]).

Whilst the Ẓiyafād always lead to a minus, when compared with the normal Sabab, the Ṭāl (which change the last feet of the two hemistichs) fall into two groups, according to whether they arise out of an addition (ṣiyāṣa) or an omission (waḥās). 1) the ṭaʾālīf, for example, adds a 'quiescent' consonant to the waṣīd maḍzhūm (thus ١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ becomes ١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩, the ṭaʾālīf a sabab ḥaṣīf (thus ١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩ becomes ١٢٣٤٥٦٧٨٩). 2) On the other hand, the ḥaṣīf means the loss of a sabab ḥaṣīf (as for muḍāfālātun [ = faḍālātun] or for faḍālātun [ = faḍālātun]), the ḥaṣīf means the loss of a sabab ḥaṣīf and the preceding vowel (as, for instance in muḍāfālātun [ = faḍālātun] and the ṭaʾālīf means the loss of a whole waṣīd maḍzhūm (as in muḍāfālātun [ = faḍālātun]).

These examples give only a rough impression of the complexity of the classical system. Even more complicated changes take place to obtain within one foot and in certain other special cases. In this manner one can derive from the 8 basic feet no less than 37 Fūrū feet, all of which actually appear in old poetry. Feet undergoing a change through Ṭāl play the greater part for two reasons. Firstly because they produce a greater plus or minus in the normal feet than the weaker Ẓiyafād, and secondly because they cause rhythmic variants, which recur throughout the whole poem. Because of the large range of varying line endings, a great number of sub-divisions appear in all metres; and because the Darb, the last foot of the second hemistich, is (being the end of the whole line) more concerned with these changes than the ʿArūḍ (the last foot of the first hemistich), the possible metres are named after their different Darb. The Tawwīl, for example, has only one ʿArūḍ, i.e., the last foot of its first hemistich always has the same form (shortened by ḥaṣīf) of maḍāfālātun; but it has three Darbū, i.e., apart from the normal form of the last foot of its second hemistich there are two further forms of its Darbū. Accordingly, one speaks of the first, second, or third Tawwīl, depending on whether the Darbū has the form maḍāfālātun, maḍāfālātun or faḍālātun. The same goes for all other metres. The Kāmil, which has 9, has the greatest number of Darbū. The sum of all possible ʿArūḍ of all 16 metres is 36, and that of all Darbū is 67; in other words, the 16 ancient Arabic metres are used by the poets in a total of 67 rhythmic variations, merely counting the changes caused by Ṭāl in the line-endings and ignoring the sporadic Ẓiyafād in the Ḥašṣā of the line.

We are now—if we trust the Arabic prosodists and follow them on their circuitous ways—in a position to scan all the metres which appear in ancient Arabic poetry, and this would appear to bring to an end the exposition of ʿIlm al-ʿArūḍ in its general structure. Nevertheless, European Orientalists have never relied unrestrainedly on the Arabic prosodists, because the inner reason for the complicated structure of their system has not been understood. What was the reason for constructing the circles? And why formulate statements about ideal metres when one cannot arrive at the actual forms of the metres except by a complicated system of permissible deviations? To these objections we must add that the underlying concepts of Arabic prosodists, and the way in which they expound the patterns of sound and rhythm, are completely alien to us. They describe prosodic phenomena externally, according to the changes which the consonants of the words in the line undergo, whereas we are accustomed—as already mentioned—to explaining the changing metrical shape of a line in different languages by giving the characteristics of the syllables of the language concerned. In the system of the Arabic prosodists we do not, however, find any direct statement concerning the length and stress of syllables in ancient Arabic poetry. Therefore it seems that we have nothing to learn from them concerning the real essence of Arabic metrics, that is to say, nothing about the way in which the characteristic rhythm of ancient Arabic poetry originated, whether—as in ancient Greek—it came into being exclusively through the harmony of periodically recurring sequences of 'shorts' and 'longs', i.e., purely quantitatively, or whether the element of accentual stress was also a factor in deciding the shape of the rhythm of their poetry. Hence one has generally tended not to accept their system, making use of its terminology with reluctance and only to the extent required in order to understand the commentaries on the ancient poems.

It has already been pointed out that the quantity of the syllables is absolutely fixed in the ancient
Literary Arabic language, so that one can assume that the rhythm in their verse has found its expression in some form of quantitative metrics. This basic assumption is shared by almost all the experts who have dealt with Arabic metrics. There is no agreement, however, on the question as to whether (and to what extent) factors other than the quantity of syllables shaped the rhythm of ancient Arabic verse. There are various views as to the composition and sequence in which 'shorts' and 'longs' are arranged into feet, and these, in turn, into metres; and there is furthermore the particularly vexed question of whether the rhythm of the lines found its expression exclusively in a quantitative pattern of 'shorts' and 'longs' in the individual feet (as in ancient Greek), or whether there was also a rhythmic stress (ictus), which recurred regularly and emphasised certain syllables in the line.

Heinrich Ewald, disregarding the theories of the Arabs, produced an entirely fresh theory regarding the organic growth of ancient Arabic metrics. He began with the thesis that its rhythm originated not only from the quantity of the syllables but also from the presence of marked stress on some of them (rhythmum constat acqueabli arses et theses visibilibus continetis). To begin with (in 1825), he found only iambic metres (marked by a recurrence of short and long syllables); but Hartmann (1833) he distinguished 5 rhythmic kinds: genus sambicum, genus antispasticum, genus amphibrachicum, genus anapaesticum, genus ionicum. This classification has gained currency because W. Wright accepted it and printed it at the end of his Grammar of the Arabic Language (3rd ed. 1898, vol. II, 361 ff.). Whereas Ewald could start on secure basis concerning the quantity of syllables, his conclusions, as far as the second rhythmical factor (stress) was concerned, could only be based on assumptions at which he had arrived by comparing the structure of Arabic verse with the structure of Greek metres and the sequence of 'longs' and 'shorts' within them. His conclusions not only cannot be proved, but are not, in fact, tenable because they start with the assumption that the same rhythm obtains in both Arabic and Greek metres, without adding any proof to this effect and without taking into account that the very presence of rhythmic stress in ancient Greek poetry is itself a matter of controversy. This is the reason why all the later experts who started from the same or similar assumptions as Ewald disagree both with Ewald and with each other on the important question of how to divide up the feet and whether any syllables are to be stressed (and, if so, which).

Stanišlas Guyard advanced an entirely different explanation of the essence of Arabic metrics: he decided to adopt a musical beat, measuring the exact time of each syllable and fixing it by a musical note, instead of merely distinguishing metric 'longs' and 'shorts' at the rhythm of 'shorts' and 'longs' at the tone of 'shorts'. Accepting the division of feet and metres, handed down in the Arabic mnemonics, he concluded from his musical measurements that a temps fort and a temps faible had to alternate every time. Apparent contradictions were explained either by describing a temps fort as weak or by inserting a pausal note (silence) — which was not, however, graphically expressed — to play the role of a temps faible. Other variations were explained by the assumption of a double ictus in every Arabic foot, and he discarded the mafsalatu foot as imaginary because it would not fit in with his theories. He was then in a position to assert that the 16 metres with all their variations did correspond to the musical rhythm which he had assumed; but far from explaining the essence of the metric line-structure in Arabic poetry he had simply transposed it into a sequence of musical terms.

Martin Hartmann is concerned with the development of the various metres and with their derivations from each other, rather than with the actual essence of Arabic metrics. He therefore does not argue with Ewald, though one may assume that he disagrees with him because he goes so far as to say that there was nothing to indicate that the Arabs ever thought of quantitative distinctions in their poetry. Although Hartmann never explicitly says this, it has been asserted that ancient Arabic poetry was in his opinion accentual in character. On the other hand, he rightly asserts that the syllable with the main stress must always be of a constant length and that its preceding short syllable must equally be of a constant duration. Concerning the origin of the metres, he assumed that these were in the last resort instinctive rhythmical imitations of the regularly recurring sounds made by camels' feet. As a camel advances its feet in pairs, he assumes the basic metre to be the one which consists of the alternation of an accented and an unaccented syllable. Depending on whether one starts with the animal's first step, as it starts off from the static position, or from one of the intermediate paces, one gets the difference between them being that the stress is on the first element in the first case and on the second in the other. According to him, Mutādarib and Mutādarib developed from these two basic metres by inserting not one, but in each case two, unstressed syllables between the two steps, i.e., between the two stressed syllables; and Wājir and Kāmīn respectively by the alternate insertion of two unstressed syllables and one unstressed syllable between the two stressed ones. Similarly, he takes Sāṭif ( ḫ ← ḫ ← ḫ ← ḫ) and Ṭawīl ( ḫ ← ḫ ← ḫ ← ḫ ← ḫ) to be defective forms of Rādijas and Ḥasādī. He, too, has difficulties with the derivation of other metres from the diiamb, because in that case there is no alternation of stressed and unstressed syllables, but two unstressed ones have to come together. Hartmann's expositions are subjective assumptions concerning the origin of Arabic poetry in general, and the derivation of metres from one original metre in particular. His arguments do not convince as he offers no conclusive proof, and also because he appears to believe that rhythmic occurrences can be adequately explained by the arbitrary inclusion or exclusion of syllables or by the simple assumption of an anacrusis or a pause. Hartmann himself admits that he has been unable to show what made the Arabs choose the particular combinations which appear in the 16 metres.

Gustav Hoelscher, too, has advanced a theory concerning the origin of Arabic metrics and the derivation of its metres from each other. The simplest, and according to tradition the oldest, metre, the Rādijas, developed from rhymed prose, Sājī, by regulating the number and quantity of syllables; it has a rising rhythm and is dipodically bound. In his opinion, all other metres developed from Rādijas: first Sājī, Kāmīn and Ḥasādī; and then, with varying forms of syncope, Wājir, Ṣāṭif, Ṭawīl and Mutādarib. The same objections must be raised here as were raised in the case of Hartmann's theory of derivation: Hoelscher himself admits that Kāmīn and Mutādarib cannot be derived from Rādijas, and apart from diiambic metres he also lists dithraic metres of a falling rhythm. In addition,
Hoelscher deals extensively with the baric rhythmic factors which determine the essence of all metres. He says that the simplest rhythmic group, the beat or foot, has a "division of time into fixed proportions" and consists of a "regular change from light to heavy"; but he does not define these two factors any further. The rhythmical time-value of the syllable, according to him, is always one single "counting-unit", irrespective of its quantity, and the law according to which a long syllable has twice the length of a short one is not to be applied to Arabic poetry. Similarly, he admits the presence of an ictus, and states that a "bar" consists of two dynamically related parts (of which the second is always the heavier); at the same time he asserts that the stronger ictus, being free, is not tied to either of the two stresses.

Alfred Bloch, in contrast to Hoelscher, stresses the existing clear difference between longs and 'shorts'. His detailed study of the patterns in ancient Arabic verse and the facility with which it can be fitted into all metres lead him to the conclusion that—comparing with other languages—ancient Arabic possessed truly ideal phonetic conditions which rendered it suitable to quantitative metrics. Furthermore, he regards quantity as the only factor shaping the rhythm of the verse, and (following Rudolf Geyer) decides against the assumption of an ictus.

The reason why such varying and contradictory theories concerning the essence of Arabic metrics have been advanced lies in the fact that we have no record of the recitation of ancient poems, and that the casuistic expositions of the Arabian metricians have such a repellent character that it seemed justifiable to disregard them completely. Thus, different experts approached the subject from personal points of view (the musical analogy, analogies with the poetry of other peoples, etc.). Neither attitude towards the teaching of the Arabian metricians (uncritical acceptance or outright rejection) is in fact justifiable. Surely as renowned a philologist as Al-Khalil, whose fundamental achievements as a phonetician, grammarian and lexicographer are recognised even today, did not construct the five circles and the complicated metric system connected with them just for fun. One may assume with certainty that thereby he meant to express his personal points of view (the musical analogy, the obvious purpose for the construction of the 5 circles. Only 4 of the 8 basic feet can be absolutely unambiguously scanned. These are the following: FÁ-O-lun, MAFÁ-li-un, MUFÁ-lula-un, mai-á-LÁTU. Since every foot must have a Wālid, one cannot divide those 4 feet into their components except as shown in print, the Wālid being represented by capital letters. In other words, the syllables which carry rhythmic stress in these 4 feet are clearly established; consequently it is equally clear which syllables carry the stress in the 4 metres Tawill, Wādir, Hasaddi and Mutahārī, because these metres consist exclusively of unambiguous feet. But, according to the teaching of Al-Khalil, there are two ways of analysing the other 4 basic feet. Either: já-ILUN, mus-laf-ILUN, lá-ILÁ-lun, muta-jā-ILUN, or: FÁ-í-lun, mus-TÁF-lun, FÁ-lí-lun, muta-FÁ-lun. In other words, the rhythmic stress in these 4 feet could actually lie on a different syllable in every case, and, accordingly, all metres of which consist of these 4 feet could also have either a rising or a falling rhythm. In the case of these ambiguous metres—which form the greater part of those in existence—there is only one possible method of showing clearly in which of the two possible ways it is to be read, namely by placing it
in one of the 5 circles. The following well thought-out inner mechanism emerges as the actual reason for the construction of the circles: the first metre of every circle—with the exception of circle 4—is the leading metre, and consists only of unambiguous feet, for which the position of their \( \text{Awtād} \) is absolutely fixed; the second and third metres, however, consist of the 4 ambiguous feet. If one writes down the mnemonic words of these metres in relation to the first metre (as reproduced in the table), it will be found not only that the short and the long syllables coincide, but also that in every circle from the second metre onwards, one of two possible \( \text{Awtād} \) falls in its entirety (i.e. in the indivisible syllable-sequence) under the unambiguous \( \text{Watid} \) of the first metre. This, in turn, means that the second possibility of scanning is out of the question. Thus the circles are graphic figures whose purpose is to show which syllables bear the rhythmic stress as \( \text{Watid} \) elements by means of the arrangement of all metres in relation to one another. Thus, for example, the two feet \( \text{mustaf'dilun} \) \( \text{fā'ilun} \), which form the \( \text{Basit} \), cannot be unambiguously scanned. However, the fact that their \( \text{TAF'I} \) and \( \text{FA'I} \) do not fall under the \( \text{Watid} \) of the \( \text{Tawīl} \), but that in both cases their \( \text{ILUN} \) falls under the unambiguous \( \text{Awtād} \) \( \text{FA'ILUN} \) and \( \text{MADF'A} \) of the \( \text{Tawīl} \), shows (as clearly as its were written in a table) which syllables of the \( \text{Basit} \) actually bear the rhythmic stress. In this way it has been proved that the metres brought together in the circles 1, 2, 3 and 5 have, without exception, a rising rhythm, and we also know, on what syllables the stresses were laid.

e) Circle 4 differs from this rule. This is already clearly visible externally, because its first metre, the \( \text{Sārī} \), does not consist exclusively of unambiguous feet. This deviation was surely intended by Al-Khalil, because (1) in contrast with the other circles, which are homogeneous and only incorporate metres of rising rhythm, circle 4 is not uniform; in it—and only in it—one finds the foot \( \text{muf's-ā-LATU} \), the only one of the 8 basic feet which has a falling rhythm, but that, too, never alone, but always together with one of the other 7 feet. The metres of this circle thus have a mixed rhythm of rise and fall. (a) The \( \text{Watid madā'mī} \), the representative of rising rhythm, \( \text{xw-£} \) has a particularly rigid structure in Arabic verse; it never undergoes any change within the hemistich and therefore clearly and distinctly dictates the rhythm of those metres in which it is to be found. In contrast with it, the \( \text{Watid maf'ārkh} \), the core of the falling rhythm \( \text{xw-£} \) is less clearly fixed in composition, hence variable and weaker in shaping rhythm. This explains why the syllables carrying the stress in the metres \( \text{Sārī} \), \( \text{Khalīf} \) and \( \text{Munsarik} \) do not stand out with the same clarity as in the other metres. It is certain that Al-Khalil realised this because he gave this circle the name “\text{al-mustabihār}” (“the dubious one, the one of several meanings”).

It becomes evident that analysis of the circles produces an answer to the questions which have been in dispute, and on which arabs have hitherto held such different views. (1) The rhythm of ancient Arabic metres was not only produced by the quantity of the syllables, but also by the element of rhythmic stress; we even know on which syllables this stress lay in all the metres. (2) Nearly all the metres have a clear, rising rhythm; in no metre was there exclusively a falling rhythm; only a few metres—namely those in circle 4—which occur more rarely, have a rhythm which changes from rise to fall and which, because of this mixture, has less of a clear character. (3) The rhythmic core of all feet and metres (excluding the few in circle 4) is formed by the sequence of a short and a long syllable \( \text{xw-£} \) which is inseparable in its sequence and unchangeable in its quantity, and where the long syllable always carries the stress.

Al-Khalil listened to recitals of ancient poetry and embodied his observations graphically in the construction of the circles, hence the results of his analysis can be taken to be contemporary evidence; and, indeed, they lead us to a complete understanding of the peculiarities of ancient Arabic metres. As we shall see, a metric system, theoretically constructed from the inseparable core of the rising rhythm \( \text{xw-£} \), is completely identical with the system of metres used by the ancient Arabic poets.

If neutral syllables are grouped around the core, we get feet of a rising rhythm; these cannot have less than 3 or more than 5 syllables. Thus we arrive at the following 7 feet: (1) \( \text{xw-£xx} \), \( \text{xw-£xx} \), \( \text{xw-£xx} \), \( \text{xw-£xx} \), \( \text{xw-£xx} \), \( \text{xw-£xx} \), \( \text{xw-£xx} \). No further or different forms of feet can be derived from the core \( \text{xw-£} \). If one does not represent these feet by symbols, but in the manner of the Arabic grammarians by \text{voces memoriabiles}, then one gets exactly those mnemonic words which Al-Khalil fashioned for the 7 feet of the rising rhythm: (1) \( \text{FA'O-lun} \), \( \text{fā-ILUN} \), (2) \( \text{MADF'A-lun} \), \( \text{mustaf'SILUN} \), \( \text{fā-ILĀ-lun} \), (3) \( \text{MUF'A-lal-un} \), \( \text{mudā-f'a-SILUN} \).

Whilst the actual rhythmic core of these feet always appears in the same indivisible and unalterable form, with the stress on the 'long', the neutral syllables (which have no part in the shaping of the actual rhythm) are neither bearers of stress nor stable in their quantity; they can be either a 'long' or a 'short', and their only function is to bring some variation into the rhythm. Such variations do appear, and the difference between them depends on whether (a) the foot begins immediately with the core, which makes a rising rhythm especially strong: \( \text{xw-£xx} \), \( \text{xw-£xx} \), \( \text{xw-£xx} \), \( \text{xw-£xx} \); (b) whether the core is at the end of the foot, which gives the rhythm a somewhat hurrying and skipping character: \( \text{xw-£xx} \), \( \text{xw-£xx} \), \( \text{xw-£xx} \); (c) or whether the core is enclosed within the foot, which somehow hampers the force of the rising rhythm: \( \text{xw-£xx} \).

Just because the grouping of neutral syllables around the core determines the rhythmic variations, it is absolutely necessary to keep to this fixed shape of the feet when scanning the metres.

By combining these 7 feet, one gets metres of rising rhythm of the following 3 groups: (1) The 7 "simple" metres are arrived at by the repetition of the 7 feet in identical form. These 7 theoretically constructed metres are completely identical with the metres \( \text{Wājir} \), \( \text{Kāmil} \), \( \text{Hasāj} \), \( \text{Rudjas} \), \( \text{Ramāl} \), \( \text{Mulkārīb} \), \( \text{Mutādārīk} \) used by the ancient poets. (2) If the 7 feet are combined not with themselves (as sub 1) but with each other, there result according to the calculation of variables many possibilities of "combined" metres. Most these potential metres, however, are incapable of realisation chiefly because they would offend against the general metric law according to which two cores can never succeed each other directly, but must always be separated by not more than two neutral syllables. It will then be seen that the three groups of feet, distinguished above, can be combined into compound metres only with
themselves, but never with each other. Consequently
of the list of possible combined metres only three
pairs are left, namely those which correspond
exactly to the metres Tawil, Basit, Madid used by
the ancient poets and to their reverses.

(3) The gap which is caused by the absence of
metres combined by feet of diverse variations of
rising rhythm (as shown sub 2) is filled in by
"mixed" metres which commence with one of the
7 feet of rising rhythm and are then varied by the
foot of falling rhythm ma-'a-LĀTU. In this case too
the theoretical construction again leads to the mixed
metres used by the ancient poets, and which Al-
Khalli has united in circle 4.

The fact that the metrical system constructed
theoretically in a circle of the rising rhythm ω is
identical with the metres actually used by the
ancient poets affords us full insight into the ground-
plan and the system of the ancient Arabic metres.

If the rising rhythm was "the" poetic form, by
means of which Arabic poets fashioned their poems,
one can, a priori, assume, that those metres which
displayed the core of the rising rhythm most
strongly were preferred and used most readily. Such
are, primarily, the two metres Tawil and Basit,
which combine unequal feet, and of the simple
metres Wājir and Kāmil (in which the rhythm is
more variable because of the sequence of the two
'shorts'), rather than the other simple metres. In
fact, this accords with the results obtained by
various arabists (cf. Bräunlich, in Islam, XXIV,
249) in their statistical investigations into the
frequency of metres: three-quarters of all Kasidas
were composed in these 4 metres, and amongst
these Tawil (as the strongest) heads the list.

Thus the peculiarity of ancient Arabic metres
lies in the fact that they are not formed by joining of
single syllables, but are developed from an inseparable pair of
syllables, the core of the rising rhythm. Only this
one rhythmical idea has taken shape in Arabic
metres, but the principle is carried out in all its
possible variations and effects. The reason why
poets unconsciously developed this one principle to
perfection can only be explained by the fact that
the Arabic literary language, in its structure of sound and syllable,
conforms to the shape of the rising rhythm and invites such development. It is
this monorhythm which basically distinguishes
ancient Arabic metrics from the polyrhythm of
ancient Greek metrics (which expressed various
rhythmic figures without developing any one, as it
were, systematically to its ultimate possibilities, as
the Arabic does). Because Arabic metrics are some-
times wrongly simply equated with Greek ones, a
further basic difference between the two systems of
versification must be pointed out: the only factor
which governs the rhythm of Greek verse is the
quantity of the basic metric units which recur at
regular intervals, and it is therefore a case of a
quantitative metric (measuring the time); the ictus
(the element of energy of rhythmic stress), if indeed
it was present, merely had the task of regulating the
quantity when this was disturbed by an anomos-
syllable. Ancient Arabic metrics are also of a
quantitative nature (every syllable in the language
has an absolutely fixed duration), but in poetry the
number of neutral syllables which can be either a
'long' or a 'short' is so great that the quantity alone
cannot have been decisive for the rhythm. Therefore,
with it we have—not only in a regulating but in a
shaping capacity—stress; these two together, in an
indivisible and unchangeable unit, form the rhythmic
core of the feet and metres. In most lines, the ictus
and the word-accent will coincide on the same
'long', but even when a word-accent falls on a
syllable without an ictus there could be no discord.
Within a line, the ictus—being the factor which
shapes the rhythm—acts more strongly than the
word-accent; but in ancient Arabic, with its contrast
of 'long' and 'short', both are dependent on the
quantity of the syllables, and hence are not as
strong as in accentual languages.

The special peculiarity of the rhythmical structure
in ancient Arabic poetry is in itself proof enough
that Arabic metrics are an autochthonous growth
which has not been transplanted from somewhere
else to Arabic soil. Merely for the sake of comple-
teness, let it be mentioned here that Tkatsch (Die
arabischen Übersetzungen der Poetik des Aristoteles,
vol. I, Vienna 1928, 99 ff.) supposes that "the
illiterate sons of the desert" had received knowledge
of Greek metrics through Aramaic-Christian inter-
vention, and that they had then developed it
further. This assumption, however, has been
accorded little attention and no acceptance because of
its lack of substantiation.

The form of the Kāṣīda and the ancient metres
used in it, have survived—though in a limited range—until today. There is considerable material on this in Sozin’s Dinos aus Central-Arabien (Leipzig,
1901, T. 1-3), where the older literature is also
mentioned (vol. III, 1 f.). The Kāṣīda and its
ancient metres are still used today by the Bedouin;
but they are rarely used by other poets, and then
only when they want to appear consciously archaic.
The metre of the modern Bedouin Kāṣīda is usually a
Tawil with the first syllable missing; Ramal, Basīt,
Kādīs and Wājir are also used. As this form of
modern verses is a direct continuation of ancient
Arabic poetry in content, form, and language, the
rules of the 'Ilm al-‘arūd are applicable to it. They
can, however, not be applied to the actual Arabic
folk-poetry, of which there are traces even in pre-
Islamic times, and which was greatly cultivated in
later centuries. This ‘muse populaire’ is different from the ancient Kāṣīda because it is longer
and its monotonous rhyme which recurs throughout
the poem but a rich strophic structure, and because it
is freer in its choice of themes, but most particularly
because the language of folk-poetry is the language
of every-day life. The sound-structure of this,
however, is fundamentally different from that of
ancient literary Arabic. The emphatic stress which
is evident in the colloquial language caused a short-
ening of the vowels and omission of the endings.
Consequently one can no longer find the regular
alternation of 'long' and 'short' and the absolutely
fixed relation in the quantity of the syllables which
were the most characteristic feature of the old
literary language, and as such determined the
rhythm of the poetry. Therefore we cannot expect
to find in popular poetry the metres which the
ancient poets created and adapted to the phonetic
structure of the Arabic literary language. In it,
as well as in the colloquial language, stress prevails;
it even gains in force when the song is recited,
because the stressed syllables are then emphasised
by beating on instruments or by hand-clapping.
The different forms of Arabic popular poetry are therefore
outside the framework of the article ‘Arūd, which
is concerned only with the metrics of the ancient
poetry.

II. The most outstanding feature of the ʿArūd system as adopted by the Persians is the emphasis laid on quantity, which gives to Persian verse a lilt and swing which can be more readily appreciated by ears to which the more subtle rhythms of Arabic verse are unfamiliar. To words ending in two consonants (mīn excepted) preceded by a short vowel, or one consonant preceded by a long vowel, an extra short vowel was added. This sin-fatha, as it is called, is now not pronounced by the Persians. By poetic licence, certain monosyllabic long syllables may become short according to scansion. Of the types of poem in use the Mathnawi and the Rudāḥ are most characteristic of Persian poetry. The former is a many-rhymed poem in couplets of which each hemistich rhymes with the other. The freedom thus allowed in rhyming renders this form eminently suitable for epic and didactic verse. The Rudāḥ (Quatrains), also called Tarāna, is said (Browne, i, 472-3) to have been the earliest of the verse-forms invented by the Persians. It is derived from no less than twenty-four varieties of the Ḥaṣān metre, and it is perhaps the form best known to the West. The Kashida lost much of its importance at an early period in Persian literature and became more and more artificial under such poets as Khākānī (d. 582/1185). In scope and subject matter, it much resembled its Arabic prototype except that in Persian hands it became more of a eulogy of the poet's patron. Of the same single-rhymed type but shorter (five to fifteen verses), the Ghazal achieved more fame at the hands of Persian poets and lent itself to a graceful sonnet-like form. In the opening lines do the hemistichs of these poems rhyme. The two types of refrain poem—the Ṭarkīb-bānd and Ṭarkīb-bānd were a Persian innovation. The former consists of about five to ten lines which differ in rhyme with a refrain (waṣīla) in the same metre. If the refrain differs in each instance where it occurs, the poem is then called Ṭarkīb-bānd. Of the various types of multiple poem which have internal rhymes and are grouped under the general term of Musammat, the Musaṭādād deserves special mention. It is a poem of which each second hemistich is followed by a short metrical line which has some bearing on the sense of the first hemistich without altering the meaning. All these rhymes rhyme together throughout the poem. The Persians have been credited with the invention of three new metres: the Dīdād, Karīb and the Manīṣākīlī, but these are of rare occurrence.

The adoption by the Turks of the Perso-Arabic metrical system was facilitated, not only by a genuine admiration for Persian belles-lettres, but also by the resemblance which the ancient Turkish method of versification (parmak) bore to the ʿArūd metres. For example, the Kulanğıbī Ṭikā, composed in 462/1069, was written in a metre which was not unlike the Mutakābībī, and the Turkoman Ṭuyuğ was similar to the rubāʾī. Both the original and the ʿArūd systems enjoyed a parallel existence until the former was ousted by the latter during the XVth century. The main difference between the two forms is that in the parmak the verses were based not on quantity but on the number and beat of the syllables. The old system survived only in the folk-poetry of Anatolia of which the most representative types are the türkū, şarkī and the manī (maʿnī). In the XVII century, a revival of the old prosody began under such poets as Karadjağhlan, and, in the course of last century, the growth of national feeling led to the victory of the Turkish system. The ʿArūd system is now obsolete and is cultivated only by a few conservative or neo-classicist poets. The most important innovation produced by the Turks in the ʿArūd was somewhat artificial, although it was very necessary. In purely Turkish words there are, of course, no long syllables, but the Perso-Arabic letters of prolongation were used as vowel-letters. By a poetic licence, these were regarded as long where the metre demanded it.

The metres in use in Persian and Turkish are rather less numerous than those used in Arabic. Some of the more popular metres such as the Tawīl, Bāṣīf, Wājīr, Kamīl and Māddī are scarce. For details of the metres most used the reader is referred to the bibliography.

Bibliography: H. Blochmann, The prosody of the Persians according to Saifī, Jāmī and other writers, Calcutta 1872; Rückert-Pertsch, Grammatik, Poetik und Rhetorik der Perser, Gotha 1874; Browne, ii, 22 ff.; Gibb, Ottoman Poetry, i, chapter 3 and 4; I.A., Aruz (by M. Fuad Köprülli). (G. Meredith-Owens)

ʿARUDI [see niyām ʿarūdī].

ʿARUDJI, Turkish corsair who seized possession of Algiers at the beginning of the 10th/16th century. He is sometimes designated by the name of Barbrossa (a term which is sometimes interpreted as a corruption of Bābā ʿArūdji), but it appears this surname more often refers to his brother Khayr al-Dīn [q.v.]. ʿArūdji came from the island of Midilli [Mytiene-
ancient Lesbos); his father was a Turk, a Muslim soldier of the garrison of occupation (Ghasawud), or a Greek potter (Haedo). He had at least two brothers, who were with him in the Maghrib; Khayr al-Din and Ishāk. A sailor and a Muslim from an early age (Ghasawud), or only from his twentieth year (Haedo), he began to act as a privateer in the eastern Mediterranean. He later decided (the exact reasons for this decision are not known) to operate off the coast of the Maghrib.

It is fairly certain that from 1504 onwards, or soon afterwards, ʿArūdī and his brothers made their base at Goletta; they started in a small way with two ships, but soon took some remarkable prizes; as a result of these they increased both the numbers of their fleets, which comprised eight galliots in 1510, and their capital, which enabled them to honour their obligations to the ruler of Tunis. The latter, Abū ʿAbd Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan (1494-1526), in fact only authorised them to establish a base on his territory on condition that he received a share of the prizes. The Ghasawud describes on one occasion the magnificent cortège organised by the corsairs in Tunis to carry to the Ḥafsid ruler his share of the booty (text, 15-16; tr., 28-30). They were authorised to establish a secondary base on the island of Djerba, and ʿArūdī was even appointed Ḥālid of the island in 1510 (Haedo). Until 1512, they cruised in the western Mediterranean and off the Spanish coast.

The Spanish, however, occupied various points on the coast of North Africa, notably Oran (1509), the Peñón of Algiers, Bidjāya (Bougie) and Tripoli (1510). Despairing of being able to retake Bidjāya (Bougie) by his own efforts, the Ḥafsid governor of that town appealed to ʿArūdī who had then at his disposal twelve ships armed with cannon, and a thousand Turkish soldiers. ʿArūdī established a naval blockade of the port, while the “king” of Bidjāya (Bougie), supported by the Turkish troops, laid siege to it by land with three thousand “Moors”. After eight days’ bombardment, ʿArūdī lost his left arm. His brother Khayr al-Din took him back at full speed to Tunis where he spent his time recovering his health. In August 1514, he attacked Bidjāya (Bougie) for the second time, with twelve ships and 1120 Turkish troops. Again ʿArūdī was forced to raise the siege, this time because of bad weather, the appearance of a Spanish relief squadron, and perhaps the desertion of local contingents; it is even possible that he was forced to burn some of his vessels in the gulf of Bidjāya to prevent them falling into the hands of the Spanish.

He may perhaps have been already established at Dijdelli [p.v.], as the Ghasawud lead one to believe. At all events, he took refuge there after his second reverse before Bidjāya, because his relations with the Ḥafsid ruler had undergone a change—we do not know for what reason.

At this juncture, apparently, ʿArūdī conceived political ambitions. Haedo describes him as supplying corn to tribes in the vicinity which had been smitten by famine, thereby acquiring great popularity, and intervening in the quarrels of the Kabyle chiefs.

When King Ferdinand the Catholic died on 22 January 1516, the inhabitants of Algiers sought to rid themselves of the threat from the Peñón, and appealed to ʿArūdī, who had him in the Maghrib. He answered their appeal, and bombarded the Peñón without success. The leader of the Arabs of Algiers, Sālim al-Tūmī, then sought to get rid of ʿArūdī and his Turks, who behaved as though they were in conquered territory. But ʿArūdī forestalled him, put him to death and seized power with the help of his Turks. Despite the intrigues of the son of Sālim al-Tūmī, who had taken refuge with the Spanish, he succeeded in maintaining his position at Algiers by exercising the greatest severity. He also succeeded in repulsing a Spanish landing carried out by Diego de Vera (30 September 1516).

The Spanish then sent the Sultan of Ténès against him, but ʿArūdī went out to meet him and inflicted on him a severe defeat, as a result of which ʿArūdī made himself master of Miliana and Ténès. According to the Ghasawud he then organised the territory he had conquered; Khayr al-Din had the territories to the East, with Dellys as his seat, while ʿArūdī took Algiers and the western territories.

ʿArūdī then received an appeal from the inhabitants of Tlemcen, whose king had accepted a sort of Spanish protectorate. He at once organised an expedition with the greatest thoroughness, and entrusted the government of Algiers to his brother Khayr al-Din. He occupied in passing the stronghold of the Kal’a of the Banū Rashid, now the site of Oued-Fodda, and left his brother Ishāk there with a small garrison. He then proceeded to Tlemcen, which he took possession of without great difficulty, after having defeated the troops of King Abū Ḥammūn in the field (September 1517). Instead of raising to power the pretender Abū Zayyān who had no link with the Spanish, ʿArūdī assumed power and despatched expeditions as far as Oudjā and the Beni Snassen; he seems to have had the intention of negotiating with the ruler of Fez against the Spanish.

The latter did not give him time for this: in January 1518, a Spanish column under the command of Don Mart. of Argote captured the Kal’a of Banū Rashid, thus cutting communications between Tlemcen and Algiers. In May, the Marquis of Comarés, governor of Oran, marched on Tlemcen. There he laid siege to ʿArūdī, who hoped, it appears, to be relieved by the troops from Fez. The inhabitants of Tlemcen rebelled against the Turks, and forced ʿArūdī to shut himself up in the fortress of Mīshāwār [see TLEMČEN]. As supplies were running low, ʿArūdī attempted a sortie and managed to escape with a few men, but he was overtaken, probably in the vicinity of the present Rio Salado (department of Oran) and put to death; he was 44 or 45 years of age (Autumn 1518).

It will be seen that on the whole very little is known about the history of ʿArūdī. It seems likely that political aspirations awoke within him, when he realised the political anarchy existing in the central Maghrib and the possibilities it offered to a bold man backed by a body of men equipped with fire-arms and artillery. But the possibilities were so great that ʿArūdī allowed himself to be carried away by ambition, and he failed because he was too far from his base, and had not prepared the ground politically to a sufficient extent.

The best known Turkish account is that given by Hadidji Khalifa in his Tutifat al-Bihar (Istanbul 1141/1728 and 1329/1914, Eng. tr. of chaps. 1-4 by J. Mitchell, History of the Maritime Wars of the Turks, London 1831). This narrative, which was used by Hammer in his account of the naval wars, rests on earlier sources, some of which are still extant. A list of Ottoman gazassnames dealing with the campaigns of Arudj and Phayar al-Din is given in Agah Shirz Levendor, Gazansnameler, Ankara 1956, 70 ff. (K. L. Turnska). Arudj also written Al-Ruk, town in Sind; it is surmised to have been the capital of king Abd Abbas Ahmad (b. Muhammad b. from Abu 'l-Salam b. Abl Bakr) b. al-Arus, who died c. 1460 in Tunis. The text cf. Marquart, Erinsahr, 25.

Bibliography: Rinn, Marabouts et Khowan, 268; Depont et Coppolani, Les conférences musulmanes, 340.

Arzachel [see al-Zarkali].

Arzan (Syriac Aroz, Armenian Arzin, Alzn). The name of several towns in eastern Anatolia. The most important was the chief city of the Roman province of Arzane, Armenian Aldmeth, located on the east bank of the Arzansu River (modern Garansu) a tributary of the Tigris, at about 42° 41' E. long. (Greenw.) and 38° N. lat. By Islamic authors Arzan is linked with the larger city to the west, Mayyafirkin.

The origin of the name is uncertain but of undoubted antiquity; see the discussion in H. Hübschmann, Die altarmenischen Ortsnamen, in Indogermanische Forschungen, 16 (1904), 248, 311. On the pre-Islamic history of the town, a Syrian bishopric, see Marquart, Erinsahr, 25.

Arzan surrendered to Ilyad b. Qhan in 20/640, and the district was included in the territory of Djazira (Baladhur, 170), later in Diyār Bakr. The town was in a rich agricultural district, and the average combined revenue from Arzan and Mayyafirk in 'Abbāsid times was 4,100,000 dirhems, according to Kudama (BGA vi, 246). Until the rise of the Hamāndis Arzan was ruled by Armenian amirs allied by marriage, as well as allegiance, to the Arabs. Cf. Canard (below), 472.

At the beginning of the 4th/10th century the Hamāndis Sayf al-Dawla resided in Arzan when preparing expeditions against the Armenians or the Byzantine Empire. In 330/942 the Byzantines captured and sacked Arzan (Canard, 748). The Hamāndis recovered the town but had to fight many times with the Byzantines in the Diyār Bakr district. Afterwards the town lost its importance and in the 12th cent. A. D. Yaghit (ed. Wüstenfeld, i, 205) wrote that it was in ruins.

Few travellers have visited the site, but it was identified by J. G. Taylor in JRIS, 35 (1865), 26, where a piastre of the ruins is given.

One should not confuse Arzan with a smaller nearby site also on a river, the Bohntaus, called Arzan al-Zarm; see J. Markwart Südarmenien und die Tigrisquellen (Vienna 1930), 41*, and 341. Also to be distinguished from Arzan is Arzan al-Rum (Erzurum), and nearby Byzantine Apure.

The name Arzan is known to have been current in the 1st century B.C. and the 2nd century A.D., when the town appears in the inscriptions of the province of Armenia Cilicia. Arzan is known to be one of the oldest towns in the region, and its name is of uncertain origin, but of undoubted antiquity. Arzan is located on the east bank of the Arzansu River (modern Garansu) a tributary of the Tigris, at about 42° 41' E. long. (Greenw.) and 38° N. lat. By Islamic authors Arzan is linked with the larger city to the west, Mayyafirkin.

Bibliography: In addition to references in the text cf. Marquart, Die Entstehung und Wiederherstellung der armenischen Nation, Potsdam 1919, 33; M. Canard, Histoire de la Dynastie des Ham-
ARZAN — ARZAN

ARZAN (Berb. Arzyu; modern orthography Arzew or Arzej), town on the Algerian coast situated between Oran and Mostaganem, 7 km. E. of the present small town of Arzeu. The Muslim town of the Middle Ages doubtless occupied "on the littoral of the plain of Sirat" the site of the ancient Portus Magnus (modern Saint Leu, still called Vieil Arzeu). In the 5th/6th century, al-Bakri speaks with admiration of the Roman town and its ruins, but declares that it was completely uninhabited. He notes however, on the nearby mountain (the one which dominates the present Arzeu), three castles which were used as wirk. This is the more remarkable because fortified monasteries were very rare on the northern coast of Barbary. The Arzaw region thus appears to have played a military and religious role. One assumes that maritime activity was, here as in other towns on the same coast, carried on not by the Berbers of the region but by Andalusian immigrants. In the 6th/7th century, al-Muqaddasi speaks of the activity. "It is," he says, "large village to which is brought the wheat produced in the surrounding countryside, which is sought after by merchants who export it to numerous countries". In the 10th/11th century Leo Africanus, in his list of the large and small towns on this coast, does not mention Arzaw.

At an unspecified period, probably in fairly recent times (18th century?), a Berber tribe which used to be known as the Botjoua, among whom the original dialect was still spoken forty years ago.


(G. MARCQ'S)

ARZÚ KHAN (Sirâdî al-Dîn ʿAllî Khân Arzû) 1099/1687-8 or 1100/1689-90 to 1168/1756. Indo-Muslim scholar and poet in Persian and Urdu. Son of Shaykh Husâm al-Dîn Husâm, Arzû Khan was, according to Shams al-Ulâm Mawlâm Muhammad Husayan Ṭâzî, descended from the family of the saint Naṣîr al-Dîn Muhâmmâd Ṭâzî-i Dîhî on his father's side and from the saint Muhammad Gawah Gwâdiyâr on his mother's.

A native of either Gwalior or Akbarâbâd (Agra), in 1124/1713 he went to Dihlî and obtained a mansab and a gâzi, also receiving patronage from Mu'taman al-Dawla Ishaq Khân, Khân-sâman to Muhammad Shâh. The former's sons Naṣîm al-Dawla and Nawmâbâd Sâlân Dîjân continued their father's favours to Arzû Khân and when Sâlân Dîjân went to Awadh in 1168/1754-5 Arzû Khân accompanied him there and secured a stipend from Shugârâd al-Dawla, the Nawmâbâd-Wazir of Awadh. Arzû died at Lucknow but his body was brought back to Dihlî for burial.

In Persian literature Arzû Khan was an important commentator on the Gulistân of Sa'dî, on the Sikandarnâma of Nizâmî and upon the Khâbâd-i Khâkânî and ʿUrîfî. His other Persian writings include a lexicon, Sirâdî al-Lughâtî, the ʿAfiyya-i

Kubrâ on simile, metaphor and metonymy, the Zâd al-Fawa'id, a dictionary of Persian verbs and the nouns derived from them, the Tanbîh al-Sâlihûn, a criticism of the poems of Ḥazîn, and the Madâmr al-Nâfâsî, a biography of ancient and modern poets with extracts from their works.

In Urdu literature Arzû Khân was more of an influence than a figure. Although he composed a few verses in Urdu he is more important as a teacher of such luminaries of the Dihlî school of Urdu poets as Mirzâ Dîn Dîjân Sâlân and Muhammad Ra'în Sawdâ, Muhammad Tâj Mir and Mir Dârî. He also composed an Urdu dictionary of mystic words, the Gharâbî al-Lughâtî and a Hindûstâni dictionary, the Nawâdîr al-Farî.


(A. JEFFERY)
Ašāba is an Arabic word meaning originally 'spirit of kinship' (the ašāba are male relations in the male line) in the family or tribe. Already used in the hadith in which the Prophet condemns ašābiyya as contrary to the spirit of Islam, the term became famous as a result of the use to which it was put by Ibn Khaldūn, who made this concept the basis of his interpretation of history and his doctrine of the state. Ašābiyya is, for Walde-Hofmann, Lat. *sym. Wb.*, the fundamental bond of human society and the basic motive force of history; as such, the term has been translated as 'esprit de corps' (de Slane), by 'Gemeinsinn' and even by 'Nationalitätssidee' (Kremmer), which is an unjustified modernism. The first basis of the concept is undoubtedly of a natural character, in the sense that ašābiyya in its most normal form is derived from tribal consanguinity (nasab, šīkhām), but the inconvenience of this racial conception was already overcome in Arab antiquity itself by the institution of affiliation (waala'), to which Ibn Khaldūn accords great importance in the formation of an effective ašābiyya. Whether it is based on blood ties or on some other social grouping, it is for Ibn Khaldūn the force which impels groups of human beings to assert themselves, to struggle for primacy, to establish hegemonies, dynasties and empires; the validity of this principle is tested firstly in Arab history, pre-Islamic and Muslim, and secondly in the history of the Berbers and other islamised peoples: the Arab empire is the product of the ašābiyya of Kuraysh, especially of the Banū ʿAbd Manāf group, but once power (mulk) has been seized, the dominant group tends to detach itself from the natural ašābiyya on which it is based, and to substitute for it other forces which become the instrument of its absolutism. This extraordinary appreciation of a non-religious force as the motive power of history (the religious element only superimposes itself as a secondary element) involved Ibn Khaldūn in delicate problems of reconciliation with the traditional view of Muslim history and civilisation, a view, moreover, which he supported with whole-hearted conviction; this effort of harmonisation, apparent in more than one page of Ibn Khaldūn's political Theory, BSOS, vii, 1933, 23-31.


Al-aṣād (a.), plural usually al-usād, al-usud, al-usūd, the most usual word for lion. It is also frequently found as a personal or tribal name (see following article concerning the presumable etymology and connexions with other names, see discussion by C. de Landberg, l.c., II/II, 1237-40). The old poetic word, which has been more and more replaced by al-aṣād, is al-layth; this is found not only in Semitic languages (Akk. nēšu, this, however, generally only in prose: Landsberger, l.c., 76), but also, according to Koehler (Lexic. in VT, 1938, 481b), in Greek λέον, λέαντης, in which it is also used by poets—though rarely—from Homer onwards. The same author, 472a, also gives, alongside the kindred Akk. λαβα' etc., the Arabic fem.: labā' (with numerous kindred forms for lioness), and gives λέος, λέαντας, λέανα as an "African" word, referring to ZDPV, LXII (1939), 121-4 (with a geographical distribution of the words). H. Osth, in Symb. Rozwadowskii, I (Cracow 1927), 295-313, derives the name of the lion in the Semitic languages (including the Arabic forms labā' and layth), Egyptian Coptic, Greek, Latin, German and Slavonic from an original Alarodic form and its variants. Recently, Indo-Germanic scholars once more refused to admit any connexion between the Semitic languages and the words for "lion", but they are unable to give any Indo-Germanic alternative (Paul Thieme, Die Heimat der u̱g. Gemeinsprache, Wiesbaden 1954, p. 32-9; also Walde-Hofmann, Lat. *sym. Wb.*, Heidelberg 1938, i, 285; and Pauly-Wissowa, RE, XIII, col. 968). The phonetic difficulties involved in the undoubted relationship between the words for "lion", "elephant" etc., in the different languages, remain a problem. It is noteworthy that all the cases concern animals which appear as characters in fables, playing a great part both in literature and ornamentation (see below, and Indogerm. Jahrbuch, XIII [1929], 94, No. 83).

It is a matter of common knowledge that various hypotheses have been advanced concerning the distribution of the lion in Arabia. M. Grünert, l.c., 3, 4, states that more than two-thirds of the great number of words for the lion (3 Arab philologists vie with one another in mentioning 600 and more) can be found in the ancient poets. In his opinion, the "epitheta ornantia" which he has collected are proof of "such a perceptive way of observing nature" that "some ancient Arabic poets really observed the lion". Here, however, it is not the great quantity, but the significance of these epithets which must be the decisive factor: they do not so much give a clear picture of the animal itself, but—and this is typical in Arabic lexicography—they give a great number of synonyms for the generic concept, such as "gibbous, crater, scatter-pieces, crusher, hammer" etc. (cf. ibid., 15 f.). B. Moritz (l.c., 40 f.) is likewise led to accept Grünert's view, in the main, because of this wealth of synonyms (following Ibn Sīda, Kitāb al-Muḥāsas, viii, 59-64). On the other hand we have the objections by G. Jacob, l.c., 17; Th. Nöldeke, in ZDMG, XLIX (1895), 713; H. Lammens, Le Berceau de l'islam, Rome 1914, i, 287 f. In addition to these objections, there is, above all, the fact that the figure of the lion as the king of animals—and hence as a personification of kingly power—appears very early in places where the living animal never existed (for example in Ceylon, Indonesia, and in parts of Europe; cf. M. Ebert, l.c., vii, 318a). It was in such places that it could most easily turn into a semi-mythical animal, engaging an imagination which had already endowed it with those ideals which its appearance evokes. This may perhaps also serve as an explanation for attributing other qualities to it, such as courage, bravery, magnanimity and the like, which some experts definitely deny to the real animal (cf. R. Lydekker, The Royal Natural History, London-New York 1893/4, i, 357 f., as opposed to Brehm, l.c., i, 144, 150).—

Another attribute of the lion is its strength, its magnanimity and the like, which some experts definitely deny to the real animal (cf. R. Lydekker, The Royal Natural History, London-New York 1893/4, i, 357 f., as opposed to Brehm, l.c., i, 144, 150).
the colour of the animal and the growth of its mane.
Facts for a more detailed description of these (cf. e.g.
Jacob, *ibid.* and Moritz, *ibid.*, 41, n. 3) are, however,
sca'ty. In Islamic countries today, one finds,
according to Brehm, *ibid.*, i, 144 ff., the Berber lion,
the Senegalese lion, the Persian lion and the Gudjarat
lion.
The Arabs caught lions in pits, a primitive method
which is still found in some parts today (Grünewald,
*ibid.*, 144; Ebert, *ibid.*, vi, 146; Brehm, *ibid.*, i, 151 ff.;
according to Pliny, this was the method employed
to catch animals for the circus: *RE*, XIII, col. 980).
Following the example of the rulers of the ancient
Orient, as well as that of the Achaemenids, Sasanids
and the Caesars, the Caliphs later went on lion-
hunts themselves and in Islam, too, it became a
prerogative of the rulers. They kept the lions in
zoological gardens, trained them as companions, and
organised shows with them in the Roman manner
(cf. *RE*, XIII, col. 980 f.; Ebert, *ibid.*, vi, 144-5; G. Contenau,
Soden, *Herrscher im AO*, Berlin 1954, 37, 75, 82, 134; C. de Wit,
*ibid.*, 10-4; Streck, *ibid.*; Mez, *Renaissance*, 385 f.; M. F. Köprülü,
*ibid.*, i, 599 f.).

"In Islamic art, the lion is the probably the most
frequently and diversely represented animal. It
rarely has an apotropaic meaning, it sometimes has
an astrological or symbolic one, but it is generally
merely decorative and without any deeper signi-
ficance. The main forms are:
1) In the round, as in the Fountain of the Lions
in the Alhambra, hewn in stone in Konya, by Faţimid
and Seljuk metal work, and in Persian ceramics of
the 12th to 14th century (particularly as pouring
vessels and censers).
2) In bas-relief, and also flat, in the various
spheres of art, and in almost any material, either:
a) passant, statant, sejant, rampant, either alone
or paired, in the so-called 'heraldic style';
b) either in battle with other animals—such as bulls,
gazelles or camels—or attacking them (thereby
going back to ancient Iranian tradition) from mere
playful modelling. However, W. Andrae, *Dargestelltes u.
Verschlüsseltes in der ao. Kunst*, in Welt d. Or., 11/3
(1956), 250-3, shows that there was often a deeper
reason behind it, especially when the lion, bull, and
eagle occur together. Here, Islam took a great deal
from older cultures without enquiring into its
significance. Frequently, ancient Egyptian art
provides the answer in its added explanation of
what is portrayed (cf. C. de Wit, *ibid.*, 84-90, 96 ff.).
— The apotropaic nature of the lion is of
considerable significance. With his fierce look, warding
off all hostile attack, he becomes the guardian of the
throne (also of the throne ofAllah: Grünewald, *ibid.*, 5)
the gate, halls and graves (cf. Keller, *ibid.*, 1, 58;
Bonnet, *ibid.*, 429, like the Sphinx: cf. C. de Wit,
*ibid.*, 66 f.). — Some representations of lions may, of
course, have resulted from mere playful
modelling.
3) Partial representations are rare; the most
frequent are: lions' paws, used as ornamental legs;
lions' heads (modelled fully in the round) as door-
knockers, as handles and in similar functions,
usually in bronze.
There seems to be little direct debt to the ancient
Orient or Hellenic art; the stylisation of the
figure of the lion, at least, is nearly always typically Islamic,
both in details and ornamentation. — There is as yet
no iconographic study of the lion in Islamic art."
his body: brain, teeth, gall, flesh, fat, etc.; these are held to be infallible in their magic effects. The court apothecary in Stuttgart sold lion's excrement as late as 1561 as a remedy (cf. Keller, Loc., i, 44; RE, X111, col. 982; Grünter, Loc., 19 f.).

Names show most clearly how much the lion entered into the cultural history of man. Usd al-Ghūbū “the lions of the thicket” is what Ibn al-Athir (died 632/1234) calls his biography of the companions of the Prophet. The names formed with Asad(s), Layth(s) are numerous (sometimes theological: J. Wellhausen, RA, 2, 64); in Turkish those formed with Arslan (particularly the Saldıņgūs; M. F. Köprüölü, Loc., 600-4 deals with personal names, place names and titles); in Persian, gūr, either alone or in compounds, such as gūrdīl “lionhearted”, ghūrmār “hero” (like asad: Landbcrg, Loc., I fii, 1239 f.; Fr. Wolff, Glossar zu Firdosi’s Shīhānma, 1925, 584-7). In the Turkish of today, the word is usually aslān, which also means “brave, upright, good”; arslancılım “my little lion”, is practically a term of endearment for boys. — Thus the likable traits of the animal, its traditional virtues, the dignity of its appearance, have triumphed everywhere.

Bibliography: Owing to lack of space, the subject can only be roughly sketched.

Max Grünter, Der Löwe in der Literatur der Araber, Prague 1899, is little more than a study from a lexicographic standpoint. — M. Fuad Köprüölü’s article Arslan in IA, i, 598-609a is hitherto the best exposition, not only for Turkish. There is no general survey of the Islamic field, nor are there any monographs on particular areas. — For comparison with antiquity, the following will be found useful: the article “Lōwe” (by Steuer) in Paul-Wissowa, RE, xii, 1927, col. 968-990; Otto Keller, Die antike Tierwelt, i (Leipzig 1909), 24-67; further: Max Ebert, Reallex. d. Vorgesch., vi, 1144-6, VII, 318-9b and especially Paulus Casell, Löwenkämpfe von Nemea bis Golgota, Berlin 1875, this also for oriental conditions. — For relationship with the ancient Orient: B. Landsberger, Die Fauna des alten Mesopotamien, Leipzig 1934; M. Streck, in Verönder-Bibliothek, vi (1936), 46ff. H. Ionescu, Reallex. d. ägypt. Religionsgesch., Berlin 1952, articles “Lōwe”, “Sphinx”, and others; especially C. de Wit, Le rôle et le sens du lion dans l’égypte anc., Leiden 1951, passim. — Concerning Arabic and Semitic matters in general, cf. F. Hommel, Die Namen der Säugetiere bei den südsem. Völkern, Leipzig 1879, 287-94; C. de Landberg, Études sur les dialectes de l’Arabie méridionale, II/ii, Leiden 1909, 1237-40; G. Jacob, Altarab. Beduineneleben, Berlin 1897, 16-18; B. Moritz, Arabien, Hanover 1923, 40-41. — For zoology in general: Brehm’s Tierleben, I (1893), 144-152.

H. Kindermann

ASAD, BANĪ (later, dialect: Ban) Arab tribe. They are a tribe related to the Kīnāna [q.v.]; the awareness of this interconnection remained remarkably alive, though it had little practical effect owing to the great distance separating them.

The homelands of the Asad are in North Arabia, at the foot of the mountains formerly inhabited by the Tayy [q.v.]. In contrast to the latter, the Asad led a mainly nomadic life. Their grazing lands extended to the south and south-east of the Nejd, from the Shammar mountains [q.v.] to the Wādi ’l-Rumma in the south, and beyond it in the neighbourhood of the two Abān in the direction of Rass and further eastwards up to Sīr. Here their territory overlapped with that of the ʿAbs [q.v.], in the north with that of the Yarbū [q.v.] of the Tamīm [q.v.], for the Asad owned the spring of Line beyond the Dahān [q.v.], as well as the adjacent tract of Ḥanz (Ḥeḍjera) to the north.

An important event in the pre-Islamic history of the Asad is their revolt in which Hujjir fell, the son of the last great ruler of the Kinda and the father of the poet Imrūʾ al-Kays [q.v.], and in which they struck the disintegrating kingdom of Kinda [q.v.]; a mortal blow. — The Asad’s relationship both with their immediate and their more distant neighbours, the Tamīm and the tribes beyond the Wādī, varied. In contrast, at the end of the sixties and the beginning of the seventies of the 4th century A.D., a permanent alliance with the ʿAyān and the Ghaṭāfān [q.v.] was developed, in which the Dhubyan [q.v.] and finally the ʿAbs joined. A few decades later, however, a rift among the allies occurred, as a result of which clashes ensued, particularly between the Asad and the ʿAyān, until Islam established peace among the tribes.

As an Asad family, the Ghanm, who had long been settled in Mecca, belonged to the inner circle of Muhammad’s disciples. But these connexions in no way affected the great Asad tribe. At the beginning of the year 4/625, Muhammad sent a raiding expedition to the Asad wells at Kaţān, where were encamped the sub-tribe Fakās, with their chief Tulayha (Taḥa) and who, according to tradition, were contemplating an attack on Medina, already weakened by the battle of Ḫudaydah. It is conceivable that Tulayha took part in the siege of Medina, the so-called Battle of the Trench (6/627). When, after further unsuccessful struggles against Muhammad, famine broke out among the Asad, Tulayha appeared with other chiefs in Medina at the beginning of 9/630 to embrace Islam. Though it is uncertain that Sura XX1X, 14-17 refers to their emissaries, as is maintained by tradition, nevertheless these verses undoubtedly reflect their attitude towards Islam. However that may be, their leader Tulayha is said to have proclaimed himself a prophet even before Muhammad’s death. During the ensuing widespread troubles of the Ridda wars, he succeeded in re-establishing the alliance with the Ghaṭāfān and the Tayy, which was joined by sections of the ʿAbs and Fazāra (Dhubyān). After being abandoned by the leader of the Fazāra [q.v.] at the battle of Buzāţ (631), he took to flight (11/632). This victory of the Muslims broke the resistance of the insurgents in North Arabia, who then for the first time were converted to Islam, the Asad among them.

In the ensuing wars of conquest, we find the Asad predominantly on the Idrāk front; Tulayha also, having in the meantime returned to Islam, fought both there and in Persia. — Most of the Asad were absorbed by al-Ḵūf; here in the course of time, they evolved from warriors to herdsmen as a result many of those who handed down the Shiʿa tradition, were men of the Asad from al-Ḵūf. Smaller groups of the Asad were incorporated in the Syrian army and subsequently settled near Aleppo and beyond the Euphrates.

When the withdrawal of the Bakr [q.v.] and Tamīm left the way to the north open to them, in the second half of the 3rd/4th century, they extended their grazing lands along the Kīfā pilgrimage road from al-Ḵīţān (Bāne) in the Dahān [q.v.] as far as Wāḵīsa. Later it was extended still further northwards: up to al-Kādisiyya [q.v.] on the frontier of the Sawād. In the East the Asad extended right up to Baṣra and in the West to Ayn al-Tamur [q.v.].
In the second half of the 4th/10th century, the Asad penetrated into the settled lands. Shaykh Mazyad of the sub-tribe Nashira settled on the Nile canal at al-Hilla [q.v.], whilst another chief, Dubays, crossed the Tigris and set up his camp in the neighbourhood of the later Ḥuwaze (Ḥuwawayza; see Ḥawza) (Khūrāsān).

The internal troubles under the Būyids [q.v.] favoured the rise of the Banū Mazyad [q.v.]. Ḥāfil b. Mazyad was confirmed in his office as a vassal of the Būyids in 401/1013-3. His son Dubays (404-474/1018-82) and the latter's son Ṣanṣūr (427-479/1082-1086) were considered to be the ideal type of Arab aristocracy. Both were surpassed by Ṣaḍaqa b. Ṣanṣūr [q.v.] (479/1086-1108), in personal nobility and political significance. In the struggle between Sultan Bāḳrīyār [q.v.] and his brother Muhammad b. Malikgāh [q.v.], he sided with the latter and occupied al-Kūfa (494/1101), Hit, Wāṣīt, Bāṣra and Tākrit and brought several Beduin tribes of Irāk under his influence; thus he was well justified in calling himself Malik al-ʿArab (Prince of the Beduin). Later however, he quarrelled with his overlord Sultan Muhammad, who defeated him at al-Madāʾin in 501/1108, in which battle he fell. Ṣaḍaqa united in his person the virtues of an old-time Arab warrior and those of an Islamic prince. He stands on the threshold of the transition from the Beduin way of life to that of urban civilisation. Though at the outset he still lived in tents, in 495 (1101/2) he set up his residence al-Hilla. The sons of his son and successor Dubays II [q.v.], who led a restless and adventurous life and was murdered at the court at Marāgha of the Sādījī Sultan Masʿūd b. Muhammad [q.v.] in 539/1143; ruled at al-Hilla under 545/1150.

The Asad had followed the Banū Mazyad to al-Hilla and remained there after their princely family had become extinct. Because they had supported Sultan Muhammad II b. Ṣanṣūr [q.v.] in the last Sādījī feat of arms in Irāk, the unsuccessful siege of Baghdād (551/1157), the Kalīfa al-Mustāqīlī [q.v.] determined to expel them from al-Hilla (558/1163). They entrenched themselves in the neighbourhood and were, with the help of the Muntakib [q.v.], finally compelled to submit. Four thousand of them were slaughtered and the remainder banished for ever from al-Hilla. The victors were perhaps induced to adopt this merciless procedure, because the Asad belonged to the dhiya (see above).

The Asad then dispersed, but must have reassembled again later. In any case, in the 14th and 15th centuries they lived to the south east of Wāṣīt.

In the course of time they finally found a new home in al-Dījāzār. The Banū Asad or Benī Sed as were punished by Turkish troops for having set fire to their home in al-Dījāzār. The Banū Asad or Benī Sed as are said to have advanced under Shek Dānā as far as the region east of ʿAmāra and later, under the latter's son Ḥeyyūn, to Little Medjer. 1894-5 they were punished by Turkish troops for having set fire to Medina (below el-Cēbāsh on the Euphrates) under Ḥasan el-Ḥeyyūn. Ḥasan was driven out of el-Cēbāsh and perished miserably in Ḥūr al-Dījāzār (ca. 1903). His son Sālim, thanks to the influence of the family of Sayyid Tālib, was appointed to the office of Shaykh over the Banū Asad in 1906. After the first world war, he remained faithful to Sayyid Tālib and declared himself opposed to the choice of Fāsyāl as King of Irāk. In 1924/5 he revolted against the Government, was taken prisoner and then exiled from his home. He now lives on his estates in Belerdž (North East of Baghdad).

Bibliography: The best comprehensive historical description with source-references is in: Max Freiherr von Oppenheim, Die Beduinen, vol. III/part 2 (= VIII. Section: ʿIrāk), revised and published by W. Caskel, Wiesbaden 1952, 452-458 (all geographical names mentioned above may be found on the appended maps). — For the early Islamic period: The Prophet's biographies, especially: Frants Buhl, Das Leben Muhammeds, German edition by H. H. Schrader, Heidelberg 1955, 261, 271, 321, etc., 352; also L. Caetani, AnnaIi, see Index, s.v. (H. Kindermann)

ASAD, ancient Arab tribe. The Asadīyōn mentioned by Ptolemy VI, 7, § 22 (Sprunger, 206), and stated by him to have lived in central Arabia, to the west of the ʿOawārub = Tanūkh [q.v.]. Like them, and perhaps with them, the Asad had emigrated to the Euphrates line before the middle of the 3rd century. They appear in the inscription on the grave of the second Lāqīmīd of Ḥira (in al-Numāra, 328 A.D.), together with the Tanūkh, as al-Asadīn, "the two Asads". Here the dual a potiori may well have been chosen in order to erase, together with the name, the memory of the Tanūkh rule, whose kings had preceded the Lāqīmīd in Ḥira. It is not obvious what this term is based on—possibly on some relationship. This is also accepted by the Arab genealogists, who say that the core of the Tanūkh arose from the Asad. The inscription in Numāra mentions that "he reigned over both the Asad . . . . and their kings." It is not known for how long the Asad were under the Lāqīmīd. Some of their descendants, the B(ānu) ʿl-Kaṣrūn [q.v.], lived until Islamic times to the south and south-east of the Ḥawrān on the eastern border of the Balkhā and down to Arabia; other branches had joined the Tanūkh.


ASAD [see SAD].

ASAD b. ʿABBĀD ALLĀH b. ASAD AL-KASB (of the Kārīest of Bagdād; not al-Kaṣhrīyān, as sometimes printed in error), governor of Kūrāsān, 106-9/724-7 and 117-20/735-8, under his brother Khalīd b. ʿAbbād Allāh [q.v.], governor of al-ʿIrāq and the East, in the reign of Hīshām b. ʿAbd al-Malik. His first period of governorship coincided with increasing pressure by Turkish forces against the Arabs in Transoxiana, which he was unable to counter effectively, although he conducted successful raids into the fringes of the Parapamisus. In 107/726 he rebuilt the city of Balkh (destroyed by Kutayba b. Muslim after the rising of Nēzāk) and transferred the Arab garrison troops to it from Barūkhān. The Caliph was forced to remove him from office, however, owing to his violence against the local Muṣarītes. But when the disorders in Transoxiana and Eastern Kūrāsān came to a climax with the revolt in 110/734 of al-Ḥārīth b. Suraydī [q.v.], supported by the native princes, Asad was reappointed to the province. He drove the rebel forces across the Oxus but in spite of a raid towards Samarkand failed to restore the Arab position in Ṣughd. In order to control the disturbed sector of Tūrghānāstān he established a garrison of 2500 Syrian troops in Balkh in 118/736. In the following year he led an expedition into Kūttal, but the local princes called for support from the powerful khākān of the Tūrghsān, Sū Lu, who drove Asad back to Balkh with severe losses (1 Shawwāl 719/
1 October 737). The joint forces of the Tūrgesh and the princes of Shughd, supported by al-Ḥanīf b. Surayqī, now crossed the Oxus in their turn, to make a raid on Khurāsān. Asad, with the Syrians from Balkh and some local forces, surprised the main body at Khurāsān, and the remainder were all but cut off in their retreat (Dhu 'l-Hijdād 119/December 737). By this fortunate victory Asad restored the Arab power in Eastern Khurāsān but himself died a few months later (120/738). In his second government, as in his first, he had had to take severe measures against the emissaries and local agents of the 'Abbāsids [q.v., p. 15 above], but he also endeavoured to reform the local administration, and gained the friendship of many diṭkāns, who applauded him as a prudent "steward" (kathṭūdā) of his province. Among other nobles, Sāmānkhudāt, the ancestor of the Sāmānīd [q.e.] dynasty, was converted by him to Islam, and named his eldest son Asad in his honour. The village of Asadābadh near Nāyshābūr is said to have been built by him, and remained in the possession of his descendants until the government of 'Abd Allāh b. Tāhir. In Kūfa also, the suburb of Sūk Asad was established by and named after him.

Bibliography: Ibn Hāzim, Djamhara (Lévi-Provençal), 366; Tabārī, index; Balādhūrī, Futūkh, index; Naṣrāshkhī (Schefer), 57 sq.; Ch. Schefer, Chronomathes persæ, History of Balkh; V. Vloten, Recherches sur la domination des Arabes (Amsterdam 1894), 24-5, 30; J. Wellhausen, Arab. Reich, 284, 291-5; H. A. R. Gibb, Arab Conquests in Central Asia (London 1923), 65-89; F. Gabrieli, Il Califfato di Hisham (Alexandria 1935), 38-41, 54-64. (G. MARÇAIB)

Asad b. al-Furāt b. Sinān, Abū 'Abd Allāh, scholar and jurist of the 2nd-3rd/8th-9th century, born at Harrān (Mesopotamia) in 124/739. At the age of two he went with his father to live in Ifrīqiya. He completed his early studies there, and in 172/788 went to Medina, where he received an initiation in Mālikism from Mālik b. Anās himself. From there he went to 'Irāq, where he profited by the teaching of several disciples of Abū Ḥanīfā. The lessons he received from Mālik provided him with the material for his great work, the Asadīyya. On his return to I'tīqāiya, he established himself as a master in the science of ṣadīq and as an eminent jurist; he was appointed by the Ḥablāhid amīr Ziyādat Allāh bādī of al-Kayrawān, jointly with Abū Muṭbih (203/818), an unusual division of this office between two holders. Of a violent nature, he sometimes quarrelled with his colleague and disagreed with the famous Saḥnūn, a Mālikite doctor whose Mudawwana outlived the success of the Asadīyya. His passionate convictions and perhaps his belligerent energy led to the appointment of this man of learning as amīr, leader of the expedition which left Sūs in 212/827 to attack Byzantine Sicily. He marched at the head of the Muslim troops and took the first step towards the conquest of the island by the capture of Mazzara. He died of wounds or of the plague before Syracuse in 213/828.


Asad Allāh Isfahānī, celebrated Persian sword-maker (shamsihār) of the time of Shāh 'Abbās I. It is said that the Ottoman sultans presented a helmet to Shāh 'Abbās, and offered a sum of money to anyone who could cleave the helmet in two with a sword. Asad made a sword with which he achieved this feat, and, as a reward, Shāh 'Abbās remitted the tax of the sword-makers, who continued to obtain exemption until Nāḏīr times (see A. K. S. Lambton, Islamic Society in Persia, London 1954, 25). For a description of Asad Allāh's work, see Survey of Persian Art, iii, 2575.

Asad al-Dawla, a title held by several princes, of whom the most important was Aslān b. Mīrād [q.v.].

Asadābād, town in al-Dībāl, 7 jārsāh or 54 kms. southwest of Hamadān, on the western slope of the Alwand Kūh at the entrance to a fruitful well-tilled plain (5659 ft. high). As a permanent caravan-station on the famous, ancient highway Hamadān (Ekbatana)-Baghdād (or Babylon), it is a settlement reaching back into antiquity, and (according to Tomasek) is probably the 'Aḥṣarātsixa of Isidor of Charax and the Beltra of the Tabula Peutingeriana (cf. Weissbach, in Pauly-Wissowa's iii, 264). In the Arab Middle ages, and even into the Mongol period, Asadābād was a flourishing, thickly populated place with excellent markets, and its inhabitants were considered well-to-do because of the rich yield of their domains, to which canals gave a plentiful supply of water. In 1872, according to Bellew, it was a fine village with some 200 houses, some of which were occupied by Jewish families. The Persians call it, according to the accounts of European travellers, Asadābād (Petermann), also Sa'dābād (Dupré, Petermann) or Sahadābād (Ker Porter). In 514/1120 there was fought at Asadābād a battle between the two Saldājūk sultans Mas'ūd of Mawṣil (Mosul) and Maḥmūd of Iṣphān, which resulted in favour of the latter. 3 jārsāh from Asadābād there stood imposing buildings of Sāsānian times which the Arabs called Mālha or Maṭbakh Khisār, i.e. the Kitchen(s) of Chosroes; for the explanation of this name cf. the legend deriving from the Risāla of Mis'ār b. Muhāhil in Yākūt, iv, 593 s.v. Maṭbakh Khisār.

Bibliography: Yākūt, i, 245; Quatrièmè HIST. des Mongols de la Perse, Paris 1836, 1, 250, 264-6, 427 f.; Le Strange, 196; Well, Gesch. d. Chalaten, iii, 218; Tomasek, in SBAK. Wien, 1883, 152; Ritter, Erdkunde, ix, 81, 344; H. Petermann, Reisen im Orient, 1861, ii, 252; H. W. Bellew, From the Indus to the Tigris, London 1874, 431; de Morgan, Mission scientif. in Perse, étud. géogr., ii, 124, 127 f., 138; Farhang Dīngūrāfaydī Iran, v, Tehran 1953, 17. (M. STRECK)

Asadi, this poetical name (tabak) is probably that of two poets born at Tūs (Khurāsān): Abū Naṣr Ahmad b. Maṃṣūr al-Tūsī and his son 'Alī b. Ahmad. According to the extremely doubtful statement of Dawlatšāh, the father was the pupil of Firdūsī (born ca. 320/932-4), while the epic composed by 'Alī b. Ahmad is precisely dated 458/1066; H. Etché concludes from this that it is impossible to attribute to the work of Houdas and R. Basset the works placed under the name of Asadi. Thus Abū Naṣr, about whom it is only known that he died during the rule of Mas'ūd al-Gharnawī, becomes the author of the Mundardī ("Debates"), which show analogies with the Provençal tensones, and are consequently important from the point of view of literary history,
Apart from their originality of matter and form. On the other hand, CAII b. Ahmad, situated at the court of the prince of Arran, Abu Dulaf composed on the advice of a minister, his Gerzasp nama, the oldest of the epics complementary to the Shakh-nama of Firdausi: this work is remarkable not only for its spirited narrative and for its style, but also for its supernatural episodes and philosophical discourses which foreshadow the later development of the Persian epic. The valuable Lughat-i Furs, a dictionary of rare words with quotations from Persian poetry, was probably written after the epic. A copy of the pharmacopoeial treatise of Abu Mansur Muwaffak b. Ali of Harat dated 447/1055-6 one of the oldest Persian manuscripts, is in the handwriting of Ali b. Ahmad, and is dated and signed by him. K. I. Tchaikin has tried to show that all these works are by one and the same author, Abu Mansur Ali b. Ahmad (Sadatellov Academici Nauh SSSR, Leningrad 1934, 119-59; resumé by H. Massé in introd. Gerzasp-nama).


AŠAF B. BARAKHYA (Hebrew Asaf b. Baraka'ya), name of the alleged waqf of King Solomon. According to the legends of thehouse of Solomon, he was a confidant, and always had access to him. When the royal consort Dariyada was worshipping idols Asaf delivered a public address in which he praised the apostles of God, Solomon among them, but only for the excellent qualities he had manifested in his youth. Solomon in anger at this took him to task, but was reproved for his speech by the introduction of idol-worship at the court. This was then done away with and the consort punished; the king became repentant.

Bibliography: Tabari, Ta'rīkh (ed. de Goeje), i, 588-91; Ta'fīr (Cairo 1321), xii, 94 f.; Tha'labi, Kīyas al-anbīyā' (Cairo 1292), 281-3; Kishā'ī, Kīyas al-anbīyā' (ed. Eisenberg), 290-3; G. Weil, Biblische Legenden der Muselmänner (1845), 265 ff., 270 f.; M. Grünbaum, Neue Beiträge zur semeitischen Sagenkunde (1893), 222; J. Walker, Bible Characters in the Koran (1931), 37. (A. J. Wensinck)

AŠAF-DJĀH, title of the Niğam of Haydarabad [q.v.].

AŠAF KĀN Abu 'l-Hasan, second son of Djahāngīr's waqf-i-kul. Titimad al-Dawla Ghīyāth Bāgh and elder brother of Nūr Djāhān. After Nūr Djāhān's marriage to Djahāngīr in 1020/1611 Abu 'l-Hasan became Khān-sūrān with the title of I'īlūkān Khān. In 1021/1612 his daughter Ardjmand Banu Begam Mumtaz Mahal married Prince Khurram, the future Shāh Djāhān. He himself received the title of Ašaf Khān in 1023/1614 and attained in 1031/1622 the rank of 6,000 shāh and wādūr and was appointed sūḥābār of Bengal in 1033/1623. In 1025/1616 the imprisoned Prince Khusraw, eldest son of Djahāngīr, was delivered over to the charge of Ašaf Khān, now sharing the real power in the empire with Nūr Djāhān, Titimad al-Dawla and Prince Khurram. Despite his negligence in allowing Mahābāt Khān, the enemy of the Nūr Djāhān faction, to capture Djahāngīr on the banks of the Jhelum in 1035/1626, his own flight to Atāk and eventual seizure there by Mahābāt Khān's forces, Ašaf Khān survived to become governor of the Pandjab and waqf.

Ašaf Khān quickly despatched the news of the death of Djahāngīr in 1037/1627 to Prince Khurram in the Dekkan. Always a supporter of the latter's succession, Ašaf Khān diplomatically proclaimed Dāwar Baksh as pādshāh at Bālimbar, pending the arrival of Prince Khurram. He also placed Nūr Djahān, who supported Prince Dāhīrīrūr, under restraint. His services in securing the succession of Shāh Djāhān were rewarded by the title of Yāmn al-dawla, the rank of 9,000 shāh and sūdūr, do-aspāsh-aspā and the office of waqf. In 1041/1631-2 Ašaf Khān was employed as commander of the Mughal armies fighting against Muṣammad-Ādī Shāh of Bidjāpur.

Ašaf Khān died in 1051/1641 and was buried in Lahore not far from Djahāngīr's tomb. A patron of Mughal miniature painting and a great builder, he left a fortune estimated, in European sources, at more than twenty five million rūpūs apart from his residences and gardens.


AL-AŞAMM, "the deaf", a sobriquet applied to several people, notably: 1. Sufyan b. al-Abbad al-Kalbī, called al-Ąṣamm, an Umayyad general famous for his eloquence, who led several campaigns against the Khāridjītes, the most notable of which, about 78/677 or 79/678, led to the crushing defeat and death of the Azrakī Khāridjīte Khāriji b. al-Fudā'ī [q.v.].

Bibliography: al-Tabari, Annales, ed. de Goeje, ii, 1018 (Cairo ed. v, 126); Dāhīz, Bayān, ed. by Ḥārūn, i, 61, 407 and ii, 264.

2. Abu l-'Abbās Muḥammad b. Ya'kūb al-Nissābūrī, called al-Ąṣamm, a celebrated doctor and traditionist of the Shāfi school, born in 247/861, died in 340/957-8, died in 340/957-8, died in 340/957-8, died in 340/957-8, died in 340/957-8; al-Muzanī (d. 320/932), who was a pupil of his at Naṣībūr, also won great renown.

Bibliography: Friīrist, 211, 212; Ibn Khalīkān, Wafayāt, Cairo 1310, i, 219 and ed. 'Abd al-Ḥamīd, Cairo, n.d., iii, 154; Dāhābī, Tabākh al-Huṣnūs (Librer Classum, etc., ed. Wüstenfeld, Göttingen 1833 fol., ii 94, no. 61. Our edition of the Tabākh of al-Subkī does not contain any notice on him. (R. Blachère)
ASAS [see ISMAILIYYA].

‘ASAS, the night patrol or watch in Muslim cities. According to Makrizi the first to carry out this duty was ‘Abdallah b. Mas‘ūd, who was ordered by Abu Bakr to patrol the streets of Medina by night. ‘Umar is said to have gone on patrol in person, accompanied by his mawla Aslam and by ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Awīl (Khīṭāt, ii, 243, cf. Tabārī, i, 5, 2742; R. Levy, ed. Ma‘ālim al-Kurba, 216; al-Ghazzālī, Nāṣīḥāt al-Mulūk (ed. Humāyūn, 13, 58). Later the ‘asas was commanded by a police officer, known as the ṣāḥib al-‘asas (Makrizi, loc. cit.; Ibn Ṭabarī, ii, 73; Nuwārī, iii, 153). Makrizi says that in his day the ṣāḥib al-‘asas was popularly known as the wa‘l-l-ṭawf (Khīṭāt, ii, 103); a ṣāḥib al-‘asas is reported in Baṣra in the time of al-Ḥādīṣī (Baladhūrī, Futūḥ, 364. On the ṭawf, apparently a synonym of the ‘asas, see also Badi‘ al-Zamān, Ma‘ālim, al-Maḥāma al-Rusūfiyya; Kālkhashālī, Ē, xxiii, 93, citing the instructions given to them in 697/1297 by the Sultan). In Mamlūk times there were also night patrols known as asḥāb al-‘arbā‘, coming under the authority of the Wālī, or chief of police; in Spain they were called ṣa‘īdūn (Makrizi, Subḥ, i, 135).

In the East, a diploma issued by the dā‘īdīn of the Sa‘īdī family of Sandgar (id. 552/1157) orders the ma‘ārīf of Rūyūs to appoint ṣa‘īdūn in the town wherever there may be the suspicion of vice and corruption (‘Atabat al-Kalbāt, ed. Muḥammad Ǧażwīnī and ‘Abdāl Ikbāl, Tehran 1950, 44).

In Ottoman times the commandant of the ‘asas (‘Assadāb) was a Janissary officer (according to ‘Oṯmān Nūrī the ṣurūdāb of the 38th būlāk, according to Hammer from an unspecified regiment). He was in charge of the public prisons and exercised a kind of supervision over public executions. He attended meetings of the Diwan of the Agha of the Janissaries and at the Saray and the Porte, in case anyone was to be handed to him for execution. He also played an important role in public proceedings. He received one tenth of the fines imposed by the Su Dağlı for drunkenness and similar offences by night, though not by day; in addition the ‘asas levied a due (Rawsī or ‘Assesīyye) from every shop. (Ewliyā Celebi, i, 517 = Hammer’s translation, i, 2, 108-9, attributing their foundation to Mehemmed 11; ‘Oṯmān Nūrī, Mejidīl-i Umār-i Beledīyye, i, 901-2, 954; Omer Lutfi Barkan, Osmanlî İmparatorluğu Zorat Ekonomisinin Hukuţ ve Mall Esasları I Kânsular, Istanbul 1943, 69, 70, 134, 139, 147, 160, 162, 163, 164, 178, 400).

In Saafawi Persia the night patrols were under the command of the dārūqāh and were called abādāh (q.v.) and constable as well as ‘asas. (Minorsky, Taḥḥīrat al-Mulūk, 149). In 19th century Shīrāz the head of the night watchmen was known as mir ‘asas (Ann K. S. Lamton, Islamic Society in Persia, London, 1954, 14-15).

In Ghārdāz in the other cities of the Māzāb, the organization of night watchmen not only assures public security and morals, but possesses a secret and almost absolute authority, superior even to that of the ūlāma of the ‘Aʿzābā and the Djāmā′s of the laymen, in the important affairs of the community. (M. Vigouroux, La garde de nuit à Ghārdāz, in Bulletin de Liaison Saharienne, no. 9, Algiers 1952, 9-16). The minaret of the Abādī mosque in the Māzāb is called ‘asās, ‘watchman. (M. Mercier, La civilisation urbaine du Māzāb, Algiers 1922, 60 f.).


The term ‘asās is used in North Africa in the sense of “night-watchman”. R. Brunschvig (La Berbérie orientale sous les Hafsides, ii, 203) uses it in connection with the night-watchmen in the sēks at Tunis. It is also found in Budget Meakin, The Moors, London 1902, 174) to denote the watchman who keeps guard at night over the caravans which have halted in the villages; the same custom, but without the word being used, is mentioned by M. Rey (Souvenir d’un voyage au Maroc, Paris 1844, 124). At Fès, the word was used at the beginning of the 20th century to denote not only night-watchmen, but policemen in general.

Whether the word ‘asās is indicated or not, the use of guards at night, particularly in the central market, at warehouses and on the ramparts, was the general practice in North African towns up to the advent of the French. There is evidence of its use in Algiers (R. P. Dan, Histoire de Barbare et de ses corsaires, Paris 1637, 102), where the ‘asās and his agents patrolled the main streets at night, and in Fes (Leo Africanus, Description de l’Afrique, ed. Épaulard, Paris 1956, i, 206), where “four police officers, not more”, went the rounds from midnight until 2 a.m., and where the central market and warehouses were guarded by Berber porters or zarīṣuwa (R. Le Tourneau, Fès avant le Protectorat, Casablanca-Paris 1940, 196), while the police of the ward commanders (‘asāsā) kept watch on the ramparts (ibid., 253). At Wazzān, the head of the family of the Shūfā of the town paid each night 58 guards who kept watch over the city (Budget Meakin, The land of the Moors, London 1901, 325), while at Sāli, the Moroccan army took part in guarding the city by night (ibid., 200).

In Spain, the term ‘asās does not appear to have been used. E. Lévi-Provençal (Xe siècle, 253), mentions the use of the word darrib to denote night-watchmen; the person responsible for nocturnal security was sometimes known as ṣāḥib al-layl, which is apparently the equivalent of the term: ṣāḥib al-shūrfa (E. Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. Mus., iii, 155, following al-Maḥāmī, Analectes, i, 134).

(Le Tourneau)

AŚFAR (A.), yellow: also, in distinction from black, simply light-coloured. Some Arab philologists and exegetes indeed claim for asfār also the meaning “black”; see the discussions thereon in the Khitānat al-adab, ii, 465. The Arabs called the Greeks Banū ‘l-Asfar (i.e. Banū al-Asfār, i, 274). ab
infra) according to Tabari (ed. de Goeje, i, 357, 17; 354, 16) signifying "Sons of the Red One" (Esau). In the Hadith mention is made of the contest of the Arabs with the Banu 'l-Asfar and of the conquest of their capital Constantineople (Musnad Ahmad, ii, 174). Mulāh Banu 'l-Asfar (Akbâr, ed. vi, 95, 14) = the Christian princes, especially those of the Rûm (ib. 98, ab infra; cf. Abû Tamâm, Dîwan, ed. Beirut. 18 ult. in a poem to Al-mu'tasîm after the battle at 'Amurîfâ). Later this designation was applied to Europeans in general, especially in Spain. Ta'rikh al-Sufy (Spanish Era) can thus be best explained; other views in ZDMG, xxxii, 626, 637. Many genealogists have explained Asfar as the name of the grandson of Esau (2oüpég in the Septuagint, Gen. 36, 16) and father of Rûmîl (Re'ü'il, Gen. 36, 14), ancestor of the Rûm. According to the explanation of De Sacy (Not. et Extr., ix, 437; Journ. As., 3. Serie, Pt. i, 94), which Franz Ermann accepts (ZDMG, ii, 237-241), the designation Banu 'l-Asfar was a literal translation originally referring to the Flavian dynasty, then became extended beyond it to the western nations. From his travels among the Nuṣayris [q.v.] H. Lammens relates that they designate the Emperor of Russia Mâlik al-Asfar (Au pays des Nosairis in Rev. de l'or. chresien, Paris, 1900, 42 of the separate edition).

Bibliography: I. Goldziher, Muhammedi-sche Studien, i, 268 ff.; Caetani, Annali dell'Islam, ii, 242; ZDMG, iii, 363; JA, 10th series, ix, 230; 10th series, xii, 190. (I. Goldziher)

ASPÂR B. SHIRAWAYHÎ. (Aspar the son of Shêrôd), a Daylamite condottiere, to be more exact a Gilie, who played an important rôle in the civil wars which followed the death in 304/917 of the 'Alid, Ḥasan al-Utrush [q.v.], the master of Tabaristân, and put an end to the domination of the 'Alids in this region. He made his appearance with another Daylamite condottiere, Mâkân b. Kâkûy (Ar. another Daylamite brigand, Mâkân b. Kâkûy (Ar. Kâkî), in 311/923, in the struggles which brought al-Utrush's son-in-law and successor, Ḥasan b. al-Kâsim, surnamed al-dâ'î al-aghrîr, "the little misi-ciery", into conflict with some of al-Utrush's sons, Abu 'l-Husayn and Abu 'l-Kâsim. He revolted against Mâkân or was dismissed from his army by the latter for his execrable conduct, and entered the service of the Sâmânîd prefect of Nâysâbûr. After the death of Abu 'l-Kâsim in 312/925, Mâkân proclaimed one of the latter's sons, Îsâmîl, in opposition to one of his nephews Abû 'All, whom he had imprisoned in Dîjrûdân; Abû 'All succeeded in escaping, killing his custodian, Mâkân's brother, and appealed to Aspar (315/927-8). Aspar came to Dîjrûdân and with 'All b. Khurshîd, another Daylamite, the leader of Abû 'All's army, defeated Mâkân and expelled him from Tabaristân. After Abû 'All's death in the same year, Mâkân recovered Tabaristân and Aspar returned to Dîjrûdân, where he was appointed governor by the Sâmânîd amir Nasr. Then with the help of the Gilie Mârdwâdî b. Ziyâr, he again took possession of Tabaristân. Mâkân had brought the Dâ'î Ḥasan back to power and they then tried to take Tabaristân from Aspar, but were routed and the Dâ'î was killed in the battle by Mârdwâdî. In this way the 'Alid dominion in Tabaristân came to an end, for Aspar seized the other 'Alids and sent them to the Sâmânîd at Bukhâra (316/928-9).

Aspar, now master of Tabaristân, extended his power over Dîjrûdân, over Rary (from which he expelled Mâkân), over Kazwîn and the other towns of the Ḍîbâl. However he lefts Āmul to Mâkân on condition that he did not seek to dominate the rest of Tabaristân. He proclaimed the sovereignty of the Sâmânîd. He removed his family and treasures to Alamût (Ibn al-Ağhîr: Kâlî'st al-Mawt), the famous future fortress of the Îsmâ'îlîs to the North of Kazwîn, which he took by a ruse. Within a short time, he conducted himself as an independent prince, adopted the external marks of sovereignty at Rayy (golden throne and crown) and defied the Sâmânîd and the Caliph. At this point the Caliph al-Muktađîd sent an army against him, under the command of his maternal uncle Hârûn b. Gârbîr, which Aspar completely routed near Kazwîn. However, Asfâr found himself the object of the hostility of both Mâkân, who had not renounced his claims to Tabaristân and Dîjrûdân, and the Sâmânîd, who marched against him and reached Nâysâbûr. Asfâr's minister persuaded his master to make peace with the Sâmânîd, paying him tribute, and recognizing his suzerainty. In this manner Asfâr avoided war and took advantage of the situation to further extend his authority by deceit and fraud. He became increasingly tyrannical, took the most fearful revenge on the people of Kazwîn for having helped Hârûn b. Gârbîr, and, in order to pay the tribute to the Sâmânîd, collected a poll-tax of one dinar per head on all the inhabitants of his possessions and even on foreign merchants in the country, in fact the dîyatî (the word occurs in al-Masûdî).

His tyranny caused his lieutenant Mârdwâdî to rebel against him; the latter made an alliance with the prince of Shâmrân in Tûrum, Sallâr, and with Mâkân, and won over a large part of Asfâr's troops. After fleeing to Rayy, where he was only able to collect a small amount of money, Asfâr wanted to set out for Khurşûn and reached Baybak; then he turned back towards Rayy, his purpose being to reach Alamût so as to regain possession of his treasures there, raise new troops and take up the struggle again. But on the way, he was overtaken by Mârdwâdî, who cut his throat (there are several versions of this occurrence). The chronology of events between 316 and 319 is not well established: Ibn al-Ağhîr gives them under 316 and 319 but Ibn Isfandîyâr under 319. The latter is the most likely date for Asfâr's death. It is with Asfâr that the domination of the Daylamites in North-West Iran really begins, continuing with Mâkân and Mârdwâdî, and then the Buwayhidîs. According to al-Masûdî, who stresses Asfâr's behaviour at Kazwîn (the muwâhhdîn thrown from the top of the minaret, the suspension of the prayers, the ruined mosque), he was not a Muslim.

Bibliography: Ḥamza Isfahânî, Ta'rikh Sîntî Mâlik al-'âd wa-l-Âmîyâd, ed. Dîwâd b. Irânî al-Tâbrîzî, Berlin 1340, 152-3 (chap. xi); al-Masûdî, Murûdî, ix, 6-19; Miskawayhî, Ta'dîjir al-Ummâm, ed. Margollouth, i, 161-2; 'Arbî, ed. de Goeje, i, 137; Tanukhî, Nîghtâr al-Mulâhâr, ed. Margollouth, i, 156; Cf. also V. Minorsky, La domination des Daylamites, 95; H. Bowes, 'All ibn 'Isâ, 307-9; B. Spuler, Iran in frühislamischer Zeit, 89. (M. Canard)

ASFÂR, ASFÂL (Fr. Safî, Sp. Safí, Port. Cânem or preferably Safim), town and port on the Atlantic coast of Morocco, a few kilometers to the south of Cap Cantin; about 25,000 inhabitants in 1936, and about 70,000 in 1953, of whom, in round figures, 62,000 were Muslims, 3,500 Jews and 4,000 Europeans.
Safi does not appear to date from any very considerable antiquity. Al-Bakri (sth. uth.) mentions it, without treating it as a place of any great importance. Al-Idrīsī in the following century considers it to be a relatively busy port, though its roadstead was not very safe. According to the same geographer, this was the point where the flotilla of roadstead was not very safe. According to the same mentions it, without treating it as a place of any great enclosure, which contained a castle called ribdh which they turned into their citadel (now Kechla). Almost the whole of these fortifications still survive. Safi was the main Portuguese stronghold in Southern Morocco. The Portuguese made it the centre of the manufacture of the rugs called hambeils (Ar. hanbîlêl), which were one of the basic articles of their trade with the rest of the Barbary States, with the Western Sahara (through their trading post at Arguin) and with Negro Africa (through their trading post at Mina on the Gulf of Guinea). Enterprising and bold captains (governors), the most famous of whom was Nuno Fernandes de Ataide, working through native notables, especially through one man who seems to have been a great chief, Yaýhâ b. Taûfîfî, gave Safi a vast military and political sphere of influence which they turned into their citadel (now Kechla). Almost the whole of these fortifications still survive. Safi was the main Portuguese stronghold in Southern Morocco. The Portuguese made it the centre of the manufacture of the rugs called hambeils (Ar. hanbîlêl), which were one of the basic articles of their trade with the rest of the Barbary States, with the Western Sahara (through their trading post at Arguin) and with Negro Africa (through their trading post at Mina on the Gulf of Guinea). Enterprising and bold captains (governors), the most famous of whom was Nuno Fernandes de Ataide, working through native notables, especially through one man who seems to have been a great chief, Yaýhâ b. Taûfîfî, gave Safi a vast military and political sphere of influence which they turned into their citadel (now Kechla). Almost the whole of these fortifications still survive. Safi was the main Portuguese stronghold in Southern Morocco. The Portuguese made it the centre of the manufacture of the rugs called hambeils (Ar. hanbîlêl), which were one of the basic articles of their trade with the rest of the Barbary States, with the Western Sahara (through their trading post at Arguin) and with Negro Africa (through their trading post at Mina on the Gulf of Guinea). Enterprising and bold captains (governors), the most famous of whom was Nuno Fernandes de Ataide, working through native notables, especially through one man who seems to have been a great chief, Yaýhâ b. Taûfîfî, gave Safi a vast military and political sphere of influence which they turned into their citadel (now Kechla). Almost the whole of these fortifications still survive. Safi became the main port of the Saências and, owing to its nearness to Marrakesh, the residence of the Sultans, and played a considerable role until the accession of the ʿAlawis; it was one of the centres of Christian trading. When the ʿAlawi Sultans transferred their residence to the North (Fez and Meknes), the activity of Safi declined to the advantage of Rabat; yet European merchants were still numerous there at the end of the 18th century. In the 19th century the town's decline became increasingly evident. The establishment of the French Protectorate gave Safi a new lease of life; it is today a busy port, exporting the agricultural produce of the ʿAbda region and the Louis-Guettî phosphates. Recently the number of factories for producing salted goods has been increased. The name of one of the two quarters of the old ribdh has been preserved, whilst the other is absorbed in the old Portuguese walls.

From 1487 (?) to 1542, Safi was the seat of a bishoeripic, held by Portuguese prelates, the best known of whom was D. João Sutil (1512-36); the Encyclopaedia of Islam remains of a Christian church, which was probably the Cathedral, are still to be seen.


(H. Basset and R. Ricard)
deeply involved in politics. After the fall of King Nu'mān (in 501 or 502), the Bakr had begun their raids into the cultivated land of 'Irbātā, along the Euphrates border where Aṣḥāb resided—presumably with the powerful Shaybān b. Tha'lāba, who shared the area in which they migrated in summer with the nomad Kays b. Tha'lāba. He threatened to bring death and destruction upon the valley of the Euphrates in an insolent reply to Khusraw II, who had demanded hostages. With equal boldness he confronted Kays b. Mas'ūd, the head of the Shaybān, when the latter—under the impression of the great losses he had suffered—went to the court (No. 34; 26). Thus the poet may be said to have helped to bring about the battle of Dhu Kār (605). If the stray and corrupted verses 5, 32-50 do indeed refer to Ḣālāb b. Ḳābiṣa, then he was also active in that change that soon brought the victors of Dhu Kar under Persian influence again. In his home country, he interceded in favour of the rightful prince, Ḥawdāha, to whom he was indebted, and ridiculed the usurper al-Ḥārīūth b. Wa'la (7, 4-5; 30). Meanwhile he had left the Shaybān in favour of the Kays b. Tha'lāba, because he considered that the Shaybān had violated the honour of his tribe (6; 9). He was therefore deeply hurt, when (a few years later) he was accused in his own homeland and lost the case. Actually, he had hesitated to reach an amicable solution until his opponent opposed him with a poetaster by name of Djiḥinnām. The two met at a fair near Mecca. A mob—stirred up by Djiḥinnām—closed in on him with whips and spearstaffs, but was then dumbfounded by his verses, in which Aṣḥāb allowed Mīshāl—his demonic alter ego—to appear for the first time (14; 38; 15). He had once previously had occasion to save himself from great danger by means of a hastily improvised poem (on Samaw'āl [q.v.]). He subsequently, with or without their consent, interfered in the quarrel between 'Amīr b. al-Tufayl [q.v.] and 'Ālkama b. 'Uṯūtha (18; 19). He also defended 'Uyyayna and Khāridjā of the Fāzārā (Gaḥṣafān [q.v.]) against Zabbān b. Sawayrā, a well-known chief of the same tribe (20, 27-37; 9). This probably took place to the beginning of the twenties. As can be seen from 1, 67; 3, 32-54; 5, 62-64; 13, 69; 34, 13 al-Asbāb was a Christian.

The poet was educated at Ḥira, where the tradition of legend and poetry was broader than that of any other individual tribe. His style is rhetorical and at times (especially in 1), artificial. Connected with this is his preference for sound-effects and for sonorous (Persian) foreign words, as well as for effective endings. He occasionally treats the traditional themes of the ḫisāda with a high-handed indifference. He likes many types of allusion. Thus, for instance, Ḥurayyara waddaṣi, 9, 1, prepares one for the recurrence of the theme, only with the motto inverted, in No. 6. The praise of Mecca and his panegyric on the leaders of the Gaḥṣafān (20, 27-37), both of which are otherwise apparently meaningless, indicate the whereabouts of Aṣḥāb, who had good reason on both occasions to avoid his homeland. The first passage discloses furthermore the place where he clashed with Djiḥinnām, and the second shows Aṣḥāb's intention to proceed against Zabbān, who is left out of the panegyric on leaders of the Gaḥṣafān.

The immediate impact of the poem seems to have been confined to his anonymous (Christian?) pupils and forgers, who counted on gaining the patronage of Aṣḥāb. Their works fill almost the whole of the second part of his Diwan (No. 52-82), although the first part, too, contains many a verse which is not authentic.

Bibliography: The Diwan of al-Asbāb, ed. R. Geyer (Gibb Mem. N. S. VI), London 1928; GAL, G 37; S I, 65-67; Muḥ. b. Sallām, Tabābādī, 18 ff.; Caskel, Oriens 7, 302. (W. CASKEL)

AṢḤĀB HAMDĀN, properly ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAbd Allāh, Arab poet, who lived in Kūfā in the second half of the 10th century. In his early career a traditionist and Qurʿān reader he was married to a sister of the theologian al-Ṣaḥīb, who in turn had married a sister of al-Asbāb. Later he concentrated on poetry, acting on occasion as the spokesman of the Yamanite faction. He was active in the wars that marked the governorship of al-Ḥādji-djādi and his health appears to have suffered during an expedition into Mumrān. The role which he played under ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. al-Asbāb is best known. He took part in his campaign against the Turks and was taken captive but escaped with the aid of a Turkish woman whose passions were enflamed for him. When Ibn al-Asbāb turned against al-Ḥādji-djādi the poet's sharp tongue aided him with satires. The decisive battle at Dayr al-Damādīm resulted unfortunately; Ibn al-Asbāb took to flight, and al-Asbāb was led prisoner before al-Ḥādji-djādi, who immediately recalled to him some of his malicious songs. His extemporaneous mannerisms made him no longer: al-Ḥādji-djādi's sentence of death was carried out on the spot (83/702). The poems of Aṣḥāb Hamdān which have been preserved to us are reflexes of his adventures and political sentiments. The level of his poetry which remained curiously unaffected by the modernism of the Medinese school is considerable, both as regards his partisan verse and his treatment of the traditional motifs of erotic description. The vigour of his diction lends a certain attraction even to his handling of conventional topics.


AṢṬĀB, nicknamed "the Greedy", a Medinese comedian who moved in the circles of the grand-children of the first four caliphs and flourished in his profession in the early years of the 8th century. He is said to have survived until 154/771. The historical information about him is rather plentiful; though contaminated by much legendary material, it permits us to get a glimpse at the life of a professional entertainer in the Umayyad period. The jokes and stories connected with his name concern politics, religion, and middle-class life. The middle-class jokes come last in the chronological development of the Asbāb legend; but then, even since early 'Abbasid times, they have enjoyed the greatest popularity in Islam. Among the famous jokes under Asbāb's name, there is a brilliant parody of the foibles of hadīth transmitters: Asbāb says that he heard 'Ikrima (or some other well-known transmitter) report that the Prophet had said that two qualities characterised the true believer. Asked which they were, Asbāb replied: "'Ikrima had forgotten one, and I have forgotten the other." Even more famous is the story of greedy Asbāb who tries to get rid of annoying children by telling them that free gifts
are being distributed in some place, and then runs after them because he thinks his story might be true. **Bibliography:** al-Aghānī, vii, 32-105; O. Roscher, Abriss, i, 235-9; F. Rosenthal, *Humor in Islam and its Historical Development* (Leiden 1956), which centres around ʿAshāb.

(For Rosenthal)

**Aṣḥāb** [see ʿAshāb].

**Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth** [see Ahl al-Ḥadīth].

**Aṣḥāb al-Kahf**, “those of the cave”. This is the name given in the ʿKūrān, and further in Arabic literature, to the youths who in the Christian Occident are usually called the “Seven Sleepers of Ephesus”. According to a legend, in the time of the Christian persecution under the Emperor Decius (250-52), seven Christian youths fled into a cave near Ephesus and there sank into a miraculous sleep for centuries, awoke under the Christian Emperor Theodosius, were discovered and then went to sleep for ever. Their resting place and grave was considered, at any rate since the beginning of the 6th century A.D., as a place of worship.

The story of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus is found in various Oriental and Occidental literatures, particularly in Greek and Syriac; the Greek version would appear to be the earliest one (texts edited by Land, I. Guidi, Bedjan, Alligier). Since Muhammad the legend is handed down in Arabic as well.

Muhammad has got to know the legend, like so many other stories of Jewish and Christian origin, has assimilated it and put it to edifying use in the ʿKūrān (viii, 9-26; hence the whole sūra is called ʿsūra al-kahf). The main outlines are clearly recognisable: The youths and their flight into the cave, so as to be able to remain true to the belief in the one God; their miraculous sleep, which lasts 309 years (v. 25), but which appears to them as at the most one day (v. 19); the circumstances of their discovery (by means of the ancient coinage, with which one of them attempts to buy provisions in the city). But some details remain doubtful. Muhammad himself points out that the number of the youths is variously given as three, five, or seven, and that only God really has knowledge of the length of their sleep.

It is strange that the dog who “stretches out his paws on the threshold” (v. 18), is taken into consideration when the number of the youths is given (v. 22); thus he also appears to be considered as holy. Not quite clear is the hint at the building of a place of worship over the resting place of the youths (v. 21). Particularly disputed is the expression ʿal-rakīm (v. 9: “those of the cave and (or) al-rakīm”; N.B. the definite article).

The Arabic commentators and historians have attempted to overcome the difficulties in the interpretation of the ʿKūrānic text and to fill in gaps, making use of much material from the Christian-Oriental tradition about the Seven Sleepers. Consequently their accounts are also of significance for the history of the transmission of the legend in pre-Islamic times. J. Koch and M. Huber have been at great pains to make use of the various reports for the history of legend and literature. Here a certain amount remains to be done. Huber’s monograph *Die Wanderlegende von den Siebenschläfern* (1910), and his translation of Arabic historians in Middle Arabic: *Forschungen*, xxvi (1909) are however still to-day useful as collections of material.

The expression al-rakīm is variously interpreted by the commentators. As the name of the dog (to whom the name ʿKūmīr is otherwise given); as a place name; and as the name for an inscription, which is supposed to have been put up in that place cf. H. Horovitz, *Koranische Untersuchungen*, 95.

Torrey suspected here a misreading for Decius, such an interpretation can however not be maintained (cf. Horovitz, loc. cit.).

Once the legend had taken root with the Muslims, it was connected with various places within the Islamic world, so with a cave in Transjordan, in Cappadocia, in East Turkistan and in Spain. This does not however alter the fact that originally it belongs to Ephesus.

In the course of time the story of “the people of the cave” has drifted into the realm of the magical. In this way can be explained the custom of hanging up leaves on which the names of the sleepers are inscribed, for the sake of ʿbarākā or for averting evil.

The name of the dog, ʿKūmīr, plays a special part. Among the Turks of East Turkistan, as in Indonesia it was still customary in recent times to inscribe letters which it was desired to protect from loss, with the word ʿkūmīr instead of “registered”.

In a treatise somewhat overloaded with symbolistic details, L. Massignon has attempted recently to do justice to the story of the Aṣḥāb al-Kahf, as it were from the inside, that is, in the sense in which it has become meaningful for Muslim believers.

ASHĀB AL-RASS, “the people of the ditch” or “of the well”, are twice mentioned in the Qur’ān (xxv, 38; lxxv, 12), along with Thamūd and other unbelievers. The commentators know nothing for certain about them, and so give widely divergent explanations and all manner of fantastic accounts. Some take al-Rass to be a geographical name (cf. Yākūt, s.v.); some hold that these people, a remnant of Thamūd, cast (rassa) their prophet Ḥanāqāl into a well (rass) and were consequently exterminated. It is also related that the mountain of the bird ‘Anfā was situated in their region. Al-Jabari mentions the possibility of their being a remnant of Thamūd, cast (rassa) their prophet and the distinction between Ashab al-Rass and other unbelievers. The commentators know nothing for certain about them; just as little do we.

Bibliography: The Commentaries on the verses of the Qur’ān in question, esp. Tabarī, Tacīr, Cairo 1321, xix, 9 f.; Damīrī, Ḥāṣb al-Ḥayyāmī, s.v. ‘Anfā; Tha’labī, Kisas al-Anbiyā, Cairo 1292, 129-33; J. Horovitz, Koranische Untersuchungen, 1926, 94 f. (A. J. Wensing)

ASHĀB AL-RA’Y, also AḤL AL-RA’Y, the partisans of personal opinion, a term of depreciation applied by the aḥl al-hadīth (q.v.) to their opponents among the specialists in religious law. Ra’y (q.v.) originally meant “sound opinion”, and was used of the element of human reasoning, whether strictly systematic (see ʿiṣārāt) or more personal and arbitrary (see istiḥsān), which the early specialists used in order to arrive at decisions on points of religious law. The aḥl al-hadīth, however, who rose in opposition to the ancient schools of religious law, regarded this as illegitimate; in particular they thought it wrong to reject, as the followers of the ancient schools used to do, traditions which were reported as coming from the Prophet, on account of ra’y. As a consequence of the success of this point of view in the theory of religious law (see ʿuṣūl), each group was apt to qualify those who on any particular question gave to personal opinion a wider scope than they themselves did, as aṣḥāb al-ra’y, and it became impossible for those who did, in fact, use ra’y, to recognise this and to justify it from Islamic premises. There never was a school of thought in religious law that called itself, or consented to be called, aṣḥāb al-ra’y, and the distinction between aḥl al-hadīth and aṣḥāb al-ra’ay is to a great extent artificial. From the point of view of the aḥl al-hadīth, both Abū Ḥanīfa and his school and Mālik and his school belong to the aṣḥāb al-ra’ay, and they were indeed so called by al-Shaḥīḥī, Ibn Ḥusayn, and others. For adventitious reasons, Abū Ḥanīfa and his school became the principal objects of the attacks of the aḥl al-hadīth, and this gave rise to the erroneous opinion that they were the aṣḥāb al-ra’ay par excellence. Warnings against ra’y and its partisans, sometimes with explicit mention of Abu Ḥanīfa and his followers, were even put into the mouth of the Prophet, his Companions and their Successors, and thereby became themselves traditions.


ASHĀM (Turkish EŞHĀM), plural of Arabic SAMA (Turkish SEHIM), share. In Turkey the word was used to designate certain treasury issues, variously described as bonds, assignats, and annuities. The Sama are called annuities by Hammer (Leibrenten) and also in the Ottoman budget of 1862-3, where they are mentioned as rentes viagères. The description is not strictly accurate, as although the eshām reverted to the state on the death of the holder, they could be sold, the state claiming a duty
of one year’s income on each such transfer. According to Muṣṭafā Nūrī Pasha, the ʾeshām were introduced in the early years of the reign of Muṣṭafā III, when assignats on the proceeds of the customs of Istanbul and other revenues were issued to creditors of the state and other applicants, with an annual income of 5%. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Weffil remarks that most of the proceeds were spent in the war with Russia beginning 1182/1768. The handling of the ʾeshām, he says, was at first entrusted to a muḥāfāza, and later transferred to a muḥāfaẓ. The records of the ʾEshām Muḥāfāzās Kālemi in the Istanbul archives begin in the year 1189/1775, and end in 1281/1864. According to Ẓewiadet the ʾeshām were introduced by the finance official Peykt Ḥasan Efendi, who first became baqṣdefterdar in 1192/1775, after having previously been defter-emmi. The issue of ʾeshām on provincial revenues is reported in 1198-1200/1783-5. The practice of issuing ʾeshām was continued by later Sultans, and Mḥmūd II used them to compensate the fiwar-holders dispossessed by the land reform of 1831.

The first regular bond issue in the European style dates from 1250/1840, when bearer treasury bonds were floated, carrying a high rate of interest. These bonds, which circulated like banknotes, were classified into ʾEshām-i ʾEmām aḥmad-i Mūḥāfāzā-i Nūkhāyye (see ʾkhilāma).

In 1864, in the course of the Taṣṣāṣūṯ [government] reforms, the old ʾEshām Muḥāfāzās Kālemi was abolished. Meanwhile, however, in 1274/1857, a new internal loan was floated under the name of ʾEshām-i ʾMiṣnadā, and was followed by a series of others—ʾEshām-i ʾPīrīde, ʾEshām-i ʾAtṣiyāye, ʾEshām-i Ṣadiyye. These mid-19th century loans are sometimes referred to collectively as ʾEshām-i ʾOḏbānīyye.

Bibliography: Muṣṭafā Nūrī Pasha, Nedēdī al-Wuqādā, iii, 114 f.; Taʾrīkh-i Luṣṭi, vi, 127; Taʾrīkh-i Ẓewiadet, iii (1309 A.H.), 101-2, 148-9, 286; Charles White, Three Years in Constantinople, ii, London 1845, 71 ff.; Ubicini, Lettres sur la Turquie, letter xiv; Hammer, Des osmanischen Reichs Staatsverfassung und Staatsverwaltung, ii, London 1845, 7* ff.; Ubicini, Les Finances de la Turquie, iii, (1309 A.H.), 101-2, 148-9, 286. As a member of the Islamic aristocracy, it was only natural for him to be appointed as an official of the treasury (Ibn Saʿd); he also appears as one of the notables of Kufa in 51/671, when he gave evidence against the followers of Ḥūdjī b. ʿAḍī (v.q.). (Tabarī, i, 131 f.; ʾAḍīnī, vi, 7), and again in 76/695-6, when he did homage to the Khdariī insurgent ʾShaībī b. ʿYaṣīr (q.v.) (Tabarī, ii, 928). It is generally taken for granted that he was Kādī of Kufa, but even early sources give contradictory reports of the circumstances of his alleged appointment by al-Hadījīdī (Mubarrad, Kāmil, 285, l. 20 f.; Wakiʿ, ii, 391 f.), of the persons of his predecessor (ʾShurayḥ), according to Ibn Saʿd, to the K. al-Muḥabbār, and to Wakiʿ, loc. cit.; ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAbd Laylā, according to Wakiʿ, ii, 407 and his successor (Saʿdīd b. ʾDjabār, according to the K. al-Muḥabbār; ʾShaʾbī, according to Wakiʿ, ii, 392, 413; his brother ʿAbū Bakr, according to Wakiʿ, ii, 412 f.), and of the length of his tenure of office (a very short time, according to Wakiʿ, ii, 392: three years, according to Wakiʿ, ii, 413: an unspecified time, between three and eight years, from 79/698-9 onwards, according to Tabarī, ii, 1039, 1191). The accounts that ʾShurayḥ should have recommended Abū Burda and Saʿdīd b. ʾDjabār by his joint successors to al-Hadījīdī (Wakiʿ, ii, 392), or that Muḥāwiyya on his deathbed in 60/680 should have advised his son Yazid to avail himself of Abū Burda’s good counsels (Ibn Saʿd, iv/1, 83; Tabarī, ii, 203 ff.) are certainly apocryphal (cf. Lammens, Moḏırā I, 139). Another anecdote (Wakiʿ, ii, 409 f.; Ibn ʿAbād Ṣabīḥī, al-ʾĪdb al-Fardī, Būlāk 1293, iii, 140) makes Abū Burda peevishly complain to Muḥāwiyya of an attack by a poet. From Ibn Ḥallīkān onwards, however, the person of Abū Burda is idealised. Abū Burda died in 103/721-2 or 104/722-3. At the age, it is said, of more than 80 lunar years.

The traditional biography of Abū Burda reflect an absence of positive information, combined with the desire of fitting his name into the fictitious picture of the development of Islamic law and the administration of Islamic justice in the first century of the hiḍrā which came to prevail. He played no part in the formation of the doctrine of the school of Kufr, and he does not belong to its authorities. The one report on a judgement of his, on the ownership of household chattels, that occurs in an early source (Wakiʿ, ii, 211), represents him as undecided among the secondary opinions held in the second century (cf. J. Schacht, Originals, 278 ff.), and is therefore not authentic. In his time, the implications of the prohibition of ʾriḥā were only in the course of being worked out in ʾīrāk rather than in Kufr; the anecdotes which report that Abū Burda, having been sent by his father to Medina for study, was warned by his teacher there against the laxness of the ʾKrārians in matters of ʾriḥā, must therefore be later, although they bear ʾBāṣān ʾismādī (on this phenomenon, see
Abū Burda appeared as a transmitter of traditions because his name was used in "breathing hands", which were meant to authenticate sayings which his father was claimed to have related on the authority of the Prophet. The fact is attested already by Ibn Sa'd, but traditions themselves are quoted for the first time only by Waki'; some express repugnance for accepting government office (Waki', i, 65 ff.; ii, 22), an attitude which became fashionable only under the Abbāsids (cf. E. Tyan, Organisation judiciaire, i, 387, n. 2; N. J. Coulson, in BSOAS, xviii/2, 1956, 211 ff.); another (Waki', i, 100) aims at enhancing the reputation of Abū Burda's father, Abū Mūsā, to the detriment of that of Muḥāsh b. Jājāl (it seems to presuppose the well-known tradition about the instructions of the Prophet to Muḥāsh b. Jājāl, and could then be hardly earlier than the last third of the second century of the hijra); there are, finally, the alleged instructions of the caliph 'Umar to Abū Mūsā on the administration of justice, which appear for the first time in Waki' (i, 70 ff.); these are certainly not earlier than the third century of the hijra (cf. Tyan, i, 106 ff.). Abū Burda's reputation as a traditionist in his own right, with a respectable number of authorities from whom he was supposed to have heard traditions, had been established by the time of Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī, and it continued to grow, together with the number of authorities from whom he was alleged to have transmitted, until Ibn Hajar could ascribe to Ibn Sa'd the statement that Abū Burda "was reliable and transmitted many traditions", although Ibn Sa'd said nothing of the sort.

A son of Abū Burda, Bilāl, became kādī in Baṣra, and authentic, contemporary information on him is ample (cf., e.g., Waki', ii, 21 ff.; Pellat, Le siècle bāzirien, 288 f.).

**Bibliography:** Ibn Sa'd, vi, 187; Muhammad b. Ḥabīb, K. al-Muhābbar, Haydarābād 1361/1942, 378; Ibn Kūṭayba, K. al-Maʿārīf, ed. Wūstenfeld, 136; Waki', Aḥhār al-ʿUkūdū, Cairo 1366/1947, ii, 408 ff., al-Tabārī, index; Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī, K. al-ʿUqūd wa-l-Qādāʾ, iii/1, Haydarābād 1360, no. 1809; al-Āhānī, Tābīnū, Tābīnū, ed. Wūstenfeld, 653 f.; Ibn Khallikān, Wājīyū, s.v. Āmīr b. Abī Mūsā; Duḥṣābī, Taḥqīqāt al-Ḥuṣaynī, Haydarābād 1333, i, 86; Yāḍī, Mīrāj al-Dīnān, Haydarābād 1337, i, 220; Ibn Ḥadīr, Taḥqīh, xii, no. 95. (J. Schacht)

**AL-ASHʿARI, ABU ‘L-HĀSAN,** theologian, and founder of the school of orthodox theology which bears his name. He is said to have been born in 260/873-4 at Baṣra, and was ninth in descent from the Companion Abū Mūsā al-ʿAshʿari. Little is known of his life. He was one of the best pupils of ʿAlī b. Ḥubbār, head of the Muʿtazila in Baṣra, and might have succeeded him, had he not left the Muʿtazila for the party of the orthodox traditionists (ahl al-ʿaṣma). This change or conversion is placed in 300/912-3. In later life he moved to Baḥbād, and died there in 342/953-4.

The story of al-ʿAshʿari's conversion is told with many variations of detail. Three times during the month of Ramaḍān he is said to have seen Muḥammad in a vision, and to have been commanded to adhere to true Tradition. He regarded this vision as authoritative, and, since the traditionists disapproved of rational argument (ḥalām), he gave up this also. In the third vision, however, he was told to adhere to true Tradition but not to abandon ḫalām. Whatever be the truth of this story, it is a succinct account of al-ʿAshʿari's position. He abandoned the dogmatic theses of the Muʿtazila for those of opponents like Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, whom he professed to follow; but he defended his new beliefs by the type of rational argument which the Muʿtazila employed.

The chief points on which he opposed the doctrines of the Muʿtazila were:

1. He held that God had eternal attributes such as knowledge, sight, speech, and that it was by these that He was knowing, seeing, speaking, whereas the Muʿtazila said that God had no attributes distinct from His essence.
2. The Muʿtazila said that Qurʾānic expressions, such as God's hand and face, must be interpreted to mean "grace", "essence" and so on. Al-ʿAshʿari, whilst agreeing that nothing corporeal was meant, held that they were real attributes whose precise nature was unknown. He took God's sitting on the throne in a similar way.
3. Against the view of the Muʿtazila that the Kurʾān was created, al-ʿAshʿari maintained that it was God's speech, an eternal attribute, and therefore uncreated.
4. In opposition to the view of the Muʿtazila that God could not literally be seen, since that would imply that He is corporeal and limited, al-ʿAshʿari held that the vision of God in the world to come is a reality, though we cannot understand the manner of it.
5. In contrast to the emphasis of the Muʿtazila on the reality of choice in human activity, al-ʿAshʿari insisted on God's omnipotence; everything, good and evil, is willed by God, and He creates the acts of men by creating in men the power to do each act. (The doctrine of 'acquisition' or ḥab [q.v.], which was in later times characteristic of the Ashʿašariyya, is commonly attributed to al-ʿAshʿari himself, but, though he was familiar with the concept, he does not appear to have held the doctrine himself; cf. J.R.A.S., 1943, 246 f.).
6. While the Muʿtazila with their doctrine of al-mansila bayn al-mansilātayn held that any Muslim guilty of a serious sin was neither believer nor unbeliever, al-ʿAshʿari insisted that he remained a believer, but was liable to punishment in the Fire.
7. Al-ʿAshʿari maintained the reality of various eschatological features, the Basin, the Bridge, the Balance and intercession by Muhammad, which were denied or rationally interpreted by the Muʿtazila. Al-ʿAshʿari was not the first to try to apply ḥalām or rational argument to the defence of orthodox doctrine; among those who had made similar attempts earlier was al-Ḥarīrī b. ʿAsād al-Muhāsibī. Al-ʿAshʿari, however, seems to have been the first to do this in a way acceptable a large body of orthodox opinion. He had the advantage, too, of having an intimate and detailed knowledge of the views of the Muʿtazila (as is shown by his descriptive work, Makābūd al-Islāmiyyūn, Istanbul, 1929; cf. R. Strothmann, in Islam, xix, 193-242). His many followers came to be known as the Ḥaššariyya [q.v.] or Ashʿarīs, though they mostly deviated from him on some points.

To a European reader his argumentation differs little at first sight from that of the ultra-conservative followers of Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, since many of his proofs depend on the interpretation of Kurʾān and Tradition (cf. A. J. Wensinck, Muslim Creed, Cambridge, 1932, 91). This, however, was because his opponents also, including even the Muʿtazila,
used proofs of this sort, and he was always arguing *ad hominem*. Yet when opponents would admit a purely rational premise, al-'Ash'ari had no hesitation in using it to refute them. Once the permissibility of such arguments was established, at least for many theologians, it was possible for the Ash'ariyya to develop this side of his method until in later centuries theology became thoroughly intellectualistic. This, however, was far removed from the temper of al-'Ash'ari himself.


**AL-ʿASH'ARI, ABŪ ʿMUṢĀ**

Ibn ʿAṣīr, Kays, Companion of the Prophet and military leader. Born about 614 A.D., Abū Mūsā, a native of the Yemen, left South Arabia by sea with several of his brothers and members of his tribe (the Ash'ar) and joined Muḥammad at Ḳhaybar at the time of the famous expedition against the Jews of that oasis (7/628) to swear allegiance to him (the information given in some sources [for example Ibn Ḵadżar, Ṭabḥāb, ii, 1265] according to which he was one of the emigrants who went to Abyssinia, is therefore most unlikely to be authentic; Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Ḵistāʿih, Ḵaydar-ābād 1318, 392, no. 1622; 678-79, no. 678). In 8/630 he took part in the battle of Ḫunayn (al-Ṭabar, i, 1667); in 10/631-2 he was sent to the Yemen with Muʿāṣa b. Ṭabāqal to spread Islam there and was one of the lieutenants of Muḥammad and then of Abū Bakr in that region. Umar appointed him governor of Baṣra when he recalled al-Mughira b. Ṣhubaʿa [q.v.] from that post in 17/638 (al-Ṭabar, i, 2529; see also 2388). At the request of the inhabitants of Kūfah, Umar appointed him governor of that town in 22/642-3, but after retaining him in the office for a few months, until the reappointment of al-Muḥirra al-Ṭabar, i, 2678 f.), he sent him back to Baṣra.

As governor of Baṣra, Abū Mūṣā organised and carried out the occupation of Ḳhūzistān (17-21/638-42), of which he must be considered the conqueror (Caetani, *Annali*, 16 A.H., para. 261). The capital Sūk al-ʿAḥwāz (or simply al-ʿAḥwāz) fell into his hands as early as 17/638, but the campaign continued and offered many difficulties, for the numerous well fortified towns of the region had to be subdued one after the other, some of them having to be retaken after 21/644, the date of the fall of the second capital of Ḳhūzistān, Tustar (= Ṣhuṣṭar or ʿṢuḥṣhtar). Abū Mūṣā also took part in the conquest of Mesopotamia (end of 18-20/639-41), uniting his forces with those of ʿIyāḍ b. Ghaṃ, and in the campaign on the Iranian plateau, where he is mentioned as being present at the battle of Niḥāwand; the occupation of several towns is ascribed to him (al-Dinawar, Kumm, Kāshān, etc.).

In 23/643-4, in a bloody but indecisive battle, he defeated numerous Kurdish tribes which had gathered with hostile intentions at Bāyrūḏ (in the province of al-ʿAḥwāz) and had attracted many of the inhabitants of the territory to their ranks; he laid siege to the town, where the survivors of the insurgents had found shelter, and took it after having subdued the rest of the country. It was on account of the distribution of the booty taken on this occasion that an accusation was made to the Caliph against him, to whom he had to justify his conduct (al-Ṭabar, i, 2708-13). After this success, he advanced into Fārs (end of 23/644) and, in several expeditions, gave support to ʿUṯmān b. ʿAbī ʿl-Ḵāṣ, who had begun the conquest of this province from Baṭrāyn and ʿUmān (al-Balādūrī, Ṭuḥāṣ, 387).

There is an episode showing that discontent against Abū Mūṣā was already threatening in 26/646-7 (al-Ṭabar, i, 2829, where a movement of insubordination amongst his troops is reported under the year 29, which in fact took place in 26: Caetani, *Annali*, 26 A.H. para. 38). But the most serious protest against the actions committed by him was brought to Medina by a delegation of Baṛṣāns in 29/649-50 (al-Ṭabar, i, 2830), whereupon the Caliph ʿUṯmān decided to replace him at Baṣra by ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmīr. However Abū Mūṣā had won the respect of the inhabitants of Kūfah to such an extent, that they demanded his reappointment, when they drove out the governor Saʿīd b. al-ʿĂṣa in 34/654-5 (al-Ṭabar, i, 2930-31; Risdal, *Istihsan* ii, 31), and he was governor of the town at the time of ʿUṯmān's assassination. Upon the election of ʿAll, Abū Mūṣā took the oath of allegiance to him in the name of the Kūfans (al-Ṭabar, i, 3089; al-Masʿūdī, *Burāqī*, 296 etc.), retaining his office, when the other governors of ʿUṯmān were dismissed (al-Yaʿṣībī, ii, 208); but when war broke out between ʿAll and ʿAḥṣāʿ, Ṭalḥa and al-Zubayr, he called on his subjects to remain neutral (al-Ṭabar, i, 3139; al-Dinawar, 153 ff., etc.), and, in spite of pressure, did not relinquish this attitude; as a result the partisans of ʿAll expelled him from the town at the first opportunity (al-Ṭabar, i, 3145-9, 3152-4) and the Caliph wrote him a letter of dismissal couched in the severest terms (al-Ṭabar, i, 3173; al-Masʿūdī, *Burāqī*, iv, 308; cf. al-Yaʿṣībī, ii, 220); yet a few months later he granted him ʿamān (Naqr b. Murāḥīm al-Minḵārī, *Waḥš al-Ṣifīn*, ed. ʿAbd al-Salām Muḥammad Ḵārūn, Cairo 1365, 572; al-Ṭabar, i, 3333).

Abū Mūṣā was one of the two arbitrators appointed at Ṣīfīn in 37/657 to settle the dispute between ʿAll and Muʿāṣīwīya and more exactly the arbitrator nominated to represent ʿAll, whose supporters had obliged him to choose someone neutral, so certain were they that the decision would be in their favour (for the details of the arbitration, see *ʿAtī b. Abī Ṭalīb*). After the meeting at Adḥrub, Abū Mūṣā withdrew to Mecca, but when Muʿāṣīwīya sent Būṣ b. Abī Ṭaṣlī to occupy the holy cities (40/660), he was afraid of his vengeance, for at Adḥrub he had opposed his election to the Caliphate, and according to some sources, he took to flight; Būṣ reassured him (see Caetani, *Annali*, 40 A.H., para. 8, note 3 for the different versions of this episode). After that Abū Mūṣā took no further part in politics, as is shown by the uncertainty of the date of his death (41, 42, 50, 52, 53; 42 is the most probable date).
Abū Mūsā was very highly thought of for his recitation of the Qur'ān and the prayers, for he had a pleasant voice (Ibn Sa'd, Ṭabākī, ii/2, 106), but above all his name continues to be connected with Qur'ānic studies, for he established a muṣḥaf which locally outlived the composition of the vulgate of Uthmān (see Ch. Pellat, Milieu de l'Ismaïlisme, 73 ff.).

Bibliography: All the chroniclers and historians of early Islam, and all the collections of biographies of early personalities speak of Abū Mūsā (the main ones have been indicated in the body of this article). Numerous quotations are to be found in Caetani, Chronographia islamica, 42 A.H., 479; idem: Annali, Indices and vols. vii-x, passim; Ibn Abī l-Hadīd, Sharh Nahj al-Balāgha, Cairo 1329, iii, 287-9, 291, 293 f., iv, 199 f., 237 f. On the conquest of Khūḏistān: Welhausen, J., Sitten und Vorarbeiten, vi, Berlin 1890, 94-113. (L. VECCIA VAGLIERI)

Aš'āriyya, a theological school, the followers of Abu'l-Ḥasan al-Aš'ārī [q.v.], sometimes also called Aš'ārīya. (The history of the school has been little studied, and some of the statements in this article must be regarded as provisional).

External history. During the last two decades of his life al-Aš'ārī attracted a number of disciples, and thus a school was founded. The doctrinal position of the new school was open to attack from several quarters. Apart from members of the Muʿtazila, certain groups of orthodox theologians attacked them. To the Ḥanbalīs [q.v.] their use of rational arguments was an objectionable innovation. On the other hand, to the Māturīdīs [q.v.], who also defending orthodoxy by rational methods, some of their positions seemed too conservative (cf. the criticisms made by an early member of that school in Sharḥ al-Fīkh al-Akbār ascribed to al-ʿAmīn). Despite such opposition the Aš'āriyya apparently became the dominant school in the Arabic-speaking parts of the 'Abbasid caliphate (and perhaps also in Ḥūraṭān). In general they were in alliance with the legal school of al-Ḥāʾī [though al-Aš'ārī's own school remained too conservative (cf. the principles made by an early member of that school in Šarḥ al-Fīkh al-Akbār ascribed to al-ʾAmīn)]. Despite such opposition the Aš'āriyya apparently became the dominant school in the Arabic-speaking parts of the 'Abbasid caliphate (and perhaps also in Ḥūraṭān). In general they were in alliance with the legal school of al-Ḥāʾī [though al-Aš'ārī's own school remained too conservative (cf. the principles made by an early member of that school in Šarḥ al-Fīkh al-Akbār ascribed to al-ʾAmīn)].

From the middle of the 5th/11th century there was a change in method. Ibn Khaldūn (tr. de Slane, iii, 61) speaks of al-Ghazālī as the first of the "moderns", doubtless because of his enthusiasm for the Aristotelian syllogism, but there are already in al-Dīwānīyyā traces of methodological advancement (cf. Gardet and Anawati, op. cit. infra, 73). It was al-Ghazālī, however, that steeped himself in the doctrines of Ibn Sīnā and others of the philosophers until he could attack them on their own ground with devastating success. Little more was heard of the philosophers, but from this time onwards their Aristotelian logic and much of their Neoplatonic metaphysics was incorporated in the teaching of the Aš'āriyya. This teaching rapidly became intellectualised in a bad sense, sometimes even views of doubtful orthodoxy were taken over, and the philosophical propenomena occupied more space and attention than the strictly theological doctrines (notably in al-ʿĀṣī and his commentator al-Dīwānīyyā). In the end the school may be said to disappear in a blase of philosophy.


Aš'ārī, Abū Muḥammad Maḍīkārī b. Kays b. Maḍīkārī, of the clan of al-Ḥāṭīr b. Muʿāwiyah, a chief of Kinda in Ṣaḍramawt. The nickname, by which he is most commonly known, means "with unkempt or dishevelled hair"; he is also called, but less frequently, al-Shaddādī, "the scar-faced", and ʿUrūḍ al-Nār, said to be a South-Arabian term for "traitor". In earlier life he led an expedition against the tribe of Murād, who had murdered his father, but was taken prisoner and
had to pay 3000 camels for his ransom. In 1063 he was leader of the delegation (waṣīla) which offered the submission of a section of Kinda to the Prophet at al-Madina. It was arranged that his sister Kayla should be married to Muhammad, but he died before she arrived in al-Madina. After Muhammad's death (10/632) al-Asūlī rose in revolt with his clan and was besieged by Muslim troops in the castle of al-Nāḍjarī; according to the legend he surrendered the castle on condition of immunity for himself and nine others, but omitted to include his own name in the document of surrender, and barely escaped execution. He was, however, sent to al-Madina, where Abū Bakr not only pardoned him but married him to his own sister Umm Farwa or Qurayba (according to other reports this marriage had taken place already at the time of the delegation to Muhammad). He took part in the wars in Syria and lost the sight of an eye at the battle of the Yarmūk; he and his tribesmen were sent thereafter by Abū ʿUbayda to join Sa'd b. Abī Waḳḳās at Kādisiyya, and he commanded one of the Arab forces which occupied northern ʿIrāk. He settled in Kūfā as chief of the Kindite sector, and appears to have taken part in the expedition to Alḥarbāyḏān in 26/646-7. At the battle of Siffin he played a leading part both in the fighting and in the negotiations, and if represented as having forced ʿAll to accept the principle of arbitration and to agree to the selection of Abū Mūsā on the ʿIrākī side (see ʿALI B. ABī TALĪB). Pro-Ṣihīte tradition accordingly represents him and his whole house as invertebrate traitors. He died in Kūfā during the government of al-Ḥasan b. ʿAll (40/661), to whom one of his daughters was married. For his descendants see IBN AL-ʿASHiq, al-Asīlī.

Bibliography: L. Caetani, Chronographia Islamica, A.H. 40, §29; Ibn Sa'd, vi, 13-14; Muhammad b. Ḥabīb, al-Muḥaabār, index; Naṣr b. ʿUzayr, Naṣīḥa (Cairo 1336), passim; general histories of the Caliphate. (H. Rückendorf*)

AL-ʿASHIQ, an Arabic word meaning lover, frequently in the mystical sense. Among the Anatolian and Aḏharbāyḏānī Turks, from the late 10th/16th or 10th/16th century, it is used of a class of wandering poet-minstrels, who sang and recited at public gatherings. Their repertoire included religious and erotic songs, elegies and heroic narratives. At first they followed the syllabic prosody of the popular poets, but later were subjected to Persian influence, both directly and through the Perso-Turkic poetry of the central Turkish ʿAshīq poets. Köprüli has argued that they represent a social element distinct alike from the popular poets, the court poets, and the madrasa or convent-educated religious poets, and are the successors of the earlier Turkish bard known as ozan (q.v.). They are especially numerous in the 17th century, when we find them among the dervish orders, the Janissaries, and other branches of the armed forces. The most famous among them are Gewheri and ʿAshīq ʿOmer.

Bibliography: Köprülizade Mehmed Fu'ad [= M. F. Köprüli], Türk Sazsairlerine ait metinler ve tarihler, i-v, Istanbul 1929-30; idem, Türk Edebiyatında ilk Mudaşavvılar, Istanbul 1918, 390-2; M. K. Köprüli, Türk Sazsairleri ve anlamları, iv, Istanbul 1939-40; numerous other writings by M. F. Köprüli on this subject will be found listed in Fuad Köprüli Armağant, Istanbul 1953, xxvii-l. For an account of the impression made on a young Turk in the 19th century by the ʿAshīq poets, see the autobiography of Ziyā Pasha, translated in Gibb, Ottoman Poetry, v, 40, 51-2. A contest between ʿAshīks in Mughlā is described by H. J. van Lennep, Travels in Little-known parts of Asia Minor, 1, New York 1870, 253-4. See further H. Ritter, Orientalia, i, Istanbuller Mitteilungen, i, Istanbul 1933, 3 ff. (Der Sängerweltstreit). (B. Lewis)

ʿASHIK, Muḥammad b. Uṯmān b. Rāyżid, Turkish cosmographer, born about 964/1555 in Trebizond, the son of a teacher at the Koran elementary school of the Kháṭümiyya mosque. At the age of 20, he left his native town to see the world. The geographical part of his writings (mentioned below), contains references to his travels covering Anatolia and Rumelia. He did, for instance, take part in ʿUtḫmān Pasha’s (died 993/1585) campaign in the Caucasus and southern Russia in the years 989-992/1581-1584. After 994/1585, the spent several years in Salonica, whence he participated in the 1002-1003/1593-1594— in Köläss Şinâ Pasha’s (died 1004/1596) Hungarian campaign. In 1005/1596, he settled in Damascus, where he completed the writing of his cosmographic work in Ramāḏān 1006/April-May 1058. The date of his death is not known. Muḥammad ʿAshīq’s work, Mandūsir al-ʿawālim is composed of two parts. Part I begins with the creation of the world and describes the upper world, and something of the ‘lower’, i.e. the stars, paradise and its inhabitants, and hell and its inhabitants. Part II treats the ‘lower’ world in 18 chapters. Chapters 1 to 12 are strictly geographical, and 13 to 18 are of a more general nature. In a final chapter, he speaks of the duration and the end of this world. It is a vast compilation of the reports of the older Arabic and Persian cosmographers, geographers and natural scientists. It is clearly arranged under headings and written in Turkish, giving precise references to the source in every case. In the geographical part, he mentions in addition—again with references—what the personal view of each author on individual objects was. There are consi-
Ashik — Ashik Pasha

Ashik, sometimes copying parts of his Manazir al-sudurah and Ashik Pasha, born at Prizren and educated at Bursa, is known about his life is half legendary. Husayn Husam al-Din, the only author who gives detailed information about his life and his family, does not mention his sources (Amasya Tarikh I, 1327, II, 1315, III, 1927, IV, 1928). Ashik Pasha was the son of Babba Muhhins, whose father the shaykh Babba Ilyas migrated from Khorasan to Anatolia and founded the Babba sect. A disciple of his, Babba Ishkh, was the organiser of the famous 15th century religious revolts in Anatolia. Ashik Pasha, educated at Kirshehir, has been an important cultural centre, had a chequered political career, was sent as an envoy to Egypt and died at Kirshehir in 733/1333, where his tomb sanctuary, of remarkable architectural interest, has been a place of pilgrimage for centuries. A devout shaikh, it seems to have had a rich and influential man. One of his sons, Elwan Celebi, was a poet of some distinction and his great-grandson is the famous 15th century chronicler Ashik Pasha-Zaade. Ashik Pasha's main work is the Gharibname (630/1330) sometimes wrongly called Divan-i Ashik Pasha or Mu'addnname. This is a mystic-didactic madhunaw of more than 11.000 couplets in ramal. The work begins with a preface in Persian and a long panegyric introduction, and is systematically divided into ten chapters (bab) and each chapter into ten discourses (dastan). Each chapter treats of a subject in relation to its number (i.e. Chapter Four—The Four Elements, Chapter Five—The Five Senses, Chapter Seven—The Seven Planets, etc.). The whole can be described as a collection of moral precepts and exhortations illustrated by quotations from the Kur'an and the Hadith and followed by relevant anecdotes. The influence of Mawlanâ Djalal al-Din's great Mathnawi is apparent in the Gharibname as in most contemporary mystic works. But Ashik Pasha's poetry is plain and merely didactic and lacks the lyrical élan of both Mawlânâ and Yûnus Emre. The Gharibname represents on the whole Sunni Islam and the question how far the heterodox tendencies which were very active at the time in Central Anatolia find an echo in it has not yet been sufficiently studied. The language of the Gharibname offers interesting philological material for the study of old Ottoman, since it was written at a period when Turkish was struggling with Arabic and Persian to secure its place as a written language in Anatolia, and Ashik Pasha's conscious contribution towards this is not unimportant. But his handling of the 'arûd is less secure and skilful than that of his contemporaries Gulshenâ and Deyhanî. The numerous copies of the Gharibname witness its great popularity as one of the main mystic-religious works in Turkish. It has not yet been edited. Among dated copies: the oldest are: Berlin No 259 (840 h.), Paris No 313 A.F. (848 h.), Vatican Turkish 148 (854 h.), Casanatene No 2054 (861 h.), Bâyezid No 3633 (861 h.), Lâleli No 2752 (882 h.). Apart from the Gharibname we have from Ashik Pasha a number of poems,
mostly hymns (ildhis), preserved in certain Gharib-nâme MSS, or other codices. In recent years some minor works by ʿAshīk Pasha or attributed to him have come to light. The most important is the Fârâb-nâme. This is a short mathnawī (16 couplets) in praise of mystical poetry, and is developed, like the Gharib-nâme but on a smaller scale, upon quotations from the Korân and the Ḥadîth. The commentary on the well-known hadith “Poverty is my pride” introduces the subject. It has been published in facsimile and edited in transcription (v. Bibliography).


ʿAṣīk PASHA-ZADE, great-grandson of the poet ʿAshīk Pasha, his actual name was Dervīsh Ahmed b. Šâykh Yâbû b. Šâykh Šâmûn b. ʿAshīk Pasha (makhâṣ ʿAshīk), one of the oldest Ottoman historians. He was born in 803/1400, probably in Elvan Čelebi near Amasya, and died some time after 889/1484. His historical work (Tawdrlkh-i dl-i *Uthmân) has been edited three times; by ʿAlî Bey, Istanbul 1932, by Friedrich Giese (Die altosmanische Chronik des ʿAṣīkpašâzde), Leipzig 1929 and by Çiftsoğlu N. Atslz in Osmanlı Tarihleri, i, Istanbul 1949. In addition to these, and to the manuscripts enumerated by Babinger (see below), mention must be made of the manuscript in the Kûnâk al-Atrâk of al-Azhâr in Cairo, Taʾrîkh No. 3732 (completed in 1021/1612), a copy of which is in my possession (No. 140 of my collection).

Bibliography: Franz Babinger, Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werke, Leipzig 1927, 35-38; ibid., Wann warb ʿAṣiy ppâzade? in MOG, ii, 315-318; Paul Wittke, Zum Quellenproblem der ältesten osmanischen Chroniken in MOG, i, 77-150; ibid., Neues zu ʿAṣīkpašâzde in MOG, ii, 147-164; also by the same author, Die altosmanische Chronik des ʿAṣīkpašâzde in OZL, 1931, 697-708 (a criticism of the edition of Giese); Fr. Giese, Zum ʿAṣīkpašâzde-Problem, in OZL, 1932, 7-18 (a reply to Wittke’s criticism), ibid., Die verschiedenen Textversionen des ʿAṣīkpašâzde; M. Fuad Köprülü, ʿAṣī Paha Paša, in IA, i, 706-709.

Arabic text: ʿAṣīk PASHA — ASHIR

ASIHR, an old fortified town in North Africa situated 100 km. SSW of Algiers in the Titeri mountains, makes its appearance in history during the first half of the 4th/10th century. It belonged to the country occupied by the Şanşâhja on the western borders of their territory. The founding of the town by Zîrî b. Manâd, chief of the main tribe of the Şanşâhja, is an episode in the struggle which brought these Berber highlanders, the sup-

porters of the Fâtimids of Ifrîkiya, into conflict with the Zanșa of the plains of Oran, adherents of the party of the Umayyads of Cordova.

As a reward for services rendered to the Fâtimids, especially during the tenure of Abû Yaṣîd, “The Man with the donkey” (q.v.), in 324/935 Zîrî obtained permission from the Fâtimid Caliph al-ʿAṣim to found a town, which to a certain extent gave this tribal chief the prestige and autonomy of a sovereign. However it should be noted that it is to Zîrî’s son Bulûkîn that al-Bakrî and Ibn al-ʿAṣîr attribute the founding of the fortified town of Asîhr, which the former dates from 364/974 and the latter from 367/977.

The new city was artificially populated by elements brought from Tobna, Msila and Hamza (now Bouira), and later from Tlemcen, which had served as a gathering place for the Zanșa. Palaces, caravanserais and baths were erected there. Bulûkîn, after being invested by the Fâtimid al-Muʿizz, who quitted the government of Ifrîkiya for Cairo (363/973), left Asîhr and repaired to al-Kâyrâwân; this exodus, however, took place in stages, the chief’s family remaining at Asîhr.

The protection of this frontier region of the Zirid kingdom was entrusted to the Banû Ḥammâd (b. Bulûkîn), and Asîhr was incorporated into their territory, when their secession was recognised by the arrangement of 408/1017. Possession of Asîhr, the town of the Banû Ḥammâd, was moreover, disputed by members of the family. It was taken by Yûṣuf the son of Ḥammâd just after 440/1048 and completely pillaged by his troops. In 468/1076 it was besieged and occupied by the Zanșa, being subsequently retaken by the Banû Ḥammâd. In 495/1094 the Almoravid governor of Tlemcen, Tâshfîn b. Tinâmer, took and destroyed it. Resurrected once more from its ruins by its Ḥammâdî masters, it fell into the power of Gbârî the Şanşâjî, ally of the Banû Gbârî (about 580/1184). After this date the name of Asîhr disappears from history.

The uncertainty which surrounds the founding of Asîhr and its attribution to either Zîrî or Bulûkîn is to some extent illustrated on the actual site, for anybody wishing to study what has survived.

The same region of the Tišer, which dominates from afar the high plains of Southern Algeria, retains traces of three inhabited places, rather different in appearance, but all three showing the characteristics of Muslim origin.

1. One of them, called Mazza Bint al-Sultan, is a fortified enclosure crowning a rocky massif 276 metres in length, surrounded by deep ravines, jutting out in a northerly direction from the Kâf Lâhîdâr range. A building—a guard-house or storehouse—stood near the centre. A large cistern was intended to assure the temporary food supply of the small garrison holding the position.

2. On the slopes falling away from the same range towards the South, there stretches a rectangular enclosure, part of the perimeter of which was encircled by a rampart two metres thick. Inside it, walls appear to mark off terraces at different levels; but no other building is visible there. A spring called “The Man with the donkey” in 324/935 Zîrî is used to denote the enclosure itself.

Outside this enclosure, recent excavations by M. L. Golvin have revealed the existence of a castle built of stone, the plan of which is remarkably symmetrical. A projecting porch in the middle of the south façade gives access to an entrance-hall.
ASHIR — 'ASHKABAD

closed at the far end by a wall. Two side passages connect this entrance-hall with the rest of the building. This entrance shows a clear similarity to that of the Fatimid palace of al-Kā'im recently excavated at Mahdiyya (see M. S. Zbis, in JÀ, 1956, 79-93).

3. The site of another fortified town faces Yashir and the castle, from which it is separated by a distance of two and a half km. and a valley. This is Benia (Banya), which covers an area sloping down towards the north of Kaf Tsemsal. Near the bottom of the slope, the rampart crowns the escarpment which borders the valley and a continuation of it extends towards the Kāj, against which the town rested. At the foot of this rocky eminence there used to be a dungeon. Three gates are set in the rampart. The ground is covered by numerous ruins. Of these the most easily identifiable is the mosque. The prayer chamber, which is preceded by the courtyard, had seven naves and four bays. Several copious springs discharge themselves in the town.

It is possible to regard these three sites in the same region as marking three phases in the history of the Zirid Šanḫādja, and to see in them three successive foundations. Manzah Bint al-Sułtan is not a town, but a refuge and an observation post of the Šanḫādja, and probably preceded the founding of a real city.

The affinity between the neighbouring castle of Yashir and the palace of Mahdiyya permits the identification of the castle and the town with the foundation of Zirī (324/934), authorised by al-Kā'im and carried out with the collaboration of an Ifrikiyan architect.

On the other hand, probably represents the city of Bulukku (364/974), of which al-Bakrī gives such a remarkably exact description.


ASHIR, usually a synonym of kabila [q.v.] "tribe", can also denote a subdivision of the latter. Thus 'Abd al-Dīlāl Tāhir, after using the word in the former sense in the title of his lectures on "The Bedouin and the Tribes in the Arab Countries" (al-Badu wa l-'Åširāh fi l-Bilād al-'Arabiyah, Inst. des Hautes Études arabes, Cairo 1955), gives it a more technical definition (20, 1, 2-7): "The social unit or nucleus of tribal society is the family qabila [q.v.]; several families descended from a common ancestor; most commonly of the fifth degree, form a šabila [q.v.]. The šabila consists of several aghāhir, and the kabila several aghāhir. The difficulties encountered by the author in chapter vii, in an effort to give precise definition to the "actual designations of these fluid social ideas", are explained by the instability of the groups, and are a reminder that "Arab authors have experimented with them over a period of centuries; from this fact derive the contradictory versions of dictionary and, as anyone can verify for himself, in al-Mawardi, al-Akām al-Sulṭāniyya, and in Bishr Fares, L'honneur des Arabes", (77-8). Josef Henninger, Die Familie bei den heutigen Beduinen Arabiens und seiner Randgebiete (Leiden 1943, 134-5), by means of the extremely inconsistent extension of the units which marks his theory, supported by numerous references, gives the same explanation of tribal structure in four stages: 1) family, šayle; 2) offspring up to the fifth degree, dīl or ahl; 3) clan; 4) tribe, ašhir, šabila, badda, jirks. These last expressions are synonymous, but "sometimes ašhir or badda are regarded as subdivisions of šabila (134) ... ašhir and badda are often used interchangeably, and ahl for a whole people" (135). On the other hand the definition of LA (vi, 250, 1, 9) suggests that some of these fluctuations may be accounted for by the normal conflict between the proper meaning and the ordinary, less precise, usage: "The ašhir of a man is constituted by the nearest male offspring of his father" (proper meaning) "who are also called the šabila" (meaning altered by synecdoche). Comparison with other Semitic languages gives no clue, because Arabic is alone in affording, from the 10th root, small group of apparently isolated derived forms with the dominant idea of "direct, intimate, relationship", and this etymological problem has only been touched on, as far as is known, by Marcel Chen (Essai comparat. ... chaminio-semistique, Paris 1947, 86). The roots of nouns of number do not seem to give, apart from a few obscure names of animals or plants, derived forms without semantic connexion with their number, and it is perhaps not impossible that the original idea was one of a group of about ten persons. This would still be an extremely flimsy basis of evaluation, because the additional remark of LA (ibid., 16): "The ašhir consists exclusively of men" (also valid for maqāṣar, nafar, baum, rahl and 'adlam) can equally well support a contrario a current use of the term which is considered corrupted, as give an indication of its social and juridical value, as a group consisting only of warriors.

Bibliography: The work first mentioned, edited by the Arab League, gives much information. The work of J. Heining, which is absolutely fundamental for all these problems, ought also to have appeared in the bibliography of the article qabila. (J. Lecerf)

ÂŞHAKÂBÂD (properly Ashkhabad; according to the Turkish pronunciation of the Arab word Âšhâb, "love", called by the Russians since 1924 Ashkhabad, previously till 1921 Askhabad, 1921-4 Poltorack), a town, since 1924 the capital of the SSR of Turkmenistan. It lies in an oasis south of the desert Kara Kum and developed out of a Turcoman and with (1881, time of the Russ. conquest) 500 tents. Already in the year 1807 it had, as capital of the district, a museum (which contained inter alia objects of interest for the ethnology of the Türkmen) and a library (with some Persian manuscripts). After 1917, in spite of the difficulty of maintaining a sufficient water supply the city became an important industrial centre in this district (woven wares, silk factories, foodstuffs, building materials), possessing also cultural significance (since 1950 Gor'kiy-University and four other higher schools, a branch
ASHKABAD — ASHRAF 'ALI

of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and other research institutes). The number of inhabitants rose (1926) to 51,593 and (1939) 127,000; no information in particular concerning their nationality has been given. Doubtless however numerous Russians live there.

The place has been very frequently (17-xi-1893, 17-i-1895, 1929) struck by earthquakes and possesses since 1947 a Soviet seismic observatory. A particularly destructive earthquake took place on 6 October 1948. Numerous buildings were destroyed and many people lost their lives. (The centre of the earthquakes is mostly fifty miles south in the Kopet Dagh.)

The district of 'Ashkabād is notable for its cotton and corn cultivation; vines, melons and vegetables are cultivated here. It contains the foothills of the Kopet Dagh, the oasis Tedjent and the central parts of the desert Kara Kum [q.v.]. Minerals: zinc, lead, sulphur, barytus.

Four-five miles west of 'Ashkabād lie the ruins of the city of Nasā [q.v.]; six-seven miles east of the ruins of the city of Anaw with the remains of a beautiful mosque with an inscription by its builder, Abu 'l-Kāsim Bābur (d. 886/1480-1) where during excavations (1904) a rich Neolithic culture of the time 3000-5000 (? B.C.) came to light.


AL-ASHMŪNA'N [see USHMŪNA'N].

ASHRAF [see SHAREF].

AL-ASHRAF, AL-MALIK [see AYYUBIDS].

ASHRAF, town in the Persian province of Mazandaran, and chief town of a district (bāštāk) of the same name, situated 36° 41' 55" N, 53° 32' 30" E, five miles from the shore of the Caspian Sea, 35 miles E. of Sārī and 43 miles W. of Astarābād on the road between these two towns. The town lies at the foot of wooded spurs of the lofty Alburz range, and commands a fine view northwards over the bay of Astarābād. Although the approaches to Ashraf are fertile and produce excellent cotton and wheat, the plain of Ashraf itself tends to be marshy. The cypress, the wild vine, the citron and the orange grow in profusion.

Formerly an unimportant town named Khar-kūrān, the new town of Ashraf dates from its foundation by Shāh 'Abbās I in 1021/1612-3. Intended by 'Abbās to be a rural retreat, Ashraf at first consisted of a group of large farmhouses surrounding the royal palace and scattered along the Sārī road, but eventually the royal residences extended over a considerable area, and comprised six separate establishments, each with its gardens. According to Fraser five of these, the Bāgh-i Shāhī, the ʿImārat-i Shāhī y Zämān (used as a banquetting hall), the Haram, the Khwāt, and the Bāgh-i Tappā, were enclosed by one wall, while the sixth, the ʿImārat-i Čaḡma, lay outside. Spacious accommodation was provided for guests and travellers. Great skill was employed in the construction of the palaces and of the famous causeway, large blocks of stone and marble being brought from Bābd, and joined by iron clamps cemented with lead.

The gardens were laid out with walks bordered by pines, and by orange and other fruit trees, and were watered by an elaborate system of reservoirs, cisterns and channels, fed by a spring which also supplied numerous fountains and cascades. On the hills above were situated the observatory known as Șaflābād, and a dam which controlled the water supply to the rice fields round Ashraf.

At the beginning of the 18th century, the power of the Șafawī dynasty declined, and Ashraf suffered heavily in the ensuing civil wars, and from Turcoman invasions from the N-E. It was plundered by the Afghāns and again by the Zand armies. The great ayyān called Chīlīh Sūtān was burnt down in the time of Nādir Shāh, and Nādir's replacement was a much meaner edifice. Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān Kāder carried out certain repairs, but what remained of the imperial residences was destroyed by Muḥammad Khān of Sawādḱūkh, Governor of Mazandaran, and Ashraf remained virtually uninhabited until Algā Muḥammad Khān Kāder escaped from Zand captivity at Sāhrāz and, making Mazandaran his base, rebuilt the town in 1193/1779-80. Though making a slow recovery—in 1826 it numbered 500 houses, in 1859 845, and in 1874 over 1200—Ashraf has never regained its former prosperity, nor can its ruined palaces do more than hint at their former magnificence.


ASHRAF 'ALI b. 'ABBĀD AL-ḤARK AL-FĀRŪQĪ, was born at Thānā Bhawan (Mozafarward district, India) on 12 Rabī‘ I, 1280/19 March 1863 and died on 6 Radjah 1352/29 July 1933. He received his education at his hometown and at Deoband [q.v.]. Leaving Deoband in 1301/1883-4 he started life as a teacher at Cawnpore. The same year he performed the pilgrimage to Mecca where he met Hādījī İmdād Allāh, İmdād Allāh al-Hindi al-Muhaddīr al-Makīt with whom he was already in correspondence. He renewed his ǧa‘īl, contracted ǧawāb, and formally became his disciple. In 1307/1890-9 he again left for Mecca and stayed there for a number of months with İmdād Allāh. He left Cawnpore in 1315/1897-8 and settled down at Thānā Bhawan for the rest of his life.

An eminent scholar, theologian and sāfi, he led a very busy life, teaching, preaching, writing and lecturing, and making long journeys. A prolific writer, his works exceed one thousand in number. These are mostly on ǧafir, hadīth, logic, kalām, ʿākīdāt and tasawwuf. His first work, a Persian maṭnāwī entitled Zīr o Bām, was written while he was still a student; his last is al-Bawdār al-Nawādir, published in 1355/1935-6, being a selection of his innumerable writings. His most famous works are: (i) Bayān al-Kurān, a commentary of the Kurān, in 12 vols. in Urdu, completed in 2½ years and first published at Delhi in 1334/1916-7. A revised and enlarged edition was published at Thānā Bhawan, in 1353/1934-5 and at Delhi in 1349-52. Since then several editions have appeared; (ii) Bihīthī Żewar, in 10 vols., also in
Urdu, a compendium of Islamic teachings meant for women. The 11th vol. "Bishti Gauhar" for men, was added much later. It has been frequently printed in India and Pakistan and is still in great demand. A collection of his fatâwâ in 8 vols., compiled posthumously, is in process of publication.


ASHRAF ALI KHAN, foster-brother of Ahmad Shah, King of Delhi (1161/1748-1167/1754) was born in Delhi c. 1140/1727. His father Mirzâ ‘Ali Khân "Nawad" was a convert of Muhammad Shâh [q.v.]. His uncle ‘Ali Khân was the nâmâz of Murshidubdî during the reign of Ahmad Shah. A composer of poetry in both Urdu and Persian, he wrote under the pen-name of "Fughân" (Figuân) and enjoyed the title of "Zarf al-Mulk Kokaltâ Khan Bahâdur", conferred on him by Ahmad Shâh.

He lived in Delhi till the dethronement of Ahmad Shah in 1167/1754, when he left for Murshidubdî. He seems to have been unfavourably received by his uncle and after a brief stay with him returned to Delhi. In 1174/1761 when the Durranis again attacked India he left Delhi for good and went to Faydubdî. He, however, soon fell out with his patron Shudâ‘ al-Dawla al-Simnâni [q.v.] and left for A‘zâmubdî (Patna) where he was well received by Râdja Shittâb Rây, Governor of Bengal and Bihar and a great patron of learning. Offended by an unkind remark of Shittâb Rây he decided to leave him. But soon after he somehow came into contact with officials of the East India Company and appears to have entered their service. Thereafter he led a comfortable life and died at A‘zâmubdî in 1186/1772-3.

A good poet, his compositions are, however, marred by biting satire and lampoon. His Urdu and Persian diwân was published at Karachi in 1950.


ASHRAF DHAJANÎR b. S. Muhammad Ibrahim was born in 688/1292 at al-Sâljuq (Khu-rânî, the principality of his father. His mother, Khadijâ, was a grand-daughter of ‘Aymâm Yâsawî [q.v.]. A fasâ‘î of the Kur’ân, with its seven readings, he completed his education at the age of 14. His love for mysticism took him to A’lâ’ al-Dawla al-Sâljuqîî [q.v.], a leading passâ‘î of his days, whose company he frequented. Succeeding his father, on the latter’s death in 705/1305-6, to the principality he soon abdicated in favour of his brother Muhammad and set out for India having been told to do so in a dream. Passing through Mâ ‘arâ‘î al-Nahr, he visited Bûkhânî and Samarkand and then left for Uchchî [q.v.] where he met Dâlâl al-Dîn al-Bûkhânî, sur-named Dâhânîyân Dâhân Gâshî [q.v.]. After a long series of travels covering Delhi, several places in the Indo-Gangetic plain, Bihâr and Bengal, including Sunârgânî, near Dacca, he finally settled at Rûhabâd (an old name for Kahâchwâ, a village 53 miles from Faydubdî), where he died on 27 Mu’harram 808/July 6, 1405 and was buried in his own Khânâmâh.

A short time after having settled at Kahâchwâ he again left on his global travels, this time visiting Mecca (twice), al-Madîna, Kârbâla‘, al-Nadîjâf, Turkey, Damascus, Bâghbâdî, Kâshân, al-Sîmânîn, Meshed, Ghaznî and Bûkhânî, returning to Rûhabâd via Multan, Pâkpattan and Delhi. On his first voyage to Mecca he was accompanied by Bâdî’ al-Dîn Shâh Madâr [q.v.].

The statement in the Latefî-ud-Ashrafî (ii, 105-6) that Sultan Ibrahim Sharki (804/1401-848/1444) was introduced to him by Khâdij Shihâb al-Dîn al-Dawlatâbâdî early on his arrival in India is apparently wrong as the Sultan succeeded to the throne in 804/1402 while the saint died four years later in 808/1405. The meeting, therefore, must have taken place during the closing years of the life of Ashraf Dhajanîr.

He is the author of Bashâr ‘al-Mu‘tâdîn and Makbûbâs-î Ashrafî, the latter is highly spoken of by ‘Abd al-Hâjîk Dihlawî [q.v.]. His shrine is visited, in thousands, by persons possessed and patients suffering from mental derangement in the hope of obtaining a cure.


ASHRAF OGULLARI, march-wardens of the Saljûqs in Anatolia during the second half of the 13th century. Members of a Turkoman tribe which had been settled by the Anatolian Saljûq state on its western frontiers, they embellished the town of
Gorgurum, and subsequently Beyshehri, and estab-
lished a principality in that region.

The first of the family who is known to us is the Saltuk amir Ashrafoghlu Sayf al-Din Sulayman Bey, who played an important part during the reigns of Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw III and Ghiyath al-
Din Mas'ud II. After the Mongols of the west, the
Ilkhans, had put Kaykhusraw III to death, they ordered Mas'ud II to rule in his stead (Rabi' I 685/June 1285), but Kaykhusraw's mother, who was at the court of the Ilkhans, and his sons as his successors, with the approval of the Ilkhans, thus declining herself against Mas'ud. She invited the Ashrafid Sulayman Bey to Konya and appointed him regent to these infant sovereigns (8 Rabi' I 685/14 May 1285).

With assistance from the Mongols, Mas'ud II, who was at Kayseri, disposed of the two children and seized power, whereupon Sulayman Bey withdrew to Beyshehri. Subsequently (687/1288) he made submission to Mas'ud and came to Konya.

Mas'ud II wished to have his brother Siyavus, whom he regarded as a rival, placed under restraint. He therefore sent him to Beyshehri, ostensibly for the purpose of bringing back the Ashrafid's daughter as a bride for himself. By prior arrangement the Ashrafid arrested and imprisoned Siyavus, but was compelled to release him and send him to Konya by the threats of the Karamanid Guneri Bey, who was favourably disposed towards Siyavus (Seldjukname, Paris, Bibliotheque Nationale, Persian MS no. 1553).

By this time the Saltuk state had lost its authority, and Sulayman Bey was in perpetual conflict, sometimes with his neighbours and sometimes with the Saltuk governors: at one point he was even in danger of falling into the hands of the Karamanid, who was attacking Beyshehri, but he later gained the victory. He also suffered considerably at this period from assaults on this territory by the Ilkhânid Gaykhâta.

Sayf al-Din Sulayman Bey died on Monday 2 Muḥarram 703/27 August 1302, and was buried in the mausoleum he had had constructed a year before beside his mosque in Beyshehri. Sulayman Bey had embellished Beyshehri, which he called Sulaymanghehri, with a number of foundations, and had repaired the fortress, placing his inscription over the fortress gate in 689/1290. He built his mosque, a distinguished work of art, in 696/1296, and his mausoleum in 1302. In his waŷhiyya he appointed his sons Muhammad and Ashraf as mutawallis of these foundations (Khâll Edhem, Anadoluas İslami kitâbeleri, TOEM year 5, 139-44; Yusuf Akyurt, Beyshehri kitâbeleri ve Eşref oğulları camii ve türbesi).

He was succeeded by his elder son Mu'abariz al-Din Muhammad Bey, who added the towns of Akshehri and Bolvadin to his domains. The Ashraf id Amir Dîya' al-Din Şîkhârî built the market mosque in Akshehri in 720/1320 (I. H. Uzungûlû, Kitâbeler, ii, 26). When the amir Cihan, the Ilkhânid governor-general, visited Anatolia in 1314 there was an Ashrafid among the Anatolian beys who came to offer them their obedience (Musamarat al-Ashrafı, 311); this must have been Mu'abûrî al-Din Muhammâd.

Muhammad Bey died after 1320 and was succeeded by his son Sulayman II, whose reign however was of short duration. The influence of the Ilkhâns in Anatolia having begun to wane, Darîmâr, son of the amir Cihan, was appointed governor of Anatolia.

In his efforts to subdue the Anatolian beys, who had grown accustomed to acting independently and rebelliously, he first took Konya (1320), which had come under Karamanid control. A few years later he marched on Beyshehri, seized Sulayman Bey, killed him, and threw his corpse into the Beyshehri lake (the Mâdâlik al-Abîr records that he was tortured to death: his eyes were put out, his nose and ears cut off, and his severed testicles were hung about his neck) on 11 Dhul '1-Ka'da 726/9 October 1326 (this is the date shown in the Paris MS of the Seldjukname; the Ta'bih-i Nûğâmî gives the year of his death as 722/1322-3).

With the murder of Sulayman II the principality of the Ashrafids came to an end. After Demirzâ's time, their territories fell into the hands partly of the Hamîlds, partly of the Karamanids. No coins of the Ashrafids have yet come to light, but it is possible that coins of Muhammâd Bey exist.

In his Mâdâlik al-Abîr, Şihâb al-Din Umârî says that the Ashrafids possessed almost 70,000 cavalry, 60 towns, and 150 villages.

It is evident from the titles used by Sayf al-Din Sulayman Bey in his inscription which he placed over the gate of the fortress of Beyshehri (which he called Suleymanghehri) in Dhu 'l-Qa'da 689/May 1290 (Amir-i Mu'âazzam), and on his other inscriptions (al-Amîr al-'Adîl: see Halîl Edhem and Yusuf Akryurt) that he was an amir of the Seldjûks.

The mosque of Sulayman Bey, its minbar and mihrâb, are choice works of art. The ornate ceiling of the mosque, which is rectangular in shape, is supported on 48 wooden pillars, decorated with stalactites. The mihrâb is adorned with porcelain mosaics, Kûr'ânic verses and hadîths. The minbar is a masterpiece of the woodcarver's art, made of jointed sections of ebony. Around the front of the door to the minbar is inscribed the Throne-verse, in Saltuk script, while above the doorway are seen the names of the first four caliphs, in Kûfîc lettering. The mausoleum of Sulayman Bey, though most artistic, has become dilapidated with age.

There exists a philosophical work in Arabic, in 9 sections, entitled al-Fusul al-Ashrafîyya fi Uşûl al-Burhânîyya wa l-Kaşfîyya, written for the Ashrafid Mu'abîrît al-Din Muhammâd Bey by Shams al-Din Muhammâd Tu'ghârî. The author's autograph copy, written at Konya in 710/1311, is in the library of St. Sophia (no. 2244).

The Ashrafid family:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ashraf</th>
<th>Sayf al-Din Sulayman I</th>
<th>Ashraf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khâtûn</td>
<td>Mu'abîrît al-Din</td>
<td>Muhammâd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammâd Bey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AL-ASH'TAR, Malik b. al-Harith al-Rakha', warrior and political agitator of the time of the Caliph 'Uthman and supporter of 'Ali. He was surnamed al-Ash'tar, "the man with inverted eyelids", as the result of a wound received at the battle of the Yarmuk (15/636). He distinguished himself by his boldness in the campaign against the Byzantines and even dared to venture further than Darb in enemy territory (see Caetani, Annali, index). He was one of the most persistent agitators against the Caliph 'Uthman and the ruling class of the period and defended the rights—or the claims—of the warriors to the jayy (booty consisting of landed property). After a violent scene in the presence of 'Uthman's governor at Kufa, Sa'd b. al-'As (36/654-5), he was banished from Kufa to Syria together with ten other agitators; Mu'awiyah subsequently sent him back to Kufa, but Sa'd sent him on to the governor of Hims. As the agitation persisted in Kufa, he lost no time in returning and stirring up the masses (al-Tabari, i, 2907-17, 2921, 2927-31). He is to be found at the head of the band of seditionists who prevented the return of the governor Sa'd b. al-'As who took upon themselves to obtain the appointment by the Caliph (35/654-5) of Abū Mūsā al-Aṣqārī. (n.b.) (al-Tabari, i, 2927-30; al-Mas'udi, Murūdī, iv, 262-5). At the time of the insurrection in Medina, which ended with the assassination of the Caliph 'Uthman (35/656), he brought two hundred men from Kufa (Ibn Sa'd, ii/1, 40) and was one of those who besieged the "House" (al-nuffarr) (al-Tabari, i, 2989 f., etc.): his name is even cited among the murderers of the Caliph (Ibn 'Asākir, in Caetani, Annali, 35 A.H., paras. 137 and 160; Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, 'Ibīd, (Bulāk 1293), ii, 278 etc.).

His violence came to the fore also during the election of 'Ali, for he threatened several recalcitrants, forcing them to swear the oath of allegiance to him (al-Tabari, i, 3068-9, 3073-77; al-Dinawarī, 132). He then attached himself to 'Ali, but was often among those of his supporters who presumed to impose their own will on him.

During 'Ali's campaign against 'Uqba, Ta'ba and al-Zubayr, he was sent to Kufa with other men of importance to persuade the inhabitants to take 'Ali's side, and after succeeding in this objective, he brought reinforcement to his master. He took part in the battle of the Camel (36/656); the sources mention a duel which he fought with 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr, and other brave deeds. At the head of the vanguard of 'Ali's army in the campaign against Mu'awiyah, he obliged the inhabitants of Ra'ka to build a bridge of boats over the Euphrates to enable the troops to cross (al-Tabari, i, 3259-60). At the battle of Siffin in which he commanded the right wing of the army, he displayed zeal and bravery (al-Tabari, i, 3283, 3284, 3294-300, 3337, 3338; al-Dinawarī 194-8; al-Mas'udi, Iv, 343-4).

'Ali wanted to have him as an arbitrator at the time when the famous arbitration between himself and Mu'awiyah was proposed (see 'Ali b. Abī Talīm), but his supporters refused, well aware that such a choice would mean the continuation of the war; when al-Ash'tar was informed that a truce had been decided upon, he wanted to go on fighting, for he thought that victory was near and the speech which he delivered on this occasion has come down to us (Naṣr b. Muzāḥim al-Minkarī, Waḥat Siffin, 562 f.; al-Tabari, i, 3331 f.; cf. al-Dinawarī, 204); he then tried to avoid signing the agreement. It was probably because of his uncompromising attitude towards the truce with Mu'awiyah, that 'Ali got rid of him, by appointing him firstly governor of Mawsil (as well as of other towns of 'Irāq and Syria which were in his possession, but al-Ash'tar encountered opposition from al-Dāhḥāk b. Kays al-Fihrī, appointed governor by Mu'awiyah, and had to withdraw to Mawsil) and then governor of Egypt; it is not known precisely whether this took place immediately after the recall of Kays b. Sa'd or after the dismissal of Muhammad b. Abī Bakr who had proved himself a bad politician (al-Kindī, Governors 22; al-Maṣāfīrī, ii, 336; al-Tabari, i, 3242; al-Ya'qūbī, ii, 227; al-Mas'udi, Murūdī, iv, 492; Caetani, Annali, 37 A.H. paras. 221-3). However that may be, al-Ash'tar never reached the seat of his appointment, for when he arrived at al-Kulzum (37/658 or 38?) he was poisoned by the local diyāstārīr (not the quaestor) but the lustriarius, see J. Maspero, in BIFAO, xi, 155-60), (al-Tabari, i, 3392-5). On hearing of his death, 'Ali and Mu'awiyah are said to have sworn the words which have subsequently become famous: — the former: li 'iyadān wa li 'l-umārā (["fallen hands and mouth [to the ground!"] an expression indicating the pleasure felt on seeing someone fall (Ma'Yânī, Amīhā, ii, 475; cf. Caetani, Annali, 37 A.H. paras. 224, n. 1); the latter: "God even has troops in the honey" Mu'awiyah was indeed suspected of being the instigator of al-Ash'tar's assassination: more certain is the fact that Mu'awiyah considered al-Ash'tar one of the "arms" of 'Ali, the other, according to him, being 'Ammār b. Yāsir.

From the physical point of view, al-Ash'tar was a giant; his sword bore the name al-lūdūdī "the sheen of running water" (TA, ii, 93).

Bibliography: Information on al-Ash'tar is to be found in all the chronicles and histories dealing with the early period of Islam as well as in the collections of biographies of early personalities; Caetani, Annali, Index and vols. vii-x passim; several quotations of sources, ibid. 37 A.H. paras. 332-9; Naṣr b. Muzāḥim al-Minkarī, Waḥat Siffin, ed. 'Abd al-Salām M. Hārūn, Cairo 1365, Index: Ibn Abī 'l-Ḥadīd, Shahr Nāḥij al-Balḍāgha, Cairo 1329, i, 158-60, ii, 28-30, 80, iii, 416, 417. (L. Veccia Vaglieri)
‘Ashūra’, name of a voluntary fast-day which is observed on the 10th Muharram.

When Muhammad came to Madīna he adopted from the Jews amongst other days the ‘Ashūra’. The name is obviously the Hebrew ‘āsūr with the Aramaic determinative ending; in Lev. xvi, 29 it is used of the great Day of Atonement. Muḥammad retained the Jewish custom in the rite, that is, the fast was observed on this day from sunset to sunset, and not as in other fasts only during the day. When in the year Muhammad’s relations with the Jews became strained, Rāmahān was chosen as the fast month, and the ‘Ashūra’-fast was no longer a religious duty but was left to the option of the individual.

—On which day of the Arabian year the fast was originally observed cannot now be ascertained owing to our defective knowledge of the calendar of the period; naturally its observance coincided with the Jewish on the 10th Tishri, and so fell in the autumn. The 10th Muḥarram finds early mention as the ‘Ashūra’; probably the tenth day of the first Muslim month was selected to harmonise with the tenth day of the first Jewish month. From the calculations which have already been made, it does not seem possible that it could have been originally celebrated on the 10th Muḥarram (see Caetani, Annali, i, 431 f.). Presumably for the sake of distinguishing themselves from the Jews some fixed the 9th Muḥarram either along with or in place of the tenth as a fast day with the name ‘Tās’ud’.

The Jewish origin of the day is obvious; the well-known tendency of tradition to trace all Islamic customs back to the ancient Arabs, and particularly to Abraham, states that the Meccans of olden time fasted on the ‘Ashūra’. It is not impossible that the tenth, as also the first nine days of Muḥarram, did possess a certain holiness among the ancient Arabs; but this has nothing to do with the ‘Ashūra’.

The fast of the ‘Ashūra’ was later and is still regarded by Muslims as commendable; the day is kept by the devout of the entire Sunni world; it is holy also on ‘historical’ grounds: on it Noah left the ark, etc. In Morocco the day is opened on the day of the ‘Ashūra’ for visitors (see Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, ii, 51). In lands which are Shi‘ite or come under Shi‘ite influence quite different usages have become associated with the 10th Muḥarram; in this connexion see Muḥarram.

Bibliography: The Chapter Sawm ‘Ashūra’ in the Collections of Traditions, and the appropriate sections in the Fīqh-books; Goldziher, Usages juifs d’après la littérature des musulmans, in Rev. des Études juives, xxviii, 82-84; A. J. Wensink, Mohammed en de Joden te Medīna, 121-125; Th. W. Juynboll, Handbuch des islamischen Gesetzes, 115 f.; Nöldeke-Schally, Geschichte des Qorān, i, 179, note; Sprenger, Das Leben und die Lehre des Mohammed, iii, 53, note; Buh, Das Leben Muḥammads, 214, 226; Lane, Modern Egyptians, Ch. xxiv.

II.—‘Ashūra’ (‘Ashura’) in the Maghrib. In practice a distinction is usually made between ‘Ashūra’, the name given to the month of Muḥarram, and ‘Ashūra’, the name of the feast celebrated on the tenth of that month. The supererogatory fast enjoined on that day seems to be unevenly kept, whilst alms-giving is a more usual practice. Perhaps this is why children from the ḥurānic schools, at ‘Ashūra’, go from door to door, singing and making collections for their masters. The dead are also honoured by visits to their tombs, which are copiously watered, and branches of myrtle are placed on them. The feast is celebrated by eating special dishes (fritters, flat cakes and gruel), and especially eggs and poultry. Popular manifestations of ‘Ashūra’ vary according to the region and are at times on an extraordinary scale.

Three essential elements can be distinguished in the practices in use: 1) Fire and water rites. A bonfire of branches, leaves and grasses is built; this is very frequently lit by a person of repute, who is possessed of haraka [g.v.]. Whilst the bonfire burns, those present jump over it (‘sammi’ of Takrom). These very common practices are throwing burning faggots from the bonfire into the river, mixing water with the ashes, bathing and sprinkling oneself with water. 2) Marriage rites (when a sacrificial animal is sometimes slaughtered). These are especially observed in Morocco: Douzrou ceremony (Tafilalet); the making of dolls and puppets representing ‘Ashūra’ and his fiancée ‘Ashurah, in the Region of Agadir, in the Sūs and the Middle Atlas, etc. 3) Carnaval rites, mainly in Morocco, in Western Oran, all along the edge of the Sahara, in the Sahara, Tunisia and Libya. The Maghribi carnival (fajrā), with numerous variations, almost always includes a trial, an execution and a funeral; the victim is usually an old man or an old woman, dressed up in a lurid costume, at times wearing animal skins or pelts or a tunic made of plaited plants (ghyāb ‘Ashūra’ at Ouargla, bā-lifā at Biskra, bā-falā in Morocco and at Timencen, bā-heremma in Southern Morocco and Oran, bu ‘l-ţālām, bābā ‘ţūr elsewhere, etc. . . .). One of the figures in the fajrā is usually that of an enormous beast, a lion, a mule or a camel, which both delights and terrifies the spectators.

It is generally agreed that the complex customs of ‘Ashūra’ in the Maghrib reflect the survival of very ancient agrarian rites, in fact the celebration of the death of the year coming to its end and the birth of their popular aspects, which are both sad and joyful. The traditional Muslim Shi‘ite mourning has, in all likelihood, become grafted on to this magico-religious substratum, whilst the lunar calendar has taken over a solar year cult, subjecting it to a temporal displacement. Through these superimpositions, remains of this ancient disrupted ceremonial have, here and there, become haphazardly attached to Muslim feas (the two ‘ids and mawlid [g.v.]) and to the various periods and holidays of the agricultural year (rās ‘el-‘ām, annār, rīb, ‘ansāra [g.v.]).

AL-'ASI is the name in use among the Arabs for the Orontes. The classical name of this river, the most important in northern Syria, is preserved in Arabic literature as al-'Urunj, al-Urunj. Presumably the origin of the word 'Aši, like that of the Greek Axios, must be sought in an ancient native name. The common explanation of al-'Aši = "the rebel" is a popular etymology with no actual foundation, and the name al-nahr al-majšūd = fluvius inversus is probably a scholarly invention.

The river-system of the 'Aši begins to the north of the watershed formed by the highland-valley of al-Bikâr not far from Ba'albak, but really only obtains its volume of water farther north near al-Hirmil from a spring, generally called simply the Orontes Spring, which wells forth in a strong stream from the rock. Following the line of the Syrian canal to its northern end, the river flows through several lakes or marshes (those of Kadas and of Fāmīya = Kaš't al-Mudīk); on its banks are situated the most important towns of central Syria, Hitim and Hamāt. At the point where the Syrian buttresses rejoin the faults of Armenia and Asia Minor the river turns away from the north and flows towards the south-west, receives the streams which, rising in the most northerly regions of Syria, discharge into the marshes of al-'Amk, and reaches the sea below Antākiya, to the south of the Amanus, at a point where the coast is flat and devoid of natural harbours (Seleucia and al-Suwaydiyya were artificial harbours).

The geographical peculiarities of the course of the Orontes, and its comparatively abundant flow, have long permitted the traditional use of its waters for irrigation. But the favourable conditions which it presents for large-scale modern development have as yet only given rise to partially realised projects.

_Bibliography:_ Yābluj, iii, 388; Abu 'l-Fidā', Tabakām, 49; G. Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, London 1890, 59-61; R. Dussaud, Topographie historique de la Syrie, Paris 1927, index; C. Cahen, La Syrie du nord à l'époque des Croisades, Paris 1940, index; J. Wellhausen, ZDMG, Ix, 245-6; J. Weulersse, L'Oronte, Tours 1940. (R. Hartmann)  

_Aśila_ (now Asila in Fr. and Port., Arcila in Span.), town and port on the Atlantic coast of Morocco, situated about 50 kms. S.S.W. of Tangiers and not far from the mouth of al-Wadl al-Hulw (Oued el-Helou). According to Spanish statistics, the population rose from slightly over 6,000 inhabitants in 1935 to just under 16,000 in 1949, with a majority of Muslims, a negligible Jewish minority and a small number of Europeans, mainly Spaniards.

The name Aśila seems to derive from the forms ḥlaši (Strabo), ḥlaš (Itinerary of Antoninus and the Anonymous of Ravenna) or ḥlīa (Ptolemy and Pomponius Mela); but the ancient authors tell us hardly anything about the town, which may have originally been a Phoenician trading-post. In contrast, it is frequently mentioned and described by the Arab historians and geographers, among others by Ibn Ḥawkal and al-Bakrī. According to the latter, Aśila was twice visited by the Normans in the 3rd/9th century. In the 6th/12th century, al-'Idrīsī describes it as a small town in complete decay. But trade must have enjoyed a certain prosperity there in the 9th/15th century, because at the time of the disaster suffered by the Portuguese before Tanjier (1471), Jewish merchants and Genoese and Castilians who traded in spices were to be found there; the Wattasid sultans of Fez, especially Muhammad al-Burtukāl: they endured several sieges; the most serious was that of 1508; the Portuguese lost the town and only retained the citadel; they were saved by the intervention of a squadron which arrived from Portugal, which was soon after reinforced by the Spanish fleet of Pedro Navarro. Furthermore, the fortress was handicapped by the insecurity of its port, which was blocked by a reef. In August 1550, King John III of Portugal (1521-57) had it evacuated — a few weeks after al-Kašar al-Saghîr — with a view to concentrating all his forces in Northern Morocco at Tangier and Ceuta. In 1577, Aśila was reoccupied by King Sebastian (1557-78), as the price of his alliance with the Sa'did prince Muḥammad al-Maslūḥ and with a view to the expedition in which he lost his life, at the battle of the Three Kings, or the battle of al-Kašar al-Saghîr (4th August 1578): it was at Aśila that the Christian army landed and it was from Aśila that it set out on 29th July 1578 to meet the Moroccan army. Philip II, King of Portugal since 1580 following the death of Cardinal Henry, gave the town back to the Sa'did sultan al-Manṣūr in 1589. From this date onwards, Aśila has led a quiet and obscure existence. It formed part of the region subject to the authority of the Ḥārîf Rāysūnī, when it was occupied in 1912 by the Spaniards, who incorporated it in their zone.

_Bibliography:_ All the requisite information on Aśila prior to 1589 is collected together in David Lopes, Historia de Arzila durante o domínio português, Coimbra 1924-5 (based strictly on the sources, especially Bernardo Rodrigues, Anais de Arzila, ed. David Lopes, 2 vols., Lisbon 1915-9); see also Adolfo L. Guevara, Arzila durante la ocupación portuguesa, Tangier 1940, and Pierre deenival, David Lopes and Robert Ricard, Les Sources inédites de l'historie du Maroc, Portugal, 5 vols., Paris 1934-53; and the bibliography of the article Aši in the dictionary of the Portuguese period. For recent events: Tomás Garcia Figueras, Miscelânea de estudos históricos sobre Marruecos, Larache 1949, 421 ff. (R. Ricard)  

'ASIIM, ABU BAKR 'ASIIM B. BHADLA ABI 'L-'ADNĀDĪD AL-ASAIDI, a mawla of the Banu Diudhayma of the Asad. Some say Bhadla was his mother's name and his father's name 'Abd Allāh, though he was known Abu 'l-'Adnādīd. He is said to have been a dealer in wheat (qanâdī) who succeeded as-Sulamī as head of the Portuguese School of Qur'an Readers, where his preeminence in Qur'anic studies secured him a place as one of the Seven Readers whose systems became canonical. Indeed
through his pupil Ḥāfs [q.v.], his system of pointing and vowelling the Kur'ānic text has become the testus receptus in Islam. He is classed as a Follower and had a small part in transmitting hadīth. His fame, however, was as a kāri' and a teacher of kīla'tī, in which he had the reputation of being a būdīgī. In this branch of learning he is said to have been the pupil of Abū 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Sulamī (d. 74/693-4), Zīr b. Ḥubaysh (d. 82/701-2) and Abū 'Amr Sa'd b. ʿIyās al-Shaybānī (d. 96/714-5). Through one or other of whom his readings may be traced back to all the most famous names in Kur'ānic learning among the Companions. He had a large number of pupils who transmitted his system, but his two rāwās in the canonical list are Abū Bakr b. ʿAyyāsh (d. 194) and Ḥāfs b. Sulaymān (d. 190). He died late in 127 or early in 128/745.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Khallīkān, i, 304, 305 (no. 314); Ibn Ḥuṣayn, Maʿārif, 263; Ibn al-Nadim, Fihrist, 29; Ibn ʿImād, Shaghārīdī, i, 175; Ibn al-Dīzārī, Chāya, no. 1496; idem, Nahīr, i, 156; al-Dānī, Taṣayr, 6; Ibn Ḥadājr, Taḥdīth al-Tahdīth, v, 38-40; al-Dhahabī, Misān al-ʿIstādī, ii, 5 no. 26. (A. Jeffery)

ʿĀSIM, ʿAHMAD, imperial historiographer of the Ottoman empire, born in ʿAynātāb (the modern Gazarante) in south-eastern Anatolia about the year 1755. He was the son of Seyyid Mehmēd, a clerk of the court, who became famous as a poet under the name of Djiynānī. His family was one of the old-established ones in the place. In his early youth he acquired an equally fluent knowledge of Arabic and Persian, and this helped him in later years to achieve his fame as a translator (muji̇rijīm) of well-known dictionaries. To begin with, Seyyid Ahmed was the secretary of the law-court of his home town, and later in nearby Kila. In 1790 he went to Istanbul, where he gained the sultan's favour with a translation of the Burdānī Kūdī which was dedicated to Selmī III. He subsequently became a professor. In 1802 he was sent to the Hijāz, and on his return he brought his whole family from ʿAynātāb to Istanbul. In 1807 he became imperial historiographer (makānī-nūkālī) as such he compiled a history of the Ottoman empire (later printed in two volumes) from the peace treaty of Sistova (4 August 1791) to the accession of Maḥmūd II (28 July 1808). Later, he translated the Kāmās al-Muḥkīt (which was reprinted several times) into Turkish. In later years he returned to his calling as a teacher, then as judge (Mulla of Selānī, Feb. 1814), and died on 28 Sept. 1819 in Skutarī, where he owned a house near the well of Neh (Nāb hành). He lies buried in the Karadāj Ahmed cemetery, and the inscription on his tomb is in ʿOthmānī Muʾīlīlīrī i, 375.

In his capacity as imperial historiographer, he surpasses his predecessors in a presentation which is at the same time a fluent day-to-day chronicle, yet also critical in its treatment of events. Finally, he translated the Cairo chronicle of the French occupation, by al-Dīzarī—whose became known in Europe too (French ed. by A. Cardin, Paris 1838)—from Arabic into his mother-tongue. This version is preserved in manuscript form in Paris (Bibli. Nationale s.t. 1283; cf. E. Blochet, Catal., ii, 221) and in Cairo. It was never printed because the Cairo chronicle was soon afterwards translated again by the court-physician Muṣṭafā Bahlūl Efendi, and then printed (as Taʾrīḥ-i Misr, 260 Ss. 12°, Istanbul 1282) after having previously appeared as a feuilleton in Dīrke-i hāwādīlī (cf. JAS, 1869, i, 477 f.).

**Bibliography** Sīdat-i ʿOthmānī, iii, 283; A. D. Mordtmann, in Augsburger Allg. Zeitung of 29 June 1875, supplement no. 180; Fafin, Lebārā, 226: GOW, 193 f. with further bibliographical details; ʿOthmānī Muʾīlīlīrī, i, 375 f.; Türk Mızdrakhārī (Istanbul, n.d., ca. 1946) 47 f. (with a picture which pretends to be a portrait).

(Fr. Babinger)

ʿASIM EFENDI ISMĀʿĪL [see CEBELI-ZADE].

ʿASIR, the taḥkūlis of Miẓrā Djalāl al-Dīn Miḥmān b. Miẓrā Muʿīmin, Persian poet and pupil of Faḍlū Harawī, born at Isfahan; probable date of death 1049/1639-40, though some sources give later dates. Unlike many of his contemporaries, he did not migrate to the Mughal court, but became a boon companion and close relative (according to one account the son-in-law) of Shah ʿAbbās I. He composed most of his poetry under the influence of alcohol, from an excess of which he died. His diwan, comprising badīdas, mathnawīs, qasidas, and ghazals, was lithographed at Lucknow in 1880.

**Bibliography:** The MSS. Catalogues of Rieu (British Museum), ii, 681, and Pertsch (Berlin), no. 938. Kiṣās al-Khādījī, 1636; Etché, in Gr. I. Ph., ii, 311. (R. M. Savory)

ʿASIR, a region in Western Arabia named after a confederation of tribes in al-Ṣarāt [q.v.]. The center of a separate region intervening between al-Hijāz and the Yaman developed in the 19th century and is now sanctioned by official Saudi Arabian practice, which uses the name ʿAsīr for the highlands southwards from al-Nimās to Nadārān, and Tiḥmat ʿAsīr for the lowlands bordering the Red Sea between al-Kaḥmā and the Yaman frontier.

From al-Taʾif to the Yaman there is no gap in the bold range of al-Ṣarāt. The core is crystalline rock, but in certain fault zones volcanic activity has produced lava fields, one of which, reaching the Red Sea just south of Hāl, used to form the natural boundary between al-Hijāz and the Yaman. The main drainage divide, some 50 to 75 m. (80 to 120 km.) inland, rises abruptly to heights of over 6000 ft. (2,000 m.), with peaks over 9000 ft. (3,000 m.). Streams fed by rain from the fringe of the monsoons have carved great gorges on the steep eastern flanks. Drainage on the gentler eastern slope follows fracture zones northwards, creating the major wadi systems of Bīsha and Taḥlibh, which eventually turn eastwards to empty their flood waters into Wādī al-Dawāsīr. Along these wadi systems Philby traces the Road of the Elephant (Darb al-Fīl).

The highland capital is Abhā (q.v.), the centre of the confederation of ʿAsīr, which consists of Banū Muḥayyad, Banū Malīk, ʿAlkam, and Rabīʿa wa-Ruwayda. Other important tribes are Rīdāl Alma b. Muḥayyad, the western slopes, Rīdāl al-Hijāz and Shahrān north of Abhā, and elements of Khāṭān, including ʿAbīda, from Abhā south to Zahrān.

Along the reef-lined coast of Tiḥmat ʿAsir are the little ports of al-Kahma, al-Shukayk, and Ṭayyār (Baysh), Šabya, and Abu ʿArlsh. Among the larger wads debouching on the plain of Tiḥmat ʿAsir are those of ʿĪtawd, Baygh, and Dāmad.

Terracing is widely practiced in the highlands, where rainfall of c. 12 ins. (30 cm.) a year provides for the cultivation of grains and fruits. Coffee is grown near the Yaman border, and kātī on the slopes of Dībāl Fayfa. Grains and vegetables are raised.
in Tihama, and some indigo around Sabya and Abu 'Arish. The dawm palm is cultivated for its fruit and leaves which are woven into baskets and mats, but almost all dates come from Bishá or by sea.

The ways of the mountainiers tend towards those of Najd, while the ways of the lowlanders indicate the closeness of their contact with Africa. Dwellings vary from mud-brick buildings with projecting stone tiles in the mountains to thatch huts on the coast. There are virtually no tent-dwellers in the mountains or on the coast plain, the nomads using a mat shelter. The isolation of mountain towns and ranges has contributed to the complexity and fragmentation of the tribal system. The Arabic speech of some of the tribes is held to be remarkable for its purity and freedom from outside influence, but kashkasha and other dialectal deviations are not uncommon.

The name 'Asfr was originally borne by several Kaššaníte tribes centred on Abáh who had attached themselves to the ʿAdnániyyé of 'Anz b. Wáhíl. Among the early divisions of 'Anz were Rabíb, Rufúyáda, and Málík. Other old tribes in the region were Kháth'am (including Sháhrún and Aklub) and al-ʿAzzd (including al-Ḥiḍr, Alímá, and Aṣzd Šanát, among whose branches were Gáhmíd and Záhrán). Sections of Kínána were established along the coast.

In the time of the Ziyyádíds, the power of the Yaman was already descending, and the nomads of the Tihama were often divided. The ʿĀʾid b. ʿAbd al-Razzáq, his son Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Razzáq, also called 'Abd al-Razzáq b. ʿAbd al-Razzáq the Šaráfí, died 959/1553, was the last of the Yaman to hold power there. His death in 959/1553 was the last of the Khayratíds, out of Abu 'Arish in 959/1553. The expanding power of Al ʿĀʾid in Tihama provoked Ottoman intervention, facilitated by the opening of the Suez Canal. In 1285/1863 Muhammad Radíf Páshá defeated Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Razzáq at Rayda and put him to death. 'Asfr, established as a mutásarriḍíyya attached to the wíldýey of the Yaman, remained under Turkish rule for more than forty years, but this rule often extended no farther than the gates of the garrison town of Abáh.

Early in the 9th century the place of the Sulaymáníds was taken by Sayyíd Muhammad b. All al-Idrísl. He was the great-grandson of Ahmad b. Idrísl, the founder of the Aḥmádiyyá (Idríslíyyá) ĥarís who had migrated from Morocco to Sabyá, which was to become the Idríslí capital. Relying on his great prestige as a man of religion, al-Idríslí brought the lowlands under his sway, negotiated with the Italians on the other side of the Red Sea, and laid siege to the Turks in Abáh. The Sharíf of Mecca, al-Ḥusayn b. 'Ali, led an expedition southwards to relieve the beleaguered garrison of Sulaymán Šhaḥí Kamáll Páshá in 1265/1849.

During the First World War, al-Idríslí was the first independent prince in Arabia to join the British against the Turks by virtue of a treaty signed in 1235/1915. After the defeat of the Turks the British awarded the port of al-Hudaydá to him rather than Imam Yábyá of the Yaman. An attempt to annex the highlands having failed, al-Idríslí solicited the mediation of 'Abd al-ʿAzží Al Saʿúd, but this was rejected by al-Ḥasan b. Muhammad Al ʿĀʾid, the lord of Abáh since the evacuation of the Turks in 1335/1918. An expedition sent by 'Abd al-ʿAzží occupied Abáh in 1338/1920. Al ʿĀʾid later revolted and continued the struggle briefly, but in 1342/1923 the resistance of the dynasty ebbed away and the highlands were incorporated in the Saudi state. Muhammad al-Idríslí concluded a treaty with Ibn Saʿúd in 1339/1920, but the dissensions within the Idríslí realm subsequent to his death resulted in the establishment of a Saudi protectorate. The Imam of the Yaman maintained a claim to the Idríslí territories until the Treaty of Al-Ṭifí, finally determined their appurtenance to Saudi Arabia in 1353/1934.

Bibliography: Fuʿad Hamzà, Fi Bîlād 'Asfr, Cairo 1951; Hamdání; Ibn Bîshr, 'Unwān al-
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ASIR — ASKALAN


(R. Headley, W. Mulligan, G. René)

ASIRGARH, a fortress situated 21° 28' N., 76° 18' E in the Burhanpur tahsil of the Nipar district of Madhya Pradesh, about 2,200 feet above sea level and 850 feet high from its base, dominating the only route through the Satpura range between the Narbada and the Tapti from north west India to the Dekkan.

Probably of great antiquity (see H. Couzens, Lists of Arabiarian Remains in the Central Provinces and Berar, Arch. Surv. India, 1897, P. 39; A. Cuming, Report on a Tour in the Central Provinces, Calcutta 1879, 210-1, Gazetteer, (Khándesh) Bombay 1886, 557-58), Asirgarh was certainly a stronghold of the Tak branch of the Couhan Radjputs from the 13rd/9th century. It was stormed by Ala 'al-Din Khalid, then muqaddas of Karra, in the winter of 695/1295-6 in the way back from his Dekkan raid (see Tod, Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, ed. C. Craddock, 1920, iii, 1463 and 1467 where the date Samvat 1351 is given), but not permanently occupied by Muslim forces until about 802/1400 when it was seized by Malik Nasir Khán Fârakh to become the supposedly impregnable stronghold of the Fârûk Shahs, sultans of Khândesh. (See Fihriga, text, ed. Briggs, ii, 544. A. in-1 AKB, text, ed. Blochmann, i, 475 and Bombay Gazetteer, loc. cit.).

Asirgarh was captured by Akbar in 1009/1600-1, becoming the headquarters of the marubân of the frontier shîba of Dândih. (On Akbar's conquest see Vincent Smith, Akbar the Great Mogul, Sec. ed. 1902, 272-286).

In 1032/1623 Shâh Dîjalân, then in rebellion against Dîlahângr, took refuge at Asirgarh and later c. 1061/1650-1 built a mosque there. In 1132/1720 it passed into the hands of Niâm al-Mulik, jâbadar of Malâw, and was lost entirely to the Mughals in 1175/1760 when the Maharata Badrâna Pâshâ occupied it. Asirgarh was first captured by the British in 1218/1803 and finally occupied by them in 1234/1819.

Bibliography: see text; also Gazetteer of the Central Provinces, ed. C. Grant, Nagpur 1870, Imperial Gazetteer, vi, Oxford, 1908, and Arch. Surv. India Report, 1922-23. (P. Hardy)

ASITÂNA [see ISTANBUL].

AŠIVA. This is the name given by the commentators to Pharaoh's wife, who is twice (xxviii, 9 and lxvi, 21) mentioned in the Qur'an. She plays the same part as Pharaoh's daughter in the Bible, so that in the second passage these words are put into her mouth: "My Lord, build me a house with thee in Paradise, and deliver me from Pharaoh and his doings and deliver me from the wicked!"

In connexion with this passage it is related that Ašiva endured many cruelties at the hands of Pharaoh because of her faith (she was an Israelite); and finally he even caused her to be cast down upon a rock; at her prayer God took her soul to himself, so that only the body fell on the stone.—It is also related that Pharaoh scourged her to death, but on Moses' praying to God she did not feel any pain. J. Horovitz explains the name as a corruption of Ašena, the name of Joseph's wife in Gen. xii, 45.

Bibliography: The Kur'an commentaries on xxviii, 9 and lxvi, 21 esp. Tâbarî, Tafsîr, Cairo 1321, xx, 19-21, xxviii, 98; idem, Ta'rikh, i, 444 f., 448-50; Ibn al-Ashârî, i, 119, 121 f., 130; Ta'rikh, Kisas al-Anbiyâ, Cairo 1292, 146-50, 164; Risâlî (Eisenberg), 199 ff.; G. Well, Bildliche Legenden der Muselmänner, 1845, 138-41; M. Grünbaum, Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Siegelkunde, 1955, 155 f., 159 f.; J. Horovitz, Koranische Untersuchungen, 1926, 86; H. Speyer, Die Biblischen Erzählungen im Koran, 281 f.

(A. J. WENSCING)

AŠKALAN, a town on the coast of southern Palestine, one (Hebrew: Aškelon) of the five Philistine towns known to us from the Old Testament; in the Roman period, as oppidum Ascalon liberum, it was (according to Schürer, Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu, ii, 65-7) "a flourishing Hellenistic town famous for its cults and festal games" (Dercetis-Aphrodite-shrine); in the Christian period a bishop's see (tomb of the tres fratries martyres Aegyptiæ).

Aškalân was one of the last towns of Palestine to fall into the hands of the Muslims. It was taken sülüs by Mu'âwiya shortly after the capture of Kaysariyya in 19/640, but may have been briefly occupied by 'Amr b. al-'Azî before that. It was reoccupied for a short time by the Byzantines during the time of Ibn al-Zubayr and was subsequently restored and refortified by 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwân (Balâghuri, Fâribî, 143-4). According to an inscription from a building which was discovered by Clermont-Ganneau, the Caliph al-Mahdi in 155/772 caused a mosque and minaret to be erected there (Rcea, i, 32-3). After varied fortunes the town passed into the hands of the Fatimids, under whose rule, according to Muhaddasi and Nâsir-i Khusrav, it attained some prosperity. It housed a mint, and served at times as a secondary naval base. Together with some other coastal towns, it was retained by the Fatimids, even after the loss of the rest of Syria and Palestine to the Saljûqs, though sometimes this retention amounted to no more than a nominal suzerainty over the local rulers. In 492/1099 the Egyptian army retreating from Jerusalem entered the town, and for a while it seemed that Aškalân itself was about to pass under Frankish rule. It was however saved by the internal dissensions of the Crusaders, and was retained by the Egyptians. For the next century and a half it was a frontier city and a key military objective in the struggle between the Crusaders and the Muslim rulers of Egypt. For the first 53 years after the coming of the Crusaders, it
was held by the Egyptians, and used by them as a bridgehead and as a base for raids into Frankish territory. With its population swollen by refugees from the Frankish occupied areas, and its garrison reinforced from Egypt, it became a major military centre. Despite the partial resumption of trade with Jerusalem, life in this outpost was difficult, and the Egyptians found it necessary to send new supplies and relief troops several times a year (William of Tyre, XVII, 22; Ibn Muyassar, *Annals*, 92). According to William of Tyre, the whole civil population, including children, was on the army payroll. After the fall of Tyre to the Crusaders in 1134, the position of 'Askalān was much weakened. To neutralise the threat which it offered to Jerusalem, the Crusaders surrounded it with a ring of fortresses, and in 548/1153, after a siege of seven months, Baldwin III got possession of the town by a combined land and sea attack. It now became the base for Frankish military and political adventure in Egypt. After the battle of Hīṭṭa it had, like most of the Crusader strongholds in Palestine, to surrender to Salāḥ al-Dīn (583/1187).

In 587/1191, after the defeat at Arsur, the latter found himself unable to hold 'Askalān against Richard of England and therefore destroyed the town. The Muslim population migrated to Syria and Egypt, the Christians and Jews moved to Jerusalem. A vivid description of the destruction of the town and the evacuation of its inhabitants is given in the anonymous Mamluk chronicle published by K. V. Zetterstéen (Beiträge, 233-5). Richard reached 'Askalān in Dhūl-Hijādā 587/January 1192 and rebuilt the fortress, but according to the peace terms of August-September of the same year, it had again to be demolished. The rivalries between al-Salih Ayūb of Egypt and al-Salih Ismāʿil of Damascus once more let it slip into the hands of the Franks. It was garrisoned and fortified by the Hospitallers, who successfully defended it against an Egyptian attack in 642/1244. After the decisive battle of Ghazza (17 Oct. 1244), 'Askalān could, however, no longer expect help, and it fell in 645/1247 to Fāḫīr al-Dīn Yūsuf b. al-Shaykh. In order to make it impossible for the Franks to effect a landing, the Mamluk Sultan Baybars [sce] demolished a number of places on the Palestine coast, and in 668/1270 levelled the last vestiges of 'Askalān, filling the harbour with trees and rubble (Makrīzī, Sulāḥ, i, 590). The town, which had never recovered from its demolition by Saladin, remained desolate until modern times. Abu 'l-Fidāʾ (239), Ibn Baṭīṭa (i, 126), Muqīlī al-Dīn (432), Piri Reis (*èsbiyye* 724, English trans. by U. Heyd, *A Turkish Description of the Coast of Palestine*, Israel Exploration Journal, vi, 1956, 205-7) and Volney (*Syrie*, ch. 10) all describe it as ruined.

In antiquity and the Middle Ages the environs of the town were famous for their wine, sycamores and henna (*Kypros*). It has given its name to a species of onion (*shallot = allium ascalonicum*). Mediaeval authors, using an expression attributed to the Prophet, often call 'Askalān the "Bride of Syria, Sponsa Syriae," "Aris al-Shām".

In the vie of the Shiʿite supremacy of the Fātimids falls the construction by al-Afaq b. Badr al-Djamāl (491/1098) of the Masjīd for the reception of the head of the Prophet's grandson, Husayn. This highly venerated relic was in 548/1153-54 saved from the Franks and carried off to Cairo (cf. Makrīzī, *Akhtaf*, i, 427; Mehren, *Cahiers et Kultur*, Copenhagen 1970, i, §§22-24; Ibn Baṭīṭa, *esbiyye*, 757; Ibn Taymiyya (ed. Schreiner, *ZDMG*, 53, 81-2) dismisses the whole story as a fable). Besides Husayn's chapel, later Muslim pilgrims visited, in particular, Abraham's Well.


(R. Hartmann-[B. Lewis])

**AL-'ASKALĀN** [see IBN HAḌĀR].

**AL-'ASKAR** [see DIJAYŠA].

**AL-'ASKAR** [see SĀMĀRĀ].

'ASKAR MUKRAM ("Mukram's Camp"), formerly a town built on the site of a camp pitched by an Arab leader named Mukram whom al-Ḥājīdīdāḥ had sent to Khurāsān to suppress a revolt near al-Ahwāz. This camp or cantonment adjoined the ruins of Rustam Kāwād (corrupted by the Arabs into Rustākūbād), a Sāsānian town which the Muslim Arabs had destroyed. 'Askar Mukram was situated on both sides of the Māsrūkān canal (the modern Ab-i Gargar) just above the point where it now flows into the Shatayt (= Shutayt, "the small river"), the main arm of the Kārūn (at the time of which we write, the Māsrūkān canal joined the Shatayt much further to the south, near al-Ahwāz); furthermore, the Dīzūf Rūl (modern Ab-i Diz) flowed into the Shatayt just west of the town. Owing to its favourable situation and its relatively good climate (see Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfi, *Nashāḥ, 112*), 'Askar Mukram developed into a flourishing town and became the chief place on the Māsrūkān canal; two bridges of boats linked the two parts of the town. It was a mint-town during the 4th/10th century, under the Bāyid ruler Muʿīz al-Dawla; cf. *ZDMG*, xi, 452. The ruins now known as the Band-i Kūr ("Bitumen Dam") are those of 'Askar Mukram; the remains of that town and of earlier cities cover an area of nearly 9 sq. m. (see Layard, *A Description of the Province of Khuzistan*, in JR, Geog. S xvii, 724); Sponsa Syriae, 126-9). The inhabitants of Shuštār (Arab. Tustar) wrongly identify with 'Askar Mukram some ruins near their city, which they therefore call Lashkar (Persian = Arab, al-Lāshkar); according to Hamd Allah Mustāwfl, *asfakān, 711*. (M. STRECK-[L. LOCKHART])
ASKARI — AL-ASKARI

ASKARI; from askar, soldier; in Ottoman technical usage a member of the ruling military caste, as distinct from the reâyä—the subject population of peasants and townspeople (reâyä sometimes means the subjects generally, sometimes only the peasants). The term askari denoted caste rather than function; it included retired or unemployed askaris, the wives and children of askaris, manumitted slaves of the Sultan and of the askaris, and also the families of the holders of religious public offices in attendance (mustazemah) on the Sultan.

The Ottoman askari class comprised both the slave military establishment (see KUL) and the feudal levies (see SIPAHI). The latter seem to have originated as offices in attendance on the Sultan.

C of peasants and townspeople dyd sometimes (re'dyd), of the peasant stock (apart of course from the deuwzime of boys) to askari positions; Koçu Bey and later memorialists aduce the violation of this rule as one of the causes of Ottoman decline. An askari could, by decree, be demoted to the reâyä class or a ra'iyyä promoted as a reward for exceptional services to be an askari. Both were infrequent in the early period. By the early sixteenth century, however, Sultan Suleyman found it necessary to issue a decree confirming sipahi of peasant descent in their fiefs, and protecting them from dispossession on these grounds. In the period of decline the dilution of the military caste by the intrusion of peasants and townspeople becomes a common complaint. By the 18th century the extension of the fiefs to the peasantry and of Janissary affiliation to the merchants and artisans had distributed the status of askari so widely as to deprive it of any real meaning.


AL-ASKARI. Two Arabic philologists of the 4th/10th century, both bearing the same name al-Hasan b. 'Abd Allah, but of a different kunya, are known by this name, a relative noun derived from 'Askar Mukram in Khuzistân.

(i) Abu Ahmad al-Hasan b. Abd Allah b. Sa'id was born in 'Askar Mukram, on 16 Shawwâl 293/ 11 August 906 and died there on 7 Dhû 'l-Hijjah 382/2 Febr. 993. The date 382/940 is less probable. He began his studies under his father and the traditionist 'Abdân, d. 306/919, and continued them at Baghdad, Başra, and Iṣbahân under Ibn Durayd, d. 321/933, and the traditionists al-Baghwâl, d. 317/929, and Ibn Abd Dâwûd al-Sidjistânî, d. 316/929. He also met al-Ṣâli and other men of letters. Then he returned to 'Askar Mukram. He declined an invitation of the vizier al-Ṣâhib Ibn 'Abbâd, but paid him a visit when the latter came to 'Askar Mukram. He went several times to Iṣbahân where his brother, the traditionist Abu ʿAll Muhammad had settled, e.g. in 340/950 and again in 354/965. He was a scholar of vast erudition and wrote a number of books (see Brockelmann S I, 193) but he was little known outside of Khuzistân; Yâkût had great difficulties in obtaining information about his chief work, the Kitâb al-Taṣhîf, contains useful information about rare and difficult words and proper names occurring in traditions and poems and misunderstood by their transmitters. It was utilised by Yâkût (IV, 384) and by 'Abd al-Kâdir al-Baghdâtî (see ʿIlâd al-Khânâna, 31 f.). Much of his learning has been preserved through the writings of his pupil Abû Hîlal al-'Askarî.

Bibliography: Abu Nuṣaym, Geschichte Iṣbahânîs, i, 272, ii, 291; Samânî, Ansâb fol. 390 b; Yâkût, Irshâd, iii, 126-135; Ibn Khallikan, Cairo 1299, i, 234 f.

(ii) Abu Hîlal al-Hasan b. 'Abd Allah b. Saïl. Of his life very little is known. He was a pupil (but not a sister's son, for he never calls him khâtîl) of the aforesaid Abu Ahmad al-Askarî and owed to him the bulk of his learning, as is proved by the numerous references in his writings. He wrote amongst other works (see Brockelmann, i, 126 and S I, 193 f.) for the benefit of budding writers (1) Kitâb al-Sinâ'ât al-Khitâb wa l-Siyâr (Istanbul 1350, Cairo 1952; cf. P. Schwarz, in MSOS ix, 206-230), a systematic hand-book of rhetoric. (2) Dîwân al-Maṣâni (Cairo 1352), an anthology of the most elegant and original expressions of ideas met with in poetry and prose. (3) Kitâb al-Furûh al-Lughawiyya (Cairo 1353) dealing with synonymous words. (4) al-Mo'tâ'dîm fi Bâkîyyat al-Akhaya (Cairo 1353; abridged ed. by O. Rescher, in MSOS, xviii, 103-130), a list of words meaning "remainder". (5) Dîmârkarâh al-Ānâfî (Bombay 1306-7 and on the margin of al-Maydânî, Cairo 1310), a collection of proverbs. Not yet published is his taṣfîr whose title Maḥâsin al-Maṣâni suggests that he dealt mainly with the stylistic beauties of the Kurâ. The latest known date of his life is the year 395/1005 in which he finished dictating his Kitâb al-Amâlî on the so-called inventors of arts etc. (Yâkût, Irshâd, iii, 130). He is said to have died after 400/1301.

Bibliography: Yâkût, Irshâd, iii, 135-9; Suârî, Bugha, 221; 'Abd al-Kâdir, Khânâna al-Adab, i, 112; Zaki Mubarak, La prose arabe au IVe siècle; R. Sellheim, Die klassisch-arabischen Sprichwörtersammlungen, The Hague 1954, 138-42. (J. W. Fück)
AL-'ASKARI, Abu 'l-Hasan Ali b. Muhammad, the tenth Imam of the Twelver Shia. He is commonly known as al-Nakhd, the son of al-Hadi. He was the son of the ninth Imam Muhammad b. 'Ali al-Ridha [q.v.], and was born in Medina. Most Shi'i authorities give the date of his birth as Rajab 214/Sept. 829, though others say that he was born in Dhu 'l-Hijja 212 or 213/Febr.-March 828 or 829. His mother, according to some sources, was a daughter of the Caliph al-Ma'mun, according to others she was a Maghribi woman named Hamama or A'yan, who was sent to Medina to escort him to Samarra. He was the son of the third Imam Muhammad b. al-Zubayr [q.v.].

As the tenth Imam of the Twelver Shia, he is commonly known as al-Nakhd and al-Hasan. He was the son of the ninth Imam Muhammad b. al-Zubayr [q.v.].

AL-'ASKARI, Abu 'l-Hasan Ali b. Muhammad, the tenth Imam of the Twelver Shia. He is commonly known as al-Nakhd, the son of al-Hadi. He was the son of the ninth Imam Muhammad b. 'Ali al-Ridha [q.v.], and was born in Medina. Most Shi'i authorities give the date of his birth as Rajab 214/Sept. 829, though others say that he was born in Dhu 'l-Hijja 212 or 213/Febr.-March 828 or 829. His mother, according to some sources, was a daughter of the Caliph al-Ma'mun, according to others she was a Maghribi woman named Hamama or A'yan, who was sent to Medina to escort him to Samarra. He was the son of the third Imam Muhammad b. al-Zubayr [q.v.].

AL-'ASKARI, Abu 'l-Hasan Ali b. Muhammad, the tenth Imam of the Twelver Shia. He is commonly known as al-Nakhd, the son of al-Hadi. He was the son of the ninth Imam Muhammad b. 'Ali al-Ridha [q.v.], and was born in Medina. Most Shi'i authorities give the date of his birth as Rajab 214/Sept. 829, though others say that he was born in Dhu 'l-Hijja 212 or 213/Febr.-March 828 or 829. His mother, according to some sources, was a daughter of the Caliph al-Ma'mun, according to others she was a Maghribi woman named Hamama or A'yan, who was sent to Medina to escort him to Samarra. He was the son of the third Imam Muhammad b. al-Zubayr [q.v.].
from the Prophet denouncing the “two liars” (al-Jadhdhdbdni) who should issue from Thaqif (i.e. al-Mughira b. Shu'ba and al-Hajidüdä b. Yüsuf). She died in Mecca shortly afterwards, in 73/693.


(H. A. R. Gibb)

AL-ÄSMÄ\(^2\) AL-HUSNÄ—“The most Beautiful Names”, these being the divine Names. “To God belong the most Beautiful Names—pray to Him, using (these Names)”, Kur'an, vii, 179. Cf. xvii, no; xx, 8; lix, 24 etc. Pious Muslims have always revered the mystery of the Name, which at one and the same time both designates and veils the Named (cf. 'Abdü al-ism).

The Theological question. A chapter of “Muslim theology” (sim al-tawfrid) is devoted to the divine Names. The reply of the narrators of Tradition, reiterated by the strict Ash'arites, is: the divine Names can only be given to God by taukif, i.e. by preconceived “determination”; by which we understand: as God Himself has “determined” it in the Kur'än and secondarily in the Sunna. The employment of the latter in this connection must be limited to “authentic” (sa'ih) and “good” (hasan) hadith. Some people admit a possible determination derived through 'asmiya'. According to the Mu'tazilites and the Karramites: when 'akl (Reason) proves that an attribute (either of existence, or negative or of action) is suitable to God, it is permissible to employ the corresponding Name, whether or not it is mentioned by the texts. This is a case of attribution of the Name by human reason. Al-Ghazzâlî admits this solution for those attributes (psi'd) which, he says, designate a significant addition to the essence; he does not admit it for the employment of the Name designating the divine essence itself. "Middle" solution of the Ash'arite al-Bâkîllâni, followed by many later Ash'arites: if the text or the tradition gives an attribute to God or speaks to us of an act of God (but in these cases only), “according to the rules of the language”, one may designate Him by the corresponding Name, even though the texts do not “determine” it. And one should in particular exclude non-scriptural names, which would evoke a notion incompatible with the absolute divine perfection. (God should not be called 'ârsî, as ma'rî'ah “presupposes that some inattention has been overcome”; likewise He should not be called sa'ih, 'âthî, etc.). According to this thesis, which has become current, the Names must, therefore, either be scriptural or at least have a scriptural derivation. Two related problems: a) the Names are eternal, Ash'arite thesis, in opposition to the Mu'tazilite thesis, which holds them to be contingent; b) Hanafite-Mâturidite line: they are equal in importance and excellence (cf. Fihk Akbar, ii, 26): Ash'arite line: a hierarchy exists among them with the Name Allâh taking precedence (or, as the Şafis are prone to say, with some other Name known to the initiated, or even the ineffable Name, only attained through initiate experience, taking precedence). The 99 Names. A hadith, transmitted by Abû Hurarya, states: “To God belong 99 Names, a hundred less one; for He, the Odd Number (= the Unique) likes (to be designated by) these enumerated Names one by one; whoever knows the 99 Names, will enter paradise”. The meditated recitation of these Names became one of the most diligent devotions in Islâm. The pious Muslim repeats them and meditates on them, usually with the help of the 99 beads of the subha ("rosary") (q.v.), except for the Wahhâbîs, who object to this custom as being a reprehensible bâtî' ("innovation"). It appears that a Syriac (Christian) custom already made use of the subha to count off an enumeration of divine Names, which was much shorter than the Muslim enumeration.

In fact, on the one hand, the traditional 99 “most Beautiful Names” do not exhaust the list of all the Kur'ânic Names; on the other hand, some of them do not occur ad litteram in the Kur'ân. As a result, the list was not always absolutely fixed and was liable to contain variants. It does not suffice, therefore, to settle the entire question of the divine Names. But the place held by this recitation in Muslim piety gives it an outstanding importance. It expresses clearly enough the pious Muslim’s faith in God, and what the supreme Name Allâh, which, in itself, recapitulates all the others, means for him. We shall reproduce the most usually accepted list, in accordance with the hadith, with a translation and a brief commentary. As space does not permit us to trace its usage historically, we shall take it in its finished form, as given by most of the tafsir to Kur'ân, xvii, 110. Fairly frequently the Name Allâh is as though set apart, the hundredth Name if one so desires (thus the tafsir of the Djallâyn): But it is also at times considered as the first of the enumeration; in which case the 67th Name al-wâhiḍ is suppressed and joined to the 68th al-akîd. Main references: al-Maḥad al-Asmd of Ghazzâlî (Cairo ed. n.d.), especially 23-72; Musannaf of ʿAḍud al-Dîn al-Jâfrî, commentary by al-Djurdjulâni (Sharh al-Mawâbiḥ) Cairo ed. 1325/1907 vol. 8 211-17 who himself refers to al-Ghazzâlî and to Sayf al-Dîn al-Amidi.

The usual order may be established as follows: the first 13 Names (or Names 2 to 14 when the list starts with Allâh) refer to the Kur'ânic enumeration of verses lix, 22-24. The subsequent order seems to be mainly mnemotechnic, governed by assonances, associations of verbal forms, doublets having both a correlative and paradoxical sense, etc. Connection with the attributes (psi'd), where indicated by us, is that put forward by al-Ghazzâlî or al-Djurdjulâni. Also to be noted: the Arabic root of several of these Names expresses different, sometimes opposite meanings, which are, therefore, present together in the mind of the Muslim reciting and meditating on the subha. It is therefore impossible at times to translate a Name into a European language by one single word or at least have a scriptural derivation.

List of the “99 most Beautiful Names”: 1) Allâh, name belonging to God, “designates God Himself and may not be applied to any other thing”; 2) and 3) al-rahmân al-rahîm, the Benefactor (or the Merciful), the Compassionate: depend on the attribute of will, both connoting the same sense; however according to al-Ghazzâlî, rahmân, unlike rahîm, may only be applied to God (reminder of Rahmân, divine proper Name); 4) al-malîk, the King indicates independence (negative attribute) towards all things, the dependence of everything as regards God (active attribute), and the perfection of the divine power (attribute of power); 5) al-kuddûs, the
Holy, in the sense of Separated (negative attribute), indicates: a) the absence of all blemish; b) giver of peace and salvation at the beginning of the creation and at the time of the resurrection (active attribute); c) will pronounce the benediction of peace over his peace and salvation at the beginning of the creation (attribute of speech); 7) al-mi4?min, al-saldm, Holy, in the sense of Separated (negative attribute), c) will pronounce the benediction of peace over his peace and salvation at the beginning of the creation (attribute of speech); b) giver of protection (amdn); 8) al-muhaymin the Vigilant: a) with regard to this Name, the doctors stress the absolute perfection of the Name, beyond the limits of human understanding, and never dominated (negative attribute); b) - according to Ghazali: is beyond the limits of human understanding, nothing bad can come from Him (negative attribute); 31) al-latīf, the Benevolent, who creates in His servants a grace of benevolence (luft), to come to their help (attribute of action); 32) al-ghabbīr, a) the Sagacious, very close to 'ulim, in the sense of knowing the intimate secrets of creatures (attribute of knowledge); b) who chooses, who decides freely (attribute of speech); 33) al-raft, endowed with gentleness, who is slow to punish (negative attribute); 34) al-‘asīm, the Inaccessible (cf. the sense given with regard to al-‘ajabbār); according to Ghazalli: is beyond the limits of human understanding, just as the earth and sky cannot be taken in at a single glance; 35) al-ghaffār, the Very Indulgent, who pardons; a) according to al-Iṣār: al-Diurđi: identical in meaning to al-ghaffār, just as al-rahmmān and al-rāhim are identical in meaning; b) according to Ghazalli: al-ghaffār stresses that God pardons even repeated sins, whereas al-ghaffār conveys in an absolute manner and without precision the infinite pardon of God; 36) al-ghabār, the “Very Grateful”, in a metaphorical sense, coming from ghfr (gratefulness), i.e. a) who gives much as reward for little (attribute of action), b) and proclaims the eulogy of whomsoever obyes him (attribute of speech); 37) al-‘ālī, the High; for al-‘īdā: synonym of al-mu‘akkabār; for al-Ghazalli: God, primary Cause, is on the highest step of the scale of beings; 38) al-‘a‘lī, the Great; for al-‘īdā: synonym of al-mu‘akkabār and of al-‘a‘lī; for al-Ghazalli: synonym of al-‘a‘lī, stresses the absolute perfection of the being of God, whose eternal existence is the source of the being of all creatures; 39) al-hafīs, the vigilant Guardian: sense close to ‘ulim according to al-Iṣār, for vigilance (hafs) is the opposite of negligence and forgetfulness, and therefore has its origin in ‘ulim; a) God is Vigilant, continually
in action, by this action watching over the whole universe, without having to give His attention to things one after the other (negative attribute); b) He assures the permanence of created forms by vigilance which resists depredations (attribute of action); 40) al-mukhl (four shades of meaning), a) the Nourisher, source of strength, for He creates nourishment (physical and spiritual): synonym of al-rasâl (al-Ghazzali), b) the Determiner, who decrees and fixes destiny, attribute of power (Hudra); c) the Witness (ghâshid), who knows the Mystery (al-ghayb), attribute of knowledge; d) the Present; 41) al-basîb, the Calculator, He who settles accounts; a) who gives sufficiency, for He creates for His servants what is sufficient for them (active attribute); b) who, by His words, asks of whomsoever is subject to the Law, account of what he does of good and of evil (attribute of speech); 42) al-dâlî, the Wise; a) synonym of al-ahad (al-Idji), endowed with wisdom, i.e. with knowledge of things as they are, close to kâfîs (and thus derived from the sense of safîm) according to al-Ghazzalî, with a stress placed on the absolute and jealous vigilance; 43) al-karîm, the Generous; four shades of meaning: a) endowed with liberality (attribute of action); b) who fixes the measure of generosity (attribute of power); c) from whom comes all nobility (attribute of relation); d) who pardons faults; 44) al-ra'dîb, the Jealous Guardian, sense close to hâfîs and thus derived from the sense of safîm; according to al-Ghazzalî, with a stress placed on the absolute and jealous vigilance; 45) al-mudûsîn, the Assenter, who grants prayers; al-Ghazzali: who hastens to satisfy the needs of creatures, who anticipates them; 46) al-wâli, the Omnipresent, who embraces and contains all things: He extends His generosity to everything which exists, His knowledge to everything which is knowable, His power to everything which may be determined by it, absolutely and without His having to pay attention successively to things (al-Djurdjianil); 47) al-bâhim, the Wise; a) synonym of al-sâlim (al-Idji), endowed with wisdom, i.e. with knowledge of things as they come from Him and with the production of actions according to what is expedient; b) the Prudent in His decisions: which corresponds to the perfect soundness of His providence; 48) al-wâdâd, the Very Loving; a) who loves the well-being of His creatures and procures it for them gratuitously; b) refers to the attribute from which proceeds the praise He bestows on the believer and the reward which He gives him; 49) al-mâjîdî, the Glorious, a) whose actions are replete with His favours abroad; b) the praise due to him belongs to Him alone; 50) al-bâ'dish, the Revivifier, who will revivify every creature on the day of the Resurrection (this name has only a traditional origin); 51) al-ghâshîl, the Witness, a) who knows the Mystery, b) and who is Present (cf. 3rd. sense of al-mukhl) • 52) al-hâshîb, the Real, supreme Truth, connotes al-‘asal (same kind of attribute): a) necessary by essence (ontological truth); b) perfectly truthful in His speech; c) who makes the Truth); manifest; 53) al-wâshâl, the Trustee, He to whom everything is entrusted, who takes care of all the needs of creatures; 54) al-bawîl, the Strong, who has power over all things; 55) al-mâshîl, the Unshakable, whose power is without limit; 56) al-wâlî, the Friend, the Protector, in the sense of helper, defender; and also: the Holder of authority; 57) al-bâmid, Worthy of praise (attribute of relation); 58) al-mukhti, the Numberer, who comprehends and knows comprehensively all numbered things (al-‘âlim) and has power over them (al-bâdir); 59) al-mubâtîn, the Innovator; a) absolute creator of beings; b) whose favours are purely benevolent; 60) al-mu‘tîd, He who resuscitates, who causes the creature to “return” after its destruction; 61) al-mukiyî, the Creator of life, and 62) al-mawmi, the Creator of death: a) who causes to live and to die; 63) al-wâdidî, the Living, one of the “essential attributes”, “in the obvious sense” (al-Idji): God is always acting and watching, whereas none can act upon Him in any way and none can perceive Him without dying: He is Living in the highest and most perfect degree of life, by reason of the absolute perfection of His Activity and His Knowledge (al-Ghazzalî); 64) al-bayyâm, the Self-Subsisting: a) who subsists in Himself and by Himself, without any reason for being other than Himself (negative attribute); b) who rules and co-ordinates creatures, and none can subsist without Him; 65) al-wâhidîd, the Opulent (the Perfect), to whom nothing can be lacking or be needed (negative attribute); 66) al-mâjudî, the Noble, the High (al-dîlî), attribute of relation; 67) al-mubâdîlî, who has power over them (al-‘âlim) and resuscitates, who causes the creature to “return” after its destruction; 68) al-mumît, the Creator of death,—He who brings and 72) He who brings and 73) He who brings and 74) He who brings and 75) He who brings and 76) He who brings and 77) He who brings and 78) He who brings and 79) He who brings and 80) He who brings and 81) He who brings and 82) He who brings and 83) He who brings and 84) He who brings and 85) He who brings and

wishes to lighten the burdens (sense close to raḥmān, according to Ghazzālī); 84) mulk al-mulk, the Master (King) of the Kingdom, who possesses in complete sovereign independence the world and each creature; 85) ʿādū l-ʿādālā wa l-ītrām, the Lord of Majesty and Generosity, sense close to al-ṣalālī, observe al-Īdālī and al-Āmīdī; 86) al-muṣṣīl, the Just, —al-Ghazālī specifies “on the Day of Judgement”, (al-Dūraydī recalls that the root, according to the verbal forms, has both the meaning of “just” and “unjust”); 87) al-ṣāmīḥī, the Assembler: a) who assembles beings according to their similitudes, their differences, their oppositions (al-Ghazālī); b) who reunites adversaries on the Day of Judgement (al-Īdālī—al-Dūraydī; 88) al-ğhāntī, the Rich, the Independent, who lacks nothing; 89) al-muṣṭāḥfī, the Enricher, who embellishes every creature, from whom creatures derive their perfection; 90) al-mānīʾ (traditional Name only), the tutelary Defender: correlative of al-ḥāfīẓ, the vigilant Guardian; al-ḥāfīẓ stresses the idea of guarding, protecting,—and al-mānīʾ the idea of prohibiting and suppressing obstacles; 91) al-dārī, He who affects, and 92) al-nāṣīḥī, He who favours: two traditional Names only; they teach that evil and good, affliction and favour, harm and benefit derive only from God; 93) al-nāṣr, the Light,—God is Light: a) of a perfect and manifest consciousness of the limits fixed to philological knowledge and poetry. They were all of them disciples of the leading philologist of Baṣra, Abū ʿAmar b. al-ʿĀlāʾ (q.v.). Among their numerous disciples the littératus al-Diḥābīs has left in his works a monument of their learning. An astonishing memory and an unusually critical mind distinguished him. Abū ʿAmar had taken over also an accurate consciousness of the limits fixed to philological knowledge: (see an utterance of Abu ʿAbbās quoted by al-Duwārīsīhī, i, 323). The method of seeking information from the bedouins in matters concerning grammar and lexicography which seems to have been developed in Baṣra under the stimulus of Abū ʿAmar was taken over by his disciples. A list of the bedouin teachers of the Baṣrans is given in Fībrīst, 43 f. (cf. al-Muṣṭirī, ii, 401 f.). In Baṣra common people were familiar with his scholarly interests and could suggest to him where he could find a ṣiḥāḥ possessing a perfect knowledge of the liḥṭā; (see al-Muṣṭirī, ii, 307). Anecdotes tell also of his rides into the desert to visit bedouins and collect pieces of poetry from their lips. Already as a young man he was sought by students who were anxious to learn from him, and his maqāṣis was widely known. Of the different branches of philological work which had already developed, lexicography particularly corresponded to his talent, whereas Abū Zayd is said to have been his superior in grammar and al-Ḫallī to have been in despair about him. From the work which had already developed, lexicography particularly corresponding to his talent, and the number of his contemporaries. Abu ʿAbbās and his companions Abu Zayd and the Kāṣīms al-Bahill from the ill-reputed Kaysite tribe al-Bāhila, a relationship which is alluded at in a satirical poem of a contemporary poet; (see Ibn al-Muṭṭāzīsīhī, Tabākāt al-Shuṣrārīsīhī, i, 117). This scholar and his contemporaries Abū ʿAbbās and Abū ʿAmar b. al-ʿĀlāʾ (q.v.) constituted a triumvirate to which later philologists owe most of their knowledge about Arabic lexicography and poetry. There were all of them three disciples of the leading philologist of Baṣra, Abū ʿAmar b. al-ʿĀlāʾ (q.v.). Among their numerous disciples the littératus al-Diḥābīs has left in his works a monument of their learning. An astonishing memory and an unusually critical mind distinguished him. Abū ʿAmar had taken over also an accurate consciousness of the limits fixed to philological knowledge: (see an utterance of Abu ʿAbbās quoted by al-Duwārīsīhī, i, 323). The method of seeking information from the bedouins in matters concerning grammar and lexicography which seems to have been developed in Baṣra under the stimulus of Abū ʿAmar was taken over by his disciples. A list of the bedouin teachers of the Baṣrans is given in Fībrīst, 43 f. (cf. al-Muṣṭirī, ii, 401 f.). In Baṣra common people were familiar with his scholarly interests and could suggest to him where he could find a ṣiḥāḥ possessing a perfect knowledge of the liḥṭā; (see al-Muṣṭirī, ii, 307). Anecdotes tell also of his rides into the desert to visit bedouins and collect pieces of poetry from their lips. Already as a young man he was sought by students who were anxious to learn from him, and his maqāṣis was widely known. Of the different branches of philological work which had already developed, lexicography particularly corresponding to his talent, whereas Abū Zayd is said to have been his superior in grammar and al-Ḫallī to have been in despair about him. From the work which had already developed, lexicography particularly corresponding to his talent, and the number of his contemporaries. Abu ʿAbbās and his companions Abu Zayd and the Kāṣīms al-Bahill from the ill-reputed Kaysite tribe al-Bāhila, a relationship which is alluded at in a satirical poem of a contemporary poet; (see an utterance of Abu ʿAbbās quoted by al-Duwārīsīhī, i, 117).
them after they had fallen into disgrace; (see al-Dihāshīyārī, 206). As an intimate of Diacfar he was himself in fear of his life when he got to know about the fall of Diā‘ar in 878/883; (see al-Dihāshīyārī, 206).

In al-Asma‘ī’s opinion, the poet Iṣḥāk b. Ibrāhīm al-Mawṣhil, his rival at the court, was more successful in obtaining from the caliph a ready-money consideration for his wit; (see Aḥānī, v, 77, al-Ḥamīs, Zahr al-Addb, 1014, and Irshad, ii, 205). The Ḥūd of Ibn ʿAbī Ṭālib contains a number of the “extraordinary tales” (nawddir) and the “amusing stories” (mulād) with which al-ʿĀṣma‘ī entertained the caliph. After the death of Hārūn, al-ʿĀṣma‘ī seems to have returned to Baṣra. According to an isolated piece of evidence he died in Marw; (see Ibn Khallikān, nr. 389).

Among the disciples of al-ʿĀṣma‘ī and related circles of Baṣra and Baḥḍād there circulated numerous stories told by him or about him which found their way into Arabic literature. Some of them certainly catch authentic features of his character. Thus we are told that, at the summit of his career, though possessing at that time considerable property, he persisted in living as a poor man. As against the luxuriousness of the Persians, the plain living ascribed to him in tradition to ʿUmar b. al-Ḥaḍhrāt and al-Ḥansān al-Baṣrī [see Irshad, ii, 416] was also the sincere piety of plain-living people. His predilection for the sentimental and pathetic elegy—he is said never to have transmitted satirical poetry—is in accordance with his idealisation of the Arab race according to his own religious feelings. In authentic traditions he relates the sayings of al-Ḥansān al-Baṣrī. Numerous traditions beginning with the formula “I heard a bedouin saying in his prayer” are in the same spirit. In the works of later writers these sentimental features dominate the character of al-ʿĀṣma‘ī. We find them in the romantic story put into the mouth of al-ʿĀṣma‘ī in one of the fictitious traditions ([ṣiddīq] of Ibn Durayd; [see al-Kālī, al-ʿĀṣma‘ī, iii, 7). In the Muhāدادār al-ʿAbdr of Ibn al-ʿArabī, the learned philologist of Baṣra, tells, as did his contemporary the Egyptian mystic Ḫūrūḥ-1-Nūn, about his meetings with poor bedouins and young girls who revealed to him an unexpected and extraordinary insight into the mysteries of the divine love; (see op. cit., 81 and 133).

His orthodox contemporaries and later writers agree that al-ʿĀṣma‘ī was an orthodox Sunnī. According to Ibrāḥīm al-Ḥarbī (d. 285/898), there were among the philologists of Baṣra only four definite adherents of the sunna, one of them being al-ʿĀṣma‘ī, (see Taʾrīḥ Baḥḍād, x, 418; cf. Ibn al-ʿAnnārī, 170).

As an instance of his piety tradition adduces that in order to “avoid sin” he answered with strict silence to any philological question which evidently had or could have a bearing upon the reading of the Kurān or the wording of tradition. (A list of examples is given in al-Mushir, ii, 325 f.). Whereas for ʿAbū ʿAmr and Abū ʿAbdālād the study of the lugha was dependent on that of the Kurān, al-ʿĀṣma‘ī thus separated in himself the “reader” from the grammarian and the transmitter of poetry. In accordance with the attitude held by his teacher Nāḥī and the readers of Medina (see about this subject Two Muqaddimas to the Quranic sciences, ed. A. Jeffery, Cairo 1954, 183) al-ʿĀṣma‘ī consequently abstained also from taṣfīr; (see al-Mushir, ii, 416, and Irshad, i, 26 f.). In this respect he was opposed to people of Muḥtāzīlitte and Ḥamāsī outlook who, in his view, commented upon the Kurān according to their “opinion” (ra‘ī), as did Abū ʿUbaydālād in his al-Mudārīb; (see Irshad, ii, 389 and vii, 167).

As a transmitter of poetry al-ʿĀṣma‘ī and his generation were essentially influenced by “the great transmitters”, Ḥāmāsī al-Ra‘wīya and Khaṭaf al-ʿAlmār [qq.v.]. The inconveniences connected with the unreliable character of these persons were clearly seen by him; (see Irshad, iv, 140 and al-Mushir, ii, 406; cf. E. Schüle, 99 f.). In order to collect in a complete and definite form the odes of the great pre-Islamic poets he sought persons known to have a reliable knowledge of the tradition. In his work he developed a critical method remarkable for his time, a deep knowledge of the topography of the Arabian peninsula, of the genealogies of the tribes and, above all, of lugha and of grammar. Handed down by his disciples, these critical remarks found their way into the works of later commentators. On the basis laid by al-ʿĀṣma‘ī, his disciples Ibn Ḥābīb, ʿAbī l. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ṭūsī and, finally, al-Suḵkārī, prepared the definitive editions of the diwāns.

From the 72 pieces or fragments of early Islamic or early Islamic poets which he collected in an anthology called al-ʿĀṣma‘īyyāt (ed. Allard, Sammelbände aller arabischer Dichter, i, Berlin 1902), we can get an idea of al-ʿĀṣma‘ī’s literary taste. On the subject of criticism (nabd al-ṣafir) numerous sayings of al-ʿĀṣma‘ī are quoted in later writers. In a note-book called Fuhūlat al-Ṣuwarā (ed. Torrey, ZDMG, 1911, 457-516), his disciple Abū Ḥāṭim al-Sīǧistānī collected answers given by his teacher to the question which poets are to be regarded as jāzī. Whereas Abū ʿAmr, according to al-ʿĀṣma‘ī, was never heard to quote an Islamic poet (Ibn Ḥaṣṭīk, al-ʿUmād, i, 73), his disciple valued the new poets who mastered the lugha; (see for instance Ibn al-Djarrāb, al-Waraka, 60). For his criticism of the muwaṣṣalāt, see J. Fück Arabiya, 22 f.).

Applying to the rich lexicographical materials collected by him the systematic methods employed by philologists from the very beginning of these studies in ʿIrāk, i.e. of grouping together items of similar materials, al-ʿĀṣma‘ī composed a series of monographs the titles of which are listed in the Fihrist, 55. In his Dīṣārat at-ʿArab, which is lost but is copiously quoted by Ṭāḥīr in his Muṭṣām, he often seems to adduce a first-hand knowledge of topography; (see for instance Muṭṣām, i, 205). About the size of these treatises we know from Fihrist only that the Gharīb al-Ḥadīth was written in 200 folios. A number of them, however, have been preserved; (see Brockelmann, I, 104 and S I, 164). That these specimens of al-ʿĀṣma‘ī’s lexical work do not represent the final state of his collections seems obvious, if one compares for instance the rather meagre text of his al-Nabāt wa-l-Ṣhadār (ed. Hafner, Beirut 1898) with the rich material on the subject quoted from al-ʿĀṣma‘ī by Abū Ḥanīfa al-Dīnawarī in his Kitāb al-Nabāt.

Among the disciples of al-ʿĀṣma‘ī, Abū Naṣr ʿĀṣmād b. Ḥāṭim al-Bāḥillī was known to be his rāwīya. He is said to have transmitted the books of his teacher to Ḥuṣayn; (see Irshad, ii, 140). As a transmitter of them there is mentioned also Abū ʿUbayd al-Kāsim [qq.v.] who divided the books of al-ʿĀṣma‘ī into chapters and added some pieces of information to them on the authority of Abū Zayd al-Anṣārī and the philologists of Kūfā; (see Irshād, vi, 162 f.).
For later lexicographers the main source of information about materials collected by al-AsmacI was the Tahdhib al-Lugha of al-Azharl. In the introduction (ed. Zettersten, MO, 1920, i, i), al-Azharl mentions the direct and indirect sources from which he drew these materials.


AL-ASMACIYYAT [see AL-ASMACI].

ASPER [see ARSE].

‘ASR (a), time, age; particularly the early part of the afternoon, until the sun becomes red; hence *salâ al-‘asr*, the prayer in the afternoon, cf. SALAT.

ASRÂFIL [see ISRAFIL].

ÂŞS [see ALAN].

ASSAB, town and port at the N.W. end of the Bay of Assab on the coast of Eritrea. The surrounding country is arid and is inhabited by afar (Danakil). Assab is generally identified with the ancient Sabae, described by Strabo (xvi, 771) as *polis euperepog*.

Its importance is due to its position opposite Mukhâ and at the end of a caravan route leading to the Ethiopian plateau, both the Red Sea and the coastal desert being comparatively narrow at this point.

In 1936-39 the Italians built a motor road from Assab connecting with the main Addis Ababa-Assmara road near Dessey. Assab was known to the Jesuit missionaries of the early seventeenth century; they called it a “very good road...where you may have wood and water freely, and refreshing for your money or coarse calicoes”. (Sir W. Foster, *Letters received in the British'intervened to check the threat of the Burmese and integrated Assam into their territory. The Ahoms retained the services of the Muslims for their skill in arts and crafts. The *Marias* (braziers) and the *Garias* (tailors by profession) are even now common in some districts. In the middle of the 19th century a large percentage of the Muslims were affected by the “Farâkhî” movement. The humber peasants have developed a peculiar local culture, combining with their faith in Islam the local rites and customs and national festivals of this region.

ASSAM, name of the easternmost province in the Republic of India, situated between East Pakistan and Burma, within 22° 19' and 28° 16' N. Lat., and 98° 42' and 97° 12' E. Long. It comprises the Brahmaputra valley and the hill ranges enclosing small plateaux, the shelter of numerous hill tribes and refuge of the Mongol hordes. The province covers 85,012 English square miles, and its population in 1951 was 9,043,707, of whom 1,996,456 were Muslims, three-fourths of these being concentrated in the westerly districts of Goalpârâ and Kârâpur, contiguous to North Bengal, and Cachar, adjacent to Pakistani Sylhet. Since 1920 their percentage has considerably increased in other neighbouring districts owing to immigration from Bengal, the eastern portion of the valley remaining unaffected.

In Sanskrit records the valley is called “Lâwhitya”, “Prâk-jyotishâ”, or “Kârâpur”. The word, Assam (correctly Asâma, locally pronounced Ah6m), is connected with the *Sanskrit* A+sama (= “peerless”) is unwarranted. The Ahom migrants had a sense of history, and produced works called *Bwakhîs*. The first king known is Sukâpha, who, in 1228, occupied a portion of the Upper Valley. His successors gradually conquered the neighbouring tribes and established the Ahom kingdom. The western valley, with the city of Gâwâtî, which lay outside their domains, retained the name of Kârâpur, and was ruled by petty landlords, collectively called Bârâbhuîyas. Twice they were integrated into the kingdom of Kârâpur-Kântâ, first by the Khens, and next by the Kochas, northern rival neighbours of the Muslim SultânS of Bengal.

The Muslim advance into Kârâpur falls into three stages. The first, which began in A.D. 1206 with Bâkhtîyar Kâhdî, is a period of raid, occasional occupation and imposition of tribute. It culminated in 1357, when Sikandar Shâh founded the mint of Gâwâtî (possibly Gâwâtî). It is in one of the neighbouring castles that Ibn Ba'ttûS possibly met the famous saint Shâh Dâ'ûl Tâhrîz. The second period began with the defeat of Kâmêsvara, the king of Kântâ, by Bârbak Shâh, and the final occupation of Kârâpur by ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn Hûsain Shâh after overthrowing the Khen king, Nîlânâban, in 1498. So far the Muslims had not contacted the Ahoms, Kârâpur being alone mentioned in contemporary Muslim records. The *BârâbûtS* speak of a first Muslim invasion in the 14th century B.C. by Torkh (possibly Bah-r-bak = “naval officer”), obviously an official posted in Kârâpur, but the invading forces were utterly routed. With the downfall of the Hûsain Shâh dynasty in 1538, the Kochas emerged and established their kingdom. Of this period the tomb of Shâh Qâhidî al-Dîn A‘wîlîyâ at Hâjî is an important memorial. The third period began in 1612, when Islam Khân, the Mughal Governor of Bengal, subjugated the Kochas and occupied Kârâpur once again. Hereafter wars with the Ahoms became frequent, and Assam loomed large in Persian chronicles. In 1662 Mîr Dîjunâ finally reduced the Ahom king and imposed an annual tribute on him. The subsequent weakness of the Mughals encouraged the Ahoms, who by 1682 occupied the whole Brahmaputra valley and continued to rule till 1824, when the British intervened to check the threat of the Burmese and integrated Assam into their territory. The Ahoms retained the services of the Muslims for their skill in arts and crafts. The *Marias* (braziers) and the *Garias* (tailors by profession) are even now common in some districts. In the middle of the 19th century a large percentage of the Muslims were affected by the “Farâkhî” movement. The humber peasants have developed a peculiar local culture, combining with their faith in Islam the local rites and customs and national festivals of this region.
There were frequent rebellions in Gurgan during both the Umayyads and the 'Abbasids caliphates. Astarabād is rarely mentioned by historians, and the geographers also give little information. It was a silk centre according to al-‘Iṣṭakhrī, 213. The port of Astarabād (and Gurgan) on the Caspian, Abaskūn, was an important trading centre. The Ḫudūd al-‘Ālam, 134, says the people of Astarabād spoke two languages, one of which is probably preserved in the dialect used by the Hurufī sect.

After the Mongol conquest of Iran we find Astarabād replacing Gurgan as the most important town of the area. The province was the scene of strife between the last Il-Khāns, the Timurids, and local Turkish tribal leaders. Sometime during this period the Kādjar tribe of Turkomans became the leading power in Astarabād. Aghā Muhammad, first of the Kādjar Shāhs, was born in Astarabād. Shāh Ḥabib I, Nādir Shāh, and Aghā Muhammad all erected buildings in Astarabād. The town, located on the steppes, continually suffered the depredations of Turkomans.

Astarabād had many mosques and shrines (see Rabino, below), and was called dār al-mu‘minīn probably because of the many sayyids living there.

The name of the town was changed to Gurgan under Rīḍā Shāh, and in 1350 it had ca. 25,000 inhabitants. There are few old remains in the town, and only two are noteworthy, the Imāmzāda Nūr and the mosque of Gushān. Rabino (below, 73-5) lists the shrines of the town as well as the inscriptions.

The province of Astarabād, as it existed under the Kādjar, was bounded on the north by the Gurğan River, on the south by the Elburz Mts., on the west by the Caspian Sea and Māzandarān, and on the east by the district of Dājadiān. The district (ghābaristān) of Gurgan under Rīḍā Shāh was smaller. The province could be divided into two parts, the mountain area and the plains. The former predominates in the mountain area and the towns, and Turkomans on the plains.

Astarabād was the second city of the province of Gurğan in Islamic times and underwent the same fortunes as the capital city Gurğan. The province was raided by the Arabs in the time of the caliph ʿUṯmān (al-Baladḥūrī, Futḥā, 334), and again by Saʿīd b. ʿUṯmān under Muḥāwiya, but it was not conquered until Yaʿṣīr b. Muḥallab defeated the ruling Turks of the area in 98/716. There is a tradition that Yaʿṣīr founded Astarabād on the site of a village called Astarak.
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travelled scholar who consorted with Sufis (d. in Baghdad in 412/1021-2). There were several well-known Astarabadi scholars in Safawid times, including Ahmad b. Tadj al-Din Hasan b. Sayf al-Din al-Astarabadhi, author of a biography of the Prophet, 'Imad al-Din ‘Ali al-Shafi'i al-Kari al-Astarabadi, author of a treatise on the recitation of the recitation of the Qur'an, and Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Karim al-Ansari al-Astarabadi, who translated an Arabic work on ethics. The misba Astarabadi is given also to several lesser known scholars, such as al-Hasan b. Ahmad al-Astarabadi, a grammarian and lexicographer, and the traditionist Muhammad b. ‘Ali.


AL-ASTARLABDH, RADII AL-DIN MUHAMMAD b. AL-HASAN, author of a celebrated commentary on the Kitabiya, a well-known grammatical work of Ibn al-Hadjib. Suyuti, who praises the commentary as unique, admits to knowing nothing of Radil al-Din’s life, except that the work was completed in 683/1285-6, and that Radil al-Din was reported to have died in 684 or 686/1285-8. He also wrote a lesser known commentary on the Shafiiya of Ibn al-Hadjib. The Radil Nuri Allah Shushtari interprets a reference in the introductory prayer as meaning that the commentary on the Kitabiya was written in Nadif, but the term haram which occurs in the Arabic edition could refer just as well to Mecca, where Suyuti obtained his information on the date of Radil al-Din’s death. There seems no doubt, however, that Radil al-Din was a Shi‘i.


AL-ASTARABADHI, RUKN AL-DIN AL-HASAN b. MUHAMMAD b. SHARAFGHAN AL-ALAWI, known as Abu l-‘Faq’al al-Sayyid Rukn al-Din, a Shi‘i scholar best known for his commentary on the Kitabiya, a grammatical work of Ibn al-Hadjib. This commentary, the Kitabiya, is known also as the ‘Alawiyya, or “intermediate”, as it was the second of three commentaries. Al-Suyuti, quoting Muhammad b. Rafi‘s appendix to the Ta’rikh Bagdad (the passage is not included in the abridged Bagdad edition of 1938) says that he enjoyed the patronage of Nasir al-Din Tusi [q.v.], in Maragha where he taught philosophy and composed commentaries on Tusi’s Tadjrid al-Ahd and Kaddid al-Akh. He accompanied Tusi to Baghdad in 679/1281-2, and, after the death of his patron in the same years, settled in Mawsil, where he taught in the Nuriyiya madrasa and composed his commentary on Ibn al-Hadjib. From Mawsil he went on to Sul‘aniyya, where he taught Shafi‘i jurisprudence. He died in 715/1315-16 or 718/1318-19 (two MSS in the Bibliotheque Nationale give the date of his death as 717/1317-18 and 719/1319-20). Rukn al-Din was reputed for his modesty as well as for the honour in which he was held in the Mongol Court.


ASTARLAB [see ASTURLAB].

ASTORGA [see ASHTURKA, in the Suppl.].

ASTRAKHAN, city and district. The city lies on the left bank of the Volga, some sixty miles from the point where it runs into the Caspian Sea, 46° 21’ N, 48° 2’ E, 207 m. below normal sea level, 7.6 m. above the level of the Caspian Sea. Ibn Battuta, ii, 410-2, who passed through here in 1333, mentions for the first time a settlement supposed to have been founded by a Mecca pilgrim, whose religious reputation brought the district exemption from taxes; this was supposed to explain its name, viz. Hadjib Tarhan (tarhan means among the Mongols in later times a man exempt from taxes, a nobleman). Other names of the form are Cytrykad or Cytrykhad, in Ambr. Contarini’s account (1487) Citirкано, in Turkish-Tatar sources also Azdarkhan and Ashtagaran. The settlement lay on the right bank of the Volga on the Shareniy (or Zareniy) hill; the first coins discovered are from 776/1374-5 and 782/1380-1. (777/1375-6: Chr. Frahn, Münzen d. Chane etc., St. Petersburg 1832, 22, no. 102; idem, Recension etc., St. Petersburg 1826, 500, no. 1; A. K. Markov, Inv. Katalog, St. Petersburg 1896, 860; 1380-1; ibidem, 476; P. S. Savelev, Money Divdven, ii, St. Petersburg 1858, 18, no. 416; also the Kaiser Friedrich Museum, Berlin, possessed a specimen.) In the winter of 798/1395-6 Timur destroyed the city, as well as Saray [q.v.] (Shaml, Zafar-nama, ed. Tauer, 1, 158-62). In contrast to the latter Astrakhan rose again and took over eventually its importance as a centre of trade; in the course of this it became, as earlier the neighbouring Khazar city of Hil (Atil) [q.v.], eventually the centre of the traffic on the Caspian Sea and the lands bordering on it.

In 871/1466 there was established in Astrakhan, during the decline of the Golden Horde [cf. nIrfords] a Tatar dynasty of the Noghays princes stemming from the Tatar Khan Kušik Mehmed. The territory ruled by the Khans Kāsim (872-966/1466-90) and his brother Ab-il-Karim (in Russian and Polish Ablungiryim; 896-910/1490-1504) encompassed the country as far as the modern Stavropol’, Orenburg (Okalov), Samara (Kuybshev) and Saratov, and was divided into various uluses. The population supported themselves mainly by cattle raising, hunting and fishing. Conflicts with the begs, the rapid changes of Khans after 910/1504 and the interference of the Crimean Tatars and the Noghaykuls brought the Khans into difficulties; the Khan ‘Abd al-Rahmad (947-51/1534-8) sought help against these and the Ottomans from the Russian Czar.

For a list of the Khans see Zambaur, 247, and for a genealogical table ibid., 241.)
In 962/1554 the Khānate (since 951/1544 under Yamghurcay or Yaghmurcl) was conquered by the Russians; since the Khan Darwlsh Fahl (in Russian Derblsh), who was nominated by them, allied himself with the Crimean Tatars and the Noghays, he was deposed in 964/1556-7 and the Khanate incorporated into the Russian state. Apart from the Russian there immigrated into the country Kalmucks [q.v.] since 1632; those of whom lived east of the Volga returned in 1770-1 to the East, while those who settled west of the Volga were driven out in 1544-5. They were followed with Russian permission by Kazaks [q.v.] since 1801. A as counterbalance 25,000 so called Astrakhan Cossacks were settled here in 1750 (new organisation in 1817; their corporation dissolved in 1919). In 1717 the Government of Astrakhan was established by the Russians; 1785-1832 the territory belonged to Caucasus. The re-established Government of Astrakhan received in 1860 new boundaries (208, 159, according to other calculations 236, 532 sq.km.). In 1918-20 the territory became part of the Russian SSR and forms since 1801. As a counterbalance 25,000 so called Astrakhan Cossacks were settled here in 1750 (new organisation in 1817; their corporation dissolved in 1919). In 1717 the Government of Astrakhan was established by the Russians; 1785-1832 the territory belonged to Caucasus. The re-established Government of Astrakhan received in 1860 new boundaries (208, 159, according to other calculations 236, 532 sq.km.). In 1918-20 the territory became part of the Russian SSR and forms since 27 Dec. 1943 (after the dissolution of the Kalmuck territory) an oval of 96,300 sq.km.

Astrakhan was rebuilt by the Russians in 1558 seven miles downstream on the left bank and has since then always contained an overwhelmingly Russian population; there was a Tatar and an Armenian suburb. Indian settlers of the 17th century mixed with the Tatars ("Agryzans"). The city was threatened in 1569 by an Ottoman-Crimean Tatar army (cf. Ahmad Refik, Bahr-i Khatær—Kara Dehvari Kanal va Eiderdgh Shari, TOEM, viii, 1-14; Hallî Ênêz, Osmanli-rus tebâebmen menesci ve Don-Volga kanal sêsibüsii, Boi, 1948, 349-402; cf. also 84216). Consequently in 1582 the Russians built a stone wall and in 1589 a fortress. In spite of this the city was repeatedly plundered by Tatars and Cossacks (especially Steénka Razinn, 1660-8); it suffered too from repeated earthquakes and epidemics. In 1722-1867 it was the naval port for the Caspian Sea (since then Baku); in 1918-21 also, during the civil war, a flotilla operated from here. Astrakhan has in 1897: 113,001 inhabitants (among them 12,000 Muslims; Persians, Tatars, etc., and 6,200 Armenians), six Şafî mosques and one Sunni, 73 madrasas and three makhâb. In 1939 the city had 253,655 inhabitants and possessed over ten Tatar schools and several Tatar newspapers. For the Soviet Union it is important mainly as a starting-place for Caspian ships and because of its fisheries (with caviar and blubber factories) and its fishing industry.


(B. Spuler)

ASTROLOGY [see nüdüm, ahkâm al-].

ASTRONOMY [see hā'īm al-].
instruments preserved date from the second half of the 4th/10th century. In learned European circles the astrolabe and its theory became first known through the writing of Muhammad ibn Zakariya ibn al-Hasan al-Idrisi (c. 1013-54); they, as all posterior European compositors, strictly depend on Islamic models, above all the Writings (spurious?, see Millas [i], ch. vi) of the earliest European instruments that have survived date from c. 1200. After the invention of the telescope, the astrolabe fell into disuse in the West, whereas, in the East, the tradition was carried on till late in the 18th and even the 19th century. As attested by the λακάβ al-asturlābī encountered since the beginning of Islamic science, the making of astrolabes was a handicraft of its own cultivated by specially trained craftsmen, but many astrolabes prove to have been wrought by other artisans, too, as is shown by the sobriquets al-ibari, “the needle-maker”, al-nadidār, “the carpenter”, etc., frequently found in colophons. According to Chardin (Voyages du chevalier Chardin en Perse, ed. Langlès, iv, Paris 1811, 332) the most highly valued instruments were manufactured, not by artisans, but by astronomers. For illustrations of astrolabes (Eastern and Western), see Gunther [1]; for the names of astrolabe-makers see Mayer [i] and Price [1].

2. Description of the instrument. The planispherical astrolabe is a portable metal (brass, bronze) instrument in the form of a circular disc with a diameter varying from 4" to 8" (10-20 cm.). The simplest type of this astrolabe, taken over with respect to its essential features from Greek and Syrian models, consists of the following pieces:

(A) The suspensory apparatus, which comprises three parts: a triangular piece of metal called kursī, “throne” (large and richly decorated in the Māghrib, esp. Persia, smaller and simpler in the Māghrib), which is firmly attached to the body of the instrument; a handle, ʿumma, L. armilla suspensoria, affixed to the point of the kursī so that it can be turned to either side in the plane of the latter; a ring, ḫalīḥa, L. armilla rotunda, passing through the handle and moving freely. When in use, the astrolabe is suspended with a cord, ʿīdāba.

(B) The body of the astrolabe, which has a “front”, ʿawidī, L. facies, and a “back”, ṣahīr, L. dorsum.

(a) The front of the astrolabe consists of an outer rim, ḥadīra, L. tawb, ṣafāfa, L. limbus or margo, which encloses the inner surface, usually depressed, called “mother”, ʿumma, L. mader. A number of thin discs, ʿaṣafīḥi, L. tympana or tabulae regionum, are fitted into the ḥadīra over the ʿumma; a bit of metal, mumṣikha, projecting from the ḥadīra and fitting into an exactly corresponding indentation on the edge of each disc, prevents the discs from turning. A hole is bored through the centre of the ʿumma and the ʿaṣafīḥi; a broadheaded pin, ṣabīt, waṣat, or miḥwar, L. clavus, axis, passing through it holds the parts together and serves as an axis around which turn the two movable parts of the instrument, viz., on the front, the “spur”, ʿankabūt (also called “net”, ʿaṣabakha), L. aranea or rete, and, on the back, the “alldad” (from the Ar. al-티dad), L. radius or regula. A wedge called the “horse”, ṡarās, L. eques, cavallo, or cauci, which is passed into a slit in the narrow end of the ṣabīt, prevents the latter from coming out. A small ring, ʿaṣr, placed under the horse, protects the spider and ensures a smooth turning. N. B. A ruler in the shape of the hand of a watch turning on the face of the astrolabe (L. index, esteor) is often found on European, but never on Islamic, astrolabes.

The mathematical divisions of the parts mentioned are as follows:

The ḥadīra carries a circle graduated from 0 to 360°, beginning at the middle point of the ḥursī, i.e., at the top of the astrolabe.

The ʿumma may either function as one ʿaṣafih (see next section), or carry a list of the geographical latitudes of a number of cities.

The ʿaṣafih carries on each of its two sides the stereographic projection of the equator, the tropics, and the horizon for one particular geographical latitude, with its parallel circles called “almacantars” (from Ar. al-ṭardīra al-mubantara) and vertical circles, daŭwīr al-sumūt. For a northern astrolabe, the centre of projection is the South Pole of the heavens, and the plane of projection, the equator; then the southern tropic constitutes the edge of the ʿaṣafih. For a southern astrolabe, the centre of projection is the North Pole, the plane of projection, again, the equator; then the northern tropic coincides with the edge of the ʿaṣafih. Most, if not all, of the astrolabes preserved are northern; only for the spicer northern and southern projections may be used simultaneously (see below, section on the ʿankabūt). Fig. 1a illustrates the face of an astrolabe with a ʿaṣafih constructed for the geographical latitude 36°. There NS represents the meridian, ḥaṭṭ ʿwaṣat al-samāʾ, L. linea medii coeli; its section CS is called the “line of midnight”, ḥaṭṭ nisf al-nahsh, L. linea meridionalis, and section CN, “line of midnight”, ḥaṭṭ nisf al-lāyīl, L. linea mediae noctis. The diameter EW represents the “straight horizon”, ʿuḫ ṣaṭīraʾ, also called east-west line, ḥaṭṭ ʿwaṣat al-maghrīb ʿwāl-maghrīb; its sections CE and CW bear, respectively, the names “east line”, ḥaṭṭ al-maghrīb, and west line, ḥaṭṭ al-maghrīb. On the meridian NN, the following points are marked (for their construction, see Fig. 1b): C = projection of the North Pole, being the centre of the three concentric circles represented, viz., counting from within, the northern tropic, madār raʾs al-saratin, the equator, al-ṭurūq al-iṭīdīl, and the southern tropic, madār raʾs al-diadiy (outer rim). The points Rₐ, R₁₀, . . . Rₙ mark the centres of the horizon, ʿuḫ, L. horizon obliquus (meeting NS at ʿuḫ and of the almacantars from 10° to 10° (intersecting with NS at 20° . . . 80°). R₉ = ζ marks the “zenith” (from Ar. ʿṣāmīr al-raʾs). The points ʿη₀, ʿη₁₀, . . . ʿηₙ (ζ) represent the second intersections of the almacantars with NS, south of the zenith.

The horizon, the equator, and the east-west line meet in the east and the west points, from which Islamic astronomy counts the azimuths (from 0°30° towards N and S). The vertical circles, daṿawīr al-sumūt pass through the zenith and the points 0, 10°, etc. on the horizon. Mₙ marks the centre of the “first vertical”, aṣawīl al-sumūt, towards the east and west points. For the construction of the other vertical circles, see Hartner [i]. 2529 and Fig. 846.

The lines under the horizon indicate the equal or unequal hours (ṣifāt al-iṭīdīl, horae aequales, and al-ṣifāt al-samānīyya, horae inaequales seu temporales), to be counted from sunset and sunrise; for their construction, see Hartner [i], 2540. The European way of counting equal hours from midnight was known to Islamic astronomers, but never used in civil life. Therefore the second division
of the ḥadīra into $2 \times 12$ hours, starting from $0^\circ$ and $180^\circ$, as shown in Fig. 1a (outer rim), is often found on European, but never on oriental astrolabes. The latitude for which a ṣafīḥa is designed is usually engraved near the middle of the disc; it may be expressed in various ways: by degrees and minutes (e.g. "valid for the lat. of $36^\circ 54'$"), by the name of a particular city ("valid for the lat. of Mecca"), or by the duration of the longest day ("valid for $14^h 45^m".") N.B. Astounding errors are sometimes found in the descriptions of astrolabes in European collections, where abjad numbers are misread for names of (non-existing) places. The number of the ṣafīḥa varies; a good instrument may contain nine and even more. Certain astrolabes have also a ṣafīḥa which gives for a particular geographical latitude the projection of the circles of position, as required for the calculation of the astrological directiones (ṭasyr); others have a ṣafīḥa "for all latitudes" (li-djemî al-ṣurūḍ) also called the "tablet of the horizons" (ṣafīha ḍāḥiyā) or "general tablet" (djamī'ul), which carries only the projection of the

Fig. 1a. Face of an astrolabe showing the division of the Ṣafīḥa.
meridian and that of the horizon for a number of latitudes; the projection of the latter is often reduced to one-half of each arc of horizon. This disc serves to solve, for any latitude, the problems concerning the hour and the azimuths of the rising and setting of stars (cf. Michel [r], 91-2). The "perfect" (kāmil) astrolabe, moreover, bore the circle of the sun's equation. Finally, by interchanging the four quadrants of a safīha, such fanciful figures as the "ogival tablet" are obtained (see Michel [r], 61 and Fig. 44); although being only a geometrical play, they allow the same measurements to be carried out as does an ordinary safīha. An astrolabe on which all of the 90 almacantars are marked, is called "complete" tāmm, L. solispartitum. If only every second, third, fifth, sixth, ninth, or tenth almacantar is marked, it is called nisfī (bipartitum), ḥuṣbī (tripartitum), ḥumsī, sudī, tusī, ḭubī.

The "ankabūt" represents the vault of the fixed stars turning around the earth at rest represented by the safīha. In order to allow the diagram of the safīha to be seen as clearly as possible it is wrought in the shape of an openwork plate, having of course due regard to its solidity and the space required for attaching the protuberances or pointers (in the sing. șāḥla, șāḥ'inna) indicating the fixed stars. It is because of this reticulated form that it has been called a "spider", referring of course to the spider's web (Gr. ἰχνος and L. aranea may both mean "the spider and its web"). In designing this "spider", no limits are imposed on imagination, and almost every conceivable type is found, from the simplest geometrical pattern to the most beautiful leaf and scroll designs. As shown in Fig. 2, its most important part is the circle of the zodiac, (mīnthat al-burūḏī), which is constructed in exactly the same way as all other circles represented on the safīha. It is divided into the 12 burūḏī comprising 30° each, but it is well to note that this division, radiating not from the pole of the ecliptic, but from that of the equator, does not indicate ecliptical longitudes, but the points of the zodiac having the right ascensions 0°, 30°, etc., and their subdivision into degrees (mediationes coeli, see Michel [r], 67 f., and Hartner [i], 253 f.). At the point of contact with the southern tropic, the zodiac carries a little point or hand, ʿA, which serves to read the graduation on the ḥadīra.

The spider is rotated by means of one or several handles, M, called mudīr or muhrīt. By combining parts (halves, fourths, sixths, even twelfths, i.e., single signs) of the zodiac represented in northern with others represented in southern projection, the zodiacal belt assumes more or less fantastic shapes for which equally fantastic names were invented: al-Bīrūnī and others tell us about ʿabātī, "drum", ʿā莘, "myrtle", sarafīnī or musafaran, "crab", ʿadāfī "shell", ẓarwī, "bull", ʿabātī, "anemone" astrolabes, etc. Probably the asturlāb zawraṭī, "boat astrolabe" of Ahmad al-Sidjzl (c. 400/1009) belongs to this category. For more detailed information, see Frank [r], 9 ff. and Michel [r], 69 f.

Other planispherical astrolabes based on other projections than the stereographic are to be regarded as theoretical constructions without practical significance, e.g. the astrolabe devised by al-Bīrūnī and called wājzāfī "cylindrical", because of its projection (Ptolemy's "Analemma"), which al-Bīrūnī called cylindrical, and which we now call orthographic; the circles of the sphere are projected there in the form of straight lines, circles and ellipses. The muḥabṭāt ("flattened") astrolabe, described by al-Bīrūnī (Chronology, 358-9), appears to have been only a stellar chart in equidistant polar projection, i.e., the pole of the ecliptic was the centre of the projection, the parallels with the ecliptic or circles of latitude (dawāṭir al-ṣārīf) were represented by equidistant concentric circles and the circles of longitude (dawāṭir al-tūl; N.B.: in European astronomy, illogically, these great circles through the poles of the ecliptic are called "circles of latitude") by equidistant radii. The other projection mentioned on 359 f. is a peculiar variant of the one devised by al-Zarqallī (see below).

(b) The back of the astrolabe is nearly always divided into four quadrants. The outer rim of the two upper are graduated from 0-90°, starting...
The inconvenience that a special saqibah is required for each latitude was remedied by the Spanish Arab al-Zarkall (Azarquiel, Arzachel) who made the meridian or the autumnal point the centre, and the solstitial colure (i.e. the meridian passing through the solstitial points) the plane, of projection. In its final form, which al-Zarkall called al-‘ubbadiyya in honour of al-Mu’tamid b. ‘Abbád, king of Sevilla (461-84/1068-92), the entire instrument consists of a single tablet with two small subsidiary pieces. On the face of the tablet in stereographical “horizontal” (as opposed to the ordinary, “vertical”) projection the equator is represented with its parallels (madiird) and its circles of declination (manarrát), and the ecliptic with its circles of latitude and longitude; the projections of the equator and the ecliptic, then, are straight lines through the centre. Then evidently the tablet is valid for any geographical latitude; moreover, since the projections of the two hemispheres exactly coincide, it suffices to add the principal stars, to make it replace the “spider” of an ordinary astrolabe. A rod (ufk md’il) “oblique horizon”, with an attached perpendicular ruler, both turning about the centre of the graduated face, fulfils the functions of the saqibah of the common astrolabe; by inclining it at an appropriate angle to the line of the equator we obtain the horizon of the place of observation, and can then deduce from its divisions the eastern and western amplitudes or else solve any other problem of spherical astronomy. On the back of the tablet are the alidad and the markings found on the back of the common astrolabes; but al-Zarkall further added the “circle of the moon”, which enabled him to follow also the course of our satellite.

—This simple and perfected astrolabe was called by the other Arabs al-saqibah al-zarkalliyah, “the tablet of al-Zarkall”. As mentioned above, the idea of making the solstitial colure the plane of projection appears to have been first conceived by al-Biruni, whose Chronology was composed 30 years before al-Zarkall was born. But curiously enough, he there (359 f.) acquiesces in devising a purely schematical, not projective, diagram, with the circles of longitude and latitude drawn through equidistant parts of the radii. It is, therefore, really al-Zarkall who must be credited with the invention of this new type of an astrolabe. Through the Libros del Saber (Vol. 3, Madrid 1864, 135-237: Libro de le asafa’ha) the instrument became known and famous under the name Saphae. It is practically identical with Gemma Frisius’s Astrolabum (sic) Catholicum of 1556; the astrolabe of Gemma’s pupil, D. Juan de Roias Sarmento (published 1550) is a variety of it, where the stereographic is replaced by orthogonal projection (cf. above, al-Biruni’s “cylindrical” pro-

![Fig. 2. Spider of an astrolabe.](image-url)

The alidad is a flat ruler turning around the kubå on the back of the astrolabe. Figs. 3 a and c show the two principal types employed, Fig. 3b being a drawing in perspective of 3a. The straight line A B passing through the centre is called kafir, L. linea fiduceae or fides. The two arms of the alidad are sharpened to a point (gatha, shaziyya) and each has a rectangular plate (libna, dafa, hadaf) standing at right angles to the plane of the alidad itself, through which a hole (thukha) is bored above the linea fiduceae.

![Fig. 3. Types of alidads.](image-url)
Another early variety of al-Zarkall's astrolabe is the "safiha shakdziyya" (or "shakdriyya"), about which we do not yet possess any accurate information.

For the difficult problem of deriving the date of manufacture of an astrolabe from the astronomical data on which it was based (position of the vernal point, longitudes of stars and, in some cases, the longitude of the perihelion), see Michæl [1], 133 ff. and Pouille [1]; for a demonstration that the application of modern astronomical methods necessarily leads to false conclusions, see also Hartner [2], 104, 135 ff.

No conclusions whatever can be drawn from the extremely slow variation of the obliquity of the ecliptic; astrolabists nearly always assume it to be 23½° sharp.

11. The linear (масаат) astrolabe, also called 'asa' l-Tusi, "the staff of al-Tusi", after its inventor al-Mu'attafr b. Mu'attafr al-Tusi (d. 610/1213-4), consists of one single piece, viz., a rod, with a plumb-line attached to its mid-point (i.e. the projection of the North Pole) a second thread fastened at its lower end, and a third thread, which is freely movable. The rod represents the NS line of an ordinary "safiha"; its main divisions are those points in which the horizon, the almucantar, etc. meet the NS line. In the upper part are marked, moreover, the centres of the horizon and the almucantar, in the lower, the points in which each of the 12 "burudj" and its subdivisions, as represented on the "spider", intersect with the NS line, in the course of one complete revolution of the latter. Another graduation, serving for measuring angles, indicates the cords of the angles 0-180°, where the cord of 90° equals the length of the whole rod. For further information, see Michel [1], 115-22, and Michel [2]; a first description was given by Carra de Vaux, L'astrolabe linaire ou bâton d'Estous, in JA, 9th series, v, 464-516.

111. The spherical (кури, ukuri) astrolabe, called astrolabio redondo in the Libros del Saber (Vol. II, Madrid 1863, 113-222, text compiled by Isaac b. Sid (Isaac ha-Hazzan, called Rabīʿa Zaq), exhibits without projection the diurnal movement of the sphere relatively to the horizon of the place of observation. Its history is at least as long as that of the flat astrolabe. P. Tannery, Recherches sur l'histoire de l'astronomie ancienne, Paris 1893, 53 ff., in dealing with the principle of the latter, demonstrates how easily the idea of a globe carrying the main constellations, surrounded by a hemispherical "spider" carrying the hour lines, could have been derived from the hemispherical sundial, струна (called ðepéýx in Eudoxus). The Fihrist (trans. by Suter in Abh. z. Gesch. d. math. Wiss., Vol. 6, 19, 1892) mentions Ptolemy as the first manufacturer of a spherical astrolabe, but this is evidently due to a confusion with the description in Alm. 5, 1 (see introduction to the present article). Neither can the instrument devised by al-Battānī (Op. astr., ed. Nallino, Vol. ii, 319 ff.) be called a spherical astrolabe, as it is a combination of a celestial globe with an armillary sphere which lacks the essential characteristics of the astrolabe, above all the "spider". The main steps in the development of the spherical astrolabe before Alphonsine X are marked by the treatises of Kūsṭa b. Lūkā (d. 300/912), Abu 'l-'Abbās al-Nayrizī (d. 310/922), al-Bīrūnī (K. fi Istīlab al-Wudhūh al-Mumkina fi Ṣan'āt al-Asturlāb), and al-Ḥasan b. 'All 'Umar al-Marrākūshī (d. 660/1262), see L. A. Sédillot's translation of the section on the spherical astrolabe in Mém. sur les instruments astron. des arabes, Vol. i, Paris 1834.

The spherical astrolabe serves the same purposes as the planispherical astrolabe. Its main disadvantage is, that it is considerably less handy than the latter and yet does not yield better results. The instrument as described in the Libros del Saber consists of the following pieces: (a) a metal globe on which are engraved three complete great circles representing the horizon, the meridian, and the first vertical; furthermore, in the upper hemisphere, the almucantars and the halves of the vertical circles that lie between the horizon and the zenith. The lower hemisphere, as on the flat astrolabe, carries the lines of the unequal hours (the equal hours can be read directly on the equator). On the meridian a number of pairs of diametrically opposite holes are bored so as to make the instrument adjustable to any geographical latitude; (b) the openwork "spider" containing the ecliptic, the equator, a number of fixed stars, a quadrant of altitude, and (only on the Alphonsine astrolabe) a shadow quadrant and a calendar; (c) a narrow semicircular strip of metal fitting closely to the surface of the "spider" and fastened with its centre to the pole of the ecliptic, about which it can be turned freely; together with the two diopters (tangent to the globe and parallel to one another) the whole of it forms the alidade of the spherical astrolabe; (d) an axis passing through the appropriate pair of holes on the globe and through the equatorial pole of the "spider". — On the Alphonsine astrolabe, the equator, otherwise always represented as a half great circle, is given the shape of a small (!) circle parallel to the equator proper. The astrolabe of al-Marrakushi, instead of the alidade, has a metal strip (safiha) turning about the pole of the equator, with a small gnomon fixed at right angles to it, which can thus be set on any point of the equator.

For detailed information, see Seemann [1].

AL-ASWAD b. YA'FUR (also called Yu'fur and Ya'fur) b. 'Abd al-Aswad al-Tamlimi, Abu '1-Djarrāb, pre-Islamic Arab poet who lived probably at the end of the 6th century A.D. He is said to have travelled about among the tribes, composing eulogies or satires in verse, and was for some time the companion of al-Nu'mān b. al-Mundhir. He is sometimes called al-Ashār of the Banū Najd, because he was night-blind, but he lost his sight at the end of his life, which is thought to have been extremely long. Of the poems which have come down to us, the most celebrated are a ḥaṣida in dīl dating probably from his later years and containing the usual commonplace on life's difficulties, the approach of death, the flight of youth, the infirmities of old age, etc.

Bibliography: His poems have been collected by L. Cheikho, Shu'ara' al-Nasirātīyya, 475-85; two ḥaṣidas figure in the Muḥaddasiyya, 1, 445-57, 846-95; Ibn Ḥutayba, Ṣahra, 134 f.; ibid., Ma'ārifi, Cairo 1353/1934, 282; 'Abd al-Malīk, Ṭabakāt, 73-74; Buṣūrī, Ḥamās, index; Ibn Durayd, Ṭabākih, 149; Aghānī, xi, 134-9; Baghdadī, Khisāna, i, 193-6; Abkāryūs, Randa, 44 ff.; O. Rescher, Abris, i, 178. (CH. PELLAT)

ASYŪT, town in Upper Egypt. Asyūt, the largest and busiest town of Upper Egypt, is situated Lat. 27° 11' N. on the west bank of the Nile. Owing to its situation in one of the most fertile and sheltered districts of the cultivable Nile valley, and also to its being the natural terminus of great desert highways it was in antiquity an important town (Syowt, Greek: Lykopolis) and the chief town of a Nomos. Under Islam Asyūt remained the chief town of a kāra (modern markaz, "district"), and on the inauguration of the division into provinces became the capital of a province (tamāl, now mudūrīyya).

Asyūt is the colloquial form of the literary Usyūt. Both are Arabic for the Coptic Siout, to which in the land registers of the Middle Ages the form Sayūt or Sayūt corresponded. But as early as the time of al-Kalqashandī (d. 821/1418) the popular pronunciation was Asyūt. A history of Asyūt cannot be written for the reason that we scarcely find any mention of it in the historians, and only towards the end of the Mamlūk period, under ʿAlī Bey, did it play any historical part, viz. in the year 1270 when it was for a time the centre of revolt. From the accounts of geographers and travellers we ascertain that it enjoyed unbroken prosperity throughout the entire Islamic period. At the end of the 19th century, it gained considerably in importance, especially after it became linked by rail with Cairo (in 1292/1875). Its population has risen from 26,000 in 1293/1876 to 42,000 before the first world war and about 120,000 at the present time.

In the Middle Ages Asyūt was famed for its agricultural products, its industry and trade. Besides corn and dates, quinces of an exceptional size were grown, as well as fine linen goods, called dabifri, dyed indigo obtained from the adjacent oases of al-Muṣār, and fine woollen goods and carpets modelled on the classical Armenian products. Today Asyūt still manufactures black and white tulle shawls with silver appliqué-work, which are much sought after for export.
after in Europe, and represent the last remains of an industry once very famous throughout the Orient. Further Asyut was engaged in the preparation of opium and in the making of high-quality pottery which, with its antique patterns, is still much in demand as black and red “Asyût-ware”.

There was a brisk trade in all these products throughout Egypt and abroad. The direct trade with the Sûdân is specially famous. The annual caravan (numbering about 1500 camels) brought slaves, ivory, ostrich-feathers and other products of the Sûdân, and received in exchange the products of Egypt’s industries, especially stuffs. The scholars of Napoleon’s expedition made careful investigations into this trade which has now so much declined.

Like all the industrial towns of Egypt, Asyût had a large Christian population—60, according to others as many as 75, churches and chapels—but no Jews at all, a fact explicitly stated. Caravanserais, bazaars, baths—one of the latter famous and very ancient—, mosques and other public buildings adorn the town to-day as formerly. In one of the mosques stood a minbar which at certain seasons was filled with corn and carried through the streets as an akhbâr (bayt al-mdl [q.v.]). Like all the flourishing towns of modern Egypt, Asyût has a strong admixture of Levantines.

Asyût is the birth place of Plotinus, the Coptic Saint John of Lykopolis and of several Arab scholars named al-Suyûtî, of whom the versatile historian Djalal al-Dîn (d. 911/1505) is the best known.


ATA. A Turkish word meaning “father”, and also “ancestor” (cf. the expression ata sîvât “proverb”). Among the Oguz, the qualifier ata was appended to the names of people who had acquired great prestige; this term can also bear the derived meaning of “wise”, and even of “holy”, “venerated”.

‘ATA, “gift”, the term most commonly employed to denote, in the early days of Islam, the pension of munifim, and, later, of the mawdûd, was impossible to give here the history of the system of pay throughout the Muslim world, and this article will be confined to a general outline.

The traditional starting-point is the organisation of the pensions by ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭîb. The first Muslims had derived no material advantage except their share of the booty from successful expeditions. The flow of taxes into the coffers of the nascent caliphate enabled a better regulated form of reward to be envisaged, which the traditionists and jurists explain in connexion with the organisation of the first divân and within the framework of their theories, subsequently evolved, on the utilisation of layâ recibir: the various versions which they give accord ill with one another, because they all reflect the desire, conceived at a later date, to find in the decisions of ‘Umar a precedent which did not exist. The main outlines, however, are clear: according to a hierarchic order which took into account kinship with the Prophet and especially seniority as regards admission to Islam, graduated pensions were distributed to the whole Muslim population which had been displaced from its homes by the holy war (the mukhâfibûn and anşâr of the early days, together with the fighting men of a later date), women, children, slaves and clients (still not numerous and not by definition foreigners), but excluding, of course, the Bedouins and others who remained, in Arabia and elsewhere, unaffected by the military expansion of Islam. The amount ranged from 200 to 12,000 dirhams, the great majority of the men receiving from 500 to 1,000 dirhams annually. The registration and classification of those eligible necessitated the organisation of a service which constituted the first divân, and the division of the beneficiaries into groups, ‘ârâfî, under the control of an ‘ârîf [q.v.]. All the quotations relevant to these questions are given with a commentary in Caetani, Annali, iv, 368-417, to which should now be added Abu ‘Ubayy Ibn Sallam, Kitâb al-anâmî, 233-71, and the references in Tritton, Notes on the Muslim system of pensions, in BSOAS 1954, 170-2, which also deals with the century following.

This system, conceived in terms of conditions at the time of ‘Umar, obviously could not continue unchanged. The ramification of family trees, conversion on a large scale, the slowing-up of the rate of the conquests and the reduction in the benefits derived from war, the increased complexity and specialisation, of military techniques during the Umayyad period, and later, during the ‘Abbasid period, the increasing professionalism and progressive “de-arabicisation” of the army, led, after many tentative procedures and irregularities, to a distinction between, on the one hand, civil pensions, reserved for the descendants of the Prophet’s family (‘Alî and ‘Abbasîd branches) and in general men of an honorary than concrete nature (we are, of course, not discussing here the salaries of officials, cf. riza), and on the other hand military pay; as regards the army, a distinction was made between the class of professional soldiers, registered in the divân and entitled to regular pay, and occasional volunteers, not registered in the divân, who received a smaller allowance confined to their period of effective service. On the other hand, whereas under the Umayyads, in spite of the ephemeral effort of ‘Umar b. Abî al-‘Azîz (cf. Wellhausen, Arabische Reich, 186-7), the mawdûd, who were by that time numerous and were for the most part Iranians, were virtually excluded from the benefit of pay, under the ‘Abbasids, it was the Khâshqâdâm and later the other elements, Turks, Daylamites, etc., who, as professionals, were almost the only persons to receive pensions, and the Arabs in the end were systematically removed from the registers in the course of the 3rd/9th century, at least in the East. In the early days, payment was made principally on a provincial basis, or, in Syria and Spain, on the basis of military districts called divân [q.v.], as a charge on the local taxes; but ‘Abbasid centralisation made the majority of these payments a charge on, or placed them under the direct control of, the Treasury (bayt al-mâl [q.v.]).

Although the amount of the payments seems to have been subject to considerable fluctuation, the
annual pay of a foot-soldier, in the second century of 'Ata’s rule, can be estimated to be of the order of 1,000 dinaars, or three times the pay of a Baghdádí journeyman, and that of a cavalryman twice as much. Commanders and specialised corps naturally received more. Kudáma describes in detail the functioning of the system, the differences between the various categories, the minute detail of the rolls, the different intervals at which different payments were made (W. Hoenerbach, 
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The extent to which 'Atá may have used traditions from the Prophet and from the Companions as his authority, he did not hesitate to use his personal opinion (ra'y), both in its disciplined and in his arbitrary form (šiyyás and šiikháns, respectively); statements which, reflecting a later fashion of thought, make him reject ra'y, are therefore spurious. The extent to which 'Atá may have used traditions from the Prophet and from the Companions as legal arguments, is difficult to ascertain; if he did so, he probably made use of the mursal (q.2) traditions. Owing to the rapid development of Islamic law at the beginning of the second century of the hijra, some of the distinctive opinions of 'Atá seem to have become unfashionable already towards the end of his life; this is probably reflected in the statement that some younger contemporaries of his ceased attending his lectures, and that the mursal traditions transmitted by him are weak. This was more than compensated by attributing to him, when the attitude to traditions had changed, personal contact with an ever increasing number of Companions of the Prophet, though some Muslim critics themselves point out that he did not hear traditions from 'Abd Alláh b. 'Umar, Umm Salama and others, and express doubt concerning his direct contact with 'Aisha. At the beginning of the second century, the interest of the specialists in Islamic law had already spread from purely religious problems to more technically legal questions; the authentic doctrines of 'Atá bear this out, and he did not specialise in the ceremonies of hajj and umrah as some sources assert in deference to the fiction that this was the favourite subject of the scholars of Mecca. Already during the life-time of 'Atá, his reputation spread far beyond Mecca, and Abu Hanífa states that he was present at his lectures; this is perhaps the earliest authentic piece of evidence on technical instruction in Islamic religious law.
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'Atáí BEY, Tayyázád 'Atá Allah Ahmad, known as 'Atáí Bey, Ottoman historian. He was born in Istanbul in 1225/1810, the son of a palace official. He himself was educated in the palace, and held various official positions. In 1293/1876 he went to the Hidjáz to take up an appointment as administrator of the sacred territory (harám) of Mecca, and died in Medina in 1294/1877 or 1297/1880. His most important work is his five volume history, known as *Ta’lím-i 'Atáí* (Istanbul 1291-2/1874-6). Its chief interest derives from its intimate knowledge of the organisation, customs, personalities, and affairs of the Imperial household in the 19th century. An autograph copy of his diwán is preserved in the Miýet library.
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**MEHMED 'ATÁÍ BEY** (1856-1919), Ottoman scholar, journalist, and public official. After the revolution of 1908 he became a member of the Financial Reform Committee and was for one week Minister of Finance. He published many articles in journals and periodicals, under the names of Meşgári and 'Atáí, and also produced a literary anthology called *Hikayé*, which was extensively read as a school text-book. His most important undertaking was the Turkish translation of Hammer’s History of the Ottoman Empire. This version, based on the French translation of J. J. Hellert, began to appear in Istanbul in 1329/1911. Of the fifteen volumes that were planned, only ten actually appeared, the last in 1337/1918.
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'Atáí ALLÁH EFENDI [see ŞAHİZÁDE],

'ATÁÍ MALIK DJİWAYNİ [see al-Djìwayn].

'ATABA, modern Arabic four line verse, common in Syria, Palestine, Mesopotamia and Irák. The first three lines not only rhyme, but generally repeat the same rhyming word with a different meaning (tadjnîs lâmîm). The last line rhymes with the paradigm jídhaa ("lovers' reproach"), and the last syllable of which is often supplied without making sense. The metre is a sort of wájír. A peculiar form common in Irák is called (a)bíðhíyye ("man of sorrow") or lámi and ends with iyya (eeyah).
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ATABAK (ATABEG), title of a high dignity under the Saljuqids and their successors. The term is Turkish and first makes its appearance in Muslim history with the Saljuqids; it is therefore reasonable to enquire whether any precedents exist in the Turkish societies of Central Asia. So far no occurrence of the actual word seems to have been reported and the fact that in the Orkhon civilisation there is apparently a person called ata, father, acting as a tutor to a young prince, is too vague to enable one to affirm a connexion; the same is true of similar cases existing in other civilisations (see for example Harun al-Rashid and Yahya al-BarmakI); moreover no such office has so far been noted even under the Karakhanids. The term atabeg, therefore, seems to be more precisely characteristic of the Oguz or the Saljuqids. Even under the latter, the first definite indication of the title, which was subsequently to make history as the title of Turkish military chiefs, applies to an Iranian 'civilian': Malikshah, who was very young when he came to power, added the term atabeg to the valab of his wazir Nizam al-Mulk, thereby indicating that he conferred upon him the entire delegation of his own authority, as though he were his father (Ibera, ed. Tornberg, i, 151; BCEA, vii, no. 2734-2737). Nevertheless the fact that from the death of Malikshah the title is to be met with in all branches of the Saljuqid dynasty, including that of Asia Minor, which has a specific evolution, prompts one to admit its existence already at the origin of the regime. In these circumstances there is no reason to reject the evidence, not apparently previously adduced, of the event at Dawla al-Saljijiyya, ed. Muh. Nizam, 28-29, which places a Turkish atabeg beside the young Alp Arslan during his father’s lifetime in the person of a certain Kuft al-Din Khurial (Kizil Sahiroglu?). The honour conferred on Nizam al-Mulk, a non-Turk and wazir, appears to have been something of an exception, all the more characteristic of his ascendancy.

However that may be, from the death of Malikshah, the atabegs appear more and more regularly, whilst the role played by them increases, favoured by princely minorities and strife between pretenders. Henceforth only Turkish military chiefs are involved, corresponding to the growing influence acquired by this element during the period of the Saljuqids regime’s decay. Malikshah appearedly during his father’s lifetime, had the djanlär Gumishtakin as ‘preceptor (murabbiyyi)’ and atabeg (‘Imad al-Din al-Ishahani, abridgement by Bundari, ed. Houssia, 53; cf. al-Rawandi, Khatat al-Shudar, ed. Muh. Kazwini, 110). He, in turn, created others for his young brothers Sandjar and Muhammed, when he accorded them autonomous appanages, and on his death-bed, also for his son Malikshah, who was still a child. At the same time, on the death of Malikshah’s brother Tutush, whose appanage was in Syria and who was the unfortunate rival of Barkyurk, we find an atabeg with each of his sons Rudwan and Duqak. Henceforth every Saljuqid prince seems to have had an atabeg, at least if he was endowed with an appanage whilst still a minor; in other words, wherever there were several sons, there were also several atabegs. As they now issued exclusively from the category of military chiefs of servile origin, their function may in a way be associated with the duty of every slave or manumitted slave to guard the interests of his master’s family to which he himself belonged. Furthermore the atabeg frequently made his position as a ‘father’ complete by marrying his pupil’s mother, when the latter became a widow (for example early on, Tughtakin at Damascus, the mother of Duqak). As for his authority, this consisted in his sharing in the unrestricted power of the prince and therefore it cannot be defined by precise attributions, as in the case of ordinary functions. However, he could be dismissed by another atabeg; in any case, when the prince grew up, the atabeg’s authority naturally disappeared, only leaving room for his influence as a counsellor, who had the prince’s ear; if the atabeg assumed more than that, a rupture with the prince followed (for example, Rudwan and Duqak), or even the atabeg’s execution (Kutlughathkin by Barkyurk’s brother Muhammed).

This, at least was the initial state. But relatively soon the atabeg’s position was consolidated at the expense of that of the prince and their claimant to the throne. The office of atabeg gave its holder great authority, which he was normally tempted to perpetuate. But in addition, from the second generation of Malikshah’s heirs, the respective roles of prince and atabeg were reversed. The starting point now was that either willingly or under duress the sultan would bestow a major governorship on a powerful amir and, in order to safeguard the formal independence of the latter, he attached one of the Saljuqid children to him, whose atabeg he became. For a while the young prince continued to serve as a cloak beneath which the chief concealed his own ambitions; such was the case in the disputes which brought Sultan Mas’ud into conflict with various of his relatives, each of whom was urged on by his atabeg. Thus Farz, Aghbaraydjan and, at one time, Mas’ud, the latter became a widow (for example early on, Tughtakin at Damascus, the mother of Dukak). The honour conferred on Nizam al-Mulk, a non-Turk and wazir, appears to have been something of an exception, all the more characteristic of his ascendancy.

A further new stage was reached when the atabeg succeeded in making hereditary, in addition to his office, possession of the governorship, which in theory constituted his reward for it. This was accomplished after the middle of the 6th/12th century by the family of the atabegs of Aghbaraydjan, who were descended from Ildegiz, the atabeg of Sultan Arsian. Lastly at the beginning of the century, the death of her son Barkyurk, apparently during his father’s lifetime, had the atabeg Tughtakin to found a dynasty which was both autonomous and in his own name. Elsewhere all-powerful atabegs reached the same results by suppressing their sultans, who were completely devoid of resources: this was accomplished at Mawji’il on the death of the atabeg Zangi by his heirs in 539/1144 and was achieved against the last Persian Saljuqid, with the help of the Caliph, by the heirs of Ildegiz, who summoned the Khwarizmshah into central Iran (588/1192). Moreover the sultan’s disappearance did not hinder the masters of Aghbaraydjan and of Mawji’il from continuing to have themselves called atabegs; the word, hence-
forth, had in practice the exclusive sense of territorial prince. Thus it seems that from the middle of the 6th/12th century the title in Fars had been adopted by the Salghurids, the vanquishers of the real atabegs, without their having any longer a sultan under their tutelage. The most famous of the Atabeg dynasties is that of Mawsil, by reason of the work devoted to them by their historian and subject Ibn al-Athir. A further new dynasty of pseudo-atabegs was to appear in the 7th-11th century in Luristan (Hamd Allah Mustawfi Kazwinî, Ta'rikh-i Guzida).

The title atabeg was still to be met with among the successors of the Saljukids, in particular under the Khwarizm-shahs, who did not allow those who bore it, exclusively tutors of young princes, to acquire much influence (Djâwâni, ii, 22, 33, 39, 209). Later on, in all those states which derived from the Mongol conquest, the appellation atabeg is to be met with upon occasion fortuitously, applied to indefinite princely tutors or as one of a number of simple honorific titles inherited from the past (see references in M. F. Köprüli, art. Atabeg in IA). More remarkable is the penetration of this title, attributed to military and feudal leaders, into Christian Georgia, which had borrowed other institutions from neighbouring Agharbaydjân, with whom they were alternatively at war or in matrimonial relationship (J. Karst, Le code géorgien du roi Vakhlang, Commentaire, i, 221 ff.; M. Fr. Bosset, Histoire de Géorgie, 1/2, passim; Allen, A History of the Georgian People, 1935, chap. xxiii).

Among the Saljukids of Asia Minor, the atabeg is attested from the beginning of the reign of Khalîl Arslân I, in the person of Thumartâb al-Salâymânî (consequently a manumitted slave of his father Salâymân b. Kuṭû lmumî) (Ibn al-Azraq, quoted in a note by Amedroz to the History of Damascus of Ibn al-Kalânî, 157). Shortly afterwards the mother of the young Saljukid of Malatya, to protect him against his brother of Kunya, gave him a series of atabegs, whom she took in marriage, the last of them being the neighbouring Arâkîl Balâk [q.v.] (Michael the Syrian, trans. Chabot, 194 and 200). In the main branch, atabegs are also reported in the 6th/11th century (RCEA, no. 3376-3377), and then in the 7th/12th century; the power of the sovereigns prevented them from expanding and it is only after that disaster which ended in the Mongol protectorate that the title occurs borne by men with a decisive influence on the régime, such as Djalâl al-Dîn Karatây. However, in Asia Minor the actual conditions of the evolution had given the power to a team of high dignitaries, friends or enemies according to the case, rather than to a single individual, and the atabeg was not the most important. In this area he does not appear to have survived the Ilkhanid régime and he was unknown to the Ottomans.

The title of atabeg, however, still had a fairly long independent career in the Mamlûk state. The Ayyûbids had made it known in their realms; it may perhaps have found expression in the ephemeral tutelage which al-Afdal exercised in 595/1198 over his young nephew, the son of al-Asfî in Egypt; in any case it was used more permanently and formally during princely minorities in the Yemen and particularly at Jâhîâ (History of Aleppo of Ibn al-Aầnîn passim). This is the way in which it reached the Mamlûks. The founder of the régime, ʻÎzâz al-Dîn Aybak, bore the title, not as tutor to a prince, but as regent-spouse of the famous heir and widow of al-Šâhîb Ayyûb, Shâdîrât al-Durr; and the title, sometimes accompanied by considerable power, at other times devoid of it, survived down to the end of the dynasty. If one may believe al-Makrîzî (Saltak, trans. Quatremère i/1, 2), Aybak bore the title of atabeg of the armies; but no contemporary author has attributed it to him and one must perhaps envisage a confusion in al-Makrîzî's mind with the title of atabak al-'asākîr [q.v.], which was usual in his time. In effect it then corresponded with a kind of supreme military command, though it only acquired this extended meaning apparently under the Circassians, following the suppression of the office of the naṣîb.

Bibliography: The only general study is by M. F. Köprüli, op. cit., where detailed references and additional information will be found. For the sources and other materials, apart from those already cited in the article, see below the articles Mamlûks and Saljuqids. On the Great Saljuqs and their irano-irakî successors, the information used here has been taken mainly from Ibn al-Athir, ʻImâd al-Dîn al-Isfahânî, and Râwandi. See also Sanaullah, The decline and fall of the Saljuqids Empire, Calcutta 1938; M. A. Köyemen, Büyûk Selçuklu Imparatoriylu Tarihi, ii, Ankara 1954; I. H. Uzunçarşı, Osmanlî Devleti lehîçilîhna medhâl, Istanbul 1941, 50-1. For Asia Minor, see principally the chronicles of Ibn Bîblî and Akkoyunlî, passim. For the Mamlûks, see the following article.

(Ç. CAHRI)

ATABAK AL-'ASĀKIR. After the decline of the office of the viceroy (Nâ'îb al-Saltanâ) the Atâbak al-ʻasâkîr (Commander-in-Chief) of the Mamlûk Army became the most important amir in the Sultanate. His functions were much broader than the name of his office indicates. For all intents and purposes he had become the sultan's viceroy. Very frequently the title muâdâbîr al-mamâlik or muâdâbîr al-mamâlik al-isâmîyya was appended to his name. It was common, especially in the Circassian period, for him to succeed the sultan on the throne. (See D. Ayalon, Studies on the Structure of the Mamlûk Army, in BSOAS, 1954, 58-59, and references on p. 59, n. 6.)

(Ç. AYALON)

ATABEG [see ATABAK].

ATABEG AL-'ASĀKIR [see ATABAK AL-'ASĀKIR].

'ÂTÂ. 'ÂTâ. 'ÂTâ. ‘átâ. 'ÂTâ. AYBAK, ILI, NASÜ Ï, known as NEW‘I-ŽANÌ 'ÂTÂ, a prominent Ottoman poet of the early 17th century and continuator of Taşkprüö-zade's biographical work on the Ottoman 'ulama' and dervishes. (Muhbîb, Khulâsâ, iv, 263, incorrectly gives his ism as Muhammâd). He was born in Istanbul in Şawwâl 991/1583, where his father (who, under the malâkâs, New', enjoyed high esteem as a poet and scholar—from 998 to 1003, he was tutor to the ill-fated sons of Murâd III) was at this time professor of the Djâfar Agha madrasa; his mother was the daughter of the famous Nishânlî Mehmed Pasha (Siďiîlî-i Öthmânî, iv, 131). Having studied under Kâfâ-žeđe Fâyd Allah Ef. (the father of the anthologist Faydî) and Akgî-žeđe ‘Abdülhalim Ef., he began his career as professor of the Djanbahîyye madrasa in Istanbul Şafâr 1014/1606, but was soon to be transferred to the judicial class by his appointment as kâfî of Lofdja in Şa‘b. 1017. He held a number of such posts in Rümî (Şaykhî) gives the most detailed information about these, the last of which was Üsküb, whence he was dismissed at the end of 1044/1635. He returned to Istanbul where he died in Diumâdâ I, 1045 (‘Uşşûhâr-zâde, i, 26b and
The most famous and valuable of his works is the Ḥaddīth al-Ḥakā‘īf fi Tahmīlīlī al-Ṣakā‘īk (completed in Rabi‘ II, 1044 and printed in Istanbul, 1268), in which he brings down to his own day the biographical sketches of the Ottoman ulamā‘ and dervishes begun by Taşkköprüzade in his Arabic al-Ṣakā‘īk al-Nu‘mānīyya (Brockelmann, i, 425). Like the latter, it is organised according to the reign in which the individual died, the last being that of Murād IV, but the language is now Turkish and the notices are far more precise in detail and frequently contain ʿAtā‘ī’s personal remarks and reminiscences. The style is similar to that used by Medjdi in his translation of the ʿṢakā‘īk, and, while the taste of recent generations almost intolerably elegant, was greatly admired by his contemporaries; and, indeed, it is this alone which redeems the work from being a mere statistical summary. The popularity of his poetry, too, has not survived (cf. Gibb, Ottoman Poetry, iii, 232 ff. for the 19th century Ottoman critics), though at least one modern scholar, M. F. Koprulū, has found his naghmā works deserving of study. These latter are included in his khamsa, of which the fifth portion, entitled Ḥiyāt al-ʿAkhdar, was until recently regarded as lost or non-existent. For a full analysis of the other four works and a short account of his divan, all still unpublished, cf. Hammer-Furgatt, Gesch. osman. Dichtkunst, iii, 244-283. (It should be remarked that the chronogram given here for the date of completion of the Naḥf al-ʿAṣr is 1020, while that given by A. S. Levend is 1034). The only other work ascribed to him is a legal monograph, al-Kawāl al-Ḥasan fi Ḍiyāwāb al-Kawāl Liman ... (Brockelmann, ii, 427), which, from its title, appears to be a reply to an unfinished work by his contemporary Mollājkī Ḍumāned Ef. (cf. Ḥakā‘īk, 669).

Bibliography: To the works mentioned by Babinger, 171 and Brockelmann, ii, 427, should be added those given by Behcet Guni, Istanbul Kültüphanelerinde al-Ṣakā‘īk al-Nu‘mānīyya Terküme ve Zeyilleri, Türkiyat Memmuadı, vii-viii, cüz 2 (1945), 161; ʿṢayyik, Ṭabaqat al-Fudalā‘, (Süleymanpaşa, Beşir Ağası, 479), f. 38; Riyāḍ, Riyāḍ al-Shu‘arā‘, (Nuruosmaniye, 3724), f. 216b. ʿUṣṭaköprüzade’s Ḥiyāt-i Şakā‘īk was used in the Murād Mollā MS., nr. 1432, f. 26a. Sadeddin Nühet Ergün, Türk Şairleri, ii, 541-550, gives the most extensive selection of his verse and reproduces in his article the statements of ʿṢayyik, Riyāḍ and Rūzi, as well as the opinions of M. F. Koprulū. On the Khamsa, cf. Ağāh Sirî Levend, ʿAttā‘înin Hiyâ-țul-Efdar, (Ankara, 1948); however, his argument in support of 1046 as the year of ʿĀṭā‘ī’s death is unconvincing.

(J. WALEH)

ATAK (Attock), a fort in West Pākistān 33° 53’ N, 73° 15’ N, commanding the passage of the Indus just below the junction with the Kābul river. Atak was founded by Akbar in 959/1553 (under the name of Atak-Banārān) to defend the main invasion route from Kābul via Peshāvar against the incursions of his brother Mīrzā Ḥakm. For contemporary explanations of the name see Fīrūzhta, 1, 502 and Abu T-Faḍl, Akhar-hāna, Bib. Ind. Text, iii, Calcutta 188-87, 355; for a comment on its possible historical derivation see Cunningham, Arch. Sur. India, ii, 1877, 7.

Coming into British occupation at the end of the second Sikh war, Atak lost some of its military value with the opening (1900/1883) of the combined road and rail bridge to carry the Grand Trunk road and the North-West railway.


(PI. HARDY)

ATALIK. A term synonymous with atābeq, used not only among the Turks, but also in the Caucasus, Turkistan, and by the Timūrids and the Turkish dynasties of India. It was still used in the 19th century by the amirs of Buğhāra and Kuḥva, and the amir of Rāshīq, ʿYaḥyā Bey bore the title of atalik ghāzī.

Bibliography: See the article, with a very full bibliography, by M. F. Koprulū in IA, s.v. (R. MANTRAN)

ʿATAMA (a.), the first third of the night, according to the lexica, from the time of waning of the ʿṣaḥāk (the red colour of the sky after sunset). This definition covers exactly the right time for the ʿsalāt al-ʿiqāb, which is therefore often called ʿsalāt al-ʿṣama, even in quite large a number of traditions. But later on, pious circles rejected this name, since the ʿsalāt al-ʿiqāb is expressly called thus in the Kūrān. A tradition appeared which declared the use of ʿṣama with regard to the prayer to be characteristic of Bedouins, who used to milk their camels at that time and call the milking itself ʿṣama. Muslims are requested to use the name which ʿAḥlām himself used in the Holy Book.

Bibliography: Wensinck, Handbook, s.v. ʿṣama, ʿiqāb.

(PI. PLESSNER)

ATAR, town in Mauritania, chief place of the Circle of the Adrar, situated at a height of 230 m. on the route Saint-Louis to Tindouf, about 420 km. to the east of Port-Etienne. The Kṣar has 4500 inhabitants belonging for the most part to the Smāṣids, a tribe of marabout. According to local tradition Atar was founded in the 16th or 17th century. At this period the pilgrims’ caravan to Mecca was organised each year by the İdān ʿĀli of Chinguetti (Shinkītī) who used to give the imamate to a distinguished member of the Smāṣids. It happened that they broke with this tradition in favour of a Ghellawi. Outraged, a group of the Smāṣids left the town in protest and arrived at an important settlement of the Azoūgui which has now disappeared, but was then rich enough for the Portuguese to have established a factory there in the 15th century. So this display of temper gave birth to Atar.

Although Chinguetti has remained the spiritual and religious capital of the Adrar, Atar is now the principal commercial centre, providing a market for the great nomads and the southern outlet for the products of Moroccan workers. It is here that graziers come to sell their camels and sheep and to stock themselves up with tea, sugar, indigo, oil etc. It is also to its important palm-grove that they come to perform the process known as ġaṭna, the cleaning of the dates, which brings in great wealth at the time of the date-harvest.

When, at the beginning of the 20th century, Coppolani and his successor, Colonel Montane-Capdebosc, extended French influence to the north of Senegal, they were soon forced to the conclusion that no peace was possible in Mauritania while the
mountainous range of the Adrar provided an ideal centre for armed malcontents.

It was Atar, capital of the Adrar, "the Key to the Situation", that Colonel Gouraud chose as the objective for his column in 1908.

After defeating the Emir's warriors and the (alibs of Shaykh Ma al-Àynayn at the pass of Hamdoun, he entered the Ksar on 9 January 1909 and received the submission of the chief of the Smacids, Sidia Ould Siddi Baba.

Since then Atar, linked by road and air to Senegal and Morocco has considerably increased its economic and commercial importance.


(S. D'Otton Loyewski)

**ATAR** (Mustafa Kemal), the founder and first President of the Turkish Republic, was born at Salonica 1881 and died at Istanbul on 10th November 1938. He lost his father, 'Ali Rida, whilst still very young, so that it was his mother, Zübeyde Khânlâ, who saw to his education. At the age of twelve he entered the military preparatory school at Salonica, where one of his teachers made him take the name of Kemal in addition to Mustafa. In 1895 he entered the Military School of Monastir, then in 1899 that of Istanbul, where he started to take an interest in political life and to play an active part in the secret opposition movements, which the despotism of Sultan 'Abd al-Hamîd [q.v.] had called into being. He obtained the diploma of the Academy of War of Istanbul in 1905, and was then sent to Damascus as a Captain, where he founded the *Watan ve Hürriyet* (Fatherland and Freedom) group. Upon his return from Salonica, he only took part from a distance in the activities of the *Hüttâd ve Terakki* (Union and Progress) movement. He took part in the defence of Istanbul during the first world war, distinguished himself in the Dardanelles' fighting (1915) and, as an Army Commander, in the fighting in the Caucasus (1916) and in Palestine (1917). After a short visit to Germany, he reassumed command of the 7th Army in Palestine, with which he retreated as far as the area north of Aleppo, where he was at the time of the Mudros Armistice (30th October 1918). Mustafa Kemal did not agree with the Draconic terms of the Armistice and came into conflict with Sultan Mehemmed VI. Recalled to Istanbul, where his national feelings were severely tested, he was then appointed Inspector of the Army of the North at Erzurum on 30th April 1919. On 19th May, he landed at Samsun with his mind made up to fight for the total independence of Turkey, threatened by the designs of the Allies, by relying on the troops which had remained faithful to him. On 22nd June he issued a circular from Amasya condemning the government of the Sultan and of the Grand Vizier Dâmâd Ferid Pasha. Through the medium of the congresses which he assembled at Erzurum (23rd July) and at Sivas (4th September) he launched the demand for the independence and unity of Turkey. On 23rd April 1920, having won a certain number of political and military personalities to his cause, he assembled the first Great National Assembly (*Büyük Millet Meşâisi*) at Ankara, which elected him President. The struggle had begun against both the Government of Istanbul and the Allies, more particularly the Greeks (1920-2). His decisive part in the campaigns conducted against the latter caused the Assembly to bestow on him the title of *Ghazi* ("The victor").

The Armistice of Mudanya (11 October 1922) set the seal on Mustafa Kemal's victory, and on 1st November 1922 he obtained the vote abolishing the Sultanate. The Lausanne Conference (November 1922-July 1923) gave complete independence to Turkey as well as national frontiers. The second Great National Assembly, the majority of whose members belonged to the People's Party (*Khalk Fırkası*, modern Tki. *Halk Fırkası*), founded by Muşafâ Kemâl (subsequently the People's Republican Party: *Cumhuriyet Halk Fırkası*), by Mustafa Kemal was elected President—an office to which he was constantly re-elected until his death—whilst 'İşmet Pasha (İşmet İnönü) was appointed Prime Minister and Ankara became the capital of Turkey. The abolition of the Caliphate was voted on 3rd March 1924.

The first years of the Turkish Republic were marked by the fierce determination of Muşafâ Kemâl to modernise the country, to free it from foreign economic tutelage and to secularise it. Relying on a single absolutely devoted party, he imposed a Constitution which virtually placed all power in the hands of the President of the Republic (30th April 1924). Secularisation, marked by the suppression of the religious courts, Kurânic schools and dervish orders, the prohibition of the wearing of the fez, the abolition of the article of the Consti-tution declaring Islam the state religion, brought about local risings (Kurdistan and the Izmir region) and reactions in some political circles, which were swiftly suppressed. Modernisation and turkisation proceeded hand in hand through the nationalisation of foreign companies, the impulse given to agriculture and industry, the creation of national banks, the development of means of communication, a reform of the alphabet, the vote for women and the introduction of new civil, criminal, and commercial codes. Muşafâ Kemâl's decisions, sanctioned by the Assembly without opposition, were disseminated throughout the country by the local sections of the People's Party and by the *Halk okler* (Houses of the people); the whole nation was affected and impreg-nated by the new ideas. In November 1934, a law required all citizens to use family names; the Assembly accorded Muşafâ Kemâl that of Atatürk.

In foreign policy, he showed himself to be pacific, though determined to protect the independence of his country: he concluded treaties of friendship or alliance with the neighbouring states and with the Great Powers. He signed a pact with Greece, Rumania and Yugoslavia, "the Balkan Entente" (9th February 1934), which was extended eastwards by the Pact of Sa'dâbdâd (Turkey, 'Irâk, Iran and Afghanistan, July 1937).

Mustafa Kemal died on 10th November 1938 at Istanbul, mourned by a whole nation, who saw in him the liberator and the renovator of their country. A provisional tomb was erected at the Ethnographic Museum in Ankara; on 10th November 1953, his remains were solemnly transferred to the vast mausoleum erected in his honour in the capital.

Mustafâ Kemâl was a man uncompromising by nature, impatient of opposition, exacting in his
demands both upon himself and others, his sole objective being the restoration of his country and the promotion of its greatness. Opposed to the Sultanate and to Islam, he strove relentlessly to suppress them both, for he considered them responsible for the decay of the Ottoman Empire. His passionate love of his country led him into the severe treatment both of ethnic minorities long settled in Turkey and of prominent Turks whose crime was that they did not subscribe to all his political ideas. Yet Atatürk has imparted to the new Turkish régime the deep imprint of his personality. There could be no question for his successors of going back on his work, except in the matter of religion and in the democratisation of the régime.


ATABARA, a tributary of the Nile, known to the ancients as Astobara. It rises in Abyssinia not far from Gondar and, entering the Sudán near Gallabat (Kallabat) is joined lower down by the Salam and Setti; it joins the Main Nile at a point about 200 miles north of Khartoum. During the flood season (end of May to end of September) it contributes a considerable amount of silt-laden water to the Nile; for the rest of the year it dries up into a series of pools.

The town of Atbara near the river mouth is important as the headquarters of the Sudán railways (population of the Municipal council area 36,143), and as the junction for the Red Sea line. In the battle of the Atbara fought on 8 June 1898 at Naghlaya, a short distance upstream from the river mouth, the Anglo-Egyptian forces under Sir Herbert (later Lord) Kitchener destroyed a Mahdist army of 12,000 infantry and 4,000 horsemen commanded by the Darwish amir Mahmud Ahmad.


(CHASELLSON)

ATEIBA [see .utfayba].

ATEK, district in Soviet Türkmenistan on the northern slope of the frontier-mountains of Khurâsân (Kopet Dagh), between the modern railway-stations Gjaur and Dughak. The name is really Turkish, Etek, “edge border” (of the mountain-chain), and is a translation of the Persia district, viz. Dâman-i Küb, “foot of the mountain”; but the word is always written Atk by the Persians. During the Middle Ages no special name for Atek appears to have been in use; being a district of the town of Abiward [q.v.] it belonged to Khurâsân. In the 10th/11th and 11th/12th centuries, it fell into the power of the Khâns of Khârizm, and later into that of the Turkomans; before the appearance of the Russians the frontier with Persia was never clearly defined. Previous to the delimitation of the borders in 1881 a part of Atek with Abiward belonged to the principality of Kalâ, which was subject to the overlordship of Persia. (W. BARTHOLOMÉ)

‘ÂTF (=? connexion), an Arabic grammatical term denoting a connexion with a preceding word. Two kinds of ‘âtf are distinguished: ‘âtf al-nasab or ‘âtf properly so-called, and ‘âtf al-bayân:

1. The simple co-ordinative connexion (‘âtf al-nasab) consists of the co-ordination of a word with a preceding word by means of one of the ten particles of connexion, e.g.: kâma Zayd wa-‘Amr. The co-ordinative particles (al-‘awdîf or huruf al-‘âtf) are distinguished according to their degree of strength: wa is used for the simple co-ordinative relationship (‘ata’-’lam); fa, qumma and hâl express relationships of governance and subordination (‘ata’-’tartib); aw, imra, or am express a fluctuation between these two terms (‘ata’-’l-khâk bi akhâ ‘l-madhâkhram), and la, bal, or lâkin an antithesis (la ‘l-khâlîl). ‘Aft can connect words (mufrad ‘alâ mufrad) as well as clauses (diwâla ‘alâ diwâla). According to Ibn Yâhya, nasab is a term belonging to the terminology of Kûfa, ‘âtf to that of Basra.

2. The explicative connexion (‘âtf al-bayân) is an apposition, which however cannot be an adjective, and which, in contrast to badal, explains the preceding word (mâdîh li-matbu’ihi), e.g.: diwâla ‘alâ Zayd, or askama bi’l-hâla Abû Hafs ‘Umar. From this point of view ‘âtf al-bayân has exactly the same value as wa-huwa.

In both kinds of ‘âtf, the second word is called al-ma’ffâl, and the preceding al-ma’faq ‘alayhi.

Bibliography: See the works on grammar, especially Zâmakshâri, Mulassal, 54, 54, 140, 142, 142, 142; Dict. of Techn. Terms, 1007-10.

(G. WEIL)

ÂTFIH, town in Middle Egypt. Atfih (also written with f instead of ç) is a town of about 4,300 inhabitants on the east bank of the Nile at the latitude of Fayyûm. The name of the town in old Egyptian was Tep-yeh or Per Hathor nebt Tep-yeh, i.e., “house of Hathor, lady of Tep-yeh”. The Copts changed this name to Petpeh, the Arabs to Atfih. The Greeks, identifying Hathor with Aphrodite, called the town Aphroditopolis, abbreviated to Atfih. The Persians, keeping the name, modified it to the modern form Atek, “edge border” (of the mountain-chain), and the preceding al-ma’ffâl ‘alayhi.

Bibliography: See the works on grammar, especially Zâmakshâri, Mulassal, 54, 54, 140, 142, 142, 142; Dict. of Techn. Terms, 1007-10.

(G. WEIL)
was already in a state of complete decay. It was only under the Khedives that the government again began to do something for this region. The incessant raids by Bedouins and Mamluks came to an end; canals were built or restored. Atfih is today a port of no more than local importance; trade is only on a small scale.

Bibliography: Kalâshandā, Daw' al-Sabk al-Musfer (trans. Wüstenfeld, 93, 104); Makrizi, Khasiat, i, 73; ‘All Mubarak, al-Kašf al-Diraidda, vii, 27; Ibn Dukmāk, iv, 153; Yâkût, i, 312; Abd al-Sālih, 560 ff.; Ibn Khurraḍdibb, 82; Amel- línea, Geographie de l’Egypte à l’époque Copte, 326; Boinet, Dictionnaire géographique de l’Egypte, 86; Baederke, Égypte, s.v.; Makrizi, Khasiat, ed. IFAO, i, 312; J. Maspero and G. Wiet, Matériaux pour servir à la géographie de l’Égypte, 21.

(C. H. Becker *)

ATFIYĀSH, Muhammad b. Yūsuf b. ‘Isa b. Șalām, called Kūṭib al-’Awmāna, Ibāḍī scholar and author of Bīnī Īṣqu (arabicised: Banū Yāṣqan) in the Mzab, d. 1332/1914, 94 years old. Descendant of a family of scholars, he brought about, by his extensive literary activity (of which the few items in Brockelmann, S II, 893, cannot give an adequate idea), a real renaissance of Ibāḍī religious studies in the West. This went parallel with an increasing strictness in religious practices and in social life, the effects of which, seen through the eyes of the women of the Mzab, have been described by A. M. Goichon (REI, 1930, 231 ff.). Shāykh Ṭafīyāsh was in close relations with his coreligionaries in the East, where another great Ibāḍī scholar, Ṣāḥib Allāh b. Humayyid al-Šālimi (Brockelmann, S II, 823), was his contemporary. Whilst defending his point of view vigorously, he did much to make the Ibāḍīs known to and respected by the other Muslims, and this brought him into contact with sultan ‘Abd al-Hamīd II. The leading Ibāḍī scholars in the Mzab in the present time are his disciples. His library, a unique collection of Ibāḍī and other works in manuscripts and in printed and lithographed editions, is a wakf in Bīnī Īṣqu; it contains many of his autograph manuscripts.

His main works are: commentaries on the Qurʾān: Himyan al-Zād illā Dar al-Ma‘ād, 14 vols., Zanzibar 1150; Tafsīr al-Tafsīr, 6 vols., Algiers 1326; traditions: Wafi al-Damāna, 3 vols., Cairo 1366-68; religious law: Sharh al-Nil (commentary on the K. al-Nil of ‘Abd al-‘Arīz al-Mus‘ābī, d. 1121/1708; Brockelmann, S II, 892), Cairo 1305-6; Ǧamīl al-‘Arī al-Wal-Far, 2 vols., Cairo 1348; Sharh Dāʾīm Ibn al-Naqṣ (on this author, see Brockelmann, II, 538), 2 vols., Algiers 1326; Taḥkīh al-Ǧamīl, Algiers 1319; dogmatics: Sharḥ Risālat al-Tazkīḥ (commentary on the ‘Irshād of Abū Haṣṣ ‘Umar b. ‘Uqayl); Brockelmann, S II, 357), Algiers 1326; al-Dhakh al-Ḫalāṣi, Cairo 1343; also works on grammar and philosophy, some poetic, and writings on various subjects.


(J. Schacht *)

ATHAR (A.), pl. Ṭāḥār, literally "trace"; as a technical term it denotes: 1) a tradition [see Ṭāḥār]; 2) a relic: al-ṭāḥar al-ṣarīr (pl. al-ṭāḥār al-ṣarīr[a]), relics of the Prophet, hair, teeth, autographs, utensils alleged to have belonged to him and especially impressions of his footprints [see KADĀM]; these objects are preserved in mosques and other public places for the edification of Muslims. Relics are also called, both by Christians and Muslims, dhakhira ("treasure").


For a description, with illustrations, of the sacred relics preserved in Istanbul see Tašzin Ğa, Hitrā-i Saʿdāt Dairesi ve Emanet-i Mukaddese, Istanbul 1953.

(I. Goldziher *)

3) Ğhār also is used as another technical term in the theory of causality, although it is less commonly used than ḥalāla and sabab with their derivatives [qf./pl.]. From the latter mode of style, e.g. from a higher, active being or thing, (for example, God), emanate taḥārāt, "influences", in contrast under certain conditions ġhār, "impressions", in lower beings or things. In contrast to the higher beings, the latter behave in a passive (or better: receptive) manner. This use of the word is most frequently found in the astrologers and natural philosophers, with reference to the influence of the stars (considered as higher beings possessing a soul) on the terrestrial world and on men. In addition, the atmospheric phenomena, which are also under the influence of the stars, are called al-ṭāḥār al-ulwiyya [q.v.]. The Meteorology of Aristotle was translated into Arabic under this title. Ğhār fi ‘l-nafs (ṭāḥārul Ṭāḥār) is the name given to the emotions and ideas of the sentient soul, because the soul experiences the impressions of things. (T. de Börk *)

AL-ÂTHĀR AL-ULWIYYA, "The meteorological phenomena," title used by the Arabs to designate the Meteorology of Aristotle and that of Theophrastus.

1. In his Risāla fi Kamiyyuṭ Kutub Aristotēlēs wa ma yuḥtāḏu ilāyah fi Taḥsīl al-Falṣafa, al-Kindi mentions, in fourth place among the books of physical sciences (al-fabiyyāt), The Book of the phenomena of the air and of the earth (Ḳūbār Āḥāṯ al-Dīsaw wa ‘l-Arṣ); (see M. Guidi and R. Walzer, Uno scritto introduttivo allo studio di Aristotele, Studi su al-Kindi, i, Atti della R. Accad. dei Lincei, Mem. della classe di scienze morali, 6: 6, 1937). The same division of the fabiyyāt occurs in al-Yaḥṣābī, i, 149, who cites the book Fi ’l-Ṣharā’ib. Also in the Mzab, d. 1332/1914, 94 years old. Descendant of a family of scholars, he brought about, by his extensive literary activity (of which the few items in Brockelmann, S II, 893, cannot give an adequate idea), a real renaissance of Ibāḍī religious studies in the West. This went parallel with an increasing strictness in religious practices and in social life, the effects of which, seen through the eyes of the women of the Mzab, have been described by A. M. Goichon (REI, 1930, 231 ff.). Shāykh Ṭafīyāsh was in close relations with his coreligionaries in the East, where another great Ibāḍī scholar, Ṣāḥib Allāh b. Humayyid al-Šālimi (Brockelmann, S II, 823), was his contemporary. Whilst defending his point of view vigorously, he did much to make the Ibāḍīs known to and respected by the other Muslims, and this brought him into contact with sultan ‘Abd al-Hamīd II. The leading Ibāḍī scholars in the Mzab in the present time are his disciples. His library, a unique collection of Ibāḍī and other works in manuscripts and in printed and lithographed editions, is a wakf in Bīnī Īṣqu; it contains many of his autograph manuscripts.

His main works are: commentaries on the Qurʾān: Himyan al-Zād illā Dar al-Ma‘ād, 14 vols., Zanzibar 1150; Tafsīr al-Tafsīr, 6 vols., Algiers 1326; traditions: Wafi al-Damāna, 3 vols., Cairo 1366-68; religious law: Sharh al-Nil (commentary on the K. al-Nil of ‘Abd al-‘Arīz al-Mus‘ābī, d. 1121/1708; Brockelmann, S II, 892), Cairo 1305-6; Ǧamīl al-‘Arī al-Wal-Far, 2 vols., Cairo 1348; Sharh Dāʾīm Ibn al-Naqṣ (on this author, see Brockelmann, II, 538), 2 vols., Algiers 1326; Taḥkīh al-Ǧamīl, Algiers 1319; dogmatics: Sharḥ Risālat al-Tazkīḥ (commentary on the ‘Irshād of Abū Haṣṣ ‘Umar b. ‘Uqayl); Brockelmann, S II, 357), Algiers 1326; al-Dhakh al-Ḫalāṣi, Cairo 1343; also works on grammar and philosophy, some poetic, and writings on various subjects.


(J. Schacht *)
Among the works of Abu '1-Khayr al-Hasan b. Suwar (born 331/942), the Fihrist, 265, mentions the translation of a Kitab al-Alghar al-Ulwiyya, by whether this title in fact refers to the Meteorology of Aristotle is uncertain. On another meteorological work of Ibn Suwar, see also Ibn Abi Ushaybi'a, i, 323.

The great commentary of Olympiodorus on the text of Aristotle was translated, according to the Fihrist, 251, by Abu 'Ishir Matta b. Yunus (died 338/950), and that of Alexander of Aphrodisias by Yahya b. 'Adi (died 363/972). None of these translations has come down to us. On the commentary of al-Farabi see Ibn al-Kifit, 279, and Ibn Abi Ushaybi'a, i, 138. In the Kitab al-Shifa' of Ibn Sina, the Meteorology and the Geography form part of the fifth fann; that part of it dealing with the halo and the rainbow has been translated by Horten and Wiedemann (Meteorologische Zeitschr., 30, 1913, 533-544). In the Kitab al-Najdi (Caio ed. 1938, 152 ff.), Ibn Sina gives the extract of the detailed account of the Kitab al-Shifa'. Of Ibn Rushd's commentaries on the Meteorologies, we possess the Arabic text of his abridgement (ed. Haydarabad 1365).

The ideas expounded by Aristotle in the Meteorology, especially those of the fourth book, have played an important rôle in the history of physical ideas in Islam. At the beginning of the third century of the Hijra, the Mu'tazilite theologian al-Nazamat [q.v.], criticised the doctrine expounded by the al-Shifa', the four elementary qualities (kwtna gharisa): this he considered to be arbitrary, since it was based only on the sense of touch (lams, malsama = tؤ altrukou). He knew the fundamental theory of the two exhalations ('awkar ard, 'awkar mar = dewyhalaznc, zayaq) and expounded an opinion on the saltiness of the sea (see the fragments of his writings cited by al-Djash, Kitab al-Hayawon, v). In Djash's system, the doctrine of the elements is clearly based on that of Aristotle; (see Kraus, op. cit., 163 ff.). In the Arab tradition of the Meteorology, starting from Ibn al-Bitrîk, down to Ibn Rushd, the doctrine vaguely indicated by Aristotle (350a 20 ff.) of the influence of the Spheres on the sub-lunar world is interpreted in conformity with the astrological theory expounded for example in the Book of the Treasure of Alexander, the Arabic text of which is cited by Ruska, Tabula smaragda, 80. According to this theory, "the world below follows the world above, and the individual bodies of the former are subject to those of the latter, because the air is contiguous (mutaṣqil) to the exterior of all the bodies and to the Spheres as well". In the Sirr al-Khalika, a hermetic work attributed to Balinas (Apollonius of Tyana) (see Kraus, op. cit., 147, n. 2), the idea of the influence of the Spheres is presented under the form of a cosmogony, according to which the successive development of minerals, plants and animals is due to the increasingly rapid motion of the Spheres. This idea is also present in Ibn al-Bitrîk's paraphrase of Meteor., i, 1:

"The movement of things directed (by the celestial bodies) belonging to the earth such as plants, the creation and production of animals, minerals, etc. taking into account their transformation and mutation, is produced by the celestial influences".

This theory is also expounded by the Ikhwan al-Shafa', in the chapter on al-Athar al-Ulwiyya, Rasani, ii, 34 ff. It is explicitly attributed to Aristotle by 'All b. Rabban al-Tabari, Firdawas al-Hithma, 21. See also Ibn Rushd, al-Alghar al-Ulwiyya, 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATHER (ATHR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Formerly a harbour on the coast of Palestine between the promontory of Carmel and al-Forfira (Dora), on a little tongue of land which lies to the north of a small bay and is washed on three sides by the sea. According to the Itinerarium Burdigalense there was a mutatio Certha there, but the name 'Athlith appears to be ancient. 'Athlith appears in the light of history in the period of the Crusades. In 583/1187 it fell into Saladin's hands. In 1218 the Castellum Peregrinorum, as the Franks called it, was reconstructed as a powerful Templar-fortress. Along with Districtum-Detroit (Khurbet Dustrî) it had to guard the passes of Carmel leading south. In 690/1291 it was conquered and demolished by the Mamlûk Sultan al-Ashraf Khallî. In the late 14th century al-`Uthmânî speaks of 'Athlîth as the southernmost wilîda of the mamlaka of Saif (BSOAS, xv, 1953, 483).

from Ṣanā‘ah, between al-Hadżar (= Dīžān) and Bayd, and is quoted already in the year 12/632 as belonging to the insurgent al-Aswad [q.v.]. Scarcity also was transferred to the opposite island(s), usually called Farasan [q.v.]. The name is not on the maps; the closest correspondents would be Khūr Abū es-Seba, or Qawz (al-Dīja‘afira) 32 km. N of Dīžān.

(4) A small place on the maritime road Adan-Mekka, between ʿĀra and Sukyā (ʿUmāra, 8), three farsakhs from the former village (Ibn al-Mudjawir, 100).

**Bibliography:** Hamḍānī, tr. Forrer, 47-51; Yāḳūt, iii, 615; Mādīsī, 53, 70, 86; Kāy, Yaman 7, 11, 141 ff., 240 f.; Ibn al-Mudjawir, 54 (ba'ni khabīb ʿAthr), 100; Sprenger, Post- u. Reisereisen, 150; idem, *Die alte Geographie Arabiens*, 45-54, 197; on the orthography of the nispa: Ibn al-Āṭir, Lubāb, ii, 122 and Dhahabi, *Mushkātab*, 377 f.

(0. ĖRFRENG)

**ʿĀTKA,** Meccan lady, the daughter of the hadjīyī Zayd b. Amr and sister of Sa‘d b. Zayd, of the clan ʿĀdī b. Ka‘b. She embraced Islam early and took part in the ḥijra. She was married first to ʿAbd Allāh, a son of Abū Bakr, then after his death to ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb (in 12/633 according to al-Tabari, i, 2077), whom she bore a son ʿīyād (Ibn Sa‘d iii/1,190). When ʿUmar was killed, she married al-Zubayr b. al-Awwām, whose death she lamented in a much quoted elegy (Ibn Sa‘d iii/1,79 etc.). The sad story of this beautiful woman and her husbands whose lives ended so tragically was soon turned into a fanciful romance and embellished with spurious love-poems and elegies.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Sa‘d viii, 193-5; ii/2,97; Ibn Kutayba, *ʿUyūn al-ʿAkhdār*, iv, 114 f.; ʿHamāsā (Freytag), 493 ff.; Aḥzābī, xvi, 133-5; *ʿAynī, ii, 278 f.; Khizdnat al-ʿAdab*, iv, 351 f., etc.

**ATIL,** or Itil, sometimes Atil (Itil)-Khazaran, also Khazarin Atil, the Khazar capital, a double town on the lower Volga, itself called Atil, Itil [q.v.] in the early mediaeval period. The exact site is unknown. According to al-Mas‘ūdī (Murūḍī, ii, 7), the capital was transferred to Atil from Samandar in the neighbourhood of the Caucasus in the time of Sulaymān (Salman) b. Rābi‘ a-bi ʿAbdi, i.e. about 30/650, though elsewhere (Tānĥīkh, 62) he says that Balandjar, also in the Caucasus region, was the original Khazar capital. Already at this date the Arabic sources speak of al-Baydā, 200 parasangs from Balandjar (al-Ṭabbar, i, 2668), by which doubtless the later capital is intended. Ibn Rusta (139) gives what are apparently the earlier Khazar names for the double town on the Volga. According to al-Īṣṭaḥkhrī (320), the west part, which was the larger, was a straggling town of felt tents with a few clay houses, several miles in extent and surrounded by a wall. The Khazars proper, i.e. the Judaised ruling class, as well as the army and the royal castle, built of brick, were on this bank. Most of the Muslims, estimated in all at 10,000, lived on the east bank, which was the commercial part of the town. Markets, baths, mosques, etc. are mentioned. There was also a considerable Christian population, and a colony of pagan Śaṅkālība and Rūs (Murūḍī, ii, 9, 12). The correct naming of the double town appears to be: west bank, Khazarān; east bank, Atil (cf. Ibn Hawkal, 369 note). Like its modern counterpart, Atina, it was an important entrepôt of trade. The products of the north, especially furs, passed through the Khazar capital, while contact was made with Kievan Russia to the west and with Khaṭārin to the east. The slave-trade seems to have been of importance. In the sixties of the 10th century the Khazar capital was destroyed by the Rūs (Ibn Hawkal, 352; Russian Chronicle, anno 956) and never recovered its former prosperity, though the Rūs withdrew and attempts were made to rebuild it (Ibn Hawkal, 398; cf. al-Makdisī 361). The Khazar state appears to have drawn out a precarious existence for some time afterwards, but Khazarān Atil ceases to be mentioned.


**ATIJA,** Athens, capital of Greece. The history of Athens in pre-Islamic times will not be treated here. The first closer—admittedly hostile—contact with the Muslims was made in 283/896, when Saracen pirates occupied the town for a short time (cf. D. G. Kambourouglios, *H Διοικητήριον Αθηναίων* τοῦ Σαρακηνικοῦ Ἰσλάμ, Athens 1913), and the remains, and influences on the ornamental style in Athens, have been traced back to this event (cf. G. Soteriou, *Arabic remains in Athens in Byzantine times*, in: *Praktikd (Proceedings) of the Academy of Athens*, iv (Athens 1929), reproduced by D. G. Kambourouglios, *I., 160; cf. also Byzant.-Neugriech. Jahrbücher*, xi (Berlin and Athens), 233-69). The whole question still appears to be in need of clarification (cf. K. M. Setton, *On the raids of the Moslems in the Aegaean in the ninth and tenth centuries and their alleged occupation of Athens*, in: *American Journal of Archaeology*, vol. LVIII (1954), 311-9).

Shortly after the time of Justinian I, Athens had sunk to the level of a provincial town, and apart from its great buildings, there was nothing left of its ancient cultural importance. During the period of western rule in Greece, Athina was the capital of a duchy which was successively held by the Burgundians and the Catalans, who occupied it in 1311, bringing it under the sovereignty of the kings of Aragon (cf. Kenneth M. Setton, *Catalan Domination of Athens* 1311-1388 (Cambridge, Mass., 1948 with excellent bibliography on pp. 261-301). From 1358 to 1458 the Florentine house of the Acciajuoli ruled in Athens. In 1397 it was temporarily taken by sultan Bāyāzīd I. In some Turkish sources this capture is mentioned as taking place before the battle of Nicopolis (which took place on 28 Sept. 1396); after the conquest of Salonica (which is mentioned as having taken place in the previous year) (Neṛrī, Rūbī; in others, as taking place after that battle (Sa‘d al-Dīn and his plagiarists, Solaksāde and ʿHādī Khālfī as well as Mūnedījīm-bashī). The later date seems preferable, as Timurtash is mentioned as the conqueror of Athens, and the *Chronicum breve* mentions a raid by Ya‘qīb-Paġha and ʿMour-tasīs, ʿMūr-tasīs = Timurtash against Morea in summer 1397. Doubtless it was only a temporary occupation of the town, perhaps no more than a raid, so that Greek sources do not mention the event explicitly (cf. Sa‘d al-Dīn, *Tādīq al-Tawdīrīk* i, 149 f. also Neṛrī in ZDMG, XV (1861), 344; and concerning the whole question J. H. Mordtmann, *Die erste Eroberung von Athen durch die Türken zu Ende des 14. Jahrhunderts*, in: *Byz.-Neugriech. Jahrbücher*, IV,
ATİNA — ATJEH

346-350). It was not until Mehemmed II, that Athens, "the city of wise men" (madinat al-hukama*) finally came under Ottoman rule, when the Conqueror personally made his triumphal entry in the last week of August, thus beginning nearly 330 years of Turkish occupation. Concerning this event and all its details, cf. F. Babinger, *Mehmed der Eroberer und seine Zeit*, Munich 1953, 170 f.; (Italian edition, *Maometto II il Conquistatore ed il suo tempo*, Turin 1956, 246). In the following centuries, Athens sank into insignificance, as one can gather clearly from reports of western travellers (cf. in particular Comte de Laborde, *Athênes aux XVIe, XVIe et XVIIe siècles*, Paris 1854, 2 vols.). The Parthenon had been converted into a mosque, and barracks were built in the Propylaea. Turkish domination meant a time of decadence for Athens, which sank to the status of a small country town. In autumn 1687, it was besieged by a Venetian admiral, Francesco Morosini (subsequently Doge), and on this occasion the Parthenon was largely destroyed (on Sept. 26th) by a bomb which hit the ammunition store there. The two mosques of the city were turned into places of Catholic and Protestant worship (the latter because a considerable number of German mercenaries were present) by the Venetian Provveditore Daniele Dolfin. Shortly afterwards, however, on April 9th 1688, Athens was again abandoned by the occupying troops (which were much reduced by an epidemic) and the Turks re-entered. A city-wall—built largely from the remains of ancient monuments—was erected in 1777. From the 17th century onwards, there was great interest in the monuments of Greek antiquity in Athens, hence there are detailed descriptions dating from that time, especially in French (e.g. J. Spon (1678) and G. Wheler (1682); cf. also Sh. H. Weber, *Voyages and Travels in Greece*, the Near East and adjacent Regions made previous to the Year 1801, Princeton, 1953. These describe vividly to what a pitiable state Athens had sunk. The Greek fight for liberation increased this devastation. In 1822 Athens was conquered by the Greeks, but had to be ceded to the Turks again no later than 1826 (the Acropolis in 1827). It was only after the London Conference (1830), that Athens was incorporated into the new kingdom of Greece. It became the capital of the country at the end of 1834, and soon developed into an intellectual and cultural centre. Owing to the quick economic and political development there was a steep rise in population. Today, Athens has about one million inhabitants. The university was founded in 1835.

Bibliography: The best bibliography of the history of Athens during the periods of Catalan and Florentine rule is found in Kenneth M. Setton, *Catalan Domination of Athens 1311-1358* (1948) in chapter XII, from 261 onwards. Concerning the Turkish rule cf. Th. N. Philadelphia, *Istoria, του Αθηνών του Τουρκοκρατία, viii, Istanbul 1928, 249-67; in connexion with this, see also short notices by Hadidji Khalifa, J. v. Hammer, *Remels und Bosna*, Vienna 1822, 109-10. There is a thorough study of Athens in the Middle Ages and in modern times by Wm. Murray, *The Universities in the Levant*, London 1908, 335 ff., with numerous further bibliographical details. Ferd. Gregorovius, *Die Geschichte der Stadt Athen im Mittelalter*, Stuttgart 1889, 2 vols. See also G. C. Miles, *The Arab Mosque in Athens in Hesperia, Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, xxv (Athens 1956), 329-44 (with plate 49). (Franz Babinger) *ATÎRA* (pl. *'ätîra*) denoted, among the Arabs of the dîkîliyya, a ewe (and by extensions its sacrifice) offered as a sacrifice to a pagan divinity, either as a thanksgiving following the fulfilment of a prayer (concerning in particular the increase of flocks), or when a flock reached the total of a hundred head (cf. the word farsa); the head of the idols before which the sacrifice was performed was smeared with the blood of the victim. If one bears in mind on the one hand that these sacrifices (which were also called radjâbyya; hence the phrase radjâbya *'átra*<sup>**w**</sup>) took place in the month of *radjab* (i.e., in the spring), and on the other hand that in principle the first born were used for the sacrifice, a close connexion will be established with the sacrifice which took place during the *umra* (q.v.), and also with the Jewish Passover and the magic rites which introduce a scapegoat. It seems that the Prophet forbade these sacrifices (cf. the hadîth: là farsa<sup>**w**</sup> (sacrifice of firstlings) wa là *'átra*<sup>**w**</sup>.


ATJÊH<sup>1</sup> (Atchin, Achin), the most northerly part of the island of Sumatra. Here flourished the once powerful Muslim empire of Atjêh, which is now a province of the Indonesian Republic. The southern limit was, under Dutch rule, formed by the residencies of Tapansuli and "Sumatra's Oostkust", now the province Sumatra Utara. In earlier times the province (or at least the sphere of political sovereignty) of Atjêh extended much farther towards the south. A considerable part of both the east and west coasts of Sumatra was subject to the authority of Atjêh, and even pagan chiefs in the Batak regions received their rank at the hands of the princes of Atjêh.

Great-Atjêh. Only the district to the north-west with the Atjêh river and the port Atjêh, the former residence of the princes of Atjêh, was from the first reckoned as Atjêh proper. The Dutch named it Great-Atjêh and the capital Kuta Radja (i.e. fort of the prince). The port of Sabang situated on the island of Pulô Wê (to the north-east of Kuta Radja) only dates from the beginning of the present century. The inhabitants of the littoral (Barûh) are distinguished in many respects from the population of the highlands of the interior (Tûnông); the customs and speech of the former (who live of course in the vicinity of the residence) are always considered to be the more refined.

The Dependencies. The other districts situated on the west, north and east coasts were under Dutch rule usually referred to as the Dependencies. Among the important towns are: on the west coast: Meulabôh, Tapa' Tuau and Singkil; on the north coast: Sigîl, the former residence of the princes of Atjêh, and even pagan chiefs in the Batak regions received their rank at the hands of the princes of Atjêh.

1) In this article tj is retained in deference to the official orthography in Indonesian; ð = closed, ð = open; ð = open, ð = closed; eu is one vowel (not a diphthong).
the year 746/1345. On the east coast are situated among others: Idi, Langsa and Kuala Simpang. A steam tramway joins the east and north coasts with Kuta Radja. A part of the population has migrated thither from Great-Atjeh; many Malays have also settled here from the neighbouring districts.

With an estimated rice export surplus of 45,000 tons in 1942, and an important export of betel nuts, patchouli, copra, rubber and live-stock, Atjeh developed under the Dutch government into a thriving country, in spite of the ruin of the traditional pepper culture, to which the settlements in one part of the Dependencies had owed their original existence. Large irrigation works were completed or were under construction. The road system was extended. In addition on the West and East Coasts of Atjeh extensive acreages of waste ground were cleared by Western estate companies for the planting of rubber, oil-palms and fibres. The BPM (Bataafse Petroleum Maatschappij) had fields in operation in Rantau (Kuala Simpang), and Peureula (Langsa); whilst in Meulaboh a concession was granted to a gold mining company.

Gayó and Alas-Countries. High mountain-chains overgrown with virgin forest separate the littoral from the Gayó-country; transverse chains divide the region of the tablelands. The most northerly (containing the great Tawar lake and the sources of the river Peusangan) is occupied by the so-called "Uorang Laut" (i.e. people of the lake), the plain to the south of it is occupied on the other hand by the "Uorang Döröt" (i.e. people of the land); to the southeast lies the table-land of Sérándjadi containing the sources of the river Peureula, which flows in an easterly direction. The fourth table-land, situated in the south and containing the bed of the river Tripa which discharges its waters on the west coast, is called Gayó Luos (i.e. the wide, spacious Gayó-countries). The Alas-countries lie south of this. The population of these regions, who differ in many respects from that of Atjeh, have from the first recognised the authority of Atjeh. The four chiefs appointed by the princes of Atjeh in the several parts of the Gayó-country (the so-called "Këdjërunus") were the mediators between the Gayós and Atjeh. Two of these Këdjërunus had their sphere of influence in the region of Lake Tawar (their distinctive titles were Rödëjë Bikut and Siah Utama), one among the Döröt (with the title Rëdjë Liingë), and the fourth in Gayó Luos (Këdjërun Pëlaambang). Sérándjadi was formerly without inhabitants; later its most eminent chiefkin was also called Këdjërun (Këdjërun abuk). In the Alas countries the authority of Atjeh was represented by two Këdjërunus.

The most important administrative centres are Takêngôn, on Lake Tawar, and Blang Këdjërin, in Gayó Luos. In the sub-district of Takêngôn, which has an area of 75,000 hectares of fir trees, an important government resin and turpentine industry has developed. Plans for the establishment of a paper factory were in an advanced state of preparation at the time of the Japanese invasion in 1942.

For accurate information about the people of Atjeh we are indebted above all to C. Snouck Hurgronje, who (first in the years 1891-1892) investigated the previously but little known social, political and religious conditions of this nation (De Atjehers; Batavia 1893-1894; cf. the English translation of this work which is provided with a new introduction and some additions by the author: The Achehnese, Batavia-Leiden 1906; Ambtelijke adviesen i, The Hague 1957, 47-438), and later described at length the land and customs of the Gayós (Het Gayóland en zijn bewoners, Batavia 1903). A wealth of ethnographical details was collected by J. Kreeker and published in his work Atjeh, 2 vols., Leiden 1922-23, which also includes the Alas region.

Population and Language. Little is known about the origin of the people of Atjeh. Linguistically they belong to the Malay-Polynesian peoples. Slaves (from the island of Nias, etc.) and other foreigners (e.g. merchants from Hindustan) have influenced to some extent the composition of the population. Atjeh has many dialects, and each dialect again many variants; the literary language has in general closest affinity with the idiom of the Baroh-district.

For the literature of Atjeh see Snouck Hurgronje, The Achehnese, ii, 66-189. Gayó is an independent language, whilst Alas is a Northern-Batak dialect.

In the 19th century Malay was almost unknown in Atjeh except among a portion of the inhabitants of the sea-ports, but formerly it was the language of the court and from earliest times in Atjeh letters, official documents and many works on theology were written in Malay. The earliest Achehnese adaptations of Arabic and Malay works date from the 17th century. Now Indonesian is the official language. For further details see C. Snouck Hurgronje, Studies over Achehskiene blanken schriftesten, in TBG, xxxv (1892), 346-442, also Achehskhe Taaldwistien, ibid., xlii (1900), 144-262; K. F. H. van Langen, Handleiding voor de beoefening der Achehskhe Taal, The Hague, 1889; H. Djajadiningrat, Achehskhe-Nederlandsch Woordenboek, Batavia 1933-1934; P. Voorhoeve, Three old Achehskhe MSS., in BSOS 14 (1953), 235-245; G. A. J. Hazen, Gayosch-Nederlandsch Woordenboek met Neder-Gayosch register, Batavia 1907.

Tribes and Families. There are still preserved traces of a division of the population of Atjeh into 4 tribes. The members of such a tribe or family—Achehnese: kaúm (from the Arabic khaum, people)—regard themselves as blood-relations in the male line, and have (especially in regard to blood-feud and the payment of blood-money) common rights and obligations. The members however of the various kaúms are scattered throughout the country; only where many kinsmen dwell together are they wont to choose a chief to represent their common interests. The Gayós are divided into families who dwell together under their chiefs (Rödijës). When Rödijës disagree decision rests with the Këdjërun.

Administration of the Villages. In Atjeh the Ketùjë (i.e. the elder) is the head of the Gampông—i.e. the village, also a quarter of a town (Mal. kampung); in case of necessity he consults the "elders" (i.e. the people who have had experience of life). The religious affairs and the legal questions of the Gampông, e.g. the leading community in the Šašt, are the concern of the Teungku meunasah. The title Teungku is borne in Atjeh both by people whose functions are connected with religion, and by those who have acquired some acquaintance with the sacred law. The Gampông-Teungkus or Teungku meunasah are not men of learning. Their rank has become hereditary, and in Snouck Hurgronje's time the ignorance of many Teungkus was so great that they were scarcely able to administer their office without the help of other people.

The Princes, Uleebalangs and Sagi-chiefs. In historical times Atjeh has always been divided into many small districts, whose hereditary chiefs—
the so-called Uleebalangs (i.e. commanders-in-chief)—lived in constant feud with each other. They paid homage however to the prince of the port of Atjeh as their common over-lord. The latter had the title of Sultan in official (Malay) documents, but was usually called by the Achehnese Radja or Pòteu (i.e. "our master"). Whilst the Sultans and their male relatives bore the title iowan, the male members of the Uleebalangs families bore the title teanka. The power and dignity of the Achehnese princes and the riches and splendour of their court, which are mentioned both in the earliest Malay and European accounts, depended on the tribute of the neighbouring regions on the coasts and the harbour-dues of the capital Atjeh. The bold Achehnese mariners were master of sea and harbours; if they demanded tribute few dared resist. The interior of the country possessed little interest for the princes. Even when the empire was flourishing (2nd half of the 16th cent. and particularly during the rst half of the 17th) the authority of the Sultan was confined to the immediate vicinity of the capital.

By the end of the 17th cent. the princes had become quite dependent on the Uleebalangs in Great-Atjeh. The latter had at that time apparently on the ground of common interests formed themselves into three federations, the so-called Sagi, "sides", i.e. of the triangular-shaped Great-Atjeh. Each Sagi had an overlord (Panjisma-Sagi), whose authority however did not extend beyond the common Sagi-interests. (In the Dependencies also such federations are found). The Sultan chosen by the three Sagi-chiefs used to pay to them a certain sum. He usually belonged to the family of the previous ruler, but strangers, e.g. Sayyids, who dwelt in Atjeh, were sometimes elected to the Sultanate. In the course of time other chiefs obtained a voice in the choice of a ruler; according to tradition at one period 12 chiefs (including the 3 Sagi-chiefs) formed a kind of electoral college.

The majority of the Uleebalangs in Great-Atjeh and the Dependencies later received their authority from the Sultan’s hand and in witness thereof were given a document bearing the ruler’s seal (a so-called Sarakata; on the Hindustani origin of this seal see G. P. Rouffaer, in BTJV, Series 7, v, 349-384; cf. C. Snouck Hurgronje, ibid., Series 7, vi, 52-55). Not all the Uleebalangs thought it worth while to go to the expense involved in the acquisition of a sarakata or deed of recognition; more important than the "tiab sikureueng" (the nine-fold seal of the sultan) was the "tiab limong" (the five-fold seal, i.e. signifying the hand as a symbol of power, meaning the ability to protect one's own interests).

The Kédjurus of the Gayô and Alas peoples on the other hand usually received a kind of dagger as symbol of their rank.

Division into Mukims. The Friday-service according to the Shi'ite doctrine is only valid if 40 Mukims are present. A Mukim is a person domiciled in the place and satisfying the stipulations of the law. Since the population of most of the Gampongs was not numerous enough to be able to hold a regular Friday-service with 40 participants, it became the custom to group together several Gampongs and as near as possible of such a district to construct a mosque for the Friday-service. The priors called Mukims (here glossed Munkim) acquired, not only in Atjeh but also in other Malay regions, the meaning: department, circle. Each Uleebalang was lord over several of these Mukims. Further the names of the 3 Sagi have been derived from the original number of their Mukims; i.e. they are called: the Sagi "of the 22 Mukims" (in the south), the Sagi "of the 25 Mukims" (in the west) and the Sagi "of the 26 Mukims" (in the east of the triangular-shaped Great-Atjeh). These ancient names were preserved even after the number of the Mukims in the Sagi of the 25 Mukims and especially in that of the 22 Mukims had mounted up owing to the increase in the population.

The chiefs of the Mukims bore the title of Imeum. This word denoted originally the leader of the Friday-service (Arab. Imām). The Imeums became however gradually hereditary, secular chiefs, who transferred the leadership of the Friday communal prayer to special officials.

Administration of Justice. Laws. As a general rule the chiefs themselves were wont to fulfill the functions of judges; they based their decisions on the unwritten law of custom ("Adat"). There are indeed some statutes (Sarakata), which tradition credits Meukuta Alam and other famous rulers with having issued, and the Achehnese, who know these laws only by name, ordinarily assume that they contain an exact statement of their law; they really consist however only of brief regulations regarding matters of court-ceremonial (including the homage to be rendered to the ruler by the uleebalangs), the division of the harbour-dues and the fulfillment of several religious obligations. These regulations date from the time when the princes attempted, without permanent result however, to centralise their imperial administration; Muslim scholars at the court also left their impress on these laws (for fuller information see C. Snouck Hurgronje, The Achehnese, i, 4-16; K. F. H. van Langen, De inrichting van het Achehsche staatsbestuur onder het sultanaat in BTJV, Series 5, iii, 381-471; Translations from the Majellis Ache [by T. Braddell] in Journal of the Indian Archipelago, V (1851), 26-32; an edition of the Malay text by G. W. J. Drewes and P. Voorhoeve is in the press). Further both the Sultan and the Panglimas had their Kali (= Ka'll), but the ecclesiastical judges only took a share in the administration of justice on certain special occasions (e.g. in the division of an inheritance, in some forms of divorce, in contracting marriages, and in other cases where the religious law was usually followed; on other occasions only if the chiefs expressly took them into council). The judge of the sultan bore the title Kali Malikun Adī = Kāli Maliku 'l-Adī; his hereditary office degenerated in course of time; he became the peculiar chief of several Gampongs within the sultan’s realms. Also the rank of the other Kalis became hereditary, and if those people who were Kali in virtue of their hereditary right possessed the knowledge requisite for this office it was by a rare chance.

Religion. From earliest times there existed trade relations between Atjeh and Hindustan. The civilisation and language of Atjeh and elsewhere in Indonesia has some peculiar features which are explained by its Indian origin. Such are, for instance, the existence of a heterodox
mysticism and some characteristics distinctively Shi'ite. The first month, e.g., is in Atjeh always called... some of his predecessors have been found after H. Djajadiningrat compiled his list from Malay chronicles and European scholars to the false opinion that the Achehnese Eeen... at that period were generally spread throughout Hindustan. The most famous representatives of this heterodox tendency in Atjeh were Shams al-Din al-Sama'tari (i.e. of Pasé; d. 1630) [q.v.] and his predecessor Hamza Fansuri [q.v.]. Its chief opponents were Rânîrî [q.v.] and 'Abd al-Ra'uf al-Sirkîl [q.v.]. Certain forms of the ancient heterodox mysticism which at that period were preserved till recent times, but such differences from the orthodox teaching, which are based on ignorance, are gradually disappearing before the increasing communication with the centre of Islam. (Fuller information in Snouck Hurgronje, *The Achehnese*, ii, 13 f.). Veneration of saints has still an importance as in many other parts of Indonesia. Formerly there were prevalent in Atjeh the forms of the diffusion of Islam in the Indian Archipelago. Its dynastic history may one day be reconstructed from the inscriptions on tomb-stones and coins, Malay chronicles (*Stéjarah Milayu* and *Hikayat Radja-radja Pasai*, ed. from the unique MS. R. A. S. Moffatt Mal. 67 by E. Dularier, *Chroniques Malayes*, 1849; romanised ed. J. P. Mead, in JMBRAS 26 (1924)), Chinese, Arabic (Ibn Battûta, see above) and European sources; until now, much material has been collected but a publication of the inscriptions is still lacking. (Reports on the work of the Archaeological Survey in: *Oudheidkundig verslag*, 1912 ff.; cf. *Encyclopaedie v. Ned. Indië*, i, 1917, s.v. Blang Mé). Many of the tomb-stones were imported from Cambay in Gudjarat (J. P. Moquette, J. MBRAS 20 (1912), 255-267; one tomb, dated 781 A.H., has inscriptions in Arabic and in Old-Malay (W. Stutterheim, *AO* 14 (1936), 268-279; cf. G. E. Marrisson, *JMBRAS* 24 (1950), pt. i, 162-165); another stone, dated 823 A.H., on the grave of an independent when Tomé Pires collected information for his *Suma Oriental* in Malacca, 1512-15 (ed. A. Cortésão, Hakluyt Soc. 2nd Ser. 89, 90 (1944)), and its trade profited greatly by the decline of Malacca after its capture by the Portuguese. This prosperity was not to last long. Though Pasé's traditional enemy Fedir (Ach. Pidé) was at that moment in decay owing to the death of its king Madafora (Muâaffar Shah?) and its being at war (apparently with Atjeh), the rising power was not Pasé but Atjeh. Pires describes its ruler as a pirate-king, 'a knightly man among his neighbours'. He had already subdued the adjoining country of Lambry (Lamuri, Lambri) and the land of Brâl, between Atjeh and Fedir (Ach. Bihue). This probably refers to Sultan 'Ach-Mughâyir Shah, the first sultan in Dja djadingrat's list, whose date of accession is uncertain. Tomb-stones of some of his predecessors have been found after H. Djadjingrat compiled his list from Malay chronicles and European
sources (BTJV 65 (1910), 135-265), but the exact relations between these predecessors are still unexplained, and Sultan 'Ali Mughayat Sháh, by conquering Daya to the west and Pidí and Pasè to the east, became the real founder of the empire of Atjeh. Leaving aside, for the time being, the data on the earlier sultans, we reproduce Djajadiningrat's list of the princes of Atjeh with only a few modifications in the dates:

II. Šaláh al-Dín (1530-†1537).
IV. 'Ali Ri'ayat Sháh or Husayn (1577-†1579).
V. Sulţán Muda (a child, reigned only some months in 1579).
VI. Sulţán Sri 'Aláam (1579).
VII. Sayn al-Ádidín (1579).
VIII. 'A Há al-Dín of Pera or Manşúr Sháh (1579-±1586).
IX. 'A Há Ri'ayat Sháh or Radjá Buyung (†1586-†1588).
X. 'A Há al-Dín Ri'ayat Sháh (±1588-1604).
XI. 'Ali Ri'ayat Sháh or Sulţán Muda (1604-†1607).
XII. Iskandár Muda (posthumous name: maráhán MakoTa 'Aláam) (1607-1636).
XIV. Tádí al-'Aláam Sañiyyat al-Dín Sháh (1641-†1675).
XV. Núr al-'Aláam Najjíyát al-Dín Sháh (1675-1678).
XVI. 'Ináyáh Sháh Zakiyyát al-Dín Sháh (1678-1688).
XVII. Kámálat Sháh (1688-1699).
XVIII. Badr al-'Aláam Sharíf Háshım Djamál al-Dín (1699-1700).
XX. Djamál al-'Aláam Badr al-Múnr (1703-1726).
XXI. Dijáwár al-'Álam Amá 'al-Dín Sháh (reigned only a few days).
XXII Shams al-'Álam or Wándi Tébíng (reigned only a few days).
XXIII. 'A Há al-Dín Ahmad Sháh or Mahrádsäh Léla Mèlyáu (1727-1735).
XXIV. 'A Há al-Dín Djióhán Sháh or Dójut Aúk (1735-1760).
XXV. Múhamád Sháh or Tutánk Radjá (1760-1781).
XXVI. Djamál al-Dín (1764-1765).
XXVII. Suláymán Sháh or Radjá Udahana Léla (1773).
XXVIII. 'A Há al-Dín Mu'hámad Sháh or Tutánk Muhammad (1781-1795).
XXIX. 'A Há al-Dín Dijáwár al-'Álam Sháh (1795-1824).
XXX. Sharíf Sayf al-'Aláam (1815-1820).
XXXI. Múhamád Sháh (1824-1836).
XXXII. Manşúr Sháh (1836-1870).
XXXIII. Múhamád Sháh (1870-1874).
XXXIV. Múhamád Dáwúd Sháh (1874-1903).

'Ali Mughayat Sháh's two sons Šaláh al-Dín and more especially 'A Há al-Dín Ri'ayat Sháh al-Káhhár increased the importance of the new kingdom. From Turkish archive documents we learn that the latter sent an embassy to Constantinople in 973/1563 asking for help against the Portuguese and saying that several of the heathen rulers of South East Asia had promised to embrace Islam if the Ottomans would save them. The arrival of the embassy coincided with the Szigetvar campaign and the death of Sulaymán. The embassy therefore waited two years in Constantinople and then a naval expedition was prepared under the command of the Admiral of Suez, Kurdoghli Khizir Reis, consisting of 19 galleys and some other ships with guns, supplies, etc. This expedition was however diverted to deal with an insurrection in the Yemen and instead two ships with supplies and military technicians were sent to Atjeh. It would seem that they entered the service of the Sultan of Atjeh and stayed there. (See Saffet, TOEM, 10, 604-614; 11, 678-683; I. H. Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı Tarihi, ii, 1949, 388-389, and iii/1, 1951, 31-33). In the first half of the seventeenth century Atjeh reached its greatest prosperity, attaining its zenith during the reign of Iskandár Muda, honoured after his death by the title of Meukuta 'Aláam, i.e. Crown of the World (supra n. XII). The dominion of the Achehnese was extended far to the south during his reign. Iskandár's expedition with a great fleet against Pahang and Malacca forms the subject of an important Achehnese epic, the Hikayat Melaka Dagang (ed. H. K. J. Cowan, The Hague, 1937). In 1638, during the reign of his successor (Iskandár Thání, supra n. XIII) a Portuguese embassy came to Atjeh and tried in vain to win over the Sultan to their side in the war against the Dutch (see: Agostino di S. Teresa, Breve racconto del viaggio . . . del regno di Achien, Roma 1652; Ch. Bréard, Histoire de Pierre Berthelot, Paris 1886). The sultans of Atjeh, who during the second half of the seventeenth century (1641-1699) reigned in the period of feminine rule, were naturally much to the advantage of the Uláebalangs whose power and authority were thereby increased; but on the other hand many disapproved of this state of affairs and declared on the authority of a jídáu received from Mecca that it was forbidden by law for a woman to rule. Thereupon at the beginning of the eighteenth century arose a series of dynastic wars. Some of the princes who contended for the throne were Sayyids (i.e. descendants of Husayn) born in Atjeh. Amongst them were the Maydún or Radia Buyung, the Liitán or Radia Raif, the Xácu, the Aulá, the Támá, etc. The Achehnese, who had been the subject of a rich European trade, at this time against the later Sultans, amongst others against Ahmad (supra n. XXIII), a man of Bugis descent, ancestor of the last dynasty of Achehnese princes. Some of these princes were enfeoffed with hollandia, with the result that the power and authority of the Sultan of Atjeh diminished and the people of Atjeh were driven into the forest to rear their stockbreeding and fishing industries. The Achehnese nobility, as a rule, was an uneducated and superstitious aristocracy. The state (hukumá) of Atjeh was, however, capable of supporting a military élite which was able to maintain itself against the attacks of the Bugis and the Támás. The Atjeh War. In the 18th century the piracy and slave-trade of the Achehnese and their raids on neighbouring territories constituted a constant danger. The Dutch government were at first not in a position to put a stop to this evil as they had pledged themselves to England in 1824 not to extend their dominion in Sumatra to the north, but this obligation was removed by a new
treaty with England in 1871. The landing of Dutch troops in 1873 was the beginning of a war (the Atjeh War), which lasted— with several pauses—from 1873 until 1910, in which year the pacification was considered complete.

Broadly speaking the three components inspiring this unexpected opposition were the ulamas, the ulêebalangs, and the sultanate. Of these the ulamas were the strongest, and the sultanate the weakest component. This last fact is understandable, since—as we have seen above—the influence of the sultan was very limited. With the capture of Kutaradja, the sultan’s stronghold, the Dutch considered the sultan’s government as at an end, and the Dutch administration took over his position and rights. Meanwhile, after the death of Sultan Mamhûd Shâh, the six-year old Muhammad Dâwûd, grandson of Sultan Mansûr Shâh (supra No. XXXIII), was elected sultan. The “pretender-sultan” Muhammad Dâwûd, who had taken refuge with his court at Keumala in Pidiê, hunted by Dutch troops from hiding place to hiding place, finally made his submission in 1903. In 1917, because of underground activities, he was banished from Atjeh. The ulêebalangs, the secular authorities or “lords of the country” (The Achêmish, i, 88), so far as they were not willing to accept Dutch authority, had to be subdued one by one. One of the most influential of them was Teuku Panglima Polém Muhammad Dâwûd, the chief of the sagi of the XXII Muîms. Now that the sultan’s government had lapsed the Dutch recognised the ulêebalangs—with the exception of those in Great-Atjeh, which was regarded as the personal domain of the sultan—each as independent rulers in their own right, whose relationship with the Dutch government must be determined by treaty. On the advice of Snuck Hurgonje the form of treaty selected from 1898 onwards was the so-called korter verklaring [short contract]. In this the rulers recognised that their territories formed part of Netherlands India, and undertook not to have any kind of political contacts with foreign powers, to follow and maintain all the regulations, and to obey all the orders given them by the Civil and Military Governor of Atjeh. The ulamas, the spiritual leaders of the people, were the real inspirers of the struggle. Here we can mention only one well-known family, the Tirô-teungkus, of whom Tjhêj Saman (d. 1890) was the best known. They were named after the gamping Tirô in Pidiê, an important centre of Islamic scholarship. The ulamas went throughout the land preaching the holy war; their war-chest was the zakût-tax levied on the people. The native chiefstains were ignominiously thrust into the background. The long duration of the war and the fanaticism with which it was fought are explained by the character of a holy war which it assumed. From this period comes the Hikayat Prang Sabi (ed. H. T. Damsté, BTLV, 84, 1938, pp. 345 ff.), in which the faithful were called to a holy war. After the submission of the “pretender-sultan” the ulamas and some ulêebalangs conducted a guerilla warfare, though Panglima Polém also submitted a few months after the sultan. In 1911 Teungku Ma’âst, the last survivor of the Tirô-teungkus, was killed.

It was a long time before the Dutch government came to comprehend the full significance of these three fundamental components in the Atjeh War, and to adapt their policies and tactics accordingly. The investigations of Snuck Hurgonje were the first to provide the political insight upon which the military campaigns of Governors J. B. van Heutsz (1898-1904), G. C. E. van Daalen (1905-1908), and H. N. A. Swart (1908-1918), could be based (cf. K. van der Maaten, Snuck Hurgonje en de Atjeh-Oorlog, 2 vols., Oosters Instituut, Leiden 1948, and the literature listed therein). Governor Swart was the last governor to be charged both with the civil government and the military command in Atjeh.

The Dutch administration. Since the sultanate was swept away by the Atjeh War, the highest authority was considered to have passed to the “regents” of the sultan, the ulêebalangs. This administrative institution which drew its sanction from ‘âdat (local customary law) was fitted into the Dutch administrative system in the following way. The ulêebalangs’ territories were recognised as “native states” (zelfbesturende landschappen), and their relationship with the Dutch government was regulated by the korter verklaring. Exceptions to this were the district of Great-Atjeh, and the sub-district of Singkel, both of which were classed as “directly ruled territories” (rechtsstreeks bestuurd gebied). Great-Atjeh, the territory of the three sagis, was included in this category because after the conquest it had wrongly been assumed that here, in contrast to the rest of Atjeh, the chiefs were dependent officials of the sultan. The border territory of Singkel was included on historical grounds. A section of this district had been brought under Dutch rule earlier, forming part of the residency of Tapanulu, and therefore in determining the form of administration the system in force elsewhere in that residency was followed. But here too the existing administrative frame-work based on ‘âdat law was maintained, so that the panglimas sagi, the ulêebalangs, and so on, as ‘native chiefs’ were made government officials.

The ‘âdat system which was thus embodied in the administration presented a picture of infinite diversity. It embraced about 100 ulêebalangs acting as independent rulers, and about 50 panglimas sagi, ulêebalangs and local chiefs with various other titles in the directly ruled territories. The size of each territorial unit varied from a village to the equivalent of a Dutch province, the populations from a few hundreds to more than 50,000, and the educational background of the rulers from a simple primary school course to training at the Civil service college (Bestuurschool) in Batavia.

Over this Indonesian administrative framework extended the Dutch administration; its task was the creation and enforcement, through these institutions, of peace, order and the rule of law, and the economic and cultural development of the land. The Government (later Residency) of Atjeh and Dependencies, administered by a Governor (later a Resident), was for these purposes divided eventually into four districts, each administered by an Assistant Resident. These were the district of Great-Atjeh, and the districts of the North Coast, the East Coast, and the West Coast. They in their turn were subdivided into a total of 21 sub-districts, each administered by a Contrôleur (District Officer).

The policy of government was consistently directed towards promoting a larger measure of personal initiative on the part of the chiefs, and bringing the Indonesian administration into line with Western standards. So the old type of chief, ruling like a patriarchal despot, gradually made way for more progressive younger men.

Thus under the Dutch régime the administration remained wholly in the hands of the hereditary ulêebalang caste, a caste consolidated on the one hand
by intermarriage between families already related to each other in a variety of ways, and divided on the other hand through the operation of adat, or customary, feuds. The hegemony of this caste, moreover, was not confined to the sphere of government. In accordance with the *adat* the administration of justice was also in the hands of the *uleebalangs*, whilst in accordance with the *hukom* they were the religious leaders of their own territory. In addition they had often important trading and other economic interests, and usually disposed of extensive estates, particularly in Pidie, where a medievel system of feudal holding still prevailed. Finally— their sons being considered first for all forms of education and training—they had in a certain sense also an intellectual monopoly.

When the Japanese War broke out there were three *uleebalangs* of outstanding importance: Teuku Nja' Arif, the chief of the sact of the XXVI Muhims, had represented *Atjeh* in the *Volksraad* until 1931. Teuku Muhammad Hasan, ruler of Glumpang Payong (Pidié), had previously been employed in the Residency offices at Kutaraqja, where he exercised a great influence on political policy. Teuku Haqji Tjihi Muhammad Djohan Alamsjah was the ruler of Peusangan (Bireun).

While the *uleebalangs* linked itself increasingly closely with the Dutch régime, amongst the *ulama* group, taken as a whole, the anti-Dutch tradition was maintained. The predominant position which the *ulamas* had attained during the *Atjeh* War was lost again with the return of peace, and the traditional superiority of the *uleebalangs* was restored. So there developed gradually between these two groups, which had co-operated during the war, an antipathy—a recurring theme in the history of Atjeh—as the result of which the *ulamas* regarded the *uleebalangs* as traitors.

Religious life itself was left to develop freely, in keeping with the tradition of the Dutch régime. At first Tuanku Radja Keumala (whose father was a great-grandson of Sultan Muhammad Shah, *supra* XXI), acted as adviser on religious affairs. But after his death this office was not refilled, whilst the advisory council on religious affairs established in 1919 under the title "raad ulama" ("Council of "Ulama") , of which this learned descendant of the sultan formed the central figure, was discontinued. For this reason the Dutch authorities were subsequently dependent for their information about developments in the religious sphere upon the *uleebalangs*, who were considered legally the religious leaders of their own territories. Ultimately, just before the Japanese invasion, another descendant of a former sultan, Tuanku 'Abd al-'Aziz, *imeum* of the great mosque at Kutaraqja, was made unofficial religious adviser. He was not an *ulama* in the sense which was attached to that word in Atjeh, and although known as *ulam* (see above) he did not enjoy anything like the prestige of his eminent predecessor.

Religious instruction retained an important place next to secular education. Besides elementary religious education *Atjeh* possessed a large number of so-called religious secondary schools in which geography, history, economics, etc., were also taught. Many *uleebalangs* made a point of having one or more religious schools in their territory, which through the fame of the *ulamas* trained in Egypt, Minangkabau, or in Atjeh itself who taught in them, would enhance their own reputations. That these *ulamas* were often more or less openly anti-Western in outlook they accepted as part of the bargain.

As for the third component in the struggle against the Dutch—the Sultan's party—its rôle was played out. The "pretender-Sultan" fled in exile in 1939 in Batavia. His son was allowed to return to *Atjeh*. The other descendants of the sultanate remaining in *Atjeh* wielded little influence. An exception was Tuanku Mahmud, an important political figure, who had been trained at the Civil service college in Batavia. He held a government post in Celebes for some years before returning to *Atjeh* as senior native official in the service of the Dutch there. In 1933 he succeeded Teuku Nja' Arif as a member of the *Volksraad*, and after the death of the "pretender-Sultan" became undisputed head of the sultan family. A campaign started in 1939 by some Achehnese merchants for the restoration of the sultanate met with little response; there was practically no support for it from the *uleebalangs*, who saw in it a threat to their own position.

The political situation itself developed favourably. The last resistance incident took place in 1933, and the military garrison was gradually reduced. The *hajr*-hate and the idea of a holy war—negative expressions of the religious consciousness—gave way to a positive local Achehnese patriotism, which expressed itself in the normal impulse to be master in one's own house, or more specifically to get an increased number of posts in the administration occupied by one's fellow countrymen.

Modern nationalist ideas had as yet hardly any hold on the Achehnese people. The same was true of the Muhammadiyya movement, which originated in Java. Though it fixed as its target the advancement of religious life, and had its connexions over the whole of Indonesia, it struck no responsive note in Achehnese religious life. It remained—despite its Achehnese leadership—a distinctly non-Achehnese movement, which attracted mainly non-Achehnese elements, or locally the militant part of Achehnese society, which in the absence of a purely political movement sought in it satisfaction for their political and social aspirations. The religious ideas of this young Islamic modernist movement were quite alien to the more conservatively orientated religious life of the Achehnese.

As a counter-weight to the modernist ideas of the Muhammadiyya, the *PUSA* or *Persatuan Ulama-ulama Seluruh Atjeh* was founded at Bireun in 1939, under the influential patronage of the ruler of Peusangan. Under the direction of *Atjeh* 's most prominent *ulamas* it was to be the vehicle of that typically Achehnese strictly orthodox religious life. Its membership was not necessarily limited to *ulamas*. Anyone else who could identify himself with its aims could join it, and its most prominent leader was Teungku Muhammad Dawud Beureu'eh from Keumangan (Pidié). The movement seemed to fulfill an important need. Through it both conservative and progressive *ulamas* were brought together, and branches were set up throughout *Atjeh*. To have assumed a political, let alone an anti-Dutch, character, would have been inconsistent with the aims of the movement. Its attitude towards the government and the *uleebalangs* was completely correct, and many *uleebalangs* accepted the position of adviser to their own local branch. The position of patron was offered to Tuanku Mahmud. A youth movement was founded under the name *Pemuda Pusa*, with its headquarters at Idi. The more advanced and militant elements, reacting against the pressure of the *adat* authorities, sought within this movement a refuge, and a means of expressing
their own ideas. As a result the youth movement quite quickly began to take on a more militant and subversive character. So the Pusa itself gradually developed into a new and potent weapon in the hands of the ulamas in their struggle against the Dutch régime and the ulëbalangs.

We have already dealt briefly with economic developments in this period, and with education in its religious aspect. Secular education expanded steadily. At the time of the Japanese invasion Atjeh had one higher grade school, thirteen schools giving Western elementary education, 348 elementary vernacular schools, 45 vervolgscholen or advanced vernacular schools and one trade and handicraft centre, founded either by the Dutch government or the native states. There were besides a number of private schools giving elementary Western education, supported by the Muhammadiyya and Taman Siiswa societies.

The Japanese occupation. Even before Japanese troops occupied Atjeh in March 1942 rebellions against the Dutch government broke out in Great-Atjeh and in the North and West Coast districts. These took on the character of a national rising, particularly in the sari of the XXII Mukims and in the sub-district of Tjalang, on the West coast. After the Japanese troops had landed the rebellion spread quickly. As during the Atjeh War the most important component of the rising was formed by the ulamas. It was led by Teungku Muhammad Dâwûd Beuereu’êh at the head of the Pusa and the Pemuda Pusa, which provided a single organisation spread over the whole of Atjeh, admirably suited for the preaching of the holy war. The participation of the ulëbalangs was at first limited to a number of discontented political elements of purely local importance. That the rebellion in the sari of the XXII Mukims was able to assume the character of a national rising is explained by the support which the ulamas experienced from the chief of the sari, the son of the great resistance leader of the Atjeh War, Teuku Panglima Pöûm Muhammâd Dâwûd, who had died shortly before the outbreak of the war in Tjalang. The participation of Teuku Sabi of Lageuân, one of the only two native rulers who had earlier supported the movement for the restoration of the sultanate, set its stamp on the nature of the rising there, so that the third component from the Atjeh War, that of the sultanate, re-appears at this time too. The movement from the Japanese side, for immediately after the fall of Penang in December 1941 a fifth column organisation was formed from the Achehnese colony there, which sent its agents back to Atjeh as “refugees” from Japanese violence. Shortly before the Japanese landing Teuku Nja’ Arif, the chief of the sari of the XXVI Mukims, joined the rebellion, whilst later Teuku Muhammâd Hasan of Glumpang Payöng also declared that he had already been in contact with the Japanese before their attack.

From the beginning the Japanese stood in a different relationship vis-à-vis the ulëbalangs and the ulamas than had the Dutch. From the outset they received support from the ulamas more perhaps than from any one else. An attempt by the Pusa to take over power locally from the ulëbalangs, however, was not sanctioned by the Japanese, since they could not allow the existing social order to be dislocated by the sweeping aside of the government machinery based on the ‘ddat. It would have undermined their own military strength. Instead Japanese policy was aimed at linking both of these political forces, that of ‘ddat and that of ḥukûm, in order to obtain the co-operation of the people as a whole in their war effort. The Japanese tried therefore just like the Dutch to keep a balance between both groups. The fact that the ulëbalangs too had taken an important share in the rising made this policy acceptable.

The rule of the ulëbalangs was thus maintained. In the sphere of government the position of the ulëbalangs was even strengthened. Dutch government officials made way for Indonesian gun-chôs who were chosen, with a single exception, from leaders of the ulëbalangs families. Two ulëbalangs represented Atjeh in the delegation from Sumatra which visited Japan in 1943, one—Teuku Muhammâd Hasan—being designated as its leader. In the advisory council for Atjeh created at the end of 1943, Teuku Nja’ Arif was appointed chairman, and Teuku Muhammâd Hasan deputy chairman. As it was first constituted, the majority of its members belonged to the ulëbalang class; but this was no longer the case when it was re-constituted in 1945.

Nevertheless the position of the ulamas was considerably strengthened, at the expense of the ulëbalangs. At the beginning of 1943 Tuankan ’Abdul Azîs was appointed adviser for religious affairs for the whole of Atjeh, and some months later he was made chairman of the newly created advisory council on religious affairs. Teungku Muhammâd Dâwûd Beuereu’êh was appointed deputy chairman of this council, which had branches throughout Atjeh, and he quickly became the leading figure in it. The principal object of this and similar organisations was to bring religion into the service of the Japanese war effort. In 1944 a court was established to hear religious cases under the name of shahâ-yûn, and in this too Teungku Muhammâd Dâwûd Beuereu’êh and his Pusa predominated. Eventually one of the members of the executive committee of Pusa was appointed inspector of religious education. Teungku Muhammâd Dâwûd Beuereu’êh and a number of other ulama were members both of the first and of the second Council for Atjeh.

The administration of justice too was re-organised, and largely withdrawn from the control of the ulëbalangs. In the magistrates courts (hu-hüm) in particular a large number of those appointed as members were supporters of Pusa, leaders of the resistance movement, and other enemies of the ulëbalangs.

This policy of holding a balance between both groups could satisfy neither the ulëbalangs, nor the ulamas. To be sure, the ‘ddat was no longer the mistress and the ḥukûm her obedient slave-girl. But the ulamas would only be satisfied with a position in which the ḥukûm would be mistress and the ‘ddat the slave. So both groups conducted a remorseless struggle over the heads of the Japanese governor. Meanwhile the pressure on the Japanese was growing from day to day. The Japanese army of occupation was dependent on what the country itself could provide both for its food and for the labour supply needed for the construction of roads, airfields and fortifications. To provide this, an almost intolerable burden was placed on the Japanese, whilst it became ever harder for the ulamas to co-operate in satisfying the Japanese demands. In September 1943 mass arrests took place throughout
Atjeh and amongst those arrested were several ulêbalangs. In August 1944 the ruler of Glumpang Payong, who was suspected of underground activities and of conspicing with the Dutch, was arrested with some other ulêbalangs, and executed shortly afterwards. At the moment of these mass arrests the ruler of Peusangan was already for some months in prison. The possession of a copy of the Hikayat prang sabi (“Summons to the Holy War”) or its recitation was made an offence. In two instances this was open resistance. As early as 1944 there was an insurrection in Bayu, in the sub-district of Lhôl Seumâwê. There an ulama Teungku ʿAbd al-Djâll who, despite his youth, was already head of a large religious school, is said to have preached the prang sabi against the Japanese. He and his followers were killed in the bloody conflict which followed. In 1945 there was another insurrection in Pandrath, in the sub-district of Bireuen. Here the heavy economic burden of compulsory deliveries and “voluntary” labour produced an outbreak which was savagely repressed.

The Japanese invasion brought at first a revival of the negative element of kâfir hatred. But as Japanese pressure increased the positive element of local patriotism grew, stimulating the urge to take control into Acehnese hands. In the end, as the result of the Japanese promise of independence, this developed into the idea of a unity, based on religion, which would embrace the whole of Indonesia.

Indonesian Independence. The Japanese surrendered in August 1945 did not bring any restoration of the Dutch régime in Atjeh and only the island of Sabang was occupied by Dutch troops. The way was thus open for a final reckoning between the ulâmas and the ulêbalangs. In December 1945 a civil war broke out which ended in February 1946 with the annihilation of the power of the ulêbalangs. A number of ulêbalang families were massacred to the last male child. Hundreds of members of ulêbalang families disappeared into republican internment camps as “enemies of the Republic”, and their property was confiscated. Amongst them were the chief of the sâqi of the XXVI Mukhims and the ruler of Peusangan.

This annihilation of the power of the ulêbalangs cannot be viewed solely as a result of the antithesis between ʿiddat and bûkim. Social, political and economic factors were also involved. Religion played the part of the instrument of a social revolution against the position which the ulêbalang class held in society as a whole, a position which has been described at some length above.

Soon after the Pusa emerged victorious from the civil war, its leader Teungku Muhammad Dâwûd Beureu'êth became military governor of Atjeh. His adherents filled those posts in the administration, the police and the judiciary which had formerly been occupied by the ulêbalangs. The lack of experience, high-handedness and corruption of the new rulers, who in fact were supported by only a minority of the population, soon led to increasing unrest, and in 1948 there was an abortive insurrection in Kutafrâdja. But so long as the central government of the Republic had not reached a settlement with the Dutch, its hands were full elsewhere and there was no question of its intervening in Atjeh. The common struggle for the recognition of Indonesian independence was in these years the only aim; Acehnese local patriotism and the idea of Indonesian unity for the moment coincided.

After the transfer of sovereignty from Holland to the Republic of Indonesia at the end of 1949 the intervention of the central government could no longer be avoided. For administrative purposes Atjeh was included in the province of North Sumatra, so that Teungku Muhammad Dâwûd Beureu'êth lost his position as governor. Achehnese military units were gradually replaced by non-Achehnese troops, thus depriving the Pusa of their military support. In 1951 a large number of Pusa leaders were arrested under cover of the general round up of Communist leaders, undertaken throughout Indonesia at this time, and inefficient Pusa adherents in official positions were removed from their posts. But the expectation of the central government that they could in this way gradually steer the government in Atjeh back into normal channels, was not realised. In September 1953 Teungku Muhammad Dâwûd Beureu'êth and his followers launched a rebellion against the central government. A bloody guerrilla warfare followed, which lasted until the middle of 1957 when an informal truce was reached between Teungku Muhammad Dâwûd Beureu'êth and the local authorities. The year before, in October 1956, Atjeh was again granted the status of an autonomous province.

(À. J. PIEKAAR)


AL-'ATK, a valley in Nadjd, the northernmost of those cutting through the western wall of the cuesta of Tuwayk. It is a true wadi with a strong flood whenever there is enough rain. The valley forms the dividing line between the district of Sudayr to the north and the district of al-Mahmal to the south. Its head (far'a) is in the low ground west of Tuwayk in the vicinity of the oasis of al-Ḳasab, south of which there is a large salt pan (mamâlaha or sabâḥa). After passing north of the hills of al-Bakarat (pl. of bakra = sheep; 3-5 years old), the valley goes through the escarpment of Tuwayk by a narrow passage. Just east of this passage, the valley of Urât descends from the uplands of Sudayr and the valley of Thâdik comes up from the south to join al-'Atk.
Farther on, the main valley of Sudayr—in which lie Dialadjil, al-Awda, and other oases—and the valley of al-Atk flows through savage gorges to reach the "southern Aures depression", which sinks down to below sea level. The Nememcha rises the Aures (Awras), the only massif of the Sahara, though it no longer retains everlasting snows. Hemmed in to the west by the Sūs and the Hawr of Marrakesh, and to the east by the Dj. Bani, it breaks up, despite several considerable peaks, into ridges and deep transverse valleys, and may only be crossed by high cols, historical routes to the Sus (Tizi n-Test) and the High Dra (Tizi n-Tishka). In the centre and the East it becomes primarily calcareous (liassic and jurassic), with narrow faulted anticlines and broad synclines; after the Dj. ‘Ayyaṣhi (3,752 m.), the chains lose height and peter out in the South of Eastern Morocco. The "wādīs" of the Dj. Saghro or al-Mahmal or proceed westwards to the "southern Aures depression", which lies Dialadjil, al-Awda, and other oases—and the valley of al-Atk flows through savage gorges to reach the "southern Aures depression", which sinks down to below sea level. The Nememcha rises the Aures (Awras), the only massif of the Sahara, though it no longer retains everlasting snows. Hemmed in to the west by the Sūs and the Hawr of Marrakesh, and to the east by the Dj. Bani, it breaks up, despite several considerable peaks, into ridges and deep transverse valleys, and may only be crossed by high cols, historical routes to the Sus (Tizi n-Test) and the High Dra (Tizi n-Tishka). In the centre and the East it becomes primarily calcareous (liassic and jurassic), with narrow faulted anticlines and broad synclines; after the Dj. ‘Ayyaṣhi (3,752 m.), the chains lose height and peter out in the South of Eastern Morocco. The "wādīs" of the Dj. Saghro or al-Mahmal or proceed westwards to the "southern Aures depression", which sinks down to below sea level. The Nememcha rises the Aures (Awras), the only massif of the Sahara, though it no longer retains everlasting snows. Hemmed in to the west by the Sūs and the Hawr of Marrakesh, and to the east by the Dj. Bani, it breaks up, despite several considerable peaks, into ridges and deep transverse valleys, and may only be crossed by high cols, historical routes to the Sus (Tizi n-Test) and the High Dra (Tizi n-Tishka). In the centre and the East it becomes primarily calcareous (liassic and jurassic), with narrow faulted anticlines and broad synclines; after the Dj. ‘Ayyaṣhi (3,752 m.), the chains lose height and peter out in the South of Eastern Morocco. The "wādīs" of the Dj. Saghro or al-Mahmal or proceed westwards to the "southern Aures depression", which sinks down to below sea level. The Nememcha rises the Aures (Awras), the only massif of the Sahara, though it no longer retains everlasting snows. Hemmed in to the west by the Sūs and the Hawr of Marrakesh, and to the east by the Dj. Bani, it breaks up, despite several considerable peaks, into ridges and deep transverse valleys, and may only be crossed by high cols, historical routes to the Sus (Tizi n-Test) and the High Dra (Tizi n-Tishka). In the centre and the East it becomes primarily calcareous (liassic and jurassic), with narrow faulted anticlines and broad synclines; after the Dj. ‘Ayyaṣhi (3,752 m.), the chains lose height and peter out in the South of Eastern Morocco. The "wādīs" of the Dj. Saghro or al-Mahmal or proceed westwards to the "southern Aures depression", which sinks down to below sea level. The Nememcha rises the Aures (Awras), the only massif of the Sahara, though it no longer retains everlasting snows. Hemmed in to the west by the Sūs and the Hawr of Marrakesh, and to the east by the Dj. Bani, it breaks up, despite several considerable peaks, into ridges and deep transverse valleys, and may only be crossed by high cols, historical routes to the Sus (Tizi n-Test) and the High Dra (Tizi n-Tishka). In the centre and the East it becomes primarily calcareous (liassic and jurassic), with narrow faulted anticlines and broad synclines; after the Dj. ‘Ayyaṣhi (3,752 m.), the chains lose height and peter out in the South of Eastern Morocco. The "wādīs" of the Dj. Saghro or al-Mahmal or proceed westwards to the "southern Aures depression", which sinks down to below sea level. The Nememcha rises the Aures (Awras), the only massif of the Sahara, though it no longer retains everlasting snows. Hemmed in to the west by the Sūs and the Hawr of Marrakesh, and to the east by the Dj. Bani, it breaks up, despite several considerable peaks, into ridges and deep transverse valleys, and may only be crossed by high cols, historical routes to the Sus (Tizi n-Test) and the High Dra (Tizi n-Tishka). In the centre and the East it becomes primarily calcareous (liassic and jurassic), with narrow faulted anticlines and broad synclines; after the Dj. ‘Ayyaṣhi (3,752 m.), the chains lose height and peter out in the South of Eastern Morocco. The "wādīs" of the Dj. Saghro or al-Mahmal or proceed westwards to the "southern Aures depression", which sinks down to below sea level. The Nememcha rises the Aures (Awras), the only massif of the Sahara, though it no longer retains everlasting snows. Hemmed in to the west by the Sūs and the Hawr of Marrakesh, and to the east by the Dj. Bani, it breaks up, despite several considerable peaks, into ridges and deep transverse valleys, and may only be crossed by high cols, historical routes to the Sus (Tizi n-Test) and the High Dra (Tizi n-Tishka). In the centre and the East it becomes primarily calcareous (liassic and jurassic), with narrow faulted anticlines and broad synclines; after the Dj. ‘Ayyaṣhi (3,752 m.), the chains lose height and peter out in the South of Eastern Morocco. The "wādīs" of the Dj. Saghro or al-Mahmal or proceed westwards to the "southern Aures depression", which sinks down to below sea level. The Nememcha rise...
mountains to the East of the Aures tower above this depression and then subdivide northwards into isolated ridges, the remains of broad domes. In Tunisia, the chains deriving from the Saharan Atlas cover the entire mountain country, except the north-west. The structure of domes, frequently faulted, and of broad basins, to be observed in the Tebessa mountains, is continued in the Dorsal range of Tunisia. Its anticlines, generally calcareous, (1,154 m. at the Dj. Chambi) and separated at times by broad transverse rift valleys, rendering communications easy, converge towards the N.E. to form one single chain bristling with sillas (Dj. Zaghwân, 1,298 m.) extending as far as the Gulf of Tunis. North of the Dorsal range, the High Tell and the Medjerda regions are composed of compressed folds, which, however, only produce mountains of moderate height, separated by broad basins, by the deep depression of the Middle Medjerda and by its tributary valleys: the "wâdîs" of Mellêgue, Tessa and Siliana. In the south the anticlinal chains of limestone or sandstone rise among broad plains, generally synclinal and covered by alluvium: from a W.-E. direction on the parallel of Gafsa, they are turned back in a S.-N. direction, bordering the plains of Eastern Tunisia.

North of the High Atlas and of the Sahara Atlas of Algeria, extend vast regions of low relief, which, however, are twice intersected by transverse chains: the Middle Atlas and the mountains of the Hodna. The Middle Atlas has the same rocks and the same style as the central High Atlas with narrow faulted anticlinal folds (Dj. Ben Nacer, 3,334 m.) and broad synclinal depressions. But in the N.W. it descends in step plateaux; the faults separating them are covered with volcanic cones and coulées. Heavily watered, it gives birth to the principal rivers of Morocco: Oum er-Rebia (*Umm al-rabîbah*), Sebou, Mouloïya. The Middle Atlas separates the rigid block of primary terrains of the Moroccan "meseta" (central plateau, hills of the Rehamna and of the Djebilet, sedimentary phosphate plateau, alluvial plains of the Tadla, the Bahrai and of the Hawf of Marrakesh) from that of the Oran-Moroccan borders, which is almost completely concealed by secondary sediments. The Rokam, to the East of the Mouloïya, is extended by the Debou and Djéreda plateaux, in Morocco, and by the undulating and faulted plateaux of the Tell Atlas of Oran: the mountains of Tiemcen, of the Mekarra, of Saïda and Frenda. North of the Sahara Atlas, the High Algero-Moroccan plains, rising to 1,200 metres in the West and 800 metres on the meridian of Algiers, are structurally similar, consisting of simple exhausted folds, which, however, are three quarters buried beneath considerable old alluvial deposits (basins of the Chott Gharbi and Chott Cheguel and of the Zabr); only the Oued Trouches reaches the sea. Further to the E., the narrow chain of the Hodna mountains and the Belezma massif, separate the very low lying basin of the Hodna (400 m.) from the high plains of the eastern and Constantine regions of Algeria (800 to 1,050 m.). The W.-E. secondary chains of which they are made up, calcareous domes or ridges, leave gaps between them and continue, intermittently spaced out, across the high Constantine plains, which they dominate, rising to several hundred metres. The so-called region of the Sebhâch in the south escapes the drainage of the Rhumel, the Seybouse and the Meskiâna (Mellêgue). As for the plains of Eastern Tunisia, these are incompletely drained behind the camber of the Sabel.

Bordering the Mediterranean, a second complex is formed, extending from Tanger to Bizerta, by the chains of the Rif and the Tell Atlas. They are very complex in structure. The cemented and loose sediments of the Secondary and Tertiary have on several occasions been heavily folded. They have been pushed and overlapped southwards by the primary eruptive masses of the "coastal belt", which only subsist still South of Ceta and Kabylia; these masses dominate in the south the lofty calcareous sieras of the Djebala and the Bokkoya (Morocco), the Djurdjura and the chain of Numidia. All the rest is formed of a thick and plastic mass of clay, sandstone and schistous sediments, usually discharged in "slip sheets" and, in Morocco, clearly carried down in a southerly direction. These structurally very complex mountains have been cut and broken up by transverse gorges and longitudinal valleys due to the vigorous erosion caused by Mediterranean torrents. The chain of the Rif, from Ceta to Melîla, forms a crescent of mountains (2,450 m. at the Dj. Tidighine), which is enlarged in the south by a variety of hills carved by the tributary rivers of the Ouergha and Sebou in the Rif and Pre-Rif sheets. From the Melîla peninsula to the Trara massif, the heavily folded zone narrows and follows the hills of the Low Mouloïya to the Djem Snassen mountains and the Tell plateaux of Oran. Then it bifurcates, continuing on both sides of a long depression, running from the sebâh of Oran to the elbow of the Middle Chelif; to the North are the hills of the Sabel of Oran, which are succeeded by the Dahra and Miliana mountains (Zaccar, 1,579 m.), and to the south, the Tessala and the Ouled Ali and Beni Chougrane mountains, which border the intermontane plains of Sidi Bel Abbès and Mascara, giving way in the East to the great Ouarsenis massif (1,985 m.), which directly dominates the high plains. The longitudinal depression recommences East of Medea and runs down by the valley of the wâdî Sabel-Soummam as far as Bougie (al-Bigâya); along its northern edge runs the Mittâja Atlas, rising above the alluvial plain of the Mittâja and the hills of the Sabel of Algiers, after which it is bordered by the Djurdjura Kabylia, culminating in the Lalla Khasidja peak (2,308 m.); to the south rise the Titeri mountains and the long Biban chain. East of Bougie, the Babor (2,004 m.) and the chain of Numidia are contiguous to Eastern Kabylia and directly dominate the plains of the Serjona and Constantine mountains. The crystalline terrains of Eastern Kabylia are partly obscured by oligocene clays and sandstones, bearing cork forests. These same sandstone form the mountains encircling the littoral plain of Bône and, in Tunisia, Khroumiria and the Mogod regions.

The Atlas makes North Africa a country of mountain chains encircling plains, which are often both elevated and arid. The relief accentuates and diversifies the climatic contrasts due to the proximity of the Mediterranean and the Sahara. Dominating the Tell regions, the steppe areas of the high plains and the desert of the Saharan Piedmont, the principal massifs are original geographical environments, which have played a considerable though mainly negative rôle in the history of the Maghreb.

**Bibliography:** See the articles MOROCCO, ALGERIA, and TUNISIA. (J. Despois)

**ATOM** [see AL-DIJUZ ALLADHIN LA VATADJIZZA*].

**ATRÂBULUS** [see TARÂBULUS].

**ATREK**, a river in the north of Khurasan, which has its source on the mountain of Hazâr.
Masjid on the Gulistan ridge of the Kopet Dagh, 37°10' N, ca. 59° E, NE of Közan (Kudan), which he drowned in blood (1078). He was unable to prevent the Egyptian army coming to threaten him in Palestine, which he sent him a high-flown message of congratulation and appeared before him at Nasā, but died shortly afterwards at Khabūshān on the Atrek (9 Dżumādā II 551/30 July 1156).

According to him and his followers, he was a hero and stood against the Seljūks and the Karā Khiṭāy (to both of whom he had eventually to pay tribute), as well as by the expansion of his territory northwards, and so layed the foundation stone of its position as a great power which lasted up to the Mongol invasion.

in Syria proper, and appealed to Malikshah, who decided to make Syria an appanage for his own brother, Tutush. Atsiz may perhaps have hoped to be able to retain a territory as a vassal, but in the interview which took place between the two chief-tains, Tutush rid himself of Atsiz by assassination (1079).

The episode of Atsiz is interesting as the first successful attempt to establish a Turkoman principality on the Western confines of the Saldjukid empire. As such it is directed against the Saldjukid regime. Naturally the Turkomans made themselves felt by their ravages in the surrounding countryside, as everywhere else; but once he had subdued the country, he took care to restore agriculture; the townspeople, in contrast, complained that he showed no interest in them. The episodes narrated above are sufficient evidence of his religious indifference; the hostility shown to him by the urban aristocracy, both pro-Saldjukid and pro-Fatimid, doubtless explains in part his evident relations with the Christians, especially the Monophysites, who, in spite of what has been said on the subject, were spared at the time of the Jerusalem massacre in 1078. It is therefore wrong to consider him, as one of those responsible, by repercussion, for the preaching of the crusade in Europe.

**Bibliography:** Claude Cahen, La première pénétration turque en Asie Mineure, in Byzantion xviii, 1946-48; Mukarrim Han Yaniç, Türkçe tarhi i, 2nd. ed. 1944; Faruk Sümer, Yına Oğuz boyuna dair, in Türküyati Mecmuasi, IX, 1951; Cl. Cahen, En quoi la conquête turque appela-t-elle la Croisade? in Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg, xxix-xx, 1939-40; E. Cerulli, Gli Epopée in Palestina, i, Rome 1943.

The sources are indicated particularly in the first of these works; much the most important is the Mir'al al-Zamān of Sibt Ibn al-Djawai.

---

**'Atṭāb b. Asīd b. Abī'l-‘Īs b. Umayya Al-Umawī, a Companion of the Prophet, who was converted on the day of the capture of Mecca; shortly afterwards, during the battle of Hunayn (6/629), he was appointed governor of Mecca by Abī Bakr. He agreed to marry Djuwayriya bint Umayya, a Companion of the Prophet, who was appointed governor of Mecca by Muhammad, and continued to hold this post under Abū Nuwas, whom al-'Atṭāb admired (see Aghānī, iv, 39); a panegyric on al-Rašīd enjoyed considerable fame (see the quotation by al-Djahiz, iii, 353 and the note by the ed.). With the exception of al-Marzubānī, this poet was greatly esteemed by the men of the Islamic Middle Ages. As regards literary history, al-'Atṭābī represents the beginning of the neo-classical current, which started in Northern Syria and was later represented by Abū Tammam and Buhurt (q.v.).**

**Bibliography:** Fihrist, 121 and also 316-18 (reproduced by al-Kutubi and Yākūt) gives a list of six works written by al-'Atṭābī; to judge from the titles, these were probably works on philology and adab. To assess al-'Atṭābī's merits as a prose writer, one must turn to the citations made by al-Djahiz and Ibn 'Abd Rabbih. Al-'Atṭābī's poetical writings seem to have been considerable (the Fihrist, 163, speaks of a collection of 100 folios) and Ibn Abī Ṭayfur, d. 280/893, gave a selection from them; see ibid., 146 in fine. Today they are only known to us-
know the mixing of drafts and potions, powders and spicest (al-Dimashkî, Kitâb al-Ishdâr wa-Makâsin al-Tâdîrî, cf. H. Ritter, in IsI, 7, 50). Today, the term also sometimes includes dyers and dye-

scholars for whom this calling may well have served as an additional source of income. The best known instance is Farid al-Dîn 'Attar.

The same word is used in India to denote an alcohol-free perfume-oil produced by the distillation of sandalwood-oil through flowers (for instance, roses).

Bibliography: (Apart from works already mentioned in the text): A. Dietrich, Zum Drogen-

handel im islamischen Ägypten (Veröffentlichungen aus der Heidelberger Papyrussamm lung, N.F. no. 1), Heidelberg 1954; G. Wiet, Les marchands d'épices sous les sultans mamlouks (Cahiers d'Histoire Ég ypienne), Cairo 1955. (A. DIETRICH)

'ATTAR, Farid al-Dîn Muhammad b. Ibrâhim. Persian mystical poet. The dates of his birth and death cannot be fixed with any certainty. According to Dawlatshâh, he was born in 533/1140 and the general belief is that he was killed by the Mongols in Nishâhpûr in the year 627/1220. This would mean that he lived to the age of 114, which is improbable, and besides, Nishâhpûr was conquered by the Mongols as early as 617/1220. According to a la'tîhî page in some manuscripts (e.g. Ibrâhim Ef. 579), in other sources (Sa'd Na'îf, Dîjâstu'dîfî, 607), and according to the inscription on the tomb erected by Mir 'Ali Shâr, he died as early as 586/1190, that is to say, three years after writing Manâth al-Tayr (Sa'd Na'îf 129). Sa'd Na'îf adheres to 627 as the date of his death, but he bases this assumption on the spurious book Mişâk al-Fustûk and on the statement of Diâmî that 'Attar had given the Asrâr-nâma to Djalâl al-Dîn Rûmî who had emigrated from Balkh with his father in 618/1221. This emigration, however, probably took place as early as 616/1219 (Ritter in IsI, 26, 1942, 117-8). Nothing definite concerning the dates of his life can be got from 'Attar's own works. The one which seems to contain most biographical information, Mashâr al-'Adîdî, is a forgery, which unfortunately misled Mirzâ Muhammad Kazwînî as well as the author of this article. 'Attar was a pharmacist and doctor, and whilst not actually a Şûfî, he admired the holy men and was edified by the tales told about them, from his youth onward. When attempting to complete his list of 'Attar's works, one meets with a pecu
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of one's self as everything, as God, as identical with all prophets. People are repeatedly recognised as God by others, and addressed as such. The presentation is broad and ill-ordered, and full of tiresome repetitions. Frequently one does not know who is speaking or who is being addressed. Anaphora is used excessively: on occasions a hundred consecutive lines begin with the same words. Sa'd Nafisi considers the works of this group as spurious, and attributes them to the writer of the third group, a man from Tus who lived in Tus for a long time, who was undoubtedly a shī'ite and must have lived in the 9th/15th century. He considers the change of style, which had been accepted both by Muḥammad ʿAlī al-ʿAskarī and by the author of this article, to be impossible. One might object that a change of style and a limitation of the field of interest are not out of the question in a poet; that the beginnings of the use of anaphora can be found in the works of the first group; and also that some of the themes frequent in the second group are traceable in the first. I therefore do not regard it as utterly impossible that the works of the second group should be genuine, though it is rather doubtful. In the time of Dīlām—that is to say in the 9th century—at least, these works were considered genuine, because Dīlām's remark in the Naṣḥāt al-ʿUmān that the light of ʿAllāh had manifested itself after 150 years in Āṭṭār, can be based only on the works of the second group, in which Hālālā plays an extensive part.

The epics of the third group, on the other hand, have been conclusively proved to be spurious. In the Mashar al-ʿAqlī, the poet asks the reader to read Ῥāżī (died 791 A.H.) and Ḳāsim-i Anwār (died 832 A.H.) and prophesies the appearance of Dīlāl al-Dīn Rūmī (Sa'd Nafisi 151 ff.). I find such a difference in style and content between the works of the second and those of the third group, that—unlike Sa'd Nafisi—I should not ascribe them to the same poet. With regard to the probable chronology of the works (on the basis of self-quotation), see my Philologica X, in Isl. 25, 1939, 144-156. The conclusions drawn in that article from the statements in the Mashar al-ʿAqlī (whose author had the audacity to claim all Āṭṭār's greatest and famous works as his own) as also in my own article "Āṭṭār" in IA, are now superseded.

Individual works: First group:
1) Dīwān: apart from love poems, this contains the exposition of the same religious thoughts as govern the epics. Printed in Tehran, but not in a critical edition.
2) Muḥākār-nāma: a collection of quatrains arranged according to themes, with an elegiatic prose introduction describing the origin of the work—which originally formed part of the Dīwān—and the destruction of the two works Dīwawāth-nāma and Shahr al-Ḵalīb (Ritter, Philologika X, 152-155). Incomplete publication, Tehran 1353.
3) Godār al-Ṭayy (Māmaṭ al-Ṭayy): grandiose poetic elaboration of the Risālat al-Ṭayy of Muḥammad al-Qazāż. The birds, led by the hoopoe, set out to seek Simurgh, whom they had elected as their king. All but 30 perish on the path on which they have to traverse seven dangerous valleys (Haft wādī: this part appears as an independent work in some manuscripts). The surviving 30 eventually recognise themselves as being the deity (ṣīrāt = Simurgh), and then merge in the last land in the divine Simurgh. Inadequate edition by ʿAlī ibn ʿUsayy, Paris 1257; Mantic uttar or le langage des oiseaux . . . . par Farīd-uddīn Āṭṭār; Traduction française and La poésie philosophique et religieuse chez les Persans d’après le Mantic uttar, ou le langage des oiseaux de Farīd-uddīn Āṭṭār; Alte Ausgabe; Paris 1860; on the translation by Baron E. Hermein, Stockholm 1929, see Jan Rypka in Archiv Orientalni 4, 1932, 149-160. The best edition known to me is the one which appeared in Bombay in 1313 A.H., published by Cooper and Cooper. For other editions see ʿAlī ibn ʿUsayy, Mantiḥ al-Ṭayy and for works of Āṭṭār in general, see E. Edwards, A Catalogue of the Persian printed books in the British Museum, London 1912; A. J. Arberry, A Catalogue of the Library of the India Office, Vol. II, Part IV. Persian Books, and the catalogues of manuscripts. A Turkish commentary was written by ʿAbd ʿAllāh ibn ʿAbd ʿAllāh ibn ʿAbbās in 1005/1596-7 (MS. Carullah 1716). For Turkish translations and studies, cf. my article on "Āṭṭār" in IA.
4) Muṣḥbat-nāma: a sāfī disciple (ṣāfī), in his helplessness and despair, is advised by a fīr to visit successively all mythical and cosmic beings: angel, throne, writing tablet, stèles, heaven and hell, sun, moon, the four elements, mountain, sea, the three realms of nature, Iblis, the spirits, the prophets, senses, phantasy, mind heart and soul (the self). In the sea of the soul, in his own self, he eventually finds the godhead. The tale may have been inspired by the hadīth al-ṣafātā. Printed in Tehran 1298 A.H.
5) Ilākī-nāma: a king asks his six sons what, of all things in the world, they wish for. They wish in turn for the daughter of the fairy king, the art of witchcraft, the magic cup of Dīm, the water of life, Solomon's ring, and the elixir. The royal father tries to draw them away from their worldly desires and to inspire them with higher aims. Edition by H. Ritter, Istanbul-Leipzig 1940, Bibliotheca Islamica 12. Concerning a Turkish version, cf. the article Āṭṭār in IA.
6) Aṣrār-nāma: it has no framework-story, and repeatedly mentions the gnostic motif of the entanglement of the pre-existing soul in the base material world. Āṭṭār is supposed to have given a copy of this book to the young Dīlāl al-Dīn Rūmī. Printed in Tehran 1298/1880 cf. M. Ritter, Seele, Mensch, Gott und Welt in den Geschichten des Farīd-uddīn Āṭṭār (Leiden 1955) for content and ideas of Nos. 3, 4, 5 and 6.
7) Ḳhūṣraw-nāma: a romantic novel of love and adventure, concerning Ḳhūṣraw, the son of the emperor of Rūm, and Gul, the daughter of the king of Ḳhūzūstān, with many adventures, befalling above all the faithful ʿAbū, who is besieged by a succession of suitors. Synopsis in Philologika X, Isl. 25, 160-173. Printed in Lucknow 1295/1878.
8) Pand-nāma: a small moral treatise which enjoyed great popularity; it has been printed in Turkey alone at least eight times (1251, 1252, 1253, 1257, 1260, 1267, 1291). Concerning further editions see Sa'd Nafisi 109-10 and the above mentioned catalogues. It has been translated into several languages (compare Geiger-Kuhn, Grundrisss der Iranischen Philologie, ii, 603 and Sa'd Nafisi 108-10). As early as 1809 it was published in London by J. H. Hindley, then by de Sacy together with a French translation: Pandeau ou Livre des Conseils, Paris 1819. For the Swedish translation by Baron Erik Hermein, see Jan Rypka in Archiv Orientalni 4, 1932, 148 ff. The Turkish translation, completed in 164/1257, was by Emr, who died in 988/1580, and it was repeatedly printed in Turkey together with the Persian text (1229, 1266, 1280, 1282). Turkish commentaries: ʿAbd ʿAllāh ibn ʿAbd ʿAllāh ibn ʿAbbās; Shuʾūrī
(died 1105/1693-4 autograph of 1083 A.H. Istanbul, Dar-ulmesnevi 185; *AbdI Pasha (died 1115/1702-3), Mūfi; Bursâli İsmâyil Hâkî (died 1357/1934-5), in great detail, printed Istanbul 1250; Mehmed Murâd (died 1264/1849) Mâhadâr, Istanbul 1252, 1260.

9) Tadhkîrât al-Awliyâ': an extensive prose work which contains the biographies and sayings of Muslim mystics. It ends with a biography of Hallâdî, who plays such an extensive part in the works of the second group. Other biographies—over 20 in number—have been added in some manuscripts. In these, as also in his epic, ʻAttâr has used his sources freely, and has often altered them in the light of his own religious ideas. For the numerous Turkish studies and translations, see the article Attar in IA; in addition Sâ'id Nafisi 110-112. The text of the edition by R. A. Nicholson, The Tadhkîrât ʻi-awliyâ' of Shaykh Faridu'd-din ʻAttâr, London-Leiden 1905-1907, Persian Historical Texts 3 and 5, is not always trustworthy. Other editions in Sâ'id Nafisi 112 and in the above mentioned catalogues.

10) Bulbul-nama: the birds complain to Solomon about the nightingale which, they say, disturbs them with her song to the rose. The nightingale is called upon to defend herself. Eventually Solomon orders that she be left in peace. Sâ'id Nafisi (106-9) regards this book as spurious. Printed in Tehran 1314. Mirdâd-nama: could well be an excerpt from the na'f of any mathnawi. In the only manuscript which I have seen, it covers a mere two pages.

11) Djuumâjuma-nama: a rather short story which might come from any of ʻAttâr's epics. Jesus resurrects a skull in the desert; the dead man, who had been a great king, tells Jesus about the torments of the grave and of hell; he then embraces the true faith and dies for a second time. For Turkish editions of this little work, see IA: Attâr.

The works of the second group (described above):

12) Ughur-nama: the central figure of the first part of this work is a Turkish puppet player, who appears as a symbol of the deity. He has seven curtains to his stage and has seven assistants. He breaks the figures which he himself had created and tears the curtain. He sends his assistants in all directions and himself withdraws in order to guard his secret. A wise man asks him for the reason for his actions. By way of a reply, he is sent in front of seven curtains. There he beholds a strange, fantastic series of events, the meaning of which is to be understood symbolically. He is always sent on by a pîr without any clear information, and on his arrival at the 7th curtain he is asked to fetch from a grave some writing written on silk in green letters. On this God has revealed matters concerning Himself, the way towards Him, the creation, and the prophet Muhammed. There is repeated mention of decapitation as a means of reaching God, and Hallâdî is repeatedly pointed to as the great example. The fruitless wandering from one curtain to another is reminiscent of the cosmic journey of the sa'îd in the Musibat-nama. The second part deals almost exclusively with ʻAttâr. On the scaffold he has talks with Djuunayd, Shaykh-i Kabîr (Ibn al-Khaffî), Bâyazîd and Shîbîl, and in these, as God, he develops a monistic-pantheistic theology. In spite of its length, the Ughur-nama is an important and interesting work which deserves closer study. Metre: Ramâl.

14) Djuunayd (Djuunâyîr) al-Dhâlî: this epos was written after the Ushkur-nama, because the latter (as well as the Musibat-nama) is quoted in it. In this work, too, Hallâdî is continuously presented as a model of the fanj and of becoming God. Among other stories, it contains the one of ʻAll whispering the divine secrets into a cistern. These secrets are then betrayed by a reed which had grown in the cistern and had been cut into a flute. The connexion with the 18 introductory lines of the Mathnawi, by Djalâl al-Dîn Rûmî, is obvious. My assumption is that it is this story (which goes back to Midas' donkey-ears via Niţâmî) which has inspired Djalâl al-Dîn; Sâ'id Nafisi, who considers the work a later forgery, assumes the reverse to be the case (p. 114) (H. Ritter, Das Prooemium des Mathnawi-i Mawlawî, in ZDMG 93, 169-196). The epic also contains the story of the youth who went on a sea voyage with his father, recognised himself as God and jumped into the sea in order to lose himself completely in the divine nature. The youth is also recognised as God by a fellow-passenger. The motif of the recognition of a man as a God by another man also appears in other works of this group. This work was printed in Teheran in 1315/1355.


16) Mansûr-nama: a short tale in the metre Ramâl, beginning: Bûd Mansûr ay ʻadâb shûrû ba'll. It is a short description of the Travels of a King. Printed in Tehran 1312. Mansûr-nama: a short Mathnawi, the centre of which consists of self-deification (Man khudâyam man khudâyam man khudâ) and fanj by decapitation. It contains verses from other mathnawis of this group. Its content is connected with the second part of the Ughur-nama. Lithographed, Tehran 1319 and several times in Lucknow.

The works of the third group (undoubtedly by another hand):

18) Maşhar al-ʻAddîbâ (the "place where miracles appear") is an honorary name for ʻAll, to whose glorification this work is dedicated. He is the divine man, the bearer of divine secrets, the Shâh of all beings, prophets and angels. Legends about ʻAll play a large part. The author claims all the works of ʻAttâr as his own, and gives a great biographical detail, including the meeting with Nadjm al-Dîn al-Kubrâ. Lithographed, Tehran 1323. Sâ'id Nafisi 126 II, 154; Sâ'id Nafisi 127. 156; Sâ'id Nafisi 128. 131-132. These two works have no literary value.

Works of the fourth group (demonstrably spurious on the basis of internal evidence):


23) Misfâd al-Fusâk: compiled 688/1289-90, according to other manuscripts 587/1191-2, by a man from Zanjân, Philologika X, 157; Sâ'id Nafisi 127-128.


25) Kans al-Hâdîk: contains a panegyric to a prince by name of Nîkî ʻGâzî. Concerning the possibly corrupt name of this prince see Sâ'id Nafisi
AL-‘ATTAR, Ḥasan b. Muḥa мм, Egyptian scholar of Maghribine origin, born in Cairo after 1180/1766. He studied at al-Azhar, and was one of the few šulami who, after the occupation of Egypt by Bonaparte, entered into relations with the French scholars and took an active interest in the new learning. He then spent many years in Syria and Turkey, and on his return to Egypt was employed as editor of the Official Journal (al-Wafr al-‘Arabī) founded by Muḥammad ‘All (1244/1828). In 1245/1830 he was installed as Shaykh al-Azhar by Muḥammad ‘All, with whose programme he was thought to be in sympathy, and died in office in 1250/1835. He was probably most influential as the teacher of Rifa‘ī al-Tahtawi, the author of the first major modern classical work of the period in Egypt and Syria. In 1821, after the revolt of Sūltān ʿAbd al-‘Azīz (q.v.), the Russians were shortly afterwards expelled from Avaristan. The surrender of the Imam Shāmil (q.v.) on 22 February 1863, Ibrahim Khan was arrested and sent into exile; on 2 April 1864, the Khanate and its territory annexed to the Avar obrug were administered directly by the Russian authorities.

After the October Revolution, the Avar territory became part of the autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic of Dagestān, attached to the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist republic (decrees of the Supreme Soviet of January the 20th 1921).

The Avar language belongs to the North-Eastern branch (Dagestān) of the Northern group of Ibero-Caucasian languages. Its sphere extends from the azi of Çirinot to Novo-Zakatali in Azerbaijan, 170 km. further to the South; it is subdivided into numerous dialects (almost one to each clan) forming two main groups: the Northern (or Khūznāk) dialects and the Southern dialects (Antaukh, Kökh, Gidatli and Zakatali). The literary language was formed from the Boluntu ("language of the country"), the vehicle of inter-tribal relations from the 16th century onwards. In the middle of the 17th century, Avar was endowed with an Arabic alphabet (completed by numerous signs for the transcription of...
Ibero-Caucasian phonemes), (called "Old 'Ajam"), which was finally perfected by Dibir, kâdi of Khûnâzk (1747-1827). Avar literature was born at the same period with Muhammad b. Mûsâ of Kudatli (died 1708), who wrote in Arabic, and Dibir, kâdi of Khûnâzk, who translated Kalîla va Dimna into Avar. At the beginning of the 19th century, it was enriched by a spate of religious and didactic works, then, in Shâmil's time, by satirical and lyrical works, the chief representative of which was the poet Maḥmûd of Betl-Kâğb rosso (1873-1919). This literature first of all found expression in Arabic and then in Avar. In 1920 the old alphabet was replaced by a simplified Arabic alphabet of 38 letters (called "New 'Ajam"), for which in 1928 a new Latin "New Avar" was substituted and then in 1938 a Cyrillic alphabet.

At the present time (1957), the Avars are numerically the largest nationality in Dâghîstân (200,000 for a total population of one million) and the most advanced. They have a literature of their own, the most famous representative of which is the poet Shâmil (died 1708), who wrote in Arabic, and Dibir, kâdi of Khûnâzk, who translated Kalîla va Dimna into Avar. In 1920 the old alphabet was replaced by a simplified Arabic alphabet of 38 letters (called "New 'Ajam"), for which in 1928 a new Latin "New Avar" was substituted and then in 1938 a Cyrillic alphabet.

The literary Avar language is used by the Æçî [q.v.] and by the thirteen small, Andi [q.v.] and Russian, however, language and are rapidly becoming absorbed into the Avar nationality; it also serves as a secondary language for certain other peoples of Upper Dâghîstân, who are subject to the cultural influence of the Avars (Dargin, Laks [q.v.]).

The present village had 884 inhabitants in 1950, ardent Shî'îites as in the past in the vicinity of Awa, and an old smârzâda in the village.

**Bibliography:**

1. A town of Awa, at present called Āwâdî, lies 70 m. (111 km.) S.-W. of Kûm on the road to Hamadân, ca. 35° 35' N. lat. and 49° 15' E. long. (Greenw.). The town is reckoned in the cold zone (sardstr) because of its altitude. In 1950 it had ca. 1800 Persian and Turkish speaking inhabitants.

There are only short notices of the town in medieval geographers. Yakût, i, 387, mentions a savant called Āwâkî from there. The only old building in the city is a caravanseray from the time of Shâh 'Abbâs.

2. Another town, also called Āhek, is now a village in the Dîzbarâbâd county of the Sâwa district, ca. 187/4 m. (30 km.) west of Kûm on the usually dry Gâwarnâ River, 34° 15' N. lat. and 50° 20' E. long (Greenw.). The medieval geographers mention it together with Sâwa. It was plundered by the Mongols but apparently regained importance, if this is the Āwa where Il-khanîd coins were minted (see B. Spuler, *Die Mongolen in Iran*, Berlin 1955, 129).

The present village had 884 inhabitants in 1950, ardent Shî'îtes as in the past in the vicinity of Awa, and an old smârzâda in the village.

**Bibliography:**

Le Strange, 196, 211; P. Schwartz, *Iran im Mittelalter*, 5, 549, 542; Hamîd Allâh Mustawfi, *Nuzha*, 60, 221 (only the second Āwa); Razmârâ, *Farhang-i Dâghhstân*, Tehran 1950, 26-7; P. Schwartz, *Drei Ortslagen in Nord-Iran*, in *Isl. 8*, 1918, 18, (only the first Āwa = Ud?).

(R. N. Frye)

**AVADH (Oudh),** a tract of country comprising the Lucknow and Faydâbâd divisions of the Indian State of Uttar Pradesh. It has an area of 24, 168 square miles and a population of 15, 514, 950, of which 14, 156, 139 are to be found in the rural districts. (Census of India, 1951). From very early times Awadh, which forms part of the great alluvial plain of northern India, has been the peculiar home of Hindu civilisation. It corresponds roughly to the Middle Country, the Madhya-desha of the sacred Hindu writings, where dwelt the gods and heroes of the Epic Period whose deeds are recorded in the *Mahâbhârata* and the *Râmâyana*. Here too arose a number of religious reactions against the sacerdotalism and the social exclusiveness of Brahmanism.

Apart from marauding expeditions, such as Maḥmûd of Ghazâna's attack upon Manaî and the doubtful exploits of Sâlar and Ghâzî recorded in the *Mîrât-i Mašrûl* of 'Abd al-Rahmân Cîshî, it was not until the last decade of the twelfth century, in the days of Kûtb al-Dîn Aybak, that the Muslim invaders established themselves in Awadh and annexed it to the Dîhil Sultânate. It formed a province of Muhammad b. Tughlûk's extensive empire, but towards the close of the fourteenth century was absorbed by the Shârîfî kingdom of Dâmnpûr, of which it remained an integral part until reconquered by the Lodî sultans of Dîhil. In the reign of Akbâr it was annexed to the Mughal empire. According to Abu 'l-Faqî it was divided into five sârkârs and thirty-eight parganas. It extended from the Ganges on the south-west as far as the Gandak on the north-east; and from the river Sai in...
the south to the Tarai of Nepal in the north. (Ālīn-i
Akbari, ii, 170-7. Jarrett, H.S., Bib. Ind., 1891). Local traditions in Awadh, however, conflict with the Muslim accounts and suggest that the Rādīpuś chief maintained their authority practically intact throughout the Mughal period. (W. C. Benett, The Chief Clans of the Roy Bareilly District, 1895). The weakness of the central government after the death of Awrangzib gave the nawābs of Awadh an opportunity of asserting their independence, although nominally they still acknowledged the authority of the Mughal emperor.

Sa'dādat Khān Burhān al-Mulk, the founder of the Awadh dynasty, was descended from a respectable Sayyid family of Nāshāpur (Muntakhab al-Lubāb of Khāfī Khān, ii, 902). During his nawabship (1722-39) Benares, Ghāzpūr, Dīawnāpūr and Ćūnār were annexed to his dominions. His successor, Šafdar Dīąרג (1739-54), was appointed wazīr of the empire in 1748. He invited the Marāthās to assist him against the Bangash Pathāns of Farrūkhābdābū who were supported by the Rohillās. The engagements entered into at that time formed the basis of later Marāthā claims on Rohlīkhānd. Šafdar Dīąרג's son and successor, the nawāb-wāzīr Shudjarā al-Dawla (1754-75), came into conflict with the rising power of the English East India Company and was totally defeated at Baksar in 1764. This left Awadh at the disposal of the Company. By the treaty of Allāhābād (1765) Clive restored Awadh to Shudjarā al-Dawla with the exception of Kora and Allāhābād, which were handed over to the emperor for the upkeep of his dignity and expenses. This alliance with Shudjarā al-Dawla was purely defensive. It was the germ of all subsequent subsidiary alliances with Awadh because the extraordinary expenses of all troops supplied by the Company were to be defrayed by Shudjarā al-Dawla. By these means Awadh was converted into a buffer state against Marāthā encroachments. In the main this was a sound policy. Its chief weakness from a strategic point of view was the handing over of Kora and Allāhābād to the Mughal emperor as the defence of Awadh necessitated the defence of these districts. Clive restored Shudjarā al-Dawla to his dominions in 1767. The resentment of Shudjarā al-Dawla was a wise move as the Company at that time were in no position to annex and administer Awadh. By the treaty of Benares (1773) Warren Hastings placed the Company's relations with this important buffer state between Bengal and the Marāthās on a firmer footing. In future its ruler had to defray all the expenses of the Company's troops required for the defence of his country, namely 210,000 rupees a month. The emperor had deserted the Company and became a puppet in the hands of the Marāthās, Kora and Allāhābād were sold to the ruler of Awadh for fifty lakhs of rupees. (For these negotiations see The Benares Diary of Warren Hastings, ed. C. Collin Davies, Camden Miscellany, Royal Historical Society, vol. lxxix, 1948).

The accession of the incapable Āṣaf al-Dawla (1775-97) enabled the hostile majority on Warren Hastings' council to alter his policy towards Awadh. By the treaty of Faydābād (1775) the subsidy for the use of the Company's troops was raised to 260,000 rupees per mensem and the new nawab was forced to cede Rājā Chait Singh's sainīndārī of Benares, Dīawnāpūr and Ghāzpūr in full sovereignty to the Company. By the treaty of Ćūnār (1781) Hastings, who had regained control over his council, proposed to reform Āṣaf al-Dawla's administration by reducing the number of English troops stationed in his territories. Unfortunately the weakness of the nawāb's government prevented this, and Hastings was forced to retain both the permanent and temporary brigades. His share in the resumption of the dāğiārs and in the sequestration of the treasures of the bēgūms of Awadh, the mother and wife of Āṣaf al-Dawla, formed one of the charges against him on impeachment. Certain conclusions may be drawn from Hastings' conduct of the Company's relations with Awadh. His object was to prevent any development which would impair the efficiency of the buffer state and weaken the Company's defences. He therefore contended that the Company had a right to dethrone a disloyal or unsuitable ruler. He also insisted on ministers favourable to the British connexion. The trouble he experienced in controlling the English Residents in Awadh, both Middleton and Bristow, illustrates the difficulty of formulating written instructions which were not liable to misinterpretation. Because of the close connexion between Awadh and Bengal a policy of non-intervention was impossible. Under the incapable Āṣaf al-Dawla Awadh could not have preserved its independence without the Company's assistance. It certainly would not have been free from Marāthā depredations. In the main Hastings' policy was followed by Lord Cornwallis and Sir John Shore. Cornwallis reduced the Company's demands on Awadh to fifty lakhs of rupees a year, but, on the accession of Sa'dādat 'Allā Khān (1798-1814) Shore raised the subsidy to seventy-six lakhs. In 1801 Lord Wellesley forced Sa'dādat 'Allā Khān to cede Rohlīkhānd, Farrūkhābdābū, Mainpur, Etawah, Cawnpore, Fatehgarh, Allāhābād, Azimgarh, Bāstī, and Gorakhpūr. This meant that Awadh ceased to be a buffer state, for, except when it was surrounded by Nepal, it was entirely surrounded by British territory. Its weakness as a buffer state had been Wellesley's excuse for these annexations. Sa'dādat 'Allā Khān was succeeded by his eldest son, Ghāţī al-Dīn Ḥaydār, who was the first ruler of Awadh to assume the title of king. The remaining kings of Awadh were Nasir al-Dīn Ḥaydār (1827-37), Muhammad 'Allā Shāh (1837-42), Amjadi 'Allā Shāh (1842-47) and Wādjud 'Allā Shāh (1847-56).

It was a provision of the treaty of 1801 that the ruler of Awadh should introduce into his country a system of administration conducive to the prosperity of his subjects and calculated to secure their lives and property. In spite of repeated warnings nothing was done and misgovernment continued unchecked. On these grounds Awadh was annexed by Lord Dalhousie in 1856. Wādjud 'Allā Shāh received a pension and was allowed to reside at Calcutta where he died in 1887, his title expiring with him. The annexation of Awadh was one of the causes of the 1857 Mutiny. Some of the fiercest fighting during this uprising took place at Lucknow and Cawnpore.

After its annexation Awadh was controlled by a Chief Commissioner, until, in 1877, both Agra and Awadh were placed under the same administrator, who was known as the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces and Chief Commissioner of Awadh. The title of Chief Commissioner was dropped on the formation of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh in 1902. It was not, however, until 1921 that this administration was raised to the status of a Governor's province.

The first land revenue settlement after annexation was carried out with a lack of consideration for the great talukdārī families of the province, who were ousted from the greater part of their estates. This
was reversed after the Mutiny when Lord Canning reverted to a talukdāri settlement and confirmed the rights of the talukdārs by sanads.

To-day in Awadh Muslims are to be found chiefly where they held sway in the past, their preference for urban life explaining their presence in the chief towns. The old talukdāri system has been abolished and a new rural hierarchy of officials and village organizations has sprung up as a result of the Uttar Pradesh Village Panchayat Act of 1947. Villages or groups of villages with a population of 1,500 have been constituted into a gōν sabhā with certain powers of local administration. Groups of gōν sabhās are controlled by panchāyät ‘addālats with judicial powers extending to civil, criminal and revenue cases. There are about 9,466 gōν sabhās and 1,380 panchāyāt ‘addālats in Awadh.


Awadhila [see awadhila].

Awā'il. Plural of awwil “first”, technically used to denote various ideas such as the “primary data” of philosophical or physical phenomena; the “ancestors” of either pre-Islamic or early Islamic times; and the “first inventors” of things (or the things invented or done first).

In the last mentioned connotation, the term characterizes a minor branch of Muslim literature with affinities to adab, historical, and theological literature. Among the Muslims themselves, only the 10th/17th-century Ḥādīdī Khalīfa (Flügel), 1, 490; Istanbul 1943-3, col. 1996, defines the awā’il as a separate “science” relating to history and adab.

Curiosity about the origin of things was deeply rooted in the historical consciousness of the ancient Semites and reached the Arabs through such literary media as the Bible. The Hellenistic world possessed a literature on the first inventors (Peri Heurēmaton, cf., most recently, A. Kleingüßer, Phīlosōphas, Supplementband XXVI, i, 1934), the history of science, such as the origins of medicine, became known in Islam directly through translation (cf. Ishāk b. Ḥunayn, Ta‘rikh al-Aṣbābī, in Oriens, 1954, 55-80, whose source was Ps.-Galen’s Commentary on the Hippocratic Oath, or, more generally, the ample material preserved in the introduction of Abū Sulaymān al-Sidjīstānī’s Sīrān al-Ikhāma). For the Muslims, the knowledge of the “firsts” connected with the history of Muhammad and the beginnings of Islam was a matter of far-reaching legal and practical importance in many respects, and already the earliest known literature on the biography of Muhammad pays attention to it. Muslim customs, such as clipping the moustache, using the toothpick, etc., were justified by ascribing their first use to the great religious leaders of the past, in this case Abraham (cf. al-Ṭalibī, Lādā‘ī al-Ma‘ārīf (De Jong), 6).

With the growing historical interest of the Muslims not only in political history but also in the history of civilization and science (cf., especially, the introductory remarks to each chapter of the Fihrist, on the origin of the science treated in that particular chapter), the question: Who was first?, was soon asked in connexion with every conceivable subject and always answered, though often in a rather fanciful manner. Nevertheless, the awā’il works of Muslim literature contain brilliant expressions of the cultural outlook and historical sense of their authors, and they are full of valuable material and interesting ideas. The wide intellectual appeal of the subject shows itself in the fact that since the beginning of our era, the Chinese also had a literature on the origins (cf. J. Needham, Science and Civilisation in China I, 51 ff., Cambridge 1954) and again in late medieval Europe, successful works on the first inventors were produced, such as the alphabetically arranged chapter on the inventors from De viris illustribus by the fourteenth-century Guglielmo da Pastrengo (published in Venice 1547, under the title De originibus rerum fol. 78a-89a) and the famous, widely read De originibus rerum, by Polydore Vergil which first appeared in 1499.

Our oldest known representative of the Muslim awwil literature dates from the beginning of the 3rd/9th century. The large Muṣanaf of Abū Bakr b. Abī Shayba (d. 235/849; Brockelmann, S I, 215) is said to contain, at (or rather, near) the end, a section on awwil, which was used as a source in al-Sbīli, Maḥbūn al-Wasā’il ilā Ma‘ṣūrāt al-Awwāl, which appears to have dealt with the awwil of early Islam and the origins of Muslim history and customs. The end of the section is preserved in MS Berlin 9409; the large sets of the Muṣanaf could not be consulted.

At the same period, works entitled Kūtāl al-Awwāl were composed by Hishām b. al-Kalbī (Yaḵūt, Iṣrā‘īl, vii, 252); al-Madā‘in al-Fihrist (Fihrist, 104); al-Hasan b. Maḥbūb (Fihrist 221), whose list of works is duplicated in Yaḵūt, Iṣrā‘īl, ii, 97; a certain Sa‘dīn b. Šā‘ārī (Fihrist 171) of unknown date. Since none of these works is preserved or quoted in the later awwil literature, it remains extremely doubtful whether they dealt with awwil in the sense discussed here (or, at any rate, contained some awwil material). According to the description given in Fihrist 133, the Kūtāl al-Awwāl by the 4th/10th-century Yaḵūṭ al-Marzubānī appears to have dealt not with first inventors but with the history of the ancient Persians and the Mu’tazila.

Late in the 3rd/9th century, Ibn Ḥūtayba, Ma‘ārīf (Wüstenfeld), 273-7, devoted to the awwil a chapter in a historical context (cf. also the later
al-Tha’alibi, op. cit., 3-17). In an adab context, a chapter on awd’il appears in the early 4th/10th century in al-Bayhakî, Maḥdîn (Schwally), 352-6. Theological awd’il works were written at about that time by Abû ʿArnûb (q.v.) and al-Ṭabarînî (d. 360/971; Brockelmann, I, 279).

Adab literature provided its first monograph treatment of the subject in the Kitâb al-Awd’il of Abû Hillâl al-Askarî (d. 395/1005), who claims to have had no predecessors. He restricts himself to material derived from Arab and Muslim history, with the inclusion of some Persian and biblical references, and ignores ‘Greek’ cultural and scientific data. He succeeds in clearly underscoring the view of Muslim historians that every important and good invention dates back to the pre-Islamic and early Islamic period while subsequent ages as a rule produced insignificant and undesirable inventions. Al-ʿAskarî’s book remained a much quoted standard work which served as a basis for later efforts, such as the awd’il works of the 8th/14th century al-ʿAttâ’îl and al-Suyūṭî (cf. Brockelmann, I, 132; S I, 193 f.).

There appears to have been a gap of about two centuries in the awd’il literature. From the early 7th/13th century, we then have the Ghayyat al-Wasd’il ilâ Maʾrifat al-Awd’il by al-Mawsîli (cf. Brockelmann, S I, 397 f.; H. Ritter, in Orients, 1950, 86 f.). A historical handbook based on the awd’il thematics of the above-mentioned Maḥdîn is the 8th/14th century Shibli (cf. Brockelmann, II, 90 f.; S II, 82; F. Rosenthal, A History of Muslim Historiography, 129, fn. 1), a highly informative work. Al-Shibli’s literary effort appears to have been continued by the poet Ibn Ḥâdîd Dârayyâ (cf. Brockelmann, II, 17; S II, 71 Ḥâdîdî Dâhilî (Flügel, i, 490). On the other hand, the theological inclination of some 9th/15th-century scholars finds expression in their awd’il works, which might have followed the lead of Ibn Ḥâjjar’s Iḥbāmat al-Dalâ’il ilâ Maʾrifat al-Awd’il (which has not yet been recovered, cf. Ḥâdîdî Dâhilî, loc. cit.). Abû Bakr b. Zayd al-Dîrâ’il (form uncertain, d. in 885/1478, cf. al-Sakhlî, Daws, xi, 32 f.) thus arranged his Kitâb al-Awd’il (Ms. Berlin 985) as an appendix to the chapters of the science of traditions, and the same was done by al-Suyūṭî, in his instructive Wasd’il ilâ Maʾrifat al-Awd’il which was based to some degree upon al-ʿAskarî. In turn, the Suyūṭî’s work was used by All Dede al-Bonsawî (d. 1007/1598, cf. Brockelmann, II, 562 f.; S II, 635) who, as was the custom among certain later authors, also included the “last things (awdîkhir)” that happened (cf., in this connexion al-Sakhlî, ʿIḍān, Damascus 1280/1930-1; 13; F. Rosenthal, op. cit., 214 ff. For a further user of al-Suyūṭî, cf. G. Vajda, in RSO, 1950, 3).

Another great historian of that time, Ibn Tulûn (d. 953/1546), wrote ʿUmawwāl al-Rasâ’il ilâ Maʾrifat al-Awd’il (Ms. Cairo, Taʾrifû, 1247; cf. Ibn Tulûn, al-Rassîl al-Mawsîlî, Damascus 1418/1939-30). The subject was also versified in a work entitled Wasd’il al-Sâ’il ilâ Maʾrifat al-Awd’il (cf. Ḥâdîdî Dâhilî (Flügel), vi, 435) which appears to have been preserved in MS. Cairo, Madâjûn 474, fols. 288b-306. In the Cairo manuscript, the author is called Shams al-Dîn Muhammad b. Muḥammad b. (Abî) ʿLutf, apparently either the father or the son (d. 552/1156 and 993/1585, respectively, cf. ibn ʿImdâd, Shâhâdât; Brockelmann, II, 367; S II, 394). The active literary interest in the subject continued into modern times (cf. M. al-Thârîfânî, al-Dhârî ilā Taṣālîn al-Sâ’i, ii, 481).


Eine literarhistorische Studie, Halle 1867, which includes the edition of a small portion of al-Suyûṭî’s. Al-Suyûṭî, al-Wasd’il ilâ Maʾrifat al-Awd’il, Cairo 1950. None of the independent awd’il works has so far been edited in its entirety. Brockelmann, I, 132, S I, 193 f., S III, 1265; S I, 279 f.; S I, 597 f.; II, 90 f.; S II, 82; II, 203; S II, 197; S II, 635; A. J. Wensinck and others, Concordances, i, 134 f.; Ahlwardt, Catalogue Berlin nos. 9368-76 (most of the works cited under no. 9376 are, however, no awd’il works); MMFA, 1941, 357-9, on the section dealing with awd’il in ʿAbd al-Rahmân al-Bistâmî (Brockelmann, II, 300 f.; S II, 323 f.), al-Fasîdil al-Miskhîyya. The awd’il are treated as part of the historical equipment of the government secretary by al-Kallâshandi, ʿSûbî, i, 412-36. A short Syriac text of the Muslim period in E. Sachau, Versenniss d. syr. Hss., 331. Berlin 1899. (F. Rosenthal)

ʿAWALIK [see ‘Awtâr].

ʿAWAMIR, al- (sg. ʿAwâmîr), a tribe of Bedouins and villagers in Southern and Eastern Arabia. The tribe is split into three main groups living in the following areas: (1) al-Kaff between the southern edge of al-Rubʿî al-Ḫālí and Wâdî Ḥadrâmawt, (2) southern al-Ẓafra between ʿAṣrâr and al-Buraymîn, and (3) ʿUmân. The groups are completely separate and have little intercourse with each other, though they recognize their common kinship, and the two main divisions of the tribe, Al Badr and Al Lazz, exist in all three groups. The southern group, whose range abuts on that of al-Ṣayyâr at the well of Tamlîs in the west and on that of al-Manâshîl at the well of Ṭhâmîd in the east, is mainly nomadic, though its members are not accustomed to pasturing their herds in the sands of al-Rubʿî al-Ḫâlî, as is by most of the Bedouin tribes in this region. The chief (tamîna) of this group is Ibn al-Ṭabāzâ of Al Badr. Like most of the Arabs in this part of Arabia, the southern ʿAwâmîr are Shâfiʿîs. The central group consists entirely of nomads, who are among the hardiest sand-dwellers of eastern al-Rubʿî al-Ḫâlî, moving about so much that they have no claim to a range of their own. The shaikhly clan headed by Ibn al-Rakkâd of Al Badr is said to have had an origin outside the tribe. Some of these ʿAwâmîr are Ḥanbalîs, the rest Shâfiʿîs. The eastern group is found almost entirely in villages in the area between Ṭâbîhânf and Wâdî ʿAndâm south of the Samâʿîl pass through the mountains of al-Ḫâjar, with some offshoots in al-Bâṭîna, al-Ẓâhirâ, and the vicinity of Muscat. There are two principal chiefs in this group, Ibn Khâmil of Al Badr in Kalʿât al-ʿAwâmîr and Ibn Sulaymân of Al Lazz in al-Ḥumâyda. As ʿAbîd b. the eastern ʿAwâmîr recognise the ʿAbîdî Imam of ʿUmân and the temporal authority of his lieutenant in al-Shârîṭiya, ʿṢâḥî b. ʿIsâ al-Ḥârîtî. These ʿAwâmîr have a tradition of having emigrated long ago from Najd, and their war-cry of Yâ awd’d ʿAmîr b. ʿṢâḥî indicates their claim to a descent from the famous tribe of ancient times (see ʿAMĪR b. ʿṢâḥî). Certain smaller elements in Eastern Arabia such as al-Sîmî and Bayt ʿĀyâl tend to associate themselves with the ʿAwâmîr; in some cases this may be due to the attraction of a glorious name.

from the generality of tax-payers, or from those of particular areas; and it was to these demands that the term \textit{\'{a}w\'arid} was applied, apparently because the total exacted varied according to the government's need and was hence regarded as \textit{\'{a}rid}, "accidental". \textit{\'{A}w\'arid} were imposed, not directly on individuals, but on what were called \textit{\'{a}w\'arid-\textit{\'{a}kk\'anes}}, which, however, were not actual "households", but rather "contribution units", so that a whole village or quarter of a town, for instance, might constitute no more than a fraction of one of them. Care was taken, when \textit{\'{a}w\'arid} were first imposed, or at least when their imposition was regularised, to ensure a just apportionment of the burden amongst all contributors to their resources, and if for any reason those resources were impaired as time went by, the government's demands were adjusted accordingly.

It seems to be uncertain whether \textit{\'{a}w\'arid} were originally money payments on the one hand, or contributions in kind or by way of service on the other. Eventually, in any case, units that rendered services, or furnished supplies, were exempt from payments in cash (\textit{\'{a}w\'arid a\text{\^{k}}\'ess}). As regards these latter, when in any emergency it was decided how much mony was needed, the total was apportioned amongst all the \textit{\'{a}w\'arid-\textit{\'{a}kk\'anes}} concerned and the provincial \textit{k\'al\'um} were instructed to collect a similar sum from each. As for persons rendering services to the state on the \textit{\'{a}w\'arid} principle, typical of these were the \textit{h\'ar\'e\'es} (oarsmen supplementing the war captives and criminals likewise employed in the imperial galleys), each of whom was supported during his term of service by contributions from the other members of his \textit{\'{a}w\'arid-\textit{\'{a}kk\'ane}}. Among supplies furnished as \textit{\'{a}w\'arid} were barley, straw and other provisions, together with carts and animals to transport them, for troops on campaign; timber, pitch, sailcloth, etc. for the admiralty; foodstuffs for the imperial kitchens; and cloth for the uniforms of the Janissaries.

Units that normally performed services or furnished supplies might be obliged, if they were unable, or were not required, to do so for any reason, to make cash payments to the treasury instead. The term applied to such payments was \textit{bedel} (plural \textit{bedeld\text{\^{t}}}) (see \textit{bad\text{\^{a}}}l), but became more and more usual from early in the seventeenth century, by which date the exactation of \textit{\'{a}w\'arid} was no longer occasional; and that these \textit{bedeld\text{\^{t}}} were distinguished from the \textit{\'{a}w\'arid a\text{\^{k}}\'ess} proper may indicate that \textit{\'{a}w\'arid} had been in origin cash exactions, from which units performing services or furnishing supplies were exempted by way of recompense, and that this exemption endowed those units with as it were an \textit{od\'j\ac} status, which they preserved by paying \textit{bedeld\text{\^{t}}} instead of reverting to the payment of \textit{\'{a}w\'arid a\text{\^{k}}\'ess}.

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries many fresh \textit{\'{u}r\text{\^{f}}t} contributions were exacted from tax-payers under a large variety of names; and since little care was by that time taken to ensure that the tax-payers could meet the demands made upon them, many found it hard to do so. It therefore became a practice among the charitable, when founding \textit{\'{u}r\text{\^{f}}fs}, to devote all or part of the revenues so engaged to the assistance of such needy contributors; and the term \textit{\'{a}w\'arid-\textit{\'{u}r\text{\^{f}}t}} was used of such foundations. In course of time, however, the original object of such \textit{\'{u}r\text{\^{f}}fs} would often be forgotten; and then the revenues in question would be devoted to

\textbf{\textit{\'{A}w\'an\text{\acute{a}}} B. \Al-Hakam Al-Kalbl — \textit{\'{A}w\'arid}}

\textit{\'{A}w\'an\text{\acute{a}}} B. \Al-Hakam Al-Kalbl, Arabic historian, d. 147/764 or 153/770. His genealogy and descent are given. His father's name is given as al-Hakam b. \textit{\'{A}w\'an\text{\acute{a}}} b. \textit{\'{I}y\ac\text{\acute{a}}} b. \textit{\'{W}izr} (\textit{\'{Y}\acute{a}k\text{\acute{u}}}t, vi, 93; cf. \textit{Di\text{\acute{a}}\text{\acute{m}}ar\acute{a}} (L\acute{e}vi-Proven\c{c}al), 428, and \textit{Futufy} 134); Ab\text{\acute{u}} \textit{\'{U}bay\acute{d}a}, however, asserted that al-Hakam's father was a slave tailor (\textit{\'{Y}\acute{a}k\text{\acute{u}}}t, ibd., citing verses by Dhu 'l-Rumma, for which cf. Ibn Sall\text{\acute{a}}m, \textit{T\acute{a}b\acute{a}l\acute{a}t al-\textit{\'{S}aw\acute{a}}}rd? (M. \textit{S\acute{a}h\acute{a}k\text{\acute{a}}}r), 482, and \textit{Aw\acute{a}n\text{\acute{a}}}ni, xvi, 121). Al-Hakam was the lieutenant of Asad al-Kasri in Khurasan in 727, the latter, when in any emergency it was decided how much money was needed, the total was apportioned amongst all the \textit{\'{a}w\'arid-\textit{\'{a}kk\'anes}} concerned and the provincial \textit{k\'al\'um} were instructed to collect a similar sum from each. As for persons rendering services to the state on the \textit{\'{a}w\'arid} principle, typical of these were the \textit{h\'ar\'e\'es} (oarsmen supplementing the war captives and criminals likewise employed in the imperial galleys), each of whom was supported during his term of service by contributions from the other members of his \textit{\'{a}w\'arid-\textit{\'{a}kk\'ane}}. Among supplies furnished as \textit{\'{a}w\'arid} were barley, straw and other provisions, together with carts and animals to transport them, for troops on campaign; timber, pitch, sailcloth, etc. for the admiralty; foodstuffs for the imperial kitchens; and cloth for the uniforms of the Janissaries.

Units that normally performed services or furnished supplies might be obliged, if they were unable, or were not required, to do so for any reason, to make cash payments to the treasury instead. The term applied to such payments was \textit{bedel} (plural \textit{bedeld\text{\^{t}}}) (see \textit{bad\text{\^{a}}}l); but became more and more usual from early in the seventeenth century, by which date the exactation of \textit{\'{a}w\'arid} was no longer occasional; and that these \textit{bedeld\text{\^{t}}} were distinguished from the \textit{\'{a}w\'arid a\text{\^{k}}\'ess} proper may indicate that \textit{\'{a}w\'arid} had been in origin cash exactions, from which units performing services or furnishing supplies were exempted by way of recompense, and that this exemption endowed those units with as it were an \textit{od\'j\ac} status, which they preserved by paying \textit{bedeld\text{\^{t}}} instead of reverting to the payment of \textit{\'{a}w\'arid a\text{\^{k}}\'ess}.

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries many fresh \textit{\'{u}r\text{\^{f}}t} contributions were exacted from tax-payers under a large variety of names; and since little care was by that time taken to ensure that the tax-payers could meet the demands made upon them, many found it hard to do so. It therefore became a practice among the charitable, when founding \textit{\'{u}r\text{\^{f}}fs}, to devote all or part of the revenues so engaged to the assistance of such needy contributors; and the term \textit{\'{a}w\'arid-\textit{\'{u}r\text{\^{f}}t}} was used of such foundations. In course of time, however, the original object of such \textit{\'{u}r\text{\^{f}}fs} would often be forgotten; and then the revenues in question would be devoted to
other reeds of the village, or the quarter of the town, concerned.


\textit{Al-Awâsîm}, name of a part of the frontier zone which extended between the Byzantine Empire and the Empire of the Caliphs in the North and North-East of Syria. The forward strongholds of this zone are called \textit{Al-Thughār} [q.v.] or frontier strongholds proper; those which were situated further to the rear, are called \textit{Al-Awâsîm}, literally "the protectresses" (sing. \textit{al-Awâsim}).

Following their quick successes in Syria and Mesopotamia, the Arabs for a while made no attempt to extend their conquests and confined themselves to making raids into Byzantine territory, on the further side of the Amanus (al-Lukâm, [q.v.]) and the Taurus. In the time of \textit{Umar} and \textit{Uṯmân}, the Muslim frontier strongholds were those which were later to be called \textit{Al-Awâsîm}, situated between Antioch and Manbiǧ, whilst those which were more precisely to bear the name \textit{Al-Thughār} were in a kind of no man's land, in the vast region extending to the North of Antioch and Aleppo, up to Tarsus and the Taurus, where the towns had been purposely depopulated by Heraclius when he withdrew from Syria, and where the Byzantines only left guard-posts (\textit{masâlîh}) held by local irregular troops, the Mardaṭṭes; they are perhaps to be identified with the \textit{Djaradîima} [q.v.] who were sometimes on the Byzantine side and sometimes on the side of the Arabs, whom they also provided with \textit{masâlîh} and spies.

This region, periodically ravaged by Muslim incursions, was designated by the Arabs by the name \textit{Al-Dawdî'l-Rum}, the outside country, or \textit{Dawdî' al-Râm} (al-Ṭabarî, ii, 1317; cf. Ibn al-\textit{Aḥrâr} under 98), an expression still in use in \textit{Abbâsîd} times by the poets Abû Tamâm and Buhṭurî. The Umayyads began to acquire a footing in this zone on the further side of Antioch and to occupy the main strategic points situated where roads intersected or at the entrance to the mountains. According to Theophanes (ed. Bonn, 555-6, A. M. 6178), the withdrawal of the Mardaṭṭes, as a result of the treaty of Justinian II with \textit{Abd} al-Malik, left this whole region undefended, and was subsequently disastrous for the Byzantine Empire.

The whole of this frontier zone in the beginning was dependent on the \textit{Jund} of Ḫıms. But from the time of Yazd b. Muṣâwiya, it was detached and made into a special \textit{Jund}, that of Kinnârsîn. In 170/986, Hârûn al-Râshîd, with a view to ensuring the defence of the frontier region exposed to Byzantine attacks, rather than with any offensive objective, (for he also organised the advanced zone for defence), detached from the \textit{Jund} of Kinnârsîn a certain number of strongholds, Manbiǧ, Dûlûk, Râ'fân, Kûrus, Antioch, Tînût, which he called \textit{Al-Awâsîm}, because the Muslims protected themselves by them and because they afforded them protection and defended them when they returned from their expeditions and left the frontier (\textit{Bağhâr}) (al-Balâdîhûrî). Another definition is provided by Ibn \textit{Ṣaddâd}: "because the inhabitants of the frontier strongholds (\textit{akhir} al-\textit{Thughâr}) protected themselves by them when a danger threatened them from the enemy", and al-Kalkashandrî gives another: "because they protected from the enemy the Muslim territory which was behind them (\textit{dânaḥā}), for they bordered upon the country of the Infidels". The same author thinks that the expressions \textit{Al-Thughār} and \textit{Al-Awâsîm} are different names applied to the same thing, which is certainly not correct, for they are both quite distinct and must have been so at an early period. But as, at the time of the creation of this province, which from 173 had the \textit{Abbâsîd} \textit{Abd} al-Malik b. \textit{Ṣâliḥ} as governor with residence at Manbiǧ, the advanced strongholds were included in it, both expressions must have been used interchangeably (see al-Ṭabarî, iii, 604: Hārûn al-Râshîd separated all the frontier strongholds of the \textit{Djazîrâ} and Kinnârsîn, made them into a single territory and called them \textit{Al-Awâsîm}).

\textit{Al-Awâsîm} and \textit{Thughâr} are often united under a single command, at times with the \textit{Jund} of Kinnârsîn. At other times the \textit{Thughâr} form a separate province. The geographers do not agree on the number of localities which form part of the \textit{Al-Awâsîm}: Ibn Khurradâdhîbî also includes al-Djûmâ, Bâdâ, Bâlîs and Rusûfât Hîghâm; Ibn Hawâlî, Bâlîs, Sandyâ, Samosate (Sumaysât), Diṣr Manbîdî, Ibn \textit{Ṣaddâd} also names Baghrâs, Darbasâk, Artâb, Kaysûm, Tall Kabbâsîn. Yâkût includes other localities. In the 10th century, the capital of the \textit{Al-Awâsîm} was Antioch.

The region of the \textit{Al-Awâsîm}, like that of the \textit{Thughār}, was the scene of bloody wars between Byzantium and the Arabs; it was reconquered by Nicephorus Phocas, who obliged the emirate of Aleppo to cede him the whole western and northern part of the region. Thenceforth, the word \textit{Al-Awâsîm} is simply a geographical expression, which continues to be used in the period of the Crusades and the Mamlûks by the Arab geographers.

We have only sparse information on the economic situation of this region, which seems to have been fairly prosperous in \textit{Abbâsîd} times. The sum of the taxation of the \textit{Jund} of Kinnârsîn and the \textit{Al-Awâsîm} together was 400,000 dinars according to Ibn Khurradâdhîbî, and 360,000 according to Kudâmâ. The population was very mixed. It included, besides \textit{Christians} of the towns and settlements, \textit{Djaradîima} of the Amanus) several elements which had emigrated or been transported thither: Arab tribes, especially \textit{Kaysîtes}, who had established themselves there, the \textit{Kîlâb} extending up to Dûlûk, foreign elements coming from India via Mesopotamia, such as the \textit{Sayâbîdâ} [q.v.], brought to the region of Antioch by Muṣâwiya, and the \textit{Zotti} [q.v.], also the same region by Muṣâwiya, then by al-Walîd b. \textit{Abd} al-Malik. It is known that some of the reasons why the \textit{Zotti} were settled in this country (as in Cilicia by Yazid II and by al-Muṣâsîm), is that this tribe practised the breeding of water buffaloes, and the presence of buffaloes cleared marshy territories, such as those of the \textit{Amâk} [q.v.] of Antioch, or of Cilicia, of the lions which infested them (see al-Balâdîhûrî, 164, 376; Wellhausen, \textit{Das Arabische Reich}, 415; M. Hartmann, \textit{Das Lived Haleb}, 7).
The population was very scanty, trade exiguous, and the inhabitants maintained themselves almost exclusively by camel breeding. Doubtless, Awdaghost's disappearance coincided with the ultimate destruction of the power of the Zanata.

**Bibliography:** Bakri, Description de l'Afrique septentrionale, trans. de Slane, 349 and passim; Idrißi, ed. trans. Dozy and De Goeje, 34; Barth, Reisen, iv, appendix 1, 602-4 (according to the Ta'Arakh al-Sudân by Sa'dî); P. Laforgue, Notes sur Aoudaghost, in Bull. Soc. Géogr., 9, 19, 190, 221, etc. (see passim); A. Sprenger, Les ruines de Tegdaoust et la question d'Aoudaghost, in Notes Africaines (IFAN), Oct. 1950. (G. Vves)

Awdaghost (or Awdaghost) African town, now no longer extant. According to al-Bakri, it was situated between the country of the Blacks and Sidjilmassa, at about 51 days' march from this oasis and 15 from Ghana. Barth thinks that it must have been situated between long. 10°-11° W. and lat. 18°-19° N., not far from Kshâr and Borka, that is to say to the South-West of the post of Tidjikja in French Mauritania.

Little is known about this town, which seems to have been at the outset a trading colony established by the Zenaga (Sanhâdja) on the Northern border of the Kingdom of Ghana. At the end of the 15th century, after the Zenaga, had conquered a large part of the Kingdom of Ghana, Awdaghost became the capital of a powerful state. As its sovereign, from 350-60/961-71, it had a Sanhâdja, who numbered more than thirty black kings among his vassals and whose empire measured sixty days' march in length and breadth. In the following century, Awdaghost was attacked by Ibn Yânî, the founder of the Almoravid dynasty. The town was taken by assault, pillaged and its inhabitants massacred (446/1054-5).

From that time onwards, the power of the Zenaga progressively declined; their kingdom was invaded by the Sústh, at the beginning of the 7th/13th century; they had to abandon it, or were reduced to the rôle of tributaries.

In al-Bakri's time (5th/11th century), Awdaghost was still a flourishing city. The population, quite considerable in numbers, was composed of Arabs from the Maghrib and Ifrikiya, Berbers (Berkadjenna, Rawâta, Zanâta, Naftâa and especially Nafzâwa) and doubtless also Blacks. The town, surrounded by a suburb of gardens and palm groves, contained mosques and schools, sumptuous public buildings, elegant houses and busy markets. An important trade flourished there in cereals and fruits from the Muslim lands, ambergris brought from the Atlantic coast, worked copper and gold thread; gold dust served as money. Signs of decadence were already visible in the time of al-Idrîsî (6th/12th century). The population was very scanty, trade exiguous, and the inhabitants maintained themselves almost exclusively by camel breeding. Doubtless, Awdaghost's disappearance coincided with the ultimate destruction of the power of the Zanata.

**Bibliography:** H. von Maltzan, Reise nach Sûdarâhim, Braunschweig 1873, 257-262 (with map); A. Sprunger, Die alte Geographie Arabiens 1875, 206, 209; C. Landberg, Arabica, iv, 54; idem, Études, ii, passim (especially indices 1807, 1828, 1834); Wyman Bury, The land of Uz, 1911, 109 f., 137 f. (with map); Doreen Ingrams, A survey of...
social and economic conditions in the Aden protectorate, 1949, passim (with map). (O. Løfgren)

Awdjila. This name designates both an oasis and a group of three palm groves situated on the traditional caravan route, which in the South of Cyrenaica and between the 30th and 29th parallels, joins Siwa, in Egypt, and Djaraboll to Tripolitania and Fezzân by Marada and the Djofta. Awdjila has been known, since Herodotus (IV, 172, 182) and the classical authors, for its abundance of dates and as a halting place. Its rôle as a halting place seems to have been enhanced by the Arab conquest of the Maghrib. Ibn Hâwâkal (trans. de Slane, JA, 3rd series, xiii, 163) describes it in the 4th/10th century as a small town recently attached to the province of Barka; likewise, 200 years later, al-Idrîsî (trans. Jaubert, i, 248) in the 5th/11th century, al-Bakrî (Description de l’Afrique septentrionale, trans. de Slane, 32) speaks of it as an important centre with several mosques and bazaars; he notes that Awdjila is the name of the district, that of the town being Arzajciyya. In the 10th/16th century, grain was imported from Egypt (Leo Africanus, Description de l’Afrique, trans. Épaulard, 456A). Awdjila was occupied by the Turks in 1640. It has been visited and described by the travellers Hornemann (1798), Hamilton (1852), Beurmann (1862) and Roblî (1869 and 1879) (see the bibliography). The development, from the middle of the 19th century, of the intransigent Sanusî order has kept Europeans away, except Rosita Forbes and Hassenein-bey (1920). It has only been studied during the Italian occupation (1928-1943), in particular by the geographer Scarîn. Since then, it has formed part of the Kingdom of Libya. The name Awdjila only designates the most westerly oasis whilst that of Djiâlo (which is applied to El-Erg and El-Lebba, 30 km. to the S.S.E.) has imposed itself on a whole area, which also includes the mediocre palm grove of Djikerra (or Legherreh), 30 km. to the North. The three oases, which are situated in slight depressions with scanty pastures in the middle of a vast desolate plain of sand and gravel (serir), have a continental and very arid climate, with little wind: the annual rainfall between 1931 and 1940 was 11 mm. 7.

Water, which is not far below the surface and is fairly copious, is obtained by draw-wells (worked by donkeys) and from wells functioning with balance-beams. It is used primarily to water the palms, occasional pomegranate and fig trees, little patches of cereals, lucerne and vegetables. Stockbreeding is very poor and trade dwindling, even at Djiâlo, which for a century has taken Awdjila’s place in the caravan trade with the Sudan and Egypt. This economic and demographic decline, due to emigration, was halted by the Italians, who established their residence at El-Erg (Djiâlo) and joined the oasis of AWDJILA by a track extending for 270 km. (and from there a road, 190 km. long, goes to Benghazî).

Awdjila itself, very much in decay, possessed in 1934 18,000 palm trees, 170 gardens, and 1,500 inhabitants, who have remained Berber-speaking and are grouped in four divisions, living in four adjoining wards: Es-Sobka, Es-Sarahna, El-Hati and Ez-Zegagna—plus a small group of Madjabra, Arabic-speaking, living dispersed in the palm grove. Djiâlo, which has not declined to the same extent, has 50,000 palm trees, 123 gardens and 2,700 inhabitants divided up into 14 “families”. They are distributed between two villages, one of which, El-Erg, is rather dispersed, whilst the other, El-Lebba, is more con-centrated, and in a number of dwellings scattered throughout the oasis. These are the Madjabra most of whom are former nomads who have become arabised and who have a taste for trade. Djikerra is simply a palm grove (13,000 palm trees) and not systematically irrigated; it is inhabited only by a few very poor families (400 inhabitants) and visited for the date harvest by the Zâlya nomads of the Ouadi Fareg region to the North-West. The houses of these settlements, built of large unbaked bricks and more rarely of loose stones, have no upper storeys, and are strung out along twisting lanes and blind alleys. The dwellings, located apart in the gardens, often inhabited by former slaves, are usually palm huts (serîba). The mosques, very rustic in character, have multiplied under the influence of the Sanusîyye; those of Awdjila generally have several domes; the mosque of Djiâlo is made of palm trees, including the minaret.


AWFAT (or WAFAT; in the Ethiopian chronicles Irât), an Ethiopian Muslim state (1285-1415) situated in the plateau region of Eastern Shoa, including the slopes down to the valley of the Mawâg. At the end of the 7th/13th century a number of Muslim states existed in eastern Shoa; the preeminent one (whose Maḫžûmîd dynasty had been founded according to tradition in 283/896) shown in a document recently discovered by E. Cerrulli to be in the last stages of disruption, was conquered in 684/1285 by the ruler of one of its tributaries, whose dynastic title was Wâlasmâa. He conducted campaigns to reduce various Shoaan and S’arar regions, including the nomad state of Adal. The reconstituted state, under the name of AWFât, is first mentioned by Ibn Sa’îd, who says that the region was also known as Djaibara (Djâbarta). AWFât seems to have been alternately tributary to the powerful pagan kingdom of Dikmot, to the Christian kingdom of Abyssinia, and at times independent. The northernmost of a number of Muslim states (Hadya, Fatâjdak, etc.), it became the buffer-state against the advance of the Abyssinian power southwards. Hâkk al-Dîn, warring against ‘Amâda Šyoûn, was overwhelmed in 1328 and AWFât made tributary to Abyssinia. Al-‘Umârî’s important account of AWFât at this time shows that its territory extended eastwards to include Zaylâ’. Continually in revolt against Abyssinia, its last attempt to regain independence was under Sa’îd al-Dîn, with whose defeat and death in 817/1415 the kingdom came to an end and its original territory was annexed to Abyssinia. When the Wâlasmâa, after brief exile in Yaman, returned to
Africa they formed a new state out of their former provinces of Adal-Zayla, and took the title of kings of Adal or Zayla with their capital at Dakar and later Harar.


(J. S. Tringham)

'AWFĪ, MUHAMMAD B. MUH., SADĪD AL-DIŃ (wrongly called Nūr al-Dīn) Bughārī, renowned Persian anthologist. 'Awfī traced his descent from ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAwfī, a companion of the Prophet, from whom he derived his surname. He came from a learned family of Transoxiana, and was the author of a dīwān which amounts to about ten thousand verses. Some of these are eulogies of his patrons, Abū Saʿīd, the Iltūṭshāh, and his vizier, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad, son of Raṣḥīd al-Dīn Faḍl Allāḥ. In one of his poems he attacks the pretensions of a contemporary poet, Salmān of Sāwā.

As a poet, Awhadī displays little originality. He is reckoned by most Persian critics as second-rate in view of some weakness which is to be found in his poetic diction. Moreover, the greater part of his verse, although not without some grace, is often laboured and lacks that subtle light and shade in bringing his ideas before the reader which is characteristic of the best Persian poetry.

Awhadī’s best work is to be found in his two mağnawāt poems, the earlier of which is entitled Dāk-nāma or, as it is called in some MSS., Manīc al-ʿUghdād. This consists of ten letters addressed by an imaginary lover to his mistress and is not of outstanding poetic merit. It was dedicated to Wadjīl al-Dīn, grandson of Naṣīr al-Dīn of Ūsūn, in 706/1306-7. The other mağnawāt, the Diwān-i Dīwān (the greater part of Dīwān), is longer and far better known. It displays a more fully developed talent, and when it was first composed, achieved a great measure of popularity. Like the Ḥadīktāt al-ʿUbaṭa of Sāfārī, it covers the whole field of ethics, with advice on moral discipline, the upbringing of children, civic responsibilities and so forth; but the last part changes its theme and deals with the Sūfī Path and all that appertains to it. The Diwān-i Dīwān was written in 733/1332-3 and was dedicated to Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad.


(G. Meredith-Owens)

AWKĀF [see WAKF].

'awl (Ar. “a little”) literally “deviation by excess”), the method of increasing the common denominator of the fractional shares in an inheritance, if their sum would amount to more than one unit. This has, of course, the effect of reducing each individual share. For instance, a man dies leaving a widow, two daughters and both parents. The share of the widow would be 1/4 = 1/24, that of the father 1/4 = 1/24, and that of the mother 1/4 = 1/24, total 1/24. The denominator is therefore increased to 27, and the two daughters receive 1/27, the widow 1/27, and the
father and the mother each 1/27. This particular
problem is called al-mas'al al-minbariyya, because
Ali is reported to have solved it on-the-fly when it
was submitted to him, whilst he was on the minbar.
The 'awl is accepted by all the Sunni schools of
Islamic law. The Ibadiis, too, recognize it, but they
asccribe its introduction to 'Umar. The Ибн-
'ashariyya or "Twelver" Shi'ites, on the other hand,
reject it and reduce the share of the daughter (or
dauthers) or that of the full or consanguine (but
not of the uterine) sister (or sisters) instead.

**Bibliography:** 'Abd al-Kadir Muham mad,
(K. al-Nahr al-Fādi), *Der überfliessende Strom in
Wissenschaft des Erbrechts der Hanefiten und
Schaften*, ed. and transl. L. Hirsch, Leipzig 1891,
96 ff.; W. Marçais, *Des parents et alliés*, Rennes
1898, 74 ff.; E. Sachau, *Muhammediischer Recht
nach schafiitischer Lehre*, Stuttgart and Berlin
1897, 256 (a special case); D. Santillana, *Sommario
del diritto malechita di Halil ibn IsTidq,
Stuttgart and Berlin 1919, 829 ff.; Sayy f b.
'Abd al-'Aziz al-Ruwhālī, *al-Nab* al-Fādi, Cairo
1357, 60 ff.; A. Querry, *Droits musulman,
recueil de lois concernant les musulmans scythes*, ii,
Paris 1872, 379; Sir R. K. Wilson, *Anglo-Muhammadan

**AWLAD AL-BALAD** (followed by the name of the eponymous
ancestor of a tribe, see under the name of that an-
ccestor).

**AWLAD AL-NAS.** The mamluk upper class
were a branch of whom emigrated to Syria and
fukahd, and Shafi
ī and other places in Syria. Hence he became the
ancestor of the Syrian and Egyptian division of the
family; but the connexions with the Iranian branch
were maintained (Sibt Ibn al-Djawzū, *Mirād al-
Zamān*, Haydarābād, 272). Of these his brother

**AWLAD AL-SHAYKH** (Banū Ḥamawiyā) were
originaly an Iranian family of ḥabīb and Shī'ī
wukāb, a branch of whom emigrated to Syria and
became influential under the later Ayyūbid kings,
al-Malik al-Kāmil (615-35/1218-38) and
the member of the clan earliest known, Abū 'Abd
Allāh Muḥammad b. Ḥamawiya (Pers. form Hama-
wiya) l-Faradj Ibn al-Djawzū, appointed him inspector of all the
privileges of full-fledged soldiers.

The Awlad al-Nās, for but for quite a small number of
exceptions, attained no higher rank than that of
Amīr of Ten and Amīr of Forty. Occasionally the
Awlad al-Nās were favoured for political reasons.

Thus sultan al-Nāṣir Ḥasan (748/1347-752/1351)
preferred amirs from Awlad al-Nās to mamluk
amirs. The privileged position of the Awlad al-Nās
under sultan Ḥasan was, however, exceptional, and
contrasted sharply with their status under other
rulers. Since theirs was an element which, by its
very nature, was excluded from the ranks of the
mamluks, their chances for advancement and for
attaining key positions were seriously limited. In
the course of time they declined together with the
Halba, and saw the same restrictions applied to
them as to the rest of that body, viz. reductions in
pay, sale of their fiefs, exemptions from military
experiences and other obligations.

There was, both among the Awlad al-Nās and
the other members of the Halba, a strong leaning
toward piety and pre-occupation with other-worldly
affairs. Many of them left the military service and
became theologians or faıkhs. (See D. Ayalon, *Studies
on the Structure of the Mamluk Army*, in *BSOS*,
1953, 456-58 and references on p. 456, n. 1).

(A. Ayalon)

The leader was the Khalifa Muhammad Sharif. In 1886
this group attempted to overthrow 'Abd Allāh but
failed. The Awlad al-balad were seriously weakened
by the defeat of the Mahdi's invasion of Egypt at
Tūshkh in 1889, since they had formed the bulk of
the expeditionary force and large numbers perished,
including their leading general 'Abd al-Raḥmān
al-Nujjām. A rising of the Aḥrāf and Danakla in
Omdurman in 1892 was foiled by 'Abd Allāh and
was followed by repressive measures. In 1897 the
Danakla moved to the upper class and were automatically ejected from
them as to the rest of that body, viz. reductions in
pay, sale of their fiefs, exemptions from military
experiences and other obligations.

There was, both among the Awlad al-Nās and
the other members of the Halba, a strong leaning
toward piety and pre-occupation with other-worldly
affairs. Many of them left the military service and
became theologians or faıkhs. (See D. Ayalon, *Studies
on the Structure of the Mamluk Army*, in *BSOS*,
1953, 456-58 and references on p. 456, n. 1).

(A. Ayalon)

The leader was the Khalifa Muhammad Sharif. In 1886
this group attempted to overthrow 'Abd Allāh but
failed. The Awlad al-balad were seriously weakened
by the defeat of the Mahdi's invasion of Egypt at
Tūshkh in 1889, since they had formed the bulk of
the expeditionary force and large numbers perished,
including their leading general 'Abd al-Raḥmān
al-Nujjām. A rising of the Aḥrāf and Danakla in
Omdurman in 1892 was foiled by 'Abd Allāh and
was followed by repressive measures. In 1897 the
Danakla moved to the upper class and were automatically ejected from
them as to the rest of that body, viz. reductions in
pay, sale of their fiefs, exemptions from military
experiences and other obligations.
'Abd al-Wahid (died 588/1192; Ibn al-Furat, cod. \textit{Vind. iv}, 1464), and his grand-nephew Sa'd al-Din Muhammad (died 650/1252; \textit{EI} ii, 260 & IV, 33; Sibt Ibn al-Djawzi, 651) are the best known. —\textit{Imad al-Din} 'Omar had two sons: \textit{Shaykh al-shuyukh} Sadr al-Din Abu 'l-Hasan Muhammed (543/1152/1148-1220), was born in Khurásan, came with his father to Damascus and became his successor. He married the daughter of the famous \textit{Kādi} Ibn Abl 'Asrūn (died 585/1189; Ibn Khalikīn, no. 334; transl. de Slane, ii, 32-3) by whom he had four sons famous as Awd (Bānū) \textit{shaykh al-shuyukh}. Sadr al-Din, a friend of Sultan al-Malik al-'Adil, 595-615/1198-1218, later went to Egypt, where he was invested with the same offices as he had held at Damascus. He died at Mawṣil on the way to Baghdad as an ambassador of al-Malik al-Kāmil.—His younger brother Tādž al-Din Ablū Muhammad 'Abd Allāh, 572-642/1177-1244, went in 593/1196 to the Magrib and served under the Almohad sultans al-Mansur Shārūn (580-95/1184-98) and al-Nasir Muhammad (595-610/1198-98) and al-Nasir Muhammad (595-610/1198-1213) for seven years in a military capacity. After his return he settled down at Damascus and followed his father and brother as an inspector of the safi institutions of the Syrian capital. He wrote several works on history only the titles of which have survived; Ibn Khalikīn saw an autograph of one of his books about Spain at Damascus in the year 668/1269 (Ibn Khallikan, no. 839, transl. de Slane, iv, 337).—The fame of the family rests upon the four sons of Sa'd al-Din, especially on Fakhr al-Din Yūsuf. Born about 580/1184, he entered upon a political career, and al-Kāmil sent him in 614/1217 as his envoy to the caliph. He gained his reputation as a skilled diplomat, being al-Kāmil’s ambassador to the Hohenstaufen emperor Frederick II from 624/1229 until the conclusion of the treaty concerning Jerusalem, February 18th, 1229. During this period he became the friend of the emperor who discussed with him even non-political problems and wrote him two letters after his return to Italy (Ibn Nasīf al-Hamawi, \textit{Ta’rīkh al-Mansūrī}, M. Amari, \textit{Bibl. Sic. App.} ii, 25). Fakhr al-Din Yūsuf held several high positions during the latter part of the reign of al-Kāmil and was a member of the crown council at Damascus after the king’s death in Radjab 635/February-March 1238. After his return to Cairo al-Adil II b. al-Kāmil (635-7/1238-40) dismissed him despite his good services and even threw him into prison. He remained out of office until 643/1246, when al-Adil’s successor and brother al-Šāhīl Nādim al-Din Ayyūb b. al-Kāmil (637-47/1240-9) restored him to all his former honours and appointed him commander-in-chief of the Egyptian army. When in 1249 Louis IX of France threatened to attack Egypt, Fakhr al-Din Yūsuf was entrusted with his defence; but after the Frankish invasion of the Nile Delta he sacrificed Damietta and retreated with his army southwards to al-Manṣūrah. When al-Šāhīl died shortly afterwards (Monday 14th Sha’bān 647/February 1249) the sultana Sharīlah al-Durr made Fakhr al-Din regent in the absence of the new sultan al-Mu’āẓma Tārānshāh b. Nadīm al-Din Ayyūb. In the meantime the crusaders slowly advanced towards al-Manṣūrah and in a surprise attack crossed the Nile and entered the city. In the fighting Fakhr al-Din was killed on Thursday 4th Dhu ‘l-Ka‘dha 647/8th Feb. 1250. —The three brothers of Fakhr al-Din, ‘Imad al-Din ‘Umar, Kamāl al-Din Aḥmad and Mu‘ūn al-Din Hasan started their political activities only in the later part of al-Kāmil’s reign having been before engaged in the teaching of the Shāhīl Mutadhāb at Cairo. They, too, belonged to the crown council after al-Kāmil’s death at Damascus 26th Dhu ‘l-Ka‘dha 640/22nd Nov. 1243. They, too, belonged to the crown council after al-Kāmil’s death at Damascus 26th Dhu ‘l-Ka‘dha 640/22nd Nov. 1243. After the death of the third brother ‘Umar al-Kāmil’s son was elected vice-regent of Damascus. When he conspired against al-Adil II, the sultan sent ‘Imad al-Din back to Damascus in order to force the abdication of al-Djawwāl. But al-Djawwāl had him arrested soon after his arrival and murdered on Thursday 637/1240 and four years later became his representative and commander-in-chief of an army to regain Damascus. But Kamāl al-Din was defeated by al-Djawwāl and al-Nāṣir Dawūd b. al-Mu’āẓma (died 656/1258) in Dhu ‘l-‘Aṣād 648/25th Aug. 1241, and taken prisoner. He died a year later on 13th Safar 640/22nd Aug. 1242 at Qāhza. —The youngest brother Mu‘īn al-Din Ḥasan was appointed wāsr by al-Sāliḥ in 637/1240 and four years later became his representative and commander-in-chief in the campaign for the reconquest of Damascus. The siege began at the end of 642/May 1245, and six months later Mu‘īn al-Din forced ‘Imād al-Din and ‘Adil to give up the Syrian capital, which he had held since 637/1239, in return for Ba‘albak, Borsa and some other places. Mu‘īn al-Din survived his triumph for only a few months and died of typhoid on Monday 24th Ramadan 643/12th Feb. 1246. Of the two sons of Tādž al-Din Muhammed the elder Sa’d al-Din Ḥafid 592-674/1196-1256, is known as the author of a small chronicle from which Sibt Ibn al-Djawzi and al-Dhahābī drew most of their information about the Banū ‘shaykh al-shuyukh. \textbf{Bibliography:} The chronicles of Ibn al-‘Aṣir, Sibt Ibn al-Djawzi, Ibn Wāṣil, Ablū Shāma, Ibn al-Furat, al-Nuwayrī and al-Makrizī. Al-Makrizī, al-Khāṣṣa (Bōlāk) ii, 33-4; al-Sabki, Tabakāt al-Shaf’īyya al-Kubdī. —Cl. Cohen, \textit{Une source pour l’histoire des croisades: Les Mémoires de Sa’d ad-dīn ibn Hamawiya Juwaini}, in \textit{Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg}, xxviii. (1950), 320-37. H. L. Gottschalk, \textit{Die Awdal Sa‘īd al-ibluŷaḫ (Banū Hamawiyya)}, in \textit{WZKM} lxxi (1956), 57-57. —\textit{Cl. Cahen, \textit{Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg}}, xxviii. (1950), 320-37. H. L. Gottschalk, \textit{Die Awdal Sa‘īd al-ibluŷaḫ (Banū Hamawiyya)}, in \textit{WZKM} lxxi (1956), 57-57.

\textbf{Awdal (pl. Awdalīk, vulg. Mawdλeį; for the etymology, see Landberg, ii, 1684 f.)} (\(a\) tribal confederation and (\(b\) territory in South Arabia, between the Indian Ocean and the desert (Ramlat Sabatayn)). It is the easternmost district of the Western Aden Protectorate. The boundaries are, in the \(W\) the Fādλī, \Awdalī, and Bāγhān districts, in the \(E\) the Dhīlībī territory of \textit{Irka}, the Wādīlī sultanate of Bil-Hāf and the indeterminate area of Djerdān. \textit{Urmā} (\textit{Urmā}) with Shabwā, and Aţ Bāryāk. This country is divided by Kāw ar-\Awd (the continuation of Kawr \Awdhilla) into two halves of very different character: 

\begin{itemize}
  \item[i.] Upper Awdalīk territory (ca. 100,000 sq. km., 30,000 inhabitants) is by far the richest and most powerful. The climate is tropical, the fertile ground produces wheat, maize, tobacco and indigo. \textit{Arḍ al-Maḥḍūr} in the \(N\) belongs to this tribal confederation (cf. \textit{al-Ḥamdānī}, 89) which comprises the subtribes Marāţlīk, Rabīz, Hammām, Dayyān and Daţkār. They inhabit the district round Anţab (Nīṣāb), where the Sultan of Upper Awdalīk has his residence.
\end{itemize}
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AWLONYA, Alb. Vlora, Valona, town in southern

Albania. (see ARAWLTWEL). The old name of

Valona, is today a town of about 10,000 inhabitants.

It lies in the bay of the same name, and is some

21/4 m. (4 km.) inland from the harbour. It played an

important part in antiquity as Aulon (hence Awlona).

Concerning its history in the Middle Ages, cf. Konst.

Jireck, Valona im Mittelalter, in: Ludwig v. Thall-
cobe, Itlyrisch-albanische Forschungen, i, Munich and
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Albanians and Slavs) were mostly Greeks, and
denominationally belonged to the autocephalous
archbishopric of Ohrd up to the 18th century.
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Kanina, there were the Vloras, who had been there
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refers to the seat of the Aulon, as in Latin Aula

(Dalhia, Dara, Kastoria, [Syr-DDarx], [Syr-DDarx]2

AD), etc. (O. Löfgren)

AWLIYA ATA. (T., "holy father"), is the old

ame of the city called since 1938 Dziambul after the

Kalách poet Dziambul Dziabaev (1846-1945),

which lies on the left bank of the Yalas in the

Kalách SSR. Until 1917 it was the capital of the
district of the Str Daryâ in Russian Turkistân and

and obtained its name from the grave of the holy man

Kara Khan (which is mentioned as early as the

13th century). The town, see M. Ashob (Mem. b. Abdân, Durân,

MS India Office 545, fol. 179r). Its mausoleum dates

from the 19th century and bears no inscription. On

the other hand the grave of the "little holy one"

(Kísîkh Auliya) there is an inscription of 660/1262;

the grave is that of the prince Ughl Bîge Ikbâl
since the time of Bayezid II and were related to him by marriage (cf. Ekrem Bey Vlora, Aus Berat und vom Rumelische Streifen, No. 13) and who traced their origin back to Şahîd Sinân-Paşa (cf. F. Babinger, Rumelische Streifen, Berlin 1938, 24 f.). In the 17th century, the fortress of Awlonya was surrounded by high and thick walls with many bastions. Within the fortress, there was a mosque endowed by Sulayman the Magnificent, and in the middle there was a tower—identical with the white tower of Salonica—built for the same sultan, supposedly by the Ottoman architect Sinân. There is a clear description by Ewliya Celebi of the Awlonya of his day (cf. the German translation by F. Babinger, Rumelische Streifen, 25 f.). The order of the Bektashi appears to have been very active around Valona. After 400 years of Turkish rule, Albanian independence was declared in Awlonya in 1912, and it seceded from the Ottoman Empire. From 1914 to 1920, the town was occupied by the Italians, and during the First World War it formed an important base for military operations in the Balkans. By the Treaty of Rapallo, this bridge-head on the Adriatic and barrier in the Straits of Otranto had to be returned to Albania—with the exception of the island of Saseno. From April 1939 to autumn 1943 Awlonya, together with the rest of Albania, was once again in the hands of the Italians.

Bibliography: Apart from works mentioned in the text of Pouqueville, W. M. Leake, Lord Holland, L. Heuzey, G. Weigand, C. Patisch, which give a description of old Awlonya.

F. Babinger

‘AWNĪ [see MUHAMMAD II].

AWRANGHĀB, a town and district in the state of Bombay having in 1951 a population of 1,179,494. During the reign of ‘Alî al-Dîn Khâlîl the Hindu rulers of this part of the Deccan were forced to pay tribute to the Muslim invaders. In 1347 it was incorporated in the Bahmanî kingdom and with the disintegration of that kingdom became part of the Niţâm Shâhî sultanate of Ahmadnagar. Under Malik ‘Ambar, an able Abyssinian minister, Ahmadnagar offered a stubborn resistance to the Mughal invaders, but, after his death in 1626, it was annexed to the Mughal empire. During the decline of Mughal power in the first half of the eighteenth century Awranghāb was added to the dominions of the Niţâm of Haydarâbâd. In 1936 it was incorporated in the state of Bombay.

The town of Awranghāb, previously named Khirkâ, was the capital of the Ahmadnagar sultanate in the days of Malik. ‘Ambar. It was burned to the ground by Mughal forces in 1612, but was rebuilt and renamed Awranghāb in honour of Awrangzib, who lived there during his second viceroyalty of the Deccan. The neighbouring village of Khuldâbâd contains the tombs of Malik ‘Ambar, Awrangzib, and Asaf Dîjâh, the founder of the Haydarâbâd state. It was once famous for its gold brocade, but this and other industries have declined. There is another small town of the same name in the Gâyâ district of Bihâr.

(C. Collin Davies)

AWRANGHĀB SAYYID, a small town in the Bulandshahr district of Uttar Pradesh, founded in 1704 by Sayyid ‘Abd al-Azîz, a descendant of Sayyid Dîjâlî al-Husayn of Bebdagh. (C. Collin Davies)

AWRANGZĪB, Abu’l-Muṣāffar Muḥammad Muḥyī ‘l-Dīn Awrangzīb ‘Alâmîr Bâdshāhī}

Ggâzî (1027-1119/1618-1707), the third son of Shâhâdîyâhân and Mumtâz Maḥâlî (daughter of Asâf Dîjâh) was born at Dhojî in Mâlîwâ on 15 Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da 1073/Nov. 1658.

I. Early Years (1027-68/1618-58). He certainly received a very good education according to the standards of the day, for throughout his life he could hold his own in disputations with the ulama as well as men of letters, and his Persian compositions have been regarded with respect.

In 1044/1635 Awrangzib was made a commander of ten thousand and put in nominal charge of a successful campaign against Dîdîjâhîr Singh Bundelâ. In 1045/1636 he was appointed Viceroy of the Dakhin but resigned in 1053/1644, either owing to a fit of religious fervour or on account of his bitterness against Dârâ, his elder brother, whom Shâhâdîyâhân seems to have had chosen as his successor. Nevertheless he accepted the governorship of Gugîjârî and was thence transferred in 1055/1646 to the command of Balîk, which the Mughal officers had conquered under the nominal command of Murâd Bâlkâshî, the Emperor’s youngest son. But the Uzbek were too strong and Dîhîfî was too far; Awrangzib established his reputation as a general and an administrator, but he had to give up Balîk to Nâsîr Mûlîmâd Khânîr and beat a retreat. Appointed governor of Multân in 1057/1648, Awrangzib was directed by the Emperor to recapture Kânâdâhîr from the Persians. He besieged Kânâdâhîr twice—in 1058/1649 and 1061/1651—but the enterprise was too difficult and he had to retreat. Awrangzib can hardly be blamed for this, for Dârâ Shûkîhî to whom the third siege of Kânâdâhîr was assigned failed even more disastrously.

Awrangzib was assigned the Viceroyalty of the Dakhin for a second time in 1062/1652. His revenue expert, Murshîd Kull Khânîr, did much to settle that desolated territory by his revenue system (dîhara). In 1065/1654 Awrangzib laid siege to Gulkûnda and could have extinguished that kingdom but the Emperor ordered him to accept a tribute and make peace. In 1066/1657 he attackedBidîpârî and had captured Bidîr and Kalyânî when orders once more came from the Emperor directing him to accept peace terms. Soon after that Shâhâdîyâhân fell ill (17 Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da 1067/Sept. 1657) and his four sons prepared to fight for the throne.

II. War of succession, 1067-68/1658-59. The war of succession shows Awrangzib at his best as a general and an administrator; he was never to attain that standard again. Dârâ Shûkîhî, the heir-designate at Agra, had the prestige of the imperial authority and the advantage of moving on interior lines. But he showed himself lacking both in capacity of organisation and strategy. Shûdîîr, the second son, who was governor of Bengal, assumed the crown (as did the youngest brother, Murâd) and moved towards the capital. But he was decisively beaten at Bahâdûrpûrî (12 Dju‘ādâd 1 1068/14 Feb. 1658) by the imperial army under Râjîa Dînî Singh and Sulaîmân Shûkîhî and fled back to Mungrî. But Dârâ’s southern army, under Djaswînt Singh, could not prevent Awrangzib and Murâd from joining their forces near Udîjîâin. The two brothers crushed Djaswînt’s forces at Dharîm (12 Râjîb 1068/15 April 1658) and then crossing the Chambal, defeated Dârâ decisively at Sâmûrgârî, eight miles from Agra (26 Sha’bân 1068/29 May 1658). Awrangzib interned his father in the Agra fort and then arrested Murâd near Mâthûrâ and sent him to Gwâîlîr where he was executed in Râbi‘ II-Dju‘ādâd 1 1072/Dec.
1661. Awrangzib crowned himself hurriedly at Delhi and then marched as far as Multan. Then he had to march eastwards to meet Shudja, whom he defeated signally at Khadjwah, near Allahabad (10 Rabî' II 1069/5 Jan. 1659). Leaving Mir Djumla to pursue Shudja to Arrakán, where that unfortunate prince met his death, Awrangzib once more marched west because Dārā, supported by Shāh Nawâz Khān, the governor of Gudjârat, had entrenched himself at Deorai, near Ajgâmez. Dārā was defeated after a three day battle (28 Dijumâdâ II 1069/23 March 1659) and, while he was fleeing towards Kandahâr, Malik Djuwân, his Balûc host, captured him and brought him to Agra, where, after being paraded with every disgrace, he was put to death as a heretic. Awrangzib's power was now unchallenged and he celebrated his second coronation on 14 Ramadân 1069/5 June, 1659.

First half of the reign, 1068-92/1658-81. The Mughal Empire during Awrangzib's long reign was really ruined by a series of wars, many of which were of his own seeking. His general, Mir Djumla, conquered Kûl Behâr and Assâm (1071-3/1661-3) with a terrible loss of life, including his own, but the territory was lost within four years. The Pathâns rose in revolt—the Yâsautâls in 1077/1666 and the Afrâdis in 1078-9—though the Emperor stationed himself at Hasan Abdâl (Râwalpindî district), the efforts of the imperial officers were strangely unavailing and peace could not be restored till 1085/1675. The death of Mahârâdja Diwânsânt Singh of Mârwar on 25 Shawwâl 1089/10 Dec. 1678, started the Râdîjâit war. Awrangzib stationed himself at Ajgâmez for the better conduct of the campaign, but his own son, Prince Khânâr, rebelled against him and fled to Sambhâdji. The Emperor made peace with Râna Râdji Singh in Dijumâdâ I or II 1092/June 1681, but the Râthors of Mârwar continued their struggle till Adûtii, son of Mahârâdja Diwânsânt, entered Dijodhpur as a victor in 1118/1707.

Meanwhile a new opponent of the Empire had risen in the Deccan. Shiwâdji son of Shâhîdî Bhonsla, a first-rate diplomat, guerrilla warrior and organiser of victory, Shâhîstâ Khân, the Emperor's uncle, was sent against him and failed disastrously, but Dâlî Singh, who succeeded Shiwâdji, compelled Shiwâdji by the treaty of Purandar (Dju 'l-Ka'da-Dhu 'l-Hijjâj 1075/June 1665) to hand over 23 out of his 37 forts. Shiwâdji came to Awrangzib's court, found that he would only be given the status of a pandji-kadâri (commander of five thousand), and pretended to faint owing to a weak heart; he was interred by the Emperor's order but succeeded in escaping back to his homeland. In 1080/1669 he began offensive operations against the Empire, plundered Sûrat for a second time (1081/1670) and started a series of plundering raids for the levy of dzîiya, on both sides. Even with reference to his religious policy has been a matter of controversy, which will continue to simmer on for some time to come. Equally valid evidence seems to be available on both sides. Even with reference to his dzîiya, a retrogressive poll-tax on the higher classes of Hindus at the rate of Rs. 3 1/3, 6 2/3 and 12 2/3 (but not higher) per year, we have Khâfi Khân's statement that it could not be levied and remained largely a tax on paper. To avoid misunderstanding it should be added that the term dzîiya was used in a very loose sense in medieval India and often meant any tax other than the land-tax (khârdî).

Bibliography: A complete list of all the available authorities on Shâhâbjâhân and Awrangzib is given in Storey, 564-99. Only the more important printed works are listed here: Dialal Tabâtabâ'i, Pâdshâh-nâma, Lucknow 1852; Salih Kanboh Lhâwri, 'Amâini Shaikh (Bibliotheca Indica); Wâhid-i 'Alâm-giri (ed. by Syed Zafar Hasan), Aliârâ; 'Alâm-giri-nâma (Bibliotheca Indica); Wâhid-i Ni'imat Khân 'Ali, Lucknow and Cawnpore; the Djuâng-nâma of Ni'imat Khân 'Ali, Lucknow and Cawnpore, also English translations by Chandra Lal Gupta and Agan Lal Verma (Agra 1909) and by Baij Nath Figâr (Lucknow 1928); Mâlûdîr 'Alâm-giri (Bibliotheca Indica); Akhâm-i 'Alâm-giri, Persian text and English translation by Sir Jadunath Sarkar; Khâfi Khân, Munâqashul Lûbâb (Bibliotheca Indica). Two contemporary works—Bernier, Travaux et Manuscrits, Storia do Mogor, 1656-1708 (Ed. W. Irvine)—are available in English. Among modern works, Sir Jadunath Sarkar, History of Awrangzâb, 5 vols. stands pre-eminent. Reference may also be made to Mawlânâ Shâhî, Awrangzâb, 'Alâm-giri (in Urdu); Lane Poole, Awrangzâb; Zaheeruddin Faruqî, Awrangzâb (Newal Kishor); Sir J. N. Sarkar, Anecdotes of Awrangzâb. (W. Irvine-Mohammad Habibi)
The Awrás is a compact massif 8,000 sq. km. in area, which extends from the depression leading from Batna to Biskra as far Khenchela and the valley of the Wādī 'l-'Arab, between the high plains of southern Constantine (Šābkh) and the Saharan depression of the 8th/9th century; it was from the Awrás that Abū Yazīd appeared, whose revolt for a brief moment imperilled the Fāṭimīd Empire. The Hīlāl invasion contributed to the arabsisation of the whole area of the mountain massif, but the populations succeeded in retaining their independence intact, escaping from the authority of the Ḥafṣīds [q.v.], then from the domination of the Turks; the latter, however, set up in the area some chieftains devoted to their policy, whose authority remained precarious. From the 10th/16th century, preachers from the extreme South of Morocco gave the Islam of the Awrás the appearance which it was to retain until about 1935: a religion closely linked with a specific social structure. At this last date, the Algerian 'ṣālmād' intervened, especially against the cult of Saints.

The inhabitants of the Awrás have always retained their old political organisation, of which the village remained the basis, a true municipal republic administered by the assembly of the people, or ǧāmi‘a, in conditions analogous to, though rather more sketchy than, those which existed in Kabylia. The French occupation only superficially put an end to this state of affairs. In 1845 the Due d’Aumale took Mghānegh, whilst Besançon made the main tribes recognise French authority; further expeditions, however, were required in 1848-1849 and 1850 to repress a revolt; French troops had to intervene again in 1859 and 1879, when risings had broken out. In 1866, the judicial system of the Mālikīs was applied to the Awrás and Kādās were sent there, but local customary law continued to be applied, as a supplement to Islamic Law and the French Penal system.

AL-AWS, one of the two main Arab tribes in Medina. The other was al-Khazraj, and the two, which in pre-Islamic times were known as Banu Kayla from their reputed mother, constituted after the Hijra the 'helpers' of Muhammad or Ansar [q.v.]. The genealogy as given by Ibn Sa'd (iii/4,1) is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clan</th>
<th>Genealogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-Aws</td>
<td>Thalaba b. Amr (Muraykiyya) b. Amir (Mā' al-Samā') b. Ḥārība b. Imri' b. Kayla</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table gives the genealogical relationships of the chief divisions of the tribe:

```
+----------------+-----------------+-----------------+-----------------+-----------------+-----------------+-----------------+
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clan</th>
<th>Malik</th>
<th>Amr</th>
<th>Wāṣif (= Sālim)</th>
<th>Khāṭma</th>
<th>Amr</th>
<th>Mūṣādh (= Mu'mān)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-Nabīt</td>
<td>Imrī' al-Kays</td>
<td>Dhiṣḥam</td>
<td>Kāṭma</td>
<td>Kays</td>
<td>Zayd</td>
<td>Wā'īl Umayya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Khazraj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ḥārith</td>
<td>Zafar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mūṣādh (= Mu'mān)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The name al-Aws probably means 'the gift' and seems to be a contraction for Aws Manāt, 'the gift of Manāt' (the goddess whom they worshipped). The fuller form tends to be restricted to the clans of Wāṣif, Khāṭma, Wā'īl and Umayya b. Zayd, and was changed in Islamic times to Aws Allāh; but these four clans seem to be called simply 'Banu al-Aws' in the Constitution of Medina (Ibn Ḥishām, 341-3).

The traditional story is that, some time after the emigration from the Yemen led by Amr Muraykiyya, his descendants quarreled, and al-Aws and al-Khazraj separated from Ghassān and settled in Yathrib or Medina, which was then controlled by Jewish clans. For a time Banū Kayla were subordinate to the Jews, but under the leadership of Malik b. al-ʿAqlīn of the Khazraj clan of Sālim (Kawākila) they became independent and obtained a share of the palm-trees and strongholds (iḍām, sing. iṣṭām). A contemporary and rival of Malik was Uḥayyā b. Dhiṣḥāb, chief of the Aww clan of Amr b. Amr. It is to be doubted whether there was at this time any conception of the Aww (or the Khazraj) as a unity. The effective units seem to have been the subdivisions of these tribes, here called 'clans'. Even the clans may not have been constituted as

The genealogies lead one to suppose, since the genealogies, which are later compilations, are entirely patrilineal, whereas there are many indications that matrilineal kinship was important in Medina. The feuds at Medina in the decades before the hidjra are commonly said to be between the two tribes, but the sources speak of fighting between clans and groups of clans; and even in the Constitution of Medina the units responsible for blood-money, which are apparently independent political entities, are single clans or groups of clans, like al-Nabīt, which consisted of the clans of ʿAbd al-Aṣghāl, Zafar and Ḥārība. It is probable that the conception of the Aww and the Khazraj as tribes was fostered shortly in order to create closer ties between the clans in alliance with one another, and that this was happening shortly before the hidjra and more particularly after it.

In the generation before the hidjra the leading man among the Aww was ʿHuḍayr b. Simāk, who by genealogy belongs to ʿAbd al-Aṣghāl, but appears at one point as leader of the clan of Amr b. Amr, against the Khazraj clan of Ḥarība, while the chief of ʿAbd al-Aṣghāl was Muṣādh b. Nūmān. Another leader was Ḥubayy b. Waṣl at the clan of Wāli b. Umayya, but on several occasions when he was in command of a party his fellows fled, and latterly he yielded the supreme command to Ḥudayr where both were present. During this period various small feuds became linked with one another, until there was a conflagration in which most of Medina and some of the surrounding nomads were involved. After a serious defeat the clans of ʿAbd al-Aṣghāl and Zafar had withdrawn from Medina, while Amr b. Amr and Aww Manāt had made peace. The oppressive policy, however, of the Khazraj clan leader, Amr b. Nūmān of Bayḍa, drove the Jewish tribes of Kurayya and al-Nādir into alliance with the two exiled clans, and enabled them to fight back. They were also helped by the nomadic clan of Muzayna, and the other clans of the Aww joined in, with the exception of Ḥārība, which had been driven from its lands by ʿAbd al-Aṣghāl. The ensuing battle of Buʿāth went in favour of the Aww and their allies, but their leader Ḥudayr was killed. Peace was not made after this battle, but there was no further large-scale fighting.

Such was the situation when Muhammad commenced negotiations, first with the Khazraj and then with the Aww also. While nearly all the Khazraj entered into agreement with Muhammad, many of the Aww held back, viz. the clans of Khāṭma, Wālī, Wāṣif and Umayya b. Zayd, and some of Amr b. ʿAww. Nevertheless the conversion of Sa'd b. Mūṣādh b. Nūmān, chief of ʿAbd al-Aṣghāl,
was a decisive event in the growth of Islam in Medina, and from the battle of Badr until his death in 5/627 he was the leading Muslim of the Banū Kaylā or Ṣanār (q.v.). The enmity between the Aws and the Khazraj died away gradually, and is not heard of after the institution of Abū Bakr as caliph.


AWS b. ḤADJĀR, the greatest pre-Islamic poet of the tribe of Tamīl; al-ʿAṣmaʾ frequently praises and comments on his poetry; in contrast the early anthologies, except the Ḥamīda of al-Ḥuṭārī, do not mention him at all. Whether al-Farazādāk, when he boasts of having “inherited from the family of Aws a tongue like poison”, means our poet, cannot be ascertained. Fragments of some length do not appear before the time of Ibn al-Sikkīt, who probably wrote a commentary to his ḥudūd, and quotes him in his lexicographical work.

With the early critics Aws was famous for his description of the (wild) ass, the bow, and “noble words” Tippot and dīwāl Thus in the Pseudo-Plotinus as the equivalent in Arabic of the Greek philosophical term, was brought into Muslim philosophy; in this sense it is usually employed alone, though at times such reiterative expressions as al-mahdā’ al-uwal, First Movement, are to be encountered.

III. In several compound expressions, awwal indicates essentially causal priority, and secondarily temporal priority, as in the terms maʿātīl al-uwal (First Caused), al-adīsām al-ūlā (First or Elementary bodies), al-ḥarāba al-ūlā (First movement).

IV. Used in the plural, awdāl [q.v.] indicates the first ones in date and, in philosophy, the thinkers of former ages.

V. Likewise in the plural, awdāl also indicates the first principles in the order of being and knowledge; for example: al-mahdāt al-ūlā, the First Principles in the order of Being or Separate Intelligences, or al-maʿātīl al-ūlā, the First Intelligibles that is to say, the First Principles of Knowledge.

VI. From awwal is derived the abstract noun awwaliyya (plur. awwalliyāt), which in the Philosophers indicates the essence of that which is first.

VII. In the plural, awwaliyyāt translates τὰ πρῶτα καὶ ἄγγελοι indiscriminately and means the First Principles in the order of knowledge, that is to say, the propositions and judgements immediately evident by themselves.


AL-ʿAWWĀl, Abū ʿAmr Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAmr, the main representative of the ancient Syrian school of religious law. His mīmāk is derived from al-ʿAwzā’, a suburb of Damascus, so called after a South Arabian tribe, or an agglomeration (awdā’) of clans, who lived there (Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʾāwak Dimashq, ed. al-Munādjidīdīdī, ii, 1954, 144; Yākūt,
An ancestor of his had been made a prisoner in Yaman (al-Mas'udi, Murudi, vi, 214). He seems to have been born in Damascus, and he died about the middle of the 3rd (9th) century, in Syria towards the end of the 4th (10th) century (J. Lopez Ortiz, La recepción de la escuela malequi en España, Madrid 1931, 16 ff.; R. Castejon Calderon, Los juristas hispano-musulmanes, Madrid 1948, 32, 43 ff.; Heffening, 148; Barthold, ibid.). The anecdotes on how al-Awza'i overcame Malik in disputation (Ibn Abi Hātim, ibid., 185 f.), reflect the struggle between the two schools.


**AYA**-pl. ayā, a sign, token, miracle, verse of the Qur'ān. The original meaning is a sign or token and as such is found in the pre-Islamic poetry (plur. āyāt, with plur. of plur. āyāt, cf. Nöldke's Belegworterbuch, sub voc.), where it is the equivalent of the Hebrew עָיָה, Aramaic āḏāḏ; Syriac āḏāḏ, the plur. āḏāṯ occurring in the Lachish Letters (iv, 12) for the fire-beacons used for signalling. This original meaning occurs in the Qur'ān, where the ark is called the token of Saul's kingship (ii, 248/249), and the sun and moon are signs of day and night (xxvii, 12/13). The wonders of nature are also tokens of Allāh's presence and power (xxx, 20/19 ff.; xii, 105 etc.), but such are also portents from which men should take warning (ii, 164/159, 266/268; xxvi, 67 ff. etc.). It is the duty of the Messengers whom Allāh sends to rehearse to men these demonstrations of Allāh's power, or wisdom, or judgment as they appear in nature or in history, and it is the condemnation of communities that they reject the signs of Allāh that are rehearsed to them (ii, 61/58; x, 73/74; xxvii, 81/83 ff.; vii, 182/181). From wonder to miracle is an easy step (xliii, 47; iii, 49/43; xii, 38; xvi, 134), and by a further step the accounts of such portents or tokens of Allāh's might could be called His signs (ii, 252/253; xii, 7; xv, 75; xxxiv, 19/18; v, 75/79). By a final step each verse of such an account becomes a sign (vi, 124; xxviii, 87; iii, 403 f.).
The Massorah to the Qur'an ayā (plur. ayāt) always means verse, and there was considerable discussion as to verse-endings (ru'āt al-ayāt), number-ending, and the faddūl of certain verses such as the "Throne Verse" (ii. 255/256), the "Light Verse" (xxiv, 35), the final verses of sūra ii, etc., which brought peculiar blessings to such as recited them in specified ways. These various meanings of āya, save the last, correspond closely with Jewish and Christian usage, where the particular religious use of the word is for signs that attest the divine presence and which accompany and testify to the work of the Prophets.

_Bibliography: _Kurṭūbī, al-Dīmī ḵākām al-Kurṭūn, i. 57 ff.; Ibn Manẓūr, Lisān al-ʿArab, xviii, 66 ff.; Suyūṭī, Iḥānān, ch. i, xix, xxviii, lix, lxii, lxiii; Fleischer, Kleine Schriften, i, 619 no. 2.; Jeffery, Foreign Vocabulary of the Qurʾān, 72, 73; A. Spitaler, Die Verszählung des Qurʾāns, 1935; C. A. Keller, _Das Wort Oth als Offenbarungsteichen Gottes_, 1946; R. Bell, _Introduction to the Qurʾān_, 153 ff. (A. Jeffery)

*AYA SOFYA,* the largest mosque in Constantinople (Istanbul), and at one time the leading Metropolitan Church of Eastern Christendom. It was known generally as Ḥ Meγάκη Ḫύσκλησία up to 1453, having been called Ζυρίτρα (without the article) around 400 A.D., and since the 5th century, Ḥ Ἅγια Σοφία.

According to the most recent research, the original Aya Sofya was not built by Constantine the Great, but, in accordance with his last wishes, by his son, Constantius, after the latter's victory over his brother-in-law Licinius. It was then built in the shape of a Basilica, and consecrated on 15 February 360 (cf. A. M. Schneider, _Die Justinianische Sophienkirche_, in _BZ_, 1935, 36). This "Great Church" met with frequent and diverse changes. There were fires and earthquakes which ravaged it (the first wooden-roofed basilica went up in flames on 20 June 404 on the occasion of the expulsion of Bishop John Chrysostom). Reopened on 8 October 415, it remained undamaged for over a century until the night of the 13th of January 532, when once again it went up in flames (as did the greater part of the city, including the imperial archives) during the fight between the rival hippodrome factions.

The emperor Justinian immediately made known his decision to rebuild the church in such splendour as had never been seen before. Even before this, Justinian had already ordered that valuable materials from old monuments in the provinces of his vast empire (where heathen works of art were deliberately left to decay) were to be sent to the imperial residence, and after the fire these materials were largely used to rebuild Aya Sofya. Two of the greatest architects of all times, Anthemius of Tralles and Isidore of Miletus, were placed in charge of the reconstruction. Since the emperor had ordered that the new building must be proof against both fire and earthquake, they decided to use a dome-and-cupola design as being the surest means of escaping these dangers. The opening of this magnificent building took place on 27 December 537 with enormous pomp, and the proud Justinian could exclaim "Solomon, I have surpassed you!"

Even during his own reign, however, the eastern part of the dome collapsed in an earthquake (on 7 May 558) and the ambo, tabernacle, and altar were smashed. The dome had been designed too flat, and it was now raised by more than 20 feet, whilst the supports of the big pillars were strengthened. It was ready for reopening on 24 December 562. The church has an enviable position: to the south is the Augusteum, with an equestrian statue of Justinian, meant for national festivities; to the north (well within the Saray walls of today) are court churches, noble monasteries and the palaces of the court officials; and to the east, that is to say towards the sea, stands the imperial palace.

The west presented a court-yard called the Atrium, flanked by open halls, to the visitor. From here, a number of doors (perhaps four or five) led into an enclosed hall (Exonarthex) which still belonged to the Atrium. From this, five doors led to the actual Narthex (Esonarthex), in addition there is a door at the extreme north and south ends. Further passages branch off, and nine rectangular openings from the entrances to the inner part of the church. The centre one of these was elaborately coloured and used to be the king's door.

The area covered by the church is almost square: the internal length is about 75 metres (excluding the main apse to the east) and the breadth is about 70 metres. The floor is shaped in the form of a cross, and above it the almost hemispherical pendentive dome rises to a height of 56 metres. Since the outside walls alone could not have carried it, it had to be supported in addition by four pillars, and these in turn are supported by small but structurally important arches and their corresponding pillars. To the east and west of the dome, there are two further semi-circular chambers, each of which has three semi-domes over it. Of greatest importance for the shaping of the interior was the two-storey arrangement of all the side-chambers adjacent to the central aisle, where the galleries (as was customary in Byzantine churches) were reserved for women. The weight of the building is carried by 107 columns (40 below and 67 above),usually monoliths of coloured marble (verde antico), but in some cases of red porphyry. An overwhelming impression was created for the mediaeval spectator by the wealth of ornaments: the lavish use of marble everywhere, the pictures of Christ and of the Mother of God, the Prophets, Apostles, and other saints which turn the walls into a sea of colour, not to mention the mighty Seraphim (in the spherical triangles of the main dome), and the gold-mosaic which adorned the dome and walls with such a splendour as had never been seen before. The mosaic ornamentation was probably not finished until the last years of Justinian, and during the reign of Justinian II.

The original walls and vault of the original building consist of brick throughout. The sanctuary (βυτικά) lay to the east of the central part of the church and was divided from it by an iconostasis of considerable height, adorned with pictures and open-work pillars. It contained the altar and the ciborium and led into the main apse. There were 425 priests (who additionally also served three other churches) and 100 doorkeepers in the days of Justinian. Shortly before the collapse of the Byzantine Empire, the number of church officials in the Aya Sofya was estimated at 800.

The first major repairs to Aya Sofya were made in the time of the emperor Basil II. A part of the dome collapsed during an earthquake on 26 October 916. The emperor had the damage repaired (the clumsy flying buttresses on the western façade probably date from that time; cf. A. M. Schneider, _Die Grabungen im Westhof der Sophienkirche_, Berlin 1941, 32 ff.). In 1204 the church was severely damaged during the Latin
sack of Constantinople, when it was ruthlessly plundered, the holy vestments and vessels even being used to clean and feed the invaders' horses; yet it became, nevertheless, the chief church and place of coronation for the new dynasty. The most extensive changes still undertaken in Byzantine times were made in the 14th century. In the first half, the walls were strengthened on all sides, the eastern wing in particular being buttressed from outside by high and broad supports.

We have no description of the interior of Aya Sofya in Byzantine times from Muslim reports. The first Muslim who mentions the cathedral in detail is Ahmad b. Rusta (1244 ff.; trans. G. Wiet, Cairo 1955, 139 ff.); the author lived around 290/902-903 but derives his description from Harun b. Yahya, who was a prisoner of war in Constantinople some time during the ninth century. Harun does not really describe the building, which he calls al-Kanisa al-'Uzma (i.e. Meveddjâl 'Ezkâhçêtêz), but he does describe in vivid detail a feast-day procession, to the church of the Byzantine emperor. On this occasion, the Muslim prisoners of war were led to the church (this might perhaps mean to the atrium of it), and there they greeted the emperor with the cry "May God preserve the king for many years" (ibid. 125). One detail is of particular importance: he mentions that beyond the Mağlis (by which he presumably meant benches) there were 24 small doors with openings a span square, at the western gate (these are not mentioned anywhere else). One of these little doors opened automatically, and closed again of its own accord, at the end of each of the 24 hours. With the decline of the Caliphate, the Muslims after Ibn Rusta grow more and more silent about far-away Constantinople. Only four centuries later, after Asia Minor had been occupied by Turkish tribes, Shams al-Din Muhammed al-Dimaşkî (ed. Fränk and Mehren, St. Petersburg, 1865, 227)—who, however, is dependent on the work of the slightly earlier paper-merchant Ahmad (ibid., viii)—mentions the Aya Sofya in a few lines. The one remarkable thing is his statement that the church harboured an angel whose home was surrounded by a barrier three cubits high, presumably meaning the area of the altar and ciborium together with the iconostasis itself.

A few decades later, Muhammed b. Batthîta (ed. Defrémery and Sanguinetti, ii, 434) is the first to ascribe the erecting of Aya Sofya to Âṣaf b. Barâkyâ [q.e.], supposedly a cousin of king Solomon. Ibn Batthîta's main merit is the detailed description of the atrium. As he stresses, he was not allowed to enter the church itself, possibly because he would not comply with the order (mentioned by him) to kneel before the cross at the entrance.

When the Turks conquered Constantinople (29 May 1453), crowds of the defenceless population fled into the church, in the firm belief that an angel would appear in the sky and drive the victors forever back into their Asiatic home-country after they had advanced as far as the column of Constantine the Great. However, the Turks came on, smashed the doors of the house of God, and dragged the frightened people—both men and women—away to slavery. Eye-witnesses do not, however, mention any blood-bath in the holy place, as was often stated to have been the case. After this wild spectacle of loot and plunder, the church was, though not seated upon a horse, as it was usually stated—entered the church. His mu'adhîdân spoke the invitation to prayer which contains the confession of faith, and he threw himself down— together with his followers—before the one God, and thereby the temple of Constantius and Justinian was dedicated to Islam.

There are very considerable changes in the interior resulting from the rules of the victorious religion. The mosaics which had formerly adorned the walls and vaults, and which had seemed to their Greek creators to have been fashioned for eternity, were hidden under a grey lime-wash (since Ewliya Celebi, Strykâmâne, i, mentions the mosaics, a few must still have been visible in his time, that is to say, in the 17th century). The iconostasis between the priests and the lay folk was torn down, and the rich decorations of the east wing, the Bema, were stripped. As the ancient Byzantine churches faced Jerusalem, whilst the Sultan had to be performed facing Mecca, the Turks have prayed more towards the south, and not towards the eastern wing of the mosque, ever since the days of the conquest. From the time of Mehemmed II, the preacher—bearing a wooden sword—ascended the pulpit on Fridays, on every afternoon of Ramazan, and on Bayramids festivals (see the article 'AANAZA and Juynboll, Handbuch der islam. Gesetze, 8, 87); and there were always two flags by the side of the pulpit. Furthermore, we know that Mehemmed II erected the mighty buttresses against the south wall, where he also built the first of those high, slim minarets. Selim II erected the two buttresses in the north and the second minaret on the north-east corner. His son, Murad III, was responsible for the other two.

Sultan Murad III undertook thorough repairs of the mosque. In the first place, this meant the correction of minor defects which had come to light as time went on, but he also contributed considerably to the embellishment of the bare chamber. He placed the two huge alabaster urns on the inside near the main entrance; each of which holds 1250 litres; he also donated the two large esrades (masâfâba). On the right hand one, the Kurân was recited during most of the day in that chanting intonation which is peculiar to the oriental liturgy of all denominations, whilst the other was meant for the prayer leaders. At great expense, Murad III also gilded the half-moon which crowned the dome. This had a diameter of 50 ells, and had replaced the cross. Thus the Muslim subjects of the Porte could behold the emblem of their faith from as far off as the summit of Bithynian Olympus.

In the second half of the 16th century, the conversion of the churchyard immediately to the south of the mosque into a mausoleum for the sultans was begun. The oldest tomb is that of Sultan Selim II. His son Murad III and his grandson Mehemmed III are also buried there. Sulthan Mehemmed III's 19 brothers, whom he had killed on his accession to the throne, are also entombed here. A few decades later, the dethroned sultan Mustafâ I suddenly died, and a suitable grave could not be found immediately; the old baptistry (on the southern side of the narthex), which the Turks had used for oil storage since their conquest, was taken over for the purpose. Later on, the nephew of Mustafâ I, Sultan Ibrâhim, was likewise buried there. Since then, the large oil stores have been kept in the hall and courtyard on the north side of the baptistry.

Sultan Murad IV (1623-1640), whose reign saw a certain measure of general revival, had the bare walls emblazoned in a memorable way by the great calligrapher Bicâdji-zâde Mustafâ Celebi, with large gold-lettered quotations from the Kurân. Some
Immediately after the conquest, the Turks took over the many legends which had grown up concerning the origin and the consecration of the church during the last years of Byzantine rule, refurbishing them in Muslim terms. A history of Aya Sofya (library of Aya Sofya, No. 3025) was written very shortly after the victorious entry, by Aḥmad b. Aḥmad al-Gilānī (in Persian, on a Greek model) at the order of Mehmed II. This was later translated into Turkish by Ni'mat Allāh (died 969/1561-2). According to Kātib Čelebi (ed. Flügel, iII, 116) there was a second Persian work written for the same ruler by the astronomer and cosmographer ʿAli b. Muhammad al-Kūshdī [q.v.]. This work, however, can apparently no longer be identified. There is another version of the year 888/1483-4, by an anonymous author, which is now in the Staatsbibliothek Berlin (MS. Orient. 8°. 821) as an appendix to an Ottoman history (the Tāwarīkh-i Kostanfiyya [Fleischer, Kat. Dresden, No. 113; Pertsch, Türkische Hss. zu Berlin, no. 231, written three years later) which is more interesting but otherwise similar in thought and sources. According to the Tāwarīkh-i Kostanfiyya the story is that Aṣḥafyya, the extremely wealthy wife of the great Kūstān̄ (b. ʿAlānīyya, died very young and ordered in her last testament that a church should be built which should exceed all other buildings of the world in height. An architect is said to have arrived from Fīrangušan. He is reported to have begun by digging down 40 ells, in order to reach water; then, having built the church with the exception of the dome, he is said to have fled. The building then stood untouched for 10 years, until he returned and put on the dome. It is also stated that the particular marble—otherwise only known by the Diwān (it is actually “marble metal”, Mermer Ma'deni)—was brought from many countries. The “metal” for the four mottled (somāhī) pillars (in fact, of course, they are simply of the hardest marble) is said to have come from Mount Kāf, and the large doors are alleged to have been made from planks of Noah’s ark and already used by Solomon for his buildings in Jerusalem and Kyzikos (Aya Sofya). The total expenditure is said to have come to 360,000 gold bars (each of 360,000 filori). In the time of the grandson of Constantine the Great, emperor Heraclius (a contemporary and secret follower of the Prophet), the dome is said to have come down, but the pious ruler rebuilt it immediately. The Tāwarīkh-i Kostanfiyya wa Aya Sofya wa ʿAli al-ʿArabī Ḥyrā, who was then in the service of the Grand Vizier ʿAlī the Fat (died 28 June 1565) and was a teacher (Flügel, Kat. der Kais. Hofbibl. Vienna, iii, 97), dates from the time of Suleyman the Great. The earliest edition belongs to the year 970/1562-3. Two years later, the author added a few insignificant details to the work and brought it out under a different title (Tāwarīkh-i Din-yi Aya Sofya, in the Bibl. Nationale in Paris, Turkish MSS. Suppl., no. 1546; Tāwarīkh-i Kostanfiyya wa Aya Sofya wa baḍ-ʾi Ḥikayāti, in Pertsch: Catalogue of Turkish manuscripts of the Kgl. Bibl. Berlin, no. 232. Fourmont has a further manuscript, Cat. cod. man. Bibl. Reg., 319, no. 147, 1). According to this, Aya Sofya was built under the emperor ʿUṣṭūnānūs by the architect Iğndaus (as also in Mehmed ʿAṣḥik). Generally speaking, the author of this is more plausible. He also gives far more detail building its predecessor in the 13th century, because he gives various versions. Thus, he must be regarded as the best Turkish authority on the history of their greatest mosque, immediately after the conquest, the Turks took over the many legends which had grown up concerning the origin and the consecration of the church during the last years of Byzantine rule, refurbishing them in Muslim terms. A history of Aya Sofya (library of Aya Sofya, No. 3025) was written very shortly after the victorious entry, by Aḥmad b. Aḥmad al-Gilānī (in Persian, on a Greek model) at the order of Mehmed II. This was later translated into Turkish by Ni'mat Allāh (died 969/1561-2). According to Kātib Čelebi (ed. Flügel, iII, 116) there was a second Persian work written for the same ruler by the astronomer and cosmographer ʿAli b. Muhammad al-Kūshdī [q.v.]. This work, however, can apparently no longer be identified. There is another version of the year 888/1483-4, by an anonymous author, which is now in the Staatsbibliothek Berlin (MS. Orient. 8°. 821) as an appendix to an Ottoman history (the Tāwarīkh-i Kostanfiyya [Fleischer, Kat. Dresden, No. 113; Pertsch, Türkische Hss. zu Berlin, no. 231, written three years later) which is more interesting but otherwise similar in thought and sources. According to the Tāwarīkh-i Kostanfiyya the story is that Aṣḥafyya, the extremely wealthy wife of the great Kūstān̄ (b. ʿAlānīyya, died very young and ordered in her last testament that a church should be built which should exceed all other buildings of the world in height. An architect is said to have arrived from Fīrangušan. He is reported to have begun by digging down 40 ells, in order to reach water; then, having built the church with the exception of the dome, he is said to have fled. The building then stood untouched for 10 years, until he returned and put on the dome. It is also stated that the particular marble—otherwise only known by the Diwān (it is actually “marble metal”, Mermer Ma'deni)—was brought from many countries. The “metal” for the four mottled (somāhī) pillars (in fact, of course, they are simply of the hardest marble) is said to have come from Mount Kāf, and the large doors are alleged to have been made from planks of Noah’s ark and already used by Solomon for his buildings in Jerusalem and Kyzikos (Aya Sofya). The total expenditure is said to have come to 360,000 gold bars (each of 360,000 filori). In the time of the grandson of Constantine the Great, emperor Heraclius (a contemporary and secret follower of the Prophet), the dome is said to have come down, but the pious ruler rebuilt it immediately. The Tāwarīkh-i Kostanfiyya wa Aya Sofya wa ʿAli al-ʿArabī Ḥyrā, who was then in the service of the Grand Vizier ʿAlī the Fat (died 28 June 1565) and was a teacher (Flügel, Kat. der Kais. Hofbibl. Vienna, iii, 97), dates from the time of Suleyman the Great. The earliest edition belongs to the year 970/1562-3. Two years later, the author added a few insignificant details to the work and brought it out under a different title (Tāwarīkh-i Din-yi Aya Sofya, in the Bibl. Nationale in Paris, Turkish MSS. Suppl., no. 1546; Tāwarīkh-i Kostanfiyya wa Aya Sofya wa baḍ-ʾi Ḥikayāti, in Pertsch: Catalogue of Turkish manuscripts of the Kgl. Bibl. Berlin, no. 232. Fourmont has a further manuscript, Cat. cod. man. Bibl. Reg., 319, no. 147, 1). According to this, Aya Sofya was built under the emperor ʿUṣṭūnānūs by the architect Iğndaus (as also in Mehmed ʿAṣḥik). Generally speaking, the author of this is more plausible. He also gives far more detail building its predecessor in the 13th century, because he gives various versions. Thus, he must be regarded as the best Turkish authority on the history of their greatest mosque.
although he is utterly unreliable from our point of view,

The contents of the legends which continue to be woven around Aya Sofya change from one epoch to the next. They seem to have their spiritual peak in the 17th century, a time when the Ottomans in general appear as the greatest despisers of this world. At that time the place was shown on which the Arabic heroes of the first century A.H. were said to have prayed on the occasion of their siege of Constantinople; the place lies in the centre of the nave, from which Khidr supervised the building of the church. In the southern gallery a hollowed stone is pointed out as having been the cradle of Christ.

One of the anecdotes which one could still hear told by young theologians in much later years mentioned Hüssey-i Tabrizl and the way in which he is supposed to have got his professorship in the mosque: the mystic (Sa'di) Sultan Mehemmed II the Conqueror had held out his hand to him so that he had to kiss the inside (ayâ), instead of the back of the hand, whereupon he promptly asked for the appointment as mu'dir of the Aya Sofya. The so-called "Damp Pillar" (yasâk desteğ) and the "Cold Window" (sotûk ûpendère) near the Kâbla gained great fame as places of pilgrimage where miracles happened within the holy walls of the church. In the southern gallery a hollowed stone was where Sheykh A'b Shams al-Dîn (whose words had a truly rousing influence on the men of his time, amongst them Mehemmed the Conqueror himself) first expounded the Kur'an. Until very recently, everyone was still convinced that the blessings brought by the currents of fresh air which entered through this "Cold Window" were of beneficial influence to the depth of theological knowledge.

In 1934, President Kemal Atatürk decreed that Aya Sofya was to cease being a place of Islamic worship, and put it under a museum administration. Subsequently, the lime-wash which had covered the figures in the mosaics was removed, and amongst others the following pictures reappeared in 1936:

- A beautiful representation of an enthroned Madonna and Child, surrounded by twelve apostles, (with a model of the town he founded) and Justinian (with a model of the church of St. Sophia) above the southern narthex door; and over the central door, leading from the narthex to the church (the old Emperor's Door), a representation of Christ enthroned, with an emperor (Leo VI? or, more likely, Basil I, cf. A. M. Schneider in Oriens Christianus 1935, 75-79) at his feet in adoration; and, finally, a Madonna in the curve of the apse.

**Bibliography:**
- Procopius, Agathias, and Paulus Silentiarius are the most trustworthy of the Byzantine sources of the time of Justinian.
- Of the more recent ones, there are above all:
  - Pierre Gilles, De topographia Constantinopolos libri iv (Lyons, 1561 and repeatedly after that date); idem, De Bosporo Thraciae libri tres (Lyons 1561, and repeatedly after that date); Charles du Fresne, sieur du Cange, Historia Byzantina, Paris 1680; J. von Hammer, Constantinopolis und der Bosporus, i, Pesth 1822; Σκαραβάτος Α. Βυζάντιου, Κωνσταντινούπολις, Athens 1851; C. Fosati, Aya Sofia of Constantinople as recently restored, London 1852; W. Salzenberg, Architektur des Baudenkmaler von Konstantinopol, Berlin 1854; Auguste Choisy, L'art de bâtir chez les Byzantins, Paris 1883; J. P. Richter, Quellen der byzantinischen Kunstgeschichte, special number of Quellen-schriften für Kunstgeschichte und Kunsttechnik des Mittelalters, Vienna 1897, by Eitelberger von Edelberg and Illg; W. R. Lethaby and Dr. A. Swainson, The Church of Sancta Sophia, Constantinople; a study of Byzantine building, London and New York 1894; Heinr. Holtzinger, Die Sophienkirche und verwandte Bauten der byzantinischen Architektur (in Die Baukunst, edited by R. Bormann and R. Graul, no. 10, Berlin and Stuttgart 1898); E.ΰγινος Μύκητι Απολογίς, Έκφρασις της Αγίας Σοφίας (in: Βυζαντινή Μνημεία Μαρταλάζι 3 vols., Athens and Leipzig 1909-1910); Alfons Maria Schneider, Die Hagia Sophia zu Konstantinopel, Berlin n.d. (1938); A Turkish account, giving the inscriptions and a description of the additional buildings in Turkish times: Hâfiz Hüseyin, Hâdîdîal-i-Dj睬mîwî, Istanbul 1281/1864, i, 3-8; further bibliography in IA, ii, 47-55 (Arif Müfûd Mansel). On the description of Hârûn b. Yahyâ see M. Izzedin, Un prisonnier arabe à Byzance . . ., in REI, 1941-6, 41 ff., where earlier studies are cited; on the Muslim legends see F. Tauer, Notice sur les versions persanes de la légende de l'édition de Aya Sofya, in Mélanges Faud Köprülü, Istanbul 1953, 487 ff.; idem, Les versions persanes de la légende de la construction d'Aya Sofya, in Byzantinoslavica xlv/1, 1954, 1-20.

Not far from the Great Sophia, there is the Small Aya Sofya (Kiçük Aya Sofya) near the Djundî square. It was built by Justinian, and was formerly dedicated to Saint Sergius and Saint Bacchus. A cupola rose from an octagonal base (which was extended by four apses). The guardian of the harem of Mehemmed II (Kîzar Aghâd) changed it into a mosque, and since then it has been fully equipped for Muslim teaching and worship. The porch, and the five flat cupolas rising from it, are of Turkish origin.

(KESSLER: [FR. TAENSCHEE])

**AYA SOLÜK,** Ayasulûk, Ayasulûğ, Ayatholûğ (from "Αύαςοφα θεολόγος, i.e., the apostle and evangelist John, who lived and died there.

In mediaeval western (Latin) sources, the town is referred to as Altoluog, today (since 1914) it is known as Selûk. It is a small town on the southern coast of Anatolia, 35° 55' north, 27° 20' east, on the site of the Ephesus of antiquity (still referred to as Afsûs or Ufsûs by Arabic geographers) in the plain which surrounds the mouth of the river Kûçük Menderes (the Kaystros of antiquity), at the foot of the Biilbul Daglî (Koresos), and now on the railway between Izmir and Aydın. It is the capital of the K联系我们 of Kusadasi in Aydın. It is the capital of the Kusadasi in Aydın. It is the capital of the Kusadasi in Aydın. It is the capital of the Kusadasi in Aydın.

In the Middle Ages, Aya Solûk was a town of considerable importance. Ibn Battûta, who visited it in 733/1333 (ii, 308 f.), describes it as having 15 gates, and it was an important commercial centre on the banks of the river Kaystros, where gardens and vineyards flourished. The harbour, which had been the source of the town's prosperity, was silted up with deposits from the river Kaystros as early as the Middle Ages. Instead of Ephesus, the harbour of Kusadasi, some 15 kms. to the south-east (referred to as Scala nova in western mediaeval sources) began to flourish; this had 5,442 inhabitants in 1945.

The advance of the Arabs to Ephesus was only a temporary one (282/798). Similarly, the occupation by Turkish troops after the victory of Melkazgerd (1071)—under the Saltînjîk sultan Alp Arslan—came to an end with the victory of the crusaders of the
first Crusade near Dorylaeum (1097). When the Rûm-Saljuq Empire fell into decline, Turkish troops again penetrated western Anatolia as far as the Aegean coast. Under their leader, they founded principalities, and then Ephesus/Aya Solûk came under the principality of Aydîn. Here Ibn Baṭṭûta met the Aydîn-oghlu Khânîr Beg as the local prince. He was in contact with the Italian Republics, and there was a Venetian and a Genoese consulate in Aya Solûk. In 1391, when Bâyazîd II absorbed the principality of Aydîn, Aya Solûk came under Ottoman rule for the first time, but after his defeat, it was returned to the princes of Aydîn by Timûr in 1402. Under Murâd II, Aya Solûk finally became part of the Ottoman Empire in 1425, and henceforth it was a kadî of the sandjak of Aydîn (evlêt of Anadolu, later wilayet of Aydîn). The fortress, however, was under the Kaptan Pâsha, being a part of the sandjak of Şugla (Izmir). Aya Solûk gradually fell into decay, and is now little more than a village. This is due in part to the changes at the mouth of the river Kayströs, where the plain is now a fever-infested swamp, and in part to the growth of the neighbouring Kuskhasî.

Noteworthy monuments include the ruins of the ancient Ephesus, the remains of the Basilica of St. John, and the imposing Mosque of Aydîn-oghlu. In 1393, the Venetians built the first fort, and in 1398, under the Kaptan Pâsha, the fortress was transferred from the sandjak, which had abused it, to the Grand Vizier; and in 1786 it was decided to abolish a'ydnîks altogether. On the outbreak of war again in the following year, however, the Porte, as before, found itself unable to dispense with the aid of these local notables; and in 1790 a'ydnîks were duly revived. Many a'ydnîs in both Rumelia and Anatolia came during the reigns of Selîm III, Mustafa IV, and Mahmûd II, to play a part in Ottoman affairs very similar to that of the dere-beyis [q.v.], often defying the Porte for long periods and managing the districts over which they had extended their control in virtual independence, although often providing contingents for the Ottoman army in time of war. Among these most the celebrated were perhaps Pâkwan Oghlu [q.v.] (who, if not strictly speaking an a'ydn himself, was the son of one), Bayrâkdär Mustafa Pâsha [q.v.] (who became one early in his career), and İsmâ'il Bay of Serer. It was chiefly to breaking the power of the a'ydnîs (and dere-beyis) in the provinces that Mahmûd II successfully devoted the first half of his reign.

Bibliography: I.A. s.v. (article by I. H. Uzunçarşılı); Mouradjea d’Ollson, Tableau de l’Empire Ottoman, vii, 286; Ahmed Djewdet, Ta’rîkh, x, 87, 116-118, 147, 191, 194, 197, 209, 216; Lutfi, Ta’rîkh, i, 11-12; Mustafa Nûrî, Nâ’dîidî al-Wukû’î, iii, 74, iv, 35-6, 42, 71-2, 98-9; Ahmed Râsim, ʻOthmânîî Ta’rîkhî, iii, 1029, iv, 1663-4, 1714; ʻOthmân Nûrî, Medîcî-l Umârîs-Belediyye, i, Istanbul 1922, 1654 ff.; A. F. Miller, Mustafa Pasha Bayrâkî; Oblomov-haya Imperîa v Nastale XIX ve. (Moscow 1935-6); T. H. Uzunçarşılı, Alemdâr Mustafa Paşa, Istanbul 1942, 2-7; H. A. R. Gibb and H. Bowen, Islamic Society and the West, i, Oxford 1950, index. (H. Bowen)

AYÂS, town on the coast of Cilicia, on the western shore of the gulf of Iskenderun, to the east of the mouth of the river Ījâhîn (Pyramos), 36° 55' north, 35° 46' east, capital of the nahiye of Yumurâlîk in the bâdî of Ceyhan (wilayet Seyhan/Adana). In antiquity it was known as Aigai (Ramsay, Historical Geography of Asia Minor, 385 f.). Italian seamen and merchants in the Middle Ages knew it as Ajazzo or Lajazzo. In 1935 it had 667 inhabitants (the nahiye 11,024) (Pauly-Wissowa, i, 943).

The harbour of Ayâs (which at that time formed part of the Christian principality of Little Armenia) only became important in the second half of the 13th century. As a result of the withdrawal of the Franks from the lands of the Crusaders on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, and also of the silting up of the harbour of Tarsus, the whole of the trade between the West and the Orient was concentrated in this harbour, which was also connected by good overland routes with Syria and Mesopotamia, as well as with Iran via eastern Anatolia. It was from here that Marco Polo started out on his journey across country through Asia in the year 1271. At the end of the 14th century, the Florentine Pegolotti describes the caravan route to

AYA STEFANOS [see YEGHIYKOV].

A'YÂN. Plural of the Arabic 'âyn in the sense of 'notable person' and often used to denote the eminent under the caliphate and subsequent Muslim regimes (cf. the celebrated Wâfâyât al-'A’yân—'Obituaries of Notable Men'—of Ibn Khallikan). Under the Ottoman regime, from having at first denoted merely the most distinguished inhabitants of any district or town-quarter, the term, often used as a singular, acquired a more precise significance, coming, in the eighteenth century, to be applied to those among such persons as then first exercised political influence and were accorded official status. A factor in their rise to such influence was the institution by the Porte, during the 17th century, of Mâlikîne tax-farms—that is to say of farms leased to holders for life. For many of these were taken up by such local notables, who not only prospered financially thereby, but also came virtually to control the districts to which these tax-farms related. During the Russo-Turkish War of 1767-1774, it was largely to a'yânîs all over the country that the Porte resorted in order to raise funds and recruit for the army; and in due course they were accorded official recognition as the chosen representatives of the people vis-a-vis the government, the provincial wâlis furnishing them with documents known as a'yânîk buyuruluşu on payment of a fee called a'yânîye. In 1779 this right of appointment was transferred from the wâlis, who had abused it, to the Grand Vizier; and in 1786 it was decided to abolish a'yânîks altogether. On the outbreak of war again in the following year, however, the Porte, as before, found itself unable to dispense with the aid of these local notables; and in 1790 a'yânîks were duly revived. Many a'yânîs in both Rumelia and Anatolia came during the reigns of Selîm III, Mustafa IV, and Mahmûd II, to play a part in Ottoman affairs very similar to that of the dere-beyis [q.v.], often defying the Porte for long periods and managing the districts over which they had extended their control in virtual independence, although often providing contingents for the Ottoman army in time of war. Among these most the celebrated were perhaps Pâkwan Oghlu [q.v.] (who, if not strictly speaking an a'ydn himself, was the son of one), Bayrâkdär Mustafa Pâsha [q.v.] (who became one early in his career), and İsmâ'il Bay of Serer. It was chiefly to breaking the power of the a'ydnîs (and dere-beyis) in the provinces that Mahmûd II successfully devoted the first half of his reign.

Bibliography: I.A. s.v. (article by I. H. Uzunçarşılı); Mouradjea d’Ollson, Tableau de l’Empire Ottoman, vii, 286; Ahmed Djewdet, Ta’rîkh, x, 87, 116-118, 147, 191, 194, 197, 209, 216; Lutfi, Ta’rîkh, i, 11-12; Mustafa Nûrî, Nâ’dîidî al-Wukû’î, iii, 74, iv, 35-6, 42, 71-2, 98-9; Ahmed Râsim, ʻOthmânîî Ta’rîkhî, iii, 1029, iv, 1663-4, 1714; ʻOthmân Nûrî, Medîcî-l Umârîs-Belediyye, i, Istanbul 1922, 1654 ff.; A. F. Miller, Mustafa Pasha Bayrâkî; Oblomov-haya Imperîa v Nastale XIX ve. (Moscow 1935-6); T. H. Uzunçarşılı, Alemdâr Mustafa Paşa, Istanbul 1942, 2-7; H. A. R. Gibb and H. Bowen, Islamic Society and the West, i, Oxford 1950, index. (H. Bowen)

The town was plundered by Muslim armies in 665/1266 and 674/1275, conquered in 722/1322 by the Mamlūk sultan al-Maḥmūd, and rebuilt by the Christians after the peace treaty of 1325; it finally fell into the hands of Egyptian Mamlūks in 748/1347. It then began to decline, and the process was accelerated by the fact that sedentary broadened the mouth of the river Dıyâbân, until the whole area around Ayas became a fever-infested swamp. It is, however, still mentioned in 1400 as the administrative centre of the province of Halab. After the conquest of the Mamlūk Empire by the Ottoman Selim I (886-79/1481-1512), Ayas Pasha became a bāša in the eydlet of Adana. Today, Ayas/Yumur탈 is an impoverished coastal town with a great number of ruins.

Bibliography: Dimashqī’ (ed. Mehren), 214; Abu ‘l-Fida’ī, Tabwīn, 248 f.; Kalkaghandī, Subh al-‘āgha, xii, 165; Muhībāṣar S. al-‘āgha, Cairo 1266, i, 297; K. Ritter, Erdkunde, xix, 1, 125, 126; W. Heyd, Geschichte des Levantehandelns ii, 79 ff.; F. X. Schaffer, Cilicia, (Petermanns Mitteilungen, Ergänzungsteil 141), 97; Hāǧidīl Khālīfā, Diwān-niμā, 603; Ch. Texier, Asie Mineure, 729 f.; Sāḥīm al-Wilāyāt ad-Adana, 12th year, 1319/1903; V. Guimet, La Turquie d’Asie ii, 107 f.; IA, ii, 42 f. (Besim Darxot).

AYAŞ PASHA (886-7-946/1482-1539), Ottoman Grand Vizier. Ayas Pasha was an Albanian born in the region of Cimera (Himara) not far from Valona (‘Ālī; Bragadīn (9 June 1526); Geuffroy). According to Bragadīn, Ayas Pasha was 44 years old in 932/1526, had three brothers (‘tre fradelli’: not, as in Abdullah); Pecevi, Ta’rīkh-i Miṣr al-Dawla, prince of Albistan (921/1515) against 3 Al(l); Pedewi). Ayas Pasha died on 26 Safar 946/13 July 1539. In the eyes of his contemporaries he had the reputation of being an illiterate man endowed with no great political talent (‘Ālī; Bragadīn; Gēvay).

Of his daughters one was married to Guzeldje Rustem Pasha, who became Beglerbeg of Buda (Sīgīl-i ‘Othmānī), while (or perhaps the same?) daughter is mentioned as having married the sandık beg of Silistria (Gēvay). A brother of Ayas Pasha, Ayed, was governor of Karamān and, later, of Damascus, according to the information given in Ibn Tūlūn (Laoust).

AYZ, Abu 'l-NADJM, favourite slave of Sultan Mahmūd of Ghaznīn. Details of the life of the historical Ayz are difficult to discover, but he was a Turkomān and, if the tradition utilised by Djalal al-Dīn Rūmī he figures as a model of loyalty and sagacity and as describing Ayz as his father's 'sneeze' and as unsuitable for appointment to the office of regent, but retained a high political standing; he died in Cairo in 646/1248-9.

In Persian literature Ayz appears as a symbolic figure under many guises. In the Gūlistān and Bustān of Sa'di he appears as a symbol of true love, in the Maḥnūnāt of Dīlāl al-Dīn Rūmī he figures as a type of the Perfect Man, in 'Avīf's Dīwān al-Maḥzdāt as a model of loyalty and sagacity and as a fit brother-in-law to Mahmūd. In the Čahār Maḥzdā the cutting off of Ayz's locks in a fit of passion by Mahmūd is made the occasion of a display of poetical skill by 'Unsūr; in the Tadhkīrât al-Awliyā' an unsuccessful attempt by Mahmūd to pass off Ayz as a sultan before Shāhiyāb Abl-Ḥasan Khūrkānī is used as proof of that saint's sagacity. In Ibn Khallikān, see under BIBLIOGRAPHY: Abu 'l-Fadl Bayhaqī, Ta'rif-i Bayhaqī, ed. Tehrān 1324/1945, i, 82, 204; Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 439; Niẓāmī 'l-Asrūdī, Čahār Maḥzdā, Gibb Mem Series, London, 1910, 34-6; Farīd al-Dīn 'Alī Ārūz, Tadhkīrât al-Awliyā', ed. R. A. Nicholson, London & Leiden 1907, ii, 208; Sādūd al-Dīn Muḥammad al-'Awīf, Dīwān al-Ḥāfīzāt, British Museum MS., Or. 2676, fol. 95a & 175b; Sa'dī, Gūlistān, 122, Bustān 111 in Kūshqāyī, Tehrān 1320/1942; Hāfīz, Divān, Tehrān, 1320/1942, 219, 210; Abu 'l-Ḥasan Fārūqī, Divān, India Office Library, Eth 1841, fol. 145b-145b; Dīlāl al-Dīn Rūmī, Maḥnūnāt, ed. R. A. Nicholson, Gibb Mem. Series, London 1925-1933, ii, verse 1049, iii, 337, v, 158 ff., 32, 331 ff., 315 ff., 3635 ff., 3708 ff., 4054 ff., vi, 385 ff.; Abu 'l-Ḥasan Zulātī, Muḥammad u Ayz, SOAS Persian MS., 42625; Amin Rāżī, Ḩaft Iklim, SOAS Persian MS. 19628, fol. 233b; Ch. Schefer, Christomatī in Paris 1883, i, 110-1; Browne, ii, 38, 119, 140; Ferdinand Justi, Islamische Namenbuch, Marburg 1895, 10.

AYAZ, the Amir, lord of Hamadhan, played an important rôle in the struggles for the throne between the rival Sālūdūk princes Barkiyārūk and Mahmūd I. After having first taken the side of the latter, in 494/1000 he went over to the side of Barkiyārūk, and, after the latter's death, became the Ata-be of his son Malikshāh, who was a minor. He could not, however, hold his own against Muizz al-Dīn, who was treacherously murdered by him in 499/1005.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Abu al-Āţār, x, 199 ff.; Houssaina, Recueil, ii, 90; see also Barkiyārūk and Muḥammad b. Malikshāh. (Ed.)

AYBAK (Turkish pronunciation Aybey), properly called 'Īz al-Dīn Abu 'l-Maṣūṣ Aybāk (Aybe), Ak-Ma'mūzām (as a mamlūk of al-Malik al-Ma'āzim) Sharaif al-Dīn ʻĪsā, who was first (597-615/1200-1218) governor of Damascus and then (615-624/1218-1227) sultan of the empire of Damascus after the death of his father al-Malik al-ʻĀdil. In 608/1211-2, Aybēg received the town of Šalḫād in the Ḥawrān and the adjacent lands as a fief and was appointed major-domo (ustad-dīr). When al-Malik al-ʻNāṣir Dāwūd succeeded his father on the throne of Damascus, Aybēk even became regent of Damascus and had the entire political administration in his hands. Shortly afterwards, however, al-Malik al-ʻAṣraf Dāwūd's uncle, took possession of Damascus; Aybēk was deprived of the office of regent, but retained his fiefs in the Ḥawrān. In 569/1228-9, he was still called "Lord of Šalḫād and of Zur'a". He was subsequently suspected of treason and lost his political standing; he died in Cairo in 646/1248-9. His remains were taken to Damascus and placed in the mausoleum built for him. The districts dependent on Aybēk were indebted to him for buildings of various types which he undertook. He created three Hanifi academies at Damascus and one in Jerusalem. As major-domo, it fell to him especially to attend to the building of khanān: as governor of Šalḫād, he sought to render flourishing that part of the trade route from Northern Arabia and from Babylonia to Damascus which crossed his territories; he built the desert fortress, Kal'a al-Asrār and repaired the great reservoir (māṭḥī; elsewhere birkah) at 'Ināk and had a great khanān set up at Šālā. His zeal for building communicated itself to his subordinates, especially to his mamliḳ 'Alam al-Dīn Kāyār. Among the buildings which he erected in his fiefs, the following are especially worthy of mention: a khanān at Šalḫād (611/1214-5); a tower in the fortress of Šalḫād (617/1220-1); arcades and a tower (minaret) in the mosque of Šalḫād (630/1232-3); a fort in the Kal'a al-Asrār (634/1237-8); a khanān at Zur'a (636/1238); a reservoir at 'Ināk (636-637/1236-1234); a mosque at al-ʻAyn (638/1240-1). The monument and khanān of Šālā must have been built about 630/1232-3. The exact date cannot be established because of the fragmentary state of the inscriptions.

Sharaf al-Dīn ʻĪsā and his mamliḳ Aybēk are both known at the time of the Crusades. BIBLIOGRAPHY: Ibn Khallikān, see under Mu'āzzam ʻĪsā; van Berchem, in ZDPV, xvi, 84 ff.; E. Littmann, Semitic Inscriptions, 204 ff.; Dussaud and Macker, Missions dans les régions désertiques de la Syrie moyenne, 326 ff., 336 ff. (E. Littmann)

AYBAK KUTB AL-DIN [see Delhi, Sultanate of]

'AYDARĀS ('Edrūs, often misunderstood as Idrūs; etymology obscure, cf. Shill, Maslagh, ii, 152) a family of learned sayyids and šāfs in South Arabia, India and Indonesia, belonging to the Sālūdūk branch of the Bā ʻAalwi (q.). and still playing an important rôle in Ḥadramawt, Wustenfeld (Culimen, 29 ff.) quotes from al-Muhibbī the details on more than thirty members of the family down to the 11th century. In the 19th century there
were in Hadramawt five ʿAydarūs mansābūn, at Ḥāzm, Bawr, Ṣallīla, Thībī and Ramla. Among the numerous members of the clan, known for its literary activity, are:

1. The ancestor, ʿAbd Allāh b. Abū Bakr (al-Sakrān) b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sakkāf (811/865-1408/1461) of Tarim, who was called by his father al-ʿAydarūs. He received the ḥikra from his uncle Ṣumār al-Miḥṣār and succeeded him at his death (833/1429) as nāṭib (manṣab) of the Bāʿ Alawī. By that time he had already won a reputation for piety by means of severe asceticism. He taught ṭafsīr, ḥadīth and fīqh, but had a predilection for the mystics (al-Ghaṣāʾīl). Writings: (a) Kashf al-Wahm ‘an mad Ghamada min al-Fahm; (b) Mfrāḍi al-Jīfariyya; (c) al-Fattāʾl al-Abd Allāh (945-1019) and Ḥatīm al-Aḥtab in whose memory he wrote ṭafsīr al-Zahr (al-Darr) fī ṭafsīr al-Abd Allāh. See al-Ṣakīfī, al-ṣakhawī, Path al-Rafrim al-Rahman i, 161 ff.; Wūst., Qufiten 372 ff.; al-Ṣakīfī, i, 617 ff.; Brockelmann, S II, 617; Sarkis 1399 f.

2. His son, Abū Bakr b. ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿAydarūs, Fakhr al-Dīn (b. 851/1447 in Tarim, d. 914/1508 in Ḥadramawt), was in Ḥāzm, Bawr, Ṣalīla, Thībī and Ramla. Among his disciples were Ḥusayn al-ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥāzm, Abīdīn, Nāṣir al-Dīn, ʿAbd al-Raḥman al-Sakkāf (811-865; no. 5), Abī Bakīr b. Ṣumār al-Maḥṣūrī (922/1517-951/1544) who wrote Mawā’il al-Kudūsā fī Manāḥif Ibn al-ʿAydarūs. Writings: (a) al-Djurūs al-Lajīf fī lʿīm al-Takhīm al-Sharīf (on ṣīfis) cf. Serjeant, Mal., 581; (b) three lītanīs (awrād); (c) Dīdar (a muṣannaf) was commented upon by ʿAbd al-Ḳādir, below, no. 4). His mausoleum, built by the amīr Murūdīn, who also was buried there in 927/1512, and his mosque are in the Aden Crater, where the ṣuyūrā of the saint is celebrated on the 15th Rabīʿ II. ʿAlī al-Ghāzī in his chronicle (see below) has written a ḥallī bi-ṭawafī al-ṣuyūrā for ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṣumār al-Maḥṣūrī and his uncle Abī Bakīr b. Ṣumār al-Maḥṣūrī (d. 940/1534) who wrote al-Nuṣrī fī ṭawafī al-ṣuyūrā. See al-Ṣakīfī, i, 85 ff.; al-Ṣakīfī, ii, 19 ff.; Brockelmann, S II, 181, S II, 233. See Wūst., Qufiten.

3. Shaykh b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Shaykh b. ʿAbd Allāh (no. 1), b. 919/1513 in Tarim, d. 950/1542 in Ḥadramawt (Gudjarāt). After studies in Mecca, Zabīd and Shīhr he removed to India, where he had many disciples. After studies in Mecca, Zabīd and Shīhr he removed to India, where he had many disciples. After two visits to Mecca and Medina he went to India, where his uncle ʿAbd al-Kādir in Ahmadābād and was taught by him. From there he went to Deccan and was favourably received by Sulṭān Būrḥān Nizām Shāh and his Grand Vizier, Malik ʿAmar. After a rupture he entered the service of Ibrāhīm II ʿĀḍil Shāh at Bijapur. He held a privileged position with this sultan, whom he had cured from a disease. After the death of ʿĀḍil Shāh he returned to Dawlatābād and was in high favour with the vizier Fāṭh Khān, the son of ʿAmar. He wrote a book on ṣīfis called al-Silsila but it fell into oblivion. See Majdāʾ, ii, 117 ff.; Wūst., Quf., 39 f.

4. ʿAbd Allāh b. Shaykh (no. 7), b. 1017 (?)/1608 in Tarim, d. 1073/1662 in Shīhr. He was educated by his uncle ʿAll Zayn al-ʿĀṣīfīn (no. 7) and his cousin ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sakkāf, whom he succeeded in the dignity of a mansāb. After two visits to Mecca and Medina he went to India, where he had a hight position a the court of the Kathīrī sultan. His literary production is restricted to a collection of Rasāʾil, among them one sent to the Zaydī Imām al-Ḥusayn b. al-Kāsim in answer to his claim for obedience from the people of Ḥadramawt. See Majdāʾ, ii, 117 ff.; Wūst., Quf., 56 f.

5. Shaykh b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Shaykh (no. 3), called Zayn al-ʿĀṣīfīn and Tadj al-Ārisīn (984-1041/1577-1632) of Tarim. He had many disciples, and won great influence at the court of the Kathīrī sultan. His literary production is restricted to a collection of Rasāʾil, among them one sent to the Zaydī Imām al-Ḥusayn b. al-Kāsim in answer to his claim for obedience from the people of Ḥadramawt. See Majdāʾ, ii, 211 ff.; Wūst., Quf., 56 f.

6. ʿAbd Allāh b. Shaykh (no. 5), b. 1017 (?)/1608 in Tarim, d. 1073/1662 in Shīhr. He was educated by his uncle ʿAll Zayn al-ʿĀṣīfīn (no. 7) and his cousin ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sakkāf, whom he succeeded in the dignity of a mansāb. After two visits to Mecca and Medina he went to India, where he had a hight position a the court of the Kathīrī sultan. His literary production is restricted to a collection of Rasāʾil, among them one sent to the Zaydī Imām al-Ḥusayn b. al-Kāsim in answer to his claim for obedience from the people of Ḥadramawt. See Majdāʾ, ii, 117 ff.; Wūst., Quf., 39 f.
Kuddäst ji 'l-Naḥm al-'Adwarūsī (comm. on a muwashšah of Abū Bakr, no. 2); (d) Ārd al-Lālī (on a baṣīda by 'Umar B. Maḥmūr [q.v.]); (e) Dīwān. See al-Sakkāf, Ta'īrīk, ii, 78 ff.

to. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Muṣṭāfā b. Shāykh b. Muṣṭāfā b. 'All Zayn al-Abīnī (no. 7), b. 1135/1723 in Tarīm, d. 1192/1778 in Cairo, the most extensive traveller and most productive writer among the Bāʾ Alawi. Having spent the years 1151-1155 in India (Sūrat, Bāhrū) he returned to Arabia, stayed for some time in Tām, then settled in Cairo (1174). After a visit to Damascus (1182) he returned to Egypt. The long series of his travels in the Near East was concluded by a visit to Istanbul in the year before his death. He had numerous disciples from all parts of the Islamic world, among them Sūlaymān al-Ḥadhīlī, his son ‘Abd al-Rahmān and Muḥammad Muṭṭalā al-Zābīdī [q.v.], who wrote al-Naḥḍah al-budādīyya [cf. Brock.] on the principles of the ṭarīqa. His literary production comprises more than sixty works, the titles of which are given by al-Sakkāf and Brockelmann. Only two collections of poetry have so far been published: (a) Tarwīk al-Bāl wa-Tawāqīq al-Balūq, Būlāq 1328; (b) Dīwān (1304) in three parts: Taṃmīth al-Asāfīr, T. al-Sāfīr and Dījāyīl. Among the remaining titles the following categories can be distinguished: (a) treatises on Ṣūfism, e.g. Miṣrī al-Ṣūmaṣī (on the Ayyūdhisīyya, al-Iṣrājjādī al-Sanīya [on the Nakḥbāndīya], al-Nāfṣat al-ʿAkīya [on the Kādīrīya]); (b) commentaries, e.g. al-Fāth al-Mūbīn (on a muwashšah by Abū Bakr, no. 2, with the supercommentaries Taṃmīth al-Kuṣāmin faṣīga yā Julymūṣī Abīn al-'Adwarūsī and Taṃmīth al-Kuṣāmin fīn Fād Taṃmīth al-Kuṣāmin), Shārkh al-Rāmīna bi-Shārkh Sāḥib Abī Fīyūn (i.e. al-Badawī, cf. Brockelmann, i, 450) and a comm. on a poem by 'Umar Bā Makhṭama [q.v.]; (c) maqālib works, e.g. Ḥādīkāt al-Safā (on Abī Ḥāfīz al-Bāhirī b. Muṣṭāfā), Taṃmīth al-Sāfīr (on Shāykh b. 'Abī Ḥāfīz, no. 3). Taṃmīth al-Sāfīr bi-baʿdat Lajāfī al-Wādī, listed by al-Sakkāf among his works, is accord. to Brockelmann, III, 1290 a comm. on his Risāla fi-'l-Wādī by 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Uḏbūrī, who also commented al-Isṭāğīhātā al-'Adwarūsīyya. In his poetry this author also used the special ḥaramā form called ḥumaynī (see Serjeant, Poetry 5). His grave with a monument is in an open place close to the mausoleum of Zaynab bint Fāṭima in Cairo. His biography (maqālib) was written by his son Muṣṭafā with the title Fāth al-Kuddāsī. See Maʿrūdī, Dilḵar al-Durār, ii, 328; Diжābāri, Aḏrāʿ al-Āṭhar, ii, 27-34; 'Ali Mubārāk, al-Khulṣāṣt al-Šaḏraṣarī (Paris 1956), ii, 484-5; M. Congu, Le Routes d'Aṣhdāb, BIFAO viii, 1911; G. W. Murray, in Geographical Journal, lxviii, London 1926, 235-40; and works mentioned in the article.

AYDIN, also known as Güzel Hisar (“Beautiful Fortress”), formerly Tralleis, a town in western Anatolia 60-80 m. above sea level, 37° 50' north, 27° 48' east. It lies at the foot of the Gevîzi Dağlî (Messogis), which forms the northern boundary of the valley of the Büyük Menderes (in antiquity the Maeander), on the little river Tatak Çay (formerly Eudon) which flows thence to the Menderes. It is surrounded by fields and gardens, and the railway line from Izmır (via Dinar) to Afyon Karahisar passes through it. It is the capital of the vilâyet of the same name and has 18,504 inhabitants (1945); at the end of the last century there were, according to Cuinet, 36,250 inhabitants with a strong Greek minority; the vilâyet (with 394,075 inhabitants) consists of the following kazās: Aydın (105,155 inhabitants), Bozdag, Çine, Karacau, Nazilli and Söke.

Tralleis was occupied by the Turks for the first time after the victory of the Salqīn sultan Alp Arslan over the Emperor Romanus IV at Malāzgerd in 1071. It was surrendered, however, after the crusaders' victory at Dorylaeum in 1098. It was occupied by the Turks for the second time— together with the Maeander valley— in 1176, after Sultan Kılıç Arslan II's victory over the Emperor Manuel; the Emperor succeeded in winning it back before long. The sâhib begi Amir Menteshē brought it finally under Turkish rule in 1280, in the time of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kay-Khusraw III, and henceforth it became known as Güzel Hisar. In 1350, another
Turkish prince took possession of the town, Aydln-oghlu Mehmed Beg, whose family name was henceforth added to that of the town; the actual capital of the principality of Aydln was, however, generally Brgi. The Ottoman Sultan Blyazid I absorbed the principality of Aydln, but Timur re-established it. In 806/1403 both town and principality finally came into Ottoman possession, and from then on formed a sandjak of their own (with Tire as capital) within the eydil of Anadolu. In the 18th century, the sandjak of Aydln and the sandjak of Saruhan together formed the hereditary governorship of the family of the Kata-Uthman-oghullar; it was not until 1249/1833 that Mdmud II brought it again under the direct administration of the Porte, when it again became a wilayet in its own right. In 1850, however, it was brought under the wilayet of Izmir as a sandjak. Kemal Ataturk re-instituted it as a wilayet in 1924. In the war between Turkey and Greece, the town of Aydln was burnt down on 7th September 1922.

Historical buildings of the town are the Uways Diimti (before 988/1589), RamaAn PaSa Diimti (1000/1594-95), Sulayman Bey Diimti (1005/1683) and Dihanzade Diamti (built in 1170/1756 by Dihanzade ʿAbd al-ʿAziz Efendi).

Bibliography: A. Philpsson, Reisen und Forschungen im westlichen Kleinasien, ii, 78 ff.; E. Chaput, Voyages d'Etudes geologiques et geomorphologiques in Turquie, 214-8; Ch. Teixier, Asie Mineure, 279 ff.; E. Banse, Die Tureken, 139 ff.; V. Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie iii, 591 ff.; W. J. Hamilton, Recherches in Asia Minor i, 335; W. Heyd, Geschichte des Levantehandels, see index; E. Reclus, Nouvelle geographie universelle ix, 634; R. M. Riefstahl, Türkisch Architecture in South-western Anatolia, Cambridge 1931; Tarikk-i Minetdidim-bash ii, 32; Ḥājjī ʿAlī Khalīfa, Diikan-nīmā, 636-8; Ewīya Celebi, Seyḥat-nāme, ix, 150-9; Sulmāne of the wilayet of Aydln 1326/1908; IA, ii, 61 ff. (Bessim Darkot).

(A. TARBSCHER)

AYDIN-OGHLU, a Turkomian dynasty which reigned from 708 to 829 (1308 to 1425) over the emirate of the same name. Aydln-oghlu Mehmed Beg (708-734/1308-1334), subbagh of the emir of Germivn, separated from him in the early years of the 8th/14th century and started to make war on his own account, associating himself with Sasa Beg, son-in-law of the emir of Menteqe. After having conquered Brgi, Ayaqoluk and Keles, Sasa turned against his former ally and was defeated and put to death by him in 730/1308. Mehmed Beg added to his conquests those of the acropolis of Izmir, Tyre, Sultan-Ḥisār and Bodemaya. His son Umur Beg (734-748/1334-1348) added to the glory of the dynasty by his victories which were celebrated in a destin. He took possession of the fortress of the port of Izmir, held by the Genoese Martin Zaccaria, and organised a fleet, with which he proceeded to lay waste the islands of the Archipelago, even extending his incursions into Greece. On the death of Andronicus III, John VI Cantacuzenus, who a few years previously had succeeded in winning the emir's friendship, appealed to him for help in his war against the supporters of the rightful heir, John V Paleologus. Umur Beg proceeded to Rumelia in 741/1344, 744/1347, and 741/1345 and helped Cantacuzenus to subdue Thrace. But whilst he was engaged in making his contribution to the triumph of his friend, Pope Clement VI preached a Crusade against him, in which Venice, Genoa, the King of Cyprus, the Knights Hospitallers of Rhodes and the Duke of Naxos participated and which culminated in the taking of the fortress of the port of Izmir in October 1344. Shortly afterwards, the leaders of the Crusade perished in a fight against the emir, who also, in 746/1346, repulsed the Crusade of the Dauphin, Humbert II le Viennois. Umur, however, was killed in the spring of 1348 whilst attempting to retake the fortress of Izmir. The immediate result of his death was the treaty of 18 August 1348 which gave the Latins great advantages, amongst these of his brothers, Khidr 748-760/1348-1460 and ʿIssa (760-791/1360-90), the emirate lost its importance and was finally annexed by Blyazid I, who in 1390 ratified the treaty of commerce of 1348, to the Venetians' advantage. In 1402, after the battle of Ankara, Timur restored their principality to ʿIssa's two sons, Mūsā and Umur II. After the death of these princes, the power passed to their cousin Djmeyd (808-828/1405-25), the son of Ibrāhīm Bahādūr b. Mehmed, well known for his intrigues against the Ottomans. He supported the claims of Dūmezde Muṣṭafā and his son, but was defeated by Murād II and took refuge in the port of Ipsili, from whence he sought unsuccessfully to obtain the assistance of Karamān-oghlu and of Venice. He was besieged by the Sultan, taken prisoner and executed together with all the members of his family in 829/1425-6. This was the end of the Aydln-oghlu, and the emirate was finally annexed by the Ottomans.


AL-AYKA [see MADVAN].

AYLA, seaport at the north end of the Gulf of ʿAḵaba, now succeeded by al-ʿAḵaba [q.v.].

Nelson Glueck, who excavated the site of Biblical Ezion-geber (Tall al-Khulayfya) near the shore of the Red Sea about three kilometres north-west of al-ʿAḵaba, has concluded that the original sites of Biblical Ezion-geber and Elath (the predecessor of Ayla) are identical. The Biblical narrative sometimes distinguishes the two (Deut., ii, 8, I Kings, ix, 26, II Chron., viii, 17), while at other time it gives the impression that they were one (II Kings, xiv, 22, 16: 6). The Old Testament name Elaḥ, of doubtful etymology, is the ancestor of the Arabic Ayla.

Judaean control of Elath-Ezion-geber, established since the time of Solomon, was finally lost to the Edomites in the reign of Ahaz (735-15 B.C.), and the site remained occupied until the 4th century B.C. In the following century the town was transferred, probably by the Nabataeans, a short distance to the south-east, where it was situated at the time of the Islamic conquest.

During the Ptolemic period (when it was known for a time as Berenike), Ayla continued as a port for trade with Arabia and Ethiopia. Under Roman rule it was garrisoned by the 10th Legio Fretensis and constituted the southern terminus of the road built by Trajan (A.D. 98-117) to connect the port with the important/ commercial centre of Bostra (Busra) in Syria. Already in A.D. 325 Ayla was the seat of a bishopric and four capitals of its Byzantine church were to be seen in the courtyard of the customs house at al-ʿAḵaba in 1940. Just prior to Islam, Ayla lay in the territory controlled by the Ghassānid phylarchs on behalf of Byzantium.

Ayla first makes its appearance in the Islamic
period in the year 9/630-1, when the town under its bishop Yuhanna b. Ru'ba made peaceful submission when the town under its bishop Yuhanna b. Ru'ba made peaceful submission. Under Islam Ayla became an important meeting-place for Mecca-bound pilgrims coming from Egypt and Syria, and trade flourished. Although the town stood at the meeting-point of Egypt, Syria, and the Hijaz it was generally considered as belonging to Syria and is described by al-Mu'addasi (178), writing in 985-6, as “the port of Palestine.” The 4th/10th century marked the height of its prosperity under Muslim rule, as is clear from the account of al-Mu'addasi. In 415/1024-5 Ayla was sacked by 'Abd Allah b. 'Irath al-Dzari and some of the Banu al-Dzarrith, while in 415/1022-3 it is said to have been destroyed by an earthquake (Ibn Taghribirdi, Nusjum (Popper), ii, 239).

The Crusading period brought a long era of strife to Ayla and at the end of it the town lay largely in ruins. Baldwin I, King of Jerusalem, took Ayla (Helm) in 1116 and it became incorporated into the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem under the barony of al-Karak and Montreuil. In 1171 the Franks were driven out by Saladin, who left a garrison in the town. Frankish control was briefly reasserted by Renaud de Chatillon, lord of al-Karak, in 1182-1183 during his remarkable but foolhardy campaign against the coast of the Hijaz and the Red Sea. With the destruction of Renaud de Chatillon's fleet by Saladin's commander Husam al-Din Lu'lu' in 1183, Ayla passed permanently into the hands of Islam, but in a depleted condition. Abu'l-Fida' (1273-1332) states that in his time nothing was left of the town but the stronghold near the shore (Tabarissi, 86-7).

This stronghold, which probably was the predecessor of the still-standing late Mamluk fortified caravansarai in al-'Aqaba (q.v.), does not represent the original fortification of Ayla. The original fort that protected Ayla lay on the island now known as Dzaizarat Fir'awn, which lies on the opposite side of the Gulf of the coast of Sinai but within sight of the town. This island was already occupied by Byzantine times. It was this island fort which was besieged by Renaud de Chatillon in 1182, and the first fort on the mainland appears to have been built by Renaud de Chatillon in 1182 or 1183. In Abu'l-Fida's day this mainland stronghold was the residence of an Egyptian governor.


AYLÜL [see Ta'rīg] AYMAK, Mongol and Eastern Turkish word meaning “tribe” and “group of tribes” (= Turkish il); in Modern Mongolian, “province”; in the USSR, “rayon.” In Afghanistan the four nomadic tribes of partly nomad origin: Dzamshidi, Hazara, Firstezkhi and Tayman, are called the “Four Aymaqs” (Cahar, or Cahar. Aymak) [see Cahar Aymak].

Arabic ُغِیْبُ" (i.e. anything that can be thought of) into two classes, things that exist in the exterior world, and things that exist in the mind, and they use for the former the expression ٌلاَّعْیِنَ، for the latter ٌژِدْحَمَ (ژِدْحَمَ) is the plural of ژِدْحَمَ (ژِدْحَمَ, mind) and it is in this opposition of the exterior world to the purely mental entities that the term ُعِیِنَ is specially used by the philosophers. In this sense ُعِیِnَ is synonymous with ُغِیْبُ, intisâb-um, and it can express also the identity of the individual thing. But a common word denoting a concrete individual, like "horse", can signify both a particular horse, e.g. the horse in my stable, and the class "horse", when you say "this is a horse", meaning that this is an animal which possesses the nature, the general characteristics of a horse (according to the Arabic grammarians an اسم ُعِیِnَ, a word denoting a concrete individual is an اسم ژیِیِنَ, a generic word).

The philosophers give to this universal character of a thing the name of ماْحیِی‌ة, quiddity, or ژِلَه, essence, but in theology and mysticism the term ُعِیِنَ is frequently used to express this meaning. And since according to the neoplatonising mystics and philosophers the universals exist eternally in God's mind, these eternal ideas are called by the mystics ُعِیِنَ or ُعِیِنَ ظِبْلَا (ظِبْلَا means stable or eternal), whereas the philosophers, use different other terms like ژِلَّظِبْلَا and ُعِیِنَ ژِلَّظِبْلَا (some Mu'tazilites too employ the terms ُعِیِنَ or ژِلَه to express the eternal ideas in God). Now, since for the neoplatonising mystics our world is but a dream—world and true reality lies in a world beyond and God is the one truly Real and the ultimate source from which all being and all beings spring, ُعِیِnَ in its double sense of the real and of source—for in Arabic ُعِیِنَ can mean also source—is used by the mystics to indicate the super-existence of God's deepest essence. In this sense it is rare in philosophy, but we find it in Avicenna, for instance when he speaks in the ژیِیدْرَد (ed. Forget 205) of those mystics who penetrate to the ُعِیِnَ, the contemplation of God's inner nature. Finally it may be remarked that the term ُعِیِنَ ظِبْلَا, the contemplation of the evident, can be used in the double sense of "intuition", i.e. the pre-rational sense of intuitive understanding of the philosophical first principles, and the post-rational sense of the intuitive understanding of super-rational mystical truth.

Bibliography: see ANNIVYA; for the mystical use of the term see R. A. Nicholson, Studies in Islamic Mysticism. (S. VANDEN BERGH)

"AYN in the medical terminology of the Arabs, like "eye", "œil", "Auge" etc. in that of the Europeans, not only refers to the bulb or eye-ball, Ar. مُهَلا، کُرَات ال-اَیْنَ, but also to the whole of the organs which make up the apparatus of vision, جِمْوَلُ دِاد ال-بَسَارَ.

The study of the human eye, for the doctors of medicine and those who wrote on the subject in the Islamic world, constituted one of the most remarkable branches of their science. This branch of knowledge, which is the equivalent of the ophthalmology of the West at the present day, has borne different names at various periods. Thus it was called کُبْلُ, a word which originally designated collyrium (black) of antimony—the pre-eminent medicine and cosmetic in the east—which was subsequently used in a much wider sense for the "science and art of caring for the eyes"; --کَحوْلَة, from the same root and used in the same wide sense; --طِبّ ال-اَیْنَ, طِبّ ال-بَسَارَ, an expression still in use; --طِبّ الرَمَادِ and ژِلّ ال-رَمَادِ, where this latter term, which originally only meant "conjunctivitis", now embraces eye diseases of all types.

From the point of view of the history of medicine, this branch synthesises and reflects the evolution of Arab Medicine as a whole. Thus it is that two periods are distinguishable here: the initial period of formation, when the scholars of the East, for the most Christians, translated Greek ophthalmological science into Arabic and used it as it stood; and secondly, the period of development, during which other scholars systematized this matter of medicine and enriched it by their original contributions. Among the former must be mentioned Yuhanna b. Mâsawayh, a native of Djundishâmûr and the author of the ژیِذبِuds-Daghal al-اَیْنَ, and Hunayr. b. ژیِشَکُ b. ژیِیدْرَد (ژیِیدْرَد), also a Christian, of Baghda'd (first half of the 5th/11th century), author of the celebrated تَذْکَرَهُ al-کَحَوْلَة. and his great contemporary "Amâr b. "Ali (ژیِیدْرَد), a Muslim of Mawâlî, who practised in Cairo, author of the ژیِذبِuds-Munâshâb fi ژیِذَبَهُ Amârâd al-اَیْنَ. The works of these four authors must be considered as the cornerstones of Arab ophthalmology.

To give an idea of the originality of Arab thought on this subject, it is sufficient to recall the relationships of cause and effect, which "Ali b. ژیِشَکُ was the first to discern, between trachoma (دَجَأَرِبَ ال-اَیْنَ, today رَمَاد ژیِیدْرَد, ژیِیدْرَد, ژیِیدْرَد) and the acute conjunctivitises which precede it, on the one hand, and the "cornea pannus" (سَبَال) and "entropion-trichiasis" (ینِسَبُت al-ژیِیدْرَد) which follow it, on the other hand; and in the operation of cataract (مُرَبَع, مُرَبَع al-ۤاَیْنَ and in Arabic ژیِیدْرَد فَوْرَا) the astonishing suction of the (soft) crystalline lens performed by al-Mawâlî, which eight centuries later, was to be adopted in the West and continued down to the present day. New contributions in this special field are to be sought in the treatises on general medicine, like the ژیِیِنَ of Ibn Snâz, where, for example, we find the first "anatomical" description of the eye motor muscles, as well as of the lachrymal ducts; also in the works of non-medical authors, such as the famous فرْبْیِ on Optics, the ژیِذبِuds-Manâsir, of Âbû "Ali b. al-Haythâm, of Başra (died ca. 431/1039), in which this great scholar put forward his rational theory of vision, refuting that of the Greeks' "sight-spirit", inherited by the Arabs (رَبَّ ال-بَسَارَ, رَبَّ البَسَارِ, رَبَّ النَّارِ etc.). Neither should the numerous minor works on ophthalmology be neglected which appeared everywhere and with great frequency in Islamic countries, some of which are in dialogue form (see the ژیِذبِuds-MusâmÂa fi ژیِذَبَهُ, author unknown, Vat. Borg. 377). Finally it should not be forgotten that there were oculists who enjoyed great fame, none of whose works on the subject have yet come to our knowledge. Such is the case, for example, of ژیِشَکُ-یزَرَفâli (3rd/9th century), who practised in Cairo before moving to al-Kayrawân, where he became one of the most enlightened masters and authors on general medicine of the Middle Ages.

Bibliography: (confined to works by oculists who were themselves Arabic scholars, or who worked in collaboration with Arabic scholars): J. Hirschberg, Geschichte der Augenheilkunde bei den Arabern, Leipzig 1908; M. Meyerhof, The Book of the Ten Treatises on the Eye ascribed to Hunain ibn Isbaq, Cairo 1928, and the whole of his valuable series of studies and original memoranda

**AYN, “evil eye”.** Belief in the evil eye is well established in Islam. According to Abū Hurayra, the Prophet said al-ayn baham “The evil eye is a reality” (al-Bukhari, commentary of al-Kastallani on the Sahih, viii, 390, 463); it is the evil action of an envious glance which is envisaged by the recommendation given in the Kūrān, cxii, 5. Orthodoxy, however, makes the Prophet condemn this belief (Munshāhīb Kanī al-Ummāl, iv, 22; Nikāyā f Ghariib al-Hadīth, iv, 202). This superstition, universally current, dates from before Islam in the Muslim countries, where it continues to be prevalent. It frequently finds expression both in religious traditions and in popular folklore: “the majority of human beings die as victims of the evil eye”, “the evil eye empties the houses and fills the graves”, etc. The effect of the evil eye, ṣūba bi-l-ayn, laḥša, ṣuha etc. is generally instigated by a desire to harm transmitted by a look pregnant with hate or envy, naḍīs, naḍīš or naḍīf, but it can be involuntary and result from the naturally injurious power of a strange or staring look masfuʿ (Ibn al-Sikkt, Takhabib al-Atlās, ed. Cheikh, 545-46; al-Mubarrad, Kāmil, 329). Deep-set eyes, blue eyes or eyebrows which meet are reputed to be baneful. Some animals, such as the viper (al-Damīrī, Ḥayāl al-Ḥayawān, i, 24) are considered as having a poisonous glance. The eye suffices to disseminate the evil. Its power, however, may be coupled with that of the spoken word: evil eye, fascinum oculo, and evil mouth, fascinum lingua, frequently go together. An unfortunate word or misplaced praise is capable of harming the person to whom they are addressed and of releasing the malefic action. Of all people suspected of possessing the evil eye, the most feared are women, especially old women or those who are unmarried or sterile. But likewise equally all who are ill-favoured or consider themselves placed at a disadvantage by nature. As a corollary, pregnant women, small children and, generally speaking, everything which is beautiful, happy, or precious, is liable to the assaults of envy and certain circumstances augment the vulnerability of persons and things which are enviable: pregnancy, childbirth, marriage and in general, feasts and celebrations. Illness, debility, death of those concerned; loss of livestock, deterioration or destruction of objects or situations; the consequences feared from the evil eye are innumerable. People strive to protect themselves against it or to remedy its calamitous effects. Whether preventative or curative, the prophylaxis of the evil eye is varied (al-Suyūṭī, Raḥma, 56-58): use of formulas, gestures; fire rites, fumigations; use of salt, alum, horn, metal, etc.; the wearing of phylacteries, amulets, jewels; tattooing. Originally, doubtless the veil worn over the face was one of these means of prophylaxis. The most effective protective symbol is the number five, ḥamsa [q.v.] and thefiguration of thefive-fingers of the hand spread out (Lefebure, in *Bull. Soc. géogr. Alger*, 1907, 411-417). The ritual attaching to the evil eye, like the belief itself, is very much more a matter of magic and superstition than of religion, even where the formula is derived from orthodox Islam.


**AYN DILFA** is a spring in the north of Syria which is of some importance on account of its situation on the road between Antioch and Aleppo, somewhat west of the large ruins of the monastery of Kaṣr al-Banāt. Its source is on the northern slope of the Diabāl Bālrīša and it runs through a narrow channel cut out in the rock into a well-house (sabīl). According to an Arabic inscription, this well-house was built in 877 (1472-1473) by an inhabitant of the neighbouring village, of the name of Mahmūd b. Ḥamād. It is highly probable that on account of the spring a settlement already occupied the spot in ancient times. A few remains of buildings from the Christian era, still more from Islamic times, can yet be seen. There are also a few inscribed Muslim tombstones. The place is nowadays uninhabited; it belongs to the people of Sermedī. From time to time nomadic Turcomans or Kurds used to camp there in their tents. The spring was of importance for the caravans between Antioch and Aleppo, which often used to rest there.


Dijālūt is chiefly known as the site of the famous battle, fought on Friday 25 Ramaḍān 658/ 3 September 1260, in which a Mongol army, commanded by Kitbuga Noyon, was defeated by a Mamlūk army from Egypt, led by the sultan Al-Malik al-Muẓaffar Kutuz. The vanguard of the Mamlūk army was commanded by Baybars [q.v.]. The strength of the Mamlūk force was estimated at 120,000; that of the Mongols at 10,000 horsemen.
(thus the Syriac and Arabic texts of Bar-Hebraeus; Rashīd al-Dīn speaks of "a few thousand"). The Mongol forces and their Christian auxiliaries, after at first being defeated at the Mamlūk left wing (or, according to others, vanguard) before them, were set upon and annihilated by the main body of the Mamlūk army. The Mongol general Kitbuga was captured and put to death. Hūlekū, infuriated by the defeat, prepared to send a punitive expedition to Syria, but was prevented from doing so by the inner struggle within the Mongol Empire following the death of Mongke Kaan (Munkū Khan) in September 1259 (cf. Rashīd al-Dīn, 359).

The Arabic and especially the Egyptian chroniclers regard the battle of ʿAyn Dīlūt as a decisive victory, which saved the Suṣo-Egyptian Empire and indeed Islam itself from the Mongol menace. For the first time, a Mongol army had been defeated in pitched battle; the fact that the victors were largely Turkish, and overcame the Mongols by using their own methods of warfare against them, if anything added to the significance of the victory, for it meant that the vitality and energies of the steppe peoples were now being harnessed to the service of Islam (see for example the remarks and verses of Abū Shahim, Tarāḍīḍ, 208 and Yunūl 167; D. Ayalon, in his The Warfādiya in the Mamlūk Kingdom, IC, 1951, 90, has drawn attention to the highly significant comments of Ibn Khaldūn, al-ʿIbar, Tardīrim, 371, on the rôle of the steppe peoples in rejuvenating and renewing Islam). The Persian and other sources sympathetic to the Mongols tend rather to present the battle as an inconclusive engagement in which a small Mongol force was overwhelmed by vastly superior numbers, who were saved from retribution only by Hūlekū’s preoccupation with other and more important matters.

The victory by no means ended the danger from the Mongols, who continued to hold Meṣopotamia and ʿIrāk and to threaten Syria from both north and east. In the event, however, ʿAyn Dīlūt was the high water mark of Mongol advance, though it seems likely that the ebbing of the Mongol tide was due to events in the East at least as much as to Mamlūk resistance.

Bibliography: the contemporary Egyptian accounts of the battle are those of the two biographers of Baybars, Ibn Shaddād and Ibn ʿAbb al-Ẓāhir, whose narratives seem to underlie those of most subsequent Egyptian historians. Ibn Shaddād’s account of ʿAyn Dīlūt is unfortunately not included in the surviving fragment of his work (MS. Selimiye 1507, Edirne; published in Turkish translation only: M. Şerefabric Yaltkaya, Baybars Tarihi, Istanbul 1941). which, however, contains several allusions to the victory. A probably abridged version of Ibn ʿAbb al-Ẓāhir’s narrative was published from the B. M. manuscript by S. F. Sadeque, Baybars I of Egypt, Dacca 1956 (13ff., and index). A fuller text of the same book is to be found in Istanbul (MS. Fatih 436). Ibn ʿAbb al-Ẓāhir is at some pains to emphasise Baybars’ vital contribution to the victory. Of the later Egyptian accounts, the most accessible are those of Maqrīzī (Suhrak, i, 430 ff. = Quatremère, Sultans Mamelouks, i, 1, 104-6) and Abu ‘l-Maḥāsin, Cairo ed., vii, 79. There are also Syrian (Abū Shahim, Tarāḍīḍ Riqqī al-Karmām al-Sulṭān wa l-Turk, Cairo 1948, 207-9; Yunūl, Dhuṣayr Muḥammad al-Zamān, i, Haydarābād 1954, 360 ff., citing Ibn al-Dīfazār, etc.) and ʿIrākī (Ibn al-Fuwātī, Al-Hamādīk al-Dīfazār, Baḥrābād 1351, 344) accounts, as well as brief allusions in Frankish and Eastern Christian sources (Eraclès, ii, 444; Win. Tyre Cont. ed. Migne 1044; the Armenian chronicle of Grigor of Ak’ans, ed. R. H. Bliss, HIAS, xii, 1949, 139; Muṣafād b. Abī l-Fadl, ii, ed. and tr. E. Blochet, Patr. Or. xii, 417; Bar-Hebraeus, Chronographia, Oxford 1932, 439-40; Abu ʿl-Faradīj, Taʾrikh Muḥāṣar al-Duwal, Beirut 1890, 489; al-Makīn b. ʿAmīd (ed. Cl. Cahen), Bēt. Or. xv, 1955-7, 175). The chief Persian source is Rashīd al-Dīn (ed. and tr. E. Quatremère, Paris 1913, 349-351). See further B. Spuler, Die Mongolen in Iran, Leipzig 1939, 57; H. H. Howorth, History of the Mongols, iii, London 1888, 167 ff.; R. Grousset, Croisades, iii, 603 ff.; Runciman, Crusades, iii, 312-3; Stevenson, Crusaders, 334; A. Waas, Geschichte der Kreuzzüge, i, Freiburg 1956, 317; Cl. Cahen, La Syrie du Nord, Paris 1940, 710-1.

AYN AL-DJARR, an ancient and important site in the Biqāʾ (q.v.) and an Umayyad residence, the Arab name of which, now pronounced ʿAndjar, corresponds to the Greek and Syriac Gerch and An Gero. The main source of the Lītānī, which comes forth at the foot of the Anti-Lebanon, not far from the modern road from Beirut to Damasūs, for a long time formed a swampy lake there stretching to Karak Nūḥ, which was only finally drained in the Mamlūk period. The remains of a temple, later converted into a small fort (hence the expression ḫam Maḍjal used at the period of the Crusades), which still dominate the present-day village of Maḍjal ʿAndjar, doubtless mark the site of ancient Chalics of the Lebanon, the capital of a state which extended from Coelesyria to Ituria, before being annexed to the Roman Empire. In contrast, the archaeological remains which exist not far away, in the interior of a vast enclosure furnished with towers, and which the excavations now being undertaken will make better known to us, have been identified by J. Sauvaget with the Umayyad town founded about 95-96/714-715 by the Caliph al-Walīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik and built, as is attested by inscriptions and the Aphrodisio papyri, with stones from the quarries of Kāmid in the Biqāʾ and by the use of forced labour. Its character as an agricultural settlement has been inferred from the existence of hydraulic works, contemporary with the ruins, but at what period it was completely abandoned is not known. The Arabic texts, which first speak of the victory there of Marwān b. Muḥammad, in Safar 127/November 744, over the troops of Sulaymān b. Hāghām and the passage of the ʿAbbāsid forces when they occupied Syria, continue in fact to mention it incidentally without giving any precise information as to the actual condition of the old Umayyad town at the time.


(J. SOURDEL-THOMINE)
АЙН МУСА: (i) A spring at the entrance of the Siq at Wādī Mūsā (Petra). It was a source of water for the later Edomite site now known as Ṭawilām and occupied in the 13th-6th centuries B.C. (Nelson Glueck, The Other Side of the Jordan, New Haven, 1940, 24). Islamic tradition associates this spring with Kuṭrān 2:57, where Moses strikes a rock with his staff and brings forth twelve springs. This appears to represent a blending of the twelve springs of Elim (Exodus 15:27) with the striking of the rock at Horeb in Exodus 17:6. Yākūt (s.v. Wādī Mūsā) gives the same story repeated later by al-Baydāwī (Tafsir, commentary on Kuṭrān 2:60 according to the Egyptian verse numbering) that the twelve springs burst forth from a stone that Moses had carried with him and set down on this spot. William of Tyre (A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea, tr. E. A. Babcock and A. C. Krey, New York, 1943, i, 124) associates the spot with Exodus 17:6, which probably represents the then current Crusader tradition. Musil (Arabia Petraea, iii, Vienna 1908, 330) reports that in his day the spring was venerated by the Liyāḥina Arabs because of its association with Moses.


(3) A small spring near the foot of Ḍiabal al-Muṣattām east of Cairo (Les Guides Bleus, Egypte, Paris 1950, 253).

АЙН АЛЬ-ТАМР, a small town in ʿIrāq in a fertile depression on the borders of the desert between Anbār and Kūfah. It is 8 miles west of Karbala. The Arabic name means fountain of dates. It was probably called so because of an abundance of palm trees (Yākūt, iii, 759).

According to Ibn al-Kaldūn, it was part of the ʿIrīte kingdom of Dīdāhyma al-Abrash (al-Ṭabarī, 750; Yākūt, ii, 376). There Ṣāḥib is said to have married Naḍīr, the daughter of the King of Ḥatta. (Al-Ṭabarī, i, 829; Yākūt, ii, 283; al-Hamdañī, al-Buldān, 130). It was probably also a tawšādi of the ʿatās of Bihkubāḏ al-Aʿlā, as it was in the ʿAbbasid period (Ibn Khurraḍaǧib ibn Khudā, 8; Kūdāma, 236; Yākūt, i, 241, 771).

When the Muslim commander Khalīl b. al-Walīd attacked it in the year 12 A.H., ʿAyn al-Ṭamr was a military post (al-Ṭabarī, i, 2057; al-Baladhūrī, 246) with a fortified citadel (al-Baladhūrī, 6-7). Khalīl defeated and massacred the garrison (al-Ṭabarī, i, 2064; al-Baladhūrī, 110; Yākūt, iii, 759; Caetani, Annales, ii, 261, 940, 991). He captured and enslaved some of its non-combatant inhabitants. These were the first enslaved captives to arrive in Medina (al-Ṭabarī, i, 2076). The sons and grandsons of many of these captives became prominent figures in the military, administrative and intellectual life of Islam (cf. their names in al-Ṭabarī, i, 2064, 2121, 3472, ii 802; al-Baladhūrī, 247, 230, also 14, 142, 352, 357; Yākūt, iv, 807; Aḥmadī, iv, 3256).

Scanty information about the Muslim conquests indicates that ʿAyn al-Ṭamr had a Christian population and a church (al-Ṭabarī, i, 2064; al-Baladhūrī, 247; Yākūt, iv, 807), and also a Jewish Community and a synagogue (al-Yaḥṣūbī, ii, 151). But probably the majority were Arabs from the tribes of Ṭaghlib, Namīr and Asad, who were sedentary agriculturists.

ʿAyīn al-Ṭamr preserved its importance in the Islamic period, not only for its products by which the nomads of Arabia and ʿIrāq were supplied, but also for its geographical situation on the routes of communication between the fertile centre of ʿIrāq and the Syrian desert. It also commanded the military approaches from the western desert to ʿIrāq and especially to Kūfah (cf. al-Ṭabarī, i, 2069,
Its importance led the governors of Kufa to station it in a military force to protect one of the approaches to their Miṣr (cf. al-Tabari, i, 3444; ii, 773, 1352, 1945, 1946; ii, 21; al-Baladhuri, Ansâb, v, 295).

By the end of the 3rd/4th century ʿAyn al-Tamr was inhabited by the Banī Asad (al-Tabari, iii, 225).

ʿAyn al-Tamr was a fortified town (al-Muḳaddasî, 117) in the 4th/5th century, a tâṣṣadî of the ʿâṣlân of Bû Khûdâbûd al-ʿAṣā. At this time its products included 14 ba.Stdar, 300 ḥurr of wheat, 400 ḥurr of barley and 45,000 dirhems per year (Ibn Khûrâdâdhibh, 10; Kudâma, 237). Its lands were considered ṭuṣr (al-Baladhuri, 248).

For the period of the decline of ʿIrâk from the 6th/7th century onwards, information on ʿAyn al-Tamr is scanty and it is confused with Shthatha, a neighbouring village. It was captured and looted by the Mongols who captured Bahgâd (ʿAzâzî, Ṭârîkh ʿIrâk baṣîr al-Hâlîdîyân, i, 357). During the turbulent 10th/11th century some of the Bedouins used it for a refuge (ʿAzâzî, op. cit., v, 182).

Gertrude Bell visited ʿAyn al-Tamr and described it as a walled village with a citadel. She mentioned its sulphurous waters, cereals and 170,000 palm trees (Armarth to Amarah, London 1924, 139).

At present ʿAyn al-Tamr is the centre of a district (nâdîya). It has four quarters: Alûbû Hardán, Kâṣr Thâmir, Kâṣr Al-ʿAyn, and Kâṣr Abî Iwâydi. The sedentary population numbers 2144, and the rural and nomadic population is 3183 (1947 Census of ʿIrâk).

Bibliography: quoted in the article.

ʿAYN AL WARDÂ is a locality which, according to Yâkût, is identical with Râsʿ Ayn (p. c.). It owes its fame to the great battle of Dhammâk I 65/ 6 Jan. 685, in which the Shîʿahs of Kûfa were slaughtered by the Syrians. See Well, Chakhsân, i, 360 ff.; Müller, Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendland, i, 374; al-Ṭâbarî, index and especially i, 257 and ii, 554 f. (Ed.)

ʿAYN ZARBA, deserted town of Anatolia, situated to the south of Sîs and to the north of Miṣrâ (the former Mopsuestia), a little to the north of the confluence of the Sûmbâz Cay with the Djîyân, built on an isolated hill in the middle of the plain, on top of the ruins of an ancient town which was called Anazarba (cf. Hirschberg in Pauly-Wissowa, i, col. 2101). The Arabs took the first element of the name Ana for ʿAyn, spring; cf. Sahmu, in ZA VIII, 98. It acquired a certain importance from the time of Harun ar-Rashid who organised the frontier for defence. In 180/796 he rebuilt and fortified it, and settled people from Khurâsân there (al-Baladhuri, 172; Ibn Fâkîh, 113; Ibn Shahhâdî, in Ibn al-Shihhân, al-Durr al-Munštâhâd, 185). In 212/827 ʿAbd Allâh b. Tâhir, governor of the region between Râṣûk and Egypt, settled Africans from the town (Michael the Syrian, iii, 60). In 180/795 al-Muṭaṣâmî, himself in some Zoṭ (al-Baladhuri, loc. cit., al-Mâṣūdî, al-Tanîkh, 335) were the object of a Byzantine attack in the same year, and in another in 241/855 when they were captured with their families and their buffaloes and carried off to Constantinople (al-Ṭâbarî, iii, 1169 and 1426; cf. Vasiliev, Byzance et les Arabes, Fr. ed., i, La dynastie d'Amorium, 126 and 224). In 289/900, the eunuch Wâṣîf, who wanted to cross from ʿAyn Zarba into Byzantine territory was captured by the troops of al-Muṭaṣâmî to the north of the place.

ʿAyn Zarba is included by the Arab geographers among the frontier towns of the Thughûr (Ibn Khûrâdâdhibh, 100; Kûdâma, 229, 253; Ibn Rusta, 107, al-Yâkûbî, 362 etc.). It flourished mainly in the 4th/5th century. In his book on the Thughûr, Ibn Hawkal, 121, described it as a town as like those of the Gâwûr (probably because of the similarities of climate and products), in the middle of a plain where palms grow, and surrounded by fertile lands (cf. al-Īṣâkhî, 55, 63). It was fortified by the Hamdânî Sayîf al-Dawla who, says Yâkût, iii, 761, spent 3 million dirhems on it. Nevertheless it was taken by Nicephorus Phocas, to whom it surrendered at the end of the year 250/962 (see Zonk, a detailed description of the siege and the ravages of the Byzantines, particularly the felling of 50,000 palm trees, in Ibn Miskawayh, ii, 190-1; for other references see M. Canard, Histoire de la dynastie des Hamdanides, i, 806-8). The Muslims were expelled and emigrated to Syria. The town remained in Byzantine hands until the time when the Armenians, expelled from Armenia, occupied it together with the other towns of Cilicia, and it became part of the territories belonging to Philaretus. But, a little before the arrival of the First Crusade the Sâldjûk took Tarsus, Miṣrâ and ʿAyn Zarba (Michael the Syrian, iii, 173, 179). Tancred, nephew of Bohemond, conquered Cilicia in 1097 and Bohemond, installed in the principality of Antioch, took possession of it and also of Tarsus, Adana and Miṣrâ in 1098. These places, the object of a dispute between Bohemond and the Byzantines, were recaptured by the latter, but the Armenian Thoros I, a descendant of Roupen, who was established in the mountains to the north of Sîs, and who reigned from 1100 to 1129, took Sîs and Anazarba from the Byzantines (RHC Arm. I, 490). During the reign of Leo I, brother of Thoros, Bohemond wanted to establish himself again in Cilicia and marched on ʿAyn Zarba, but he came into conflict with the Dânishmand of Cappadocia who also wanted the country, and was killed in 1130. After Leo had conquered Tarsus, Adana and Miṣrâ in 1132-33, the Byzantines invaded Cilicia in 1137 and John Comnenus recaptured ʿAyn Zarba and took Leo prisoner (Kâmûl al-Dîn, ed. S. Dâban, ii, 263), but in 1151 Thoros II, son of Leo, regained ʿAyn Zarba as well as all the other large towns in Cilicia. Kilîd Jâr Aslân II of ʿOnya, at the instigation of his ally Manuel Comnenus, attacked ʿAyn Zarba without success. In 1159...
Manuel reoccupied it with the other places in Cilicia, but Thoros II took it again in 1162 (cf. concerning these events, F. Chalandon, Les Commmunes, ii, 115-6, 426-30 and R. Grousset, Hist. des Croisades, ii, 51, 86, 333, 399, 566).

The Rumelians kept Cilicia until the 14th century. From 1266 the Mamluks of Egypt made numerous invasions into the kingdom of Little Armenia (see the articles Armenia, Cilicia, Missisa, Slv); during one of them the region of 'Ayn Zarba was pillaged (in 1279, Bar Hebraeus, Chronography, 462). Finally in 823 Arm. = 776 A.H. = 1374 A.D., in the reign of Malik_Aghraf Sha'bdn, Cilicia was conquered, 'Ayn Zarba destroyed, and Leo led into captivity in 1375 (see RHC Arm. i 686 and 719). After this the town lost all importance. Like the rest of Cilicia it passed into the hands of the Turkoman family of Ramdan-oglu in the 15th century and then to the Ottomans in the 16th.

In the 14th century the name of the town was corrupted into Nawar沙 (cf. Abu 'I-Fida', ii, 2nd part, 29). To-day the place is in ruins and is known as Anavarra.

Bibliography: In addition to the sources mentioned in the course of this article, see Le Strange, 129; Ritter, Erdkunde, xIX, 56; G. Schlumberger, Un empereur_byzantin au Xme sicle, Nickelhore Phocas, 191 ff. (M. CANARD)

AYNABAKHTI, Turkish name for Lepanto, or Naupaktos, in Greece. It is on the Gulf of Corinth, has a picturesque position, but is—these days—an Anavarra.

Bibliography: In addition to the sources mentioned in the course of this article, see Le Strange, 129; Ritter, Erdkunde, xIX, 56; G. Schlumberger, Un empereur_byzantin au Xme sicle, Nickelhore Phocas, 191 ff. (M. CANARD)
 persona grata with the rulers of his time, the Sultans al-Mu'ayyad, al-Malik al-Zahir Tatar and al-Malik al-Aghraf Barnbây. He translated al-Kuduri's legal treatise into Turkish for Tatar; he read his Arabic chronicle, translating it orally into Turkish as he went along, to the Sultan al-Malik al-Aghraf in the long and frequent interviews he had with him. For the rest, the one-time Şüfi of the Barkûkıyya, now become a perfect courtier, composed panegyrics in honour of his masters (a Life of Mu'ayyad, an Eulogy of al-Malik al-Zahir Tatar and al-Malik al-Aghraf. Appeared in 829/1425-6. chief hâdi of the Hanafis, he occupied this post for 12 consecutive years. In 846/1442-3, he even succeeded of the Hanafis, he occupied this post for 12

The life of al-‘Ayni affords a most interesting testimony on the relationships of the scholar class with the Mamluk Sultans. This scholar took an active part in the intellectual movement of his century and was in contact, though on rather bad terms, with two of the most outstanding men in Muslim science of the period, al-Makrizi and the Shaykh al-Islâm Ibn Ḥajjar al-Askalânî; he supplanted the former in the office of muhâtasib, thus incurring his hatred; he sustained a very lively argument against the latter concerning his commentary on the Şâhi of al-Bukhârî. Al-‘Aynî’s works are at any rate very numerous; some of them are in Turkish, though the majority are in Arabic. The three best known are: (1) his general history called Úbd al-Dîjamîn fi Ta'rikh Ahi al-Zamân (an extract in Recueil des historiens des croisades, Hist. or., II, 183-254); (2) his commentary on the poetical examples cited in four commentaries of the Alîfiyya of Ibn Mâlik, entitled al-Mabâhid al-Nabîyya fi Şarî' al-Mu'awwâdî (printed on the margin of the Kâzînân al-Âdâb of al-Baghâdî, Bâbîk 1299, 4 volumes); (3) his great commentary on the Şâhi of al-Bukhârî, entitled Umdat al-Kâtî fi 'Arî' al-Bukhârî (printed in Cârî 1308, and Constantinopile 1309-1310, 11 volumes); in this last work, al-‘Aynî shows proof of a certain method, which contrasts with the usual confused disorder prevalent in the work of Muslim exegetes; in the study of each hadîth he proceeds in the following order: connexion between the hadîth and the chapter heading; study of the isnâd, of its peculiarities and its authorities; enumeration of other works or other chapters of the Şâhi where the hadîth occurs; study of the literal sense; study of the juridical or ethical rules which can be deduced from the hadîth.


‘AYNṬAB (Arp. Antaph, Lat. Hamtab, to-day Antep or Gaziantep since 1921: ethnically ‘Ayn, and also ʻAynabî, see 1001 Nights, Night 864, Cairo edition) important town, chief place of a vilayet in the south-east of Anatolia, with 50,000 inhabitants (1935). The vilayet has five katas: Gaziantep, Kilis, Nizip, Islahîya and Pazarcik.

The town is situated on the upper Saljûq, a tributary of the Euphrates, near the junction of two important roads, one running north-south from Marâs to Aleppo, with a fork south of Marâs to Malatya; the other east-west; the latter runs from Diyarbakîr, Urfa (Edessa) and Bireçikj on the Euphrates, and, after following a short section of the Marâš road just outside Gaziantep, branches off towards Adana. Secondary roads also diverge from Gaziantep, one to Besni (Bahasmâ) to the northeast, the other to the Syrian frontier in the south-east. A new railway line links, through Gaziantep, the Adana-Malatya line to the Bagdad line, thus avoiding the détour into Syrian territory via Aleppo. Gaziantep is 55 km. from Bireçik, 45 from the Syrian frontier and 100 from Aleppo.

The region of ‘Aynîbî has always been the hub of important routes, but it was Doliche (Dülük, now Dülük-baba), a little to the northeast, in which ancient times took the place of ‘Aynîbî and the latter, which was probably the Diba of Ptolomy, the Tyba of Cicero, was only a dependency of it. It was not until Dülük had been taken by the Byzantines in 351/962 under the Ḥamdânî Sayf al-Dawla that ‘Aynîbî began to assume the importance lost by Dülük, with which Yâkût wrongly identifies it. On the eve of the First Crusade it was part of the domain of the Armenian Philaretus. It was allotted to the Franks, with Tell Bâghîr, to Joscelin of Courteney, vassal of Baldwin of Le Bourg, count of Edessa, then to his son Joscelin II. After the capture of Joscelin II by the troops of Nûr al-Dîn in 1150, it was ceded by the Franks, together with the rest of the region, to the Byzantine emperor Manuel Comnenus, but in 1151 the Saldjûks or Kûnya, Masîd, annexed it. After his death in 1153, it was taken by Nûr al-Dîn. It was from then on part of the province of Aleppo and was an advance post, first for the Ayyûbids and then the Mamlûks, against the Saldjûks and the Armenians. It was temporarily occupied by the Mongols in the course of their expeditions against northern Syria in 1271 and 1280. Taken in 1400 by Timûr, it was then annexed by Khârâ Yûsuf of the Turkomân dynasty of the Kûra-Koyûnlu, master of the two İrâks, and then it passed to the Turkomân dynasty of the Dhu'l-Kadr, who submitted to the Ottomans in the 16th century. It was from then on part of the Ottoman empire, and was only temporarily detached to Egypt in the time of Muhammâd Alî, between 1832 and 1840. At the end of the First World War, ‘Aynîbî was occupied by the English in 1919, then by the French until 1921.

Before the First World War ‘Aynîbî contained a large proportion of Armenians, nearly a third of its total population. It was also the centre of an American mission which had a college there. The region is also the centre of the preserve or must of grapes called pekmez. It was a stronghold with its citadel towering on a great mound on which the ruins are still visible.

Bibliography: Yâkût, ii, 759; Dimashqî, Cosmographie, ed. Mehren, 205; Abu 'l-Fida', ii/2, 45; Ibn Shaddâd, al-A'âkîh al-Khâfîrâ, MS. in the Vatican, i. 156 ff., (cf. A. Ledit, in Masâbîr, xxxiii 1935, 211-2 under Dülük); Ibn al-Shihna, al-Durr al-Munâfikîn, Beirut 1909, 271-2 and passim; Kamâl al-Dîn, Ta'rikh Halâb, Damascus, 1951-4, ii, 302-311; RHC, Or. I and III in the index; Bar Hebrenus, Chronography, Oxford 1932, i. 277, 281, 315, 372-3, 400; Ghazzî, al-Nahr al-Dhâbak fi Ta'rikh Halâb, Aleppo 1927, i, 416-55; Ritter, Erdhunde, 1034 ff.; Cunet, La Turquie d'Asie, ii,
AYNTAB — AYYAM AL-ADJOZ

188 ff.; G. Le Strange, Palestine, 42, 286; Houg-
mann, Hist. Topographie von Nordsyrien im Altertum, in ZDPV, 1923-4, no. 160; Dussaud, Topographie de la Syrie et médicité, Paris 1927, 299, 434, 472 and passim; R. Grousset, Hist. des Croisades, 1934-6, i, 49, 392, ii, 192, 296-7, 299 ff., 302 ff., 306-7, iii, 661, 697; C. Cahen, La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des Croisades, Paris 1940, 115 ff., 118, 388, 405, 705. For the fighting round 'Aynatb in 1930, see André, La vie militaire au Levant, Paris 1923, — see also the article Aynat in IA, which lists the Turkish monographs on the town. (M. Canard)

AYT, a Berber word meaning “sons of”, the singular of which, w (and var.: w, aw, ag, ag(e), i) appears in compounds and before proper nouns. Ayt consists of a suffix of number iyt, aw, ?g, ag(g), i(1) element “sons of mother = brothers”), or before a proper noun to indicate a tribe (Ayt Isgad, Ayt Warayn, etc.), in the same conditions as the Arabic Banu (> Bni) or Awlad (> Úld); in the more evolved dialects, Ayt tends to be replaced by these Arabic terms, but it is still very prevalent in the more conservative dialects (particularly in Morocco, where, however, in the Ssâ, it is challenged by a composite id-aw: Id-aw Samalal; in the pirant dialects (Rif, Kablya, etc.), the evolved form Ath, from which the actual radical has disappeared, has replaced Ayt (Ayt Iznason, Ath Iratan, etc.). In Touareg, ayt is very prevalent in its primary function (see Ch. de Foucauld, Dict. touareg-français, Paris 1935, iii, 1440 ff.), but in the names of tribes, although it is known, it disappears before Kgl (Ch. de Foucauld, Dict. abrigé touareg-français des noms propres, Paris 1940, passim). (Ch. Pellat)

AYWALK, (Greek Kydonia), small town on the Aegean coast of western Anatolia. Situated on a peninsula in the gulf of Edremit, 39° 18' north, 26° 40' east, opposite the island of Mytilene, Kgl Dîjîr on ikinci asirda Istanbul hayatl, Refik, Hicri on tkinci asrda Istanbul hayatl, Istanbul 1930, 171). To what extent Greeks were in fact so employed is not clear. This order could have had no lasting effect, for an ayyaz called Sergis, an Armenian of Van, is one of the stock figures in the Karagöz shadow-plays: in modern Arabic he is known as 'aywâh, and has a wife, Umm Ma'waqa (A. Barthelemy, Dictionnaire Arabe-Français, Paris 1935-54, 562, 567).

The duties of the ayyaz included waiting at table, lighting and stoking the mangals, filling and cleaning the lamps, and doing the shopping for the household (basara giden in the hukm quoted above). There is reason to suppose that this last duty was sometimes a source of profit to both servant and tradesman: ayyaz hasap hep bir hasap (“ayyaz and butcher; it all amounts to the same”) is still a Turkish saying used of two identical things. A senior ayyaz who acted as steward was entitled ayyaz khyâya (kethhûdâ).

The usual dress of an ayyaz was a purple jacket, waistcoat and trousers, variously coloured woollen stockings and black shoes, with a white towel over the shoulders, a broadstriped apron, and a fez surrounded by a turban.

Pakalla (see Bibliography) states that certain men-servants in government offices were also called ayyaz, and that there was an ayyaz in the Foreign Ministry “till recently”, whose job was to clean the carpets.

The origin of the word is dubious: it is thought to be a corruption of the Arabic 'iwaâd (so IA: see Bibliography): the plural awwâd would seem a more likely etymology, on formal grounds, though ayyaz is the form taken by the Arabic 'iwaâd in the dialect of Gaziantepe (Ömer Ashm Askoy, Gaziantep ağıl, Istanbul 1945-6, iii, 60). Either way, the connexion of ideas is hard to see. (2) Ayyaz ('Awwâd or 'Iwaâd Khân) is the name of a leading character in the Körôglû folktales: he is the son of a butcher (from Georgia, Urfa, or Üskûdar in the several versions), who is kidnapped by Körôglû and eventually becomes his most valiant follower (see Pertev Naili, Körôglû destanî, Istanbul 1931, passim; and Pertev Naili Boratav, Halk hikâyeleri ve halk hikâyeciliği, Ankara 1946, Index s.v. Ayyaz).

Bibliography: IA, article Ayyaz, by Sabri Esat Siatavyglu, from which the present article is largely drawn, as is the article Ayyaz in M. Z. Pakalln, Osmanlî tarîh deşımleri ve terimleri sözlüğü, Istanbul 1946-56. (G. L. Lewis)

AY_YAM AL-ADJOZ “the days of the old woman”. In the Islamic countries bordering on or near to the Mediterranean, certain days of recurrent bad weather, generally towards the end of winter, are called “days of the old woman”. This expression, which is old, is also to be met with in contemporary folklore. It refers to a period of variable duration, from one to ten days, though more frequently of one, five or seven days duration. Its place in the yearly cycle varies according to the country. There is only

AYWAN [see Iwân].

AYWAZ, ‘Aywap. (1) A term applied to the footmen employed in great households in the later Ottoman Empire. They were generally Armenians of Van, sometimes Kurds. A hâkm-i şerif to the cavughbashl, dated Rabî‘ I 1164/1751, speaks of “the Armenian dhimmis who have for some little time been employed in the houses of the râjdî-i dewlet-i ‘âsîye” and who drink wine and steal in their places of employment and evade payment of dijya: henceforth Armenian and Greek dhimmis are not to be employed in the houses of the great, but are to be replaced by Muslims (Ahmet Efîk, Hicri on tkinci asrda Istanbul hayatl, Istanbul 1930, 171). To what extent Greeks were in fact so employed is not clear. This order could have had no lasting effect, for an ayyaz called Sergis, an Armenian of Van, is one of the stock figures in the Karagöz shadow-plays: in modern Arabic he is known as ‘aywâh, and has a wife, Umm Ma’waqa (A. Barthelemy, Dictionnaire Arabe-Français, Paris 1935-54, 562, 567).
one reference mentioning the winter solstice (see R. Basset). It often involves the last four (or three) days of February and the first three (or four) days of March (months of the Julian calendar or their equivalents): this is the case with the Turks, in Syria and the Lebanon and in Egypt. These seven days each have a special name: Şinn, Şinnabar, Wahr, Âmir, Mu'tamir, Mu'allil, Mutfi? al-Dimâr (var. Mu'fi? al-Żâ'n); if there are five days, the fourth, fifth and sixth names are omitted: the study of these eight names has still to be undertaken (see an interpretation in R. Basset). In the West, this seven day period at the end of February and the beginning of March bears another name, and it is the last day of January or the first of February which is connected with the legends about the "old woman", though it is rarely called "day of the old woman". In point of fact, this appellation, even in the East, has numerous variants based on Arabic, to which must be added, for the West, the Berber variants: 1.—"days of the old women"; or indeed "cold of the old woman" (Turkey, Persia, Syria, Lebanon, Egypt); "the old woman" (Berber Morocco); 2.—"the borrowed day or days" (Syria, Lebanon, Kabylia, Northern Morocco). 3.—"cold or bad weather or period of the goat" (Egypt, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco). These various expressions are almost always connected with a legendary commentary in which an old woman is the main actor; an old woman dead from cold, an old woman predicting a cold spell, an old woman killed by the wind when the people of 'Ad were exterminated, in the case of the old texts, and, as regards contemporary folklore, in the majority of cases, a story about the old woman and her calf, her goat or her flock, combined with the legend of the borrowed days, explaining why February has only 28 days (hence the expressions 2 and 3 above). This legendary old woman seems to come from remote ages. No doubt this tradition should be linked with those existing in the countries of Europe and which concern certain meteorological phenomena, certain place names and perhaps certain themes of folklore involving an old woman.


(A. GALAND-PERNET)

AYYAM AL-'ARAB, "Days of the Arabs", is the name which in Arabic legend is applied to those combats (cf. Lisân, s.v. yâum xvi, 139, 1 according to Ibn al-SikKitî) which the Arabian tribes fought amongst themselves in the pre-Islamic (some times also early Islamic) era. The particular days are called for example Yaum Bu'dth = "Day of Bu'dth", Yaum Dhl Kar = "Day of Dhl Kar". Their number is considerable. Many of them however are not commemoratives of proper battles like the "Day of Dhl Kar", but only of insignificant skirmishes or frays, in which instead of the whole tribes, only a few families or individuals opposed one another. The Arabs themselves sometimes noticed this fact. Al-Zubayr b. Bakkar for example, when speaking of the combats between the Aws and Khazrajî tribes, observes that only on the day of Bu'dth a proper battle had been fought, and that on the remaining days the fight had been limited to throwing of stones and beating with sticks (Aghâni, ii, 162, 1. 12; this passage was evidently derived from Zubayr's account of the combats between the Aws and Khazrajî, which is mentioned in the Fihrist i, 110). The number of these combats, handed down by tradition, has moreover been increased by the fact that a great many were called by different names after the settlements, well-springs, hills etc., near which they took place. Consequently one and the same occurrence has been recorded in various places under different names.

The course of events on each individual day follows a somewhat similar pattern. In this respect what has been said by Wellhausen (Sitten und Vorarbeiten, iv, 28 ff.) about the particular combats between the Aws and Khazrajî, applies to the Ayyâm in general. At first only a few men come to blows with one another, perhaps in consequence of a border dispute, or some insult offered to the proteges of a man of influence. Then the quarrel of a family spreads into the hostility of whole races or even of entire tribes. They meet in battle. Bloodshed is generally followed by the intervention of some neutral family. Peace is soon restored. The tribe which has lost fewer men, pays to the adversary the price of blood for the surplus of dead bodies.

The accounts of the Ayyâm, written in good old prose, together with the ancient poems, supply excellent information concerning conditions before Islam. They especially afford us an insight into the chivalrous spirit, by which the old Arabian warriors were inspired. Popular memory kept the recollection of these heroes alive for centuries. Hence similar subject-matter to that found in the Ayyâm often recurs in later popular romances, drawn out, it is true, in legendary fashion. One example may suffice: Zîr, a hero of the Siyar Bani Hilîl is none other than Muhalhil, brother to Kulayb Wâhî, who acts a leading part in the Basîs war between the Bakr and Taghlib tribes (Muhalhil is already called al-Zîr = "the visitor of women" in Aghâni IV, 143, 15).

Tradition affirms (cf. Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihî, ʿAbd, Cairo 1302, iii, 61 towards the end), that Muhammad's companions already discussed the events of the Diâbelîyyûn in their assemblies (mâdîbîs). Consequently the Ayyâm al-'Arab afforded at an early period a favourite subject of study to the Aâbdîryûûn, i.e. traditionists, who were engaged on the Aâbdî al-'Arab, the old Arabian tales, amongst which the Ayyâm are included. In the Fihrist (mâkîla iii, fann i) several of these authors are mentioned as having written narratives of particular battle-days or of all of them. None of these works on the Ayyâm has come down to us in its original form; but considerable extracts by
subsequent writers are extant. Most of these have borrowed from Abu 'Ubayda (d. 210/825). Of his works on our subject only the title is mentioned in the Fihrist (i, 53 fl.). Something more concerning him is reported by Ibn Khallikân (ed. Wüstenfeld, no. 741, who is followed by Hâdidjî Khalîfî, i, 499 no. 1353 s.v. 'Im 'Ayyâm al-'Arab). According to these authorities Abu 'Ubayda wrote two books on the Ayyâm, a shorter one describing 75 days, and a more extensive one, in which he treats of 1,200. The information concerning the Ayyâm which later writers have preserved is partly given in scattered bits, and partly in entire chapters in proper sequence. Instances of the former are found in al-Tibrîzî's Hamâsa commentary, in the Kitâb al-'Aqâdq, where they are inserted by way of explanation of events alluded to in the ancient verses, in the collections of proverbs, and in the works on geography (al-Bakrî, Yâkûtî). Examples of the latter are contained in the 'Ibîd al-Fardî of Ibn 'Abd Rabbîhi (iii, 61 fr.), in al-Nuwayrî's encyclopaedia Nikâyât al-'Arab fi Funûn al-Adâb (fann v, hîsîm iv, kitâb v) and in Ibn al-'Athîr's historical work al-Kâmî li 'l-Ta'rikh (i, 367-517).

The account in the 'Ibîd was probably based on the minor work of Abu 'Ubayda. It is very concise, often to such an extent as to obscure the meaning, which can only be ascertained by comparison with more detailed accounts by other writers. Al-Nuwayrî has—apart from details—copied the whole chapter on the Ayyâm from the 'Ibîd. Ibn al-'Athîr has tried to arrange the separate "Days" in chronological order, in accordance with the character of his history. His account goes into greater detail than that of the 'Ibîd. A great deal of it must doubtless be traced back, either directly or indirectly, to the larger version of Abu 'Ubayda's work; much also to other sources all of which cannot be retraced.

Finally, it should also be noted that al-Maydânî treats of the Ayyâm al-'Arab in the 29th chapter of his Mağmûa al-'Amâkhî. His narratives are extremely short, but very useful for quick orientation. He restricts himself as a rule to giving the pronunciation of the name, explaining its meaning and enumerating the tribes which engaged in the battle. In this way 132 pre-Islamic days are dealt with by al-Maydânî. In addition to those, 88 Islamic days are moreover enumerated in a second section of that chapter. For further bibliography cf. E. Mittwoch, Procli Arabum paganorum (Ajjâm al-*Arab) quomodo litteris tradita sint (Diss.) Berlin 1899; C. I. Lyall, Ibn al-Kalbî's account of the First Day of al-Kuldh, in Orien

AYYÂR [see ta'ârîk] 'AYYÂR, literally 'rascal, tramp, vagabond'; Arabic pl. 'ayyârîn, Persian pl. ʿayyârân. From the 9th to the 12th century it was the name for certain warriors who were grouped together under the futuwwa [q.v.] in ʿIrâk and Persia, and gradually also in Transjordania, similar to the ʿahdâh [q.v.] in Syria and Mesopotamia, and to the rindân (v. Aqût) in Anatolia. Occasionally, the term is used to mean the same as jîyân (v. Fâta). Thus one of their leaders might sometimes be referred to as sar-ʿayyârân, and sometimes as râl-ʿayyân. On occasions they appeared as fighters for the faith in the inner Asian border regions, on others they formed the opposition party in towns and came into power at times of weakness of the official government, when they indulged in a rule of terror against the wealthy part of the population, as they did, for instance, in Baghhdâd in the years 1133-44.

It is perhaps of interest, concerning the attitude of the ʿayyârân, that in the Kâbas-nâma (written in 475/1082), or Andar-nâma, ed. R. Levy, 142, ll. 13-143, l. 4, trans. 248, there is mention of rivalry between the ʿayyârân of Marw and those of Khušktân over the futuwwa (dâwânamardi) being resolved by virtue of "juridical expedients" (bîyâl [q.v.]). In Šûfī literature there is mention of a Šûfī by the name of Nûb al-ʿAyyâr al-Nâshrî as a representative of the futuwwa (cf. R. Hartmann in ZDMG 72, 1918, 195; and idem, in Der Islam, 8, 1918, 191; Fr. Taeschner in: Der Islam, 24, 1937, 50 ff.). At any rate, a distinction was made between the ʿayyârân and the Šûfīs as far as the futuwwa was concerned. In this connexion, the following remark is of some interest: Hûjîwîrî (d. 465/1072) mentions that this very Nûb al-ʿAyyâr has said that the futuwwa of the ʿayyârân consisted in their wearing the muraḫkaʿa of the Šûfis, in other words that they behave like Šûfîs and keep the holy law, the şârâʿa, whereas the futuwwa of the Šûfîs of the Malâmât persuasion (see Šala
tamiyya) consisted not in wearing any external marks, but in keeping the mystical spirit (kâlîkâ). (The Kashî al-mâkîyîn, al-Hujwîrî trsl. by R. A. Nicholson, Leiden and London 1911, 183; Kitâb-i Kasî fi maqâliîb, ed. V. Schukovskij, Leningrad 1926, 228. lines 10-18; Fârîd al-Dîn ʿAṭṭâr, Tadhkhirat al-Awliyâ', ed. R. A. Nicholson, i, 332, lines 9-16). The same Nûb al-ʿAyyâr defines the difference between these two futuwwa by saying that the one of the ʿayyârân consists in faithfulness to the spoken word (maqâliîb) but that of the Šûfîs consists in faithfulness to the spirit. This report first appears in Ibn Dîjâdawayhî (5th/11th century) (Fr. Taeschner in: Documenta Islamica inedita, Festschrift R. Hartmann, Berlin 1952, Sentence No. 19, 113 and 118).


AL-ʿAYYÂSHI, Abu ʿl-Nâṣr Muhammad b. Masûd b. Muhammad b. ʿAyyâshî, a Šîʿite writer of the 3rd/9th century. He was a native of Samârkand, and was said to have been descended from the tribe of Tamîm. Originally a Sunnî, he was converted while still young to Šîʿism, and studied under the disciples of ʿAll b. al-Ḥasan b. Fadlî (d. 242/859-860/Târîkh 93) and of ʿAbd Allâh b. Muhammad b. Khâlid al-Ṭayyâlîstî (al-Astarâbâdî, 211). He spent his patrimony of over 300,000 dinârs on scholarship and tradition, and his house was a centre of Šîʿite learning. He is credited with the authorship of over 200 books. Though accused of relating traditions on weak authorities, he is often cited by later Šîʿite writers. Muhammad b. ʿUmar al-Kâshî, author of a well-known Šîʿite biographical work, was his pupil.
AL-'AYYASHI — AYYUB 795


(B. LEWIS)

AL-'AYYASHI, ABD SALIM 'ABB AL-LAH B. M.U.M.A.M.M.A.D, mn. of letters, traditionist, lawyer and Sufi scholar, born in the Berber tribe of the Aft (Ayt) 'Ayyash of the Middle Moroccan Atlas at the end of Sha'ban 1037/April-May 1628, died of plague in Morocco on 10 Dhu 'l-Ka'da 1090/13 December 1679. After having travelled through Morocco "in search of knowledge" and obtained an sijda from 'Abd al-Kadhir al-Fasi (q.v.), in 1059/1649 he made his first pilgrimage to Mecca going via Toussi, Ouargla and Tripoli; then, in 1064/1653-4 he made a second pilgrimage, on returning from which he wrote his Rikhah, called Ma' al-Muwaid (Fez 1316/1892, 2 vols.). This is one of the most important travel accounts for information on the road taken by caravans going from the Maghrib to Mecca, in spite of the fact that the author attaches less importance to describing the countries through which he passed than he does to the enumeration of the celebrated men whom he met, especially scholars and Sufis; the style of the Rikhah is faidy simple when al-'Ayyash is not speaking of Sufism, though it is lacking in colour and vivacity. This work, which enjoys great popularity in the Maghrib, has only been partially translated into French (see A. Berbrugger, Voyages dans le Sudan de l'Algérie . . ., in Exploration scient. de l'Algérie, ix, 1846, and Motylinski, Itinaires entre Tripoli et l'Egypte, Algiers 1900). Another travel account, composed in letter form, has been translated into French by M. Lakhdar (Les étapes du pèlerin de Sidi Jalilma à la Mecque et Médine, in 4e Congrès Fédér. Soc. sav., Algiers 1939, ii, 671-88).

Al-'Ayyash is, moreover, the author of several further works: Mansima 'li 'Ibunya, a treatise in verse on sales, with a commentary; 2) Qadimah 'li 'Himam al-'Aliya 'alal 'Izahd 'li 'I-Dunya 'li 'I-Dinma, treatise on Sufism; 3) a study on the particle law; 4) al-Hum wa l-'Adl wa l-'Insaf al-Dahl 'li 'I-Khadij fi-ma waba'a bayn Fuhabah? Sijdimalwa min al-Tahlid; 5) Ibtihaj al-Adar ba'd Dhahib Ahi al-Akkar, biographical collection; 6) Tuhfat (Iftik) al-Akhillah bi-'Asadiha al-Akhbair, biographies of his masters (these last two works probably forming his Fakhrasa).


(M. BEN CHENEN-[CH. PELLAT])

AYYUB, the Biblical Job. The name apparently occurs in pre-Islamic Arabia but only as a name derived from the Biblical story. Job is mentioned twice in the Kur'an in lists of those to whom Allah had given special guidance and inspiration (iv, 165/161; vi, 84), and fragments of his story are given in xxi, 83-84; xxxviii, 41-44; Muhammad being expressly bidden to make mention of him in his preaching. These fragments merely tell of his suffering affliction at the hands of Satan, crying unto his Lord for relief, and being healed, so that his case becomes an admonition for men. In the story of the Quran, Quarah and Wadd, the latter being considered as the best one, is commonly explained by Arab lexicographers as meaning the mountain-goat (waHl). This identification, however, is not fully borne out by the descriptions of the waHl which are given by Muslim zoologists. Here, the properties and ways of behaviour of the animal only partly apply to the mountain-goat, while, in the main, they rather point to the deer, which is also in keeping with the meaning commonly attributed to corresponding forms in other Semitic languages. This conclusion, moreover, gets support by a comparison of the terms used in earlier foreign sources and in the respective accounts as transmitted in Arabic zoological literature. However, in pre-Islamic and early Islamic poetry (see, e.g., Nûdke's Belegwörterbuch, 53, and TA, ii, 121; against Hommel, 279) waHl may actually mean the mountain-goat, since the deer probably never existed in the Arabian peninsula.

These facts can serve as an illustration of the inconsistencies in medieval zoological terminology, which not infrequently denotes different animals by one name and vice versa. For this reason, too, part of the information given by several writers with regard to the waHl is to be found, e.g., in Kazwini under the heading bakar al-wakhr. Comp. also Dîhîz, iv, 227 with vii, 30 f. (on waHl). Because of the graphic similarity of waHl and ibil both words have sometimes been confused through mistranscription, and the accounts on either animal became transferred to the other.

A considerable part of the information on the waHl contained in Arabic works goes back to foreign sources, such as Aristotle's Historia Animalium (quoted, e.g., by Dîhîz) and the ancient Physiologus literature. The latter, especially, contributed a number of fabulous accounts.

According to Arab pharmacologists certain parts of the waHl's body and in particular its horns can be put to various medicinal uses. For this reason, too, the interpretation of dreams, which is pointed out, e.g., in 'Abd al-Ghanî al-Nâbulûsî's Ta'hir al-Anâm (s.v.).


(L. KOPF)
taking a bundle in his hand and striking with it, there may be a similar confusion with the story in 11 Kings xiii, 14 ff. (See Bell, Qurʾān, 454 and Introduction to the Qurʾān, 163.)

Later Muslim writers greatly amplified this meagre Kurʾānic account, drawing partly on the Biblical Book of Job, (which Ibn ʿAshkīr actually quotes), partly on Rabbinic tales from Talmud and Midrash (for which cf. Encyclopaedia Judaica, s.v. Job) and the Greek Testament of Job, but also exercising pious imagination in developing various details of the story. That Job was a descendant of Abraham through Isaac is generally agreed, though generally there is great confusion in the names which appear in his genealogy. His mother was a daughter of Lot. His wife, who figures so largely in the story, is generally called Rahma, daughter of one of the sons of Abraham, though some said she was Leah the daughter of Jacob (obviously a confusion of Leah with Dinah, who in Rabbinic sources is said to have been Job's wife). His great wealth is described in the account of the...
dādīds lost Dvin, Shādhā entered the service of the Saljūq military governor of Irāq, Bihruz; Bihruz, who held Takrit as an ifrāt, made Shādhā governor of a part in which his son Ayūb soon succeeded him (V. Minorsky, Prehistory of Saladin, in Studies in Caucasian History, Cambridge 1953, 107-129). It was in this capacity that Ayūb earned the gratitude of the master of Mawsil and Aleppo, Zangi (Zanjī), who after being defeated by the Caliph, was able, with the help of Ayūb, to cross the Euphrates and withdraw without a disaster. In the country behind Mawsil, Zanjī first of all adopted a systematic policy of subduing and then of recruiting the Kurds. In 532/1138, Ayūb entered his service. He was at once used by him in Syria, being appointed governor of Bālṭabak, opposite Damascus. On Zanjī’s death, Ayūb placed himself under the Būrīd prince of Damascus, who gave him the governorship of that town, whilst his brother Shirḵūh, followed Zanjī’s son, Nūr al-Dīn, the master of Northern Syria, who gave him Hims as an ifrāt. However, the trend of public opinion in Damascus finally led to the unification of Muslim Syria, with a view to the more effective prosecution of the war against the Franks, under the command of the prince with the most power and the greatest enthusiasm for the dījāhād, Nūr al-Dīn; in the surrender of Damascus the activities of the two brothers Shirḵūh and Ayūb played a major role, and Ayūb chose the side of Nūr al-Dīn, the governor of the Syrian capital.

It is impossible to describe the activities of Shirḵūh in Nūr al-Dīn’s service in detail here. The family fortunes began, when he was chosen, rather against his will, by Nūr al-Dīn, to lead the army to Egypt, which, at the request of the wāza Shirḵawr, was to intervene in that country against his adversaries. The result of several years of difficult fighting was the assassination of Shirḵawr and the proclamation of Shirḵūh as his successor to the wāza. It is true that he died a few weeks later (564/1169), but his nephew, Șalāh al-Dīn b. Ayūb, was with him, and quickly succeeded in getting himself recognised by the occupying troops as his successor. Șalāh al-Dīn (known in Europe as Saladin) is the real founder of the dynasty. Its history can be divided into three periods: that of Șalāh al-Dīn himself, a formative period bearing the imprint of his personality, the strongest in the family, to which, however, the policy of his successors was opposed on many points; the period of his early successors, a period of organisation, up to the death of al-Malīk al-Kāmil (615/1218); lastly, the period of long-drawn-out decline. Under the second period it will be convenient to group together the study of several problems of interior organisation, which are common to the whole history of the régime.

I. The detailed history of the reign of Șalāh al-Dīn cannot be given here, but will be given in the article concerning him; an attempt will only be made to reveal those features which are indispensable for the understanding of the following period, which one has especially in mind when speaking of the Ayūbīds.

Although the assumption of power by Shirḵūh and Șalāh al-Dīn took place in Egypt with much the same forms as in the case of the preceding wāzas of the Fāṭimid régime, by the conferment of a diploma by the Caliph al-Âdīd, they were none the less the representatives of the carthaginian tradition inherited from the Saljūqids, more or less common to all the Turkish princes of Muslim Asia at that time, and especially typified by Nūr al-Dīn. In 566/1171, Șalāh al-Dīn considered he was able to suppress the Fāṭimid Caliphate and proclaim the return of Egypt to the caliphate in a state of open allegiance to the ʿAbbāsīd Caliph of Baghdad. For the first time in two centuries, Egypt became officially Sunni again; in point of fact, the majority of the population had never been won over to the Ismāʾīlīsm of the Fāṭimidids, and although those elements which were most strongly attached to the régime, and which were, moreover, partly of foreign origin, attempted to re-establish their position by revolts, the advent of the new régime was received among the masses with the same passivity which they had shown to its predecessor.

Invested by the Fāṭimid Caliph, then by the ʿAbbāsīd Caliph, and at the same time a vassal of Nūr al-Dīn, Șalāh al-Dīn found himself in an equivocal position vis-à-vis the latter, which would doubtless have led to conflicts, had Nūr al-Dīn not died in 569/1174. Disagreements and the weakness of his successors produced the immediate result that the dominant military power in the neighbourhood of the “Latin Orient”, which for fifty years had resided in Northern Syria, now passed to Egypt. Whilst Nūr al-Dīn’s successors dropped the policy of the holy war, which had given the former his prestige and strength, Șalāh al-Dīn adopted the idea, though it is not possible to discern to what extent ambition was combined with undoubtedly sincere conviction. (H. A. R. Gibb, The Achievement of Saladin, in Bull. of the John Rylands Library, xxxv-1, 1952, 46-60). However that may be, this idea led him to claim for himself the unified command of the Muslim armies, to win a large share of public opinion for his cause and, ultimately, to constitute to his own advantage a state, in which the heritage of Nūr al-Dīn, including Egypt, Muslim Syria and a part of the Džazira, was regrouped and extended, in a more solid manner than that of his predecessor’s kingdom, at the time of its brief and final apogee; this was an accomplished fact in 1183. At the same time, relatives of his established themselves in the Yemen and one of his generals, Kārkush, on the borders of Tunisia.

The power formed in this way enabled Șalāh al-Dīn to utilise the internal crisis of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, the difficulties of the Byzantine Empire and the tension which had arisen since 1180 between himself and the Latins, to undertake to drive the latter out of Palestine and Syria. His success was his main title to glory among his contemporaries and posterity; in 583/1187 the Franks were crushed at Hattīn, Jerusalem became Muslim again after eighty years, and in the ensuing months, almost all the Christian territories fell, including a large part of the coast, where only Tyre, Tripoli and Antioch still held out against him.

Șalāh al-Dīn’s power was founded on the strength of the army, and his whole policy required a strong army. This was no longer, with the exception of a few contingents of irregulars, the army of the Fāṭimidids. It was the Kurdo-Turkish army, completely alien to the Egyptian population, inherited from Nūr al-Dīn and developed by Șalāh al-Dīn by means of the resources of Egypt. In 577/1181, the Egyptian army amounted to 111 amīrs, 6,970 jawālī (cavalrymen with full equipment) and 1,135 haraghalīm (second grade cavalrymen), without mentioning the Arab frontiermen, unfit for foreign campaigns (H. A. R. Gibb, The armies of Saladin, in Cahiers d’Histoire Égyptienne, iii/4, 1951, 304-320). To this
army must be added the Syro-Djaziran contingents, including those of Maw'il, which the treaty subse-
tquent to the hostilities of 1174-1183 allowed Salāh al-Dīn to call together in case of need: a little
over 6,000 men in all. It was with almost his entire
forces, some 12,000 horsemen, that Salāh al-Dīn won
the victory at Hāṭṭīn and his later successes. But, as
was the case with the European armies, such an
assembly of troops could not normally be kept on
campaign for a protracted period, owing to the
revictualling requirements of the soldiers (cf. tāra'il).
And considerable efforts and conviction would be
required to maintain the indispensable effective
strength over the whole of the time which the
struggle against the Third Crusade lasted. Campaign
and siege equipment, which had probably increased
in quantity and quality, was also the object of
attention, as is shown by the treatise on gun-making
of Murdāb (or Murdīb) b. 'All, which has come down

In the first years of his rule, Salāh al-Dīn had been
threatened by the Byzantine, Norman and Italian
flotillas, using the bases in the Latin Orient. He made
a great effort to reconstitute the Mediterranean navy
of the Fāṭimid, which had deteriorated in the 6th/12th century as the result of internal troubles
and the progress of the Crusaders and the Italians.
By this means he was even able to carry out offensive
operations against the nearest Frankish ports. The
possibility cannot be excluded that the expansion
of Karakūsh along the African coast had as its aim,
at the same time as providing an outlet for turbulent
Turkmān. The control of the shores along which
Muslim vessels were able to range, and a closer
approach to the source of supplies of wood and
salt, the Crusade put an end to this effort, which
was weakened by Egypt's inferiority in these last
two respects, and it does not seem to have been
repeated by his successors (A. S. Ehrenkreutz, The
place of Saladin in the naval history etc., in JAOS.,
LXXV-2, 1955, 100-116).

There is no doubt that it was partly the need to
procure the raw materials required by his armament
on land and sea, and not only preoccupation with
commercial interests, that led Salāh al-Dīn, very
soon after he came to power, to renew and increase
the connexions which had existed under the Fāṭimid
with the Italian trading cities, including Pisa, which
had gone furthest in encouraging the Franks to
attack Egypt. Pisans, Genoans and Venetians
flocked to Alexandria, where the Venetians found,
more than at Acre, compensation for the impossibil-
ity of trading at Constantinople, a situation in
which the Byzantine government placed them from
1171 to 1184 (Cl. Cahen, Orient Latin et commerce du
Levant, in Bull. de la Fac. des Lettres de Strasbourg,
xxix-5, 1951, 332). Salāh al-Dīn could boast in his
letters to the Caliph that Franks themselves were
delivering arms to him which were destined to be
used against other Franks (Aḥū Shāmī, i, 243).

Saladin also took advantage of political develop-
ments in Byzantium and Cyprus to negotiate, un-
beknown to either of them, with their princes
against the Franks. When he felt the approach of the
European menace, he attempted, after having been,
via Karakūsh, the ally of the Almoravid Banū
Ghāniya of the Balearic Islands against the Normans
and the Almohads, to draw near to the latter to
form an alliance, mainly maritime, against the
Crusaders: this attempt, however, met with no
success (cf. Gaudefroy-Demobynes, in Mélanges
Rene Basset II, and Sa'd Zaghlūl 'Abd al-Ḥamīd,
in Bull. Fac. Arts Univ. Alexandria, vi-vii, 1952-3,
24-100). The same reasons explain his negotiations
with the Saldjukids of Asia Minor.

A war policy, naturally, was expensive and all
the evidence goes to show that Salāh al-Dīn was a
bad financial administrator, always on the point of
going bankrupt. In necessary conformity with the
religious ideal with which he infused all his propaga-
ganda, he everywhere suppressed the taxes deemed
by fiqh to be illegal. Similarly, his desire to eliminate
all traces of the Fāṭimid régime, led him to replace
the coinage by a new one, of variable weight, in the
case of both gold dinars and dirhams, which could
no longer be obtained at a fixed value; but the burden
of expenditure, the decline in income, especially to
begin with, as the result of disorders, the exhaustion
of Egyptian gold, the precariousness of the routes
towards Sudanese gold, which were controlled by
the Almohads, even caused instability in the standard
of the dinar, the minting of dirhams containing
variable quantities of alloy in addition to the legal
Egyptian dirham, (which contained 30 % silver,
worth 1/40th of a dinar), and, as a natural con-
sequence, the disappearance of sound coinage.

Salāh al-Dīn, and after him, al-'Aẓīz, lived on loans
from the merchants and amirs, which were never
repaid. Of course, it could be maintained that the
profits derived from the war would make it possible,
in the long run, to restore financial stability. But
this calculation, if ever made, turned out to be
wrong, as the result of the Third Crusade (cf. A. S.
Ehrenkreutz, Contribution to the knowledge of the
fiscal administration of Egypt . . . . , in BSOS., xv-3,
1953 and xvi-3, 1954; The standard of fineness of
gold coins in Egypt . . . . in JAOS.. lxxiv/3, 1954;
The crisis of the dinar in the Egypt of Saladin, ibid.,
xxiv/3, 1956).

One of the results of Saladin's policy was the
formation of a coalition, for the salvation of the
Latin Orient, of the western forces, which was even
joined by the Italian towns, adversely affected by
the loss of the Syrian ports. In the end, even if the
Franks did not retake Jerusalem, at least they
recovered the major part of the Syro-Palestinian
coast; moreover, they laid hands on Cyprus, which
henceforth provided a secure naval base and a
position to which they could withdraw. Salāh al-Dīn
was by no means defeated. But the formidable
effort which he had had to sustain for two years,
convinced him that it was fruitless to wish to expel
the Franks, and made a period of détente and recovery
a matter of urgency. It is impossible to know what
Salāh al-Dīn might have done, for he died a few
months after the conclusion of peace (589/1193).

II. The period of the reigns of al-Malik al-Âdīl
and al-Malik al-Kâmil (died in 635/1238) appears
especially as one of détente and organisation after
the disorders which followed the death of Salāh
al-Dīn.

The first eight years which followed the disap-
pearance of the founder of the dynasty put to the
test the conception of family unity which he had
entertained as regards his monarchy and succession.
He had granted, either in the form of fiefs during
his lifetime or as shares in his inheritance, in addition
to the Yemen, where two of his brothers reigned in
succession, Central and Southern Syria to his son
al-Âdīl, Egypt to his other son al-'Aẓīz, Aleppo to
a third son, al-Ẓāhir Ḡāṣil, whilst Ḥamā passed to
his nephew Tāk al-Dīn 'Umar, Ḥimṣ to his cousin,
Shirkuh's grandson, al-Mudjāhid, and lastly the
Djazira to his brother al-Âdīl Abū Bakr. The
latter, who had played an important rôle during the reign of Salâh al-Dîn as a diplomat and administrator, was now the eldest member of the family and indisputably the most eminent of its surviving members. The sons of Salâh al-Dîn, who were incapable of doing anything but amuse themselves or wrangle among themselves, upon several occasions solicited his alliance or his arbitration. Whether or not al-‘Aḍîl was an ambitious man, it was becoming clear that the security of the Ayyûbid monarchy required him to take over its destinies. In 597/1200, he had himself proclaimed Sulṭân in Cairo, distributed the governments of Damascus and Diyar Bakr among his sons, and after the last hostilities in 1201, of the other former princes, he only permitted those of Aleppo, Hims and Hâmâ, who were forced to do homage to him, to continue to exist. Naturally, after al-‘Aḍîl’s death, similar problems again arose. The presence at that moment (625/1227) of a Crusade at Damietta maintained solidarity for a time around his eldest son, al-Kâmîl, who, like him, governed Egypt, and was moreover an imposing personality. Once the Frankish danger was removed, the agreement between him and his brother al- Mu’âṣẓam of Damascus, who died in 625/1228, and then the latter’s son and successor, al-Nâṣîr Dâ‘îd, was disrupted. Al-Kâmîl was helped by the loyalty of his other brother Al-Âṣḥâf, to whom he gave Damascus in exchange for Diyar Muṣdâr, whilst Dâ‘îd was relegated to Karâk. Then, for a few years, al-Kâmîl was the undisputed head of the family; however, a coolness was making itself increasingly felt between al-Âṣḥâf and himself, when the former died (635/1237). Al-Kâmîl then took Damascus away from the other brother, al-Sâlîh, whilst al-Âṣḥâf had designated as his successor, but he himself died at the beginning of the following year; he was the last Ayyûbid who might have been able to unite the whole Ayyûbid family behind him. One should not be misled by the disagreements; up till then there had always been a majority of members of the family willing to place solidarity in the face of their common enemies above their individual interests, and, in one way or another, solidarity had always been restored for half a century or so; after the death of al-Kâmîl the situation changed.

Ayyûbid rivalries with neighbouring princes, however, interfered with their dissensions among themselves. In 604/1207, the troubles at Aḥlāf provided al-Awhâd, the son of al-‘Aḍîl and at that time governor of Diyar Bakr, with the possibility of annexing to Ayyûbid territory the inheritance of the Shâh-Armin (upon al-Awhâd’s death, he was succeeded there by al-Âṣḥâf). Other annexations were carried out in Diyar Bakr and Diyar Râbî’a, and lastly, in 631/1233, that of Ââm and Hûs Kayâfî; only a single branch of the old Arûkîd dynasty subsisted, that of Mârdîn. Thus it was that the Ayyûbids emerged from these wars increased in stature.

However, from about 1225, Mesopotamian-Iranian politics were dominated by the approach of Djâlîl al-Dîn Manguberti, who at the head of his Khwârîzmians fleeing before the Mongol invasion, was putting Iran and its borders to fire and sword. Al-Mu’âṣẓam and the Diyar Bakr opponents of al-Âṣḥâf and al-Kâmîl adhered to him, and he was eventually able to take Aḥlāf, which was pillaged in terrible fashion (1229). The Khwârîzmiâns then invaded Asia Minor, where the Salâḫûkîd Sulṭân was reinforced by al-Âṣḥâf: this time the invaders were crushed near Erzinjân (628/1230). There were more lasting causes of friction between the Salâḫûkîds and the Ayyûbids. The interests of the two dynasties had already clashed at Diyar Bakr in the time of Salâh al-Dîn, and in the 13th century the development of the Salâḫûkîd power made conflicts inevitable. The Salâḫûkîds sought to spread from their mountains over the Arab plains, from Northern Syria to Diyar Bakr. According to circumstances, they achieved this either by attacking the Ayyûbid territories or by posing as the sovereign protectors of the Aleppo branch against their Egyptian cousins. Al-Âṣḥâf’s expedition to the assistance of Kaykubâd gave al-Kâmîl the impression that the conquest of the Eastern part of the Salâḫûkîd territory would be an easy matter: in 1233, a coalition of all the Ayyûbid forces invaded it. Ignorance of the country and the lack of enthusiasm of some of those taking part led to failure of the enterprise. Later, the Salâḫûkîd army took Ââm from al-Kâmîl’s successors (1241). It had already taken the ruins of Aḥlāf from the lieutenants of al-Âṣḥâf.

Finally, there were the Christian enemies: the Georgians, whom it had been necessary to fight in the vicinity of this same Aḥlāf, and, naturally, the Franks themselves. In the latter case, the Ayyûbids drew from the Third Crusade a moral diametrically opposed to the policy of Salâh al-Dîn. Their purpose was to preserve the peace, by avoiding any hostile action, on the one hand in view of the economic advantages of peaceful relations, and on the other hand to avoid giving any pretext for further crusades. Further crusades did in fact take place, but their immediate initiative came entirely from Europe, rather than from the Franks of the East. Naturally the Ayyûbids took every precaution in their way to resist them, and there was no question of military negligence. The fall of Byzantium and the decline of the Almohads deprived them of the possible allies which Salâh al-Dîn had endeavoured to obtain, and, having relinquished the maintenance of a large and vulnerable fleet, they afforded Egypt protection by the land army, by fortifications, sometimes by destroying coastal installations (Tinnis), and by espionage. However, with the Crusaders, even al-‘Aḍîl and al-Kâmîl had tried as far as possible to replace the costly chances of war by diplomacy.

In accordance with the tendencies of this policy, in 1204 al-‘Aḍîl restored to the Franks the coastal places which he was occupying, which reconstituted the continuity of the Frankish territories, with the exception of the enclave of Lâdîkîyâ, which belonged to the principality of Aleppo. At the time of the Fifth Crusade, his successor al-Kâmîl, whilst calling his brothers in Asia to his assistance, offered to restore Jerusalem to the Franks, who refused it, in exchange for the evacuation of Damietta, and took care to avoid any real battle. It was especially at the time of the Crusade of Frederick II that this attitude was disclosed in a manner most calculated to affect public opinion. Al-Kâmîl’s desire for peace with the Franks was then strengthened by the menace of al-Mu’âṣẓam, the ally of the Khwârîzmiâns. Aware of circumstances which predisposed the Emperor for his part to negotiations, he finally granted him Jerusalem, with the reservation that it should not be fortified and freedom of worship should be maintained; pious Muslims and pious Christians were equally scandalised. A real friendship arose between the two sovereigns, which was to continue even between their successors.

The principality of Aleppo was confronted by slightly different local problems. These princes,
disturbed at being the only direct descendants of Saladin to confront the family of al-Adil, sought both to ally themselves with them by marriage and to guard themselves against the masters of Egypt, sometimes through the Ayyubids of Djazira, Hims and Hamah, and at other times through the Seljukids of Rum, and naturally also, at times, with the ones against the others who had encroached too far. The ambitions of the Armenian kingdom of Cilicia also troubled them, and they several times intervened, with the Seljukids against it, giving assistance to the Frankish princes of Antioch, who were weaker.

A normal and intended consequence of the peace policy adopted towards the Franks was the resumption and intensification of commercial relations with the Italians (and now, to a lesser extent the Southern French and the Catalans). Even before formal treaties had been concluded once more, as is shown by the private documents in the Venetian and Genoan archives, Genoan, Pisan and Venetian ships, after the Third Crusade, were once again going to Alexandria, and, to a lesser extent to Damietta. Under al-Adil, a series of agreements confirmed their rights, a reduction in customs' dues and administrative and judicial facilities. Furthermore, the accessibility of the principality of Aleppo to the sea had the result that even in Syria, Italian merchant vessels were to be seen no longer confining themselves to Frankish ports, but were also disembarking at Ladhikiya and regularly visiting the markets of Aleppo and Damascus. An important personage of Genoa, William Spinola, seems at one time to have enjoyed al-Adil's special favour, accompanying him on his journeys through his estates (this can be seen from a comparison between the Annals of Genoa used by Schaube, Handelsgeschichte der Mittelmeer-Romanen 121, and Ibn Natli, cited in Amari, Biblioteca arabo-sicula, ii, Appendix, 35, which was unknown to Schaube).

Egypt sold to Europe, besides the products of the Indian Ocean which passed through its territory in transit, native resources, the chief of which at this time seems to have been alum. Naturally the Crusaders, or the fear of such, were not likely to provoke crises, as for instance the day in 1215 when three thousand merchants assembled at Alexandria were temporarily arrested. But even after the Damietta Crusade, relations were resumed (as is shown among other things by a document of immunity in Arabic from al-Kamil to the Venetians which is to be published by Subhi Labib) and lasted in the main without undue interruption until the middle of the century.

But, though the Italians were the masters in the Mediterranean, and Egypt played a purely passive rôle in trading with them, only making a profit from the taxes and commissions, they were prevented from access to the Red Sea, and the commerce of the Indian Ocean remained exclusively in the hands of the subjects of Muslim (or Hindu) states. We are not in a position to determine exactly what rôle the Egyptians played, or that of the Yemenites or other more easterly peoples. The exact nature of the merchants called Karimi, specialists at Aden and in Egypt in the trade in products brought from the Indian Ocean and especially spices, still remains obscure; they appear to have existed since Fatimid times, but it is in the Ayyubid period that they really made their appearance in the rôle which was to be more especially theirs in the following century (cf. the elucidations of Goitein and Fischel in the press for the Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient, 1958, and G. Wiet, Les marchands d'Epices... in Cahiers d'Histoire Egyptienne, 1955). The occupation of the Yemen by the Ayyubids may have had as its primary motive the hemming in of the supporters of a Fatimid restoration or the formation there of an eventual refuge for the Ayyubids; but its object was doubtless also the improvement, which in any case occurred, of commercial relations, of primary importance for both parties, between the Yemen and Egypt, with whom Yemenite currencies and some measures were aligned (Ibn al-Mudjawir, ed. L. LoGren, 12 ft.).

The almost complete internal peace which Egypt enjoyed, and the relatively long periods of peace from which Syria profited, certainly had a favourable influence, though it is difficult to give precise indications, on their economy, which was also stimulated by the possibilities of trade and which the Ayyubids deliberately strove to promote, even though only for their fiscal interests. For Syria and the Djazira we are able to gain a certain idea of their resources through the 'Adik of Ibn Shaddad, who describes the situation on the eve of the Mongol assault; more precisely, for the crafts of Damascus, much information is to be found in the treatise on hiba composed about 600/1200 by 'Abd al-Rahman b. Nagi al-Shayrawi (ed. 'Arifl, Cairo 1946, trans. Bernhauer, Les institutions de po& e etc. in JA, 1860, where the author is called Nabrawi), apparently the prototype of all successive treaties of this kind in Syria and Egypt. For Egypt, besides the information preserved by al-Makrizi, many indications are to be found in the treatises of Ibn al-Mamm& and al-Nabulusi (cf. infra); the latter especially attests al-Kamil's interest in the maintenance of forests, irrigation works, state cultivation of sugar cane etc. In general, Egypt, in contradistinction to the other Ayyubid states, remained, as always, the country par excellence with a partly nationalised economy, especially for mining and forest production, trade in metals and wood, certain means of transport and tools, arms etc. The Lam of al-Nabulusi, a pamphlet composed after the disorders which followed al-Kamil's death, outlines these in detail, and by the interference of private undertakings with those of the State, and by the frauds perpetrated by officials at the first relaxation of control. Under al-Adil and al-Kamil, in addition to the attention paid to economic matters, a strict financial policy was maintained. Al-Adil's great minister, Ibn Shukr, made himself famous by his competence combined with intractable behaviour towards everyone, including his own sovereign. After him, al-Kamil maintained an equally energetic control over expenditure and resources (including the ibd of the amirs) and on his death left a treasure almost equal to a year's budget. For Egypt, the inquiry carried out by al-Nabulusi in the Fayyum, although relating only to 642, shows the minuteness of the cadastral survey and accounts (cf. Cl. Cahen, Le &ime des impôts dans le Fayyûm ayyubûde, in Arabica iii/1, 1956). For the northern states, Ibn Shaddad has left us lists of taxes for the towns of Aleppo, Manbij, Sarbij and Balis. The care taken with the finances and the economy also made possible the resumption of the large-scale minting of dinars at the standard normal before 619 al-Din. Nevertheless, it seems to have been difficult to check the flight of silver coinage before that of copper (De Bouard, L'évolution monétaire de l'Egypte moderne, in L'Egypte Contemporaine, 1939).
The internal history of the Ayyubid states has been the subject of few studies. Yet it is essential that it should be known, especially for Egypt, since it is at this period, by means of a partial break with the Fatimid past and the introduction of Saljūqid and Zankid traditions from further Asia, but also inevitably with some retention of the Egyptian heritage and with innovations and adaptations, that the foundations were laid of the régime which, to a large extent, the Mamluks, for two centuries, simply prolonged and completed in detail. Naturally only a few rather incidental allusions can be made here.

The Ayyubid régime, approximately up to the late years of al-ũlũ, was a semi-feudal family federation, as, for example, had been that of the Buɣyids and, to a lesser extent, of the Saljūqids and Zankids. Under a sovereign to whom all owed allegiance, a certain number of territories were distributed to vassal “princes of the blood” who, apart from the limitations imposed by their primarily military allegiance to the ruler, enjoyed complete autonomy in administering them (cf. for example, the diploma of investiture of a prince of Hamā by al-ũlũ preserved at the end of the Chronicle of Ibn Abi ũ-Damm, Oxford Bodl. Marsh 60). Within these great appanages there were lesser ones, likewise distributed to princes of the blood of second rank or to a few great officers, whose loyalty was to the vassal prince, and whose effective independence was naturally more restricted. It was only still lower down the scale that the military šīḥā proper so-called, of which we shall speak later, were to be found. However, towards the end of al-ũlũ’s reign, this régime began to undergo certain modifications; the aggravation of family conflicts obliged the Sulṭān, who during his absence in Egypt had himself represented by a nāʾib, sometimes belonging to his family and sometimes not, to replace the princes in the Asiatic provinces also by governors, taken from among their domestic attendants, as for example at Dīyār Bakr, Ħams al-Dīn ũwāb, either standing beside a young prince or not, and whose title of nāʾib also stressed his dependence better than any other title would have done. The conditions in which, after al-ũlũ, al-ũlũ Ayyūb reconstituted Ayyūbīd unity, led to the triumph of this centralist conception; moreover, in Egypt, there had never been autonomous appanages, except as a quite exceptional and temporary measure (for example in Fayyūm). In Asia, on the other hand, all the autonomous princes, like the sovereign in Egypt, now bore the title of Sulṭān, which ūlalah al-Dīn had never officially made use of, perhaps because of its connexion, in the Fatimid heritage, with that of mašir; and even the subordinate Ayyūbīd lords bore that of mašīkh.

The organisation of the Ayyūbīd states, as a natural result of the preceding considerations, was never unified. In general, leaving aside the Yemen, there can be distinguished on the one hand the territories of Asia, which perpetuated Zankid institutions without any great modifications, and on the other, Egypt, where newer institutions were introduced, or at least newer as regards Egypt. As is normal, the central organs of government there were transformed to a greater extent, in relationship to the Egyptian past, than the fundamentals and rules of local administration. An attempt to adjust matters was made, once the initial troubles were over, during the lifetime of ūlalah al-Dīn himself, as is shown by the description of Fatimid institutions composed for the new régime by ūb al-ũtwār (extracts in al-Makhrūz and Ibn al-Furâr), the treatise of the ũdī Abu ũ-Hasan on ḥasād (extracts in al-Makhrūz) and the famous ʿusūl al-Darrārīn of Ibn al-MMnīt, which have been preserved; others could be added, as, for example, a little later the more literary work of Ibn ʿSbīl al-ũ-Kūrī on the diwāns. As the counterpart of this and in contrast to these methodical accounts, there appeared at the end of the Ayyūbīd régime the various treatises, preserved or known only through quotations, of ʿUthmān b. ʿIbrāhīm al-Mnbulus, which are a vivid witness of his concrete experience.

The central government was naturally directed, more or less effectively according to temperament, by the Prince himself; most of the princes holding appanages had a mašīr, that is to say, an official who ensured in the Prince’s name the unity of direction of the whole administration. But the institution was less usual in Egypt; whatever prestige the ũdī al-Fādīl may have enjoyed in ūlalah al-Dīn’s eyes, he certainly never, despite what has been said, bore the title or fulfilled the functions of mašīr, first because this sovereign himself performed the functions of government, and second because it was as mašīr that he had originally come to power in Egypt in accordance with the late Fatimid practice of conferring the wazīrate with plenary authority. For quite a long time his brother al-ũfīl had the redoubtable ūb ʿShukr as his mašīr, whom he had learned to value as his associate in directing ūlalah al-Dīn’s navy; al-ũlũ took him back for a time, but then subsequently assumed the direction of the administration himself, with the help of high officials, to whom he sometimes, but not always, gave the title of nāʾib of the wazīrate. After him, al-ũlũ Ayyūb had as his mašīr one of the “Sons of the Shaykh”, of whom we shall speak again later. Princes who were minors and orphans had an atabeg [q.v.]. The uṣūl al-Darrārī, a kind of intendant of the Sovereign’s “Household”, played an important political rôle.

Below the prince and the mašīr, the central administration was divided between the diwāns, the names and attributions of which no longer exactly corresponded to those of the Fatimid period. It was essentially the army for which this régime still operated, hence the importance of the Diwān al-Diwān, a section of which dealt with the šīḥā and, in this respect, possessed a competency which in part coincided with that of the Diwān of Finance; on this latter were dependent all questions of taxation, income and expenditure, and the Treasury, with a section devoted to the finances of “the Gate itself; it is described in detail, with the exclusion of the others, in the treatise of Ibn al-MMnīt. The third great Diwān, which in certain respects was pre-eminent among those just mentioned, was the Diwān al-Inqūl, the Chancery, entrusted with correspondence and the composition of diplomas; of this the director enjoying the greatest reputation was al-Fādīl, who had been taken over from the Fatimid régime (“Inmād al-Dīn al-Ifshānī, who emulated him in belles-lettres, was private secretary to ūlalah al-Dīn). Finally, marginal, though of no less importance, was the Diwān of the ubās, indicated by al-MMnbulus, which naturally evolved complete autonomy as against those just mentioned. The Ayyūbīds adopted the Saljūqid taẖra, which they distorted (Cl. Cahen, in BSOAS, xiv/1, 42). The work of these offices involved large numbers of documents and employees supervising...
The military policy of the Ayyubids was completed by the construction of impressive fortresses both urban (Aleppo, Cairo etc.) and rural, which they matched especially against those of the Crusaders. At times there has been speculation as to the extent to which certain characteristics of the Ayyubids can be attributed to their “Kurdism”. Considerations of this kind too often derive from gratuitous prejudices and falsified information. It does not seem that the presence of Turks beside Kurds in the Ayyubid regime differed profoundly from that of Kurds beside the Turks in the Zankid régime, and both institutionally and intellectually the two regimes are related, allowance being made for the consequences of environmental conditions. Yet it is probably not a matter of chance that the Ayyubids sought to expand to Diyar Bakr and Akbät, that is to say towards their country of origin, or at least into Kurdish territory, so as to ensure the continuity of Kurdish recruitment. However, within the actual dynasty, in the course of successive generations, Turkish and Kurdish blood was mixed; and we shall see that in its last days the régime divested itself of its Kurdish aspect.

The Ayyubids in any case, like the Zankids and their other contemporaries, were staunch Sunnik Muslims, working, under the aegis of the sovereign, to promote Orthodox Islam against heresy. This attitude was first of all revealed by the reintroduction of Egypt into the ‘Abbâsid family, and more durably, at a time when the Caliph al-Ņâṣir had restored a certain prestige to the Caliphate, it was manifested by an expression of respect, of a concordance of opinions which, whilst not naturally diminishing the autonomy of the Ayyubids, were not however purely verbal, authorising, for example, in the settlement of disputes, the frequently effective mediation of such caliphal ambassadors as Ibn al-Djawâzî. Furthermore, the Ayyubids, like other rulers of their times, entered the kind of futuwwa order by which al-Ņâṣir tried to take in hand the lower classes of Bagdad and at the same time consolidate his administration and reassert his moral authority among the aristocracy; he had to associate the princes with himself in this undertaking, both in order to attach them to himself and to enable them to conduct a similar line of action among their own people (cf. the latest assessment of this question by Fr. Taeschner, Die Futuwwa etc., in Schweizerisches Archiv für Volkskunde, LIII, 1956).

The orthodox attitude of the Ayyubids is also shown in the concrete encouragement which they and their high dignitaries gave, after the Saldjûkids and Zankids, to increasing the numbers of madrasas in Syria and the Dîjâzra, and to their introduction into Egypt. Al-Ṣâlîh Ayyûb appears to have been the initiator of a new form, the madrasa for the four rites including in its buildings the tomb of the founder. On the other hand, the Ayyubids welcomed the mystical orders, often originating in the East, for whom they founded various khanaksîhs, under the direction of a shaykh of shaykhs. More generally evident is the fact that quite a few immigrants of recent or remote Iranian origin are to be found surrounding them, as with the Saldjûkids and Zankids, especially in the controlling spheres of intellectual life; there seems also to have been a tendency for them to associate the kâhsîs and religious circles more extensively with the government. Especially remarkable under their rule was the so-called family of the Sons of the Shaykh, of Khurâsânian origin (see Awlâd al-Shaykh), who,
contrary to the almost universal particularisation between the military, religio-legal and administrative castes, succeeded in being eminently represented in all three, especially in the case of the ma'mir Ma'in al-Din and his brother the amir Fakhr al-Din who, for a short time before his death in the battle of Mansûra, acted as regent of the realms.

Nevertheless, if one compares the behaviour of the Ayyubids with that of the Great Saljuqs, a greater flexibility is certainly to be observed. This is doubtless connected with the general aim of relaxing tension which we have noted, moreover, in the policy adopted towards the Franks. But it must also be said that the heretics of Syria had been sufficiently weakened by the Zankids for it to be no longer really necessary to fight them, and that in Egypt Islam seems hardly to have left any regrets. At Aleppo, however, the government of al-Zahir Ghâzi was stained by the blood of the Iranian mystic Suhrawardî Maqûl, executed during the lifetime of Shâh al-Din; but it must be said that this was a very special individual case, and that this measure was demanded by pietistic circles of Aleppo. The majority of the Ayyubids were Shâfî'is, in contradistinction to the Turks who were Hanafis, and although doctrinally this does not impinge to the latter a stronger degree of intolerance, the result may nevertheless have been that the Ayyubids had a less intimate contact with the pietists, devoted to the militant spiritual mission of the Saljuqs. However, al-Mu'azzam and his son Dâûd were Hanafis, and this perhaps partly explains their conflicts with al-Kâmîl; they certainly appear, for example, at the time of the dealings with Frederick II, doctrinally to represent the intransigent party.

Christians and Jews, generally speaking, likewise appear to have had no grounds for complaint against the dynasty. As is almost always the case, when an exception occurs, the motive is political and not confessional. There is no doubt that the Ayyubid occupation impaired the exceptionally favourable conditions enjoyed by the Armenians under the last FâtiMids (see ARMENIA). But it was the Copts who profited from these confiscations and not the Muslims. Similarly, when Shâh al-Din retook Jerusalem, he favoured such of the native Christian communities there as could not be suspected of conniving with the Franks (cf. inter alia Cl. Cahen, Islamisme et Croisades, un médecin d'Arménie et de Saladin, in Syria 1934, and E. Cerulli, Etoïps in Paléstine, I, Rome 1943). The Ayyubid period in Egypt was one of vitality for the Coptic Church.

When moments of arousal were in general as a counter effect of Crusades, in so far as collusion might be feared, for example, between Melkites and Latins. That it was not considered necessary, however, in normal circumstances, to prohibit intercourse between indigenuous and Latin Christians is shown by the permission accorded by the Ayyubids for Dominican and Franciscan missionaries to enter their kingdom, provided that no attempt was made to convert Muslims. It is true that the traditional discriminatory measures in respect of non-Muslims were from time to time revived, always with the same ineffectiveness. The Jews were also passably well treated, even being invited to return to reconquered Jerusalem, and refugees from Spain, such as Maimonides, were favourably received (see E. Ashtor-Strauss, Saladin and the Jews, in Hebrew Union College Annual, 1956, 303-26).

The climate certainly offers a partial explanation for the intensity of cultural life in the Ayyubid domains. Syria in the 13th century was truly the heart of Muslim culture in the Arabic language. Egypt was soon to rival her, but had not as yet quite achieved a synthesis between the survivals from her own past and the imported elements disfavoured by the Ayyubids. All the credit for this flowering cannot indeed be claimed by the Ayyubids, but it would be unjust to deny them any credit, who were themselves frequently men of letters and scholars, and who in general sought to protect and attract the representatives of all disciplines compatible with orthodoxy. The economic progress and the general advance of Muslim recovery in the area which the Crusades had involved most directly in the struggle, must have accomplished the rest.

There is little object in giving a list of names of men of letters and scholars. The names of the historians and geographers will be found in the bibliography of sources; Ibn al-Kîfî (ma'mir of Aleppo) and Ibn Abî Usaybî'a, biographers of scholars and physicians, draw our attention to the importance of the support given to these latter in the hospitals; among the poets (some of whom were studied by Rikabi, La Poësie profane sous les Ayyubides, 1949), the historian will perhaps more especially note al-Amîjd Bahârmîkh, himself an Ayyubid, or a man of the sâks such as Ibn al-Djazarî (cited in the Mughrib of Ibn Sa'id). Furthermore, emphasis should be laid on the many Spanish refugees who established themselves in the Ayyubid domains, men as diverse as the historian-geographer Ibn Sa'id, the grammarian Ibn Malik, the botanist Ibn al-Baytar and the mystic Ibn al-Târîkh. It is not possible to speak at length here of the Ayyubid principality of the Yemen; Ayyubid intervention here certainly had the same importance for the country as was the case in Egypt. Ayyubid rule to a certain extent restricted the quarrels of sects and princepings who divided the country among themselves, and brought about a political unity which was to survive them; although, from 629/1232, the Ayyubids were supplanted by the Rasûlîds, the latter had their origins in their officer milîw and continued their traditions. The Ayyubid régime reintroduced Sunnî Islam to the Yemen and linked it more closely to Egypt, politically, economically and institutionally. The persistence of religious divisions in the population may have been the origin of the strange attempt on the part of the third Ayyubid to pass himself off as an autonomous Umayyad Caliph; after his overthrow, al-'Adîl and al-Kâmîl stressed their intention of not allowing the Yemen to escape from their hands by sending one of the sons of the latter to take over the succession. Al-Kâmîl, however, was unable to prevent the accession of the Rasûlîds, but the latter were at pains to show themselves, at least at the outset, as allies of the Ayyubids; later there arose conflicts of influence between them at Mecca; commercial relations, however, seem never to have been broken off.

III. The death of al-Kâmîl marks the end of the true Ayyubid régime, with the reservation that the resulting degradation was in a large measure, implicit in its very constitution. al-Kâmîl had relegated his eldest son al-Šâlîh Ayyûb to the government of Hisn-Kayfaya and designated jiś youngest son al-'Adîl to succeed him; al-'Adîl made himself disliked and his opponents appealed to al-Šâlîh. The latter, in the course of fierce struggles, accompanied by
many reverses, conquered his throne and restored the unity of command of the Ayyubid states (a unity restored epistemically by his death), not only at the expense of his younger brother, but also of the majority of the Ayyubids of Syria, especially al-Shālīb Ismā‘īl, who had become master of Damascus.

It is true that there had already been conflicts between Ayyubids, but these conflicts did not prevent either of the protagonists from in the first place receiving the territories which they governed from the Sultan, the head of the family, or family solidarity from keeping the harmful effects of these conflicts within definite limits. This time, the adversaries viewed one another as usurpers, and it was naked strength which gave the victory to al-Šālīb. Nevertheless, this strength was no longer derived from the old Kurdo-Turkish army; during al-Kāmil’s lifetime, the disgrace of al-Šālīb had been due to the fact that, as his father’s lieutenant in Egypt, in his distrust of the Kurds, he had carried out a large scale recruitment exclusively of Turkish slaves. The army which he organised on becoming master of Egypt was exclusively Turkish. But, in the meantime, his successes had been due to an even more disquieting element: the Khwārizmians who, after the defeat and death of Dżālāt al-Din, had been driven back from Asia Minor where for a time they had served the Salğūks, and were seeking an employer and a territory. He invested them with Dīvār Muṣṭar and summoned them to fight against his enemies in the Djuždra and in Syria; it was partly due to them that these wars were of so devastating and ruthless a character, until at last al-Šālīb, having no further need of them, caused them to be annihilated by his cousins of southern Syria. Furthermore, though the previous Ayyubids had kept the peace with the Franks, and at one point al-Kāmil had even entertained an alliance with Frederick II against his brothers, such plans had never been actually realised. This time, the Franks appeared in alliance with al-Šālīb Ismā‘īl and with al-Nāṣir Dā‘ūd of Karak himself against al-Šālīb Ayyūb and the Khwārizmians, which resulted in an irreparable disaster for both of the former. This marks the appearance in al-Šālīb of a warlike spirit against the Franks which was unknown to his predecessors, and the ordeals of the Franks gave rise to a new Crusade, that of St. Louis, at the beginning of which the Ayyubid ruler died.

In effect, he was the last Ayyubid. His son Tūrānshāh was massacred after a few months by his troops, and even though several child puppets still carried on the name of the Ayyubid dynasty for a time, it was in fact from 647/1249 that the establishment of the new so-called Mamlūk régime dated. Al-Šālīb was the real creator of this régime. The well-knit and well-disciplined army of Turkish slaves, called the Bahriyya from the name of the barracks on an island in the river (Bahr), was the real arbiter of the situation; neither al-Šālīb nor Tūrānshāh were military leaders. The dynasty might have lasted longer if the latter had not been unbalanced; it was inevitable that sooner or later the Bahriyya would supplant him by a leader promoted from among themselves, which they in fact did when, on the death of Tūrānshāh, they raised the Turkomān ʿĪzā al-Din Aybak to power, first as aṭābeq and then as sultan. The “Kurdish” dynasty was succeeded by the “Turkish” régime, in the words of contemporaries.

The Northern Ayyubids continued for a little while longer, but without further success. Their lives were spent under the shadow of the terror caused by the approach of the Mongols. They hesitated between submission which they feared might be annihilation, and armed resistance of which they despaired in advance. However, al-Nāṣir of Aleppo, with the advent of the Mamlūk régime, had become the standard-bearer of the Ayyubid cause, and it required the mediation of the Caliph in face of the Mongol danger to bring about an agreement that all Syria belonged to him, the Mamlūk Sūltān being satisfied with Egypt. But in 1258 Baghdād fell and, in 1260, Aleppo, Damascus and Mayyafarīkn were either taken or capitulated of their own accord before the invader, who seemed to be invincible. The unfortunate al-Nāṣir, who unlike others did not dare to seek refuge in Egypt, was finally captured by the Mongols and, well treated at first, paid with his life when news arrived of the defeat of a Mongol army by the Mamlūks at ‘Ayn Dżālūt [q.v.] in Syria at the end of the same year. In the ensuing conquest of Syria by the Mamlūk sultan Baybars, the principality of Karak (which moreover had been lost to the family of Dā‘ūd in 1248), which was of great strategic importance, was subjugated; the principalities of Aleppo and Hīnḫ had disappeared of their own volition; that of Hamāh alone, made illustrious by its writer-prince Abu T-Fidā‘l, was restored, and existed (with one interval) until 1342, by reason of its absolute docility.

There was however another branch which survived for more than two centuries under the Mongols and their successors, in the vicinity of Ḥīn Kayfā; reduced to the level of a local seigniory, it returned in a rather odd way to its origins, in that it drew a large part of its strength from the Kurdish tribes who had become powerful in the region and among whom it attempted to play an ever-repeated rôle as arbiter. It succeeded in surviving the Timūrid catastrophe, preserving a centre of culture, but in the end succumbed to the Āk Koyūnlā; nevertheless several of its members regained a minor local importance at the time of the Ottoman conquest (cf. Claude Cahen, Contribution à l’Histoire de Djužar Bahar au XIVème siècle, in Jd, 1955).

Bibliography: A. Sources. A number of archival documents of the Ayyubid period have been preserved; official documents, reported in Sinai (A. S. Atya, The Arabic MSS. of Mt. Sinai, Baltimore 1935), or discovered in the Italian archives and published (M. Amari, Diplomi arabi del Archivo Fiorentino, 1863-67; Tafel and Thomas, Urkunden zur älteren Handelsgeschichte Venedig, 3 vols. 1856-7); cf. also ʿubd al-Lābîb cited above); private documents, in the collections of papers of Cairo, Vienna, etc. (cf. for example A. Dietrich, Eine Eheurkunde aus der Aiyubidenzeit, in Doc. islam. med., Berlin Akad. Wiss. 1952). Moreover partial collections have been preserved of copies of the correspondence of the Kādī al-Fādīl (con whom see A. N. Helbig, Der Kadi al-Fadhl, 1909, inadequate), of the Ayyubid al-Nāṣir Dā‘ūd (Broekelmann, 1, 18, and Cl. Cahen, REI, xxiv, 341), and of al-Afdāl’s maṭrī, Ḍiyā al-Dīn b. al-Āṯīr (analyses of MSS. by Margoliouth, Xth Congress of Orientalists, Ḥābib Zayyāt, in Machqiq xxxvii/4, 1939; and Cl. Cahen, in BSOAS, xiv/1); numerous extracts of the first also occur in Abū ʿAbdāl Shāmīa cited infra; various Jewish documents in the collections of the Cairo Geniza.
On the whole, the essential sources for us continue to be the narrative sources, on which several comprehensive studies are to be found in the Introductions of Cl. Cahen, *La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des Croisades*, 1940, and H. Gottschalk, *Malik al-Kāmil* (in the press); for the times of Salāḥ al-Dīn, H. A. R. Gibb, *The Arabic Sources for the Life of Saladin, in Speculum*, xxvii, 1950. For this first period, the main source is ʿImād al-Dīn al-Isfahānī, *al-Barak al-Shāmi*, of which only two fragments exist, at Oxford (cf. H. A. R. Gibb, in WZKM, iii, 1953), but of which more or less complete summaries are given in all the subsequent literature and especially in Abū Shāma, *K. al-Rawdatayn*, Cairo ed. 1287/1872, 2 vols. (the first part of a new critical edition by Hilmy M. Ahmad appeared in Cairo in 1956; it goes as far as 558/1163); extracts in *Hist. Or. Crois.*, iv and v; it should be completed by al-Fath al-Kūsī, edem., E. Landberg, devoted to the events of 1187 (cf. J. Kraemer, *Der Sturz des Königreichs Jerusalems in der Darstellung des—*, Wiesbaden 1952). The other important Arabic sources are Ibn Shaddād, *Life of Saladin*, in *Hist. Or. Crois.*, iii; Ibn Ābī Ṭāyyīf quoted in Abū Shāma, op. cit.; the *Dustān al-Dīwān*, ed. Cl. Cahen, in BEO, Damascus 1937 and the Christian Abū ʿAlī the Armenian, *Churchier*, etc., ed. Everts. For the beginning of the 7th/13th century, the Kāmil of Ibn al-ʿĀthīr becomes the main Arab source, to which must be added the last pages of Ibn Ābī ʿl-Damm (Oxford MS. Marsh 360), Ibn Natīf (MS. Leningrad IM 159 ed. in preparation by H. Gottschalk: a few extracts from Amari, *Bibliotheca Arabo-Sicula*, ii, Appendices; continuously utilised in Ibn al-Furūt, *infra*), the extracts from the Memoirs of ʿAbd al-Laṭif preserved in the *Taʾrīḵ al-īslām* of Dihābī and the authors quoted for the following period. For the 7th/13th century of the Ayyūbīd family as a whole and especially from about 1220, the fundamental source is the *Maʿrajirī al-kurūb* of Ibn Wāṣil (ed. undertaken by al-Shayyāl, who so far has published the first two volumes stopping at the death of Saladin; extracts quoted in the *Bibliothèque des Croisades* of Michaud, iv (by Reinnaud) and in the comments on the translation of Makrīzī by Blochet in *ROL*, ix-xi); this work and the *Mīrāṭ al-ʿāmān* of Sīhī Ibn al-Dīwāzī (facsimile ed. Jewett, on which is based that of Haydarābhādī, ii, 1952, inadequate, cf. *Arab. 1957/8* review by Cl. Cahen), especially important for Damasc, are the two sources used almost exclusively for the whole of the subsequent historiography; the overrated Abuʿl-Fidāʾ in the main only reproduces the work of his less noble compatriot for this period; Ibn Wāṣil had previously written a more concise *Taʾrīḵ al-Sīhābī* based on different sources of information (unpublished). To these authors must be added especially Abū Shāma, *Dhayl al-sāla al-Rawdatayn*, Cairo ed. 1366/1947, the Christian al-Makīn b. al-ʿAmīd (edition in BÉLOR, 1958, by Cl. Cahen), the *History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria* (this part unpublished, quotations, among others, in Blochet-Makrīzī loc. cit.), the extracts of Saʿd al-Dīn (Cl. Cahen, *Une source pour l'Histoire des Croisades*, in *Memoires de —*, in Bull. Fac. Lettres Strasbourg, xxvii-7, 1950); for Northern Syria, the *Zubād of Kāmāl al-Dīn* Ibn al-ʿAdīm (ed. undertaken by Samī Dahān; meanwhile, Blochet trans. in *ROL*, iv-v) and the *Bughyā* by the same author (unpublished), and *ʿĪz al-Dīn Shaddād, cf. infra; the ʿīrāt point of view is to be found in Ibn al-Fuwati, *al-Ḥawādīth*, etc., ed. Cl. Cahen, *Dīwān*; the Khwārizmīzī in Nasawī, *Vie de Djalāl al-Dīn Shaddād*, ed. trans. Houdas; the Sajdūkī (of Rūm) in Ibn Bībī, ed. Houtsma (somewhat abbreviated; in Persian). See also the historians of the Mongols and of the first Mamlūkīs. Among later Arab historians who have preserved some original materials, *Bzäzīr* (Cl. Cahen, in Orients, ix/1, 1951, 153-31), *Dīwān al-Dīwān* (ed. in preparation), Nuwayrī (Cairo ed.), Ibn al-Furūt (this part unpublished), Makrīzī (Ṣulāḥ, ed. Must. Ziyād; Ḳhīāt, Būlāk ed. and, for the beginning, ed. Wiet, the only good edition). For the Yemen under the Ayyūbīds, better than the celebrated Khazraḍī (ed. trans. Gibb Mem. Ser.), of late composition, the contemporary Ibn Muʿādhwīr (ed. Lőfgren) and Hamdānī (Brokelmann, I 323, unpublished). For the principality of Ḥūn Kayfā, the anonymous Vienna manuscript studied in Cl. Cahen, *Contributions etc.* cited above.

A general history of the whole Ayyūbīd family was composed at the beginning of the 9th/15th century by an anonymous Syrian (Brit. Mus. Add. 7311, unpublished). On the whole, too many important sources are still in manuscript form and their publication (at least photographically) is a pressing desideratum. Translated extracts from the Arabic historians will be found in F. Gabrielli, *Storici arabi delle Crociate*, Rome 1957, and J. Östrup, *Arabiske Kronkiler til Kortogenes Periode*, Copenhagen 1906.

To the historians must be added the biographers, not only Ibn Khallīkān, but also Ibn al-Kīṭīf (ed. Lippert) and Ibn Abī ʿUsāṭībī (ed. Aug. Müller), and the geographers, Yākūt, Ibn Saʿīd (unpublished), and especially ʿĪz al-Dīn b. Shaddād (Northern Syria, ed. Ledit in Machriq, 1935; Aleppo, ed. Sourdel, Damascus 1958; Damascus, ed. Dahān 1957; Dīwānī, analysis by Cl. Cahen in REI, 1934; further extracts by Sobernheim in *Centenario di Amari*, ii, (Baʿbak) and in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Arab. passim*), historical and administrative, to be compiled by Sīhī Ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Les Tétrici d'Or*, analysis and trans. Sauvaget, 1950, and ʿUlaymī, *Description de Damas*, ed. Sauvare, in JA, 1894.


The *diwāns* of the poets should not be neglected.

Naturally non-Arab and non-Muslim literature must also be consulted, which cannot be given in detail here: especially the Latin and French historians of the Crusades and of the Latin Orient, and Syriac literature (Michael the Syrian, ed. and trans. Chabot; Bar-Hebraeus, ed. and trans.)
Budge; Chronique anonyme syriaque, ed. Chatob, in Corpus Script., or., iii, 14-15.
The epitaph material has been collected in the RCEA, viii-ix; the inscriptions of Sulaymân al-Dîn studied by Wiet in Syria, iii. To the numismatic material provided by the usual catalogues, should be added the recent studies of Balog, Minost and Jungfleisch in MIE since 1950.

B. Modern Works. There is no complete general study on the Ayyûbids. The two best general accounts, though short, are those of G. Wiet in the Histoire de la Nation Egyptienne edited by Hanotaux, iv, and of H. A. R. Gibb in History of the Crusades (Philadelphia), i, (Saladin) 1955 and, ii (The Ayyûbids after Saladin) in the press. There is not even a serious biography of Saladin; the latest is that of A. Champourris, Paris 1956, and the least bad still that of Lane-Poole, New York 1898. Of the rest of the Ayyûbids, al-Kâmil alone has just been the subject of an important work, by H. Gottschalk (in the press; the same author has given notice of an article on Ayyûbid Yemen).

The studies on various special problems have been quoted in the article. For trade, hardly anything new has been added from our point of view to the two old classical works of W. Heyd, Histoire du Commerce du Levant, i, 1882, and of Schaub, Handelsgeschichte der Mittelmearommanen, 1906, which view matters from the Western point of view. Some information on institutions is contained in W. Björkmann, Beitrag zur Geschichte der Staatskanzlei im islamischen Ägypten, Hamburg 1929. See also the general histories on the Crusades and the Latin Orient; F. Butcher, The history of the church of Egypt, 1897; and supra and infra the articles devoted to the Adilshah, diebedjis, and again unmarried, the term azab, who, like those employed at sea, were Treasury-paid. Their duty was to guard war-ships whilst in dock.

Bibliography: Mużafâ Nûrî, Nâdî’dî al-Wubû’î, i, 144; d’Ohsson, Tableau de l’Empire Ottoman, vii, loc. cit.; Hammer, Des osmanischen Reichs Staatsverfassung, etc. ii, 280, 287-8; Zinckesius, iii, 202; E. M. art. Lewend (Kranmers); IA art. ‘azab (Urung and Governmental), Islamic Society and the West, i (part I) index.

AZAD, ABU’L-KALAM [see Supplement].
AZAD, MUHAMMAD HUSAYN, an Indian Muslim writer and poet, who wrote in Ùrdû and is noted for the unique charm of his agreeable and picturesque style and for the important role he played in the field of literature and education. He was born in Delhi about 1834, being the son of Mawlân Muhammad Bâkîr, himself a pioneer of journalism in Northern India. After the political upheaval of 1857, he left Delhi and after several years’ wandering arrived in Lahore in 1864. He spent the rest of his life there in the service of the education department of the Government of the Pândjab, writing among other things textbooks for students of the Ùrdû and Persian languages. He also made journeys to Persia and Central Asia. He died at Lahore in 1910.

His principal works are: Ab-i Hayât, a history of Ùrdû poetry, with an introduction on the history of the Ùrdû language; it is his greatest and best-known work, which is celebrated and highly prized not only for its subject-matter but also for its vivid and graphic style; Subjan-i Pârs, on Persian philology and the development of Persian prose style; Nigarîstân-i Pârs, dealing with Persian poets of India and Persia; Nayrang-i Hayât, a collection of allegorical essays, translated or adapted from the English; Darbâr-i Akbar, which deals with the reign of the Mughal Emperor Akbar the Great and his brilliant court, and Kâysâr-i Hind, or stories from Indian history. He also collected and edited the poetical compositions of his master, Muhammad Ibrâhîm Dhâwûk.

He used Azad as his pen-name; and along with Atâf Husayn Hall [q.v.] he is regarded as a pioneer
of the new school of Urdu poetry, which is characterised by naturalness and greater breadth of subject and treatment and also by increased attention paid to

Bibliography: B. R. Saksena, A History of Urdu Literature, Allahabad 1927; M. Bakir in Supplement to the Oriental College Magazine (Lahore) for Feb., 1939; Muhammad Sadiq, Muhammad Husayn Azad, his Life, Work and Influence, Doctoral Dissertation in the Pangab University, 1939; S. M. Husayn Rizawi, Ab-i Bayat ha Tanhdi Musha'ala, s.v. (Sh. Inayatullah)

AZAD BILGRAMI, Mir Ghulam 'Ali b. Noh Al-Husayn Al-Wasta'bi, b. at Bilgram on 25 Safar 1116/29 June 1704; he received his early education from Mir Tufayl Muhammad Bilgrami (Subha al-Mardjani 99-100).

When his friend Samsam al-Dawlawa Shab Nawaz Khan [q.v.] died at Haydarabad, was murdered and his house plundered (1171/1758), Azad recovered most of the dispersed fragments of the unfinished MS. of the latter's Ma'dhbir al-Umarai, which he re-arranged and edited. The works of Azad himself cover hadith, belles-lettres, history, biography and poetry. His Arabic hadid in praise of the Prophet have earned him the title of Hssain al-Hind, after the Prophet's progeny Hassan b. Thabit [q.v.].

His notable works are: In Arabic: (1) Subha al-Mardjani fi Ajab Hindustani (lith. Bombay 1303/1886), incorporating two independent works by the author: Shamlamul 'Anbarah and Tasiliyat al-Fudah, the former containing references to India in Kur'anic commentaries and hadith and the latter on biographies of Indian scholars and ulama'. The chapter on rhetorical figures was later translated into Persian by the author himself under the title of Ghidwan al-Hind (MSS. Asafiyya, i, 169; Eth6, 2135; Berlin 1051); (2) Diman in 3 vols. (Haydarabad 1300-1882-3) containing more than 3000 verses; a selection from his seven other diwaani entitled al-Sab'a al-Sayyida was published at Lucknow, 1280/1910; (3) Daya al-Darari Sharah Sakhih al-Bukhari, an incomplete commentary on al-Bukhari (MS. Nadwat al-'Ulama', Lucknow, 99); In Persian: (4) Khasa'i-i 'Amira, alphabetically arranged notices of some 135 ancient and modern Persian poets with a brief history of the Marathas, (Cawnpore 1871, 1900); (5) Ma'dhbir al-Kirdam, on the pious and learned men of Bilgram (lith. Agra 1901); (6) Sura-i 'Asad, biographies of 243 Persian and Urdu poets of India (Lahore 1913); (7) Yadi-i Bayat, alphabetically arranged lives of 532 poets, originally compiled at Swat in (i.e. Sihwan, in Sind, where he was nabh Wakhri-nigah in 1145/1732) (MS. Asafiyya, ii, 162; Ind. Off. 3966 b); (8) Rawda al-Auliya, a short compendium on the saints of Deccan (lith. Awrangabad 1310/1892).

For a detailed list of his works see GJAS (L), 1936, 119-180; Shams Allah Kadir, Rumi al-'Ulama, i, 32-5; Storey, ii/2, 255-66.

Bibliography: Autobiography in Subha al-Mardjani 118-23, Khasa'i-i 'Amira 127-45, Ma'dhbir al-Kirdam 161-64, 303-11; Siddiq Hasan Khan, Ishq al-Nubalah, 530; idem, Abgjiad al-Ulam, 920; Hadidik al-Hana'ifiyya, 454; Tadhkirah 'Ulama'i Hind 134; Wadif al-Din Ahsan, Bahri-i Zakhkhmak (MS), fol. 315; Rieu, Pers. Cat., i, 373 b, iii, 976 b; Asiatic Miscellany, Calcutta 1778, i, 494-511; Shibli Nu'mani, Mubadi (in Urdu), v, 111-35; Brockelman, S, II, 600-1; Makkhi Ahmad 'Amrani, Hayat-i Dauli Bilgrami (in Urdu), Allahabad 1929, ii, 163-77; Ibrahim Khali, Subhi-i 'Abdulrahim, s.v.; Zoubayd Ahmad, Contribution of India to Arabic Literature, index; Lacti Narayan Shafkat: Gol-i Ra'ma, s.v.; Majib, Le Zor, Ghulam 'Ali Azad Bilgrami, Haydarabad.

(A.S. Bazmee Ansari)

AZAK, Russian Azov; called Tana by the Italians after the ancient Tana (the Old-Tana of Jos. Barbaro) is first found on an Italian map of 1306. The Turkish name Azak has appeared on coins since 717/1317. First the Genoese around 1316, then the Venetians in 1332, established trade colonies in Azak. It appears, however, to have remained essentially a Muslim-Tatar city which was administered by Tatar governors such as Muhammad Khaz'dia about 1334. Sich-beg in 1347 and 1349, Toloby about 1358. A mint of the khans was active there as late as 1411. An emporium of the East-West trade in the 14th century, Azak declined perhaps more from the competition of the Genoese Kaffa than Djani-bek's hostile policy toward the Italian colonies (1343-1358) or Timur's depredations (September 1396). Conquered by the Ottomans in 1475, Azak is described as a hadid of the sandjak of Kaffa in the defter of 1545. The town consisted of three parts: 1. Venedik-kaleesi (in Ebuya Celebi, Frenk-hisari) with 128 Muslim families including garrison; 2. Djenevi-kaleesi (later Orta-hisari) with 109 Muslim families including garrison; 3. Toprak-kale with 500 Tatar akhndj and 104 families of fishermen and 57 Greek families. Extensive fisheries and large production of caviar as well as slave-trade were the chief economic resources in this period. Later when the Cossacks, Cerkes and Russians began threatening it Azak was transformed into the main Ottoman bastion in the North. The first serious siege was attempted by Dimitrash, a chief of the Cossacks, in 1559. They eventually captured it in 1637, but had to abandon it in 1642. As the attacks were renewed in subsequent years especially in 1656 and 1659, the Ottomans made it stronger than ever (in 1666 Ebuya Celebi saw a garrison of 13 thousand men and numerous canons in it) and later erected new fortifications around it such as Seddi-i Islam. After an unsuccessful attack in 1695, Peter the Great captured Azak on August 6, 1696. Compelled to surrender it at the treaty of the Prut (1711), it eventually only evacuated it two years later. The Russians recaptured it in 1736.


AZAL [see KIDAM]

AZALAY (current orthography: azala), a term for the great caravans made up of several thousand camels (or to be more precise, dromedaries) which in the spring and autumn carry the salt from the salt deposits of the Southern Sahara to the tropical
regions of the Sahel and the Sudan. This salt, which
used to be exchanged by the Blacks against its
weight in gold, if one is to believe al-Bakri (trans-
de Slane, 2nd. ed., 327), is exchanged today for
food-stuffs: rice, millet, sugar, tea ... The salt from
I'jil, to the West, which has perhaps been known
since the 6th century A.D. (Anonymus of Ravenna),
is collected by manumitted slaves of the Kounta
(Moors) of Chinguetti and transported by the Moors
to the markets of the Western Sudan. The salt
depots of Taoudenni have replaced those of
Teghaza, a source of wealth of the kings of Mali
and of Gao (14th-15th centuries), and have been
worked since 1585; the salt, after being collected by
sedentary miners, is taken to Timbuctoo by the
Kounta and by a few small Touareg caravans; it is
distributed throughout the whole of the Central
Sudan and the Upper Volta. To the East, the salt
depots of Bilma, Seguine and Fachi are worked
by the Kanouri and the salt transported by asalay
by the Touareg of Air and Damerou; it is sold in
Nigeria and in the Niger Colony. The salt of Borkou
(Faya) and of Ennedi furnishes supplies to the
blacks of the plains of French Equatorial Africa.

As regards the salt of Amadror, to the North of
Nigeria and in the Niger Colony. The salt of Borkou
(Faya) and of Ennedi furnishes supplies to the
blacks of the plains of French Equatorial Africa.

As regards the salt of Amadror, to the North of
Nigeria and in the Niger Colony. The salt of Borkou
(Faya) and of Ennedi furnishes supplies to the
blacks of the plains of French Equatorial Africa.

As regards the salt of Amadror, to the North of
Nigeria and in the Niger Colony. The salt of Borkou
(Faya) and of Ennedi furnishes supplies to the
blacks of the plains of French Equatorial Africa.

As regards the salt of Amadror, to the North of
Nigeria and in the Niger Colony. The salt of Borkou
(Faya) and of Ennedi furnishes supplies to the
blacks of the plains of French Equatorial Africa.

As regards the salt of Amadror, to the North of
Nigeria and in the Niger Colony. The salt of Borkou
(Faya) and of Ennedi furnishes supplies to the
blacks of the plains of French Equatorial Africa.

As regards the salt of Amadror, to the North of
Nigeria and in the Niger Colony. The salt of Borkou
(Faya) and of Ennedi furnishes supplies to the
blacks of the plains of French Equatorial Africa.

As regards the salt of Amadror, to the North of
Nigeria and in the Niger Colony. The salt of Borkou
(Faya) and of Ennedi furnishes supplies to the
blacks of the plains of French Equatorial Africa.
part is rather uncertain), and Ch. Le Coeur, Le rite et l'outil, Paris 1939. (R. RICARD)
AZAR, the commonly accepted name of Abra-
ham’s father, based on Kūrān, vi, 74. “When
Abraham said to his father, Azar: ‘Dost thou take
idols as gods?’”, where Azar is taken as a proper
name in approimation to “father”, though some of the
commentators, aware that the name of this father was
Terah, explain Azar as an exclamation of disgust,
an abusive epithet, or the name of an idol. The
majority opinion, however, is that it is the name
of Abraham’s father, either a second name for
Terah, as Israel was for Jacob, or a title. In any
case it was recognised as a foreign word and is listed
among the mu‘arrabāt of the Kūrān. There can be
little doubt that it is a deformation of the Hebrew
Eleazar, the name of Abraham’s faithful servant in
the Genesis story which, as that story came to
Mu‘ammed, was mistaken for the name of his father. (Cf. also Ibrahīm).

Bibliography: The commentaries on the
passage: Ibn Manṣūr, Lisān al-‘Arab, v, 76;
Ṭabarī, Annāles, i, 253ff.; Thālib, Kīsās al-
Anbiyā‘, Cairo 1339, 51; Suyūṭī, Ithāk, 318; Ibn
Kaḥīr, al-Bidāya wa ‘l-Niḥāya, i, 142; Ibn
Asākir, al-Ta‘rīkh al-Kabīr, ii, 134; S. Fraenkel,
in ZDMG, vi, 72; A. Jeffery, Foreign Vocabulary of
Anbā‘, 53-55; J. Horovitz, Koranische Unter-
suchungen, 85, 86. (A. JEFFERY)

AZARĪKA, One of the main branches of the
Kharidjītes [q.v.]. The name is derived from that of
its leader Nāfī‘ b. az-‘Azrāk al-Ḥanafi al-Ḥanzālī,
who, according to al-‘Ash‘ārī, was the first to cause
disputes among the Kharidjītes by supporting the thesis according to which all adversaries should be
put to death together with their women and children
(ishtirāq). As regards the man himself, it is known
that he was the son of a manummated blacksmith
of Greek origin and that in 64/683 he came to the aid
of Ābd Allāh b. al-Zubayr, besieged in Mecca by the
troops of the Syrian general Ḥusayn b. Numayr al-
Ṣakūnī. Once the siege was raised, Nāfī‘ with other
Kharidjīte leaders, including Naqḍāja b. ‘Amīr and
‘Ābd Allāh b. Ḥarāj, returned to Baṣra, where he at
once took advantage of the situation which had
broken out on the announcement of the death of
Yazīd b. Mu‘āwiyah. It was the Kharidjītes under his
orders who assassinated the governor nominated by
‘Ūbayd Allāh b. Ziyād, Mas‘ūd b. ‘Āmr al-‘Atākī,
and who subsequently refused to recognise the
governor sent by ‘Ābd Allāh b. al-Zubayr; ‘Umar
b. ‘Ūbayd Allāh, so that the latter was obliged to
use force to gain possession of the town; in this
he was helped by the inhabitants, who found it
difficult to tolerate the Kharidjītes’ importunities.
Expelled from Baṣra, Nāfī‘ encamped at the gates of
the town and, after collecting reinforcements,
succeeded in defeating ‘Umar b. ‘Ūbayd Allāh in the
course of fierce fighting and in retaking the town.
To re-establish the situation, Ibn al-Zubayr dispatch-
ed an army under the command of the general
Muslim b. ‘Ūbayy. It is probable that it was on this
occasion that the opposition between the moderate
elements and the extremist elements arose in Baṣra
which led to the division of the Kharidjītes into
Ibādites and Azarīkā, an event placed by tradition
in that year (65/685-6). Whilst the former, less cour-
gage, preferred not to fight Muslim and remained in
Baṣra, the latter, resolved to fight to the end, left
the town and under the leadership of Nāfī‘ withdrew
to Khuzistān (al-Ahwāz). Muslim caught up with
them at Dālāb: in the severe fighting which ensued,
both Nāfī‘ and the Zubayrid general met their
deaths (65/685). The Azarīkā, however, reorganised
themselves under the command of ‘Ubayd Allāh b.
al-Māḥzūr and continued the struggle until the
enemy troops, exhausted and discouraged, withdrew
to Baṣra. For several months the region between
Baṣra and a-Ahwāz was the scene of massacres,
looting and arson, the Azarīkā massacring all who
refused to recognise their sect. The population of
Baṣra in alarm called upon al-Muhallab b. ʿAbī
Ṣuḥra, who agreed to lead the struggle against the
Azarīkā. After dislodging them from their stronghold at the
East of Dūdjayl (66/686), following which they
withdrew into Fārs. ‘Ubayd Allāh b. al-Māḥzūr was
killed in the fighting and the command passed to his
brother Zubayr, who, having reorganised his sup-
porters within a short space of time, again set out on
a campaign. Descending once more into Ḥirāk, he
advanced as far as al-Malā‘īn, where he sacked, mas-
sassing the inhabitants. But, faced by an army from
Kūfah, he turned about and attacked Isfahān, which
was governed by ʿAttāb b. Warkṣ. In an engagement
near the town, the Azarīkā suffered a reverse and,
on the death of Zubayr b. al-Māḥzūr, they fled in
complete disorder into Fārs and thence into the
mountains of Kūrmān (68/687-8). It was a warrior
from Lurisṭān, Ḥaṭkārī b. al-Fūjā‘ī’s, who, combining
fierce energy with exceptional gifts as an orator and a
poet, succeeded in rekindling their enthusiasm
and reorganising their ranks. After a period of time,
he became active and, having occupied al-Ahwāz,
descended once again into Ḥirāk and advanced towards
Baṣra. The new governor of the town, Muṣṭāb b.
al-Zubayr, convinced that only al-Muhallab would
be capable of opposing the Azarīkā, recalled him
from Mawṣil, where he had sent him as governor,
and entrusted him with the direction of the campaign.
But, although al-Muhallab succeeded in launching
a wide offensive against the Azarīkī condottiere,
the latter succeeded in keeping him in check for a long
time and in holding his position on the left bank of
the Dūdjayl, even after Ḥirāk had fallen into the
hands of Ābd al-Malik following the defeat of Muṣṭāb at Maskin (71/690). The situation did not
change until al-Hadīdijāb b. Yūsuf, having completed the pacification of Western Arabia, took over the
government of Ḥirāk (73/694). The latter confirmed
al-Muhallab in his command of the operations and ordered him to go over to the attack at once. Then it
was that there started a long series of campaigns,
conducted by al-Muhallab against the Azarīkā, which led
to their being increasingly relegated to the periphery
of the Empire. For, in spite of their fierce resistance,
they were compelled to abandon Dūdjayl, retreat
to Kāzīrūn and finally to evacuate Fārs and with-
draw into Kūrmān. Having established their head-
quarters in the town of Dījūrt, they managed to
hold their positions for a few years until the diver-
gencies which arose in their army between Arabs and
Muslim led to a split. Whilst Ḥaṭkārī with the
Arabs was compelled to abandon the town and to
take refuge in Ṭabaristān, the Muslimīn continued
to hold Dījūrt under the command of Ābd Rabbih
al-Kabīr (in addition to whom the sources speak of an
Ābd Rabbih al-Ṣaḥḥīr, who is supposed to have
commanded a second group of dissidents). Whilst
al-Muhallab was easily able to deal with the Azarīkī
remains in Kūrmān and massacred them all, the
Kalībī general Sūfyan b. al-Abraḍ, who had joined
the governor of Ṭabaristān, caught up with Ḥaṭkārī
in the mountains of this region and inflicted a
decisive defeat on him. The brave condottiere, having fallen from his horse and been abandoned by his own men, was discovered and killed (76-79/669-670). His head was taken to Damascus to be shown to the Caliph. The remnants of the Azrīka who, under the leadership of ‘Abdī b. Hilāl, had barricaded themselves in at Sadjahwa, near Kūmis, after a prolonged siege were exterminated in an attempted sortie. In this manner the revolt, which of all the Khārijī disturbances was undoubtedly the most dangerous to the unity of the Muslim Empire and the most terrible by reason of its savage fanaticism, came to an end.

**Doctrines:** The principal religious theses which separate the Azrīka from the other Khārijītes are, according to al-‘Ash'arī: 1. The exclusion from Islam (barā’a) of the quietists (al-ḥadha’ī); 2. The examination (mi‘āna) of all who wished to join their army; 3. Regarding as unbelievers (taḥkīf) those Muslims who did not make the hīdāra to them; 4. The slaughter of the women and children of their adversaries (istīrāḍād); 5. The exclusion from Islam (barā’a) of those who recognised tabiyya either in word or deed: 6. The children of the mushrikin are in Hell, as are their parents. Further, according to al-Šahrastānī and al-Baghdādī: 7. Suppression of the stoning of adulterers which is not prescribed by the Kur‘ān; 8. The exclusion from Islam (isti‘rāḍ) of those who were Jews, Christians or Zoroastrians (evidently before Sīs mission; further, according to Ibn Hazm: 9. Amputation of the thief’s hand, which is not prescribed by the Kur‘ān; 10. Women during the menses must perform the prayers and observe ritual fasting; 11. Ba‘īf on killing those who acknowledged that they were Jews, Christians or Zoroastrians (evidently before Sīs mission).


*AZD* (by assimilation from Asd, both spellings are current), name of two ancient Arab tribal groupings in the highlands of ‘Asr (Azd Sarāt) and in ‘Umān (Azd ‘Umān), which united in Basra and Khorāsān in Islamic times. Hence the latter reports that the Azd were a tribe in Yemen, of whom part migrated to the north and part to the east, after the breach of the Mārib dam. One cannot, however, prove any basic relationship between these two tribes of the same name. In the genealogical system (al-‘Azd b. al-Ghawīb b. Nabd b. Mālik b. Zayd b. Kahlān b. Saba‘), where al-Azd is the surname of the tribal ancestor Dir‘i‘i‘rā‘b b. al-Ghawīb) there is a fusion not only of the Azd Sarāt and the Azd ‘Umān, but also of the Ghassān, Khuzā‘a, al-Aws and Khuza‘āi appear as part of the Azd in it. The name Azd, however, can only be applied to those tribes who derive from Naṣr b. a. ‘Azd (in Sarāt and ‘Umān), to the Bārīk and Shahr (Sarāt), derived from ‘Adī b. Ḥāriskh b. ‘Amr Muzayyikīyā, to the ‘Al‘ṭik and al-Ḥādir (‘Umān), derived from Sīs ‘Abbās b. ‘Amr Muzayyikīyā, and to the tribes of al-Hinw b. al-Azd, Ḥarrān b. ‘Abbās b. al-Azd, ‘Arman, ‘Alma‘ and Ḥadi‘n b. ‘Amr b. al-Azd (Sarāt).

The Azd Sarāt, who were well known as weavers, were largely settled, hence their homes remained essentially static. The tribes of Daws (Sulaym b. Fāhr, Ṭārīf b. Fāhm, Munhib b. Daws) and the Banū Māshīkah were the ones furthest north, parts of them as far as north-east of Tā‘if, most of them on the upper Wādī Dawkā. To the east and south-east of them were the tribes of Zahrān (Ṣalāmān, Kaddā, ‘Ubayd b. ‘Ubrā); further east, in the Sarāt Ghānīn were the Namir b. ‘Uğmān, al-Qaṣārī‘, Zārā, Abābīb, Karrān b. ‘Abdān and others. Their area reached from the upper Wādī Kanawān eastwards. These tribes were separated from their relatives living further east by the Kaḥṭām. To the east of the Kaḥṭām were the al-Beṣām (from Ḥwālà b. al-Hinw) in Turābā, the Banū Ṣāḥr (Banū Wālān) were to the north-west and the Karr b. ‘Abbāl to the south of Tabālā. Further south, still in the Sarāt al-Ḥādir, were the numerous branches of al-Ḥādir b. al-Hinw (the most important were the Banū Shahr with the Bal-Asmar) who were in the area round Ḥalābā in the north and reached as far as the areas south of the Wādī Ta‘āmān/Wādī
Bal-Asmar. Their main centres were: Ḥalabāb, al-
Ḳaḍrāb, Ṣuḥār, Ta’izz. Some few lived further
south still, towards the Wādī Bārīk to the west, enclosing the Ḫaṭḥām enclave
from the south. On the whole they lived in the
valleys, whilst the Ḫaṭḥām inhabited the highlands.
A few groups of the Azd (ʿAlma), ʿAlfā b. al-Hinw
and parts of the al-Ḥādir b. al-Huw) were settled as neighbours of the Khina on the coast
around Ḥatt. Originally, the Azd Sarāt
had been much further south, and only in compar-
tatively recent times did they penetrate to their later
region, after continuous battles against the Ḫaṭḥām. Remnants were still living under the Banū Maʿāfīr
in Islamic times, south-west of Ta’izz, and under the
Banū ʿAwd in the Daḥṣūna. The frequent term
Ṣanāʿa remains obscure. As the name appears as a
war-cry in a poem by the poet Ḥadījīz b. ʿAwf, one
may suppose that it is a genealogical rather than a
topic term. The current explanation (Ṣanāʿa
b. al-ʿAzd) is obviously erroneous; which individual
tribes belonged to the ʿṢanāʿa can no longer be ascertained.

The Azd ʿUmān consisted of those tribes which
descended from Mālik b. Fahm in genealogy (Huna ʿAwf)
Farāḥb, Ḥudaydān, Nawā, Muʿād, Djarāmī, ʿUqā a,
Kasāmūn, Sulaymī, ʿAshākīr), some descended from Naṣr b. Zahrān (Yaḥmād, Ḥudaydān, ʿAwf)
and those descended from ʿImrān b. ʿAmr Muʿāk-kiyā, that is, the al-ʿAtik and al-Ḥādir b. ʿImrān
(it is probable that the link with ʿImrān, which
made them brother tribes of the Anṣār, was postu-
lated in honour of the Muhallabids; the true link
was preserved in the genealogy al-ʿAtik b. al-ʿAzd
b. ʿImrān). There is little information concerning the
sites on which the individual tribes lived. The
Maʿ āwil were in and around Ṣuḥār; the Yaḥmād and
the Ḥunā on the neighbouring coastal areas. The
Humaym (from Maʿ n b. Mālik b. Fahm) were in
Nazwā; al-ʿAtik in Dābā and al-Ḥādir nearby;
the Ḥudaydān were in the hinterland of the Pirate
Coast. In between, there were settlements parti-
cularly the Sāmā b. Luʿayy, who were later collec-
tively known as the Nīzār. The Banū Djuḍayd (from
ʿAshākīr) advanced in Islamic times to the west as
far as Zufār Ḥadrāmawt, where they captured the sea-port of Raysūt after battles against the Mahra.
Even in pre-Islamic times, parts of the Azd ʿUmān,
such as the Salimā b. Mālik b. Fahm, migrated to the
islands in the Persian Gulf and to Kirman. As
fishermen, sea-farers and merchants, the Azd ʿUmān
did not enjoy a good reputation among the other
Arabs. The term Muṣūn, occasionally applied to
them, seems to have been a nickname. It may be
supposed that they immigrated from the north and
imposed themselves on the previously settled non-
Arab inhabitants. The tradition which identifies them with the Asad (2), (g.,q.) mentioned in inscrip-
tions, and which makes them the allies of the Tānūk, is
erroneous.

Little is known of the Azd Sarāt in pre-Islamic
times, as there are hardly any poetic writings; the
only well-known poet was Ḥadījīz b. ʿAwf (Banū ʿAlāmān).
There is mention of battles against Ḫaṭḥām
and Khina, and fights by some tribes against the
powerful clan of the Al ʿAtifīt of the Wādī Ḥanaw-
ānā) at the beginning of the 7th century. Members
of that clan are said to have been the keepers of the
shrine of Manāṭ in Kudayd. It is possible that the
name ʿAtifīt in the genealogical lists of Medina from
came that quarter. The following are mentioned as
deities of the Azd Sarāt: Dhu-ʿAlām, Ṣināʿa, Dhu-ʿAlāyā
(shrine in Tabālāh), Dhu-ʿAbd b. Kaftām and ʿAṭīm. Still
less is known of the early history of the Azd ʿUmān.
Apart from mythical fights against Persians and Mahra, there is mention of one against the ʿAbd al-
Kays. Bāḍiʾ/Nādīir is mentioned as their deity.

The Azd Sarāt accepted Islam in 10/631. Small
risings during the ṭiḍda were quickly put down in
11/632 by ʿUmmān b. ʿAbd-Asmāʾ, the governor of Taʿizz. As early as 13/634, there was a short-lived
alliance which ʿUmmān sent to the Euphrates.
Some Azd Sarāt were amongst the first settlers in
Basra and Kufr and some went to Egypt. On the
whole, however, there was little emigration. Islam
had already entered ʿUmān a few years before. This
was due to a difficult situation into which the
brothers ʿAbayd and ʿAbd—heads of the ruling
group, the al-Djuḍaydā (from Banū Maʿ āwil in Ṣuḥār)—had got themselves in relation to ʿAtik b.
and other tribes of the inland regions under the
leadership of ʿAmīr b. Mālik al-ʿAtikī. ʿAmmān b. ʿAb-
As was sent to Ṣuḥār in the year 8/629, and with
his assistance, the tribes managed to recover their
power completely. ʿAtikī tried his luck once
more during the ṭiḍda and ʿAbd had to flee, but in
the year 12/635 the rising was finally put down by ʿIrān b. ʿAbd ʿAṭīlāḥ. The Banū ʿDjuḍaydā
remained practically completely rulers in Ṣuḥār for
many years. ʿAbbād b. ʿAbd b. al-Djuḍaydā took
over the rule in the time of ʿUmānā. He was killed
in battle against the Khawārīdī of the Yamānā in
67/686. His sons Saʿīd and Sulaymān succeeded him. It was not until the time of al-Ḥādirījīdī that the
two brothers could finally be ousted from Ṣuḥār, and
the territory re-incorporated. A great number of Azd ʿUmān had emigrated to Basra in 60/659–67. In the process, some of them remained in
eastern Arabia, where an Azd emirate was founded
in Żārā in the 3rd/9th century. They united them-
sew themselves with the Azd Sarāt who were already settled in Basra, made an alliance with the ʿAbdī in
and thereby became the opponents of the Tamīn. As early as 39/659, the Azd Sarāt of Basra had protected the
governor Ziyād b. Abīb against the Tamīn. Simi-
larly, ʿAbayd Allāh b. Ziyād got assistance from the
Azd, when, after the death of Yazīd I (64/668) the
Tamīn rose against him. The subsequent tribal
warfare, in the course of which Masʿūd b. ʿAmīr al-
ʿAtikī, the leader of the united Azd and ʿAbdī was
killed, with be settled by ʿAbd aḥāf, the leader of
the Tamīn. The enmity, however, remained, and
spread to Khurāsan, especially when the Azd there
(always in league with the ʿAbdī) became the leading
tribes among the Muhallabīdīs after 78/697. They
were greatly offended at the removal of the Muhallabīdīs
and were largely responsible for the events which
led to the defeat and death of Kuṭayba b. Muslim in
66/675. The Azd remained the leading group up to
the beginning of the reign of Yazīd II in 107/720.

The subsequent systematic extermination of the
Muhallabīdīs brought for them a time of subjugation
by Kyṣīdī governors. Their enmity against these
contributed greatly to the fall of the ʿUmayyādīs.
During the troubled times at the end of the reign
of the ʿUmayyādīs, the Azd—apart from a few short-lived alliances—remained in opposition to the
governor Naṣr b. Sayyūk, a fact which considerably
facilitated the advance of Abū Muslim. In Basra
too, the Azd followed the ʿAbbāsīdīs, having risen
against ʿUmayyādī rule and having been beaten by
Tamīn and Syrian troops. ʿAbdī teaching, brought
over from Basra, began to be accepted in 'Uman atba out the same time. In 132/749, al-Djidzilanda b. Mas'ud, a member of the old ruling house of the Banu 'Djidzilanda, was elected the first Imám. He was killed in 134/751, fighting against Kházím b. Khuzyáma, general of Abu 'l-Abbâs. The subsequent years were very troubled ones for the country. Nominally, it was under an Abbâsid governor, but there were constant battles, usually between the Banu 'Djidzilanda—who were trying to re-establish their former rule—and the Ibâd. It was not until 177/793 that the latter gained the upper hand and elected a new, rightful Imám. Henceforth, Nazwa became the seat of the Ibâdi Imáms, who were, almost without exception, of the Ya'izí' tribe. After 230/844 troubles broke out again. In addition to the activities of the Banu 'Djidzilanda, there was tribal warfare between the Azd and the Nizar. Azd b. Azzan b. Azzan b. Tamîl fell in 288/893, fighting against Muhammad b. Nûr, the Abbâsid governor of Bahrain. After 288/893, there were again Ibâdi Imáms in Nazwa, but their powers remained limited.


AL-AZDI, ABU ZAKARIYYA *YAZID B. MUH. B.

Azimabad (Patna) on the request of Rayi posed at

Azerbajxân [see ARZHAVJAN].

AZER mistakes a woman's death.

AZEMMUR [see AZAMMUR].

AZERBAYDJAN [see AZAFARI].

AZAFARI, MUHAMMAD ZAMIR AL-DIN MIRZA 'ALI BAQIR BAHADUR GÜRÜĞI, a lineal descendant of Arawangzî and a grandson of 'Ifftâr Arâ Begum (daughter of Muhammad Mu'azza al-Din Pâghîb, i.e. Djalâhdâr Shâh), son of Shâh 'Ali (Bahâdur Shâh I), was born in the Red Fort at Delhi in 1172/1758 and educated within the fort. Like other princes of the line of Timur, Azerfârî was in receipt of an allowance from the East India Company. Azerfârî decided in 1202/1789 to escape from the fort. Passing through Dîjâpur and Dîjodhpûr, Azerfârî reached Lucknow where he was received with open arms by Aşaf al-Dawla, the ruler of Awadh. For seven years he stayed there and then left for Patna en route to Maksûdâbâd, (an old name for Murshidâbâd [q.v.]) where he arrived in 1211/1797. After a stay of some ten years he left for Madras, where he stayed until his death in 1234/1818. Azerfârî was polyglot and spoke Arabic, Persian, Turkish and Urdu fluently; during the closing years of his life he also learned a little English. He was well-versed in different sciences such as medicine, astrology, prosody, geomancy and metrics, but was more attracted by poetry. In addition to an Urdu dâstân he left behind a large collection of verses in Persian and Turkish. These Persian and Turkish collections as well as some of his works enumerated at the end of his memoirs (a Câghatay grammar, Tenkari Târ—a Turkish-Hindi compilation) are, however, lost.

His chief work is the Wâbûtâdi Azerfârî (MS Berlin 496, Rieu, iii, 1051 b; Madras, i, 450, 451) commenced in Mursûhidâbâd in 1211/1797 and completed at Madras in 1221/1806. It is an account of his wanderings and personal experiences in addition to being a valuable historical sketch of the ephemeral rise of Ghulâm Kâdir Rohilla [q.v.], who captured Delhi in 1203/1788 and blinded the Emperor Shâh 'Ali I. This work is also of great geographical value.

At the end of his above-noted memoirs Azerfârî mentions 7 of his works, in addition to an earlier one: (i) Lughât-i Turkî-î Caghdâmi (compiled during his stay in Lucknow); (ii) A Persian translation in rhymed prose of 'Ali Shâr Nawât's [q.v.] Turkish work Mâbâb al-Kulub; (iii) Nisâb-i Turkî, (in verse); (iv) Tenkari Târ, a Turkish-Hindi compilation on the lines of Khâkî-kâbî, erroneously ascribed to Amâr Khusrâw; (v) A Persian metrical translation, from Arabic, of the Risûla-i Kabriyya, a supposed treatise by Hippocrates on the signs of approaching death; (vi) Nûshka-i Sânhât, detailing his experiences and tribulations. It contains 109 anecdotes; (vii) A metrical grammar of Câghatay Turkish (composed at 'Azimâbâd (Patna) on the request of Râyî Tikà Râm, a hereditary bakhshî [q.v.] of his family; (viii) Wâbudî al-Mubâdî. **Bibliography:** Muh. Ghawth Khan, Subb-i Watan, Madras 1258/1842, 35; García de Tasay, Hist. de la litt. Hindoue et Hindoustanie, Paris 1870, i, 265; Elliot and Dowson, History of India as told by its own Historians, viii, 234; A. Sprenger, Oudh. Cat. 208; Berlin Pers. Cat. No. 496; Sabâb al-Din 'Abd al-Rahmân, Basm-i Timûriyya (in Urdu), A'tâmârâh 1948, 426-7; Storey 642-3, 1322; OCM (Lahore), xi/4 (Aug. 1935), 41-8; Wâbidî-i Azerfârî, (Urdu trans. 'Abd al-Sattâq), Madras 1937, 15, 98. (A. S. Bâzârî Ansârî)

AL-AZHAR [AL-DJIZM] AL-AZHAR. This great mosque, the 'brilliant one' (a possible allusion to Fatîma al-Zahrâ', although no ancient document
confirms this) is one of the principal mosques of present-day Cairo. This seat of learning, obviously Isma'ili from the time of its Fatimid foundation (4th/10th century), whose light was dimmed by the reaction under the Sunni Ayyubids, regained all its activity—Sunni from now on—during the reign of Sultan Baybars. Its influence is due on the one hand to the geographical and political position which Cairo occupies in the Muslim world (especially since the downfall of the Bagdad 'Abbásids), attracting scholars and students and accommodating many Maghribi pilgrims on their way; on the other hand it is due to the situation of this capacious mosque itself in that quarter which was up to the 19th century the epicentre of the town of Cairo. One institution of learning among many others in the Mamlûk era, it benefited from the almost complete disappearance of all the Cairo colleges under Ottoman domination, and became the only stronghold in the capital where the study of the Arabic language and religious learning could be maintained. From the 18th century, in spite of the decadence of its intellectual methods, its organisation, becoming consolidated, gained for it the dignity of a harmonious whole, at once a school and a university; and it can be considered from that time as the principal religious university of the Islamic world. In the 20th century, al-Azhar, outgrowing the framework of its mosque, began to acquire a whole network of establishments of Islamic education. With its faculties in Cairo of university status, and with the various primary and secondary institutions in Egypt which are directly connected with it, its strength in 1933 was a total of 30,000 pupils and students, 4,500 of whom were foreigners. Some institutions thus functioned, and took to himself the privilege of the kubãba; the Friday prayers in al-Khùrìra took place only in the al-Hâkîmi mosque. This mosque had been restored to Muslim worship by Sâlâh al-Dîn after having been used by the Franks as a church. Al-Azhar continued to exist, although on the decline ('Abd al-Latif al-Baghdadi taught medicine there at 567/1171-2). Sâlâh al-Dîn had certain ornaments torn down (silver band from the minaret which was at a dangerous angle was demolished at the same time), but the buildings were very neglected. With the Mamlûk sultans the situation changed. The amir 'Izz al-Dîn Aydimur al-Hillî, residing in the neighbourhood, was so distressed by the dilapidation of al-Azhar that he financed some works with the help of sultan al-Zahir Baybars, who amongst other things permitted the kubãba to be read again in 665/1266 (Corp. Insr. Arab. Egypt., i, no. 128). Some wahfîs were allocated to provide for Sunni teachers. Once again vigorous life returned to it, never to cease up to the present day. Badly damaged (sabâta) by the well-known and disastrous earthquake of 702/1302-3, it was restored by the amir Salâr. Marble made its appearance, discreetly, in the undated repairs of the minaret (beginning of the 14th century), though it was used with magnificent effect in the madrasas of the three small new erections of fine stone built against the exterior of the mosque, which were later to be incorporated with it: the madrasa of the amir Tâybars, founded in 709/1309 to the right of the west door; that of the amir Akhûgâhid 'Abd al-Wâhid in 733/1335 to the left of this door; and the charming madrasa founded by the eunuch Djawhar al-Kâfûkâbî, who was buried here in 844/1440, at the eastern corner of the mosque. In 725/1325 some constructions are recorded, and about 761/1360 the makhtâras were rebuilt, some improvements were made, funds for feeding the poor and for teaching were established, e.g., a sabîl for water, and teaching the Qur'an by new minarets, which was at a dangerous angle was demolished and then rebuilt on three occasions for the same reason (800, 817, 827/1397-9, 1414-5, 1423-4). On this last date, a cistern (zâkîrî) with a wash-basin (mi'da) was built in the middle of the mosque, and an unsuccessful attempt was made to
establish four trees in the courtyard. The sultan Sytbay was responsible for much work: for the west door, which he demolished, he substituted an elegant doorway with minaret attached (873/1469; Corp. Insr. Arab. i, no. 21), had a host of little dwellings, which were excrescences on the terraces, cleared away (881/1476), and ordered a general restoration (901/1496). Kânsîh al-Ghîrîl bestowed on al-Azhar another minaret, thanks to which it can today be recognised from afar among the assembly of minarets in Cairo (915/1509). Funds for teaching continued during this period. At the time of the Ottoman conquest the sultan Selîm looked with favour on al-Azhar. The 18th century was, in the history of al-Azhar, as important as the Fâtimid era; possessing from that time on the monopoly of religious studies in Egypt, the mosque was considerably enlarged. A chapel for the blind (Zâwiya al-‘Umâyän) was built by ‘Uthmân Katkhûdâ al-Kazâdîgil (Kasîd Oghîlî), who died in 1149/1736. But its greatest benefactor was ʿAbd al-Rahmân Katkhûdâ or Kîhya (died 1190/1776, buried in the mosque), who caused the following constructions, which lack the beauty of the ancient works, to be carried out: demolition of the ṣâhib wall of the prayer-hall except for the original mihrâb which remains, the addition at the rear of four new bays of stone arches on slightly raised ground, a new mihrâb, a minbar, his tomb, a cistern, and a Kurzânîc school for children. Victuals and gifts in kind were provided for poor students. A new enclosure, with doorway, brought in on the west the two madrasas of Taybars and Akbûgâhî, whose façades were rebuilt (1157/1743).

The Azharîs, like students of all countries, came out into the streets from time to time. Al-Dîjabarti indicates that there were some troubles in the quarter, in which they took part. He makes mention of the rising against the French under Bonaparte who were occupying Cairo (10 Dîjmâdâ I 1213/20 October 1798); the immediate repression found in al-Azhar and its neighbourhood the last bastion of resistance. The mosque suffered from the final bombardment, and was profaned by the troops. The restoration of autonomous rule, under Muhammad ʿAll, was scarcely favourable to al-Azhar, whose wahfîs were misused. Later the Khedives and then the kings of Egypt became its benefactors, reserving to themselves the upper hand in its affairs, and hoping in return for the tractability of its shâhkhs, a hope which was generally realised except in a few cases of proud and sudden boldness which even today form a topic of conversation. ʿAll Pasha Mubârâk, and for the modern period Van Berchem and Fluri, are collected with references in Creswell, The Muslim Architecture of Egypt, i, Oxford 1952, 36-64, with plates and plan. See also Hauteceur and Wiet, Les mosquées du Caire, Paris 1932, 2 vols; Hasan ʿAbd al-Wahhâb, Târîkh al-Masâjidîd al-Athâriyya, i, Cairo 1946. See also EI, article Ḥashar § I.

II. Al-Azhar as a sanctuary and house of the people. Like all mosques, al-Azhar had this dual function. The regular prayers were said here, as well as those on exceptional occasions. Its history from this point of view is linked with that of Egypt: people collected here in times of catastrophe (such as epidemic, famine, or war) to call upon God, and to hear special readings from the Kurān or from the Bulğârî; it was also a place of refuge for fugitives (see Ibn Ilyâs, ii, 177, 264, iii, 106, 132, 167). In modern times also, some events of national significance have been organised there. The spaciousness of its buildings, and the constant presence of students, were appropriate for large meetings, e.g., that of 1919 (see Madâni Kitâb al-Azhâr, xxvii, 306-400). Here they extorted the Muḥajirîn or combatants during the Palestine war (1948), and at the time of the guerilla warfare against the British in the Suez Canal in 1951-2. Al-Azhar is, moreover, a 'people's house' for those poor men who, since its...
foundation, have found there either a temporary or a permanent shelter: many have spent the night there, as al-Makrī points out with regard to the intervention of the amīr Sudūb, nāṣir al-azhar, who in 818/1415-6 wished to free the mosque of all who were dwelling therein, whether students or otherwise. His intervention was the occasion for pillage, and opinion turned against him. Some inhabitants of Cairo, even the well-to-do, would pass the night here, specially in Ramaḍān, at the beginning of the 15th century (Khitat, iv, 54-5). At the present time, among the poor pilgrims coming from as far as North Africa and the Atlas Mountains (1400 in 1952), many stay at al-Azhar during the month of Ramaḍān before setting off for the Hīdāz. Many Azhari students give them moral and material help (in the middle ages the Maghribi pilgrims camped at Ibn Tulun—Khitat, iv, 40). Countless āifts have been made by rich Muslims at all times for the poor of al-azhar, in the middle ages al-Azhar was open to āifts also, although its tendencies were predominantly juridical. Umar b. al-Fārābī chose to live there towards the end of his life (Ibn Iyās, i, 82, 3). One text mentions the dhikr which took place there (Khitat, iv, 54). Akhūdža’s madrasa is also said to have had a permanent group of āifts (ibid., iv, 225).

The mosque of al-Azhar was above all a ‘people’s house’ for the teachers and the pupils whom it housed under its arcades, and its history here again is inseparable from that of Islamic teaching in Egypt (see Ibrāhīm Salāmā, L’enseignement islamique en Égypte, Cairo 1939). Teachers found within it peace and adequate quarters; sometimes, however, their position was not official: at times we hear of passing scholars supported by a sovereign during their stay. There were in the course of time schools for orphans. In 784/1382-3 a decree of Sultan ʿAbd al-Malik al-Būyānī, māʾīlī law at al-Azhar, and dictated the Mukhtasar, a work of his father’s (Khitat, iv, 156; Brockelmann, Sl, 325). After having been named waṣāṭ, Ya‘kūb b. Killis held in his own home meetings of litérateurs, poets, jurists and men of the kāhad (theologians), to whom he gave a pension, and who thereafter taught the Ḥadīth doctrine in the mosque of ‘Amr. Al-Azhar profited by this trend. In 378/988-9 al-ʿAzīz assigned to 35 jurists a house near to al-Azhar, with provision for their support. On Fridays, between midday and the asr prayers, they held meetings, and their chief, Abū Yaʿkūb Kāḍī al-Khandaḵ, was responsible for the teaching. (Khitat, iv, 49; al-Kāshāshbāndī, III, 507). Al-Makrī, writing of the al-Anwar (al-Ḥākim), notes only recently inaugurated, notes that in Ramaḍān 380/990-9 groups of listeners followed courses there given by the teachers who instructed in the mosque of Cairo, that is to say, al-Azhar (Khitat, iv, 55), which implies that it must have always had a stable organisation. It is known, moreover, that Ibn al-Haytham elected to live at al-Azhar (Ibn Abl Usayfiʿa, ii, 90-91). But the remarkable effort of the Fāṭimid rulers in both sacred and secular culture is specially evident in the Dār al-hikma founded by al-Ḥākim in 395/1005, which became the real cultural centre of Cairo at this period (Khitat, iv, 158). Under the Ayyūbids the Šīʿite teaching was swept away. Al-Azhar had always opened its doors to scholars (e.g., for Abd al-Lāṭif al-Baghdādī), but it was supplanted by the official Sunnite madrasas recently created. Under the Mamlūks al-Azhar regained its position.

In 665/1266 the amīr Bīlāk al-Khāzīndār installed a vast maṭṣāra and provided it with a fund in order that a group (gīmāṣa) of jurists might teach Šīʿī law there. He appointed a teacher of hadith and spiritual doctrine (ḥādīth), seven people to ‘read’ the Qurʿān, and a tutor (muḍārīz) (Khitat, iv, 52). In 761/1359-60 a course of Hanafi law was started, at the same time as a Qurʿānic school for orphans. In 784/1382-3 a decree of Sultan Ṣūlṭān Bārkūk provided that students should inherit their property of those of their friends who died without heir (see Tritton, Education 123, for a discussion of arrangements of this kind). Al-Makrī, on the events of 818/1415-6, mentions 750 provincial or foreign inhabitants, ranging from Maghribis to Persians, as residing in the mosque, grouped according to strict riwāāt. They read the Qurʿān and studied it. They devoted themselves to law (fikr), to tradition (ḥadith), to commentaries on the Qurʿān, to grammar (naww), to meetings devoted to preaching and to dhikr (Khitat, iv, 53-4). It is often said nowadays that al-Azhar was always the Egyptian Muslim university excellence; in fact, in the Cairo of the Mamlūks, bursting with life, it was an important centre of learning, but a centre among many others (see Masqīdī). Al-Makrī, writing in the 15th century, makes mention of more than 70 madrasas in Cairo (Khitat, iv, 191-258). He points out the intellectual activity within the mosques: in that of ‘Amr, before the great plague of 749/1348, he mentions forty-odd courses or ṣalāha (ibid., iv, 227); in that of Ibn Tulun, at the beginning of the 14th century, there were all the wāḥis maintaining what could be described as chains of learning, and others again for the maintenance of certain categories of students.

III. Teaching in the mediaeval and post-mediaeval periods. Information on the situation in early times is both fragmentary and incomplete. Under the Fāṭimid s in 365/975 the great official proprietor of his arrival in Cairo in 784/1383, taught at al-Azhar, which he later left in order to teach elsewhere (Ibn Khaldūn, Tawrīḥ, 248). The courses in the four schools and a course in medicine (ibid., iv, 40-1); in that of al-Ḥakīm, in the same period, law courses in the four schools (ibid., iv, 57). There was moreover still ṣūfī teaching in the convents or khānsūqās. Ibn Khaldūn, for example, from the time of his arrival in Cairo in 784/1383, taught at al-Azhar, which he later left in order to teach elsewhere (Ibn Khaldūn, Tawrīḥ, 248). The courses in the four schools were of more than 2000 works belonging to the fikhrī doctrine in the mosque of ‘Amr. Al-Azhar profited by this trend. In 378/988-9 al-ʿAzīz assigned to 35 jurists a house near to al-Azhar, with provision for their support. On Fridays, between midday and the asr prayers, they held meetings, and their chief, Abū Yaʿkūb Kāḍī al-Khandaḵ, was responsible for the teaching. (Khitat, iv, 49; al-Kāshāshbāndī, III, 507). Al-Makrī, writing of the al-Anwar (al-Ḥākim), notes only recently inaugurated, notes that in Ramaḍān 380/990-9 groups of listeners followed courses there given by the teachers who instructed in the mosque of Cairo, that is to say, al-Azhar (Khitat, iv, 55), which implies that it must have always had a stable organisation. It is known, moreover, that Ibn al-Haytham elected to live at al-Azhar (Ibn Abl Usayfiʿa, ii, 90-91). But the remarkable effort of the Fāṭimid rulers in both sacred and secular culture is specially evident in the Dār al-hikma founded by al-Ḥākim in 395/1005, which became the real cultural centre of Cairo at this period (Khitat, iv, 158). Under the Ayyūbids the Šīʿite teaching was swept away. Al-Azhar had always opened its doors to scholars (e.g., for ‘Abd al-Lāṭif al-Baghdādī), but it was supplanted by the official Sunnite madrasas recently created. Under the Mamlūks al-Azhar regained its position.
and sub-commentaries on these glosses (kalāhir). All the energy of the students was absorbed by the effort of memory necessary to retain by heart this complicated learning, which was presented with no pedagogical method whatever. General culture was non-existent. Arithmetical studies were limited to that elementary technique necessary for apportioning an inheritance, and astronomy to that which allowed the times for prayer, or the beginning of the lunar months (al-nilā), to be determined. But one should not judge the mediaeval intellectual activity of Cairo by this period of post-mediaeval decadence.

In the middle ages, the office of superintendent (nādir) of al-Azhar was held by a person of high rank. Moreover, each riwaḍ, a group analogous to the 'nations' of the mediaeval universities of Europe, as well as each faculty, had its own head (shaykh, naḥḥib). From Ottoman times al-Azhar had its rector (shaykh al-Azhar), who remained in office until his resignation, dismissal or death. The shaykhāt of the different departments were subordinate to him, and he was directly responsible to the government. Al-Djabarti gives us a partial roll of these from the beginning of the 18th century (see § V, below).

Al Paşa Mubarak has described (Khitat Di., iv, 26-30) life at al-Azhar as it was in 1875 at the dawn of the modern reforms. This picture gives an idea of the ancient customs: the students were grouped in a circle (kalba, literally 'circle'), extended to mean 'course', seated on the mats (ḥusra) of the mosque around the teacher, who himself was seated Turkish-fashion on a low wide armchair placed at the foot of a pillar, each pillar having its own accredited holder and being, moreover, up to 1872 the undisputed owner of part of the property of the juridical school. Morning lectures were reserved for the most important subjects, that is to say successively taṣfir, hadith, fiqh, then at noon the Arabic language; other subjects were kept over for the afternoon. At the end of each class the students kissed the hand of their teacher. The Azharīs lived meagrely on the regular issues of food (qiṣrīyāt), supplemented by that which came from his family and which would often work in order to earn a little more, by giving readings from the Qur'ān, copying manuscripts, etc. He lived in the mosque or in the town. There was no examination at the end of the course of study. Many of the students were well advanced in years. Those who left al-Azhar obtained an idāza or licence to teach; this was a certificate given by the teacher under whom the student had followed courses, testifying to the student's diligence and proficiency. Teacher-pupil relationships had a rather patriarchal aspect, disturbed only by rather rare rebellions. Quarrels between rival cliques of students were more frequent.

A proctor (qiṣā), was responsible for the administration of the rules, for the care of the books, and for distributing the provisions in kind; he had a staff of some size under his command. In 1293/1876 the distribution of the 361 teachers and 10,780 students according to schools was: Shafi'īs: 147 teachers, 5,651 students; Mālikīs: 99 teachers, 3,826 students; Hanafis: 76 teachers, 1,278 students. The Ḥanbalis were poorly represented: 3 teachers, 25 students. There were in addition some non-registered students. The students were grouped into 15 kāiras and 38 riwdīs (Khitat Di., iv, 26). There were numerous foreign students (see list of riwdīs, E1, s.v. Aṣhār, § II, VI). The vacation began in the month of Raqiţ and ended in mid-Shawwal; there was in addition the twenty days leave for the great Bayrām (festival of sacrifices), the same for the
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consist of three *ulamā* from al-Azhar and two official *ulamā* from the government; it fixed the minimum age for the admission of pupils at 15; declared that conditions of admission were to be able to read and write, and to know half the Kurān by heart; it reorganised the programmes, forbade the teaching of glosses to new pupils and restricted it for the older ones. Two examinations led, either after a minimum of 8 years study, to the diploma of *ahliyya*, or after 12 years, to the diploma of *šālimyya* (with three honours classes). Modern subjects were introduced, either obligatory (such as elements of arithmetic, algebra) or optional (such as the history of Islām, composition, elements of geography, etc.).

The length of the vacations (summer, Ramadān, festival of sacrifices) was fixed. A medical officer was appointed to be in charge of health and hygiene. A list of prescribed texts for the syllabus was drawn up. The implementation of this law came up against fierce resistance, which was likewise expressed in the press.

—In 1903 came the foundation of the institute of Alexandria, affiliated to al-Azhar.—In Muḥarram 1325/Feb.-March 1907 came a law instituting the ḥādis' school in the orbit of al-Azhar.—The law of 2 Saḥīr 1326/6 March 1908 set out the studies in three standards, primary, secondary and higher, each of four years’ duration, with a certificate given after each final examination. The optional subjects of 1896 were made compulsory. This law was regarded as a blow to the autonomy of al-Azhar, and provoked an outcry. There was a serious student revolt in Cairo, and in Ṭanṭā (quickly put down), but nowhere else. It was decided to apply this law only gradually.—In December 1908 came the foundation of the Free University of Cairo, the embryo of the four modern faculties, and of the western type. This was the origin of a competition that was painful for al-Azhar.—The law of the 14 Džumādā I 1329/13 May 1911 harked back to that of 1908: it laid down that the rector was to be nominated by the Khedive, enlarged the advisory council (the rector, the *shaykhās* of the four schools, the director-general of the *msāfah*, and three members nominated by the decision of the council of ministers), created the tribunal of the 30 chief *ulamā* who were incumbents of the 30 special chairs, from among whom the rector was to be elected. In the conditions of entry for pupils, the age limit was from 10-17 years; other provisions were as in 1866. Modern studies were slightly augmented, etc. This law was still the subject of opposition. One interesting problem arose, in that the graduates of the dār al-*ulum* and of the school of the ḥādis' obtained situations more easily than the Azharis, and earned more.—In 1921 the conditions for entry required the knowledge of the whole of the Kurān, no longer just half.—In the law of 13 Muḥarram 1342/26 August 1923 the highest standard was renamed 'specialisation' (*taβabsus*) and comprised many branches. The school of the ḥādis, which since 1907 had been banded about between different ministries, was at last affiliated to al-Azhar and abolished as such, becoming simply a branch of specialisation (1923-5). In this period several missions from al-Azhar were sent to study in Europe before returning to teach at al-Azhar.—In 1925 the State University of Cairo (Futūd al-Awlia' University) replaced the Free University.—A law of the 24 Džumādā II 1349/16 November 1930 laid down that the Tribunal of the chief *ulamā* was competent to judge whether any *šālim* was guilty of any act not in conformity with his dignity. It enlarged the advisory council of al-Azhar (Grand muftī; the *shaykhs* of the three faculties instead of the *shaykhs* of the four schools, etc.), and stipulated that students should be under 16 years of age on admission (18 in the case of foreigners, who were exempted from knowing the whole Kurān by heart). The primary course was 4 years, the secondary 5 years, the higher 4 years, in one of the three faculties constituted by this law (Islamic law or *shari'a*, theology or *usul al-din*, the Arabic language or *lugha al-arabiyah*), and in appropriate cases more specialisation or *taβabsus*, in those faculties which existed only in Cairo, was allowed. The programme of the higher standard (*šālimyya*) was completed by the special mention of those who had attained distinction in their specialist studies, for example the grade of *usālīd* in such and such a subject, etc. A ‘general section’ was created for those unable to take the normal courses. The vacations were to be fixed each year.—The law of the 3 Muḥarram 1355/26 March 1936, still in force in 1955, provided that the age of entry be from 12-16 years; duration of specialisation, 2 years. The regulations concerning the subjects to be taught (these were to be still more detailed in the individual syllabuses printed later) make this law the real charter of present-day teaching. Apart from the traditional subjects, the following should be noted: English or French language (compulsory for the *usul al-din* faculty, optional for the two others); rudiments of philosophy, history of philosophy, etc., for the *usul al-din* and *lugha al-arabiyah* faculties; common international law, and comparative law, in the *shari'a* faculty. Certain branches of *taβabsus* had in addition a compulsory Oriental language (section of *waṣīya wa rūhādi*), or the elements of Hebrew and Syriac (sections of *ba'idha* and *balidha*), the history of religions, etc. The normal programme (*nisām*) of the secondary course had as modern subjects the rudiments of logic and the art of rhetoric, of medicine (with the use of the microscope), of chemistry, zoology, botany, history and geography. The primary course comprised history, geography, arithmetic, algebra (up to simple equations with one unknown), and hygiene. The *al-bu*warzīth, reserved for foreigners who were unable to follow the normal courses, comprised 12 years’ study divided into three courses of four years, with an easier syllabus. Of modern subjects they had only arithmetic, history, geography and logic. It must not be forgotten that all these modern subjects take a secondary place in the teaching, and that little time is given to them.—In 1945 the dār al-*ulum* was affiliated to the University of Cairo, with the status of Faculty. In 1952 the dār al-*ulum* ceased to be reserved for Azharis, and admitted candidates coming from Government schools. A women's section was opened in 1954.—About 1954 there was a slight alteration of the programmes at al-Azhar; a foreign language became compulsory in the faculty of *lugha al-arabiyah*. The retirement age for teachers was fixed at 65; this applied equally to the chief *ulamā*, who previously had been appointed for life.—In 1955 came the abolition of the *shari'a* tribunals, thus doing away with the chief outlet for the Azharis of the *shari'a* faculty. There was talk of opening a women's section at al-Azhar; by the end of 1957, everything was ready, only budgetary credit was lacking for the law. In 1953, the faculties comprised respectively 1,603 *shari'a* students, 1,655 for *lugha al-arabiyah*, 707 for *usul al-din*. The institutes had 12,598 primary students, 6,559 secondary, and 3,703 in the attached
sections; the free institutes had 2,458. At the end of 1955 there were in Egypt some ... man of character, admired by the Egyptians, had had in the law school an influence on his disciples, who played an im-

In 1953 the number of foreign students was as follows: Sudan, 2,634; Nigeria, Gold Coast, Senegal 141; Abyssinia, Eritrea, Somaliland, Zanzibar, 309; French Sudan, 57; Uganda and South Africa, 37; India and Pakistan, 46; China, 8; Java and Sumatra, 60; Afghanistan, 15; Kuwait, 6; Iraq, Bahrayn, Iran (rivâd al-'Abbâd) 21; Turkey, Albania, Yugo-

Until the Law no. 15 of 1927 was promulgated, al-Azhar was directly responsible to the King. The rectorship was a coveted post with regard to the biographical notice of a third party, that al-Djabarti mentions the name of a rector, the earliest that is known to us, 1. Muḥ. b. 'Abd Allâh al-Khirshî, d. 1101/1690; 2, Muḥ. al-Nasrî, d. 1120; 3, 'Abd al-Bâqî al-Qašînî, whose nomination was the occasion of a battle, and some firing, within the mosque; 4, Muḥ. Shânân, one of the richest men of his time, d. 1133; 5, Ibrâhîm b. Muḥ. al-Fayyûmî, d. 1137; 6, 'Abd Allâh al-Qâhârî, poet and wit, frequented and defended the Sâlihî, d. 1177; 7, Muḥ. sâlim al-Hînâwî al-Khalwâtî, Şûfî and jurist, author of glosses, d. 1181, perhaps poisoned by the amîrs; his tomb became an object of veneration (Brockelmann, II, 323; S II, 445); 8, 'Abd al-Ra'ūf al-Sâdjînî, d. 1182; 9, Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Munîm al-Damanhûrî, d. 1192; 10, 'Abd al-Rahmân al-

The well-organised library of the mosque contains upward of 20,000 manuscripts, and has a printed catalogue. The libraries of some rivâds have interesting manuscripts, but still uncatalogued in 1955. Each establishment has in addition a library for its students. Since 1349/1930 al-Azhar has had its monthly review, the official organ of its teachers, and whose title Nûr al-Islâm was changed to Madjillat al-Azhar at the end of its sixth year. A second monthly review, the organ of the wa'y wa irdâd section, has retained the name of Nûr al-

The Islamic Congress, dating from 1953, has received in all £E 8. Certain countries added a supplementary lodging allowance for their nationals.
portant part in Egyptian politics; he had presided over the Governing Body of al-Azhar, was chosen to supervise the 1896 reforms, and resigned in 1317/1899; 24, Abd al-Rahmân Kûthî al-Nawâwi, his brother, d. the same year: the rapid resignations of his successors show the unrest that the reforms had provoked; 25, Salîm al-Bîshrî, a pious man who had known poverty, the last in date of the muhaddithin (he knew the very authorities for the traditions), fiercely opposed to Muḥ. 3Abu and to the reforms which he instigated, resigned in 1320; 26, Allâ al-Bîblîwî, resigned in 1323; 27, Abd al-Rahmân al-Shirînî, greatly esteemed for his piety and integrity, resigned 1324; 28, Ḥassân al-Nawâwi, for the second time, resigned in 1327/1909 consequent on the 1908 law. 29, Salîm al-Bîshrî, for the second time, d. 1335; 30, Muḥ. Abd i-Fâdj al-Djizâwî, d. 1346/1928; 31, Muṣṭâfâ al-Marâghî, disciple of Muḥ. 4Abu, resigned in 1348/1929; 32, Muḥ. al-Aẖmîd al-Zâwîhî, resigned in 1354/ 1935; 33, Muṣṭâfâ al-Marâghî, second time d. 1364/ 1945; 34, Muṣṭâfâ 4Abu al-Râzîk, a very cultured man, admirer of Muḥ. 4Abu, had taught Arabic at the University of Lyons (France), and later Muslim philosophy at the Egyptian University. He was nominated by King Fârûk although he was not of the body of the chief 4Abu and as such he was the victim of such hostile demonstrations that he died of a heart attack in 1366/1947; 35, Muḥ. Ma’mûn al-Shînhâwî, d. 1369/1950. The brief duration of the following rectorships corresponds to the political undercurrents of Egypt: the struggle against the British in the Canal Zone, the Cairo riots of 26 January 1952, the coup d’etat of 23 July 1952. In several cases, the Government brought pressure to bear on the rectors in order to secure their departure. 36, Abd al-Madîd Sa’mîn, resigned, 4 September 1951; 37, Ibrâhîm Hamrûgh, resigned 10 February 1952; 38, Abd al-Madîd Sa’mîn (second time), resigned 17 September 1952; 39, Muḥ. al-Khîdîr Ḥusayn, resigned at the beginning of January 1954; 40, Abd al-Rahmân Tâdî, docteur ès lettres of the University of Paris, nominated 8 January 1954.

VI. Results of the reform. It is difficult for those who are neither Muslims nor Egyptians to assess these; one requires to know in what spirit the programmes were implemented, and in each case the portion of them which is made effective in the classes. From the outside it can only be assumed that, in spite of the significant improvements referred to above, all is not well. Further signs, indicated by the Egyptians themselves, are revealing. Many teachers of al-Azhar send their sons to Government schools and not to their own establishment. The Government has not accepted the principle of equality between the teachers of the State Universities and those of the higher standard at al-Azhar. Outside their functions as teachers, in their own establishment, as imâms, and as preachers, which are theirs by law, the Azharis have positions in life inferior to those of their colleagues in the State universities. The recent suppression of the sharîṭ tribunals has abolished a traditional outlet for Azharis. The channel of Azhâr study to which one is committed at the age of 6 on entry into a Kûrânic school, and that of normal secular study, are poles apart. Entry as a student into the State Universities is refused to Azharis. If the latter wish to be admitted as teachers of Arabic into the cadre of the Ministry of National Education they have to pass through the Dâr al-‘ulûm or through the Institute of Education. Furthermore, al-Azhar feels that she is criticised by the State Universities, and suspects certain opponents of resenting her autonomy, and of wishing to abolish the primary and secondary institutes, perhaps even of wanting to tamper with the faculties (see Mâjidât al-Azhar, xxvii, no. 4, Rabî’ II 1375/ 1955, entirely devoted to defending herself against such attacks). The question becomes complicated when one sees, among the Egyptians who desire more far-reaching reform, not only atheists but also sincere Muslims, even members of the Muslim Brotherhood. For sixty years the question of al-Azhar has from time to time been a vexed one. Fundamentally it is a question of knowing what exactly al- Azhar’s real mission is with respect to the needs of the Muslim community of the twentieth century, and further whether the intellectual and moral instruction that she provides is adapted to these needs. Al-Azhar has laid great stress on the place that her teachers and former pupils have held, and continue to hold, in the life of Egypt and the Islamic countries. She has asked for recognition of the fact that she has deserved well of scholarship. This scholarship, in fact, presents many aspects. First of all stands that knowledge of the great Muslim values that her students absorb by the very atmosphere of their place of study as much as through the intellectual content of the courses. Al-Azhar has in this way continued to maintain Islamic ideas in traditional circles, both rural and urban. She has upheld those virtues which made up her appeal: a religious and serious attitude to life, hospitality, respect of parents and teachers, and the duty of almsgiving. She recalls the finest aspects of the Kûrâ of and of the hadîth that are traditionally stressed. Some of her teachers, specialists in the Arabic language and in law, have again taken up the traditional subject-matter and restated it in simpler forms, without, however, modifying the basic assumptions and principles, except on a few points (polygamy, etc.). In history, certain modern monographs (for example, on al-Azhar itself) fulfil the same function as the mediaeval works, and use the same methods (compilation of documents, biographies, etc.). Other teachers, who are conversant with an impressive number of ancient linguistic or religious treatises, have been able to produce editions of texts invaluable to scholars. Such scholarship as a whole is adapted to the needs of millions of Muslims whose peaceful and untroubled faith has not been touched by foreign ideas, or even to those people ‘nearer to nature’, as the present rector calls them, among whom, as in Africa, Islam does not cease to make progress. Azhârs agree, however, that there is a decline in the Muslim faith in many universities, and that the West is impervious to the message of Islam. As a counter-measure, they teach their pupils to answer this by short compositions, rather stereotyped, educational or apologetic, which are taught in the mukāf or essay classes of the primary and secondary courses (e.g., personal hygiene, the use of the ritual alms or saḥâb, the evils of wine, the wisdom of polygamy, etc.). Reviews and sermons continually give examples of these apologetics. But more vital problems are not considered in them. Some of the Muslim brotherhood in their exhortatory efforts, while developing this sort of stereotyped apologetics, have seemed more aware of modern difficulties. In 1951 one of them urged al- Azhar to speak of such topics as the dignity of labour, of social questions, of Capitalism, of Marxism, etc. (Sayyid Kûthî, in the review al-Risâla, 18 June 1951). The Mâjidât al-Azhar followed this with
several replies (among others, xxii (1371), 89-95). But the substance of these replies is very brief, and it does not appear that the defendants would have recognized themselves in the picture that has been drawn of them, elementary as it is.—Such a conception of scholarship has given and still gives service, but those Westerners who are in the best position to observe events are struck by its limitations, which Egyptians educated by modern methods also perceive. There is as yet no question at al-Azhar of studies profiting by modern historical methods or broadening themselves under the influence of modern trends of thought. Learning by heart, and storing up pages of texts in the memory, seems to be the essential requirement of students. Some would wish to attribute the cause of this limitation to a withering casuistry in which vital subjects, e.g., divorce, are taken as subjects for abstract logical exercises, wholly oblivious of their human repercussions (see the daily al-Diyumharyya from 9 to 17 January 1954). Others reproach al-Azhar with having always put a brake on any reforms, and of posing as the only defender of Islam, although Islam is a religion based on equality, refusing clericalism, and one in which every intelligent believer has a voice in affairs. Some bodies, such as the State Universities, which have their own courses of Kur'ānic exegesis, of Islamic law, of Arabic, etc., would wish to be their own masters and the only judges of such culpable deviation: among their students or their teachers as is a matter for internal discipline (case of Muḥ. Ahmad Khalaf Allāh, 1947-51, see MIDEO, i, 39-72). Recently two censures made by al-Azhar have been quashed by the civil tribunals (judgment of 27 May 1950 permitting the reprinting of the proscribed book Min hund nabeeda of Muḥ. Khalīl Muḥ.; the case of Shaykh Bahktī in 1955 (MIDEO, iii, 46, 8). The Grand National Assembly at Ankara has likewise discussed the question of al-Azhar with regard to according or refusing student status to Turkish subjects who are students there: the final vote was negative (13-16 February 1954).

But, in their turn, Azharis reproach their adversaries with forgetting the needs of the Muslim community. Few Azharis would willingly consent to a reduction of their establishment to the status of a Faculty of Higher Religious Studies as was the case with the Zaytuna at Tunis a short while ago. On the contrary, although the prestige as-
Azhar enjoyed great renown in his time. Al-Suyūtī is reckoned as one of his pupils. 


(C. Brockelmann *)

AL-ĀZHARī, Abū MANSūR MUḤAMMAD b. AHMAD b. AL-ĀZHARī, Arab lexicographer born in 282/895 at Harāt, died in the same town in 370/980. Al-Āzhari was a pupil of his compatriot, the lexicographer Muḥammad b. Ḫudayr al-Mundhīrī (329/940), who was himself a disciple of Thālab (q.v.) and al-Mubarrad (q.v.)

Azhar enjoyed great renown in his time. Al-Suyūtī, who was himself a disciple of Thālab (q.v.), includes Al-Āzhari in the list of his masters, he must have had a thorough knowledge of Shāfiʿī law. In 312/924, he was returning from Mecca to Kūfa with the pilgrim caravan, when they were attacked by the Ḷārāmītā (q.v.) at al-Habīr and partly massacred or taken prisoner. Al-Āzhari spent two years as a prisoner of the Bedouins of Bahrayn who were converted to Carmathianism. In a passage cited by Yakut and Ibn Khallikan, he describes how he took advantage of his sojourn among these nomads to study and teach those who were converted to Carmathianism. In a passage cited by Yakut and Ibn Khallikan, he describes how he took advantage of his sojourn among these nomads to study their language, which according to him, was very pure. The rest of his life remains a mystery for us and seems to have been spent in his birthplace in study and retirement.

Al-Āzhari’s work is known to us by a list containing fourteen titles provided by Yakūt and Ibn Khallikān (reproduced in part, by al-Suyūtī, Bughyat al-Wuṭūrī, 8); with the exception of his commentaries on the Muṣallākāt and the Divān of Abū Tammām, these are lexicographical studies. Among these works, a dictionary has come down to us (ten volumes in Ibn Khallikān’s time) entitled Tahdhib al-Lugha. The work has not been edited; there are MSS. of it in London, Istanbul and in India; see list in Brockelmann. This is a compilation made by means of the materials, which Al-Āzhari received from his master al-Munqidhīr; Yākūt, Irshād, loc. cit., even speaks of a riwāya of a dictionary of al-Munqidhīr. The essential feature of the work is that it continues the tradition initiated by Khall in his Kitāb al-ʿAjwān: the roots are not arranged in the usual alphabetical order, but in accordance with a phonetic classification, commencing with the “gutturals” and ending with the labials. The Tahdhib was copiously used by Ibn Manṣūr in his Liṣān al-ʿArab.


(ʿABDULLAH MORTADHLA)

ʿĀZĪM ALLĀH KHĀN, said to have been the brain of the political upheaval (known as the Mutiny) of 1857 in India, came of a poor Pathān family which had settled in Cawnpore long before the famine of 1857-8 (George Dunbar, A History of India from the Earliest Times to the Present Day, London 1943, ii, 485). An orphan, saved from starvation by a Christian missionary, he began life as a khdīm adīr in an Anglo-Indian family of Cawnpore (Mowbray Thompson, The Story of Cawnpore, London 1890, 54; G. O. Trevelyan, Cawnpore, London 1907, 58), who sent him to school, where he learnt English and French, and acquired high proficiency in both. Soon after completing his education he joined the same school as a teacher. On the request of Nānā ʿṢāhib, adopted son of Bāḍūr Rāo II, the last of the Pāshwās, he entered his service as a private tutor and English secretary. He soon found favour with Nānā who appointed him as his political adviser. Following the death of Bāḍūr Rāo II in 1851, Nānā ʿṢāhib succeeded to his title, pension and estate but the Governor-General of India, Lord Dalhousie, discontinued his pension and refused to recognise him. Thereupon ʿĀzīm Allāh Khān prepared a memorial for his master which was submitted to the British authorities in 1852. It was, however, rejected by the Court of Directors of the East India Company. In 1853 ʿĀzīm Allāh Khān left for England to plead Nānā’s case personally. Here he failed in his mission but through the charm of his personality he won the heart of many ladies who continued to write him scores of letters even after his return to India in 1855. These letters were later published in two vols., The Indian Prince and the English Press and Love Letters, which were soon proscribed (Trevelyan, 59).

On his way back from England, ʿĀzīm Allāh Khān visited Paris, Constantinople, Sebastopol and the theatre of war in the Crimea (Russell, My Diary in India, London 1860, 169). A frustrated and disillusioned man, having spent £50,000 on his fruitless mission to England and anxious to continue in the favour of his master, ʿĀzīm Allāh Khān suggested to Nānā the overthrow of the British power in India through a military coup d’etat. With this aim in view he visited, early in 1857, along with Nānā, military stations in northern India but met with little success. The Indian princes falsely promised help to Nānā’s emissaries sent out at the instance of ʿĀzīm Allāh Khān, who himself took part in many of the lost actions which his master subsequently fought against the British. On the fall of Bithūr, Nānā’s stronghold near Cawnpore in Dhu ʿl-Ḥididja 1273/July 1857, he disappeared from the scene, never to be heard of again. He is said to have died in Rabī’ 1-II 1276/October, 1859 at Bhūṭwāl (Nēpāl) where he had fled along with the other leaders of the Revolt. His end, however, like his origin, still remains shrouded in mystery.


(ʿABDULLAH MORTADHLA)
The reign of al-'Aziz was in fact a period of luxury. His fondness for precious stones, cut glass from observing the dietary laws, if there is danger to health or life. Ābd al-Wahhāb al-Sha'rānī, in his Kitāb al-Mizan al-Kubrā, consistently explains the divergent opinions of the several schools of religious law as expressing these two complementary tendencies. Cf. Goldziher, in ZDMG, 1884, 676 f.; idem, Die Zählerin, Leipzig 1884, 68 f.

In magic, an adjuration, or the application of a formula of which magical effects are expected. Cf. Goldziher, in Orientalische Studien Theodor Nöldeke ... gewidmet, Giessen 1906, i, 307. (1. Goldziher*)

AZIMECH [see NUDJUM].

AZIMA [see NURDÜM].

AL-'AZIZI [see AYYUBIDS].

AL-'AZIZ BILLĀH NIZĀR ĀBD MANSŪR, fifth Fātimid Caliph and the first whose reign began in Egypt. He was born on 14 Muharram 344/10 May 955 and had been designated as his successor by his father al-Mu'izz after the death of his brother Ābd Allāh in 364/974. He succeeded his father on 11 Rabī' II 365/18 December 975 (or 14 Rabī' II 21 December) after the latter had had him recognised as his successor by his family and dignitaries on the preceding day. The official proclamation, however, only took place on 10 Dhū 'l-Hijjah 365/9 August 976.

The sources describe him as tall, with red hair and blue eyes, generous, brave, fond of horses and hunting and very humane and tolerant in disposition. He was an excellent administrator, subjected the State finances to a rigorous supervision, introduced the system of fixed salaries for officials, whom he forbade to accept bribes and presents, and issued an order that no payments should be made except on the production of written documents. He was the first to assign fixed rates of pay to his troops and police personnel. He, moreover, the first of the Fātimid Caliphs to employ Turks in the army, a practice which was later to be fraught with serious consequences.

He was well supported by his minister Ya'qūb b. Killis, the director of taxation, to whom in 968/979 he gave the title of wazir, previously unknown to the Fātimids, and who remained wazir until his death in 980/991, with two short periods in disgrace, one because he was accused of having had the Turk Alptakin (Aptegin; see below) poisoned in 968/979, and the other in 373/984 when he was imprisoned and had his possessions confiscated, perhaps because of the famine which broke out in that year, but two months later he recovered his liberty, possessions and offices. It was to Ibn Killis that al-'Aziz's finances owed their prosperity. He also played an important literary rôle, according pensions to the men of letters, lawyers and poets whom he gathered round himself, and composed a book of Isma'ili Law based on pronouncements by al-Mu'izz and al-'Aziz.

The wazirs who succeeded him did not remain as long in office. These were all 'Alī al-Addās, Ahmad b. Faḍl b. al-Farāt in 381/992, al-Husayn b. al-Hasan al-Bāzīyārābād, Muḥammad b. 'Ammār, al-Faḍl b. Sāliḥ, who had been a collaborator of Ibn Killis, and lastly in 385/995–996, the Christian Šāh b. Nešṭūrs, formerly Secretary for Finance. Another important officer of al-'Aziz was the Jew Manasšah (Manasseh), Secretary for Syria. The employment of a Christian and a Jew in high offices was in keeping with the spirit of toleration of the Fātimids in matters of religion and race. Al-'Aziz was still further inclined to toleration, being influenced by his Christian wife, the mother of his son and successor al-Ḥākim. This Princess's two brothers were indebted to his influence and to the Caliph's recommendation for being appointed, the one, Orestes, Patriarch of Jerusalem, and the other, Arsenius, Metropolitan of Miṣr and Cairo in 375/986. The Christians, throughout his reign, enjoyed great freedom. The Coptic Patriarch Ephraim, in spite of strong Muslim opposition, obtained permission to rebuild the Church of Abu 'l-Sayfayn (St. Mercurius) near al-Fuṣṭāt, The Caliph looked favourably on the controversies between the Bishop of Aḥmūnayn, Severus b. al-Muqaṣṣa and the kadi Ibn al-Nu'mān, president of the Court of Mašūlim. He refused to take action against a Muslim who had become a Christian convert. This policy was bound to cause considerable discontent among the Muslims, and tracts were circulated against Manasṣah and Ibn Nešṭūrs. To appease the Muslims, the Caliph had the Jew and the Christian imprisoned, but as it was difficult to do without their services, they soon re-established their position. In 386/996, this dis- content provoked a popular movement against the Christians, following the burning of the fleet, of which some merchants from Amalfi were accused; the latter were massacred and several churches were looted.

Though al-'Aziz was tolerant towards Christians and Jews, he was less so towards the Sunni Muslims. He followed a strict Isma'ili policy (defamatory inscriptions for the companions of the Prophet; suppression of the salāt al-ta'rīwī of Ramaḍān in 372/982; the punishment in 381/993 of a man who had in his possession the Muwatta' of Mālik). In 366/976, he inaugurated in Cairo the mourning ceremonies on the feast of the ʿAshūrā'. On the other hand, however, the holding of solemn processions on the Fridays in Ramaḍān and the distributions of sweetmeats at the feast ending the fast (jīfā) are due merely to his love of display.

The reign of al-'Aziz was in fact a period of luxury. His fondness for precious stones, cut glass
ware, rich materials of *dabīsh* and of *siqlān*, rare animals, truffles and sea fish etc. (once cherries who received a salary of 100,000 dinars, also lived in great style. Al-ʿAzīz also spent a great deal on buildings like the ʿArṣ al-Dhāhab, the ʿArṣ al-Bahr, parts of the group of buildings known under the name of Great Palace, the Mosque of al-Karāfa and that called the Mosque of al-Ḥakim, which however was started by al-ʿAzīz.

The foreign policy of al-ʿAzīz was really only active in Syria. In North Africa, he confirmed Yūsuf Bulukkīn in his office. The latter's son, al-Manṣūr (373-386/984-996), however, likewise confirmed, by the Caliph, was by no means docile; he did not hesitate to go to war against the Kutāmā, in spite of the Caliph's disapproval, and progressively detached himself from Egypt. Similarly in Sicily, the Caliph confined himself to bestowing the investiture, after the event, on amirs of the Kalbite family. He entertained diplomatic relations with the Buwayhīd ʿAḍūd al-Dawlā who, according to Ḥīlāl al-Ṣāḥī (in Siḥ Ibn al-Dḥawī) is said to have taken the initiative in the matter. The letter of ʿAḍūd which has been preserved, seems to indicate that he recognised the Fāṭimid's sovereignty, but this seems doubtful, for, according to Ibn Ṣāfīr, ʿAḍūd al-Dawlā disputed the official Fāṭimid genealogy.

Al-ʿAzīz's principal aim was to ensure his possession of Southern and Central Syria, and latterly that of the Amirate of Aleppo, so as to realise his dreams of expansion at the cost of Byzantium and the Ṭabbās. In Southern Palestine, the Bedouin chief Mufarrīdī b. Daḥfal al-Ṭaʿūsī charged with the government of Damascus. He was joined by Ibn Killīs, who distrusted Bakdīr and Mufarrīdī, and who made several attempts to rid himself of Bakdīr, led finally to his being expelled from Damascus by a Fāṭimid army in 378/988. He took refuge at Raḥṣa. After the death of Ibn Killīs in 380, Mufarrīdī obtained the Caliph's pardon and Bakdīr once again won al-ʿAzīz over to the idea of a conquest of Aleppo. The Caliph promised him the support of the garrison of Tripoli. However, at the instigation of the secretary Ibn Nestūrīs, whom Bakdīr had made ill-disposed toward himself, the Fāṭimid general abandoned Bakdīr at the decisive moment in the fighting against Saʿd al-Dawlā, so that he was defeated and handed over to the Ḥāmānīd in 381/991, being then put to death. After his victory, Saʿd al-Dawlā threatened him from putting his plan into execution.

The Caliph was once again urged to undertake the conquest of Aleppo by the former secretary of Bakdīr, ʿAlī b. ʿAlī b. ʿAlī b. ʿAlī b. Ḥusayn al-Maghribī, who had taken refuge in Egypt, as well as several amirs who had left the Ḥāmānīd Abu ʿl-ʿAṣāfīl. From 381/992 until his death, al-ʿAzīz methodically pursued his attempts to take Aleppo, but without any success, owing to the support given by the Byzantines to their dependant, the amir of Aleppo. The first attempt, led by the Turkish general Mangūṭakīn, supported by Ibn al-Maghribī, was marked by an unsuccessful siege of Aleppo, though there were successful engagements fought to the north of Aleppo against the Byzantine governor of Antioch, Burżes (al-Burğī), whom the Emperor Basil II, informed by Ḥāmānīd messengers when in Bulgaria, had instructed to intervene. At the end of 382 (end of 992 or beginning of 993), Mangūṭakīn, without
authorisation from the Caliph and at the instigation of al-Maghribi, who was dismissed for that reason, raised the siege and returned to Damascus. After the consolidation of Fāṭimid territorial gains south of the amirate of Aleppo, a second attempt took place in 386/994. There was a first period of siege lasting two months, then Mangūtkān was obliged to march against Burzuz, and routed him at the ford of the Orontes in September 994, after which he resumed the siege, which lasted until May 995 and was only lifted on the arrival after forced marches of the Emperor Basīl II in person, whom the Hamdanid messengers had again gone to summon from the Bulgarian front. The Emperor saved Aleppo, but did not succeed in adequately ensuring the defence of the advance positions of the amirate of Aleppo against the Fāṭimids, for though he placed a garrison at Shayzar, he was unable to take Tripoli. Al-ʿAzīz resolved to intensify the struggle and the close of the year 385/995 and the beginning of 386/996 were marked by great military and naval preparations in Egypt.

The navy built by Ibn Nəstūr having been accidentally set on fire (see above), a new navy was immediately called into existence and sent against Anṭartūs, a Byzantine stronghold, to which Mangūtkān, after having executed in the spring of the year 996 several incursions in the direction of Antioch and Aleppo, was laying siege. The intervention of the Byzantine troops from Antioch caused the operation to fail, but the southern region of the amirate of Aleppo remained under Fāṭimid influence. The Caliph decided to take the field in person, and set out to place himself at the head of his armies, accompanied by the coffins of his ancestors, like al-Murād on his departure from Africa. However, he fell ill and died at Bilbays on 28 Ramadan 386/996.

Al-ʿAzīz was certainly the wisest and the best of all the Fāṭimid Caliphs of Egypt. Though he did not realise all his aims, it was, nevertheless, during his reign that the domination of the Fāṭimid Caliphate reached, at least nominally, its greatest extent, for the Khawba was read in his name from the Atlantic Ocean to the Red Sea, in the Yemen, in Mecca, and on occasion, even at Mawṣūl under the ʿUkaylid ruler.

AZIZI — AL-AZRAKI

no. 772) shows him with a white beard. Among the poets his contemporaries who used the nom de plume 'Azizi he was the most famous.

All his biographers found it noteworthy that, in contrast to the works of most of the other poets of his time, his poetry was inspired not by boys, but by women. This reputation seems to have derived from his most famous poem, a *şahrengiz* on the courtesans of Istanbul, entitled *Rengin-nâme*, which is remarkable for its lively style and bold use of idiosyncratic expressions and proverbs; each of the 49 beauties is described, in a set of three couplets, with images befitting her name or nickname. Other poems by him are found scattered in *tekhibres* and anthologies.

Bibliography: Gibb, Ottoman poetry, iii, 179-86 (1904), with English translation of 12 stanzas of the *şahrengiz*; Sadeddin Nûzet Ergun, *Türk şairleri*, i, 632-37 (about 1938), containing passages on 'Azizi from various tekhibres, and several of his scattered poems; Istanbul Üniversitesi Küütphanesii, Turkish MSS. no. 6492, is a complete copy (dated 1304/1886-87) of the *Rengin-nâme*; article in *IA*. (A. Tiitter)

'AZIZI [see KARAÇELE-DE-ZADE].

'AZL, coitus interruptus. According to the hadîth this practice was not unknown to the ancient Arabs, and the Messenger of God did not declare it to be *harâm*. The doctors of the Law agree that the master can practise it with his slave concubine unconditionally, and he who has a wife; in the latter case, however, there is controversy on the question whether the wife's permission is necessary. According to al-Ghazâlî, although 'azl is not in conformity with the general spirit of marriage, it is not forbidden, and is at the most only mildly reprehensible: it may also be practised with a view to ensuring, for example, that the consequences of a confinement do not imperil the husband's "continued enjoyment of marital rights"; with greater justification, and although it is preferable to leave the matter trustingly in God's hands, "the fear of incurring great financial hardship on account of the size of one's family" renders this contraceptive practice admissible.


'AZL, dismissal [see supplement].

'AZMÎ-ZADE MUSTAFA, Ottoman poet and stylist, as a poet known under the name of Hâletî. Born in the so-called *laylat al-barâd* in Istanbul on 15 Shabân 977/23 Jan. 1570. He was the son of 'Azmî-Efendi, who was the well-known and well-respected tutor of Murâd IV as well as a poet, writer, and translator (died 990/1582). As a pupil of Sa’d al-Dîn (q.v.) who became famous as a historian, he studied law, and to him he owed his special love for historical investigation. He became mûderris at the madrasa of Hâdîjî-Khatîn in Istanbul, but in 1011/1602-3 he was transferred to Damascus as a judge. Two years later he went to Cairo in the same capacity. When Dâmûd Ibrâhîm-Paşâ (cf. Hammer-Purgstall, iv, 156 ff.) the governor of Egypt, was killed in a military rising in Cairo, 'Azmî-zade (who had occasionally represented him) was dismissed because of his lack of prudence, and soon afterwards (1015/1606-7) he was moved as Mulla to Brusa. As a reward for his good services in the fight against the 'Alîd rebel Kaleder-oghlu, he became Mullah of Adrianople in 1020/1611-2. His behaviour when a judge was punished for wrong-doing led to his transfer to Damascus where, however, he remained only until 1023/1614, to go from there to Istanbul as a judge. This important office he held for four years. Subsequently he was sent to the provinces once again, this time to Cairo. In Rabî’ II 1030/ Feb.-March 1621, he next became a military judge in Anatolia and in Rabî’ I 1037/Nov. 1627, in Rumelia, where he had again been without office (ma’tûl) since Dhul ‘Il-Kâda 1032/Sept. 1623. This last post, too, he held only for a short time. He was dismissed in Ramadân 1038/April-May 1629, and moved to the school attached to the Sulaymâniyya mosque (dâr al-hadîth) in Istanbul. He died soon afterwards (26 Shabân 1040/30 March 1631), and is buried in the courtyard of his school, not far from his house in Sofular Cârığusu.

As the poet Hâletî, 'Azmî-zade achieved fame because of his *diwân*, his *Sâkî-nâmé*, and his quatrains (*rubâ‘i*), and he was known as the Turkish 'Umar Khayyâm by his successors. He was very widely read and left a library of manuscripts of some 4000 volumes, all of which are annotated in his own hand. The library was dispersed. None of his works has yet been printed, and his poetry deserves a fuller critical appreciation. 'Azmî-zade's *Sulaymân-nâmé* would appear to have nothing to do with the sultan Sulaymân the Magnificent; the contents stands in need of an examination (there is a manuscript in the Ef‘ad-Efendi library in Istanbul (No. 2284, cf. GOW, 76)). The best example of his skill in this genre is his *Munshidât*, of which there is a manuscript in the Hamidiyya library in Istanbul (No. 599). There is another one in London, in the British Museum (Or. 1169, cf. Rieu, 96b.) with a reference to a further manuscript in Vienna (Nationalbibliothek) containing only 13 letters (cf. G. Flügel, catalogue i, 265), Cf. also Hammer Purgstall, iv (1828), vii.


AL-AZRAKI ABU ‘L-WALID MUHAMMAD b. ‘ABD ALLAH b. AHMAD, historian of Mecca and of its sanctuary. The ancestor of the family was a Byzantine (Rûmi) slave of Kalada or al-Hârij b. Kalada in al-Tâ‘îf, called al-Azrâk on account of his blue eyes. According to Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr (*Isti‘âb*, s.v. Sunayya), he married Sunayya, the mother of Ziyâd b. Abâhi. During the siege of al-Tâ‘îf in 8/630 al-Azrâk went over to Muhammad, was freed, and settled at Mecca. His descendants rose to power and influence and married into the Umayyad aristocracy. In order to obliterate their humble origin they pretended to belong to the clan of Ikâbb of the Banû Taghlib (Ibn Sa’d, iii, 176) but later, when the antagonisms between Kays and Yaman
became prominent, they were persuaded by the Khuzaca to join the Yamanite camp by maintaining that al-Azraq was the son of 'Abdirr b. al-Harith b. Abi Shamir and hence a member of the royal family that al-Azraq was the son of

A great-great-grandson of al-Azraq was 'Abd b. al-Walid b. 'Abdirr b. Abi Shamir and hence a member of the royal family that al-Azraq was the son of 'Abdirr b. al-Harith b. Abi Shamir and hence a member of the royal family.

al-Azraq's book was translated with many additions, especially about the renovation of the Ka'ba in 281-474/4, and transmitted the book to his grand-nephew 'Abd al-Mu'min b. al-Khuza'i and others to prove that visits to the shrines of saints and divines are unlawful; al-Durr al-Manafi'd af'tu imra'at al-Majahid. He is also the author of a short biographical work on Urdu poets entitled Tadhkira-i Mukhabbar dar Hāl-i Raghbaguyān-i Hind (Browne, Šubpt, 304). Some of his poems were reproduced by (Sīr) Sayyid 'Almād Khān in the Åkhar al-Sānādī, Delhi 1827, 70-11.

BA (cf. B0), genealogical term used in S. Arabia, especially among the sayyids and mashā'ik of Hadramawt, to form individual and (secondarily) collective proper names, e.g., Bā 'Abbād, Bā 'Alawi, Bā Ḍafīl, Bā Ṣakāf, Bā Ḥasan, Bā Ḥassān, Bā Ḥurrūz, Bā Wāzīr (see special articles and the lists of Nallino (in Gabrieli, Nome proprio arabo-musulmano, Rome 1915;忽然, secondarily collective proper names, e.g., Bā, Bā Alawi, Bā Ḍafīl, Bā Ṣakāf, Bā Ḥasan, see below).

The genuine Bā thus would be identical with indeclinable Abā “father” forming individual (pseudo) kunyas, with the actual function of a nisba in -i, or of ḍāḥū in western Yamanite tradition. This is the view of Ibn al-Mujādīwar, al-Shilli (Masgra'a, i, 281), al-Sakāf (Ta'rikh al-Shu'ārā' al-Hadramiyin, i, 53 n.) and Flügel (ZDMG, ix, 227). In order to indicate the tribe or family Abl or ṣawālūd is prefixed to Bā, e.g., Abl Bā 'Alawi, Ablūd Bā Ḫūḍayr; this may have caused the equation Bā = Banū found in al-Muḥḥibb (Khuldsat, i, 74) and approved of by Wüstenfeld (Geschichtsschreiber, 256; Čuflen, 4 n. 1).

From this primary Bā-formation must be distinguished another with Bā (sometimes Bil) < bin Ab-, e.g., Bā-Ṣakāf (not identical with the Bā-Ṣakāf cited above) = Ibn al-Ṣakāf (al-Sakāf, op. cit. ii, 54 n. 2), Bā-Ḥadsī (surname of members of the Bā-Ṣakāf) = Ibn al-Ḥadsī. The use of Bin, along with the nisba in -i, as a nomen unitatis of Bā-names, attested by van den Berg (loc. cit.), as also that of Ibn Ḥassān for Bā/Abū Ḥassān (cf. MO, xxv, 131 and BSOAS, xii, 293-299), may reflect different local habits or even some uncertainty on the part of native authorities.


BĀ 'ABBĀD, a family of Ḥadrami mashā'ik and scholars, associated with the shrine of the prophet Hud. Among its members were (1) ‘Abbād Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abbād al-Ḳalāmān Bā ‘Abbād al-Hadrami (d. 687/1288) and (2) Muḥammad b. ‘Umar b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abbād al-Ḳalāmān (d. 721/1321) both of them buried in Shāhān (al-Shāriji, Ta'rika 70, 136). For two mashā'ikh-works on this family, see Serjeant, The Sayyids of Hadramawt, 6, 11 f. (O. Løgren)

BĀ 'ALAWĪ (more precisely: Al Bā 'Alawi, cf. art. Bā; according to al-Shilli [Masgra'a, i, 31] alawī is “a well-known bird”; nisba: al- 'Alawi [also al-Bā'Alawi], not to be confounded with the usual nisba belonging to 'Allī, a large and influential clan of S. Arabian sayyids and ʿūṣūs, for the most part living in Ḥadramawt, in or near the town of Tarim [q.v.], and buried in the Zanbal cemetery there. The noble descent of the Bā 'Alawi sayyids is said to have been checked in the sixth century by the traditionist 'Allī b. Muḥammad b. Abīd b. Duḍū (d. 620/1223); Ta'rika[=]thabār 'Adān, i, 157; [Masgra'a, ii, 233) by means of trustworthy witnesses. Special works on S. Arabian sayyids are: al-Qaṣṣār al-Shaffā'ī by Abd al-Ḥajj Ṣakāf (1353/55). Here only the most prominent members of the main line can be listed; for the branches of al-Muḥḥibb's Khuldsat al-Ṭabarān, only the 11th/12th century, but gives useful genealogical tables of different branches of the Bā 'Alawi sayyids (to be used with caution as to details). Much material is to be found in the Ta'rika[=]al-Shīrāzī al-Hadramiyin by 'Abbād Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Ḥāmid al-Sakāf (1353/55). Here only the most prominent members of the main line can be listed; for the branches of}


3. Abū Ali b. Muhammad (no. 4), d. 669/1270, and his son Abū Allāh b. Alawi (672/1272-731/1330), both of them renowned Sufis, introduce the line-bal al-Alawi, strictly speaking. For details on their life see the full biographies in MAṣḥaṣ, i, 211, esp. 184 ff.

4. Muhammad b. "Ali b. Muhammad (no. 3), d. 705/1305 in Tarim, d. there 705/1305. Having performed the pilgrimage he settled in a place near the tomb of Ťūrī called Yabhar, hence his surname Mawla al-Ŷunus al-Ḏātī. His son is Abī al-Raḥmān al-Sakkāf (730-819), ancestor of the important branches Sakkāf and Aydarus (see these arts.). MAṣḥaṣ, i, 199 ff. and MAṣḥaṣ, ii, 158-159; MAṣḥaṣ, ii, 127-135; Serjeant, S II, 535 (with two more titles).


called Ibn Shihab (1262-1341/1846-1923), see Sarkis 140 f. (with titles of nine works, printed in India 1305-1331).

e) Muḥammad b. 'Alī b. 'All b. Yaḥyā (1279/862-1350/1931) wrote al-ʿĀlab al-djamīʿ (pt. 1342); Brock., S II, 822.


**BA FADDL** [see FADDL, BA].

**BA FAṣKH** [see FAṢKH, BA].

**BA HASSĀN** [see HASSĀN, BA].

**BA HURMUZ** [see HURMUZ, BA].

**BA KĀTHR** [see KĀTHR, BA].

**BA MADĪTH** [see AL-SUWAYN, SAʿD b. `ALI].

**BA MAḪRAMA** [see MAḪRAMA, BA].

**BA** [see HIRZ].

**BA** [see MAWĀZĪN].

**BAAŁBEK** [see BAAĻBEKK].

**BĀB** = Gate. This question is best treated under two headings, (i) in mosques, (ii) in fortifications.

(i) **IN MOSQUES, MAUSOLEUMS, ETC.**

Down to the end of the 3rd/9th century, no mosque had a monumental entrance. All mosques, large or small, were entered by simple rectangular doorways in the enclosure wall, e.g. the Mosque at ʿAṣ-Ṣaḥrah al-Sarkhi (110/729), the Great Mosque at Ḥarrān, entrance, c. A.D. 744-50; the Mosque of Cordova, 710/787; the Mosque of ʿAmr (ibid., Plate 358). The entrance which dates from 221/836 and is 8.86 x 18.83 m. with its flanks decorated by projection and 15.50 in width, against 3 m. x 8, is the Entrance Bay of the Masjid-eʿAtiq at Mahdiyya (Plate 541 A), 750/1349, the Great Mosque at Varamin (ibid., Plate 406), reproduced here, Plate XXVIII b). During the 14th century, portals usually take the form of a high arched bay, like a small ṭahrīm, covered by a semi-dome on stalactite pendentives (quite different, however, from the Egyptian variety), e.g. the Khan-kākh at Naṭanj (ibid., Plate 369), 704/1304-5, the Shrine of Shāykh Bāyazīd at Bīšām (ibid., Plate 416, reproduced here, Plate XXVIII b), 713/1313, the Great Mosque at Varāmīn (ibid., Plate 406), 723/1323-5, the Mausoleum of Bābā Kāsim at Isfahān (ibid., Plate 417), 741/1340, the Great Mosque at Kirmān (ibid., Plate 541 A), 750/1349, and the Madżīdī Pā-Manār, 794/1391, also at Kirmān (ibid., Plate 451 B). At the end of the 15th century we have the remarkable portal at Balkh belonging to the Shrine of ʿAbū Naṣr Pārā (ibid., Plates 422 and 424), which projects boldly from the façade. In the central part is a high arched bay, with the entrance at the back as usual, but the flanks are bevelled off at 45°, and are in two storeys, each with a pointed arched recess, against 3 m. x 8 for Mahdiyya. This type was brought to Egypt by the Fatimids, where it appears in the Mosque of al-Iḥākim in 933/1043, but on a more imposing scale (6.16 m. x 15.50 m. in width). The earliest portal of this type is the Masjīd al-ʿAkmar, 519/1125 on a much reduced scale, and in the Mosque of Baybars, 665/1266-9 on a very large scale (8.86 x 18.83 m.) with its flanks decorated by three arched panels, against 2 m. x 4 m. for Mahdiyya. It also appears in the Mosque of al-Aṭar, 519/1125 on a much reduced scale, and in the Mosque of Baybars, 665/1266-9 on a very large scale.

(ii) **IN FORTIFICATIONS**

The earliest gateways of Muslim fortified enclosures were usually "straight-through" entrances defended by a machicolli and a pair of half-round flanking towers, e.g. the single gateway of the Sāmarrā, where a deep entrance bay is covered by a semi-dome on a pair of squinches. Given this scheme it is obvious that, on its importation at a later date into Syria, the squinches would be replaced by the device there in use for supporting domes. That this has actually happened may be realised on comparing our earliest example, the entrance bay of the Madrasa of Shābdābkht (Plate XXVII a) with the pendentives of the dome in front of the mihrāb of the nearly contemporary Masjīd al-ʿAṣrār at Aleppo, 608/1211-12. In both cases we have the typically Syrian treatment, a series of horizontal courses, decorated with niches, set straight across the corner and advancing one over the other.

In Persia the earliest portals such as that of the Mausoleum of Chīl Duḥṣṭārān at Dāmghān (Sarre, _Dennämder_, Abb. 136), 856/1454, the Gunbad-i Surkh at Marāḡā (Pope, _Survey_, Plate 34 A, and Godard in _Atgār-e ʿIrān_, I, fig. 89), 542/1448, and the Mausoleum of Muʿīnma Khāṭūm (ibid., Plate 345 and Sarre, op. cit. Taf. 3, reproduced here, Plate XXVIII b) at Nakhdīvān, 582/1186, consist of a rectangular doorway with an arched tympanum above, set in a shallow rectangular recess. The next step, apparently, was to replace the arched tympanum by a shallow recess filled with stalactites, e.g. a tower-tomb at Khīov (Pope, _op. cit.,_ Plate 343) and another at Salmās (ibid., Plate 344, reproduced here, Plate XXVIII e). During the 14th century, portals usually take the form of a high arched bay, like a small ṭahrīm, covered by a semi-dome on stalactite pendentives (quite different, however, from the Egyptian variety), e.g. the Khan-kākh at Naṭanj (ibid., Plate 369), 704/1304-5, the Shrine of Shāykh Bāyazīd at Bīšām (ibid., Plate 416, reproduced here, Plate XXVIII b), 713/1313, the Great Mosque at Varāmīn (ibid., Plate 406), 723/1323-5, the Mausoleum of Bābā Kāsim at Isfahān (ibid., Plate 417), 741/1340, the Great Mosque at Kirmān (ibid., Plate 541 A), 750/1349, and the Madžīdī Pā-Manār, 794/1391, also at Kirmān (ibid., Plate 451 B). At the end of the 15th century we have the remarkable portal at Balkh belonging to the Shrine of ʿAbū Naṣr Pārā (ibid., Plates 422 and 424), which projects boldly from the façade. In the central part is a high arched bay, with the entrance at the back as usual, but the flanks are bevelled off at 45°, and are in two storeys, each with a pointed arched recess, against 3 m. x 8 for Mahdiyya. This portal may well be the prototype of some of the monumental Indian examples such as the famous Buland Darwāzā at Fathpur Sikrī, 1020/1612, and the main entrance of the Great Mosque at Delhi, A.D. 1644-58.

At Constantinople mosque entrances are usually in the form of a slight salient, in which is set the entrance bay, covered by a very high stalactite hood composed of very small niches, e.g. the Mosque of Sultan Bāyazīd, 906-11/1500-1505, the Mosque of Sultan Selim (Plate XXIX a), 929/1522, the Mosque of Shāhzāde, 955/1548, etc.

In North Africa the entrances of mosques are usually emphasised, not by a vaulted salient (as at Mahdiyya), but by an elaborat eawning resting on brackets and covered by a sloping roof of tiles, e.g. at Fez (see H. Terrasse, _La Mosquée des Andalous_, pl. XV-XVII).
Lesser (Plate XXIX a) and the four gateways of the Greater Enclosure of Kasr al-Hayr al-Sharqī, built by the Caliph Hishām in 110/729.

But as early as the building of Baghdad by al-Manṣūr in 145-7/762-5 a new type appears—the bent entrance—which was employed for the four gateways of the outer wall. This is clear from the description of al-Khaṭṭāb, who says: "When one entered by the Khurāsān Gate one first turned to the left in an oblong passage (āshārī dādāyī) with a vault of brick, 20 cubits wide and 30 cubits long, the entrance of which was in the width and the exit in the length, and passed out into a ṭabaḥa . . . at the far end of which was the second gateway which was that of the city". Only one turn is mentioned, and as one then passed into a courtyard at the far end of which was the main gateway, it follows that the first direction must have been at right angles to the direction of exit, so it is obvious that the entrance must have been in the flank of the gateway tower.

It is frequently stated that bent entrances occur in Byzantine fortifications in N. Africa. It is not going too far to say that not a single example of such an entrance is to be found in any work of Justinian's reign, or before it, either in North Africa, Rome, Constantinople itself, or anywhere else in the Byzantine Empire (see my art. in the Proc. Brit. Academy, xxxviii, 101-5). The first bent entrance in Byzantine architecture is the south gate of the inner Citadel at Ancyrā built, according to an inscription, by Michael III in A.D. 859.

It is probable that the device was brought by the 'Abbasids (who came from the north-east) from the Oxus region, where pre-Muslim fortified enclosures have recently been discovered by the expedition led by Tolstov. The oldest of them, Djanbas Kālā, is about 50 km. from the river, in a region no longer irrigated. It consists of a fortified enclosure of mud brick, measuring 200 × 170 m. with walls still standing 10 m. high, provided with a bent entrance (see Field and Tolstov, in Arts Islamica, vi, 150).

The Arabic term for a bent entrance is bāẖāra, as is perfectly clear from the passage in which Makrīzī describes the Bāb Zuwayla of Cairo: "... he (Badr al-Djamālī) did not make a bāẖāra, as is the custom for the gates of fortresses. This disposition consists in arranging a bend ('āfīf) in the passageway to prevent troops taking it by assault during a siege, and to render impossible the entry en masse of cavalry" (Bāẖāra, ii, 380, l. 35, 381, l. 5).

Normally, therefore, the bāẖāra was an integral part of the gateway (as in all the examples of a bent entrance cited below), but it could happen that alterations were made subsequently to an old "straight through" gateway to convert it into a bent entrance, e.g. the Bāb al-Shārī at Damascus. This was a triple gateway of the usual Roman type, but von Kremer (c. 1850) found that the central and southern openings had been walled up and an addition (long since removed) built in front of the northern one, so as to force people to make a right-angled turn to pass through (Topographie von Damascus, 1, fig. on p. 10). This helps us to understand what Makrīzī means when he speaks of a bāẖāra at the entrance of the Bāb al-Nāṣr and Bāb al-Futūh, although they disappeared in the xvth century. They must have been built in front of them subsequently, as at Damascus, to remedy the weakness of these "straight through" gateways. I say "subsequently" because there is no trace on the well preserved masonry of these two gates of anything having been torn away.

On the other hand it follows than when a bāẖāra is mentioned anywhere (e.g. at Subayba near Baniyās) and the gateway itself has a right-angled turn ('āfīf), there is no need to assume that there was ever any structure in front of it.

But in spite of its obvious advantages the bent entrance did not become the general rule henceforth; it was not even employed by al-Manṣūr himself when he built Raīkā a few years later. The architect merely adopted the "oblique approach" system (see my E.M.A., ii, 38-45).

Nevertheless a very formidable type of gateway is employed in the famous Ukhaydīr (Plate XXIX a) towards the end of the 2nd/8th century. The entrance arch, which is 3 m. wide, is set back 92 cm. between two quarter-round towers. On both sides, close up to their inner corners, a deep groove 20 cm. wide runs right up, showing that there must have been a portcullis here. Behind this entrance arch, at a distance of 1.95 m. is another archway, and between the two is a vestibule, 3 m. wide and 1.95 deep, covered by a tunnel-vault in which there are three slits 17 cm. wide running from wall to wall (Fig. 1).

Now supposing Ukhaydīr were about to be attacked, the portcullis would be kept in a hauled-up position.

Fig. 1. Ukhaydīr: plan and section of west entrance.

Nevertheless a very formidable type of gateway is employed in the famous Ukhaydīr (Plate XXIX a) towards the end of the 2nd/8th century. The entrance arch, which is 3 m. wide, is set back 92 cm. between two quarter-round towers. On both sides, close up to their inner corners, a deep groove 20 cm. wide runs right up, showing that there must have been a portcullis here. Behind this entrance arch, at a distance of 1.95 m. is another archway, and between the two is a vestibule, 3 m. wide and 1.95 deep, covered by a tunnel-vault in which there are three slits 17 cm. wide running from wall to wall (Fig. 1). Now supposing Ukhaydīr were about to be attacked, the portcullis would be kept in a hauled-up position.
until a party of men entered the outer archway to try to break down the door behind the inner archway. At a signal, given by men looking through the slits in the vault, the portcullis would be released and missiles, molten lead, or boiling oil dropped on the storming party trapped below. It was impossible for a storming party to approach the door without exposing themselves to be fatally trapped in this fashion.

The finest gateways of the 5th/11th century are the three Fatimid gates of Cairo, the Bab al-Nasr, Bab al-Futuh (Plate XXX) and Bab Zuwayla, built by 578/1182, in the three gateways of the Northern Enclosure of the Citadel of Cairo, 571-9/1176-84, and likewise the gateways in that part of the Wall of Cairo due to him (Plate XXXIb). So thoroughly were the advantages of the bent entrance appreciated that it had even reached the Far West of Islam before the end of the 6th/12th century, e.g. the gateway of the Kasba of the Oudaya at Rabat in Morocco.

For the 7th/13th century three typical examples of it may be cited: Ka'far al-Nagi on the Tigris, 605-12/1208-15; and two at Bagdad, the Talisman Gate (blown up by the retreating Turks in 1918) and the Bab al-Wustani.

The supreme example of a bent entrance is al-Malik al-Zahir's gateway in the Citadel of Aleppo finished according to Ibn Shaddad in 611/1214. Here there are no less than five right-angled turns in the passage-way (Plate XXXII and Fig. 2).

(B. LEWIS)

Bab, a term applied in early Shi'ism to the senior authorised disciple of the Imam. The hagiographical literature of the Twelver Shi'a usually names the bāb of the Imams. Among the Ismā'iliyya (q.v.) bāb was a rank in the hierarchy. The term was already in use in pre-Fatimid times, though its significance is uncertain (cf. W. Ivanow, The Alleged Founder of Ismailism, Bombay 1932, 125 n. 2, citing al-Kašshī, Sīdīqī, 322; idem, Notes sur l'Ummu 'l-Kitāb, in REI, 1932, 455; idem, Studies in early Persian Ismailism, Bombay 1955, 19 ff.). Under the Fatimidns in Egypt the bāb comes immediately after the Imām, from whom he receives instruction directly. He in turn instructs the ḥudū⃣ṣī, who conduct the da'wa. The term thus appears to denote the head of the hierarchy of the da'wa, and to be the equivalent in Ismā'ili terminology of the expression dā'ī al-duʿā', which is used in the general historical literature but rarely appears in Ismā'ili texts. Thus, for example, al-Mu'ayyid fi 'l-Dīn al-Shirāzī, who is described in Ismā'ili writings as the bāb of al-Mustanṣīr, is called his dā'ī 'l-duʿā' by the historians (e.g. Ibn Muyassar, 10) and is actually named as such by al-Mustanṣīr in a sigillū of Ramāḍān 481/July 1069 addressed to the Sulayyīd ruler of the Yaman (Al-Siqillūt al-Mustansīriyya, ed. Abū al-Munṣīr Mājdīd, Cairo 1954, 200). Some indications of the status and functions of the bāb in Fāṭimid Ismā'iliism will be found in Ħamīd al-Dīn al-Kirmānī, Rābat al-ʿAbī, ed. M. Kāmil Ḥusayn and M. Muṣṭafā Ḥilīm, Cairo 1953, index; cf. R. Strothmann, Gnosis-Texte der Ismailiten, Göttingen 1943, index, esp. 82, 102, 175; W. Ivanow, Studies, 20-23). In the post-Fāṭimid da'wa the office dwindled in importance and seems eventually to have disappeared. In the description of the da'wa organisation at Alamūt given by Naṣr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī, (Taṣawwurāt, ed. W. Ivanow, 97, introduction xiii), there is only a bāb-i bāmīn, who ranks with the dā'ī, and in later Ismā'ili writings the term seems to drop out altogether.

In the system of the Nuṣayrīyya (q.v.) the bāb comes after the ism and is identified with Salmān (q.v.). The bāb is personified in each cycle. (Lists of Nuṣayrī bābs are given in R. Strothmann, Morgenländische Geheimkünste in Abendländischer Forschung, Berlin 1953 (Abhandlungen der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, Jahrgang 1952 Nr. 5) 34-5; L. Massignon, Nuṣairīyya, in ERI; for a similar Ismā'īlī list see Dīāfār b. Maḥṣūr al-Yaman, Kitāb al-Kaṣhī, ed. R. Strothmann, 1952, 14).

Bibliography: in the text. (B. Lewis)
a. MAHDIYYA: Great Mosque, main entrance. 308/920-21.

a. ALEPPO: Madrasa of Shadbakht, entrance. 589/1193.

b. ALEPPO: Ribat Nasiri, entrance. 635/1237-8.
a. CAIRO: Madrasa-Mausoleum of Zayn al-Dīn Yūsuf. 698/1299.

b. NAKHĪVAN: Mausoleum of Mu'mina Khātūn. 582/1186. (Photo: Sarre)
a. Salmās: Tower-tomb of the daughter of Arghun Āghā. VIth/XIIth century (?). (Photo: Pope)

b. Bistām: Shrine of Shaykh Bāyazīd. 713/1313. (Photo: Pope)
a. ISTANBUL: Mosque of Sultan Selim, entrance. 929/1522.

b. KASR AL-HAYR AL-SHARQI: entrance of Lesser Enclosure. 110/729.
a. CAIRO: Bāb al-Futūb. 480/1087.

b. Section of the same. (Drawn by Maurice Lyon, M.C.).

a. ALEPPO: The Citadel. 606-8, etc./1209-11, etc.

b. ALEPPO: The Citadel: bridge across dry moat.
BAB, an appellation [see the preceding art.] made specially famous by Sayyid 'Ali Muhammad of Shiraz, the founder of the new religion of the Babis [q.v.] and, according to the Bab's precursor the new prophet Bahá'u'lláh [q.v.] is the mirror of the breath of God', were arrested, brought before the Governor of Shiráz, Mirzá Husayn Kháán 'Abdu'lláh, severely punished, and expelled from the city. A representative of the reigning sovereign (Muhammad Sháh), Sayyid Yáhúd-i Dárábí, sent to conduct an enquiry, was won over by the charm of the Bab, and became converted to the new doctrine. Whilst all this was going on, Mirzá Núrí (the future Bahá'u'lláh) and his brother Mirzá Yáhúd Núrí (the future Sháh-i 'Asul) at Tehran, at the same time, persisted in the faith, after a meeting with Mullá Husayn. At Shiráz an epidemic of cholera broke out, and everyone from the Governor down prayed for deliverance. The Bab remained at Isfahán, where he was protected by the governor, the Georgian Manúchehr Kháán Mu'tamad al-Dawla. On the death of the latter the Bab was called to Tehran by order of the minister Hájjí Mirzá 'Abdu'lláh, but shortly before arriving in the city he was arrested and sent as a prisoner to the fortress of Mákú in the trackless mountains of Ādharbayjádán (summer of 1263/1847). In 1264/ April 1848, following more serious disorders which had broken out in different parts of Iran on account of Bábí propaganda [see Bábis], the Báb, whose powerful religious influence had converted the governor of the fortress of Mákú, 'Abdu'lláh Kháán, was transferred to a more rigorous prison, the remote castle of Cíhrík, from which he was shortly afterwards to be removed to Tabríz to be questioned by a committee of muddájhíds; it was decided to commend him forthwith. The powerful minister Mirzá Ta'íl Kháán, who had succeeded Hájjí Mirzá 'Abdu'lláh after the latter's dismissal by the new sovereign Náṣir al-Dín Sháh (1848), considered that the death of his enemy would break up this dangerous movement which was continuing to attract new adherents. In the spring of 1266/1850 the news of the execution of the seven martyrs of Tehran [see Bábis], among whom was his uncle and well-beloved tutor, reached the Bab in the fortress of Cíhrík where he had been imprisoned, and greatly distressed him. He prophesied that his end was near. He was taken at the end of the month of Sháh Wal id 1266/July 1850 to Tabríz, and was condemned to be shot at the same time as two of his disciples, Mullá Muhammad 'Ali of Yazd and Áqá Sayyid Husayn. The second, during the doleful procession of the three condemned men through the streets of Tabríz, under insults and blows, made pretence of abjuring the Bábí faith, and was released; he had previously been charged by the Báb to carry out his last wishes and to deposit some of his personal belongings and writings in a safe place. (He was, however, killed at Tehran shortly after having carried out this mission). The Báb was secured with the same ropes as his disciples to a pillar in the courtyard of the barracks at Tabríz, and the Christian regiment of the Frúd-dárún, commanded by Sám Kháán, fired. The first shot, according to the descriptions even in Muslim sources and others hostile to the reformer, merely severed the ropes, leaving the Báb completely free. Sám Kháán, terrified, refused to re-open fire, and consequently another firing-squad was detailed. On 9 July 1850, about midday, the Báb prays for preaching his doctrine with his life. The mangled body was thrown into a ditch in the town and after many vicissitudes (disinterred by the Bábís, hidden for several years at Tehran), it was removed on the order of Bahá'í Alláh [q.v.] to 'Akka, where it now rests in a large mausoleum on the slopes of Mount Carmel.
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Works.—The works of the Bab, all manuscript—some lost, others of doubtful authenticity (partially due to an unexpected feud after his death between Bahá’ís and Azals, see Bábís)—are very numerous. In more or less chronological order, and mentioning only the best known, they are: 1. The Káyyám al-Asmá’ or commentary on the súra of Yúsuf, referred to above, of more than 9,300 verses divided into 111 chapters (one verse of the famous súra), which opens with the well-known apostrophe to the kings of the earth: ‘O kings! do not take unto yourselves that which are the witnesses (the imams) of God for his creatures ...’, he means to say that ‘they have been created in another world but also to that of the prophetic cycle. From the castle of Cihríj, etc. Although the Babís interpret as predicting the prophetic vision of Bahá’ Alláh (q.v.) in the Tehran prison in the year 9, i.e., 1269/1852-3, various other passages of the Bayán effectively suggest that the Bab believed the Future Manifestation possible at a nearer date. Particularly interesting is the fine chapter XI of the IVth wáhid of the Arabic Bayán (138-9): ‘Be not the instruments of your misfortunes, for not to be grieved is one of the greatest commands of the Bayán. The fruit of this command shall be that you shall not grieve Him Whom God Shall Manifest.’

The metaphysics of the Báb is similar in certain ways to that of the Ismá’íllís. It sets out, in essence, as opposed to the unitary conception of existence as in Pantheism and to the dual conception (divine/human) of orthodox Islám, a division of Being into three parts: the World of the Essence of God, absolutely unattainable and transcendent, the World of Nature and of Man, and the World of Manifestation, that very pure mirror in which alone God can see himself. The Báb’s doctrine seems to attach very great importance to this invisible world which is concealed behind and between visible things: thus, all the eschatological terms, such as beatific vision, death, eternity, paradise, etc., being solely in this sense, appears in the Kur’an and other sacred works, such as the ‘Promised One’ towards whom alone all must travel, will be made manifest (ibíd., 166). The care for property, particularly recommended by the Báb, is justified eschatologically, in order that the eyes of ‘Promised One’ shall not look upon anything unclean (159). As well as the familiar passage (166) ‘All of you get up from your seats when you hear the mention of the name of Him Whom God Shall Manifest .... And in the ninth year you shall attain to perfect Good’, which the Bahá’ís interpret as predicting the prophetic vision of Bahá’ Alláh (q.v.) in the Tehran prison in the year 9, i.e., 1269/1852-3, various other passages of the Bayán effectively suggest that the Báb believed the Future Manifestation possible at a nearer date. Particularly interesting is the fine chapter XI of the IVth wáhid of the Arabic Bayán (138-9): ‘Be not the instruments of your misfortunes, for not to be grieved is one of the greatest commands of the Bayán. The fruit of this command shall be that you shall not grieve Him Whom God Shall Manifest.’

The metaphysics of the Báb is similar in certain ways to that of the Ismá’íllís. It sets out, in essence, as opposed to the unitary conception of existence as in Pantheism and to the dual conception (divine/human) of orthodox Islám, a division of Being into three parts: the World of the Essence of God, absolutely unattainable and transcendent, the World of Nature and of Man, and the World of Manifestation, that very pure mirror in which alone God can see himself. The Báb’s doctrine seems to attach very great importance to this invisible world which is concealed behind and between visible things: thus, all the eschatological terms, such as beatific vision, death, eternity, paradise, etc., being solely in accordance with the vision of the prophet, there remains only very little room in which to interest oneself in the life of the other world, which has led certain authors, perhaps wrongly (see E. G. Browne in the Preface to M. H. Phelps, Abbas Effendi, London 1912), to believe that the Báb denies the immortality of the individual soul, at least in the traditional sense of the word. In the same way, his conception of the return of Muhammad, of the imams, etc., in its actual presentation has led some writers wrongly to believe that he subscribes to the doctrine of reincarnation. On the contrary, the Báb in his original conception of the novelty of the different ‘worlds’ of the successive prophetic cycles, besides denying the Islamic and Christian dogmas of the resurrection of the body, denies as well the reincarnation of the soul in another body; when he writes (Arabic Bayán, wáhid 1, chapter 11.) ‘Those (our lieutenants) are, firstly Muhammad, the prophet of God, then those who are the witnesses (the imams) of God for his creatures ...’, he means to say that they ‘have been created in another
world, i.e., that God has re-created them ex novo in the world of the Bayan after having created them in the world of the Qur'an. It is easy to deduce from such a 'bookish' conception of the worlds of nature and of the spirit that letters, the written word, and the corresponding numerical values have enormous significance for the Bab. The love of calligraphy (according to tradition, his own writing was superb) is for him a feature of religion, and more than once, in the Báb, he commands that copies of the Holy Book should be conserved in the most elegant writing possible. The number 19, for instance, has great importance in Báb numerology; having abolished the 'natural' calendar, the Báb substitutes for it a purely spiritual and mental calendar of 19 months each of 19 days, each one bearing the name of an an attribute of God. The last month (that of 'A'id) is that of fasting, effective from dawn to sunset. This calendar, with some minor modifications, has been adopted by the Bábís also. The Báb took pleasure also in writing the most complicated haykal (pl. of haykal, 'temple' or 'shape'), a kind of talisman in an obscure gishasta script, which he considered to be the most acceptable to God.

It would be difficult to put into order the very varied moral and juridical precepts contained in the Babí writings. Besides such excellent verses as 'Each day recollects my Name. And if each day my thought penetrates into your heart, then are you among those who are always in God's thoughts' (Arabic Bayán, wáhibi, chapter 9), one finds prescriptions which seem not a little strange, such as the injunction, already quoted, not to possess more than 19 books, or discussions on the correct way to eat eggs. The extreme leniency of the penalties, which are reduced to fines and to the prohibition of sexual relations with one's own wife, is characteristic. The greatest penalty is incurred by the homicide: the culprit is condemned to pay 11,000 mighdás of gold to the heirs of the victim, and to abstain from all sexual activity for 19 years. Some penalties are likewise inflicted not only on those who strike their fellow-creatures, but also on those who lift their voices against them. Certain passages seem, however, to deal with relations between believers and unbelievers (it is only in the Bahá'í doctrine that Holy War and the confiscation of the goods of unbelievers have been definitely abrogated). There exist, moreover, regulations concerning taxes on benefits, on capital, etc. Divorce is allowed, but discouraged. Widowers and widows are obliged to remarry, the first after 90 days, the latter after 95. Ritual purity and seclusion of women are abolished. Public worship is abolished, except for the rites of the dead. The Báb's birthplace, the places of his imprisonment, etc., are considered as places of pilgrimage. Every 19th day one should invite 19 persons, giving them 'if only a glass of water'. All alcoholic drinks are forbidden, and it is as strictly forbidden to beg as to give individual alms to beggars.

BAB AL-ABWAB — BAB-I HUMAYUN

The principal source of information about them is an anonymous 11th-century Turk i al-Bab, which is quoted by Ahmad b. Lu'lu' Allah Minagdiri (Muneccim) Baj in (17th century) in his Dtim al-Duwal. This source adds considerably to our knowledge of the movements of the Rûs, e.g., it mentions that in 423/1032 the ghâISIS of al-Bab caught and destroyed a party of Russian raiders in a defile of the Caucasus (Minorsky, Studies in Caucasian History, 77).

The period of Turkish predominance at al-Bab, in common with the neighbouring provinces, begins in the time of the Saltikovs (cf. A. Zeki Velidi Togan, Umum Turk tarihine giris, i, 190, 411). Under the Mongols al-Bab figured in the march of Subutai northwards through the Caucasus (1222). Timir and Djiaba (Jebe) campaigned more than once in the neighbourhood. The general effect of the Mongol period was to confirm the Turkification of the N.-W. provinces of what had formerly been the Caliphate.

The most detailed account of Bâb al-Abwâb comes from al-Kazwînî (674/1275), who describes the place as a thriving Muslim town, built of stone, its wall washed by the waters of the Caspian. In length it was about 2/3 of a farsakh and in breadth a bow-shot. There were towers on the city-wall, at each of which was a mosque, to serve the neighbourhood and those occupied with the religious sciences. Guards were constantly maintained upon the wall, and a beacon-fire on an adjoining peak was kept in readiness against the danger of invasion from the N. Al-Kazwînî mentions what he calls talismans set up to keep back the Turks, probably remains of sculpture from the pre-Moslem period. He speaks of a cistern outside the city with steps descending to the water. Outside the city wall, on the latter road that the main entrance is to be found, corresponds to the Turkish Kapu (Lowenklau alias Leunclavus and Dukas, in the 9th/10th and 16th centuries, etc.).

Up till the end of the Empire, the Sublime Porte also housed the Ministry of the Interior (Dâhidîyye Nêtâret), the former offices of the Keşigâhâ (Kekâya, Kekâya, Kikâya) Bey, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Khedîjiyye Nêtâret), the former department of the Reis ul-kultûb (Reis-kîap), literally “Chief of the Secretaries”, the Council of State (Şarâyî Edevel), without counting two more modern commissions which were suppressed by the Young Turks.

Five days after the abolition of the Sultanate (1 November 1922), the premises, prior to becoming the seat of the ülâyet of Ankara, served for the offices of the Delegation of the Government of Ankara (Refet Paşa, soon replaced by Rauf Bey and Adnan Bey Adivar, all three of whom later belonged to the opposition).

The road formerly called Bâb-i dli dîddesî, which climbs northwards from the station of Sirkelî and circles round the enclosure (which also contains a mosque), has been renamed Ālâddî dîddesî. It is lined with bookshops and runs into the Souk Çeçmâne road, passing between this enclosure and that of the Top Kapî Saray. It is in this latter road that the main entrance is to be found, opposite the gate of the Saray, which is called the Souk Çeçmâne gate; at a short distance from this is to be found a huge belvedere, called Ayâ Înâka, incorporated in the same wall. Since last century its population has shown a slight increase, but evidently it is of much less relative importance than formerly.


BAB-I ÂLÎ (modern orthography Babî âlî), less frequently Bâb-i âsafî, the (Ottoman) Sublime Porte, former ministerial department of the Grand Vizier, originally called Paşa (or Vent) Kapusu.

The custom of calling the palace, court of government of a ruler “ort” or “mûderris” was very prevalent in ancient times (Iran of the Sasanids, Egypt of the Pharaohs, Israel, Arabs, Japan). The term returned to Isfahân in the more Turkish form of Âlî Kapu (Chardin).

The “Porte”, which a the same time was the personal dwelling of the Grand Vizier and at the outset tended to be rather mobile, gradually lost the character of a semi-private residence and became finally established, under what was henceforth to be its official name, from 1718, when the Grand Vizier Newshenhirî İbrahim Paşa returned with his father-in-law, Sultan Ahmad III, from Adrianople to Istanbul, after the peace of Passarowitz (Sigilk-i Ormândî, iv, 750). Prior to this date the term Bâb-i âlî denoted rather the palace of the Sultan or the Imperial diwan. The same confusion arises in Byzantine and European usage with the terms Porta, Porte, Porte, Πόρτα, which moreover corresponded to the Turkish Kapu (Lowenklau alias Leunclavus and Dukas, in the 9th/10th and 16th centuries, etc.).
the effects of those who died without known heirs were deposited here; at others it served as a treasury or for other purposes.

Many European writers, especially in the 19th century, ignoring Hammer (Staatsverfassung, ii, 95) and D’Ohsson (Tableau, viii, 158), asserted that Böbi Humayun meant “Sublime Porte” (the Western name for the Ottoman Government), while in fact the latter denoted the Grand Vizier’s residence (see entry Bab-i Khiran). There is even no reason to assume that the term “Porte”, which until the 18th century signified the Sultan’s Court, originated from this gate, as some travellers (e.g., Tournon, Voyage du Levant, Paris 1717, i, 496) believed (cf. Dergah, Kapu).


**BĀB AL-LĀN** (Bāb Allān), ‘Gate of the Alans’, Persian Dar-i Alan, mod. Darial (Darial), a pass in the middle Caucasus, E. of Mt. Kazbek and S. of Vladikavkas. It is described as a magnificent gorge through which the Terek rushes between granite cliffs rising to heights of from 4,000 to 5,000 ft., and was apparently known to the ancients as the Caucasian Gates (cf. Pauly-Wissowa, XXXII, i, col. 325). It lay in the territory of the Alans, in the early days of Islam and later a national group of hardy mountaineers, distinct from and usually independent of their neighbours N. and S. of the Caucasus. Their present-day representatives, the Onsetes, live athwart the pass.

Bāb al-Lān was scarcely reached by the first wave of Muslim conquest. It is mentioned in 105/724, when al-Djarrāb b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥakami invaded Khazaría by this route. Next year al-Djarrāb is said to have received the ḥiyya and ḥulul from the Alans (Dhahabi, Ta’rikh al-Islām, ed. Cairo, iv, 88), but Maslama b. Abd al-Malik in 109/727 had to occupy Darial (Yaḵūt, ii, 395). It was perhaps at this time that Maslama placed an Arab garrison, mentioned by al-Mas‘ūdī (Murūjīdī, ii, 44), in the fortress which defended the pass. This fortress was built on a massive rock overhanging a bridge across the ravine and was, says al-Mas‘ūdī, one of the most famous in the world. Yet in 112/729 the Khazars marched through the pass, defeated al-Djarrāb in a pitched battle and captured Ardabīl, before retiring with their booty (Tabarī, i, 530-35). In the operation of Marwān b. Muhammad against Khazaría in 119/737, he himself advanced through the Darial pass to a rendez-vous with Abū Yaqūb al-Sulāmi advancing from Bāb al-Abwāb. This was the beginning of a highly successful campaign north of the Caucasus, but Marwān did not attempt any permanent occupation. The Arabs made sporadic attempts to hold Darial, e.g., again under Yaqūb b. Uṣayd al-Sulāmi circa 147/758 (Baladī, 290-210). But no great fortress-city developed here as at Bāb al-Abwāb (q.v.). Al-Mas‘ūdī states that in his time (4th/10th century) there was still in the pass an Arab garrison, provisioned from Tiffis, at five days’ distance through infidel country (ibid.).

Darial pass is mentioned repeatedly in the Mongol period, and later retained its importance.

**Bibliography:** Mas‘ūdī, Murūjīdī, ii, 43-45; Ḥudūd al-ʿAlām, 446; D. M. Dunlop, History of the Jewish Khazars, Princeton 1954, index.

**BĀB AL-MANDAB**, the straits between the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden. They are divided by the volcanic island of Mayyūn (q.v.), called Perim by Westerners, into Large Strait, c. 14 km. wide, and Small Strait, c. 2.5 km. wide, the former being generally used by large vessels. Water runs out of the Red Sea during the south-west monsoon from June to September and into it during the north-east monsoon from November to April, causing currents which make the passage dangerous for sailing craft. The hill of al-Manhall (270 m.) on the Arabian shore rises east of Small Strait, and just north of this is the site of al-Shaykh Saʿīd (q.v.), from which, as from Mayyūn, entrance into the Red Sea can be controlled.

Arab tradition holds that Asia and Africa were joined together until Dhu ‘l-Karnayn split them asunder here and created the Red Sea. Yaḵūt associates the origin of the name al-Mandab (‘place of lamentation for the dead’) with a crossing of the Abyssinians over the sea to the Yemen. The Mandānī applies it to a not clearly identified portion of the southern Yaman coast, which lay within the territory of Banū Madjad and Farasān. Amber (called ḥaddīkh al-bahr) used to be collected in al-Mandab.

Two Sabaean inscriptions of the early 6th Christian century (Ky 507 and 508) mention stil (or sīl) mubn (= silsilat al-Mandab) in connexion with the conflict between Yūsuf Asʿar Dhu Nuwas and the Abyssinians; this may have been a chain stretched across the very narrow and shallow mouth of the inlet at al-Shaykh Saʿīd, if al-Mandab lay as far south as that, as its appearance in the name of the straits would suggest. Such a barrier may well have been the source of the implausible tradition of a chain across the straits themselves.

The variant Bāb al-Mandam, probably to be explained by no more than the not unusual substitution of m for b, is especially current among seafaring Arabs, who often refer to the straits simply as al-Bāb.


**BĀB-I MASHIKHAT**, (also Shāykh al-Islām Kapīlī, Bāb-ī Pètwā and Pītwārīnī), a name which became common in the Ottoman Empire during the 19th century for the office or department of the Shāykh al-Islām (q.v.), the Chief Mufti of Istanbul. Until 1241/1826 the Chief Muftis had functioned and issued their rulings from their own residences or, if these were too distant, from rented quarters. In that year, after the destruction of the Janissaries, Sultān Mahmmūd II gave the former...
residence of the Agha of the Janissaries, near the Suleymaniye Mosque, to the Chief Mufti, who thus acquired a permanent establishment. This step, taken simultaneously with the creation of an Inspectorate of wa'af to centralise the supervision and control of wa'af revenues, prepared the way for the bureaucratisation of the ‘ulama. Deprived of both their financial and their administrative autonomy, the ‘ulama were gravely weakened as against the sovereign power, and were unable to resist effectively successive diminutions of their competence, authority, and status. In the course of the 19th century, they lost control of education and justice to the new Councils and Ministries created for these matters, and even the drafting of fetwas was entrusted to a committee of legal specialists in the Chief Mufti’s office. The Chief Mufti himself became a government office-holder, a minister or head of department and a member of the cabinet. Eventually a point was reached when his term of office ended automatically with the fall of the cabinet. Unlike the other ministers, he was appointed by the Sultan and not by the Grand Vizier, with whom he was theoretically equal (cf. Art. 27 of the 1876 constitution). The office however declined steadily in influence and importance, especially after the Revolution of 1908. Finally, on 3rd March 1924, the Office of the Chief Mufti was ended, the office of Shaykh al-Islam, which had lapsed with the Sultanate in 1922, was replaced by a department of religious affairs attached to the office of the Prime Minister in Ankara. The head of this department (Diyanet İşleri Reisî) is the chief religious functionary of the Turkish Republic, with responsibility for mosques and mosque personnel, but not for wa'af, law, etc.


BABA-I SERASKERI or SERASKER KAPÎSÎ, the name of the War Department in the Ottoman Empire during the 19th century. After the destruction of the Janissaries in 1826, the Agha of the Janissaries was replaced by a new commanding officer, the Ser’asker [q.v.]. The title was an old one, given to army commanders in former times. As applied by Mahmûd II, it came to connote an officer who combined the functions of commander-in-chief and minister of war, with special responsibility for the new style army. In addition, he inherited from the Agha of the Janissaries the responsibility for public security, police, firefighting, etc. in the capital. In a period of growing centralisation and enforced change, the police function came to be of increasing importance and the maintenance and extension of the police system one of the chief duties of the Ser’asker. In 1262/1845 the police were taken from the jurisdiction of the Ser’asker and placed under a separate department called Zabtiyye (see ZABTIYYA) Mubahîrîyyetî.

Mahmûd II at first lodged the Ser’askerate in the old Saray, from which a few remaining parts of the Imperial Household were transferred to the new Saray. Later, in 1282/1865, new buildings were provided for the Ser’asker and his staff. For a short time in 1297/1879-90, and then permanently in 1324/1908, the old name of Ser’askerate was replaced by Ministry of War (Harbîyye). These buildings remained the seat of the Ministry until the time of the transfer of the capital to Ankara, when they were handed over to the University of Istanbul.


BABA, (Turkish and also Persian) “father”; in East Turkish it also denotes “grandfather” (Vambahy, Cagatay, Sprachstudien, 240; Süleyman Efendi, Lughat-i diaghatay, 68). Baba, put after the name, is used in various ways as an honorific for older men, and in Turkey it is used as a form of address even today. As part of a name, it is best known from the story of “Ali Baba and the 40 thieves” in The Thousand and One Nights. As a cognomen, it was used particularly in Dervish circles (e.g. Geyikli Baba, who is said to have accompanied Orkhan Beg in the siege of Brusa), and there particularly with the Bektaşî. Aḥš Bābā [q.v.], in corrupt form also Aḥū Baba and similar forms) was the title of Aḥšl Eywârîn’s [q.v.] successor in his Tekke in Kırşehir (Anatolia) and master of the leather cutters (tanniers, tanners, and shoemakers), in which he held the privilege of inducting apprentices into the guild. There was a movement of dervishes who called themselves Bâbâ’is [q.v.] under the Rûm Sâlîdî Sultan Kayhüsraw II. The epithet Baba also occurs with non-religious civil servants in the ancient Ottoman Empire, e.g. Agha Babaî (Barber de Meynard, Supplement, i, 257), the leader of the 40 guards of the imperial harem, who were white eunuchs. In Iran the epithet Baba precedes the name, again frequently in the case of dervishes (e.g. the dialect poet Bâbâ Tâhir ‘Uryân [see BABA-TAHIR]). Occasionally, Bâbî appears in its own right, e.g. a member of the Khân family Girây on the Crimea, Bâbî Girây, son of Muhammed Girây, who, after the death of his father, succeeded him as Khân, but was murdered six months later (929/1522); as also the Özbek prince Bâbû Beg [q.v.].

As part of a place name, Bâbî indicates that the place had dervish associations. Thus, for example, Bâbâ Daghî [see BABA-DAGH], in the Dobrajdja, where the tomb of the famous saint Şarî Şaltîk Baba is; there is another Bâbâ Daghî near Denizli in Anatolia, and foothills called Bâbû Burnu (formerly Assoe) in western Anatolia, a part of mount Ida in Troas, at the foot of which lies the harbour Baba Liman. In eastern Thrace there is a small town called BABAESKI [q.v.].

Bibliography: Barbier de Meynard, Supplement aux dictionnaires turcs, viz.: ‘Ali Eldawâd, Dioghriyya lughâtî, 143; Sâînâmeh ed Edirne (1325), 906, 980; Texier, Asie Mineure, 20; IA, ii, 165 ff. (by M. Fuad Köprülü). (F. TAECHNER)

BABA AFDAL AL-DIN MUHAMMAD B. HUSAYN KÂSHÂNÎ (or Kâgîl), generally called Baba Afdal, a Persian thinker and the author of poems in quatrains, born in Mârakh near Kâshân, where he is also buried. His dates are still rather uncertain. According to Sayîd Nafîî he was born around 582/ 1186-7, or 592/1195-6, and died after 654/1256 or 664/1265-6; the date given as the date of his death by Brockelmann, ii, 280, viz. Rabjâd 666/March-April 1266, is near to this. According to M. Minovî, Bâbû Afdal died considerably earlier, at the beginning of the 7th/13th century; the date of death given by

...
E. G. Browne and others, 707/1307-8, is certainly incorrect. There is scant information on his life, and that of little importance. Thus, for example, the relationship between Baba Afdal and Nasir al-Din Tusí (q.v.), which has been accepted by some, proves on closer examination to have been impossible. Admittedly Nasr al-Din Tusí had a teacher named Kamál al-Din Muhammad Ḥāsíb, who had been a pupil of Baba Afdal. Of the two quatrains in praise of "Afdal" ascribed to Nasr al-Din Tusí, one is not definitely his whilst the other is in self-praise. The assertion that Nasr al-Din had protected Kāghān from Ḥollāgū to please Baba Afdal is a fiction. It is hardly possible that there was ever a meeting between Baba Afdal and Sa’dí. Baba Afdal’s thought was influenced by the Bājnīyīya and Avicenna, whom he resembles also in his attempts to substitute Persian technical terms for Arabic ones. His writings comprise 16 treatises, a posthumous book of questions and answers, some 40 short essays, 6 letters, a collection of quatrains, some ghazals and kifas. These figures, especially where the short essays and letters are concerned, must not be regarded as final, because—though most of his treatises had already been printed individually before—scientific and systematic research into his works has only recently commenced. He wrote chiefly in Persian, though occasionally also in Arabic (cf. primarily the Madārij al-Kamal, which he later translated into Persian by request). His prose works are concerned with philosophy, theosophy, ethics, and logic; they are partly original, partly editions or translations, and are distinguished by their simple, clear and readily intelligible style, which follows that of the ancients closely. M. Bahār regards his translation of the Kūšd al-Mafṣūs of Aristotle as exemplary. Baba Afdal’s logic al-Mishkād al-Mubin is based on al-*Ibn aos-l-Nafs of Aristotle though it is not identical with its model, but has independent developments of its own. Baba Afdal’s Ḫakār "Umūnīn gives a selection from Ḥazzālī’s Kimyā-yī Sa’dād, which consists partly of selected pieces from the Persian text of Ḥazzālī, partly of translations of the Arabic parts of the book, which Ḥazzālī had not included in the Persian version. Baba Afdal’s quatrains are extremely attractive, and their occasionally shrill note has already been remarked on by E. H. Whinfield. It is no wonder that several of them have achieved currency as works attributed to ’Umar Khayyām.


BABA BEG, an Ozbek chief of the family of the Keneges, who was till 1870 prince of Shahrisabz. This town having been conquered by the Russians, he fled with a small body of those faithful to him. Finally he was seized in Ferghanā and obliged to reside at Taškent. In 1875 he entered Russian military service and took part in the campaign against Khoshand. He died about 1898 at Taškent. (W. B. SPULER)

BABA DĀGHĪ [see BABADAGH].

BABA ESKİSİ [see BABAKES].

BABA FIGHÂNĪ [see FIGGAN].

BABA ISḤĀK [see BABAI].

BABA-TĀHIR, a mystic and poet who wrote in a Persian dialect. According to Riḍā Kūl Khánum (19th century), who does not give his source, Baba-Tāhir lived in the period of Daylamī rule and died in 401/1010. Among his quatrains there is an enigmatical one: “I am that sea (baḥr) which entered into a vase; that point which entered into the letter. In each alif (‘thousand’, i.e., of years?) arises an alif-badd (a man upright in stature like the letter alif). I am the alif-badd who has come in this alif.” Mahdī Khánum in the *JASB* has given an extremely curious interpretation of this quatrain: the letters alif-kadd have the value 215, the same as the letter alif in the word qasār (Persian equivalent of the Arabic baḥr “sea”) and those of the name of the poet Tāhir. If we add alif-kadd (215) to alif (111) we get 326 (the same value by the way as the Persian word kāzār, “thousand”), if we spell it kā, zā, alif, rā. In this way the phrase “an alif-badd came into the alif” would give the date (326) of the birth of Baba-Tāhir who may well have lived till 401.

In spite of the ingenuity of this explanation, it is nevertheless true that the only historical evidence that we possess about Baba-Tāhir is that of the *Rubāt al-Ṣūdar* (c. 601/1204, GMS, 98-99), the author of which “had heard” that when the Saljuq Sultan Tughril entered Hamadān (in 447/1055), Baba-Tāhir addressed an admonition to him (“O Turk, how are you going to act towards the Muslims?”) which much impressed the conqueror. The anecdote suggests for the death of Baba-Tāhir a date later than 447/1055 but is in no way contradictory to the statement that Baba-Tāhir flourished under the Daylamīs, i.e., under the Būyids and their relatives, the Kāköyids, whose rule in Hamadān lasted till the expedition of Ibrahim Yinal in 435/1043-4. Baba-Tāhir may well have been the contemporary of Avicenna (Ibn Sīnā) who died at Hamadān in 428/1037, but the legends which make him a witness of
the execution of the mystic Ayn al-Kudat of Hamadan in 533 and the contemporary of Nasir al-Din Tusi (672) are pure inventions.

The sources sometimes call Bábá-Tahir Hamadán (cf. the Arabic MS. 1903 of the Bibl. Nat. Paris, the Sarandjád, etc.), sometimes Lurí (Lurí). This latter form—in place of Lur [q.v.], is somewhat puzzling: does it mean some other connexion than that of origin between Bábá-Tahir and Luristán? It is certainly well to remember that in the 5th/11th century there were very close links between Hamadán and Luristán and the poet may have spent his life between the two places. In Khurramábábá there is a quarter bearing the name of Bábá-Tahir (cf. Edmonds, Geogr. Journ., June 1922, 443). The association of Bábá-Tahir with Luristán in the beliefs of the Ahl-i Hákk [see below] is also significant. In the quatrains of Bábá-Tahir (cf. nos. 102, 200, 274 of the Díván), Mount Alwand [q.v.] overshadowing Hamadán is frequently mentioned. The tomb of Bábá-Tahir lies on a little hill to the north-west of the town in the Bun-i-bazar quarter; beside the tomb of Bábá-Tahir are those of his faithful Fátima [see below] and Mírzá ‘All Naqí Kawkhi (19th century); the building is a humble one and of no interest. The tomb is mentioned in Šád Allah Mustawfi, Naṣaḥ (740/1339, 75); cf. the photograph in Moxorský, Malevásh, Moscow 1911, xi, and Williams Jackson, A Visit to the Tomb of Bábá-Tahir at Hamadán, in A Volume presented to E. G. Browne, Cambridge 1922, 257-260.

The stories one hears in Mázandarán about Bábá-Tahir’s connexion with that province have no foundation and may have been brought by immigrants from Luristán (the Lák). Besides, all the nomads of Persia like to claim Bábá-Tahir as a compatriot.

The language of Bábá-Tahir. Since all the facts and traditions connect the poet with Hamadán and Luristán, it is reasonable to expect to find in his dialect traces of a dialect of this region of Persia. But as this dialect was very close to Persían and as so many different mouths have been trying to render more comprehensible the verses transmitted orally, there is little hope of re-establishing the text in its dialectic purity. It is not an improbable suggestion that Bábá-Tahir simply wanted to imitate the dialects of his adorers. In our own day a Kurd Christian claims to have made verses in the Gurání dialect, quite distinct from his own, in order to “transmit the message” to the Ahl-i Hákk (Dr. Sa’dí Khán, in MW, Jan. 1927, 40).

The country between Hamadán and Khurramábábá still has many dialects, but that of Bábá-Tahir is not connected with any definite one and seems to borrow from all. The closeness of the present text of Bábá-Tahir to literary Persian is undeniable; on the other hand changes like nám > nám “name”, daslam > dastum (“my hand”), raštam > raštum (“I have gone”), dór > dir (cf. Huart, xiv = Díván, no. 82) are typical of the Lur dialects; the stems wádí “to speak”, hár “to do” are common to the Kurdish and central dialects; the forms mi-har-á “he does” and dá-yá “he comes” recall particularly the Gurání spoken much farther to the west. For certain peculiarities (dáram > dārum) we only find analogies at Kárán (near Shíráz).

Hodák’s detailed analysis has clearly proved this mixture of dialects (Dialektgemisch) in the quatrains, at least as we know them now. The term “Muhammadan Pahlavi” proposed by Huart (1885) for the language of Bábá-Tahir has not been accepted by scholars.

The metre of the quatrains of Bábá-Tahir and of his ghásals is almost exclusively hasádi muasaddas mahdūf ——— | ——— | ——— which has made the new editor call the quatrains du-baytī (distichs) instead of rubá‘í, the last term being too closely associated with some regular rubá‘ī attributed to Bábá-Tahir. The metre of Bábá-Tahir is also found in popular songs (Mírzá Día’far [Korsch], Gramm. Pers. Yázka, Moscow 1901, 308).

Bábá-Tahir—poet. Down to 1927, all that was known of his poems was a rather small number found for the most part in anthologies of the 18th and 19th centuries. Huart’s researches produced in 1885, 59 quatrains, and in 1908, found 3 new quatrains (they are moreover very doubtful). Leszczyński (who used the Berlin manuscripts) has translated 80 quatrains and one ghásal (a different one from Huart’s). Finally Husyn Wahíd Dastgirdl ʻIṣfahān, editor of the Persian review Armaẖān, published in 1906/1927 at Tíhrán a Díván of Bábá-Tahir containing 296 du-baytī and 4 ghásals of this poet; as an appendix the editor gives 62 du-baytī found in the “different collections” and the 3 rhymes added by or for K. L. Allen. The quatrains of the Díván are arranged in the alphabetical order of the rhymes. The editor unfortunately gives no details of the manuscripts of the Díván reproduced in his edition. The new quatrains several of which mention Táhir’s name, the mountains of Alwand and Maymand (?) etc., confirm the characteristics already known of Bábá-Tahir, while making them a little more banal by the inevitable repetitions. The dialectical flavour of most of the quatrains is in favour of their authenticity, although an imitation of the peculiarities of the language of Bábá-Tahir would really not be a very difficult matter. The question of the authenticity of the quatrains of Bábá-Tahir certainly arises, as it did in the case of those of Šáhír Khayyát. Zúkowski says that quatrains of Bábá-Tahir are found in the Díván of Mulla Muhammad Šufí Mázandarán (5th/11th cent.). A certain Shahtir Beg Muhammad, a modern poet of Hamadán, claimed to be the author of several “Kurdí (Pahlawí)” quatrains attributed to Bábá-Tahir (cf. Díván, 21).

The choice of subjects in Bábá-Tahir is very restricted, but the poet’s work bears the stamp of a distinct personality. We give an analysis of the 59 quatrains published by Huart to enable the reader to judge. As usual it is difficult to draw a rigid distinction between the expression of mystical and that of profane love; 34 quatrains are almost equally divided between two categories of lyric poetry. Two quatrains are simple hymns to God. The rest is more individual and characteristic. Bábá-Tahir often refers to his life as a wandering darvishi-baladun, without a roof above his head, sleeping with a stone for a pillow, continually harassed by spiritual anxieties (nos. 6, 7, 14, 28). Cares and melancholy torment him; the “flower of grief” alone flourishes in his heart; even the charms of spring leave him still unhappy (34, 35, 47, 54). Bábá-Tahir professes the philosophy of the true Súfí, confesses his sins, implores forgiveness for them, preaches humility, invokes nirvana (fanép) as the only remedy for his misfortunes (1, 13, 45, 50, 58). One human failing is especially
characteristic of Bābā-Tahir: his eyes and his heart do not readily detach themselves from the things of this world; his rebellious heart burns with love for them, leaves him no rest for a moment and the poet cries in anguish: "Art thou a lion, a panther, O my Heart, thou who art continually struggling with me. If thou fall into my hands, I shall spill thy blood to see what colour thou art, O my heart" (3, 8, 9, 26, 36, 42).

Bābā-Tahir's psychology shows striking contrast to that of 'Umar Khayyām. Bābā-Tahir shows no trace of the hedonism of the latter (d. 517/1123?) nor of his serenity in face of the changes brought by death, while 'Umar Khayyām lacks the mystical fire of Bābā-Tahir (cf. Christensen, Critical Studies in the Rubā‘iyāt of 'Umar-i Khayyām, Copenhagen 1917, 44).

What pleases in Bābā-Tahir is the freshness of his sentiments which Šāfi routine had not yet stereotyped, the spontaneity of his images, the naïveté of his language, with the local tang.

Bābā-Tahir—mystic. The Persian dervishes with whom Žukowski talked about Bābā-Tahir knew that he was the author of 22 metaphysical treatises (cf. also Rīdā Kull Khān) but it is only from Ṣūfī and Ḡloch oth that we have learned in Europe of the existence in Oxford and Paris of commentaries on the maxims of Bābā-Tahir. The complete treatise [al-‘Ikhld, iHikfr], ("The brief sayings") has now been published in the edition of the Armaqāh. This treatise consists of 368 Arabic maxims divided into 23 bāb dealing with the following subjects: knowledge (‘ilm); gnosis (ma‘rifa); inspiration and penetration (iḥkām, fi‘rāsā); reason and the soul (‘aḥl, nafs); this world and the beyond (dunyā, ‘aḥlāh); the musical performance (samā‘) and the dhikr; sincerity and performance (qiyād, ‘iḥfād), etc.

Here are a few specimens of these maxims: no. 86: "Real knowledge is the intuition after the knowledge of certainty has been acquired" (al-hakīmat al-muqadhamat ba‘da ‘ilmī li-yahshīn); no. 96: "Ecstasy (wa‘idā‘) is the loss (of the knowledge) of existing things and is the existence of lost things"; no. 368: "he who has been the witness of predeterminations (coming) from God remains without movement and without volition"; no. 300: "he whom ignorance has slain has never lived, he whom the dhikr has killed will never die".

The "Brief Sayings" seem to have enjoyed considerable popularity among the Šāfis. The Persian editor mentions the following commentaries on this treatise: the Arabic commentary attributed to ‘Ayn al-Kuţd al-Hamadānī (d. in 533/1138-9 but often associated in legends with Bābā-Tahir); another Arabic commentary by an unknown author; the Arabic and Persian commentaries by Mulla Sulṭān ‘Alī Gunabādī; the Persian commentary was printed in 1326/1906 but is very rare. The editor of the Armaqāh expresses the hope of being one day able to publish the "Brief Sayings" accompanied by one of the commentaries.

The Arabic manuscript 1903 of the Bibl. Nat. contains the first 8 chapters of the maxims of Bābā-Tahir in an abridged form (fol. 100b-105b), as well as a commentary on them (fol. 74a-100a) entitled al-Futūḥāt al-Rabbānīyya fi Ighārat al-Hamadānīyya.

The manuscript seems to be in the hand of the author of the commentary, Ḥanī Beg al-‘Azīzī who began his work in Shāhwa‘l 889 and ended it on 20th Shāhīn 900/1 September 1485. The commentary was written at the request of a certain Ṣ̄aybī Abū l-Bākā who had possessed the Ighārat of Bābā-Tahir since 853/1449-50. He had let them fall into the well of Zamzam at Hamadān but the manuscript was miraculously recovered. The ‘u‘lamā‘ had dissuaded Abū l-Bākā from writing a commentary on the text on account of its profundity and obscurity. Finally Abū l-Bākā engaged Ḥanī Beg to accomplish this task. The commentary deals with the text of the maxims of Bābā-Tahir word by word.

Bābā-Tahir—saint. As is the case with the majority of the mystical poets (Aṭṭār, Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, Ḥāfiz), there are numerous legends of the life and miracles of Bābā-Tahir. It is related that when Bābā-Tahir had asked the students of the madrasa of Hamadān to show him the way to acquire knowledge, the students as a joke told him to spend a winter night in the icy water of a tank. Bābā-Tahir carried out the advice and next morning found himself enlightened and exclaimed: Āmsaytu Kurdisīyān wa-asbahū ʿAbīshīyān ("last night I was a Kurd and this morning I have become an Arab"). This story was heard by Žukowski in Tehran and by Heron Allen's informant at Būshīr; it is widely current in Hamadān (cf. the preface to the Dīwān, 17 and the manuscripts from Hamadān). This Arabic utterance is found in the preface to the Majma‘a of Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, where however it is referred to an unknown (mystic?) ancestor of Ibn Āẓīr, a Turk of Urmīya. In the Nafashāt al-Uns of Ẓāmīlī, ed. Nassau Lee, 362-363, the phrase is attributed to Abū ‘Abd Allāh Bābūnī (a Gūrān tribe, see Ibn Āḏīr, ix, 247).

Other pious legends represent Bābā-Tahir as making the snow on Mount Alwand melt by the ardour of his spiritual fire, tracing with the point of his great toe the solution of an astronomical problem which had been put him, etc. (Žukowski, Heron Allen, Leszcynski, preface to the Dīwān, manuscripts from Hamadān).

Gobineau, Trois ans en Asie, Paris 1859, 344, already knew that the adepts of the Ahl-i Ḥaqq sect were in the habit of "praising exceedingly and giving pride of place to the names of famous Šāfis, notably of Bābā-Tahir whose poems in the Lur dialect are highly esteemed, and of his sister Bībi Fatīma" etc. The discovery of the religious work Saranāyām has enabled us to locate Bābā-Tahir in the theogony of the sect. The Ahl-i Ḥaqq (q.v.) believed in 7 manifestations of the divinity, each of which was accompanied by a retinue of 4 angels, each of whom had special duties. Bābā-Tahir is regarded as one of the angels of the third period and the incarnation of Azrā‘īl and Nuṣayr. The mystic stage to which the period of Bābā Khoshshīn generally corresponds is the ma‘rifa. The events of this cycle take place in Luristān and Hamadān. The manuscript of the Saranāyām recounts the visit of the "King of the World" to Bābā-Tahir in Hamadān. Bābā Khoshshīn is meant by the "King of the World" but the legend seems to be inspired by memories of the episode of Tughrl (see above). Bābā-Tahir and Fāṭima Lārā ("the thin") of the tribe of Bārā Shāhī (of the Gūrān country?), who was in his service, fed the whole army of the King with a dūr-yāh of rice. The latter tempts Bābā-Tahir with all the treasures of the world but he only desires the “beauty of the King”. Fāṭima wants to follow the King of the World; she lays her head on his knees and gives up the ghost. The King consoles Bābā-Tahir for his loss.
and promises that on the day of the Last Judgement he will reunite him to Fātima so that they shall be like Laylā and Majānūn. 13 poetical fragments (mutated but in the style of Bābā-Tāhir) are scattered through the text (cf. Minorsky, 29-33, 99-103; these facts have been utilised by Leszczynski, op. cit., 18-25). Fātima Lārā, who is mentioned in the text is buried beside Bābā-Tāhir. According to the custodians of the tombs of Bābā-Tāhir, she is not to be confused with another Fātima also buried in the same bukhā (?). Gobineau and A. V. W. Jackson mention the sister of Bābā-Tāhir, Bībi Fātima or Fātima Laylá. Āzād-i Hamadānī (Diwan, 16-21) speaks of the tomb of the dāvd “nurse” of Bābā-Tāhir: everyone seems to endeavour to translate into the language of everyday life the mystic relations of Bābā-Tāhir to Fātima.

The quatrains already quoted at the beginning of this article (all, aif-hadd) may reflect some high aspiration of Bābā-Tāhir.

**Bibliography:** The MSS. containing the quatrains of Bābā-Tāhir are as follows: Konya Museum no. 2347 (88/I,1444); 2 Khān, 8 du-baytī, see M. Minuwi, Madājdla-yi Dānshqada-yi Adābyyāt, Tehran, iv/2, 1325, 54-9; Asiat. Soc. Beng., Pers. no. 923, Catal. Ivanow, 424 (a madjam‘a of 1000 [1592]); Preuss. Staatsbibl., Catal. Pertsch, 727, no. 697 (written in 1820 and used by Leszczynski): 56 quatrains; Bibl. Nat. de Paris, pers. 174, Cat. Blochet, ii, 290-292 (collection made by Baksh ‘Abbās Karabaghl, dated 1820 [1844]): 174 quatrains and a ghasal. In the library of the mosque of Sipāsālār in Tehran, Ūzkowski found a manuscript, Ḥādī-i Bābā-Tāhir bā-indimām-i aṣhārāz, but the title does not correspond to the contents of the MS. The MSS. of the mystical treatises of Bābā-Tāhir are as follows: Bibl. Nat. de Paris, Arāb 1903 (Blochet, o.l., ii, 291) and the Oxford MS. Ethé, Cat. Pers. Mss. Bodleian Lib., no. 1296, fol. 302b-341. The anthologies which mention the poet are: ‘Ali Kuli Khān Wālī, Ṣiyāḥ al-Shu‘arā’, 1161/1748, cf. Leszczynski, 10; ‘Utūf ‘Abbās beg, Aqāshqāda, 1303/1799, Bombay 1277, 247 (25 quatrains); ‘All ‘Ibrāhīm Shāh, ‘Ṣubūt-i Ibrāhīmī, 1205/1791, unique MS. in the Preuss. Staatsbibl., Pertsch, 627, no. 663 (utilised by Ūzkowski and Leszczynski); Riḍā Kuli Khān, Madjam‘a al-Faṣāḥā, Tehran 1295, i, 326 (10 quatrains); idem, Ṣiyāḥ al-arifīn, Tehran 1303, 102 (24 quatrains); 57 quatrains of Bābā-Tāhir were published at Bombay in 1297 and 1308 (with those of Umar Khayyām); 32 quatrains (with the Mundāḏīl of Āṣārī) at Bombay 1301; 27 quatrains (with those of Khayyām) at Tehran 1274; the ghasal of Bābā-Tāhir is given in the appendix to the Diwān of Shams-i Maghribī, Tehran 1298, 158, in the appendix to the Mundāḏīl of Āṣārī etc. The Diwān of Bābā-Tāhir (cf. text) with the Kalimāt-i ḥijdār, a preface by the editor, a biography by Māhmūd ‘Irīfān, a description of the tomb of Bābā-Tāhir by ‘Āṣād-i Hamadānī, etc. were published as a supplement to the 8th year of the magazine Armagan, Tehran 1306/1927, i-124.—Huart, Les quatrains de Bābā-Tāhir ‘Uryān en pekhārī musulman, in J.A, series viii, vol. vi, Nov.-Dec. 1885, 502-545; Ūzkowski, Koye ṣote o B. Tāhirī Gottkē, Zap., 1900, xiii, 104-108 (bibliography, 3 anecdotes, 2 new quatrains one of which is no. 146 of the Diwān), cf. also Zap., ii, 12; E. Heron Allen, The Lament of Bābā-Tāhir, London 1902 (text of 62 quatrains, transl. by the editor and verse by Elisabeth Curtis Brenton); Browne, i, 83-87, ii, 259-261; Mirzā Mahdī Khān (Kawkāb); The quatrains of Bābā-

Tāhir, in JAS, 1904, no. i, 1-29 (new edition of the quatrains of Heron Allen [1-4] quatrains with important corrections and a very interesting commentary); Huart, Nouveaux quatrains de Bābā-Tāhir, in Spiegel Memorial Volume, ed. J. J. Moï, Bombay 1908, 290-302 (28 quatrains and 1 ghasal) completing the collection of 1885 recently discovered: in an extract from the Kaḡḵbāl al-Fuhārd of which the original is in the Muḥammadīyya mosque (Fāṭih) of Constantinople, in the Diwān of Maghribī and in an album (dūng). This second collection of quatrains published by Huart contains sundry pieces, the translation of which is not certain; Minorsky, Materiali ("Materiālia per servire à l’étude des croyances de la secte persane dite les Ahl-i Haqq ou ‘All-i Nā‘īrī"), vol. xxxiii, of the Trudt Lassaei, Instituta, Moscow 1911, 29-33 (transl. of the passages from the Sarandjāmīn), 99-103 (Persian text of the intercalated poems and notes) G. L. Leszczynski, Die Ruʾbā’iyāt des Bābā-Tāhir ‘Uryān oder Die Gottestränen des Herzens, aus d. west-medischen [sic] Originalen, Munich 1920 (biographical and bibliographical, verse transl.); H. Hadane, Die Mundarten v. Ḥumān, etc., in Kurd.-pers. Forsch. v. O. Mann, series iii, vol. i, Leipzig 1926, introduction, xxxvii-iv (complete study of the question of the language of Bābā-Tāhir, bibliography); A. J. Arberry, Poems of a Persian Sūfī, being the quatrains of Bābā-Tāhir, Cambridge 1937, (60 dūngs) translated into excellent five-lined stanzas in the style of a E. Housman). (V. Minorsky)

**BABADAGH,** a town in the Dobrudja, now part of Rumania. Its Turkish name refers to the semi-legendary dervish (Baba) Sarī Saftīk, who is said to have led a number of Anatolian Turcomans to the Dobrudja in the mid-thirteenth century, and to have settled with them in the neighbourhood of Babadaghi. (On this settlement see Paul Wittke, Yassighoq ‘All on the Christian Turks of the Dobruja, in BSOAS, 1952, 639 ff.). There are several tombs of Sarī Saftīk in various towns; the most generally accepted is that of Babadaghi. What appears to be the first reference to it occurs in a passage in a travel in the language of Bābā-Tāhir, bibliography; A. J. Arberry, Poems of a Persian Sūfī, being the quatrains of Bābā-Tāhir, Cambridge 1937, (60 dūngs) translated into excellent five-lined stanzas in the style of a E. Housman). (V. Minorsky)

and is consecrated by Bayezid II as a waḥf for Sarī Saftīk and his followers. Two documents relating to the waḥf of Bayezid, of 1078/1667 and 1111/1699, are listed in the catalogue of the Topkapı Sarayl (Arşiv Klasavv, Istanbul 1935, i, 52). The area was no doubt occupied by Bayezid I in the course of his Danubian campaigns, but its final annexation by the Ottomans would seem to date from 1332-3.

According to Ewliya Čelebi, the town was first conquered for the Ottomans by Bayezid I, and was consecrated by Bayezid II as a waḥf for Sarī Saftīk and his followers. Two documents relating to the waḥf of Bayezid, of 1078/1667 and 1111/1699, are listed in the catalogue of the Topkapı Sarayl (Arşiv Klasavv, Istanbul 1935, i, 52). The area was no doubt occupied by Bayezid I in the course of his Danubian campaigns, but its final annexation by the Ottomans would seem to date from 1332-3.
the tomb of Sarî Saltûk (Mohâtdnâmâ; Hammer-Purgstall, ii, 152). At this time it seems to have been included in the sandîqâ of Silistre, though it was not large enough to be listed as a town (M. Tayyib Gökbilgûn, Kanuni Sultan Süleyman devri başlarindan Rumeli eyaletleri, iv, 278-82). At this time it seems to have been of great importance in the general history of the social and cultural development of the Turkish people. It can only be understood by reference to certain general features of the development of the Seljûq state of Rûm. By the 13th century, the latter had become a state with a strong administrative and cultural framework, the product of Iranian influence, based on the Muslim and mainly Sunnî population of the towns; the Seljûq element of the rural areas and the frontieriers, which had remained far more faithful to the old Turkish traditions and had been penetrated to a much greater extent by heterodox doctrines, was thus becoming more and more isolated. At the very moment when the rift between the State and the Seljûq element was widening in this way, the Seljûqams, as the result of the influx of their Seljûq cousins who had been pushed back first by the Khwarizmians, then by the Mongols, received simultaneously reinforcement in numbers and the seeds of future troubles, in the form of doctrines stemming from Central Asia. This was the environment in which shortly before 638/1240 a Baba (popular preacher), Ishâk, better known under his self-assumed title of er-sül (Allâh), who came from the Kafarsûd region on the Syrian border, began preaching to the Turkomans both of the region south of the eastern Tarus, and of the region of Amasya, and then of all the intervening and surrounding districts. In 638, taking advantage of the fact that the breach between Kay-Khusraw and the Khwarizmians, the remnants of whom, after finding a temporary home in Asia Minor, had taken refuge in Djišra, had weakened the regime, Bâbâ Ishâk raised the standard of revolt. He successively defied several large Seljûq armies, and was only finally defeated and captured by the employment of ‘Frankish’ mercenaries; even then the movement was not completely suppressed.

Little is known of the distinctive features of the movement. The adepts wore a red cap (as did, later, the kâtîl-bâqî), black robes, and sandals. Ishâk called himself a prophet, and allied himself to the extremist forms of Shi‘ism which were prevalent in Irano-Turkish popular circles; his precise relations with another Bâbâ, of Khurâsan origin, Ilyâs, and with the kandars (Djiawâlîq) of Asia Minor, are yet to be established. At all events, the movement was fundamentally opposed to the aristocratic movement of Djiâl al-Dîn Kûmî and the Mawlawîs.

Although so little is known about it, the Bâbâî movement must have been of great importance, since it is mentioned, apart from the Seljûq kid chronicler Ibn Bîbi (phot. MS. ed. 498-502, Houtsma’s summarised ed. 227-231), by the contemporary Arab from Damascus Sîbîn al-Dîjâwî (ed. Jewett 845),

The town has two mosques, one dating from the time of Mehmed II, and the other built by the architect Sinân in the name of the Grand Vizier Allî Paşa Semsî (p.v.): A stone bridge, built during the reign of Murâd IV on the river Ergene, to the west of the town, also deserves mention as a historic monument.

Bibliography: Sâmi, Kâmûs ul-A’îâm, ii, 1178; article Baha in IA (by M. Fuad Köprülü); Türk (İnönü) Ansiklopedisi, s.v.; Ewliyâ Celebi, Sıyâhat-nâmê, iii, 480 ff.; T. Gökbilgûn, XV. ve XVI. asrîlarda Edirne ve Fça Başova, İstanbul 1952, 203 ff., 502 f.

BABAESKI (Bâbâ-î ‘atîk) or Babaeskisi, a small town in eastern Thrace, situated 50 km. S.E. of Edirne, on the railway line which links Kîrkîlereî to the Edirne, Istanbul main line. At the time of the Byzantine empire it was called Bulgariophygon; its present name is derived from the Turkish dervishes (bâba) who settled there, as at other places, during the Ottoman expansion in the Balkans.

Babaeskî was a kâdaî of the sandîqâ of Vîza in the 17th century, and was later attached to the sandîqâ of Kîrkîlereî. In 1640 the kâdaî of the sandîqâ of Kîrkîlereî; its population in 1945 was 5,936. The population of the whole region, numbering 37,607 (1945), is mainly occupied in agriculture.
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the Franciscan missionary Simon of St. Quentin (in Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum, xxxi*, 139-40), and, a little later, by the Byzantine historian Bar Hebraeus (ed. trans. Budge, 405-6). The basic problem is to establish the connexion between this movement and, on the one hand, the creation of the Karamânid principality of Taurus, and, on the other hand, in the second half of the century, the religious group of Ḥādījī Kębţah; Eflaki (amend Huart’s trans., i, 296, following Köprülî, *Orig.* (see bibl. below), 407) explicitly connects the latter, which was destined to have such important developments, with the Bâbâ’î movement. There are doubtless other popular creeds of the period of the Mongol Protectorate which are worthy of consideration. Although the texts are so vague, there is little doubt that the Bâbâ’î movement was at the head of currents which the dislocation of the Saljuq state later rendered irresistible, and it is this which gives it its importance.


#### Bâbâk

**Bâbâk, head of the Khurramî sect** [see Khurramî]; his name is an arabised form of the Iranian Pâpak. The son of an oil-merchant from al-Madâ’in (or, according to some, the descendant of Abû Muslim), he was following an obscure calling in Adharbayjan when he was noticed by Diâwedân b. Sahî, head of the Khurramîs, who died shortly afterwards. Bâbâk claimed that the spirit of Diâwedân had entered into him, and began to stir up the people living in the region of al-Badhdh, a place, not extant to-day, situated in the mountainous region of Arrân, not far from the Araxes [see Âgbarbayân, map]. He imparted new vigour to this religious and social movement, derived in part from Mazdakism, and employed particularly violent methods. It appears that his operations date from 201/816-7, and that they were assisted by the rebellious schemes of the governor of Armenia, Hätim b. Hartama, and facilitated by the various difficulties in the eastern province which followed al-Ma’mûn’s return to Baghdad. In 204/819-20, al-Ma’mûn sent against Bâbâk Yahya b. Mu’âdh, who attacked him without success on several occasions, as did other commanders whose efforts were attended by no better fortune. By the end of al-Ma’mûn’s caliphate the revolt had spread as far as the Dîbâl, and first concern of al-Mu’tasîm was to extirpate the insurgents in this region. In 220/835, he placed al-Afghân [g.v.] in charge of operations against Bâbâk. This commander rebuilt the fortresses on the al-Badhdh road which Bâbâk had destroyed, and, despite the defeat suffered by Bughâ the Elder at Hashtâd-Sar, succeeded in surprising one of the rebel leaders, Târkhan. Then, reinforced by troops under Diâ’far al-Khayyât and by Abû Dula’s volunteers, he established in 222/837 a camp, protected by mountain scouts, from which he harassed the fortress of al-Badhdh. After an unsuccessful attack by the volunteers, al-Badhdh was taken and sacked on 9 Ramaḍân 222/15 August 837 as the result of an assault by the troops from Fârghânâ. Bâbâk fled, and after being handed over to al-Afghân by the Armenian elder Sahî b. Sunbât, with whom he had taken refuge, was sent to Samarrâ where he arrived on 3 Saḥar 223/4 January 838. Al-Mu’tasîm had him paraded on an elephant and executed with extreme cruelty; his body remained hanging on the gallows, which gave its name to a quarter of the town.

The capture and execution of Bâbâk did not put an end to the Khurramî movement, which continued to give evidence of its existence during the 3rd/4th century; the devotees of the former rebel, calling themselves Bâbâkiyya, continued in the 5th/11th century, at al-Badhdh, to wait for the Mahdî and to practise certain special rites.

Egypt and Western States, written in Latin and published by Amari. The name may also be found in the contemporary literature of Europe as well as in charters; for example in the works of the traveller Mandeville and of Boccaccio who calls Saladin “Soldano di Babilonia”.

Bibliography:
- Yăkūt, i, 450; Makrizī, Khīṭāq, IFAO ed., v, 6-13; Abū Sallīh (ed. Evetts and Butler), fol. 234; Casanova, Les Noms Copsets du Caire et des Localités voisines, in BIFAO, i, 26.

BāBān, the name of an important family and dynasty of Irākī Kurdistan. It rose early in the 11th/17th century from an obscure origin in the Fīshād country in the person of one ʿAbd al-Fāqīh, whose son became a power, and his grandson Sulaymān Beg a major power, in the Sharḥīʿīr era. They made their home at Kūt Kāla, which remained the Bābn head-quarters until the foundation of Sulaymānīyya [g. v.] in 1708/1783; and in spite of an unsuccessful invasion of Persia, and chequered fortunes in his own newly-crested principality, Sulaymān Beg gained a measure of recognition from the sultan and transmitted a princely position (or at least princely pretensions) to his sons. Under his grandson, in the 12th/18th century, Bābān rule, always insecure and unaccompanied by any regular administration, stretched from the Lesser Žāb to the Sirwān (DIYĀLĪ). In spite of the violent fall of Bakr Beg and the re-assertion of Turkish authority, the Bābān prince of the time (Khāna Pasha) gave important military help to the Žāb of Baghdad in the struggle against the Persians (1316-1326/1754-1764). Under his nephew Sulaymān Pīshā (1167/1754) Bābān rule covered the sīndāb of Koy, Khānīḵān and wide areas of Western Persia; but it remained precarious, resented by the Turkish authorities in the Irākī u/Irākī, threatened by rivals in the same family, and weakened by ceaseless intrigues with (and by) Persian supporters of this or that candidate. In these conditions, even valuable services rendered from time to time to the pāshās of Baghdad could not secure consistency in Turkish policy towards the Kurdish principality, nor a respectful attitude by the latter; even the greatest of the Bābāns—notably ʿAbd al-Rāḥmān Pāša, in power (with interruptions) from 1304/1789 to 1227/1812—fell victims every few years, or months, to the constant vicissitudes of frontier warfare and intrigue, and the rivalries among their brothers and cousins. Their territory was more than once occupied by Persian or Turkish forces.

The final eviction of the Bābān rulers, which was anyway inevitable under the modernising policy of the Turkish Government after 1246/1830, was the easier since the appearance of signs of Turkic-Persian accord—frontier agreements were reached between the two powers in 1235/1812 and 1264/1847—and the destructive rivalries of the sons of ʿAbd al-Rāḥmān Pāša. In spite of a brief “Indian summer” when new weapons and modern military methods were introduced in the Bābān armed forces, the centralising efforts of the mid-century wāli of Irāk prevailed finally in 1267/1850, when the last of the Bābāns prince left Sulaymānīyya. Numerous descendants of the family survive.


BāBār, the name of a certain distinctive charm. He is however, chiefly remarkable for the virtuosity and richness of his letters in rhymed and cadenced prose. In this genre, and in his own period, he stands out as a master.

Bibliography: Fihrīst, 169; Khāṭīb Baghdādī, Taʿrīḵ Baghdādī, xi, 11; Ibn Khalliḳān, Cairo 1310, i, 298; Samʿānī, Ansāb, 64; Badiʾī, al-Subh al-Munanbīʾan Ṣayf al-Dawla, Paris 1935, 134, 141, 155; Z. Mubarak, La Prose arabe au IVe s. H., Paris 1931, 129 ff.; idem, al-Nāṣr al-Fānnī, Cairo 1934, i, 286-96, ii, 226-42; for the rest of the bibliography,
The information previously possessed on Babylon’s history and culture, following its downfall, was in a state of confusion and contrasts, as set forth above. Actually, they had no other established reference on this subject but the relevant accounts mentioned in the Old Testament, statements related by some of the ancient Greek historians of the classical period and sagas transmitted by uninformed people.

The real facts about this city were not discovered until the arrival of archeologists at its ruins early in the 19th century A.D.; they brought to light innumerable relics and artifacts, among which were tablets with cuneiform inscriptions. Upon deciphering these writings, practically all of the facts about this city were set in the right order, thus putting an end to the numerous previous legendary and unfounded accounts; these are now replaced by established facts, which are found in the many works on this city in various European languages.

**Bibliography:**

**Bâbis** followers of the religion founded by the Bâb [q.v.]. The history of the Bâbis has been and still is, at least in the East, one of persecution. It can be divided into two phases: the first, from the foundation of the new faith (1844) up to the persecutions following the attack on Najîr al-Deh Shâh (1868-1852), which seemed as though they would crush the new movement for ever, a period characterised by a frequently violent attitude on the part of the Bâbis themselves; the second, which might be called ‘pacifist’, from that date to the present day, a period which has seen the schism of the Bâbis into two factions of unequal numbers and importance. After the first dissemination of the faith following the declaration of the founder’s mission (see Bâb) and the first persecutions, which the Bâbis in various localities r.sisted with force, the most important event in the history of the community is the convention of Badaṣht (1264/1848), at which the Bâbis, abandoning their initial pre-cautions, openly declared their total secession from Islam and the khāṭa; in this a major role was played by the famous Bâb heroine, the beautiful and cultured poetess Zarrîn-Tādî, better known by the names of Kurrât al-ʿĀyn and Dînâbâbī Tâhîra (‘H. H. The Pure’), born at Kazwîn, the daughter of the erudite theologian Mullâ Šâhîb. There, first among Persian women, she dared to show herself unveiled to her brothers of the Faith, a living example of the abrogation of the Islamic khâṭa. After the convention, in which many of the principal Bâbis, among them the future Bâhá’ Allâh [q.v.], took part, Mullâ Ḥusayn of Bûshrâyâ (see Bâb) ascended himself with a small troop of Bâbis in the
sanctuary of Shaykh Tabarsi near Bārfurūsh, where with another ‘Letter of the Living’, Mullā Muḥammad ‘Allī Khān Khānlī called Kuddūs, he resisted heroically the troops of Nāṣīr al-Dīn Shāh (shortly afterwards succeeded by Muḥammad Shāh), even making successful sorties; but eventually Mullā Ḥusayn was killed, and Kuddūs and the other survivors surrendered when it was promised that their lives would be spared, though they were in fact vilely and cruelly massacred (Ramadan 1265/July–August 1849). Shortly afterwards, at Nayriz in Fārs, another heroic Bābī insurrection took place, led by one Sayyid Yāḥyā-ī Darbī, who had been converted by the Bāb at Shīrāz (see Bāb) and who had assumed the name of Wāḥib; the Bābīs, barricaded within the old citadel of the town, defended themselves bravely, with the sympathy of the population, for several days until they were all massacred (January 1850).

Almost at the same time there occurred an insurrection of even greater magnitude at Zangān. The Bābīs, under the leadership of Mullā Muḥammad ‘Alī-ī Zendānī, surnamed Ḥudjdijat (‘the Proof’), barricaded themselves in the citadel called Kīn-ī ‘Alī Mardān Kūsh. After various turns of fortune the Bābīs, who numbered more than 3,000, were cruelly massacred (February 1850). Four months prior to the execution of the Bāb, Tehran also had her heroes, the so-called ‘secrets martyrs of Tehran’, one of whom was the tutor and uncle of the Bāb; their heroic conduct in the face of most horrific punishment is a glorious chapter in the history of the Bāb faith. The unsuccessful attempt on Nāṣīr al-Dīn Shāh (28 Shawwāl 1268/16 August 1852) by two Bābīs maddened by the persecutions led to a new reign of terror, to which numerous personalities of the Bābī faith fell victims. Among these was the poetess Kūrrat al-Ḍhirī (q.v.) and the followers of Ṣubb-ī Azāl, who adhered to the letter of the Bāb. The Azāls remained always in the minority, however, and even the number of 50,000 which some authorities have ascribed to them seems in fact to be somewhat exaggerated.
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BĀBūR, Zohīr al-Dīn Muḥammad, soldier of fortune, one of the Mughal rulers in India, diarist and poet, was descended on his father’s side in the fifth generation from Timūr and through his mother Kūṭūk Nūgār Kānum in the fifteenth degree from Čingīz Khān. He was born on 6 Muḥarram 888/14 February 1483 and succeeded his father ‘Umar Shāykh as Mirāz of Fārgānā in Ramadan 899/June 1494.

Bābur inherited his father’s struggle with his kinsmen for the towns and fertile areas of Central Asia. By Rabī‘ I 903/November 1497 he had fended off the attempts by his elder paternal uncle Sultan Ahmad Mirzā of Samarqand and by his elder maternal uncle Sultan Muḥammad of Taqḵent to deprive him of his father’s position in Fārgānā, and using quarrels among his cousins had occupied Samarqand. Four months later lack of booty and conspiracy at Andīḏīn, his headquarters, forced him to let Samarqand go. Andīḏīn he soon recovered and then so as soon lost to the Mughals under Taqḵal who nominally were supporters of his brother Djaḥāngīr. In 905/1548-9 Bābur divided Fārgānā with his brother, married and was forestalled in a race for Samarqand by Shāybaṇ Khān Uzbak (Ozbek). Next year he took the city by surprise, only to be starved out by Shāybpān Khān after losing the battle of Sar-i Pol in Ramadan 906/April-May 1501. Bābur, having relinquished Andīḏīn to his brother when he took Samarqand, now became a fugitive nomad, dependent for his personal safety on ties of kinship.

His uncle, grudging hosts, the Khāns of Taqḵent and northern Mughalāstān, furnished him with troops against Taqḵal and finally marched to his support. Taqḵal however appealed to Shāybpān Khān who routed and executed the Khāns at Arīqyān in Dhu ‘l-Hijjah 908/June 1503.

For nearly a year Bābur wandered with a small following among the nomads of remote Sugh and Ḥusayn, safe in their hospitality. But Shāybpān Khān’s continuing success decided Bābur to seek a headquarters outside the main area of Uzbak interest. In Muḥarram 910/June 1504 he turned for Kābul, an uncle’s possession until 907/1501, but then in Aḏrūg hands. Joined by other refugees from the Uzbaks, Bābur, with his brother, secured Kābul and successfully asserted his claims to tribute from the surrounding Aḏrūg tribes. By 911/1506 Bābur could leave Kābul for Herāt, in response to Sultan Husayn Mīrzā Bāykapār’s appeal for aid against the Uzbaks.

The death of Sultan Bāykapār and the ineffectiveness of his sons allowed Shāybpān Khān to conquer most of Kūrkhāsān, so that Bābur recrossed the Hindū Kūsh empty-handed. In 913/1507 he took Kandahār from the Aḏrūgs, but withdrew towards India rather than defend it personally when Shāybpān I Khān besieged the new acquisition. But Shāybpān Khān came into conflict with Shāh Ismā’īl Šafawī,
who defeated and slew him at Marw on 1 Ramadan 916/2 December 1510. Babur thereupon occupied Samarkand for the third time, in Rajab 917/October 1511, but as a client of Shāh Ismā‘il, making an outward profession of Shi‘ism and probably striking coins in the name of his Safavid overlord. (The numismatic evidence on this is equivocal. See bibliography). His acceptance of Shi‘ism cost him popular support, and when defeated by the Uzbek at Kul-i Malik in Şafar 918/15 May 1512, he could not hold the city. On the defeat at Ghujjūwān on 3rd Ramadan 918/12th November 1512 of the brutally intolerant Safavid general Najdmi Thānī, whom Babur hastily abandoned, Babur’s last attempt to win the city nearest his heart ended.

After two years adventuring in the Kandahar area Babur returned to Kābul, his centre thenceforth for enterprises to the more promising east and south. Several attempts to retake Kandahar from the Ardhanās ended in its occupation by negotiation in Dżumādā I 928/May 1532. This secured, Babur turned more vigorously towards Hindustān, probed by minor expeditions since 922/1516.

The victor at Kandahar was invited into Hindustān by Dawlat Khān Lodī of Lahore and ʿAlam Khān, uncle of Ibrāhīm Lodī, sultan of Delhi, to help them against Ibrāhīm. On his second advance, having dispossessed Dawlat Khān and utilised ʿAlam Khān to attract Afghan support, Babur destroyed the forces of Ibrāhīm Lodī at Fādpat in Rajab 932/April 1526. He occupied Delhi and his forces pressed as far eastwards down the Ganges as Dżiwānr and Uñŷāpurū. Babur’s victory at Āḏbāḏūn over Rānā Sānuč of Čitor in Dżumādā II 933/March 1527 had the result that the encircling movement with telling effect in his Indian career. His experience enabled him to hold together small collections of defeated but still personally ambitious Timūrids, and the even less reliable Mughals, who had gathered around him in Kābul, until success gave him the undisputed power to command.


LITERARY WORKS: i. Bābūr-nāma. In this famous autobiography, written in Caghatay Turkish, Bābūr tells his story from childhood to the last years of his life, with no attempt to conceal his weaknesses, his mistakes, or his defeats. It is in no sense an apologia pro vita sua; indeed, so matter-
of-fact and unemotional is the tone of the work that the casual reader might not recognise it as the memoirs of a skilful and valiant soldier and the founder of a dynasty, which closer study reveals it to be. It cannot be said that Bābur is impartial in his picture of himself, his friends, or his enemies. For example, we can see that his feelings got the better of him in his evident desire to belittle the important and worthy Shāybin Khān. But despite occasional injustices of this nature, the Bābur-nāme is far more reliable than the general run of such works. The author's keen powers of observation and his analytical mind are apparent in his descriptions and explanations of works of art, of flora and fauna, of the group-psychology of peoples, and the characters of individuals. As a literary work, the simple and chaste language of the Bābur-nāme, its natural style, its colourful and lively descriptive passages, are some of the reasons which justify our regarding it as one of the finest examples not only of Caghātay but of Turkish prose generally.

2. Arād risāle is. It was known that Bābur had written a Caghātay treatise on prosody, from the Bābur-nāme, certain copies of his Dīwān, and the Muntakhab al-Ṭawārikh of Bādānūn (Calculta 1668, i, 343), but the work did not come to light till 1923, when it was discovered by M. Fuad Köprüli in a Paris manuscript (E. Blochet, Cat. des MS turcs, Paris Bibl. Nat. Supp. no. 1308). It does not differ greatly from similar works in Persian; its chief importance is that on certain Arūd verse-forms used by the Turkish poets its information is fuller than that given by Nawā'ī in his Mitān al-Awzān. Bābur gives both Persian and Turkish examples of metres in general use, including some from his own poems, but only Turkish examples of metres of his own invention. At the end of his Dīwān he states that the Arūd risāle was finished 2 or 3 years before the completion of the conquest of India; i.e., between 932 and 934/1525-6.

3. Mubayyān. A mathnawi in ḫuff trimeter catalectic (fa'slatun maš'īlun fa's'īlum), completed, according to a reference in the Arūd risāle, in 928/1522-3. It deals with some problems in Ḥanafī law, together with some verses of paeinquent. This simple didactic work is of no artistic importance, but it does show that Bābur was interested in ḫīb and was a sincere Ḥanafī. Till recently it was known to Orientalists as Mubīn; A. S. Beveridge so refers to it, even though he mentions that the Indian historians Abu 'l-Faḍl and Bādānūn read the title as Mubayyān (and that Sprenger called it Fīkh-i Bābur). Mubīn is in fact the name of a commentary on this work, written by Bābur's secretary, Shāybin Zayn.

4. Translation of Risāla-i Wādiyya. The author of this work on Şūfi ethics was Khāzва 'Abayd Allāh Aḥrārī, the great Central Asian Şūfi and spiritual guide of the Timurids. As the title implies, he wrote it at his father's insistence. Bābur's Caghātay translation was made in 935/1528-9, and forms part of his Dīwān. It is a mathnawi of 243 lines in Ramāl trimeter catalectic (fa'slatum fa's'īlum fa's'īlum). Though pleasantly and simply written, it has no aesthetic merit, but is of interest as showing Bābur's Şūfi leanings.

5. The Dīwān. The bulk of this is in Turkish, but some of the poems are in Persian. The verse-forms represented include the ghásal, mathnawi, rubā', ḫīfa, tuṣug, mu'allama, and mulad. We find in it the various verses whose composition he mentions in the Bābur-nāme. The existing copies are not arranged in the classical Dīwān manner; the poems are set down in no apparent order. In the technique of versification Bābur was not inferior to any of the 16th-century Caghātay poets, not even Nawā'ī, and he expresses his thoughts and feelings in an unaffected language and style. Side by side with Şūfi songs of love and wine there are poems on everyday themes. Signs of the influence of earlier poets, especially Nawā'ī, are not wanting, but there are no slavish imitations. Though Bābur had a taste for literary artifices and poetic tours de force (there are 19 of the latter in the Dīwān), and though, in obedience to the fashion prevailing at the time in both Persian and Turkish literature, he wrote numerous mu'allamāt (the Dīwān includes 52), the greater part of his work is simple, sincere, and natural. He wrote a number of tuṣugāt, a verse-form peculiarly Turkish, as well as some rubātis of great beauty. Among his turkis, which belong to popular poetry, we find one poem in syllabic metre (cf. MTM, i, 27). He was capable of writing Persian poems—there are over 20 in the Dīwān—but his affection for his mother-tongue is evident in the preponderance of Caghātay. Further, in his poems he often refers to the valour of the Turks, and the fact that he is one of them. In this respect he was following the intellectual and literary trend which had begun with Nawā'ī in the previos century and which prevailed not only in Khūrāsān but at all the Timurid courts. The literary influence of Bābur was responsible for the subsequent rise of poets writing in Caghātay both among his descendants and among their courtiers. Certainly the literary historian must assign Bābur a leading position among the Caghātay poets after Nawā'ī.

BABI — BABAD
As Sh! cite theology in general is influenced by Muctazilite speculation, so the Muctazilite argument exist till the object of it exists; what does not yet exist (ma`badm) cannot be known and therefore His knowing follows His not-knowing as soon as things exist (Abd al-Kahir al-Baghdadi, Kitab al-Fark bayn al-Firak, Cairo 1326/1910, 49), subtleties which appear in modern times in the Shi`ite Shaykh sect (RM, xi, 435 ff.). This idea allows for a knowledge in God corresponding to fresh phenomena and a change of mind determined by them. Muslim historians of the sects agree that the idea of badd was first suggested by Mukhtar [q.v.] and then became part of the creed of the Shi`ite Kaysaniyya (al-Fark bayn al-Firak, 36; cf. Ahmad b. Yahya al-Murtada in M. Horten, Die philos. Probleme der spek. Philosophie in Islam, Bonn 1912, 124). This origin of the idea is also ascribed to `Abd Allah b. Nawf (Tabari, ii, 732). When Mukhtar had to fight the decisive battle of his career against the superior force of Mus'ab b. al-Zubayr, he (or `Abd Allah b. Nawf) announced that God had revealed to him that victory was certain. When the alleged oracle was proved false by his defeat, one of the two said, referring to Sura xiii, 39, that something had intervened (badad lahu) which had made God change His mind.

During the calamities which befall the Shi`ite community this idea was accepted as a convenient explanation of the failure of the hopes and prophecies of the defeated imams. It had been God's purpose that the deliverance (farad) and victory of the lawful imamate should take place at a certain moment; He had however changed His plan on grounds of expediency. His promises were an encouragement; had the Shi`a known that victory would come only after one or two thousand years, they would have lost heart. This principle also serves to explain the change in the legitimate succession of the imams when, in place of the predestined Isma`iil, his brother Musa al-Kazim succeeded Dja`far as the seventh imam. They ascribe to Dja`far the words, “God has never been led by a new consideration (to change His mind) as in the case of my son Isma`iil” (ma badad la`dhi kamadi badad fi Isma`ili smi). To many Shi`ite theologians this crass application of badd might have seemed discreditable; so the speech of Dja`far has been made more tolerable by transferring it to abd; God's change of mind is hereby transferred from the son to the ancestor of the imams, to Isma`iil the son of Abraham, the expected `ghabias; God released Abraham from offering the sacrifice which He had originally ordered.

The most important arguments adduced by the Shi`a in support of badd are: A) passages in the Kur'an: xiii, 39; xiv, 11/108 (these are the strongest proofs); lv, 29b; the frequent assertion that God will change His resolve to punish sinners when they repent vii, 152/153; stories like the sparing of the people of Yunes x, 98; the sacrifice of Isma`ili xxxvi, 101/102-107; Moses' talk with God prolonged from 30 to 40 nights, vii, 138/142; B) traditions telling that by the practice of certain virtues (e.g., honouring one's parents) the allotted span of life might be lengthened and the appointed destiny (al-badd al-mubram) might be changed; the prayer of Umar that “God might strike his name out of the book of the damned and write it in that of the blessed” Ibn Khatiba, Ta`wil mukhali al-Badrih, Cairo 1256, 71; C) pious legends from which it is plain that misfortunes threatening individuals may be averted by acts pleasing to God; D) the doctrine of the abrogation of divine laws (masah) which is a tenet of Sunni doctrine; badd is creative cancellation and cancellation is legislative badd.

As Shi`ite theology in general is influenced by Mu'tazilite speculation, so the Mu'tazilite argument
based on al-aslah (the most expedient) is connected with bada*, that God in His dealings with men is guided by expediency and the common good. Accordingly it considers bada* from the point of view that divine decrees may change with changes in the demands of the general good (kadidráli um-umur talabaddal bi-tabaddul al-mas'ildh). Moderate Shi'ites had to exercise much ingenuity in evading the theological antinomies which this conception implies in order to reconcile the assumption of the appearance of new determining moments in God's knowledge, as expressed by bada*, with a belief in His absolute omniscience, in the eternity of His knowledge which is identical with His being, as most Mu'tazilites believed; and to meet the objection of the orthodox to the assumption that God might be ignorant of the end of things (waq'id al-umur) which the admission of bada* implies (cf. Djurgänni on Ṣidd. Mawṣūli, Leipzig 1848, 346). The effort to meet the objections raised from this angle led them, in spite of their protests against the Jews and Sunnites who denied bada*, to devise formulae which would meet these objections and to accuse their Sunnite opponents of crediting them with a false idea of bada* which was invented by the Sunnites. Their contention is that the term bada* is not to be understood in its literal meaning but metaphorically (madjdz an); the latter explain that a future bada* implies a change in the divine knowledge or regret for what has happened. God does not will absolutely what He has announced but only so far as it is determined by the common good. In fact, the difference between the Shi'ite and Sunnite theologians is only an idle war of words for the former explain that a future bada* is decreed in the eternal foreknowledge of God which includes all particulars (sād waq'id al taṣfī). A remarkable way of reconciling bada* with the doctrine of the Preserved Tablet (al-lash al-makfīz, Sūra lxxxv, 22) is the assumption of two tables of fate, one on which the unalterable decrees of fate are set out and a lash al-makw wa 'l-iṣhāq (cf. Sūra xiii, 39) which contains those decrees which may be altered by the intervention of new determining moments (Dildār *Allī, i, 114 foot), a view which has also penetrated into Sunni circles and given rise to esoteric mystical subtleties (kalimāt 'adāq wa asrār khāmida, Fakhir al-Dīn al-Rāzī, Maṣ'īth al-Ghayb, 5, 310). Therefore two kinds of divine knowledge must be distinguished; 'im maškūm, the unalterable knowledge the details of which God makes known to prophets and angels, and 'im maškūm, the knowledge entrusted by God to no one, which concerns matters in suspense (umr mašb̲a'fa 'ind alāh) (Kulīn 85). Thus God knew that He would not punish the people of Yūnus and did not tell him so that he might worship God wholeheartedly while in the fish. A contrary view is that "angels write on lash al-makw wa 'l-iṣhāq". According to the Shi'ite Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, the greatest stress on the concept of bada* was that of Abū al-Muḥāfīz al-Firārī, one of the Shi'ite Zaydi sect, who rejected the Imāmītes with embracing two errors, takhyya [q.v.] and bada* (Shahrastānī, 119 foot). The bitterest opponents of bada* were the Jews who based their rejection of the abrogation of divine law (naṣṣḥ al shari'a) on the fact that this proposition implies the recognition of bada* as was shown by the Jewish theologian Yabāy b. Zakariyya al-Kātib al-Ṭabarānī in his controversy with al-Mas'ūdī al-Ṭanbīh, 113, 13; cf. Faruqī.'

In the 3rd/9th century bada* seems to have been one of the problems for testing sagacity and shrewdness because of the difficulties it raised which could only be resolved by hair-splitting. This can be inferred from Djāhīz, Tarbiy (ed. Pellat, §§ 74, 189; however see ibid., index, s.v. RDF).
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BADAJOZ [see bātalwās].

BADAKHSĀN, also frequently written BADAKHSHĀN and sometimes in the literary language (with the Arabic plural Inflection) BADAKHSHĀN, a mountainous region situated on the left bank of the upper reaches of the Āmū-Daryā or more accurately of the Panj, the source of this great river; the adjective derived from this noun is Badakhshāni or Badakhshāni. J. Marquart (Ernäshahr, 279) gives this name the meaning of "region of Badakhshā or Balaksh, a type of ruby, which, it is said, is only found in Badakhshān, on the Kokha". It is more probable, however, that the word Badakhshān (whence the French Balais, the English Balas) is a dialectal form which originally denoted the region and which only later came to be used to denote the type of ruby in question. Yākūt (i, 528) gives the form Badakhshān as the one most popularly used for the name of the region. Marco Polo also gives the same form. The mines from which the rubies were extracted were situated, as is already asserted by Marco Polo, outside Badakhshān proper—in Shughnān on the right bank of the Āmū-Daryā; during the historical period, however, the country was usually subject to the same power as Badakhshān. The rubies (Ar. la', Pers. lâl) of Badakhshān were famous in the Middle Ages throughout the Muslim world. In Persian poetry, the expression "lâl-i badakhshān" or "lâl-i badakhshāni" often denotes in a figurative sense wine or the lips of the Beloved. In Central Asia, this expression is today in universal popular use. The region which contains the mines in question is at present a dependency of the territory of Bukhārā, which is subject to Soviet rule. Nevertheless the mines are worked with the same primitive methods as before, and still have not acquired any importance for the European precious-stone market.

The Kokča or Kōkče, called Khirnāb in the Budād al-ʿĀlam (written in 372/982-3), a tributary of the Āmū-Daryā, waters Badakhshān. From the economic point of view, the valley of the Kokča and its tributaries alone have always played an important part for the region. In this area were situated the towns of Badakhshān—doubtless near the present capital of Fayghābād—Djirm and Khām. The last two, which are mentioned in the earliest Arab documents, have preserved their names to this day. The lapis lazuli of Badakhshān, equally famous in the Middle Ages, came from mines situated on the upper reaches of the Kokča. The trade in these gems at present a monopoly of the Afgān government,
and they are only exported to India. In addition, Badakhshan possesses iron and copper mines.

The first mention of the name of Badakhshan occurs in the Chinese documents of the 7th and 8th centuries A.D., in Hsuan-tsang in the form Po-t'o-ch'angna, the ancient pronunciation of which, according to Schlegel, was Pat tok-ts'ong-na, in T'ang-shu in the form Pahto-shan, in the Encyclopaedia Ce-fu-yuen-koci in the form Pu-t'o-shan. The Chinese described the country as forming part of Tuho-lo (Turkistan). The Arabs also gave two meanings to the word Tukhristan: in the strict sense, Tukhristan was only the region situated between Balkh and Badakhshan, in the wide sense, it comprised all the regions east of Balkh and on both banks of the Amu-Darya. The name clearly derives from the Turks who made their appearance in the 2nd century A.D. and conquered the Graeco-Bactrian empire. In the 5th century A.D., these same territories were occupied by the Haxtal (the Ethnolatines of the Byzantines); in 'Awil's Anthology, compiled in the 7th/11th century, we find a story which describes how a king of the Haxtal conferred on his son the domain "of Dzirm and Badakhshan" (Barthold, Turkestan, 1, 91). In the 6th century A.D., the Turks put an end to the empire of the Haxtal; at the time of the first Arab invasions by the order of Tukhristan (in the wide sense) bore, according to Arabic and Chinese documents, the Turkish title of Yabghu (Budíin) (in Arabic_Djapbhaña); the princes of every country, including also the prince of Badakhshan, were his vassals. We have no precise information on the date of the conquest of Badakhshan by the Arabs and the manner in which Islam was introduced there. Abu Bakr only mentions the name of the country once. Among the events of the year 118/736, he describes a campaign against "Kishm in the country of Djapbhaña" and against more distant places. According to al-Ya'kubi (Buldán, 288), Djirm in Badakhshan was the city which marked the frontier of Islam on the trade route to Tibet via Wakhsh. In the same passage, a Turkish prince, otherwise unknown, called Khwa-ham (this is the correct form of the name), is described as "king of Shikinan and Badakhshan". Al-Iṣṭakhrî (278) describes Badakhshan as the "territory of Abu 'l-Fath"; this is doubtless a reference to the prince Abu 'l-Fath al-Yaftali, whose son Abu Nasr, according to Sam'ud (W. Barthold, Turkestan, 1, 69) and Yaftali (iv, 1023), fought against Kara-Tegus, the lieutenant of the Tukhristan (d. 340/952-2, cf. Ibn al-Aghir, viii, 157, 370). Apart from these facts, we know nothing of the political situation of Badakhshan during this period.

In the 9th/10th century, the poet Nasir-i Khusrav brought Isma'ili doctrine to Badakhshan and preached it there with success. His tomb on the upper reaches of the Kokcha is still shown today. His teachings have been preserved to this day in the formal and the frontier regions. In the second half of the 6th/12th century, Tukhristan in the wide sense (with Badakhshan) came under the rule of a side branch of the house of Ghúr, which resided at Bámíyán and which, like other branches of this dynasty, was dispossessed at the beginning of the 7th/11th century by the Khwarizm-shah Muhammad.

Badakhshan escaped the fury of the Mongol invasion and remained up to the 9th/15th century in the hands of its national dynasty. The legend which traces the descent of this royal family from Alexander the Great was first quoted by Marco Polo, and is subsequently frequently mentioned by the Muslim historians. Muhammad Haydar (Ta'rikh-i Kashf, trans. E.D. Ross, 203) attributes to the daughter of the last ruler the statement that her ancestors had been kings of Badakhshan for 3000 years. Timür himself and his successors only succeeded after hard battles in obtaining recognition of their suzerainty, and the country was only annexed to the Timúrid empire by Timúr's great-grandson, Abú Sa'id. The last prince, Sháh Sultan Muhammad Badakhšán, had previously renounced obedience to the ordinances of Alexander the Great, in order to compose, under the pseudonym of Láli, a Persian diván (Ta'rikh-i Kashf, 147). He submitted without resistance to the army sent by Abú Sa'id, and went to Haráth; his son fled to Káshghávar; Mirzá Abú Bakr, son of Abú Sa'id, was named prince of Badakhshán.

Shortly afterwards, the prince returned from Káshghávar; Abú Bakr was driven out, and Badakhshán had to be conquered afresh. With this object, Abú Sa'id had Sháh Sultan Muhammad executed in 871/1466-7 (Dawlatsháh, 453). It follows that, on the inscription discovered in 1883 by the British, according to which this Muhammad constructed a stone bridge in 881/1479-80 (Ta'rikh-i Kashf, 221), the date has doubtless been misread. Abú Bakr was later driven out of his kingdom by his brother Sultan Mahmúd, prince of Hijar. Up to the conquest of Hijar by the Ōzbegs (beginning of the 15th century), Badakhshán continued to form part of its territory. A national movement arose in Badakhshán against the Ōzbeg conquerors. At the head of this movement were Mubárak Sháh and Zubayar Rágí. It is said that they took as their base a fortress situated on the left bank of the Kokcha, which still today bears the name of Kálªa-i Zafar ("Victory Fort") given to it by Mubárak Sháh. The Ōzbegs were driven back; the Timúrid Násir Mirzá (brother of Bábúr), whose aid had been invoked by the insurgents, was proclaimed ruler of Badakhshán (end 910/February 1505), but, unable to come to terms with the leaders of the rebellion, was driven out two years later. In 913/1507-8, the Ōzbegs, led by Sultan Mahmúd Mirzá, went to Badakhshán with the consent of Bábúr and was received at Káľa-i Zafar. Shortly before, Mubárak Sháh had been killed by his comrade Zubayar. The latter, who tried to keep power in his own hands even after the arrival of the new sovereign, was removed by assassination. Shortly afterwards, Sháh Rájî al-Din, leader of the Ismá'íllis of Kuhistan, made his appearance in Badakhshán, gathered round him the followers of this sect, and subjugated part of the country. However, he was put to death in the spring of 1509, and his head taken to Káľa-i Zafar and presented to Mirzá-Khán. The latter died in 926/1520 on the throne of Badakhshán. Bábúr summoned Súlaymán the son of Mirzá-Khán, who was still a minor, and replaced him in Badakhshán by his own son Humáyún. In 935/1528-9, Humáyún was recalled by his father and sent to India. After an unsuccessful attempt by Sa'id Khán, ruler of Káshghávar, to seize possession of the country, Súlaymán was recognised as prince of Badakhshán both by Bábúr and by Sa'id Khán (1536). Súlaymán reigned until 983/1575; driven out in the first half of that year by his grandson Sháhrukh, he retired to India and thence to Mecca, but later returned to his own country. In 1584, Badakhshán was conquered by the Ōzbegs under 'Abd Alláh Khán. Súlaymán and Sháhrukh were forced to flee to India, but
returned later and made several attempts to repel the conquerors. At the beginning of the 17th century there occurred another insurrection, provoked by Badi' al-Zamán, son of Shahrukh. In 1665, the Timúrids occupied both Balkh and Badakhshán, but in the autumn of 1669 the two countries were finally ceded to the Özbegs. The Özbeg empire in the 17th century was still divided into several independent states. In Badakhshán, a dynasty was set up founded by Yār Beg, who built the town of Fayžhābād. The representatives of this dynasty also, claimed descent from Alexander the Great, a claim which they still maintained in the 19th century. Like the other Özbeg princes in present-day Afghánistán, these princes bore the title of Mir, an abbreviation of Amir. In 1822, Mir Muhammad Sháh was dethroned by Murád Beg, ruler of Kunduz. Mirzá Kalán, a dependant of Murád Beg, was despatched as prince of Badakhshán. After the death of his sovereign, he declared himself independent and even became for a time master of Kunduz. His son and successor, Mir Sháh Nizám al-Dún, died in 1862. The latter’s son Džáhnádár Sháh, from 1867 onwards had to contend for his throne with another prince of the same dynasty, Mámúd Sháh. In 1869, Džáhnádár was decisively repulsed and, after one last effort, he withdrew in 1872 to Russian territory, and Učkurgán in Farghánā was allotted to him as his place of residence. An annual pension of 1500 roubles was assigned to him. In 1878, however, he was assassinated at Učkurgán by unknown assailants. In 1879, the Afghán government deposed Mámúd Sháh; he was sent to Kábúl, where he remained until his death. His territory was annexed to Afghánistán, and formed part of the province of Turkistán.

From 1725 onwards, there are reports in Russia of the rubies and lapis lazuli of Badakhshán and also of its alleged gold and silver mines. In 1733, “the conquest of the rich country of Badakhshán” is mentioned as one of the aims of Russian policy in Central Asia, but Russian penetration only really began after 1876. In 1885, Post Pámírskii was founded on the Murgháb, and in 1891-2, after an armed encounter at Yeşálí-Kul, the Russians occupied the whole of eastern Pámír, which became the “district of Pamír” of the region (oblast) of Farghánā, administered by the leader of the Russian military detachment in Pámír.

On 11 March 1895, an exchange of notes between the British and the Russians in London delimited the frontiers of Pámír between Afghánistán and the principality of Buhkará under Russian protectorate; Badakhshán proper was left in the hands of the rulers of Afghánistán, while the territories of western Pámír lying north and east of the Pándj were allotted to Russia.

The revolution of 1918 abolished the principality of Bukhárá, but Soviet power did not become firmly established in Pámír until 1925, after four years of fighting between the “White” elements and the basmagí [q.v.].

Autonomous region of Soviet Gorno-Badakhshán.

On 2 January 1925, the two parts of Pámír (east and west) were reunited in a “Special Region of Pámír”, attached administratively to the Central Executive Committee of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Turkistán (founded on 14 October 1924), in December of the same year its name was changed to the Autonomous Region of Gorno-Badakhshán, forming part of the Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic of Tadjikistán (which on 5/12/1929 became the Soviet Socialist Republic of Tadjikistán). Its capital is Khorog (Khorg).

Gorno-Badakhshán comprises all the territory of Soviet Pámír; it is bounded in the north by the Trans-Alaí chain, in the east by Chinese Sinkiang, in the south by the Afghán possessions and in the west by the Pándj and by the Darwáz and Academy chains. Its area is 61,900 sq. km.—In 1951, the Autonomous Region was divided into 7 districts (tuman = “zone”):

1. Shughán (administrative centre Khorog), comprising the Ghund valley.
2. Ishkashim (administrative centre Ishkashim), comprising the upper valley of the Pándj and the former territories of Wakhán, Ishkashim and Ghurán, up-stream from the confluence of the Pándj and the Shákhp-dara.
3. Roshk-Kal’a (administrative centre Roshk-Kal’a) in the Shákhp-dara basin.
4. Roshán (administrative centre Roshán) in the Pándj valley downstream from Khorog.
5. Bartang, comprising the basin of the Bartang river and its tributary the Kudara, as far as Lake Sarez.
6. Murgháb (administrative centre Murgháb, the former Post Pamírskii) comprising the whole of eastern Pámír.
7. Wán (administrative centre Wán), comprising the Wánč and Yaghulán valleys.

In 1954, the Bartang district was abolished, and its territory incorporated in the Roshán and Wánč districts.

At the beginning of the 20th century, the total population of Pámír (Russian and Bukhárán) did not exceed 20,000; since 1925, as the result of improved communications and the introduction of new agricultural techniques, it has increased appreciably. At the 1926 census, there were 28,924 inhabitants, and at the 1939 census, 41,789. In 1956 the total population was in the region of 62,000.

Ethnically, Gorno-Badakhshán comprises two quite distinct regions: 1) the high plains of eastern Pámír are inhabited by a small number of Kirghiz nomads. In 1926, there were 2,660 belonging to the Ičiklik tribes, made up of the following clans: Kesek, 1,400: Teit, 800: Kıpčak, 300: Naiman, 100. In 1939, their number did not exceed 3,000, or about 11% of the total population of the region. These Kirghiz are nominally Sunnis of the Hanáfi rite. 2) In the valleys of western Pámír live Iranian peoples whom their Tadjik neighbours call “Chaláč”, and the Russians “Gornyje tadjikí” (an inaccurate term, which causes confusion with the Tadjik of the mountainous regions of Darwáz, Karataegín and Zarafshán), or “Pámírsku Narody” (“Peoples of the Pámír”). The inhabitants themselves call themselves “tadjikí”, a term which also leads to confusion, and call their neighbours in Darwáz who speak Tadjik, people who speak Persian (pársí-gúy). Their total number is estimated at more than 50,000 or 85% of the total population of the Autonomous Region. They are for the most part Nizáří Ismá‘ílíls [q.v.], apart from a small number of the Bartang, the majority of the Yárghuláni, and all the Wánč, who are Hanáfi Sunnis.

The people of the Pámír constitute several groups:

1. The Shugháno-Roshk group, numerically the most important (35-40,000 people), comprising: a) the Shughí (Hugnî), numbering 20-30,000, in the districts of Shughán [q.v.] and Roshk-Kal’a (valleys
of the Ghurid, Pandj and Shakh-dara); b) the Roshan: about 8,000 in the Roshan district north of the Shughni (Pandi valley); c) the Bartang: about 2,000 in the Bartang district (valley of the river Bartang), and d) the Oroshor (300 in 1925). These four peoples speak closely-related dialects.

2. The Wakhi (Wukh, Wakhabd) [q.v.], numbering 6-7,000, living in the district of Ishkashim situated in the southern part of Soviet Pamir, the high valleys of the Pandi and the Wakhan-Darya (a similar number of Wakhi live in Afghanistan).

3. The Yaguhlami (Yuzdom, Zgamik), whose number does not exceed 2,000, distributed among 13 villages situated in the valley of the river Yaguhlami (Wan district).

4. The Ishkashimi (Ishkashum), numbering 400 in Soviet Badakhshan (1,500-2,000 of their brothers, who speak the Zebaki and Sanglicl dialects, live in Afghanistan), living in one village only, Rym, on the upper Pandi (Ishkashim district).

Finally, in the extreme north of the Autonomous Region, in the valley of the river Wanâ, live the Wanâ, who are completely tajikised and whose language has not been in use for more than a century.

The peoples of the Pamir belong to the eastern Iranian linguistic group; none of the languages is fixed by writing, despite an abortive attempt by the Soviet authorities in 1931 to give the Shughni a Latin alphabet and make it a literary language (in 1931 a Shughni primer for children was published in Stalinabad (A. Djakov: Xugnoni alifba Kudaken âat, and in 1936 Tadjikistan State Publications published the first works in Shughni: cf. Revolution i Nationalnost, No. 4, 1936). Tadzhik is the language of civilisation (administration, courts, schools, the Press), and bilingualism (local dialect + Tadzhik) is general. Some languages, such as Ishkashimi, are fast disappearing and only survive as “domestic languages”, others (Bartangi, Roshan . . .) are strongly tajikised; on the other hand Yaguhlami, which is extremely isolated, and Wakhi are putting up a more effective resistance.

In 1954, Gorno-Badakhshan possessed seven newspapers; two of these were regional organs appearing at Khorgor: Krasnyi Badakhshan (in Russian) and Badakhshanskii Svidkh (in Tadzhik); four were local papers in Tadjik, namely the Roshani-Svidkh (at Roshan); Habbati-Wan (at Wan) and the Buxori-Svidkh and a Kirghiz paper at Murghab.

Tadzhik influence was also exerted through teaching. In 1954, there were in the region some 200 schools, of which 11 were secondary (decennial schools), and a teaching institute at Khorgor with a total of 12,000 pupils.

Formerly extremely isolated, Gorno-Badakhshan has since 1934 been connected with the Farghana valley by a motor road (the Osh-Murghab-Khorgor road, 740 km. in length), completed in 1940 by the Khorgor-Stalinabad road which follows the Pandi valley. The economy of the region nevertheless is still of a traditional type: nomadic stock-breeding (cows, caprines), terrace horticulture, and silk production in the western part of the region. The country is rich in deposits, some of which have been exploited for a very long time: lapis lazuli and malachite in the Shakh-dara valley, precious stones, gold and copper (near Porshniv).

The capital of the region, Khorgor (927 inhabitants in 1926, 2,500 in 1954) has a few small industrial undertakings.


Information concerning the regions situated on the upper reaches of the Oxus in the 19th century has been collected with the greatest care, based on the accounts of English travellers, by J. Minajew, Swjedjeniya o stranach po verchovjam Amu Darji, St. Petersburg 1879. Barthold was in addition able to consult the narratives of two Russian travellers of the year 1878, which are not generally available.

On the state of these regions, on the eve of the Revolution, cf. especially Count A. Bobrinskoy, Gortzy verchovov Pjandza, Moscow 1908, partly based on R. Leitner, Darasdan in 1866, (1889 and 1892), and idem, Darasdan in 1893. In 1957 the Academy of the sciences of the Tadjik SSR published an excellent work by A. M. Mandel'shtam: Materialy k Istoriko-geograficheskoi obzaru Pamira i prispamirskich oblastii, Stalinabad 1957 (vol. II of the proceedings of the first of hist., ethnol. and ethnology of the Acad. Sci. Tadjik SSR), containing the descriptions of the Pamir by Greek, Chinese and Arab historians and geographers to the 10th century.


Tadjik is the language of civilisation (administration, courts, schools, the Press), and bilingualism (local dialect + Tadjik) is general. Some languages, such as Ishkashimi, are fast disappearing and only survive as “domestic languages”, others (Bartangi, Roshan . . .) are strongly tajikised; on the other hand Yaguhlami, which is extremely isolated, and Wakhi are putting up a more effective resistance.
BADAL (Turk. Bedel: plural bededli), a term used under the Ottoman regime to denote a contribution made by a tax-payer in lieu of his performing some service for the government or furnishing it with some commodity. Certain categories of the sultans' subjects were excused payment of duties and taxes on condition of their discharging such duties. If they failed to fulfil their obligations, however, or if the government forwent its rights in this regard, instead of again becoming liable to ordinary taxation, they were required to make special "substitute" contributions; and it may have been in description of these that the term bedel first came into use.

From the end of the 16th century, when the Ottoman central treasury was frequently short of funds and generally pursued short-sighted policies, harassed Defterdarlıs were often tempted to forgo services or supplies from those bound to render or furnish them—even though these might later have to be bought at equal cost—in order to exact such cash contributions in lieu. By the middle of the 17th century quite half the cash revenues accruing to the MiRı were obtained from bededli of many different kinds (see the "budget" of Tārkhundjī Ahmed Paşa in the Teyābî Kândî of 9Abd al-Rahmân Wefik, i, 327 ff., and the Osmanî Tārîkhî of Ahmed Râsim, ii, 214 ff., notes). Of these one of the best known, from its being of wide-spread application, was the bedel-i nâṣûl, apparently exacted in lieu of the supplies and accommodation with which, according to an original arrangement, inhabitants of places through which travelling officers and officials passed were obliged to furnish them free. This became so general a contribution that it is linked in some accounts with the "awârid [q.v.]."

Two or three other "old-regime" bedels may be mentioned as of particular interest. One is the bedel-i dīwāni paid by the Hospodars of the Danubian principalities and the republic of Ragusa. This was a contribution received in lieu, not of any service, but of the payment of dīwāna [q.v.] by the individual Dhimms [q.v.] of those territories. A second was called bedel-i ẓimâr. It was first exacted in 1069/1659—apparently from ẓimâr-holders who were no longer performing the military duties in return for which they held their fiefs, to the extent of as much as half their revenues, and even if it did not become a permanent impost was still in force five years later. Another levy on fief-holders was first imposed somewhat later and long continued, viz. the bedel-i dīvešt, which, as its name indicates, was paid by those of them whose revenues exceeded a certain sum, originally 40,000 akçe a year, in lieu of their maintaining and appearing in the field accompanied by one or more armed and mounted retainers.

Although many ancient usages were abandoned under the new régime of Maḥmûd II and his successors, recourse was still had to bededli in several connexions during the second half of the 19th century. Thus in 1272/1856 what was later usually referred to as the bedel-i 'aškerî was instituted under the name of vâme-i 'aškeriyya. By the famous Khâdi-i Humâyûn of that year (see art. 'Abd al-Mâdiq [q.v.]) the Ottoman reformers sought to abolish all legal distinctions between the sultan's Muslim and his Dhimmi subjects, and to this end both abrogated the collection of dīwāna from the Dhimms and declared them now for the first time liable for military service. In practice, however, they did not wish to employ Dhimms as soldiers, any more than the Dhimms wished so to be employed themselves; and it was decided that the Dhimms should instead pay this bedel, which thus became to all intents a substitute for the dīwāna. At first collected by government agents from individuals, its collection was later delegated, until its abolition in 1907, to the leaders of each religious community primarily concerned.

Two other late contributions of this kind were alike called bedel-i nâšû, "cash payment in lieu". The first was instituted by a decree of 1302/1886, from which date it might be paid by men conscribed for lot for military service by way of exemption either from serving altogether or else from serving more than a shortened term. The sum payable for total exemption was then fixed at 50 Ottoman gold pieces. By another decree of 1332/1914 those paying this bedel (still of the same amount) were obliged to perform six months' service and were then relegated to the reserve. The practice of selling exemption was even continued under the republican régime, a decree of 1346/1927 fixing the payment for a shortened term of service at 600 liras.

The second bedel-i nâšû was a payment accepted from persons in the provinces who were obliged by law to maintain roads in their area in lieu of this service.

Bibliography: Şârl Mehmed, Naṣâ'î al-Wiṣâsî, trans. and ed. Wright, Ottoman Statecraft, index; D'Ohisson, Tableau, vii, 258; Sülêyman Süddî, Defter-i Mübârasî, i, 123-124; 9Abd al-Rahmân Wefîk, Teyâbî Kândî, i, 322; Muştafa Nûrî, Notâ'îdî al-Wa'bâ'sî, ii, 101; Ahmed Râsim, Osmanî Târîkhî, i, 380, note ii, 214, note iii, 1156, note 1158, note 11; id. arts. Bedel-i ˙Asheri and Bedel-i Naḥâd (both by S. S. Onar); Gibb and Bowen, Islamic Society and the West, i (part 2), index. (H. Bowen)

BADAL [see ABDAL and NAHW].
BADAN [see DJISM].
BADĀRĀYA [see BADAR].
BADĀ'OON (BUDĀ'ON or BADAYUN), an ancient town, about a mile east of the river Sot and headquarters of the district of the same name in India, situated in 28° 2' N. and 79° 7' E.; it is variously spelt by native historians as BEDAMA'ON, BHAĐA'ON and BADĀWAN. Population (1951) was 53,521.

Little authentic is known about the town before the advent of the Muslims towards the end of the 6th/12th century when Kûth al-Dîn Aybak [q.v.], the wali 'aškî of Mu'izz al-Dîn b. Sâm in India, invaded and captured it in 594/1197-8 (Fakhîr-i Mudabbir, ed. Ross, 24). Tradition, however, ascribes its fall in 411/1020 to the pseudo-historical figure, Ghâzî Mâṣûd Sâlîr [q.v.], said to be a nephew of Maḥmûd of Ghazna. Tâj al-Dîn Yıldız, after his defeat by Iltutmîsh near Lahore in 612/1215, was sent to Badā'ûn as a captive where he died in 628/1230. It served as a military station during the Khâlidî period. In 690/1291 Dîjlî al-Dîn Khâlidî came to Badā'ûn with a large army in order to quell the revolt of Malik Čâdîdî. Muḥammad b. Tughluq, however, did not favour the idea of retaining it as an army base. Consequently the refractory tribes all round rose in revolt. Fêrîd Tughluq marched down to Badā'ûn in 787/1385, crushed the revolt, appointed Čâbûl Čân Şirwânî as the military governor and retired. 'Abâl al-Dîn, the
last king of the Sayyid dynasty, abdicated from the throne of Delhi in 855/1451 (Ahmad Yadgar, Ta’rikh-i Bada’uni, Bibl. I nd. 257, 10) and passed the rest of his life in Bada`un where he died in 883/1478.

Under Akbar the town was formed into a sarkar of the saba of Delhi in 964/1556; and a mint was established where only copper-coins were struck. In 979/1571 a great fire broke out, consuming the entire town, in which a large number of the residents perished.

The town lost its importance during the reign of Shâhjahân when the sarkars of Bada`un and Sambhal were amalgamated under the new name of Kateehr with head-quarters at Bareilly. With the decline of the Mughal power the town lapsed to the service of Husayn Khan as the latter’s sadr. In 981/1574 they quarrelled and parted. During the intervening years Bada`uni continued his religious education by visiting such saints as Shâykh Nizâm al-Din of Ambeth, Shâykh Aban of Amroha, Shâykh Allah Baksh of Garmatkesar and Shâykh Muhammad Husayn of Sikandra. In 981/1574 Bada`uni was presented to Akbar through the good offices of A’yân al-Din Kúchí a mansâbdar of 500 and Hákim A’yân al-Mulk a court physician. Impressed by Bada’uni’s ability as a controversialist, in 982/1574-5 Akbar appointed him an imám and ordered him to bring horses to the brand as a mansâbdar of 20. Bada`uni’s failure to match Abu ’l-Faḍl’s efforts in this sphere (the latter had come to court about the same time as Bada`uni) embittered him and led him to accept a madâd of 1,000 bighâs (originally at Baswar but transferred in 991/1583 to Bada`un). Bada`uni’s failure after this error of judgment to gain the preferment he considered he deserved, undoubtedly influenced his view of Akbar’s court and of the religious activities in which Abu ’l-Faḍl was prominent. For absenting himself on attendance from Akbar, Bada`uni nearly forfeited his grant, being saved largely by the good offices of Khwadja Nizâm al-Din al-A’lî, author of the Ta’dik-i Akbari, whom he had met at Ágra in 957/1559. Akbar continued however to employ Bada`uni on literary work from 982/1574 onwards. His date of death is variously given, (see Storey, i/1 437) but as Storey points out (i/2, 1309)”1024/1615 must be nearest to the truth, if the reference to the death of “Zuhúr” and “Mailk” Kummi is not a later insertion in the notice of “Zuhúr” in the Muntakhab al-Tawdrikh, iii, 269”.

Bada`uni’s literary work comprised: (1) Kûtub al-l’Hadîth, now lost, or a collection of 40 traditions on the merit of waging holy war, presented to Akbar in 986/1574; (2) Nâma-yi Khwâdja-afzâ, a translation of the Sing’i hajam batîsî, a collection of 32 tales about Râdja Bikramâlî of Mâlwa, ordered by Akbar in 982/1574; (3) Rasm-nâma, a translation of the Mahâbhârata, undertaken at Akbar’s request in 990/1582; (4) A translation of the Râmâyana begun at Akbar’s command in 992/1584 and submitted to him in 997/1589; (5) Part of Ta’dik-i Akbari, a general history of Islam down to the thousandth year, commissioned by Akbar in 993/1585 the first two volumes of which were revised by Bada`uni in 1000/1592-3; (6) Nâma-yi Râshdâd, a work on Sûfism, ethics and the Mâhdawi movement of Bada`uni’s day; (7) A rewriting and abridgement of a translation by Mullâ Shâh Muhammad Shâhâbodî of a history of Kashmîr (probably the Râdja-tarangî); (8) A part of a translation into Persian of Yâkût’s Mu’jam al-Buladîn; (9) A translation in epitome of Râshdâd al-Din’s Dâmî-yi Ta’wârîkh, requested by Akbar in 1000/1592-3; (10) The completion of Bada`uni’s translation into Persian of a Sanskrit tale, apparently the Kathâsârit-sâgara, made earlier for Sultan Zayn al-Ábidîn of Kashmîr. Akbar ordered this task in 1003/1595; (11) Muntakhab al-Tawdrikh, a general history of the Muslims in Hindustân from
Subuktig to 1004/1595-6, commenced in 999/1590, followed by biographies of shaykhs, scholars, physicians, and poets. Until 1002/1595, the Munta-
kh al-Tanzâlî, is based largely on Ibn Khaldun, Nizâm al-Din Ahmad’s Tabâkât-i Akhbarî, with characteristic
asides by Bâdâwâli. The work is noted for its hostile comments on Akbar’s religious activities. Its existence was apparently kept secret until at least the tenth year of Dîjahângîr’s reign, (Mulla ʿAbd al-Bâqî Nahâwundi, author of Muḥâibîr-ı Rackîmî, did not know of it when he completed his work in 1025-1616). According to the Mi’irâd al-ʿÂlam, by
Sayyîkh Muḥammad Bâkî Şâhâranpûrî, composed in 1087/1677, Bâdâwâli’s children asserted to Dîjahângîr that they did not know of the existence of the work (British Museum Add. MS. 7657, folio 452 a-b). Bâdâwâli himself hints at an intention to conceal the work (M. al-T., iii, 398).


BADAWI [see ÂHMAD AL-BADAWI and BAWI]
AL-BADAWIYYA [see ĀHMAD AL-BADAWI]
BADAWLAT, a title of the chief Ya’âkbî Beg of Kâshâghar (q.v.).

BADGHIS or BADGHI, a district in the north-western part of modern Afghanistan, in the province of Harât; the name is explained as being derived from the Persian bädhîz (“a place where the wind rises”) on account of the strong winds prevailing there. By the geographers of the 4th/10th century only the district to the north-west of Harât, between this town and Sarâq, is called Bâdghîs. The author of the Ḥudâd al-ʿÂlam, probably writing from personal knowledge, describes it as a prosperous and pleasant place of three hundred villages. Later the name was extended to the whole country between the Harîrûd and the Murghâb; at any rate it is used in this sense as early as the 4th/10th century by Yaḵût. There have never been any cities in Bâdghîs and its small towns and fortresses have never been of great importance. At the time of the Arab conquests Bâdghîs became known as a Hepthâlîte stronghold and it is said that Nizâk Târkhan the Haytal retreated there after the loss of Harât. Yaḵût writes of it as dâr manâmakht al-
Havaylân, but this can only refer to the very end of the period of Hepthâlîte power. Even under the Tâḥrids and the Šâmânsk Bâdghîs remained a hotbed of sedition.

At the present day Kalâ-ʾi Naw is regarded as the chief town. The rivers, including the tributaries of the Murghâb, still contain, as a thousand years ago, only small streams of brackish water; for the irrigation of the cultivated fields the people are for poetical artifices, such as metaphors and similes, on a scale unprecedented in pre-Islamic poetry. Hence, there arose among some ‘Abbâsîd circles of critics, the idea that this art was a bâdî, an innovation or a new creation. The word began to be used in that wide undefined sense in the critical writings of the 3rd/9th century. It occurs in more than one place in the writings of al-Ḍâbi; in one of them the author quotes a line of poetry containing a figurative expression and says: “This and what they call bâdî (‘Al-Bayân wa*l-Tabyin, Cairo 1948, i, 51, iv, 55). The first author to attempt a treatment of bâdî as a literary art and to define what he took to be its principal categories, was the caliph-poet Ibn al-Muṭazz (247-296: 861-908). In a book entitled Kitâb-al-Bâdî, Ibn al-Muṭazz tried to show—by quoting copious examples from the Karâns, the Traditions, speeches of Bedouins, and early classical poetry, that what the moderns called bâdî was not a creation of Bâshshâr and his contemporaries. These merely extended the already known art of literary figures in their poetry until it became widely used, and was given the name bâdî. Then came the poet Abî Tamâm (d. 231/850) who was very fond of this art and used it extravagantly to show himself as a poetical innovator. Its hostile comments on Akbar’s religious activities. Its active sense it means Creator or Originator, hence its use as an Attribute of God. In the passive sense it means ‘discovered’ or ‘invented’, and from this, it became a name for the innovations of the ‘Abbâsîd poets in literary figures, and later for trope in general; ‘îm al-bâdî was a branch of rhetorical science which dealt with the beautification of literary style. Some ‘Abbâsîd poets of the 2nd/8th century, like Bashshâr, Muslim b.

(275-337/888-968, a polymath), tended to depart in certain respects from the established ways of the classics and especially in the use of poetical artifices, such as metaphors and similes, on a scale unprecedented in pre-Islamic poetry. Hence, there arose among some ‘Abbâsîd circles of critics, the idea that this art was a bâdî, an innovation or a new creation. The word began to be used in that wide undefined sense in the critical writings of the 3rd/9th century. It occurs in more than one place in the writings of al-Ḍâbi; in one of them the author quotes a line of poetry containing a figurative expression and says: “This and what they call bâdî (‘Al-Bayân wa*l-Tabyin, Cairo 1948, i, 51, iv, 55). The first author to attempt a treatment of bâdî as a literary art and to define what he took to be its principal categories, was the caliph-poet Ibn al-Muṭazz (247-296: 861-908). In a book entitled Kitâb-al-Bâdî, Ibn al-Muṭazz tried to show—by quoting copious examples from the Karâns, the Traditions, speeches of Bedouins, and early classical poetry, that what the moderns called bâdî was not a creation of Bâshshâr and his contemporaries. These merely extended the already known art of literary figures in their poetry until it became widely used, and was given the name bâdî. Then came the poet Abî Tamâm (d. 231/850) who was very fond of this art and used it extravagantly to show himself as a poetical innovator. Its hostile comments on Akbar’s religious activities. Its active sense it means Creator or Originator, hence its use as an Attribute of God. In the passive sense it means ‘discovered’ or ‘invented’, and from this, it became a name for the innovations of the ‘Abbâsîd poets in literary figures, and later for trope in general; ‘îm al-bâdî was a branch of rhetorical science which dealt with the beautification of literary style. Some ‘Abbâsîd poets of the 2nd/8th century, like Bashshâr, Muslim b.
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book on the whole field of Arabic rhetoric, al-Askari devoted a long section to the explanation of baldgha and the enumeration of its kinds and categories. Al-Rummani (296-386/908-996), a Mu'tazilite rhetorician, considers baldgha [q.v.] or eloquence as one of seven directions in which kūranī 'idās can be seen, and without mentioning baldgha, he includes some of the figures of speech as categoric of baldgha. But the Sunnite al-Bakillani (d. 403/1013) in his Ighās al-Kur'dn, devotes a long chapter to the baldgha of speech, maintaining that baldgha [q.v.] could help to appreciate, but could not sufficiently explain 'idās. Ibn Rashīk, the author of Al-'Umda, "On the Excellencies and Requirements of Poetry", illustrates in his book more than sixty categories under the heading "The Invented and the baldgha". Ibn Khaldūn points out that Ibn Rashīk's Al-'Umda had a great influence in the Muslim West, in North Africa and Spain, where the use of baldgha was highly appreciated and practised. The turning point however in the history of Arabic rhetoric in general, and of baldgha in particular, as a separate science of stylistics came about in the hands of al-Sakkaki (555-626/1160-1228), who in his book Miṣḥāt-al-'Ulam built a logical system for the classification of the instrumental sciences of literature, making use in the section on rhetoric of the solid philosophical foundations laid down earlier by 'Abd al-Kahir al-Djurdjâni (948-1013). From al-Sakkaki's time down to the present, books on Arabic rhetoric have revolved round the compact text of his book, its abbreviations and the long and detailed commentaries on those texts. Notable among the epitomisers and the commentators of the Miṣḥāt were al-Khaṭṭîf al-Kaẓwîni (666-739/1267-1338) and al-Tâfâšâfî (722-793/1322-1390). This period was characterised in literature by ingenuity in using ornaments of style and by love for the art of baldgha. Some poets of the period delighted in using all kinds of figures of speech in one and the same poem. Such poems, called baldgha'iyya, were composed by Saḥ al-Dîn al-Ḥilîî and others. In that period, the sciences of rhetoric were clearly and rigidly delineated. Thus, aspects of literary structure became the domain of the science of baydn or "Exposition". The artifices of the ornamentation and embellishment of speech remained the instruments and categories of baldgha.

Bibliography: A. F. Mehren, Die Rhetorik der Araber, Copenhagen-Vienna 1853; Amjad Trabulsî, La critique poétique des Arabes, Damascus 1956; Abû Hûlâl Al-Askari, K. Al-Sind al-'Udâlyn, Istanbul 1320; Abû Bakr al-Bakillânî, Ighâs al-Kur'dn, Cairo 1349; [The sections on poetry were discussed and translated by G. E. von Grunebaum in A Tenth-Century Document of Arab Literary Theory and Criticism, Chicago 1950]; Al-Djâhî, K. Al-Bayān wa T-tabyn, Cairo 1948; 'Abd al-Kahir al-Djurdjâni, Aṣrâr al-Baldgha, Ed. H. Ritter, Istanbul 1954; Cairo 1930; Al-Ma'râghî, Ta'rif al-'Ulam al-Baladgha, Cairo n.d.; Al-Khaṭṭîf Al-Kaẓwîni, Taḥkîs al-Miṣḥât and K. Al-'Iṣâfī (together with al-Tâfâšâfî's Muḥâḍarayn), Cairo 1342/1923; Abû Yakúb Al-Sakkânî, K. Miṣḥāt al-'Ulm, Cairo n.d.; Sa'd al-Dîn Al-Djâfâynî, Al-Sharq al-Kabîr, Istanbul; ibidem, Al-Sharq al-Qâhir, Cairo and Calcutta; 'Abd Allah Ibn al-Muṭṭâfî, Kitâb al-Mutbâkîn, London 1935; Kudâma b. Diyâr, Nābî al-Shîrî, ed. S. A. Bonebakker, Leiden 1956; Ibn Khaldûn, Muḥâḍarayn, book vi, § 371 section on 'ilm al-baydn; Ibn Rashîk al-Ḳayrawânî, Al-'Umda, Cairo 1333/1934; [M. Khalafallah, al-Bâdi', al-Asṭurlâbî, Hîrat Allah b. al-Husayn b. 'Aḥmad (also Yûsûf), Abu 'l-Kâsim, illustrious Arab scholar, physician, philosopher, astronomer and poet, who distinguished himself particularly for his knowledge and construction of the astrolabe and other astronomical instruments. The date of his birth is not known. In 520/1126-7, we find him at Isfahân in intimate contact with the Christian physician Amin al-Dawla Ibn al-Tînlîghî. Later he lived in Baghâdad, where the excellence of his art, so it is said, brought him a considerable fortune under the Caliph al-Mustâshîrî. According to Abu 'l-Fâdî, astronomical observations were made under his direction in 524/1130 in the palace of the Saljûqids sultans at Baghâdad. It is probable that the tablets of Muḥmûd composed by him and dedicated to the Sultan Abu 'l-Kâsim Muḥmûd b. Muhammad (1118-31) are the result of these observations. He died at Baghâdad in 534/1139-40 and it is said (Abu 'l-Fârâdî is the sole source of this tradition) that he was buried in a state of coma. As regards his poetical works, Ibn al-Khiṣṭ maintains that they were "beautiful and excellent", Ibn Khallîkîn that they reached the limits of lechery and obscenity. Ibn Khallîkîn and Ibn Abî Usaybi'a give examples of his best pieces. In addition to a Dies irae, poems, al-Bâdi', al-Asṭurlâbî published a selection of the poems of Ibn Hadjîdî in one volume, divided into 141 chapters and entitled Dururat al-Tâdîn min ghîr Ibn Hadjîdî (Brocckelmann, S I, 130). The praise which the Arab biographers liberally bestow on al-Bâdi', al-Asṭurlâbî, should not lead us to place his merits too high. The historians and biographers of the 7th/9th century possessed too little mathematical and astronomical knowledge to enable them properly to appreciate the really eminent services which the scholars of the 9th/10th centuries rendered these sciences. They thus frequently fell into the error of extolling to excess the work of scholars closer to them in time, to the detriment of the works which mark the zenith of Arab science. Nowhere are the praises of al-Battânî, Abu 'l-Fârâdî and al-Bîrûnî sung so eloquently as those of al-Bâdi', al-Asṭurlâbî, though the former are scholars of much greater distinction than the latter. Bibliography: Ibn al-Khiṣṭ, 339; Ibn Khallîkîn, Cairo 1310, ii, 186 (trans. de Slane, iii, 380); Ibn Abî Usaybi'a, i, 280; Abu 'l-Fârâdî (ed. Şâlîbînî), 366; Abu 'l-Fâdî, Annals (ed. Reiske and Adler), iii, 441-483; Hammer, Literaturgesch. d. Araber, vi, 431; H. Suter, Abhandlungen zur Gesch. der mathem. Wissensch., x, 117; V. Klotz, Irshad, vii, 241-242; Sarton, Introduction to the History of Science, ii, 204; F. Rosenthal, Al-Asṭurlâbî and as-Samaw'î on Scientific progress, in Osiris 1930, 555-564; (H. Suter). Bâdi', al-Dîn, surnamed Kutb al-Madar (axis of the Universe) and popularly known as Šâh Madâr, is the Methuselah of Indian hagiological literature and one of the most celebrated saints of India. He is said to have been born at Aleppo in 290/864, and to have been descended from Abû Hurayra [q.v.], one of the companions of the Prophet. The statement in the Miḥâl-i Madârî that he was a Jew and embraced Islam at al-Madînâ is not supported by other authorities. Like his descent, his date of birth is also controversial, the Taḏkhirat al-Muttaḥîn gives it as i Shawwâl 442/Feb. 1053; the Miḥâl-i Madârî has 715/1315, which is most probable. According to the Kitâb-i Aṭrâs and Mihr-i...
BADIS, a town (now in ruins) and anchorage on the Mediterranean coast of Morocco. It is 69 m. (110 km.) south-east of Tetuan, between the territory of the Ghumara [q.v.] and the Rif [q.v.] properly so-called. It is situated on the territory of the Banū Yaṣṭūfat (utafa: Bni Yitṣūft) near the mouth of a torrent named Tālān-Badīs (tulga: Tālemštāds). An attempt has been made to identify it with the Partīnsa of the Itinerary of Antoninus; but this ancient place-name could equally well refer to the more sheltered cove of Yallish (= Iris on our maps) which is only 7 km. to the south-west.

The town of Badīs and its port formed part of the kingdom of Nukūr, and later of the Idrīsid principality of the Banū Ṣumayr. The Almoravids, the Almohads and the Marinids used it as a naval base and devoted their energies to fortifying it.

The author of the Maṣḥad (end of the 7th/13th century) and especially Leo Africanus (beginning of the 10th/16th century), describe Badīs as a township of 600 households. Under the Marinid Abū Sā'id (709-31/1310-31), it paid 1000 dinārs in taxes, as did Melīla and Larache. The port possessed an arsenal where foists and other kinds of galleys were built of cedar-wood from the neighbouring mountains; it was frequented by Venetian merchants, and was the terminus of the shortest route from the Mediterranean to the Banū Khālid. The population devoted themselves to trade, fishing (sardines) and also to piracy on the coasts of Spain. The governor of the Rif had his residence there; his authority extended over the coastal towns from Yallish to Wādī Nukur, and also over certain tribes of the interior: Bukkāya, Banū Mansār, Banū Ḥabbāl, Band Yaddīr.

Less than 100 metres out to sea there were two small rocky islands, the larger of which was called Ḥadjar Badīs, the Peñon de Velez of the Spanish. In 1508 the latter, in order to put an end to the activities of the pirates, occupied it and fortified it. In 1520, however, they lost it as the result of treachery. In 1526, the Wattasid sultan Abū Ḥassīn, deposed by his brother, received as an appanage the Rif, with his seat at Badīs, whence he acquired the surname of al-Badīsī [q.v., No. 3]. In 1554, he ceded the town and the Peñon to his Turkish allies from Algiers: the latter made it a lair for corsairs operating in the region of the Straits of Gibraltar. The Sa'dīd sultan Abū Allāh al-Ǧalīlī bīlālī was alarmed by this activity, and feared that the Turks might use Badīs as a base from which to undertake the conquest of Morocco. In 1564, he forced the Moroccans to evacuate the town, Velez, perhaps has its origin in the town called Velez (de) Malaga (Ar. Balish).

The old town of Badīs is now in ruins. After the Rif war (1927), the Spanish attempted, without success, to establish nearby a small settlement called Villa Jordana. The Peñon still belongs to Spain and constitutes a sovereign territory: Peñon de Velez de la Gomera. The Spanish corruption of the name of the town, Velez, perhaps has its origin in the existence, opposite, on the European coast, of a town called Velez (de) Malaga (Ar. Bālij)
BADIS — BADJ

BADIS B. HABUS [see ZIRIDS OF SPAIN].

BADIS B. AL-MANSUR B. BULUKKIN B. ZIRI, alias ABU MANAD BADIS NASIR AL-DAWLA, third Zird of Ifrîkiya, enthroned on 16 Rajab 386/8 April 996. Entrusting eastern Ifrîkiya to a devoted Arab vice-amir, he set about containing a powerful Zanatan offensive which, from 386/996 onwards, pushed forward from Tiaret to Tripoli. In 389/999, he faced the amir of the Maghrîba, Zirb. b. Aţtiyya, who had as allies Fulful b. Sa'id, chief of the Zanata, and his own great-uncles. He finally defeated them (391/1001), his triumph being mainly due to his great-uncle Hammad b. Bulukkîn. From 395/1004 onwards, the latter repelled a new Zanatan offensive. From 390 to 406/990-1007, the Zird also fought in Tripolitania against Fâtûmid intervention and against Yânis, Fulful b. Sa'id and Warrû b. Sa'id. While the Zanatan menace gradually abated in the south-west, in the east he had to suppress the revolt of Hammad, founder of Kala in 398/1007-8. In the course of this campaign, which commenced at the end of 405/May 1015, after having won a decisive victory at Chelif (1 Dju'madî 406/17 October 1015), but failed to take Kala which had been besieged for six months, Bâdis died on 30 Dhu'l-Ka'da 406/10 May 1016. The creation of the Hammadid state had begun, and the anti-Shî'ite disturbances at Tunis (406/1015-6) portended the break with the Fâtûmids which occurred under his son and successor al-Muẓaffar b. Bâdis.


AL-BADISI, ethnic adjective referring to the town of Bâdis [q.v.], and borne by three notable Moroccan personalities:

1. ABU YA'KUB ÝUSUF AL-ZAHAYLÎ AL-BADISI, saint and savant of the 8th/14th century, who is buried outside the town. The author of the Makâbîd (cf. infra, a) devoted a notice to him (cf. trans., i, 14 and 218). Ibn Khâlidûn regarded him as the last of the great Moroccan saints (cf. Prolegomena, trans., ii, 199; Histoire des Berbères, i, 230). Leo Africanus (ed. Schefer, ii, 273; ed. Épaulard, Paris 1956, 274) speaks of his shrine which is still venerated: Sidi Bû Ya'kub.

2. 'Abd al-Ĥaţî al-Bâdisî, still living in 722/1322. He is the author of a collection of the lives of the saints of the Rif entitled Al-Makâbîd al-Sharîf fi Dhikr Sulahâ al-Rif, which has come down to us in two editions which differ appreciably from the point of view of vocabulary; annotated trans. by G. S. Colin in Archivio Marocaines, vol. 26 (1926).

3. 'Ali, son of Muhammed al-Shaykh al-Wâltâsî. His normal kunya was Abu 'l-Hasan, but he is known by the hypocoristic name of Abu Ĥassûn. His father, while still young, was entrusted with the government of the Rif, with his residence at Badis, and, when he was deposed, he received the same province as an appanage. He lived there from 1526 to 1549; hence his surname al-Bâdisî, and title “king of Velez” given to him by European chroniclers.
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BADYA (see Supplement).

BADJ, the Arabicised form given to the Persian bâdî in the Islamic period (al-Sayyid Addî Shîr, Kitâb al-Alfâz al-Fârisîyya al-Mu'arraba, Beirut 1908). From the roth to the 14th century bâdî is more common; thus it is usual form in the Shâh-nâma (though bâdij occurs too), and the phrase bâdî u sîrî is not infrequent, while the expression bâdî u rûm is used there with reference to the tribute and indemnity paid to the victorious Persians by the rulers of the Eastern Roman empire (Fritz Wolff, Glossar zu Firdowski Schâhname, Berlin 1935). The Ghaznawid poet Bahârîu uses bâdî, whereas the 15th-century poet Bâbâ Fighânî uses bâdji (see Amîn Ahmad Râzî, Haft Ikhâm, Bibl. Indica, Calcutta 1939, i, 267), and it was in the latter form that the word entered Turkish. After the Ottoman occupation of the Balkans the word was borrowed by the Bulgars and Serbs (Kari Lokotsch, Etymolog. Wörterbuch, Heidelberg 1927), and it is used in Armenian with the same form and meaning (Horn, Grundriss der Neupersischen Etymologie, Strassburg 1893, 34).

Asadi, in his dictionary (Lugata-i Furs, ed. P. Horn, Berlin 1894), defines the word simply as kharâdî. 'Abd al-Kâdîr Bâgîdâdî (Abdulqâdir Bagdadînîs lexicon Sânâmamum, ed. Salemann Wood Petersburg 1895) explains it as meaning 'customs-dues, title, and tax': the words bâdîbân, bâdîbêdîb and bâdîdår he explains as 'desiring toll, customs-officer', and bâdîgêh as 'place where customs-dues are levied' (all four words occur in the Shâh-nâma). In the Turkish translation of the Burhân-î Kâtîfî, in addition to the meanings 'title, tax, customs-dues', it is stated that the word was also applied to money and gifts received by suzerains from vassal rulers. In Turkish texts generally, as in Persian, the meaning is 'tax'. The word became current as a fiscal technical term among the Turks, because a number of Turkish states were founded in the Persian area, beginning with the Ghaznawids and Sâlğûks, and because the Sâlğûk administration preserved Sâmânid and Ghaznawid traditions. It will also be recalled that Persian was the official language of Asia Minor under both Sâlğûks and Iklhâns. A study of the available documents shows that as well as being used for 'tax' in general, the word was applied to various forms of tax. The poet Nasîr-i Khurâsânî, describing Aleppo in his Sânâmamum (ed. Ch. Schefer, Paris 1883, 19), says that it was a bâdîgêh (i.e., customs-post) between the cities of Syria, Rûm, Diyarbakîr, Egypt, and 'Irâq. Nasîr al-Dîn Tûsî, in a risâla containing his views on politics and finance, presented to the Iklhâni Abdâb (Şerefeddîn Yaltkâya, Ilkhanler dei rîvî idârî tekiştîndîn dârî Nisârebânî Tûsî'în bir eseri, in Türk tarihî ve tctiât tarihî mecman, ii, 135; M. Minovî and V. Minorsky, Nasîr al-Dîn Tûsî, Monograph on Finance, in BSOS x. 3, 1941, 763), uses it in the general sense; Yaltkâya translates it as 'customs-dues' in this somewhat ambiguous passage, but as customs-dues had been levied from ancient times it is certain that there would be nothing shameful in a ruler's
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exacting them. As the context indicates, and as Minorsky rightly shows, the bddi here referred to must be the râkdârî (‘traveler's protection tax’) levied in the Ilkhanid dominions in return for maintaining peace and security on caravan-routes and lakes. The historian of the Ilkhanid period, Rashâd al-Dîn (Ta’rîkh-i Mudràrak-i Ghiyâtî, ed. K. Jahn, GMS, London 1940, 280 ff.), when describing measures taken to safeguard the great caravan-routes in Ghiyât’s time, speaks of bddi taken from travelers at certain specified places, according to a fixed scale. He also uses the word of a tax of one third, when discussing Ghiyât’s agricultural reforms.

A century later, the historian Shâraf al-Dîn Yazdî uses bddi together with saw, kharâdî, and diisya, i.e., loosely in the sense of ‘tax, impost’ (Zafar-nâmâ, Bibl. Indica, Calcutta 1888, ii, 378). At the end of that century the historian Khândâmî (Dastur al-Wuṣûrî, ed. Sâdîd Nafti, Tehran 1327/1909-1910, 463) mentions bddi along with the tamgha taken from merchants, sawâr, and kharâdî, but apparently as a general term only, for he gives no information about its nature. The early Şâfawîd historian Hasan Rûmî states that some neighbouring tribes had long paid bddi to the rulers of Harât (Ahsan al-Tawâriskh, ed. C. N. Seddon, Baroda 1931, i, 357). He establishes the sense of such a word, legislative texts are clearly of more use than historical texts, but the oldest relevant ones, those of the Âk Köyûnlî, have not come down to us in their original forms. Thanks however to the tenacity of tradition, common in medieval Turkish and Muslim bureaucracies, we find Âk Köyûnlî laws surviving, at most slightly altered, in Ottoman bdnâns (as is expressly stated in the Ottoman fiscal bdnâns for the eastern Anatolian vâlayets, formerly subject to the Âk Köyûnlî); and in them the word bddi occurs frequently (cf. W. Hinz, Das Steuerwesen Ostanatoliens im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert, in ZDMG, 1930, 179-201).

These laws were first discussed by I. H. Uzuncârlî (Osmanî devleti teşkilâtına mededdîh, Istanbul 1941, 213, 276, 302) who sets out to explain such expressions as bddi-i tamgha and bddi-i buzurg. He states, on the basis of the Farkang-i Şâwîrî and the Shâraf-nâmâ, that the tamgha was branded on animals and that bddi-i buzurg was the tax peculiar to land customs, and he notes that bddi-i buzurg was the name of two taxes, one levied on subject rulers and princes, the other on commercial goods in transit and articles brought from village to city. He explains bddârdî as ‘a guardian of roads, taking money from caravans in return for maintaining the security of the roads, in the Ilkhanid period’.

But in this he is incorrect: the bddârdî was a tax collector, in the Ilkhanid and Djalârîd periods, who collected tolls at certain places, according to a tariff fixed by the central government (this tariff is mentioned in Italian sources for oriental trade in the Ilkhanid period: see G. I. Brattini, Recherches sur le commerce génos dans la Mer Noire au XIII s., Paris 1929, 184, 189). The ‘guardian of roads’ was quite distinct; he was the tutbavmî (Persian râkdâr), paid by the central government and under the orders of a senior military commander. At times when the central government was weak, however, lawless men assumed this title and took protection-money arbitrarily from caravans, thus performing the functions of râkdâr and bddârdî. The vagueness of I. H. Uzuncârlî’s explanation of the words bddi-i tamgha and bddi-i buzurg is due to his reliance on dictionaries rather than on bdnânâmâs. It is possible to get a clearer and more accurate picture from a set of bdnânâmâs of the Âk Köyûnlî period, published by Omer Lütfî Barkan (Osmanî devrinde Âk Köyûnlî hukûmâtır Uzun Hânîn Beyi aî kânûnlar, in Türkîc veikalarî, i, no. 2, 91-106; no. 3, 184-97). These bdnânâmâs, termed yasa under the influence of the Ilkhanid administrative tradition, relate to the regions of Diyârbakr, Mardin, Erzûh, al-Ruhâ (Urfa), Erzindâm, İshiyurt (Harput), Çermik, and ‘ArabÎbîk, and are mainly of the time of Uzun Hân. From a study of them the following facts emerge: bddi is generally used for ‘tax’, as in the expression bddi-i tamgha.

The meaning of tamgha is quite plain; it is the tax levied on all kinds of goods bought and sold in cities, on woven stuffs and slaughtered animals, and is normally referred to as ‘black tamgha’ (tamgha-i sîyâk). Bddi-i buzurg was the customs-duty levied on goods in transit through or imported into the country; such goods, when sold in the market, were also liable to ‘stamp duty’ (bddi-i tamgha). It is expressly stated in the bdnân of Erzûh that tamgha was levied on the buying and selling of immovable property; i.e., the word is here used in the general sense of ‘tax’. It is apparent that bddi in these bdnânâmâs is not a technical term.

This observation is confirmed by the use of the word in Ottoman literary texts. Sâdî al-Dîn uses it in the general sense when he says that the bddi and kharâdî in 14th-century Rûm were not onerous as they were in Persia (Târîkh al-Tawâriskh, i, 214). So too a number of Ottoman poets use it as synonymous with kharâdî in the phrase bddi u kharâdî. On the other hand, the word is used as a technical term in some historical texts and above all in the early bdnânâmâs of the Conqueror, apart from the non-technical use, we find bddi applied to a sum denoted in local towns. This bdnânâmâ lays down that bddi is not levied on immovable property such as land, houses, shops, and mills, but on goods sold in markets; not however on anything sold in villages. It specifies the amount of bddi to be levied on the sale of all sorts of goods, including slaves (who in the eyes of Islamic law are movable property), and makes it clear that sometimes only one party is liable to pay, sometimes both. It also prescribes the amount of bddi—generally 20%—to be levied on goods from abroad (e.g., from ‘Frenk’ and ‘Dobrovenîdîk’ = Dubrovnik = Ragusa), but there is a clause which states that this will depend on the terms of contracts made with these countries. The text however is a little doubtful and corrupt, so no positive conclusions can be drawn (F. Kraelitz, Kanunnâmâ Sultan Mehmedes des Eroberers, in MOG, Vienna 1921, i, 26, 30 ff.). But it is safe to say that the reference here is not to customs-duty levied on goods coming across the frontier, for the term gümûrk occurs in numerous official documents of the period, and customs-duties seem not to be described as bddi (idem, Osmanîc ve Ílkhânîç Urunlar, in Türkefsprache, Vienna 1922, no. 2, 4). It may therefore be conjectured that when goods entered the Ottoman dominions they paid customs-duty (gümûrûk), and when they were brought to a city and sold, they paid a separate bddi.
BADJA — BADJA

The word is used in the bānīn nāme of Suleymān just as it was during the 15th century; indeed, some paragraphs concerning bādji are taken unaltered from the bānīn nāme of the Conqueror (cf. Kānīn nāme-i Āl-i ʿOṯāmān, Supplement to TOEM, Istanbul 1329, 21 ff., with the bānīn nāme of the Conqueror, 30 ff.), though there are some additional ordinances too. It is clear from these two bānīn nāmes that bādji meant both a specific municipal tax (īḥšāb īsm) and ‘tax’ in general: the latter meaning being seen in such expressions as bādji-i bādār, bādji-i ʿaẓāmān, bādji-i lamgā. It is still in use among the Turkish people of eastern Turkistān in the general sense (cf. F. Grenard, Le Turkestan et le Tibet, Paris 1898, 263, 265. In the dialects of Kāshgar and Yarkand the meaning is ‘customs-duty’ (G. Raquette, English-Turki Dictionary, Lund-Leipzig 1927, 24, 119).

Bibliography: Sources have been shown in the text, in detail, in the text, in full, of a complete study of the work. Osman Nuri, when dealing with the ʿīḥsāb taxes (Meffelle-i Uμār-i Beldiyye, Istanbul 1922, i, 364-70) confines himself to quoting relevant passages from Aḥṣāk pāshāzāde, Neshrī, the bānīn nāme of Suleymān, and another bānīn nāme of unspecified date. (M. Fuad Köprüdö)

BADJA, the birthplace of Firdawsī, a small village in the vicinity of Tūs. The name is not found in any of the Arab geographers, and is mentioned only by ʿArūḏī: Samaḵzőndī (Cāhind Maḵāla, ed. Mirzā Muḥammad ʿAznwī, GMS i, 47, 190).

BADIJA, a town and district of Muslim Spain, modern Beja in S. Portugal, the classical Pax Julia. The Roman origin of Bādja is referred to by the geographer al-Rāzī (q.v.), who speaks of its fine wide streets. Abundant honey was obtained there, and its water was specially suitable for tanning (E. Lévi-Provençal, “La „Description de l’Espagne“ d’Aljmad al-Razi,” in Al-Andalus, XVIII, 1953, 85ff). Bādja is frequently mentioned from the time of the Arab conquest. When Seville fell, its defenders withdrew to Bādja, whence they later returned and gained a temporary advantage (Aḥkār Maḏmūʿa, 16, 18). Bādja became one of the militarised zones (kwaw muqaddama) of Muslim Spain. In 746/747 at Bādja the commander of the Egyptian qādīn, al-ʿĀlī b. al-Muqthī revolted, donning the black dress of the ʿAbbāsidīs and displaying a black banner sent from the East by al-Manṣūr (Aḥkār Maḏmūʿa, 101-102; Ibn al-Kūṭiyya, 32-33). In 744/745 Bādja is said to have been attacked by Norse Vikings (Makkārī, Analedes, i, 223). At Bādja later, local chiefs disputed the authority of the central government (cf. Lévi-Provençal, Histoire de l’Espagne musulmane, ed. Cairo 1944, i, 271, 298), and at another time the ʿAbbāsidīs of Seville (Ibn ʿIdhārī, Bayān, iii, 192-193). The town was probably more important in early times than afterwards. It is not described by Ibn ʿIdhārī (548/1154). Its most famous son was the theologian Abu ʿl-Walid al-Bādī (q.v.). Bādja in Spain is sometimes called Bādjiat al-Zayt (see below).

Bibliography: E. Lévi-Provençal, La péninsule ibérique au Moyen-Age d’après le Kitāb ar-Raʿaw al-Mīṭār, Leiden 1938, 35-46; Arabic text, 36-37. (D. M. Dunlop)

BADJA (ancient Vaga; modern orthography: Béja), important town in Ifrikiya, situated about 100 km. west of Tunis. Its population at the present time is nearly 23,000. Resting against the fertile slopes of the valley of the Medjerda, it constitutes “the most considerable town of the region, which existed in ancient times and has continued to exist down to our time . . . . its strategic position, of supreme importance, on the road from Tunis to Algeria, was constantly emphasised throughout the Muslim period” (P. Brunschwigg, Hafṣides, i, 300).

Capital of the province richest in cereal crops, it was for this reason called the “granary (kūr) of Ifrikiya”, just as it was called, throughout the Middle Ages, Bādjiat al-ʿAmīn (“Bādja of the corn”) to distinguish it from the other towns, in Africa and Spain, which bore the same name (see below).

The celebrated geographer al-Bakrī gives an exact and detailed description of the town which is still valid today, apart from certain changes in place names which took place at a later date. “Bādja”, he says, “is three days’ journey from al-Kayrawān. A large town, encircled by several streams, and built on a high bow-shaped hill named ʿAyn ʿShām (“the spring of the sun”). This spring still feeds the town and bears the same name. The other important monuments which he mentions are: the ramparts, which were later augmented by a second, exterior wall enclosing new quarters of the town; the citadel (still to-day al-ʿAṣābā) “an ancient building, solidly built of great blocks of stone” (a Byzantine fortress, built by Count Paulus at the time of Justinian, as is indicated by a Latin inscription of that period. It was frequently repaired during the Hafṣūs, Turkish and Husaynī periods); and the Great Mosque which, “solidly built, has the city walls for the kibla”. The town also possessed “five baths (hammām), a large number of caravanserais (fundoš), and three open spaces (rīkū) where food markets were held”.

The environs of the city were, he says, “full of magnificent gardens watered by streams”.

At the time of the siege of Carthage by Hasān b. al-Nuʿmān, about 76/695 part of the Byzantine garrison took refuge at Bādja and entrenched itself there. After its capture by the above-mentioned Umayyād general, Bādja subsequently became an important strategic centre for the Arab qādīn. Al-Harawī states that Maʿbād b. al-ʿAbbās b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, the cousin of the Prophet, died there, and that his tomb is to be found in the meadow (mardī) of the town.

Al-Yākūbī, who visited Ifrikiya in the 3rd/9th century, tells us that “the population of Bādja is descended from the soldiers of the old ʿAbbāsid army and from non-Arab autochthonous elements”.

Al-Kalḵashandī, quoting an ancient source, notes that the tribe of the Banū Saʿd, among whom the Prophet was brought up, had been scattered across many lands, and that in his own time there only remained a small group of them, who lived at Bādja in Ifrikiya alongside the ʿAbbāsid troops.

Under Aghlabid dominion, the city became the important capital of the whole North-Western district of Tunisia. Powerful officials, belonging to the family of the ʿarifs, the Banū Ḥumayy, relations and allies of the amirs, succeeded one another as heads of its government, and strove to preserve it as a rich and lucrative fief; kādis, chosen from among the most famous jurists of the capital, were nominated to this high office; experienced generals assumed command of the militia and the Aghlabid allies. And there is reason to think that the veterans of this
militia, who continued to dwell in this region, gave the name of their tribe, Kuḍā'a, to an important commune (kuttdb) of Bādjā, which retains this name to the present day.

During the Fātimid period, the town was sacked, pillaged and partly burnt by the Berber troops of Abū Ya'qūb [q.v.], "the man with the ass", in 335/946. But it quickly recovered its prosperity, by virtue of its agricultural products. At the time of the Ḥilālī invasion (5th/11th century), it received groups of the Kūḍā‘ tribe, which settled in the surrounding countryside, and the town passed successively from the hands of nomad chiefs to the Zirid princes of Bougie (al-_BIGJAYA). With the advent of the Ḥafsids, the town recovered a measure of its former prosperity and frequently served as a refuge for rebels against government.

During the Turkish period (10th-11th/16th-17th centuries), Bāđja had a garrison of janissaries who left their posterity there. A Hanafl mosque was built inside the town. From the time of the IJusaynids, Bādjā had a garrison of Janissaries who represented the authority of the Beys. Certain monuments were built, notably a citadel 1 km. west of the town, called "Bārdō" after the name of the famous palace of the Beys on the outskirts of Tunis. Bādja was the birthplace of a number of scholars, jurisconsults, poets, and local historians. Reference will only be made here to the al-Kalghāni family, which supplied 9th/15th century Tunisia with seven or eight eminent ḳādis and jurists, and to Muḥammad al-Ṣaghīr b. Yūsuf, who wrote an eye-witness account of the history of the first four Husaynid Beys (from 1705 to 1768 A.D.).


Two other Tunisian centres were also named Bādja: BĀDJĀL AL-ZAYT ("Bādja of the oil"), so called in order to distinguish it from its homonym in the north. It was a town in the district of Rusfa (the ancient Ruspae of the Romans and Byzantines), situated, in the heart of the olive-tree forests of the Tunisian Sahel, on the road from Mahdia to al-Djān, 13 km. east of the latter centre. The commune (ġayyba) in which it was located still bears the name of Wādī Bādja (governorate of Mahdia). It seems that it prospered up to the time of the Ḥilālī invasion, and then declined and completely disappeared during the Ḥafsid period. Its site, however, with its numerous ruins, notably of a vast hydraulic installation (laqiyya), still exists. It is mentioned several times by al-Maliki and Yākūt, who quote passages from Ibn Rashīk in his anthology of the poets of al-Kayrawān.

Bibliography: Maliki, Riyād al-Nūfūs, ii, 79-81 (ms. coll. Abdul-Wahab); Yākūt, Cairo 1323/1906, ii, 25; Safadi, al-Wādī bi l-Walajā, iii (Zaytūn, ms.); Bādja al-Ḳifta ("the ancient"), a hamlet no longer in existence today, but whose ruins are still visible. It was situated near the present-day town of Mannūbā north-west of Tunis. It possessed a mosque, a school (kutdā), a market and a certain number of dwellings. Its chief claim to fame was that it was the birth-place of a great Tunisian mystic (ṣūfī), Abū Sa‘īd Ḵaṭāfa b. Yāhya al-Tamīmī al-Bādji, born in 555/1160, died 582/1185. This Bādji, in 1231, the pupil of Abū Madyan Ṣu‘ayb of Timceleb, was buried in the village of Diyabal al-Manār, and has since become known from Marsa to Carthage as Sayyid Abū Sa‘īd (Sidi Bou Said).


BĀDJĀLĀN. Both surviving branches of this formerly large tribe are now settled in Irāk. The main branch occupies the area of Bīn Kudra and Kurutū, north of Khānahīn. An offshoot, known variously as Bāḏīlān, Bāḏīwān or Bāḏīwān, is to be found in the Shabak [q.v.] area on the left bank of the river Tigris opposite Mawṣil. Although the tribe has always been known as a Kurdish one this is only so in the wide sense that all nomads of the Zagros area, including the Gūrān [q.v.] and the Lurs, are considered by their neighbours to be Kurds. In fact, all Bāḏīlānīs appear to speak a dialect of the (Iranian, but not Kurdish) Gūrānī language—a pointer, failing evidence to the contrary, to their Gūrānī origins.

A great number of Bāḏīlān nomads paid homage to the Ottoman Grand Visier at Mawṣil in 1039/1630 (Nafta, Ta‘vīq, s.a.). For a time the tribe gave its name to a sandbā, Bāḏīwām, between the two rivers Zāb (Ḫādīdī Khalīfa, Dīkūn-numūt, 435). The present Bāḏīwān community may stem from this section. According to their own traditions (Rawlinson, in Journal of the Royal Geographical Society, 1893, ix, 107; Minorsky, in EJ, i, 728, s.v. Lāh) part of the tribe retired from the Mawṣil area in the 14th/15th century to Luristan (Psh-i Kūh), where it became assimilated to the Lakk Kurds. Another group had settled in the plain between Gānān and Kus-kī Shīrūn, the chieftains residing first in Zühāb and, after its decline, in Khānahīn. Early in this 14th/15th century the two main sections of the Bāḏīlān were astride the Turco-Persian frontier, the Dūmmūr in the Zühāb area and the Khānahīn near Bīn Kudra. The Persian sections seem since to have concentrated on the Kurutū area.


AL-BADJALI, AL-ḤASAN b. ‘ALI b. WARSANG, founder of a sect among the Berbers of Morocco, whose adherents are called Badjaliyya. Al-Bakrī states that he appeared there before Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Shī‘ī [q.v.] came to Ifriqiya (before 280/893). Al-Badjal came from Nafta (Nefta) and found many adherents among the Banū La-
más. His teaching agreed with that of the Rawafid, but he asserted that the Imamate belonged only to the descendants of al-Hassan. So al-Bakri and Ibn Hazm state, in opposition to Ibn Hawkal (ed. de Goeje, 65), who says that he was a Musawl (cf. Ibn Khurradadhbih, 97, 7). Bakri is an Arabic rendering of the Aramaic Bêgh (Be) Garma while Bakmarmak goes back to some Middle Persian form of the district, like Garmakan. The latter word comes from the Gurumu, a nomadic people mentioned in cuneiform inscriptions, the *Gaparmakos* of Ptolemy.

**Bibliography:** Ibn al-Fakht, 35, 21, 179, 5; Ibn Khurradadhbih, 94; Baladhuri, Futâkâ, 325, 333; Yâkût, s. 454; G. Hoffmann, *Auszüge aus syrischen Akten persischer Märtyrer*, Leipzig 1880, 44, 45, 253; M. Streck, Art. Garamatex in Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. (where further references are given).

(See M. STRECK*)

**BADJARWÂN,** (1) A town and fortress in Mokân (Adharbaydjan) lying s. of the river Aras (Araxes), between Ardabîl and Bardha (where further references are given). Badjardja was mentioned several times in the accounts of the Muslim conquest. Its capture by al-As̱̄ẖâfât b. Kays al-Kindî seems to have been the signal for the final collapse of resistance throughout the province (Baladhuri, Futâkâ, 326). It was occupied by Saʿîd b. ʿAmr al-Ḥarashi during his campaign against the Khazars in 112/730 (D. M. Dunlop, *History of the Jewish Khazars*, Princeton 1954, 72-74). After the Umayyad period Badjarwan is seldom mentioned. It is still named by Hand Alîh Mustawfi in the 8th/14th century as a stage in the road to the N.W. frontier, though it was then in ruins. (2) A town of Divîr Mûdar in al-Ijazira, near the R. Ballûk between Hisn Maslama and al-Râkû. (See M. Streck, Art. Garamatex in Pauly-Wissowa, s.v.)

**Bibliography:** Le Strange, 105, 175-176, 230-231.

(See D. M. Dunlop*)

**BADJAWR,** tract of mountainous country in the Lîr, Swât, and Čitral agency of the Peshawar division, West Pakistan. It is bounded on the north by Dîr; on the east by Dîr and Swât; on the south-east and south by the Utnâm Kîlî and Mamund territories; and on the west by Afgânistân. It has an area of about 5,000 square miles and is intersected by five valleys—the Čahārmûn, Bâbûkûrâ, Watalî, Rûd, and Sûr Kâmâr. In the absence of any census the population has been estimated at 100,000. Badjawr is the home of the Tarkanî Pathîns who claim to be akin to the Yûsûfuizis. They are divided into four sections: the Ismāʿīlīz, ʿĪsāzî, Salarzâi, and Mamunds. The Salarzâi and Mamunds are also found across the Durand boundary in Afgânistân. Like the tribes of Dîr, they are Sunni Muslims but are unusually susceptible to the influence of their mullahs. The Khan of Nawagai claims to be the hereditary chief of all the Badjawr tribes. The history of this area is almost inextricably interwoven with that of Dîr and Swât. The fort of Badjawr was taken by Bâbur in 1526 (vide S. Beveridge, *Bâbur-nâmes*, 567-73). Akbâr's forces were cut to pieces by the Yûsûfuizis in 1585. In the reign of Awarngâb they constantly attacked the Mughal frontier outposts. They fought against the British in the Ambeyla campaign of 1820/1823 and during the frontier confrontation of 1314-13/1897.

(C. COLLIN-DAVIES)

**BADJÎNA,** (Sp. Pechina), ancient Spanish town which is to-day no more than a small country town. The Rio Andara (Wâdi Badjîna), which descends from the southern watershed of the Sierra Nevada, flows through Badjîna and discharges itself into the sea 60¹/₂ m. (10 km.) lower down, near the watch-tower (*Mâriyyât Badjîna*), the site of the town which, under the sole name of al-Mâriyya (Sp. Almería), became the most active and flourishing Mediterranean port in al-Andalus. The groups of sailors settled between Alicante and Aguilas were in the habit of proceeding in the autumn towards the African coast, where they passed the winter, and on returning in the spring to the Peninsula, with huge cargoes; a number of them settled in the North African ports and founded, *inter alia*, the new Téns, in 262/875. The canton of Pechina was then occupied by the Arabs of the Yemen, who had been charged by 'Abd al-Râhmân II with the task of maintaining a *ribât* to protect the coast against possible attack by the Madjûs [e.g.]; in return, he had granted them possession of the fertile valley of the Andarax. Andalusian sailors returning from Téns came to terms with these Arabs in order to found a sort of maritime republic, and made Badjîna the capital of a small state. A large mosque built by the Arabs in the 10th century and the ramparts erected by the sailors, made it a town which, as a result of the trade of its fleet, which anchored at Almería, rapidly increased in size and prosperity. But after thirty-seven years of semi-independent existence, during which it was threatened by the Arab league at Elvira, it was incorporated in 310/922 in the Umayyad community; it maintained its prosperity during the first half of the 4th/10th century, until 'Abd al-Râhmân III, in 344/955, made Almería the capital of the region and put in hand important town-planning schemes there. During the reign of al-Hâkam II, the importance of Badjîna declined still further, and in the 5th/11th century it was no more than a humble village, while Almería became the capital of one of the kingdoms of the taifas.


(A. HUGI MIRANDA)

**AL-BADJÎ,** Abu 'I-Walîd Sulaymân b. Khalaf, a distinguished theologian and literary figure in 11th-century Spain. Born in 403/1012 of a family from Başalyâwâs (Bádajoz) which had emigrated to Bâdja, modern Beja in S. Portugal (Ibn Bassâm, cited Makkari, *Analectes*, i, 511), he frequently attended the schools at Córdova, gained some success as a poet and in 426/1035 travelled to the East. He was absent from Spain for 13 years, three of which he spent at Mecca, in the service of the hâfiz Abû Dhârr al-Harawi, who had been educated at Harât, Balkh and other places in Khurâsân, and with whom Al-Bâdî now studied.
Mālikī šīkḥ and badīḥ, accompanying him regularly to his home in al-Sarawat, i.e., the mountainous country between al-Tihāma, Najd and al-Yaman. Later al-Badji passed to Baghdād, where for another three years he continued his studies, though so poor that he is said to have been obliged to earn his living as a night-watchman. We hear of him also at Mawsil, where according to one account (Makkārī, i, 507, cf. Ibn Bashkulwī, i, 200, no. 449) for a year he applied himself to the recently-invented kalām (scholastic theology), at Aleppo and Damascus, and in Egypt. He returned to Spain in or about 439/1047 as poor as when he left it, but with greatly extended views. About this time, at the instance of the Spanish jaḥāk, he disputed in the island of Majorca with the fafrīk, living as a night-watchman. We hear of him also at Mawsil, where according to one account (Makkarī, i, 511). His proposals to this end, made in person, were on the whole badly received, except at Sārakasta (Saragossa) on the N.E. frontier, where the strength of the Christian kingdoms was fully appreciated. Al-Muktaḍār b. Ḥūd of Saragossa (reigned 1046-1081) sent for al-Badji, and evidently he remained with al-Muktaḍār for a considerable time, since it was a Saragossa that his works appeared (Ibn Khākān, Kālib, ed. S. al-Harārī, 215). Al-Badji died at Almeria in 474/1081, i.e., in the same year as his patron.

If the main political purpose of his life remained unrealised, al-Badji was a prolific author of books, including a Commentary (ṣaḥr) on the Muwaṭṭa2 of Mālik, which especially in its short form, entitled al-Munkād, enjoyed high estimation. Of his other works there have been printed (1) a Reply (Djānsab) to the so-called Letter of the Monk of France (Risālat al-Badji min Ifrānsa), for which see D. M. Dunlop, A Christian Mission to Muslim Spain in the 11th Century, in Al-Andalus, xvii., 1952, 147. The Reply shows much dialectical ability, and repeatedly refers to kalām. (2) The Epistle on Definitions (Risāla fi ‘l-Hudād), principally in šīkḥ and badīḥ, edited by Djawda Ḥādī in Revista del Instituto Egipcio de Estudios Islamicos en Madrid, (Sakḥfat al-Muḥad al-Miṣrī), Vol. ii, Madrid 1954, Arabic section, 1-37. Bibliography: Brockelmann, i, 410, and S I, 749-745. M. Asín Palacios, Abūkāsir al-Darab, i, Madrid 1927, 200-208. (D. M. Dunlop)

BADJI, an Arab tribe, reckoned along with Khāṭám as a subdivision of Anmār; the nisba is Badji. Badjil was sometimes said to be a woman, but her place in the genealogy is vague (cf. F. Wüstenfeld, Register zu den genealogischen Tabellen, 101-35; also Die Chroniken der Städte Mexka, Leipzig 1856, ii, 134). Some genealogists held that Badjil was a Yemenite tribe; others made Anmār the son of Niṣr b. Ma’add b. ‘Ardān (Ibn Ḥaḍar, Usd al-Ghāba, i, 279, art. ‘Darūr b. ‘Abd Allāh’; Ibn Durayd, ed. Wüstenfeld, 101 f.). The tribe was sometimes taunted with this uncertainty about their ancestry (al-Maṣ‘ūdī, Murūjū, vi, 143). Along with Khāṭám, Tamīm, Bākrah, and ʿAbd al-Ḵays they raided ʿIrāq under ʿAbd al-Muḥtafī (c. 370-379), but suffered severely when he counter-attacked. In Mālikī law, i.e., since the fall of the Umayyad Caliphate the lands in the Sawād (al-Baladhur, Futūḥ, 253, 267), but three years later they were persuaded to give up their lands and to receive instead a stipend. ʿUmar ordered sections of Badjil which were under the protection (ṣuwar) of other tribes to attach themselves to ʿIṣār (Muḥaddalīyā, i., also Usd al-Ghāba, i., l.c.). It is stated that at this time ʿArfdji b. Ḥārūmah b. Bārik, a part of the ʿAzd, though only a bāṭil of Badjil, was its sayyid. Khāydī b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd al-Kasrī, who was prominent in the later Umayyad period, belonged to Badjil, though his adversaries questioned this (cf. I. Goldziher, Muhammedanische Studien, i, 205).

BADJIMZA or Baqimza, in the time of the ʿAbbadī Caliphs, was a village north-east of Baghdād, some 8 miles from Baʾkūbā, where the caliph al-Muḳtaṣī bi-Amr Allāh put to flight the troops of the Seldjuk Sultan Muhammad II under Alp Kūsh Kūn-i Ḫar in 549/1154.

Bibliography: Yāḵšt, i, 497, 706; Ibn al-Aṣḥār, xl, 129; Houtsma, Recueil, ii, 237 f. (Ed.)

BADJISRA. This was a small town in ʿIrāq, situated some 10 ʿarbahs to the north-east of Baghdād and a short distance due south of Baʾkūbā on the left bank of the Nahrawān river, which attained the name of Tāmārār on its arrival at Baghdāsara. The town is described by the Arab geographers as being a prosperous and pleasant recreational centre with many date groves and a considerable population, but it was laid waste in the time of Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakīm, author of the Mardquda, who died in 739/1338. The name Badjīsra, which is derived from Syriac, means “house of the bridge” i.e. the location of the bridge.

The modern village named “Abū Dāhirra”, however, is not the same town. Apparently, the name of this village is inferred from the ancient nomenclature of Badjīsra. Modern ʿAbd al-Dāhir is one of the larger villages in the Miḳdādīyya (Ṣahrābān) baddī 2 in the Diyalā liwa2 of ʿIrāq. According to the 1947 census, its inhabitants totalled 768 in number.

There are various references to Badjīsra in the histories. It is mentioned by Ibn al-Aṣḥār in the
annals of the years 68/688, 334/945-6, 439/1047, 488/1095 and 496/1102-3. During the last three of these, the town was subjected to plundering. In the annals of the year 597/1201, Ibn al-Sa*! mentions the death of Mihkül, an attendant of the daughter of the ʿAbbāsid caliph Al-Mustan|id, al-Ffruzadiiyya, who was the administrator of the prefecture of Bādįsra. Bādįsra is the birth place of a number of poets and men of letters, and some of them are mentioned by Yākūt.

Bibliography: Yākūt, i, 454; Ibn ʿAbd al-Haḳk, Marṣūd, Cairo 1954, i 147; Ibn Serapion (ed. Le Strange), in JRAAS, 1895, 19; Ibn Khurra-dābīrī, 175; Ibn Rusta, 90; Al-Mukkaddasī, 115; al-Masʿūdī, al-Tanbihī, 53; Miskawayh, Taḏḏarūb (Amedroz), ii, 84; Ibn al-ʿAfdhir, iv, 242, viii, 337, ix, 367, x, 166, 244; idem, al-Lubāb ḥī Tānbihī al-Ansābī, i, 82; ʿAmid Allāh Mustawīf, Nisāḥa, 45; Le Strange, 59; Sumer, viii, 1952, 249; A. Sousa, ʿɒy y Sāmārā, Baghdād 1948, 36.

BADIKAM (Abū l-Husayn), properly Bādkam (an Iranian word which passed into Turkish, meaning the tail of a horse or yak, see Benveniste in JA, 1948, 183), name of a Turkish amīr who was initially a ḡulâm in the service of Mākān and subsequently in that of another Daylamī, Mardawīd. Bādkam had been unable to come to terms with the Iludiārī guards. Ibn Raʾik, who had confiscated his property, started to correspond with Bādkam, encouraging him in his resolve, and recommended him to the Caliph al-Rāḍī as a successor to Ibn Raʾik. Al-Rāḍī adopted Ibn Mūkla’s views and secretly encouraged Bādkam, as can be seen from an account given by the historian al-Šāfi, a confidant of the Caliph and of Bādkam (42-44, trans. i, 89-90), though he nevertheless handed Ibn Mūkla over to Ibn Raʾik. In Dhu l-ʿAyar da 326/September 938, Bādkam, who had marched on the capital on the pretext of coming to ask for the pay for his troops, entered Baghdād, in spite of the efforts of Ibn Raʾik, who had tried to stop him on the Nahr Diyālā by flooding it with the waters of the Nahrawān canal and destroying a bridge. At Baghdād, whilst Ibn Raʾik sought refuge in flight, the Caliph at once appointed Bādkam amīr al-umārā. Bādkam, the amīr al-umārā, had to contend with the Hamdānid of Mawsīl, Ḥasan b. ʿAbd Allāh, who was not fulfilling his financial obligations. At the beginning of the year 327/October-November 938, Bādkam marched against him with the Caliph, and entered Mawsīl after having crushed Hamdānid resistance below the town, but was unable to take Ḥasan, who fled into the Dirāzā, where Bādkam pursued him to no avail. Bādkam’s troops were unremittingly harrassed at Mawsīl. Thereupon, as Ibn Raʾik had taken advantage of these circumstances to make a sudden irruption into Baghdād, Bādkam negotiated with the Hamdānid and likewise with Ibn Raʾik. A treaty was concluded at the end of 938 with the Hamdānid who offered to pay over an initial sum as part of the tribute. Ibn Raʾik agreed to leave Baghdād and to accept as compensation, the government of the Tarāk al-Forūṭ, the Dirāzā, the djund of Kinnarīn and the waṣīm. He left Baghdād on the 28th of January 939 and the Caliph and Bādkam returned to the capital at the beginning of February 939. Bādkam then had to carry the menace from the Būyids which overshadowed Lower ʿIrāq, and this led to a closer though ephemeral understanding between Bādkam and al-Barāʾī. He thus received the governorship of Wāṣīt and carried out a successful operation against the Būyids in Susiana. He then obtained the office of waṣīr, but remained at Wāṣīt, his functions at Baghdād being performed only by a delegate. In 328/940, Bādkam married one
of his daughters. The Buyid had not relinquished his ambitions and had obtained the support of another of his brothers, Hasan (Rukn al-Dawla), master of the Diibal. The latter marched on Wasit and set up his camp on the left bank of the Tigris opposite the town, though he was obliged to withdraw, when the arrival of Badikam and the Caliph was announced. On the other hand, the army sent against the same Hasan in the Diibal by Badikam was defeated.

It was not long, however, before dissension arose between Badikam and al-Baridi, who did not conceal his intention of becoming amir al-umara and who was very careful not to support the expedition sent by Badikam into the Diibal. At the end of 328/August 940, Badikam removed him from the office of wa`ir and decided to carry out an expedition against Wasit. For some time he had been worried by the behaviour of al-Baridi and, in July, he abandoned the plan he had formed of going to fight the Buyid in the Diibal and returned hastily to Baghdad. Then he marched against Wasit and entered the town abandoned by al-Baridi. Badikam remained there until his death. He was there when the Caliph al-Radi died in Rabii' I 329/21 April 941.

Badikam, the Turkish slave, had received his training at the hands of Malkan, to whom he was always very grateful. He understood Arabic, though he hesitated to speak it for fear of making mistakes, and employed an interpreter. He was, however, respected by men of letters, and enjoyed the company of men like al-§ull and the physician Sinan b. Ibrahim al-Lakanl; (7) a gloss on the commentary of Musannifek on al-Tirmidh!; (8) a commentary on a versification of Muhammad's career. Though there is a wealth of material, it is generally held that the earliest and most reliable version is that contained in a letter from €Urwa b. al-Zubayr to the caliph cAbd al-Malik (preserved in al-Jabarf, i, 1284 ff.), though even this
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BADJAM, or Badur, Ibrahim b. Muhammad, a Shi`i scholar and author. Born in 1218/1773 in Badkur, a village in the Manufiya province of Egypt ('All Pasha Mubarak, al-Khitat al-Diidayda, Bulak 1306, ix, 2), he studied at al-Azhar, became a very successful teacher there, Rector (shaykh al-Ashkar) in 1263/1846, and died in 1276/1860. The most popular items in his very extensive but wholly derivative literary production are: (1) a Risala fi 'l-Tawbi; (2) a commentary on the K. al-Saman`i al-Tirmidh!, a commentary on the K. al-Shama`i of al-Tirmidh; (3) a gloss on the commentary of Musannifek on the Burda of al-Busti; (4) a gloss on the Fath al-Karib of Muhammad b. al-Kasim al-Ghazzal, a commentary on the Ta'rif or Mu`allas of Abu Shudaila (transl. by E. Sachau, Muhammadisches Recht, Stuttgart and Berlin 1897; cf. C. Snouck Hurgronje, 393 ff.); (5) a commentary on the Taka'd al-Sa`i`id al-Sama`i of his teacher al-Faadil; (10) a commentary on the Ma`lid of al-Sardir; (11) a commentary on al-Tarab i fi `Ilm al-Tawbi by 'Abd al-Rahman b. Is`a al-Murghidi; (12) a gloss on a commentary on the Farid al-Fawa'id fi `Ist`adra al-Layfi al-Samarqandi; (13) a commentary on a versification of the Adjurriyya of Ibn Adjurru.

BADR, or Badr Hunayn, a small town southwest of Medina, a night’s journey from the coast, and at the junction of a road from Medina with the caravan route from Mecca to Syria. It lies in a plain, 5 m. (8 km.) long and 21/4 m. (4 km.) broad, surrounded by steep hills and sand-dunes, and was a market centre.

Here occurred on 17 (or 19 or 21) Ramadaan, 2 A.H. (= 13 or 15 or 17 March, 624) the first great battle of Muhammad’s career. Though there is a wealth of detail in the early sources, it is difficult to give a clear account of the battle and the events which led up to it. It is generally held that the earliest and most reliable version is that contained in a letter from Urwa b. al-Zubayr to the caliph 'Abd al-Malik (preserved in al-Tabari, 1, 1284 ff.), though even this
has some material which seems to be legendary. Muhammad received information that a rich caravan was returning from Syria to Mecca, led by Abū Sufyān b. Ḥarb, chief of the clan of Umayya. He collected a force of slightly over 300 men (about 80 Emigrants, the rest Ansār), and marched to the neighbourhood of Badr in hopes of intercepting the caravan. Abū Sufyān on his side had sent a request to Mecca for a force to protect the caravan while it traversed the region easily accessible from Medina. Since the Meccans are said to have spent over a week on the way from Mecca to Badr, Abū Sufyān must have sent his request some time beforehand, though the sources assert that he only did so after hearing of Muhammad's preparations.

The Meccan force, commanded by Abū Djiāh of the clan of Mağhrūm, consisted of about 950 men from all the clans of Kūraysh. Before they reached Badr they received a message from Abū Sufyān to say that, by forced marches along a route closer to the coast than the usual one, he had eluded the Muslims. Abū Djiāh, however, despite the disapproval of some senior men and the withdrawal of the contingents from the clans of Zuhra and 'Adī decided to go forward to Badr and make a display of strength. He and his supporters doubtless considered that they were so strong that Muḥammad would not venture to attack (cf. Kurʿān viii, 47/49).

Muhammad does not appear to have known of the expedition under Abū Djiāh until the evening before the battle when some of his men captured a Meccan water-carrier at the wells of Badr. The camp of the Meccans was still out of sight behind a hill. This fortuitous encounter may have made it easier for Muhammad to persuade all his followers to fight, since in the circumstances it would have been dishonourable to withdraw. On the following morning Muḥammad moved quickly and seized the wells, filling all with sand except that nearest the enemy, where he stationed his men. The enemy was thus forced to fight for his water supply willy-nilly. All that can be said of the course of the battle is that there appear to have been some single combats followed by a general mêlée. What is certain is that the Meccans suffered a catastrophic defeat. Nearly seventy of them were killed (including Abū Djiāh and a dozen of their leaders) and nearly seventy taken prisoner and later ransomed for considerable sums; only about fifteen Muslims were killed.

This was a disaster for Mecca, but not a crippling one. The loss of many leading men was grave, but perhaps the most serious aspect was the loss of prestige. To recover prestige it was essential that they should punish Muḥammad. For the Muslims it seemed a vindication of their faith, brought about for them by God (cf. Kurʿān vii, 17, 24/43; they believed that He had sent his angels to their assistance vii, 9, 12).

Muhammad spent much time in prayer and received assurances that he would be victorious (vii, 7, 9). The Muslims looked on this as the punishment long foretold for the unbelievers. According to a probable suggestion (R. Bell, The Origin of Islam in its Christian Environment, London 1926, 118 ff.; Introduction to the Qurʿān, Edinburgh 1953, 136-58), the word jurbān applied to Badr means 'deliverance from judgement' (cf. Kurʿān, vii, 29, 41/48). The Muslims were thus confirmed in their faith and led to exaggerate their own importance—an exaggeration which resulted in a spiritual crisis after the reverse at Uḥud (Kurʿān, vii, 65/66; contrast 66/67). Muhammad himself from this time onward was in a much stronger position in Medina. The self-confidence induced in the Muslims by their victory, and the prestige they thus acquired, were factors without which Islam could hardly have developed as it did. Those who had fought at Badr as Muslims—the Badriyyūn—came to be regarded as an aristocracy of merit, and in most versions of the diwān of Umar are said to have constituted the highest class of Muslims.

Muhammad undertook a second expedition to Badr in Shaʿbān or Dhu 'l-Kaʿda 4 A.H. (= Jan. or April 628) in accordance with a promise given to Abū Sufyān as he retired from Uḥud. Both Muḥammad and the Meccans had much larger forces, but there was no fighting, though the Muslims did good trade.

Badr is mentioned by the geographers of Arabia; e.g., Yākūt, i, 524 ff.; al-Bakrī, 141 ff.; al-Mukaddasī, 82 ff.; al-Masʿūdī, 237. The traveller J. L. Burckhardt examined the site with the battle in mind (Rassen in Arabien, 1830, 614-19).


**BADR** (Pīr), SHAḤYKH BADR-AL-DĪN BADR-Ī AL-ʿĀLAM, a sain of the Dīnjaydiyya order, venerated by the people of Bihar and Bengal. In Bengal he enjoys the reputation of sharing with Pānē Pīr of Sonargaon the dominion of the waters. While putting to sea the sailors of Bengal utter the invocation: "Allāh, Nabī, Pānē Pīr, Badr, Badr." Pīr Badr originally belonged to Meerut (in Uttar Pradēsh) where his great grandfather, Shaykh Fakhr al-Dīn Zāhid (d. 704/1304) had established a great mystic centre. His grandfather, Shaykh Shihāb al-Dīn Ḥakīm-ī, was killed by Muḥammad b. Tughluq (725-752/1325-1351) for criticising his religious views. Pīr Badr received his spiritual training at the feet of his father, Fakhr al-Dīn II, and the Suhrawardī saint, Sayyid Djiāl al-Dīn Bukhārī. Shaykh Sharaf al-Dīn Yābūyī invited him to Bihar but he reached there after the former's death in 782/1380. He first married into a Hindu family of Bihar, and later entered into a matrimonial relationship with the ruling house of Dīnpur. During his travels in East Bengal he converted a large number of Hindu sailors to Islam. He also helped in the establishment of Muslim power at Sonargaon. He sojourned for sometime in CitTagong where his tīllā, in the western quarter of Bakhālī Bazar, is regarded as the palladium of the city and is visited by Hindu and Muslim sailors alike. Authority over the seas and rivers is considered a special spiritual attribute of his family. Fakhr al-Dīn Zāhid is reported to have rescued a party from sinking into the river Yamunā. It is said that Pīr Badr reached CitTagong 'floating on a rock'. He died on 27 Ṭadbīb 841/22 December 1440 in Bihār where his mausoleum is known as Chotl Dargah (the mausoleum of Sharaf al-Dīn Yābūyī Manerī being known as Barī Dargāh).
Badr, Abū Bakr al-Abîyûr, Delhi 1891, 129; Ghulâm Mu'ān al-Dîn, Maṭirî al-Widâyâ (Personal collection) ii, 536. (K. A. Nizami)

Badr b. Hasanwayh [see Hasanwayh, Banû].

Badr al-Dawla [see Aruqî].

Badr al-Dîn [see Liu'lu'].

Badr al-Dîn b. Kâdi Samâwannah, eminent Ottoman jurist, Şu'fi and rebel. Badr al-Dîn Mahmûd b. Kâdi Samâwannah was born in 760 AH/3 Dec. 1358 in Samâwannah (which corresponds to the former Greek city of Aşkülû (Ashkelon) near Adrianople). He was the eldest son of the judge Ghasîr Israilî, who was one of the oldest fighters for the faith of his time, and traced his ancestry back to the Saldûks. His mother was Greek, and took the name Melek under the incapable Caliph Mustansîr (427-487/1036-1094). The Saldûks were pressing forward into Syria, in Egypt after the death of the prince of Sinope. After the victory of Sultan Mehmed I near Camurlu (1413), he was dismissed from his post and banished to Iznik under rather humiliating circumstances. There he wrote and taught, and Ak Shams al-Dîn [see Maṭirî al-Widâyâ (Personal collection) who later became famous as Shâykh of the Bayramîyyah—is said to have been one of his pupils for a short time. It was probably there, too, that he became connected (in ways which are not yet clear) with the communist underground movement of a certain Bûrûkîyye Muṣṭafâ, and a certain Torlak Hû Këmâl, which led to the extensive rebellion in 1416, as whose ideological head Badr al-Dîn appears. Whîlîs on the one hand the biography of Badr al-Dîn (which was written by his grandson Khâlîl) asserts his complete innocence in all these events, the official Ottoman historians, on the other hand, accuse him of active participation—even of leadership in the rebellion. At the time when Bûrûkîyye Muṣṭafâ and Torlak Hû Këmâl started their attack in western Asia Minor (where, to begin with, they had considerable success), Badr al-Dîn left Iznik and reached Rumelia with the secret help of the discontented prince of Sinope. After the rebellion of Bûrûkîyye Muṣṭafâ and Torlak Hû Këmâl had been most cruelly suppressed, the revolt in Rumelia also collapsed and Badr al-Dîn was caught by troops of the Sultan and dragged to Serres in Macedonia, where Sultan Mehmed I was fighting the "false Muṣṭafâ" (Dûrûmeş Muṣṭafâ [g.r.]). After a somewhat questionable trial, Badr al-Dîn was publicly hunged as a traitor in Serres on 18 Dec. 1416. The rôle played by Badr al-Dîn in this rising is still by no means clear. It is certain, however, that his ideology was in sympathy with it, and that his ideas did have an enduring influence. There is documentary evidence that there were followers of the Badr al-Dîn movement in Rumelia even under Sulêymân the Magnificent. After the death of their hero, many of them turned to the now politically active Şaфawiyyah, whilst others merged into sundry sects, especially the Bektâşhîyyah. The most famous of Badr al-Dîn's descendants—beside his three sons Ahmîd, Israilî and Muṣṭafâ—was his grandson Khâlîl (the son of Ismaîlî) who was Badr al-Dîn's biographer.

As a writer, Badr al-Dîn was extremely prolific. He wrote close on 50 extensive works, most of them on matters of law. His most important Şu'fi works are the Wûrûdlî and the Nûr al-Kulâb.


H. J. Kissing

Badr al-Djamâle, a Fâtîmid commander-in-chief and vizier. The formerly brilliant Fâtîmid empire was on the verge of downfall under the incapable Caliph Mustansîr (427-487/1036-1094). The Saldûks were pressing forward into Syria, in Egypt...
the Turkish slave-guards were fighting with the negro-corps, a seven years' famine was exhausting the resources of the country; all state authority had disappeared in the general struggle; hunger and disease were carrying off the people, licence and violence were destroying all prosperity and it appeared as if the Fāṭimid kingdom must disappear in a chaos of anarchism. Then, on the call of the Caliph, the Syrian general Badr al-Djamāl took command of the government as well as of the army and with great though brutal vigour brought order into affairs again and indeed a second period of splendour to the Fāṭimid empire.

Badr was an Armenian slave of the Syrian amīr Djamāl al-Dawla Ibn ʿAmmār, whence his name al-Djamāl. He must have been born about the beginning of the 5th/11th century, for at his death in 487/1094 he was over 80 years old. Even before he became vizier he had made a great name for himself in Syria. He was twice appointed Governor of Damascus, but fell into difficulties each time on account of his stringent measures with the pampered troops. He then became commander-in-chief of ʿAkkā and in this capacity had to fight against the troops of Malikshāh. He had an Armenian bodyguard for himself and the soldiers he commanded were also to be relied on. He took them with him on being summoned by the Caliph in 466/1073 to deliver him out of the hands of the despotic Turkish officials. The latter never suspected the reason of Badr’s coming to Egypt, fell into the trap prepared for them and were all murdered in one night. Badr thereby became master of the situation. Now followed his appointment as commander-in-chief of Amīr al-Dhuwwārī (in the popular language Mir-ʿamīr), as chief justice, and vizier. The most popular of these titles was the first; the Djabal al-Djuwwāshī is still a common appellation of the Muṣṭafāmam commanding Cairo on the spur of which Badr built a mosque, a masghād in which according to popular belief at the present day the Sūr Dhuwwāshī lies buried. After quitting the capital he re-established order in the east through to the west of the Delta. Alexandria had to be taken by storm. The task of conquering Upper Egypt was also difficult as the Arab tribes had set themselves up as independent there. In Syria he was not so fortunate. Affairs were mismanaged here, and Damascus fell into the hands of the Sālāḥūdīn about the end of the year 488/1076. The Fāṭimids were never to regain it. In the following year the victorious Salīḥīn general Aṭlūz appeared before Cairo itself, but Badr had time to collect his troops and drive back the Salīḥīn. In spite of repeated attempts in the years 471/1080-9, 478/1085-6, and 482/1089-90, he was not successful in regaining Damascus and Syria, and at his death only a few towns in the South of Syria were still in the possession of the Fāṭimids. His strength in Syria was weakened by unrest constantly breaking out in Egypt, inspired by one of his sons.

Of his activity as a governor we know little, but it is praised on all sides. Under his rule the annual revenue of Egypt from taxation was increased from about 2 to about 3 million dinārs. These large receipts enabled him to put into practice the lessons learned from the Salīḥīn invasion. Cairo was invested by him with its second wall, and the three strong city gates which are admired to this day, the Bāb Zawilla (Zuyayla), the Bāb al-ʿAṣr and the Bāb al-Futūb, were built. In Rabī’ I 487/March-April 1094 Badr’s active and successful career came to its close, after he had arranged that his son al-Afdāl Shāhanshāh [q.v.] should succeed him in all his offices. The Caliph Mustansir, who had then been reigning for 60 years, died a few months later.
scene of a settlement by Khusraw I Anusharwan of captives from northern Syria. Mounds near and in modern Badra represent the old city, which was ruined by floods, pestilence or war.


**BADRKHÂNÎ, THURAYYÂ (1883-1938) and DIJALADAT (1893-1951), sons of Amîr Amlîn ‘All, eldest son of Badr-khân (died 1868), Prince of Bohtan (Dijartat Ibn ‘Umar) of the ‘Afsizân family, who fought against the Turks for the independence of Kurdistan (1836-1845). The two brothers, born at Maštala (Syria) died, the first in Paris and the second, as the result of an accident, in Damascus. Both devoted their lives to the Kurdish national cause, Thurayyâ in the sphere of organisation and political propaganda and Dijaladat mainly in the cultural field.

Thurayyâ, after having obtained the Diploma in Agronomical Engineering at the University of Constantinople, began to lead a turbulent life, in which is mirrored the history of the national struggle of his people. In 1904 he was found guilty of plotting against the security of Turkey and sent to prison. He spent two and a half years in prison and in exile. After the Young Turks’ coup d’état, he returned to Constantinople and started his newspaper “Kurdistan” in Kurdish and Turkish. In 1910, the newspaper was suspended and he was again thrown into prison, and condemned to death for having taken part in the preparation of a military revolt. He was pardoned and in 1916 banished. In 1912, however, he returned to the capital, where he organised a secret Kurdish revolutionary committee. He was condemned to death, and for the third time saw the inside of a prison. He made his escape and finally left Turkey in 1913. During the 1914 war, Thurayyâ recommenced the publication of his newspaper in Cairo, where he also organised a Committee for Kurdish independence. He played a role in the drawing up of the Treaty of Sèvres (1920). As this diplomatic instrument, which envisaged an international Kurdish statute, remained a dead letter, Thurayyâ resumed his revolutionary activities after the signing of the Treaty of Lausanne (1923), and in 1927, together with his supporters, he joined the National Kurdish League Khoybun, which had just been formed, largely as a reaction to the failure of the Treaty of Sèvres. Thurayyâ became its propaganda chief and prepared educational material, publishing “booklets” (spelling-books, readers and books on religion; in all 12 appeared). During the last war, Dijaladat also published the review *Kurdî* (Light).


**BADRKHÂNÎ, under the ‘Abbâsî Caliphate a district south-west of Baghîd, the land south of the Nahîr-Shârat, a branch of the Uruphates canal Nahr l’Isâ [q.v.]. The Shârat separates it from the Katrâbbl district; the southern part of the western half of Baghîd (the so-called town of al-Mansûr) as well as the suburb of Korkh were situated within the bounds of the district of Badrkhânî; the latter formed, like the district of Katrâbbl, a subdivision of the circle of Astân al-’A zaman.”

**Bibliography:** *Mukaddasî, iii, 119, 120; Ibn Khurrahdâbîbhî, 7, 9, 235, 237; Balâdhdîrî, Futuh, 250, 254, 265; Yâkût, i, 460; Streck, *Babyoloiyen nach den arab. Geol.* (1900), i, 16, 10, 25; G. Le Strange, *Bagdad during the Abbasid Caliphate* (1900), 50-1, 315; Le Strange, 31, 66, 78, 80, 82. (M. STRECK *)

**BADÜSBAÑIDS (Pâdûsbañids), minor Caspian dynasty, noteworthy for its longevity (451-1006/665-590) as well as for that of its princes, who reigned for 50 years. Its power in Tabaristan (Mazandaran) extended to Rustamdâr, Rûyân, Nûr and Kadîr. Its origins are traced to Gâwâbara who came from Armenia in the time of Yazidîrd III, who appointed him governor. He had two sons, Dâhîya and Badûsbân, established respectively in Gillân and Tabaristan, the former being the eponymous ancestor of the Dâhûwân dynasty (40-144/660-701), and the latter that of the Badûsbañids. The history of this latter dynasty is given in an excellent résumé by Rabîn [see APRASVABHIDES], including a genealogical table with some forty names with numbers indicating their order. There exists, furthermore, a Taragh-i Rûyân (T.R.) by Mawlânâ Awdîyâ Allâh of ’Arnul, written fo. Pakhûr al-Dawla Shâh Gharî b. Ziyâr (died 786/1384) which does not cover the whole of the period of the dynasty as described in Rabîn. On the other hand, it contains abundant details on the internal life of the dynasty, so that these two sources, therefore, admirably complement each other. We learn, for example, that two major revolts took place in Tabaristan against the Arab occupation; one in the time of ’Umar b. al-’All, was the joint work of the isfâbab Shahrwîn Bâwand and Shahrîyâr Bâdûsbañids.
with Wandad Hormizd of the Sukhra clan (T.R., 46); the other broke out at Djalus (Cams) and was savagely repressed (T.R. 52). These risings appear to have been provoked by the burden of excessive taxation.

In some cases, for example the revolt of Mazyar [q.v.], religious movements have served as a pretext. Shī'ism was only imposed as late as the middle of the 9th/10th century by Kayūmartār (no. 36 in Rabino). The resistance opposed by Iranian national feeling to all foreign usurpation is less evident in respect of the Uigūrs. Their reign is portrayed as a period of well-being (T.R., 122). Nevertheless, the destruction caused by the Mongols (T.R., 130) and by Timūr (Rabino) is not passed over in silence.

The protection of the Saljūqids was sought from time to time: Hazārāsp sought that of Toghur, for example (T.R., 103). Khārīzma (T.R., 106, 107), the Ṣaffārīds (T.R., 70) and the Sūmānīds (T.R., 74, 75) are mentioned in various episodes, the latter for the most part in connexion with the ʿAlīd Sayyids. As for the internal struggles, which are purely of local interest, the Bādūsbanīds were sometimes in alliance with their neighbours and sovereigns, the Bāwand, and at other times were against them. After a number of conflicts with the Buwayhīds, a modus vivendi was found which maintained the peace (nos. 13, 14 in Rabino).

The Ismāʿīlīs, heretics (malāḥids), are the object of violent diatribes (T.R., 90), but when needed, their help was sought (T.R., 100, 10). Both the Bāwand (Ṣḥams al-Mulūk) and the Bādūsbanīds (Ṣḥāhrākīn b. Nāmawar) contributed to their final defeat by the Mongols at the siege of Gird-i Kūh (T.R., 110). Other characteristic features are the Iranian habit of wearing the hair long (curled or plaited) and special head-dresses (T.R., 135) as well as non-Muslim personal names: Shīrāzd, Bahman, Rūzāzād, Farīdūn, Gudarz, Pāshang, Iridj, etc. The name Bādūsbaṇ should be connected with Bāwand and Bāḥarab. Note avela-dī dāhban (T.R., 35). There are verses cited in the Tābarī dialect (T.R., 111, 114), Arabic (T.R., 121, 129) and Persian (T.R., 74, 75, 77, 108). The Muslim aspect appears in the names of pious men (T.R., 3, 54, 55, 112, 115) and of religious foundations. As regards geography, there is ample toponymic data. Attention must be drawn to the old name of Māzandarān, farātextdājdā (T.R., 27, 28) (V. Minorsky disputes this).

Bibliography: Cf. the art. AFRASİYAB, BĀND, and: Awwīl-Allāh Ṣamīʿ, Taʾrīkh-i Rūyān, ed. ʿAbd Allāh Ṣamīʿ, Tehran 1313/1934 (cf. pages given in parentheses); B. Dorn, Muḥammadānische Quellen zur Geschichte der Südlithen Küstenländer des Kaspischen Meeres, 4 parts, St. Petersburg 1850-58; V. Minorsky, La domination des Daila-mites, Paris 1932; idem, The Guran in BSOS, 1943 (on the Guran gd (v) bāra (k)); Djalāl Āl-i Ṣāmāḏ, Avarādān, Tehran 1333/1954 (for the Tālīḵān dialect); Mahdī Muḥākkak, Ismāʿīlyyya, in Yaghma, 1337, no. 2.

BADW. I. Pastoral nomads of Arabian blood, speech, and culture are found in the Arabian Peninsula proper and in parts of Iran, Soviet Turkestan, North Africa, and the Sudan. This article is limited to their way of life in their home territory. Unlike primitive hunting and gathering, pastoral nomadism is a sophisticated system of exploiting land incapable of cultivation. Later than agriculture, pastoralism utilizes seven species of domestic animals: the sheep, goat, and ox, domesticated in Neolithic times as part of the herding and sowing complex of Western Asia; the ass, domesticated by early Bronze Age times for transport; and the camel, horse, and water buffalo, introduced during historic times.

Hunting peoples living off gazelle, oryx, ibex, ostrich, bustard, and quail were probably the desert's sole occupants until about 5,000 B.C. As Neolithic cultivators began to settle the edges of the waste, its seasonal wealth of herbage enticed shepherds and goatherds to lead their flocks out a certain distance during the winter and spring. After the camel had been introduced around 1000 B.C., full-time nomads found it possible to live out on the desert throughout most of the year, summering at wells or on the edges of oases and perennial streams. With the riding horse, introduced after 500 B.C., and perhaps as late as the time of Christ, Arabian camel nomads acquired an animal from whose back they could fight each other efficiently, and the golden age of Arabian life on the desert could begin.

The enormous number of unexplored archaeological sites in the Arabian desert, the advance of dessication since the introduction of the camel, and historical references in pre-Islamic literary sources indicate that the Arabian nomads for the most part are descended from farmers, traders, and caravan men who took to pastoralism during the early centuries of this era, as both business and the landscape deteriorated, just as cowboys and pastoralists in the United States, Canada, and Australia are descended from agricultural and urban peoples who took advantage of newly opened territories. The period during which Arabian nomadic life developed and crystallized lay between the time of Jesus and that of Muḥammad.

Four kinds of nomadism are practised in Arabia. In the ʿDībāl-ʿAl-ʿArābī, in Ẓafar, on the Indian Ocean, peoples who speak Semitic languages of the Mahri-Socotran group graze hump-backed cattle on grass provided by the abundant rainfall of the summer monsoon. In cultivated regions of southern ʿĪrāq special families of herdsmen raise water-buffaloes, pasturing them in reaped and fallow fields. These people live in semi-cylindrical houses of poles and matting, which they move about seasonally over short distances. On the desert fringes, and particularly in the neighbourhood of Kuwayt, whole clans and tribes of shepherds mounted on donkeys drive their sheep and goats from pasture to pasture. Out in the middle of the bedouin proper herd their camels, migrating to the areas of recent rainfall in winter and spring and remaining near sources of permanent water in summer.

These four kinds of nomadism are dependent on the different physiological needs and capacities of the animals herded. Humped cattle need green grass and daily water, water-buffalo streams or irrigation ditches to wallow in. While sheep and goats can graze on dried vegetation part of the year, they move slowly and cannot be kept more than a day or two from water. Camels can go as long as seventeen days without water in 100° F. heat, and can drink 30 gallons at a time. Their ability to withstand the rigours of the desert are due not only to their capacity for holding water but also to their ability to preserve it: a camel can tolerate an increase of up to eleven degrees F. over normal body temperature without much water loss through sweating. They also store energy in the form of fat in their humps. The Arabian horse, when it is kept
on the desert, is watered on transported water, and fed grain, being treated with the same solicitude as human beings. Sheep, goats, cattle, water-buffaloes, and camels all produce milk. Goat hair is used for tents, sheep and camel wool for clothing. All these animals are eaten, except horses. The horse provides nothing but the kinds of transport directly concerned with warfare and prestige. As social status combined with independence is the most important of all considerations to a desert Arab, the horse is honoured accordingly.

The most ancient dwellers on the desert are the Śūlabā [q.v.], probably descended from early hunters, and representing a phenotypically homogeneous desert-adapted Mediterranean racial strain. In northern Arabia they dwell among the noble Bedouin, whom they serve as guides, tinkers, and workers in wood. At times they also hunt. Their women provide entertainment. Second in probable antiquity are the shepherd tribes, as for example the Śharārāt and the Muntafik confederations. These are in the most part dependent on the camel nomads because of their relative immobility and hence defencelessness. Individuals of these tribes serve the camel nomads as hired herdsmen. Members of the noble tribes own camels, drive and ride them on migrations, and guard and defend them while grazing. In the heat of summer they sometimes pick dates in oases, or even go pearl-fishing. These tribesmen are also served by blacksmiths, mostly negroid, who come out from the settled places, and by Negro slaves. Shopkeepers from the towns sometimes set up special tents in the Bedouin camps to vend their wares, while travelling agents of large camel-purchasing companies buy up young camels which will be collected upon reaching the desired state of maturity. Much of this business takes place at camel markets like that of Burayday in Najjd. Members of the noble tribes often visit the cities of Saʿūdī Arabia, Jordan, Syria, ʿIrāq, and Kuwayt where some of them maintain town houses. Many have taken to settled life, and some have risen to high offices in the various Arab countries.

The material culture of the Bedouin is designed around mobility. The black tent of goat-hair is loosely woven, to permit circulation of air, yet its fibres swell when wet to keep out the rain; in summer it provides an area of much-needed shade, open on the sides to the breeze; in winter, with sides and rear closed it is warm. Except for special tents used only as dīwāns, or reception halls, it is divided by a curtain into a family section, occupied by women and children, and the guest section in which the head of the household receives his male friends. Kitchen utensils are of metal and wood, but each family usually owns a set of small porcelain coffee cups carefully packed in a compartmented wooden box. Arab clothing, loose and flowing, is warm in winter and cool in summer, as it protects the skin both from the cold and from the hot, dry wind; the man's headcloth, and the woman's headdress and veil, also help to keep dust and sand out of the eyes, nose, and ears. Most of the Bedouin's outfit is purchased, including the cotton cloth for his under-clothing, his tools, and his containers. So is much of his food, including wheat, rice, dates and coffee. Only milk and meat are produced locally.

Like other Semites, the Bedouins lay great stock in genealogies, and consider kinship of paramount importance in human relations. The preferred mating being with the father's brother's daughter, descent is patrilineal. Divorce is easy, polygyny both serial and contemporary. Bedouin women, often unveiled, in many cases married more than once, have more freedom than their sisters of the towns and oases. Beyond the immediate family is a group of kin which usually goes out to pasture together; several such groups will spend the hot season together; this is usually the limit of the kin responsible for mutual vengeance. Beyond this is the tribe, finally the confederation. Among the Bedouin proper, also called Aʿrab, two main lineages are recognised, those descended from Kaḥṭān, who lived before Abraham, and the Aʿrab al-Mustaʿriba, descended from Ishmael, son of Abraham and Hagar, who was daughter of a king of Hidjāz. The Bedouin proper include the ʿAzaʿa confederation, of which the Ruwalā is the best known tribe, the Ǧammār, the Al Murra in and on the borders of the Empty Quarter, the ʿUdmán, and the Banū Khalīd. All of these tribes follow a strict code of chivalry when fighting one another.

Being mobile camel-owners, these aristocrats are concerned chiefly with the use of winter and spring grazing lands, the locations of which vary from year to year with the whim of the rains. In each camp the work is done mostly by dependents — slaves, Śūlabā, hired herdsmen, and blacksmiths, all of whom are considered non-combatants. A Bedouin shaykh entertains lavishly in a large tent where food is always available to his followers and guests. The ritual of coffee drinking is highly formalised and nearly always in progress. Members of other tribes fleeing vengeance seek the protection of his "face". Travellers cross his territory under the protection of his guards. In inter-tribal warfare, which most frequently arises over pasture rights, he will often lead his men into battle in person. Bravery, generosity, and good judgment are the qualities traditional in such a leader, who does not inherit his office directly, but is chosen, often after a sharp contest, from the paramount family. Before trucks, buses, railroads and airplanes took over the desert carrying trade, the Bedouins guided, protected, and raided caravans, including the huge pilgrim processions. The Bedouins are Muslims, characteristically Sunnite. Many (especially in Eastern Arabia) follow the Maliki code, but the Wahhabis universally follow the Ḥanball. The Bedouins generally are said to spend less time and effort in religious devotions than townsmen but the conditions are sometimes reversed. In some of their rituals can be seen a survival of veneration for ancestors.

The political situation of the Bedouins varies from period to period. When the central governments to which the tribal territories are officially assigned are weak, the paramount Shayqhs rule virtually as kings, and even cities have paid them tribute. At times when the central governments are strong, their authority becomes purely local. At the present time Bedouins are found within the political boundaries of Saʿūdī Arabia, Yaman, Aden Protectorate, Maskat, Trucial Oman, Kuwayt, ʿIrāq, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Israel, Egypt and the North African states. For the most part these governments endeavour to keep their nomads at home. In some countries this effort has been implemented by programmes to settle some of them on newly irrigated land, and new water-tanks along the Tapline are used by a number of tribes, including the Ruwālā. Part of one tribe, the Dawāsir, whose home in southern Najjd, moved to the Persian Gulf and onto the island of Bahrayn. In 1923 they crossed...
back to the mainland, and settled in al-Khubar and Dammam. During the last three decades some of the Dawasir, for the American Oil Company, have set up in businesses of their own, including construction and transportation.

Today the Bedouins are in a state of transition. Some still concern themselves with camel breeding for the meat, skin, and wool markets; others are truckers, machinists, and skilled operators of oil producing machinery, and are sending their children to school and college. They are showing themselves just as adaptable to the machine age as they were to life on the desert when an earlier opportunity called them.


II. THE HISTORY OF THE ORIGIN OF NOMADISM IN ITS GEOGRAPHICAL ASPECT

(a) Goat and Sheep Nomadism.
(b) The Nomad on Horseback.
(c) Bedouin Nomadism in Arabia.
(d) The Appearance of Camel Nomadism in North Africa.

(a) Goat and Sheep Nomadism.

The expressions “nomad” and “nomadism” lose their scientific practicability, if they are not used in their restricted meaning: “roaming from place to place for pasture” (Concise Oxford Dictionary). Nomadism is unsettled roaming, pasturing herd animals. Roaming gatherers and hunters as well as a population with a shifting agriculture (ladang, miùpa, see Gourou) should not be called nomadic.

If we follow the succession of “agricultural origins” of the Old World in C. O. Sauer’s conception (1952) taken over and elaborated by the authors in two papers (1956, 1957), nomadism in this restricted sense began much later than planting and breeding “household animals”, i.e. dog, pig, and fowl. (Sauer distinguishes between household animals and herd animals).

The still hypothetical sequence of creative centres of domestication and cultivation, according to Sauer’s interpretation, began along the river banks and coasts of moist tropical forest round the Bay of Bengal, where a rather sedentary fishing folk, which in addition hunted and collected plants and mussels, began to breed these “household animals” (dog, pig, fowl) and to plant tubers and fruit shrubs and trees (cf. also E. Hahn, Hettner, Menghin, Werth 1950, 1954, Dittmer, Smolla).

Cultivation of seed plants (“millets”—this is a term including the diverse species of small seed cereals—as well as pulse and oil plants) was then added in the winter-dry forest, which is easily burnt down, and in the wooded steppe, at first in India. These plants supply proteins and oil, making man more independent of animal food, especially of fish.

In this progressive succession of cultures, in which man became “the lord of creation”, the next step seems to have been the breeding of goats and (then) sheep in the mountain areas north-west of India, round the Hindukush. This was probably initiated by a near contact between seed-planters and roving hunters, among whom the wild goat or sheep was a holy animal. A culture thus resulted in which herding was added to seed-planting and hunting. It may be regarded as a primary stage of
farming, as a goat and sheep farming culture ("Kleinvieh-Bauernlust"), if we understand the meaning of farming to be a combination of tilling and herding.

Results of the ethnological expedition of A. Friedrich (Jettmar 1957b) strongly support this hypothesis, especially for the goat. In the remote valleys of the Shin of Gilgit, the markhor, the wild goat with screw-shaped horns, and the ibex are holy animals, "herded by goddesses". The domestic goat, an offspring of the wild goat of the same region, partakes in this holiness. The economy of the Shin consisted in a scanty growing of millet, but an intensive breeding of goats and an important hunting of the markhor and ibex. Jettmar brings several indications for the thesis that the domestication of the goat took place in these regions. The experience of domestication—of this tremendous intervention in the balance of nature—must have always implied a profound religious emotion. Jettmar calls this a religious shock of domestication (cf. E. Hahn).

The growing of the two-rowed barley (Hordeum spontaneum) as the first large seed grain ("Haim-getreide") may have already been developed in that region. Probably in this stage, if not earlier, small-scale irrigation was started.

But only the thesis of the following great step, which largely diversified social and economic modes of living, is more or less archaeologically proved up to now: in the highlands and the mountains of Western Asia, somewhere between Western Iran and Syria, cattle were bred and primitive wheat (emmer, Triticum dicoccum; einkorn, T. monococcum; and possibly spelt, T. spelta) was grown as an addition to the basic goat and sheep farming. It was the foundation of a complete farming culture ("Vollbauernlust"), which later became the basis of early civilisation in Mesopotamia and Egypt.

These four main nuclei of creative cultures which reared animals and plants were based on one another. They may be looked at as only one moving centre, appearing near the Bay of Bengal and progressing finally to the highlands and mountains round Mesopotamia. Each of these four stages sent out waves of dispersion over large parts of the world. In comparison with these creative centres, all other regions seem to have been more or less stagnant areas, where elements of these waves were taken up or transformed or rejected, according to cultural or climatic circumstances.

The first data we can use for inserting this succession into a frame of absolute time are the radiocarbon data for the pre-pottery settlements with complete farming near Kal'at Djarmo in the hills east of Kirkuk, c. 4750 B.C., a settlement without irrigation (Braidwood), and of those of the fortified irrigating settlement of Jericho, in the 7th millennium. W. F. Albright doubts the latter date (oral communication). The emmer grown at Kal'at Djarmo was still nearer to the wild form than to the later cultivated form (Helbaek, Schiemann by letter). This might show that no very long time had passed since the beginning of emmer cultivation. The oldest strata of oasis settlement known in Jericho are said to go back into the early 7th millennium B.C., but we are not yet informed by Kenyon and Zeuner about the domesticated animals (except the goat) and cultivated seed plants there. The Natufian culture of Palestine (Garrod, Bate) is probably older than the oldest strata of Jericho. Like Sauer and Albright (1949, 129), we suppose that seed agriculture, probably growing some species of millet, was already carried out during the Natufian stage (cf. Clark, Nair 1956).

On the other hand we now know with considerable certainty that the 9th millennium B.C. was a very cold period globally (glacial advance of "Salpaußeldane" in North ra Europe, of "Schlern" in the Alps, of "Mankato" in North America as far as the Great Lakes, of the moraines round the piedmont lakes of East Patagonia), in which the snow line was about 800 metres and more lower than at present (Caldenius, Firbas, Deeevey, Gross, Rathiens, Butzer). But from about 9000 to 2500 B.C. temperatures were higher all over the globe than they are now, so that the snow line, timber line and potential cereal line were situated about 400 metres above the present ones (Thermal Maximum, Mittlere Wärmezeit). It seems improbable to me that a herding culture took its origin in the mountains north-west of India in a time of glacial advance or of very heavy glaciation. I suppose that the happened in the period of glacial retreat, perhaps in its first half. This glacial retreat took place throughout the whole period from 8100 to 5500 B.C. Temperatures rose rather quickly, and the timber line and cereal line climbed up to those high elevations mentioned above. But natural oases in the deserts round the mountain chains of Central Asia always became smaller and scarcer, as they were fed by rivers derived from retreating glaciers continually diminishing in size. Towards and during the Thermal Maximum, a sheep breeding culture was able to spread over Tibet, where the climate was much more favourable then. This culture was not purely nomadic (cf. Hermanns, Kussmaul). It probably began to grow the six-rowed barley (Hordeum vulgare, i.e., hexastichum), the wild form of which probably is Hordeum agriocrithon, which has been found round Lhasa and in Eastern Tibet, (Freisleben, Schiemann 1948, 1951)

It seems that the cultivated varieties of six-rowed barley all derive from this form. They spread over China and India; and from India they seem to have taken their way to South Arabia and Abyssinia (which became a secondary centre of variation) and thence to Upper Egypt, where cultivated emmer had entered from Syria and was grown in Upper Egypt beside six-rowed barley in the late 5th millennium B.C. (Caton Thompson and Gardner, Brunton, Libby, Arnold, Kees).

It seems that the route from the Hindukush and Eastern Iran by South Arabia to Africa has been of great importance for the spreading of cultures—especially during the periods of the spreading of early seed planting as well as of goat and sheep farming. There are no wild goats in Arabia and Abyssinia. But the veneration and ritual hunt of the ibex was also spread in these countries. The idolisation of the ibex was common in South Arabia in the last millennium B.C. The ibex god Ta'lab was protector of goats and sheep (Beeston, Höfner). Up to date, ibex hunting has been a ritual act in Hajar ammawt (van der Meulen - von Wissmann 177 f). The ibex seems to have had a similar position in the Badarian and early Naqada cultures of Upper Egypt after 4000 B.C. (Brunton, tables), in the latter beside the bull. We must also mention that Agatharchides (about 130 B.C.; C. Müller, Geogr. Græc. Min., 1, 133 describing the nomadic Troglodytes near the western coast of the Red Sea (known as Blemmyes and Bedja), writes that they call bulls and rams their father, cows and sheep their mother.
The early cultures of goat and sheep farming with millets and of a complete cattle farming with large-seed cereals were more or less restricted to the climates and vegetations from light forest and wooded steppe to semi-desert as well as to the natural and artificial oases. All of these mostly have a light and rich soil, which is easily cultivated (map 1). The wooded steppe is good for both agriculture and pasture. The dry steppe is a rather good pasture. It is arable, but agriculture depending on rainfall is endangered in dry years. The desert steppe or semi desert is too dry for this kind of agriculture. It can be used, however, as a meagre pasture for goats and sheep, but not for cattle. Good pasture is also found in highlands above the cereal line.

In areas of desert steppe where oases do not exist or are scarce, pastoral folk herding sheep and goats, but not cattle, could branch off from the steppe-farming tribes and become independent nomads. However, such nomadic people breeding ghana in the semi-desert must always have lived an impoverished life compared with tribes of moister zones or of regions interspersed with oases. In these latter regions, parts of a tribe may have been agricultural, other parts pastoral ("partial nomadism"). Thus a pure nomadism was carried out by a branch of a steppe-farming or even oasis-farming clan or social unit. (This way of living somewhat resembles South-European transhumance.) W. F. Albright (1946 a, b, 1949, 147, 154, 162 ff., 257) supposes that the Semitic neighbours of the Sumerians were such pastoral tribes, partly nomadic, when the Sumerians, at the outset of civilisation, began to irrigate Lower Mesopotamia. The western Semites (Amorites) pressed on the Babylonians mainly from 2100 to 1900 B.C. These ancient nomads differed from any modern form of society in Arabia, Bedouin, semi-nomad or Slaib (Sulaba). They possessed goats, sheep and donkeys. Hunting and robbing the harvest were important for them. They travelled and attacked on foot. This made a complete crossing of the desert impossible for them, except in spring. They did not dare to move more than a day's journey (30 km.) from a watering place. In summer they had either to depend on oases or other settled areas or to herd in tillable regions of the Fertile Crescent. On the attitude of the Egyptians towards this roaming population and on their frontier control in the East cf. Kees, 64 ff., 106 ff., esp. papyrus Petersburg 1116 A, l. 51 f. "He (the Asiatic) never lives in the same place and his feet are wandering since the time of Horus, he fights and is neither victor, nor is he defeated". The difference between nomads, semi-nomads, partial nomads, steppe farmers and farmers of small oases was much smaller and occupational overlapping was more common than in later periods (see W. F. Albright, 1946, 181 ff., esp. 1949, 239 ff. on the Israelites in the desert, the patriarchs and the 'Apiru or Khabiru). In many of these cases, it is better to speak of pastoralism than of nomadism.

In no part of Asia does there ever seem to have spread any complete cattle nomadism, such as exists in parts of Africa south of the Saharā, except yak nomadism in the highlands above the timber line in Tien-shan and Tibet. Cattle are not fitted for semi-desert grazing. They also find difficulty in grazing in winter in a steppe with a frozen snow cover, as in West Siberia (cf. Potapov, and Hančar, 390).

We have recognised that pastoral life has been an essential part of the farming cultures since their origin. We saw that the earliest domestication of herd animals and pasturing was probably developed in the Hindukush area by seed planters surrounded by mountain hunters of ibex and wild goat (and perhaps sheep), and that this was an invention correlated with deep religious emotion, an invention by which these seed planters became steppe farmers. Because of the pastoral branches of their clans, these steppe farmers must have been of greater mobility and more migratory than the seed planters had been. But only in places, where herdsmen of sheep and goats entirely split off from their kinship or group and gave up agriculture, may we speak of complete nomadism. When an oasis became more extensive and its settlement larger, its population became increasingly sedentary. The new excavations of pre-pottery Jericho show that such irrigating villages were fortified like towns very early, in Jericho perhaps

Map 1. Oasis and steppe regions of the Dry Belt of the Old World, classified according to their thermal conditions.

1-highland desert; 2-desert, semi-desert; 3-forest; 4-oasis, steppe and wooded steppe; 5-steppe with cool summer and cold winter; 6-oasis and steppe with long, hot summer; 7-steppe, tropical, no frost; 8-mountain chain.
in the 7th millennium (Kenyon, Zeuner). This may have been the first germ of what became early civilisation (in the delta oases of Mesopotamia, where large irrigation schemes needed collaboration, centralisation and the formation of states, where mass labour was required as well as division, specialisation and intensification of labour, and where technical inventions sprang up (wheel, cart, plough). As a result of this development, the intensity of contrast between steppe farming and oasis civilisation was continually growing, while the common offspring is displayed by the Magen Mater and bull idols worshipped in both of them.

Meanwhile steppe farming with all its pastoral traits had spread via Asia Minor to south-eastern Europe and to the light oak forests of Central Europe (Danubian culture, since c. 4,000 B.C., according to radiocarbon data). And since the 3rd millennium it began to infiltrate from the Tripolye culture (west of the Dniéper river) into the wooded steppes of Russia and Siberia, which then were occupied by an advanced hunting population (Hančár). All these regions were unfit for oasis economy because of their cool or short summers (map 2).

I think it is a quality of the largely hypothetical sequence of creative centres, which step by step gain and enlarge the domination by man of other organisms, that it corresponds excellently with the succession of cultures presented by several ethnologists, e.g., by Dittmer. It also has the advantage of making parallel inventions largely unnecessary (Sauer).

We cannot treat here the hypothesis of Flor, W. Schmidt, Polihhausen and others, in which the reindeer represents the earliest domesticated herd animal, so that nomadism begins among hunters breeding the dog, in the boreal conifer forest (taiga, muskog) of Eurasia and spreads to the south. Since lately jetta (1952) and others have shown that impulses for reindeer domestication came from horse breeding, which itself was a rather late acquirement (compare below), the number of adherents of this hypothesis became small. The foundation of Hančár’s suggestion that the reindeer was employed as a trailing and riding animal about 5,000 B.C. (547 and table 63) has broken down too. Jettmar (compare below), the number of adherents of horse breeding, which itself was a rather late acquirement, that it corresponds excellently with the succession of cultures presented by several ethnologists, e.g., by Dittmer. It also has the advantage of making parallel inventions largely unnecessary (Sauer).


(b) The Nomad on Horseback.

Among the Equines, the African donkey (Equus subgen. Asinus) and the South-West and Central Asiatic onager (Equus subgen. Hemionus) were early in use as transport animals. Hančar's opinion is that the find of bones of one onager in Kašat Djano (about 4750 B.C.) is important in this connexion. According to Hančar, a subordinate breeding of the horse (Equus subgen. Caballus), which was wild in the steppes and light forests of the North, can be recognised in the early 3rd millennium B.C. in the Tripolye farming culture in the wooded steppe between the Carpathians and the Duieper river.

A decrease of temperature and probably an increase of precipitation (cf. Tostlows and Butzer's different view) since about 2400 B.C. depressed the snow line in Central Asia and thus considerably enlarged the oasis areas of Türan, so that farming and herding as well as oasis civilisation could expand in that region (which before had been a desert of greater aridity). At least for some centuries, this desert seems to have lost its function as a strong barrier (Wissmann 1957). The advanced hunters of the North and the farmers and the oasis civilisation of the South came into contact along an extensive border. It seems that by this meeting an amalgamation took place, and a new vital and vigorous culture was growing, in which, since the early 2nd millennium, the horse, the war-chariot (with its origin probably some re in the South-West Asiatic highlands round Armenia), and Indo-European peoples played an important rôle. During this process, the veneration of the deer, which had had a central position in the religious conceptions and the myths of the northern hunters, was replaced by that of the horse, which was also brought into contact with the old South-west Asiatic chthonic fertility and bull (bucranion) worship (Kussmaul 1953b).

If we take this broad cultural process as a whole, we may say that by it civilisation was often relieved from oasis seclusion, where it had been in danger of stagnating and of becoming barren. Here also, we can distinguish steppe-farming and oasis-farming branches. When the Shang, who belonged to this cultural complex (Kussmaul 1953a), occupied China from Central Asia about 1500 B.C. and became its ruling class, they had been mainly oasis farmers (Eberhard, Franke, Bishop, Wissmann and Kussmaul 1956, 1957). The Aryans however, when destroying the Indus civilisation in about the same period, must have been steppe farmers, but cannot be called nomads.

According to excavations, the breeding of the Bactrian camel as a transport animal seems to have started in Türan in the second half or the last quarter of the 3rd millennium B.C. (Walz, and especially Hančar). This is a few centuries earlier than the time in which we know of horse breeding in this region. Even in Mesopotamia, reliable proofs of horse domestication only begin about 2000 B.C. or shortly before (Boessneck, Hančar).

In the northern wooded steppe and marginal light forest with its rich black soil (chernozem) from Russia to Siberia, agriculture gradually became important beside hunting and herding. In the middle of the 2nd millennium, even western Siberia was inhabited by a comparatively dense farming population (Andronovo culture). In such a region without oases, pure steppe farming with large herds offers good conditions for a social gradation as well as the formation of clans, of a warlike nobility and of dynastic leadership (Kussmaul). This farming in the black soil belt was then penetrating more and more into the open steppe, where inevitably its pastoral and migratory branch was increased and strengthened (Hančar).

However, the first people to find out that fighting on horseback was of great advantage were probably that kind of farming tribes with a strong pastoral branch, which lived in highlands and mountain basins, where the war chariot must have been of comparatively little use. This perhaps took place in Transcaucasia or even in the Carpathians (Kussmaul, Jettmar). Probably, these tribes still remained what we have called steppe-farmers. Hančar considers the northern border of the Tian-shan Mountains and the Altai Mountains as the regions of origin of horse riding (397). But Jettmar 1957 shows clearly that Hančar's main argument in this question broke down (cf. above). Reindeer riding was begun later than horse riding. In most other questions, Hančar's important basic work remains untouched.

The Cody branch of the horse took up which we may call equestrian nomadisation. Once aware of the great superiority of fighting on horseback over the older ways of fighting, especially in war chariots, “North Iranian” tribes, probably between the rivers Volga and Irtysh, the Scythians and their neighbours, the Sakians, gave up steppe-farming life entirely and specialised in the breeding of herd animals, especially horses. Perhaps about 900 or 800 B.C. they became the first horse-riding...
nomads, the first archers on horseback (Hančar, 390 f.). They were the first to break into the neighbouring countries, disseminating panic among sedentary populations. When we use the word nomad, we usually think of this equestrian type. This disastrous transformation overwhelmed not only the open steppe but also the wooded steppe with its dense farming population. It even attracted hunting tribes of the taiga forest to join the new way of life. The distinct social gradation of the steppe farmers now became the base for the appearance of leaders of high political and military ability in assembling hordes of growing size. The poorer farmers and hunters were probably forced to join the "aristocracy" of horse-breeders, so that a horde organisation, unknown before, was brought about which grew by raiding, sacking, killing and enslaving other populations, and by winning over vassals, especially other hordes of horsemen, owing to admiration or fear. The warm climate and the refined oasis civilisation of the South, known to some returned men through their service as mercenaries, as well as the mild climate and open plains of the West, ending in Roumania and Hungary, attracted invasions.

It is improbable that the predecessors of the Scythians in Southern Russia, the Cimmerians, were completely nomadic already. They seem to have been steppe farmers with a strong pastoral branch and with dangerous mounted warrior bands (Kussmaul 1953a, ii 302, Hančar 101). Perhaps the early Medes can be mentioned in this connexion, at the time when they superseded the highland farmers of Irán (cf. von der Osten). Even the Achaemenids did not abandon knighthood ideals, "horse-riding, archery, and love of truth".

Eastward, through the gap of Dzungaria along the foot of the Altai Mountains, nomadisation worked like a chain-reaction of explosions. The "North Iranians", especially the Scythians, were followed by the Wu-sun, who probably lived in Central and Eastern Tiem-shan. We may suppose that in this period herdsmen, hunters and farmers of the open and wooded steppe, surrounding Mongolia, were forced to take up nomadic life. It is possible that the pressure of the Wu-sun against the population of the oasis chain of Kan-su caused the last invasion of a farming people into China, the Zhung, which led to the breakdown of the dynasty of the Western Chou (770 B.C.). The first nomadisation to be traced in Chinese reports is that of the Hsiung-nu from about the 5th century B.C. These were neither Iranians nor "Proto-Turks". According to Ligeti, their language seems to have been isolated. The Yenisei-Ostyaks may have taken over features of the Hsiung-nu language, when both were neighbours. In their habitat between ancient China and the Gobi Desert, the Hsiung-nu had taken over en bloc a considerable group of elements of the culture of the North Iranian nomads. Some of the traits of the life of the Hsiung-nu prove their former dependence on China. Others show their old cultural relations to the non-nomadic primitive tribes of Manchuria (Kussmaul). During centuries of fierce wars, in which the Chinese defended themselves against the Hsiung-nu and built the Great Wall, again the Chinese took over a part of the cultural elements derived from the North Iranians, e.g., iron, cavalry, trousers, the concept of heaven as a tent. There is an old Chinese proverb: Horseback forms state.

Map 3 shows how the spark of nomadisation caught one tribal organisation after the other along the borderland between forest and desert north-east of China during and after the time of the Hsiung-nu empire. Agrarian and urban China, itself in a country of loess and steppe, counterbalanced or endured the pressure or became vassal or partly subdued or even marginally transformed into pasture, all this during long periods of alternate defence and retreat and of regaining ground for agriculture. As the object of this article is a synopsis of the history of the origin of nomadism, we cannot deal with the growth of more or less short lived nomadic realms and empires, which in their tendencies saw a model in the universalistic and cosmological state doctrine of the Chinese Empire. Nor can we deal with those tremendous migrations and invasions into the West, during which the Dry Belt served as a corridor, through which the invaders broke into the countries of old oasis civilisation in South-west Asia or into the beginnings of forest civilisation in mediaeval Central and Western Europe, where they were one cause of the Migration of Nations (Grousset, Spuler).

All these movements destroyed what had been left of steppe farming in the plains of the open and wooded steppe. The hilly and mountainous regions surrounding Mongolia in the north, however, with a pattern of steppe, meadow and forest, became areas of retreat and regeneration of a population which made its living by hunting, by cattle-breeding, and also by farming (cf. Lattimore). The ruins of a defence wall cutting off the north-eastern corner of the steppe of Mongolia near the Gan and Argun rivers (Plaetschke) show that such a farming population must have been quite numerous sometimes. We may trace on map 3 how again and again in such hilly border regions of the forest new nuclei of horde formation sprang up among hunting, herding and farming groups, who led a simple life under hard conditions. In these we find some able man, endowed with the gifts of leadership, organising a heterogeneous horde by raiding, robbing and winning vassals. Sometimes the name of a clan, little known before, became the name of a growing power or even of a vast empire. By some lucky chance, a Secret History of the Mongols has been preserved (Haenisch), which is the story of the life of Čingiz Khan and his clan, and of how he founded the Mongol Empire. It was written by a Mongol in A.D. 1240 as a plain first hand report. In the time of his forefathers, the semi-sedentary clan living in the Kentei Mountains owned but a few horses, cattle and sheep. There was some scanty agriculture. Wild vegetables were collected. Hunting on horseback was important. However, the neighbours in the open steppes outside the mountains were true horse-riding nomads with large flocks and herds. Some had become sated with raiding and addicted to the luxuries of civilisation with which they had become familiar during their raids. From hiding places in the valleys and forests of the Kentei hills, the incipient clan of Čingiz Khan robbed among the rich nomads of the plains. The booty consisted of horses, cattle and sheep, women, children and servants. Thus the clan turned entirely nomadic, growing by the acquisition of new vassals, an association taking its name from the leader's clan, growing in strength according to the looting ability of the leader. Finally, well-known tribes and peoples lost their independence as well as their name and merged with the great "Mongol" unit.

Virtually no region on the margin of the dry belt
of Mongolia, which once had been the cradle of such a fast growth of nomadism and then had been thoroughly nomadised, ever repeated the formation of a new nomadic aggregation.

The empty spaces of the Dry Belt were terribly enlarged by the destructive incursions and migrations of the mounted nomads. Steppe farming was annihilated in Eurasia except in mountainous regions, if we do not include in this term the agriculture of North China and parts of India. Oasis civilisation was disastrously weakened and reduced. It is true that the larger nomadic states contributed to the interchange of materials and ideas across the continent. But this interchange would certainly have been stronger in a peaceful development. Yet we do not know to what extent suffering may be necessary to save from degeneration and decay that which is sound and good in man's mind.

**Bibliography:**


(c) *Bedouin Nomadism in Arabia.*

There are indications that the wild one-humped camel (the wild dromedary) lived in North Africa and the Near East until the 3rd millennium B.C., and that it became extinct later on except in Arabia. We do not know when this process of extermination ended in North Africa.

A cord made of camel hair has been found from the 3rd dynasty in Egypt. An Egyptian relief published by James (1955) shows the dromedary among wild animals. Judging from its style, it belongs to the New Kingdom. The camel was domesticated neither in the valley of the Nile, where the local climate is detrimental for its health, nor in any desert region of North Africa. This question is treated thoroughly by Walz (1951).

Agatharchides (in two versions, cf. C. Müller, *Geogr. Gracc. Minor. i, 179*) and Artemidorus (Strabo xvi, 4, 18) give reports of the Red Sea coast of Arabia which inspire confidence. In these reports they also write that, in the hinterland of the coast of present Northern Hijjāz, there are herds of wild animals, of "cattle," onagers (ΞΟΛΟΥ ΗΜΟΝΟΥ; ἄχθις τος ἄχθις ἡμών καὶ βοῦ), wild camels (καμήλων ἄγριων), deer and gazelles, and also numerous lions, "panthers" and wolves. All these descriptions were probably taken over from one original report, perhaps of Ariston, c. 280 B.C. (cf. Tarn, op. cit. report, later, 14). Musil (1926, 302 ff.) believes that these camels probably were not really wild ones. (He mistakes onagers, "half-asses", for mules, and is right in saying that mules cannot be wild.) Littmann
Map 2. The zones of vegetation and the oases of the Dry Belt of Inner Asia.

Map 3. The spreading of explosive outbursts of horse-riding nomadism with feudal state-building. The previous population had an economy of agriculture, herding and hunting, concentrated in the wooded steppes (cf. map 2). The Roman numerals show the succession of the outbursts. The dates are approximate.
Map 4. The Red Sea and Arabia in Pre-Islamic Periods.

Recent names are given in parentheses. The broken lines are:
1. The incense roads from Žaflr (Dufár) and Kana' via Yaj'rib to Ghana and Damascus and to Gerrha, (2), the roads from the Nile near Koptos to the Red Sea harbours, (3) the "Darb al-Fil" (6th to 7th century A.D.) from Žaflr and Sah'a to Bankh Harb and Karo al-Mankil (and Mecca), (4) the coastal road from Karo al-Mankil to Ayla.
(1940, 3) has demonstrated that the rock-drawings which are found in connexion with Thamúdean (cf. below) graffiti show—besides domesticated animals—camels, horses and dogs—hunted animals in great quantities: gazelles, “wild cattle” (oryx), ibexes, wild boars, hares, ostriches, lions, wolves, hyenas. Only once is a goat shown. No sheep and no domesticated cattle are drawn. The nomads between Mídian and the Hāwrān must have been fervent hunters, but not much interested in sketching their ḍ̣emanam (goats and sheeps). Also Xenophon (Anabasis, i, 5, r ff.) speaks of onagers, wild cattle (oryx), ostriches and bustardus, and he describes the hunting of onagers on horseback.

So perhaps there still were also wild dromedaries in desert Arabia in the 3rd century B.C.

We cannot tell where in Arabia the one-humped camel was first domesticated. Albright supposes that this was done in South Arabia, somewhere round the great southern desert (1938, note 5). Nothing is known about the dromedary as a domesticated herd animal before the 11th century B.C. (Albright, Walz 1951, 1956, against Dussaud 207): Judges, 6-8 says that Mídianids, Amálekites, and the sons of the east made ingressions on camel’s back into Palestine across the Jordan river. This was about in the first half of the 11th century B.C., and, according to Albright and Walz, is the earliest date for a mention of the domesticated dromedary. It is the time when iron was introduced into Palestine. Albright (Arch. 1953, 227, note 31) is of the opinion that the dromedary was effectively domesticated in Arabia between the 16th/15th and the 13th/12th centuries B.C. The spreading of Semites to South Arabia goes probably back to a still earlier time: the reliefs of the Punt expedition of Hātšepsút (about 1455 B.C.) show that the Orientalid sub-race of the Mediterranean races (Mediterraneus sensu stricto—Orientalis—Iranian—Indic—Gondí; cf. von Eckstedt, Biasutti, Coon, Field 1956, Pöch), which must have been a very old race among the North Arabian Semites (Moscati), was already represented then in South Arabia, at least among the reigning class (Dr. Hella Pech, oral comm.). This agrees with the supposition of Contí Rossi (101, 47) that the names of the chiefs of Punt mentioned by Hātšepsút and by Rámses II were Semitic (Parúa—forú; Náhás—nḥ̣ḥ̣āḥ̣ā; cf. Brunner-Traut, 307; Wissmann 1957).

That Punt was located at least partly on the Arabian side of the sea also becomes probable, I think, when we draw conclusions from the somatic features of people of Punt in Egyptian reliefs as early as the 5th dynasty (Sabúrê, cf. Kees, 59). These features are similar to those of the Egyptians (cf. Pöch 1957).

W. F. Albright estimates that, in the desert climate along the interior foot of the highlands of Yaman, civilisation was beginning about the 13th century B.C. He assumes that this was due to an immigration from the north. His dating is partly based on the fact that the excavation in Ḥadjar b. Ḥumayd (cf. below) has shown that 4-5 metres of probably agricultural (irrigational) silt had been deposited before the foundation of that settlement. This foundation took place c. 1000 B.C. While 8 metres of silt were deposited during the existence of the settlement from c. 1000 B.C. to c. 200 A.D., the lower 4-5 metres may represent about half a millennium (R. Le Baron Bowen, 67, 117; Albright 1958).

It is peculiar that camel-riding and horse-riding both seem to have begun to spread in the second half of the 2nd millennium B.C., camel-riding from Arabia, horse-riding probably from the mountains of Transcaucasia. Hanáčar suggests that an increasing demand for sumpter animals for the transport of metals may have been a stimulus to the intensification of horse breeding in Mesopotamia (1937). Also the breeding of the one-humped camel in Arabia must have been accelerated in connexion with a growing demand for transport between South Arabia on one side, the Mediterranean lands and Mesopotamia on the other, a transport of frankincense, myrrh, precious stones and gold from South Arabia, of Indian and East African goods from the South and of cloth, products of civilisation and objets d’art (Segall 1957) and perhaps iron wares from the north. The introduction of waterproof plaster for irrigation works and cisterns in South Arabia, which had spread before in Syria since about 1200 B.C., must have impelled agricultural development “probably not before the 10th century B.C.” (Albright 1958).

While the excavations of N. Glueck in Ezion-Geber (Smithsonian, Inst., Ann. Rep. 1941. Publ. 3652, 1942) prove that the reports of the navigation of Solomon and Hirám to the gold land of ʿOfir refer to historical facts, the story of the queen of Sabaʿ (Shebā), which is told in relation with the ʿOfir expeditions in 1 Kings 9-10, must also have some historical background (cf. Albright 1956, 3). At least it shows that camel caravans were travelling between South Arabia and Palestine in the 10th century B.C. Sabaʿ, ʿOfir and Ḥawīlā are named one after the other as brothers in Genesis 10 (9th or 8th century, cf. Albright, Arch. 1953, 327), beside Ḥaṣarmāwēth, among the sons of Yōkštān, son of ʿEber. I can support the hypothesis that the gold-land of ʿOfir (1 Kings 9-10, 224; 1 Chron. 295; 2 Chron. 84, 98; Job 224, 2814; Psalms 4543; Isaiah 13) was in south-west Arabia on the Red Sea coast: in Ḥaṣār round Dhāhabān (Sprerger, Moritz, Delbrueck 12, Wissmann 1957, 1959; cf. Glaser 357-384, Albright Arch. 1953, 212, note 14). In Somaliland, where some authors put ʿOfir, the outcrop of crystalline rock and of its dikes, the matrix of gold, is much smaller than in Ḥaṣār (cf. Carte Géol. Afr. 1952). On Sabaʿ sending gold cf. 1 Kings 10, Isaiah 60, Ezhech. 274 (but cf. J. Ryckmans 1958).

The most plausible identification of the gold-land of Ḥawīlā of Gen. 24, 104, 105, 214, 1 Sam. 155 in my opinion as well as that of Niebuhr, C. Ritter, Sprunger, Moritz and others, is that with Ḥwālān. This name is known from inscriptions, from al-Ḥamān, and is still used today. North Ḥwālān bordered on ʿOfir. South Ḥwālān adjoined Sabaʿ. That North Ḥwālān was highly renowned in Greece for its rich gold mines, probably at about 400 B.C., is explicitly stated by Agatharchides (C. Müller, Geogr. Graec. Minor., 184 f; Wissmann 1957, esp. 1959).

In the genealogy of Genesis 10, the Southarians are considered as being descendants of both ʿKūb and ʿEber. The descendants of ʿEber and his son Yōkštān were settled as far as “Ṣefar, the mountain towards the East”. Commonly, this Ṣefar is thought to be Ṣafar, the capital of the Ḥimyar in Yaman. But this town was probably founded about 100 B.C. (cf. below), when the Ḥimyar had occupied this region. It lay on a hill in the highlands of south-west Yaman and is not “a mountain towards the east”. Fresnel, C. Ritter, Rödiger, Tkac and others suppose—and I believe they are right—that Ṣefar was Ṣafar (or Dufar), a town and region east of Ḥadramawt and Mahra-Land, which, however, is not known by this name in pre-Islamic inscriptions or literature, but only since the early Arab geographers. It is the best frankincense region of South Arabia. The eastern
mountain promontory and cape of this region is really the last region from which in antiquity ships left the coast to use the monsoon in the direction of India (Schoff, Frisk, Lc. later). It is also the last area of South Arabia towards the East with a settled, non-nomadic population. East of it, the great desert touches the sea as far as Um An (lagarde 61, note; Volters, Zaschr. j. Assy. 22, 223 f. is of the opinion that Sefar of Gen. 10 is to be identified with Safarī in Bahrayn. But this "balad" (Yākūṭ 3, 96, citing Ibn al-Fāḳhī) was neither frontier place nor mountain.)

I think one may conclude that the "Table of Peoples" (Yahwist) means by the "sons of Yokṭān" the agricultural peoples of South Arabia (map 4); and I suppose that in Gen. 25, the camel nomads of central and north-west Arabia were comprehended as the sons of Yishmā'īl, and in Gen. 37, and Judges 8 as Yishmā'īlites. Gen. 25**: "And they (the sons of Yishmā'īl) lived from Hāwla as far as Shūr, which is east of Egypt, on the way to Ashṣūr.* They lived, it seems, in the triangle of desert-steppe between the agricultural countries of South Arabia (Khawālān), Egypt and Assyria (cf. Skinner, Internal Crit. Comment., and Kautzsch-Bertholet).

Certainly, troops mounted on an animal so well adapted to the desert, capable of enduring thirst so well and of travelling long distances so quickly, as is the camel, must have enjoyed great superiority when fighting against war-chariots drawn by horses. Albright says (Stone Age 1946, 120; Arch. 1953, 97): "Arab nomadism is conditioned by the domestication of the camel, which makes it possible for Bedu to live entirely on its herds of camels, drinking their milk, eating camel curds and camel flesh, wandering through regions, where only the camel can subsist, and making rapid journeys of several days, if need be, through waterless desert. The camel eats desert shrubs and bushes, which even sheep and goats will not touch."—Over long distances a riding camel is three times as quick as a horse. It can cover 300 km. in one day. The load of a caravan camel may weigh as much as 200 kg., that of a horse up to 150 kg. Arabia has not only bred races of transport camels and of riding camels of the lowlands but also stocks of mountain camels capable of going on fairly steep paths, as in "Aslr (Tamiisser ii, 31, 47, 197) or in "Awālīk country and Ḩaḍramawt (own experience). When coming from the plains to an "ākaba (pass) of the mountains, the camels of a caravan must be changed near the foot of the "ākaba from one breed to another. In Arabia, only the western slope of the Yaman highlands seems to be too moist for camel breeding. We must consider that, before the time of camel domestication, the donkey (and perhaps the onager) was the only transport animal in Arabia (cf. above). It is peculiar that the Bactrian camel, which had been domesticated in Tūrān about a millennium earlier than the time when the domestication of the camel dromedary must have taken place in Arabia, never became important for riding but only for transport.

It looks as if the domestication of the dromedary went hand in hand with its employment for riding. This cannot be said of any other animal. Since excavations in Arabia did not go down to strata of early periods, our knowledge is based only on historical data. We are not yet able to see the source of the impulse for this domestication. Wälz (1956) opposing Wiesner (1955) insists on the statement that the domestication of the one-humped camel was totally independent of the breeding of the Bactrian camel and the horse. It seems, however, that parallel inventions are rare in prehistory and history (Sauer i.e., 2). The horse was in use in Mesopotamia at least about 2000 B.C.; but troops riding on horseback are not mentioned there before of 1130 (Nebuchadnezer I of Babylonia; Thomson in Pauly-Wissowa, vi, 109 ff.). As the Bactrian camel was bred in southern Tūrān since at least about 2100 B.C., it is improbable that it was not brought to Mesopotamia and further south now and then in those turbulent periods of the early iron and middle millennium B.C. This may have given an impulse for the domestication of the one-humped camel.

A camel's head, part of a pottery jar found in the excavation of Ḥadījar b. Ḥumayd in Bayḥān (ancient Ḥatabān) in South Arabia by W. F. Albright, was approximately dated by him to belong to the 8th (or 9th) century B.C. (Van Beek 1952, 17, Wälz 1956, footnote 34, Albright, letter 1957). The publication of a radiocarbon date for a low stratum of Ḥadījar b. Ḥumayd (Van Beek 1956) shows that Albright's prehistory palaeographical dating of a monogram found during this excavation is not too early but may perhaps be even a century late.

A relief of a dromedary rider from Tell Ḥalāf is from the 9th century (Wälz). The first cuneiform records of camel-riding nomads seem to be "Aramaean Bedouins" fighting against a vassal of Assur Naṣîrpal in 880 B.C. A little later, 854 B.C., "Gindibu the Arab", from an Arabi district, fought against Salmanassar III, leading a troop of thousand camels. The article Al-'Arab (i) by A. Grohmann contains a summary on the Arabi country and the Arabs in the 9th to 7th centuries B.C. from cuneiform data. In this period, Aribi is the northernmost part of Arabia between Syria and Mesopotamia, including the Palmýrene and Waði Sīrān. The Arabs are its nomadic and oasis inhabitants. The central oasis Adummatu is, according to Grohmann and Musil (1927, 331 f.), Dūmāt al-Djandal in the Djawf. The "kings" are chiefs partly of oasis settlements, partly of nomadic tribes. This state of affairs is also meant in Jeremiah 25**: "The kings of Arabia and all the kings of the Arabs who live in the desert." (The first mention of 'Arab in the Bible is in Isaiah in the late 8th cent. B.C.) Bd., Bita, against which Assarḥaddon undertook a long expedition in 676 B.C., is, according to Weidner's latest discoveries, in Eastern Arabia, in the hinterland of Dilmān (Bahrayn), not as Musil (1927, 482 f.) thought, in Waḍi Sīrān (Albright, letter).

It is evident that the caravan roads, especially the "incense road" from Ghazzat on the Mediterranean and from Damascus by Ma'ṣūl (Musil 1926, 243), Daydān (al-'Ula') and Yathrib (al-Madīna) to Rapīt (Naǧīrān), Ma'ṣīn and Sabā (cf. Albright 1953, Wissmann 1957, Segall 1957) played an important political rôle, e.g., when in 732 B.C. queen Samsī of Arībi joined a great coalition including the state of Sabā, the king of Damascus, the important oasis of Ta'yym and tribes near Ta'yym and Daydān against Tiğlāth-Pileṣar III. The first sovereign of Sabā named in cuneiform inscriptions, is a mukarrīb (priest-king), brings tribute to Sargon II in 725 B.C. (cf. Albright, in BASOR 143, 1956, 10; idem, 1958; Wissmann 1957). The tributes received by Assyrian kings in this period from different queens and kings of the northern half of Arabia show that long-distance caravan traffic must have been considerable. Cattle, gold, silver, lead, iron, elephant skins, ivory and cloth were transported (Casel 1954).
It must be emphasised that South Arabia, which was represented by Saba* since at least the 8th century (cf. Albright, in BASOR, 1952, note 26, 1958), was a country with a numerous and farming population and with but little and unimportant nomadism, a country producing aromatic goods, especially frankincense (Exodus 30**, 1 Kings 10, Isaiah 60', Jer. 6'), cf. J. Ryckmans (1958). South Arabia certainly introduced Indian and East African wares to its ports, and it must have already monopolised the traffic on the "incense roads" to the north-west and by central Arabia to the north-east (map 1) in this period to some degree. (On the strength of Saba* in the 8th to 6th centuries, cf. von Wissmann 1957). Perhaps the Chaldaeans lived in 'Umân in those periods and mediated between Saba* and Mesopotamia (and India?), before they occupied Mesopotamia, where Chaldaean kings begin in 625 B.C. (cf. Albright, in BASOR, 1952).

Albright suggests (cf. van Beek 1952) that no time was more opportune for the commercial expansion of Saba* westwards into Ethiopia than about the 10th century B.C. "Egypt, which previously enjoyed exclusive trading rights in Ethiopia and Punt by land and by sea, was unable to maintain its commercial relations with the south after the fall of the New Empire." According to Albright, "boustrophonon" Sabaean inscriptions in the temple 'Awa* or modern Yebâ on the plateau of northern Ethiopia east of Aksûm (Littmann 1913, Nos. 27-32 and D. H. Müller, Epigraph. Denkmäler, Yeba 5) palaeographically belong to the 5th century (letter from W. F. Albright, March 1957, cf. Conti Rossini 1952). An inscription on the base of a rather archaic statue recently found in Maqallâ (Caquot and Drewes) seems to be somewhat earlier. So, even in the new chronologies of A. F. L. Beeston (in BSOAS 1954) and Frenne (1956 b), who emphasise a "rejuvenation" of the early South Arabian chronology, the 5th century B.C. would not be too early. Sabaean colonisation was already firmly established in this region at that time. The probable name of the temple of modern Yebâ, 'Awa*, was also the name of the great oval temple of the state god of Saba* near Mârib. In a remarkable boustrophonon inscription on an incense altar of Maqallâ in Abyssinia (Caquot and Drewes, 30-32), a "mukarrib of Da'mat (place near later Aksûm) and Saba***** dedicates (the altar?) to Almâkah, which was the main state god of South Arabian Saba*. J. Ryckmans suggests that, in a period before the first known Sabaean inscriptions of Mârib and Sîwârât (which probably date, from the 8th century B.C.; Wissmann 1957), the centre of Saba* was in the mountains and highlands of present southern Yaman, round Djabal Ba'dâ and Djabal Hawamîm (-Dhât Ba'dân and Dhât Hawamîn were the most important sun goddesses of Saba*), and that the region of Mârib in the north-east as well as North Abyssinia in the West were both colonised from this area (J. Ryckmans 1958; cf. Albright 1958).

Glaser (387 ff.) and von Wissmann-Höfler suppose that Ka'nân and 'Adam, the best natural ports of South Arabia on the Indian Ocean, are named as Kânâ and 'Èدم in Ezekiel 27** (early 6th cent. B.C.). Ezekiel says: "Hârân and Ka'nân and 'Èdam (Mt) "merchants of Shebâ" or (S): "they were merchants". Mostly all three places are identified in Northern Mesopotamia, where an ancient Hârân is well known (cf. Cooke, Int. Crit. Comment.). Isaiah 37** and 2 Kings 19** mention this northern Hârân along with the Bê'nê 'Èdam: "Gozân, Hârân, Rešel (in Palmyrene) and Bê'nê 'Èden in Tel'âsâr". But al-Ikarî mentions Hârân al-Hârân in South Arabia between North Khâwâlûn and "Bghât Bu'tân", (which name is a mistake for Basyâh; Grohmann ii, 1933, 131). The location is in the Tiha'ma lowlands north of the present northern frontier of Yaman, somewhere near present Abû 'Arsh. Ritter (Arabien i, 189, 199) and Büssing supposed that this is the Hârân mentioned in Ezekiel. The difficulty is that Kudâmâ and Ibn Khurâdshîb do not mention a place of this name on that route, but al-'Ursâsh (Abû 'Arshshâ) instead. I suspect that there is some mistake in al-Idrî's text. But there are different places named HRN in Ancient South Arabian inscriptions: Hirrân near Ka'taba north of 'Aden, Hirrân south-west of Mâ'ûn and Hirrân north of Dhamâr (on the last cf. W. B. Harris, 272 ff.). Perhaps the Septuagint (S) translators changed the text from "merchants of Shebâ" into "they were thy merchants", because they knew the northern, but not the southern Hârân and 'Èden and therefore could not understand the meaning. In connexion with "merchants of Shebâ", one should consider that Saba* (Shebâ) was a state, not a town, and that the three places mentioned may have belonged to this state.

Ezekiel 38*: "Shebâ, Dedân, merchants of Tarshîsh" (Tartessos or Sardinia) shows opposite outposts of Ezekiel's terra cognita. (Dedân is the Daydân of South Arabian inscriptions.)

Considering this important position of South Arabia in this period and its central place in the oldest seafaring area, that of the Indian Ocean, we must keep in view that the North and Central Arabian home of camel nomadism was surrounded by civilised agrarian countries, on all sides where it was not touched by the sea.

The difficulties of crossing the desert with long distances between watering-places could only be mastered after the domestication of the camel. The desert routes of greatest importance for traffic were those between Mesopotamia and Syria. But also the difficulties in crossing Arabia from north to south, and from the Mediterranean coasts to the fertile highlands of South Arabia could more easily be overcome by camel caravans. The springs and wells of the northern part of Arabia became important as resting places of caravans and as commercial and political centres. As the nomads were breeding the camels needed for the caravans, their tribes were interested in peaceful traffic and it was expedient for them to join coalitions among each other and with the oasis town kingdoms on the main routes.

Since Tiglath-Pileasar III (748-725), north-western Arabia, including the northern part of the incense road from Daydân to Gharzat may have become more tightly bound to Assyria, and later to Neo-Babylonia, after each conquest. It seems to be of great importance for the cultural and religious development of the "Arabs", that Nabûna'id (Nabonidus) of Babylonia conquered Tayma* in 550 B.C. and that he reigned there for eight years and made an expedition as far as Yahrib. He built a palace and temple in Tayma* and made this place the centre of an archaistic religion and cult round the Aramaean moon god Shîn, perhaps with the sun disc resting in the crescent as the main symbol of this religion (Musil, 1928, 224 ff., Moortgat, Segall). There should be investigations on the close resemblances between this cult and that of South Arabia and Ethiopia. SYN was the state god of Hadramawt since the earliest inscriptions of this state. (Albright
1952, note 8, brings reasons for an early introduction of this god into Ḥadramawt). Ḥaṣāna of Abyssinia changed the crescent and disc for the cross on his coins when he turned to Christianity (4th cent. A.D.) (Littmann 1913, i, 60).

The exceptional temporary position of Taymā' may have stimulated the other town states of the oases of Arabia Deserta to partake to some degree in the civilisations of the surrounding countries in the north-east, the north-west and the south, while trying to preserve or to re-establish always again a certain amount of independance. Different scripts were used and developed. Even the clansmen of the nomadic tribes knew how to write. Nevertheless, pure camel nomadism was common. Agatharchides and Artemidorus (Diod. in C. Müller, Geogr. Graec. Minor, 184, Strabo xvi, 4, 18) in their accounts on the tribe of the Dbai in the lowlands (Ṭihāma) of 'Arḍr write: “They live merely from their camels. From these they fight, on these they travel. Their food is camel milk and camel meat”.

The scripts of the rock graffiti of the nomads of Arabia Deserta, which are spread from near the Ṣafātīc area south of Damascus and from the Sinai peninsula to the borders of Ṣadjān in South Arabia, form a unit though with strong regional (and probably temporal) variations which have been classified as Thamūdean scripts, although a part of these graffiti have been written by the tribe of Thamūd in its area round Dayān (Littmann 1940, van den Branden, J. Ryckmans 1956). In many respects these scripts are (and remained?) more archaic than the scripts of the settled populations, which were altered by their adaptation for monumental inscriptions (cf. J. Forenne 1955, 44 ff.). Related graffiti are even found in South Arabia especially along the desert margins (cf. Höflner, and Jammé 1955). That all “Thamūdean” inscriptions seem to have been written by nomads shows that the nomadic tribes must have had some awareness of interdependence and a certain spirit of solidarity and that their life was separated and rather independent from the oasis town states.

It is evident that this situation of camel nomadism in Arabia was very different from what we know of horse-riding nomadism in the northern steppes of Eurasia. One main reason for the strong difference certainly is that the long and hard winters of the north do not permit more than one extensive crop and hinder the development of oases, although humidity is greater. Where the sub-tropical desert is dotted with oases of restricted size as in many parts of Arabia north of the line from Wādī Bayṣṣ to Ṣadjān and to the Rubʿ al-Khāli, it seems that a balance of power could result there to some degree between the nomadic tribes on the one hand and the merchant town states on the other, while probably the inhabitants of oases, although often to live in bondage to townsmen or to nomads.

The history of nomadism in Arabia is closely connected with the word ‘Arḍ. In Semitic languages and pre-Islamic times, this word was only used for inhabitants of the Bedouin and oasis regions north of the Rubʿ al-Khāli. It especially meant the camel nomads but also included the oasis dwellers. Even Muhammad used the word ‘Arḍ for Bedouin. Only the Greeks have transmitted this name to the whole peninsula, probably already after the expeditions of Darius (Sylax). Theophrastus (372-287) calls Arabia Ἀρδαύων χερσόνησος (Hist. Plant. ix, ch. 2, § 2). Eratothenes (late 3rd century B.C., Strabo xv, 4, 3) gives its division into Arabia Eudaimōn and Arabia Ἐρέμων (Arabia Felix and Arabia Deserta of the Roman period). But already Euripides mentions “Arabia eudaimōn” in his Bacchae (16-18), and Aristophanes (Aves 144 f.) a “polis eudaimōn on the Erythraean Sea”, both in the late 5th century B.C. The South Arabsians never called themselves ‘Arḍāb.

We have no knowledge about the pre-Islamic history of the nomadic tribes south of the Rubʿ al-Khāli, north and east of Ḥadramawt and west of Ḫumayn. To-day, they are genuine camel nomads possessing some ḵamām, just as those of the North. They still have holy rocks and holy places near wells, where they bury their dead (van der Meulen, own experience, Thesiger). But they do not live in tents. They have tropical clothing and south-Semitic dialects. In mountain regions they use caves for shelter. They do not possess horses. Unlike the northern ḍāw they have stayed outside of known coalitions.

The fate of camel nomadism in Arabia was closely connected with that of caravan trade. So the decline of this trade must have been of great importance for the nomad. This decline slowly set in in the 4th or 3rd century B.C., when the tolls, which had to be paid on the road were constantly increased because of the political division of South Arabia into different states (Pliny xii, 14, 55). It became stronger when, from round 115 B.C., the straits of Bāb al-Mandāb were opened for direct traffic from Egypt to India. The overland incense traffic almost vanished, when this oversea traffic from the Roman Empire to India became important from about 48 B.C. (Strabo, ii, 5, 12, ibid., xvii, 7, 13, Pliny, vi, 23, 104). This must have been a hard blow for the kingdoms of South Arabia and even more for the Bedouins who took part in the overland traffic and sold camels for this.

The name Ḫarrabaitai (‘Arḍāb) was used by the great Abyssinian (Aksūm) king who erected the Monumentum Adultanum (cf. below, section d), of which we know the Greek version, probably before the middle 2nd century A.D. This is in his account of the submission of the Ḫidżād and ‘Aṣr north of the Sabaean and south of the Roman frontiers. Here “Arrabaitai” seems to signify the population of the hinterland of the Kinaidokolpitai who, according to C. Ptolemy, lived on the coast of Ḫidżād and of ‘Aṣr.

‘Arḍāb Bedouins had begun to interfere in the conflicts in South Arabia towards the 2nd cent. A.D. (J. Ryckmans 1951, 215 f., 1956). In the inscription Nāmil 71 to 73, A‘rāb and Khb-m-y-s are mentioned together several times. Perhaps Khb-m-y-s (Khumays ?), probably derived from khums) means the regular army (M. Höflner, letter), while A‘rāb means contingents of northern Bedouins on camels and on horseback. The inscription Maml 71 to 73 belongs to the third century A.D. (king Alḥān Naḥfān; cf. Mordtmann-Mittelwoch 218-220). The inscription “Ryckmans 535”, belonging to the same period, shows that camels and horses were used in the South Arabian armies (G. Ryckmans, in Musdon, 1956, 154 f.; on the chronology of this period, cf. v. Wissmann 1957). It should be investigated if there are earlier convincing indications of camel troops in South Arabia (cf. v. Wissmann-Höflner, 46).

The inscription “Ingrains i” does not point to such conditions. The preliminary translation we used in v. Wissmann-Höflner, 333, was wrong (cf. Drewes).

In 328 A.D., the inscription of al-Namāra, east of
Djâbal Hawrân, in the Syrian desert (RES 483), tells us: “This is the grave of Inama al-Kays (mrâ' Kays) b. 'Amr, the king of al the A'râb, who... and advanced successfully (?).” The siege of Nâjjân, the capital of Shammar” (Lidzbarski). We see that Inama al-Kays calls himself king of all A'râbs, although he is not in possession of Nâjjân on the north-eastern margin of agricultural South Arabia, but perhaps king of most of those Bedouin tribes who live in tents. i.e. A'râb. Nâjjân is at that time a town of “Shammar”, probably Shammar Yuharîsh (cf. Pirenne 1956, Jamme 1957, J. Ryckmans 1957, 22, note, Pirenne 1957, 59, note 4), who assumed the title of “King of Saba” and Dhubay Rayda'n and of Hadramawt and of Yammat” (Dhubay Rayda'n stands for the Hnymyr. Yammat probably is a name of the coastal region south of Hadramawt; Wissmann 1959). This title means that Shammar was or claimed to be king of the entire agricultural country of South Arabia.

In the early 5th century, when great parts of Northern Arabia belonged to the domain of the South Arabian king Abikarib A'sad, who according to tradition undertook a campaign into Persian territory, the title was assumed and now was worded as follows: “King of Saba’ and Dhubay Rayda'n and Hadramawt and Yammat and of their (pluralis majestatis) A'râb in the highlands (Central Arabia) and the Tilâm (lowlands of Hidayh and Asiyat).” Again only inhabitants of Desert Arabia are meant by A'râb (cf. map 4).

The constant wars between Rome and Persia and between Ethiopia and Saba’ and the economic decline of the Mediterranean regions, the rising competition of sea traffic—from which South Arabia had become eliminated—against overland traffic and trade, the decay of feudalised South Arabia and its interminable feudal and religious wars in the 3rd to 6th centuries A.D. gave rise to great insecurity in Arabia (cf. Boekest 1954, Sydney Smith, J. Ryckmans 1956 b). In the regions of steppe climate in the fertile crescent, nomadic tribes intruded into country of rain agriculture. Even oasis areas decayed or were given up entirely, especially in South Arabia along the borders of the desert, in the Hadramawt (cf. v. Wissmann-Höfner, 121; L. Le Baron Bowen), where camel nomadism penetrated from the north by invasions as well as by gradual infiltration. A renowned example is the neglect, bursting and desertification, of the old capital of Saba’, and the total breakdown of this town and its oasis. In Yaman and 'Uman, the strong feudalisation of the highland farmers, the 'Abîbîni, in their fortified castle-like dwellings, led to an extreme distillation of power and even to anarchy, as well as to tribal organisation and to feuds similar to those of the barbarised camel nomads. Gradually the nomadic population became more and more migratory over long distances in Arabia. Such migrations of entire tribes were mainly directed from South to North. In the South a part of the farming population became nomadic, while in the north the wars between Rome and Persia probably attracted such nomads, as could not sell their camels for the declining caravan trade, to serve in camel troops on the side of one of the two opponents. The Arab proverb: “Al-Yaman is the womb (the cradle) of the Arabs, and al-'Irak is their grave”, already suits this period. Nevertheless there have also been migrations in the opposite direction, like that of the Kindites into Hadramawt in the 6th century A.D. which according to al-Hamdânî amounted to more than 30,000 men (Forrer, 134 ff.). With the decline of power of the surrounding states, which were based on agriculture and had a much higher population density, Bedouin influence was rising. Czatkol (1953) demonstrates that, before this period of barbarisation, the social and economic way of living, which we call Bedouin, did not fully obtain the character familiar to us by the descriptions of Doughty, v. Oppenheim and Lawrence. Writing now disappeared among the nomads, but oral tradition flourished.

It would be interesting to know when the combined use, during a qamar, of the camel for the riding over long distances and of the horse for final attack, was employed for the first time, a skillful practice which was still carried out by 'Abd al-'Azîz b. Su'ûd. King Malchus (Malik) II of the Nabataeans (al-Abnâb) sent 1000 horses and 5000 foot for the assistance of Titus in his attack on Jerusalem about 67 A.D. (Hitti, 68). The rock-drawings accompanying the Sâfistic inscriptions in the Hâsa south-east of Damascus (2nd to 4th centuries or longer; cf. Littmann 1940) show that these true Bedouins made their razzias combining horse and camel. We also hear from Ammianus Marcellinus (4th cent. A.D.) that the Blemmyes made their raids in that way (xiv, 4, 3).

In South Arabia, the horse seems to have been always of smaller importance than in the north. Nevertheless we hear that among the presents sent by Yîth'â'amâr of Saba’ to Sabego in 715 B.C. there were horses. The Periphas Mari Erythraei (until 80 A.D.) tells that horses were shipped from Egypt to Mozau (Mauhid); cf. Wissman 1959) by the Greek merchants. Strabo (XVI, 4, 22, 16) when giving a short but good report on the agriculture of South Arabia, says that horses were lacking, and that their functions were carried out by camels. We have but few presentations of horses from South Arabia, which seem to be importations or copies from the north or to belong to late periods. Probably the horse only became of greater importance in South Arabia since Bedouin troops were used, i.e., since at least the 3rd century A.D. The inscription G. Ryckmans 355 (in Muson, 1956, 146 ff) from the late 3rd century A.D. tells us that horses and camels were used in South Arabian armies, and that there were horsemen beside the regular troops.


The Appearance of Camel Nomadism in North Africa.

It is surprising that the state and civilisation of the great river oasis of Egypt blocked for so long a period the spread of camel breeding and camel nomadism. It exercised a strong frontier control and showed an aversion against the Asiatic nomad. There is no specifically Egyptian word for "camel" (Albright 1950; cf. Préaux).

It has been supposed that the Sabaeans introduced the camel into the lowlands of North Ethiopia, when they colonised this country, perhaps some time in the beginning of the last millennium B.C., bringing with them the plough, terracing, and artificial irrigation. We have mentioned above that the colony was firmly established and probably old in the 5th century B.C. Even Conti Rossini supposed such an early introduction of the camel (103, 106). Yet he did not find any proof. There is no mention of the camel in the "Sabaean" inscriptions of Ethiopia (cf. above); but this again does not mean much, as the number of these inscriptions is still small. However, we may not forget that even today the camel has not been introduced into the highlands of Ethiopia, but has only spread in the lowlands and on the lower slopes. Near the harbours of northern Ethiopia, this area is a narrow strip of land, just as in Western Yaman.

There is one piece of information and one linguistic fact from which we may probably conclude that the Sabaeans did not introduce the camel to the African side of the Red Sea: Agatharchides (perhaps about 130 B.C.) gives a good and detailed description of the nomadic Troglydotes behind the African coast of the Red Sea north of Ethiopia (the later Blemmyes or Bediis). He does not mention any breeding of camels but only of cattle and goats (Diodor., cf. C. Müller, Geogr. Graec. Minor, 1, 153). Probably Agatharchides has taken over his story from a much earlier description (cf. von Wissmann 1957).

The linguistic fact is that the name of the camel in the Ge'ez language as well as in all the Semitic languages of Ethiopia is gamal as in the North Semitic languages and in Egypt, while ancient South Arabia merely used the word "\textit{hibil}" for it (Höfner by letter). It is only in one single inscription of the 3rd century A.D. (G. Ryckmans, Nr. 533) and then in the 6th century A.D. (Yusuf Dho Nuweš, G. Ryckmans, Nr. 507) that the word "\textit{gimal}" turns up in South Arabian inscriptions. The first known mention of the camel in the Ethiopic language is in the 4th century A.D. in Littmann, \textit{Aksum} 9 (1913).

We do not hear anything of the presence of the camel from hieroglyphs or from Greek or Roman authors or any sculpture or rock drawing either in Egypt or in any part of the Hellenistic period. There is one exception, however: When Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285-246) repaired the old roads from Koptos to the Nile to the Red Sea (173 km.) and opened a longer road from the same place to his new harbour town Berenike Troglyditič (380 km.) by founding eleven stations, he did this not only for foot passengers but also for merchants travelling on camels (Strabo XVI, 4, 44, XVII, 4, 45, 63, Pliny, h.n. VI, 102, 103; Berenike Troglyditič in 23° 51 in the Bay of Sikkat Bandar al-Kabīr). Strabo says that Koptos became a town belonging to Arabs as well as Egyptians, and that Arabs worked in the mines between Koptos and Myos Hormos. Pliny also mentions Arab tribes in the region of Berenike. Philadelphia had reopened the canal between the Nile and the Red Sea. He founded naval bases along the western coast of the Red Sea (cf. below). It is probable that the caravan camels and their Arab owners were introduced by Philadelphus and were transported by him to Philotera, to Myos Hormos and to Berenikē Troglyditič over sea from the coast of Northern Hijāz (Ritter II, 703). Ptolemy II seems to have put this coast of Northern Hijāz under his influence by establishing friendly relations with Daydān on the incense road, thus being able to divert the incense traffic which until that time had followed the road from Saba' and Ma'ān to Ghazzat on the Mediterranean, from Daydān to a new harbour on the Red Sea (T-sh-y-t ?) and then by boat to Egypt (cf. Tarn, appendix by Sidney Smith; Delbrueck). As Daydān was a colony of the kingdom of Ma'ān, which had developed north of Saba', the sarcophagus inscription of an incense trader of Ma'ān, living in Memphis, probably of 264 B.C. (Albright 1953, note 12), confirms this connection. This trader brought myrrh and other wares to Egypt on his own ships, and he brought byssos clothes to Arabia (Rhodokanakis, Kortenbeutel). As Ptolemy II and his successors were able to transport elephants on large boats on the Red Sea, the latter was easily able to transport camels. The Arabs who were brought to Egypt with their camels probably knew how to write the so-called Thamīdean script of northern Hijāz. Numerous Thamīdean inscriptions have been found in the eastern desert of Egypt, especially along the roads (Littmann 1940, 3, Green, J. Pirenne by letter).

We now may ask again, how the camel was brought to Ethiopia. There are two possibilities, I think. It was introduced either by Ptolemy II or his successors, or by the kings of the Ḥabashat, of Aksum, in about the 2nd century A.D.

Ptolemy II founded the fortified town of Ptolemiār Thērōn on the northernmost part of the Ethiopian coast (cf. the stele of Piḥom in Egypt). One of the stelae found in Adulis south of modern Maṣawwāt by Cosmas Indicopleustes (Winstedt) reported that Ptolemy III Euergetes (246-221) and his father hunted elephants in that region. We do not know when Berenike hē kāta Saba' (Strabo xvi, 4, 10, Berenike Epidirēs of Pliny VI, 29, 170; Conti Rossini against Kortenbeutel) was founded near modern ʿAssab, and when this southern Berenike was replaced by a colony called Arsinōe (Conti Rossini 60 ft., map, Strabo xvi, 4, 14, Pittschmann, Arsinōe, Pauly-Wissowa). We only recognise that the Ptolemies put the whole African coast of the Red Sea more and more under their naval influence and power. Ptolemaic shipping and trade were under strict state control. Before this time, Saba' may have had still influence on the old Ethiopian colony, especially on the coast, in spite of its difficult position in South Arabia between the new strong states of Ma'ān in the North and Katabān in the South, Katabān reaching as far as Aden and the Bab al-Mandab straits. There was a Sabalitikon Stōma south of Ptolemiār Thērōn (Artemidorus according to Strabo), there was a place called Sabat (Šabāt ?) opposite the island of Maṣawwāt (Strabo, Pliny, Cf. Ptolemy), and there was "the wealthy town of Saba'", probably in the bay of modern ʿAssab (Strabo xvi, 4, 8-10, cf. Conti Rossini, Map pl. 16).

On account of the internecine wars in South Arabia, the Ptolemies must have found it rather easy to interfere on the Ethiopian coast. As they
transported elephants in large boats from this coast to Egypt; they may have brought camels to the inhabitants of this coast from Northern Hidjâs. Before about 225 B.C., the Katabâniân harbour of ʿAden was an important place of trans-shipment, where freights came from Egypt and India (cf. von Wissmann 1937). When at that time the new state of Ḥumyar replaced Katabân in ʿAden and ʿAden was destroyed, Potlemaic ships were more and more successful in sailing directly to India. It seems that the kingdom of Aksûm (Ethiopia), which is for the first time mentioned in the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea (about 82-96 A.D.), was a powerful state already at that time and learned much from Graeco-Roman navigation in the Red Sea. Then a king of Aksûm, who probably lived in the mid 2nd century A.D. (Winstedt; Mommsen, Römische Geschichte V, 599; Mordtmann-Mittwoch 6) according to the Monumentum Adultum, which he erected, built a great empire from the frontiers of Egypt to Somalland (cf. Dittenberger, 287-296; Littmann 1913, i, 42 ff.). He conquered the coast of Arabia and its hinterland from Leukê Kômê in Northern Hidjâs as far south as the frontier of the Sabæan kingdom (Wâdî Bayyঀ in southern ʿAsîr; Wissmann Ic., 1955). He mentions that he used a navy for this conquest. His name is not known. The Monumentum shows that Aksûm had become a sea power at that time, perhaps supported by Rome. The Monumentum was written in the Greek language and script. Already in the first century A.D. (Periplus) Aksûm had cultivated the Greek language. So it may also have been the king of the Monumentum Adultum, who introduced the camel to Ethiopia from his colony in Northern Hidjâs. That period must have been a time of quickly rising national consciousness in Ethiopia, in which an official Ethiopian script was probably developed, based on the monumental and cursive Sabæan scripts and influenced by the Greek (left to right, numerals) and the “Thamûdeân” script (cf. J. Ryckmans 1955, Ullendorff, Drewes). In the third century, the South of the Red Sea seems to have been under Ethiopian supremacy, while direct trade between the Roman Empire and India had become reduced (Sir M. Wheeler, Wissmann 1959).

The first African people who became camel breeders after those Arab tribes, which had been probably introduced to Berenêkê Troglydityêkê and Myos Hormos by Potlemy II., seem to have been the Bhrûmyês or Bedjûj (Pauly-Wissowa, “Blemmyes”, by Sethe). According to Strabo xvi, 286, 819, and Ethiopian inscriptions, they lived south-east of Syene between the Nile and the Red Sea. In Strabo’s time they were “not very numerous or warlike” (xvi, i, 53), breeding sheep, goats and cattle. They were no danger for the Empire then. In the following centuries, however, they must have learned camel breeding from their Arab neighbours to such a degree that they became real, and “excellent”, raiding camel nomads. Under Decius (249-251 A.D.), their camel razzias became difficult for the Roman Empire. Twenty years later, they were already completely masters of the roads between the Nile and the Red Sea. The trade from Egypt to India on that route had become totally dependent on the good will of the Blemmyes (cf. Bensch, 264 f.). Under Probus (276-284) the Blemmyes temporarily occupied Koptos and Potleman. Diocletian had to pay tributes to them in 296 on the frontier near Syene. This emperor had called the “Nobatae” (Nobades, i.e. Nubians ?) for help against the Blemmyes and had given them the Dodekaschoinos as a base of settlement (Procopius, Persian War XIX. Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. “Nubai”). In the fourth century A.D., the Blemmyes and the Arab tribes of Egypt with their camels and now also horses became always more dangerous to the Empire by their raids (Ammian. Marcellin. xiv, 4, 3). The Empire had to draw up troops of camel riders against them. At the time of emperor Valens (r. 370), new Arab tribes migrated across the Isthmus of Suez and occupied the northern part of the “Arabian” Desert east of the Nile, probably as far as the latitude of Thebes. They may have reinforced camel nomadism and fighting on camel’s back in the regions round Egypt.

On the rock drawings he discovered in the “Arabian” Desert east of the Nile, H. A. Winkler recognised a “Blemmyyan” group, in age between that of cattle breeders and that of the Islamic era. That this group must be dated in this period seems to be certain (Greek and Coptic letters, Hellenistic influence, typical brands). It mostly shows armed people (with bow, spear, sword and rectangular shield) riding on camels or also on horseback. Here, the camel is the main livestock, shown beside horse, donkey and cattle. Winkler says (1918): “In all the former rock drawings peace prevails. In the pictures of the camel-owners all is war. And war they brought, wherever they went”.

The author of this article is not qualified to describe the development of nomadism in the dry belts of Africa. When taking the rock drawings as a basis, it looks as if there has been an early period of cattle-breeding, not only in the steppes of the Sûdân and East Africa, but also in the regions of the Sahârâ. Even if we admit that the climate may have periodically been a little moister than at present, it may be doubted whether horned cattle were the main livestock in those desert regions, for which they are not well fitted, although it may be that cattle were introduced earlier than sheep and goats. It seems probable to me that, when nomadic life was completely installed, cattle as holy animals were represented on the rocks although they were of secondary importance in the nomadic economy compared with the goats and the sheep. We may remember that the “Thamûdeân” rock drawings in Western Arabia show the hunted animals and the camel, but very little of goats and sheep, although we can be sure that the nomads of those regions then possessed flocks of these animals.

According to Lhote 1953, rock drawings show that in the area of Ghadâmês, Fezzân, Taessíl and Ahaggar, the horse and a war chariot were introduced in an early period, according to Lhote’s hypothesis about 1200 B.C. by “Sea Peoples” from the Aegaean region. Among those war chariot people riding was developed at some time later on without rein and snaffle, just in the way ancient authors describe horse riding of the North African nomads of their own time (Strabo, Polybius, Silius Italicus). In the middle of the 3rd century B.C. riding had fully replaced the use of the war chariot in North African wars. Nomadic razzias were carried out on horseback.

It is curious that we know nothing about the ways the camel was introduced totally dependent on North-West Africa and the Sahârâ. In literature the camel appears for the first time there in Caesar’s De bello Africano (c. lxiii, 4) for the year 46 B.C., when 22 camels were among the booty taken from king Juba. But Juba was a man with wide and varied scientific, especially geographical, interests, and a collector in
the Hellenistic style. It seems probable that he had imported these animals to try out their usefulness in North Africa. Only in Cyrenaica the camel may have been bred in greater numbers in that period. It is shown on coins of the mint of L. Lollius, a commander in Cyrenaica under Pompey. Then there is a hiatus. From the 2nd or perhaps 3rd century, a statuette of a camel rider and a relief showing a hippodrome with a race of chariots drawn by camels were found in the necropolis of Hadrumetum (Sousse, Tunisia). The next indication in literature, however, is for the year 363 A.D. The Roman comes of the province of Africa demands 4000 transport camels from the inhabitants of Leptis Magna on the Syrtre (Ammanin. Marcellin. xxviii, c. 6, 5, xxix, 5, 55). About 400 A.D. there is the report of Synesius that herds of camels and horses then formed the wealth of the inhabitants of Cyrenaica. In the 5th century reports on camel breeding become always more abundant in North Africa, mainly in the regions round the Syrtre.

Most authors, especially Gautier (190 ff.), Gsell and others have concluded from these rather meagre sources that the camel was eventually introduced to North Africa across the Mediterranean Sea. When, however, we consider the position of the Blemmyes in Upper Egypt in the 3rd century A.D. (cf. above), the chain of oases west of Egypt also seems to be a probable route. Besides, we must not forget that any way south of the Libyan Desert remained outside the area of which we have historical reports.

Perhaps future linguistic research as well as excavations may give us help in solving these questions. In the language of the Beja(Blemmyes) the main name of the camel is ḫām (ḫām), in northern Nubia it is ḫam (ham) (Professor Dr. O. Rüssler by letter). The Tibbu call the camel ǧem, and this name seems to have been spread by them far over the eastern part of the Sudan, where Tibbu are told to have introduced the camel (Bensch 171 according to Barth). So in the Mandara Mountains (northern Cameroons) there is called ǧem, the male camel ǧel ǧem (Barth, ii, 534, footnote). Even the Masai call the camel en-tomes (Nandi, tomes). In the Berber languages including that of the Tawārīk, a main designation of the camel is akhām or alem. From akhām the Haussa name rako is derived, and the Nuppe name rakum are certainly derived (Q. Rüssler). All these names do not seem to be derived from Arab names, but there are other names showing such an etymology.


(H. v. Wissmann)

III. Pre-Islamic Arabia

(a) Sources.

(b) History.

(c) Political Relationships.

(d) Moral Outlook.

(e) Religion.

(a) Sources. Our knowledge of the Bedouin in pre-Islamic Arabia is derived mainly from two sources. Firstly, there has been preserved a certain amount of pre-Islamic poetry. Secondly, there are commentaries on this poetry and on old Arab proverbs, composed by Muslim scholars of the second Islamic century and later, and containing much traditional material about events in pre-Islamic times; this
material was also collected by other scholars in special works. The authenticity of pre-Islamic poetry has been denied by modern scholars, notably by D. S. Margoliouth and Taha Husayn, but their theories have not been accepted by the majority of scholars who, while admitting some falsifications, consider that on the whole pre-Islamic poetry has been faithfully transmitted (cf. A. J. Arberry, *The Seven Odes*, London 1957, 228-45). Similarly, the historical traditions, though once regarded by Western scholars as worthless, are now mostly held to have some factual basis and to reflect the conditions of life in the Dakhliyya, even though they are insufficient for a proper history. In certain points this traditional material is confirmed by statements of the Kur'an or inferences from these, and is both confirmed and supplemented by the numerous inscriptions found in Arabia by modern archaeologists.

(b) History. From the dawn of history nomads from the Arabian steppe have been pressing on the surrounding lands of settled civilisation. At some periods the pressure has been greater and the penetration of the settled lands deeper, and the nomads have been said to come in "waves". In pre-Christian times Hebrews, Aramaeans, Arabs and Nabataeans entered Syria and 'Irak, while in the six centuries before the Hidjra there was further pressure from Arabs and Palmyrenes. The nomads would come first of all to raid, but frequently they would themselves settle (e.g., the Tanthkh in 'Irak about 225 A.D.). Close relations between settled nomads and those still in the desert facilitated trade. Only nomads could conduct caravans of merchandise across deserts, and only strong bodies of nomads could guarantee the safe transit of such caravans. Thus in the history of the Byzantine and Sassanian empires the nomads appear in the two roles of raider and trader.

The two empires tried in various ways to defend themselves from the hostile and predatory incursions of nomads. The most effective way was found to be the employment of semi-nomadic rulers on the imperial frontiers to ward off from the settled lands raiding parties from the heart of the steppes. In 'Irak this rôle was played by the Lahmid kings of al-Hira from about 300 A.D. to the end of the dynasty in 602. On the Byzantine frontier the corresponding rôle was played by the Ghassânids, but they were later in attaining importance (it was in 529 that Justinian granted certain titles to the Ghassânid king), and apparently had only a camp-like position. 'Neighbourly protection' (djiwar) or, in the case of the smaller groups and subdivisions, 'sub-tribes' and 'clans', but those terms do not correspond exactly to Arabic terms. There are a number of words in Arabic for such social and political units, but the commonest usage is to refer to a tribe or clan simply as Banî Fudān ("the sons of so-and-so").

The structure of these pre-Islamic tribes has not yet been adequately studied in the light of recent advances in social anthropology. They are presented in Arab tradition as being primarily constituted by kinship in the male line, though there are certain exceptions to this. A person not related to a group by blood (not a sahih or samim) could enjoy some of the privileges of membership, above all protection. He might do so as an 'ally' (khil), a 'protected neighbour' (djar), or a 'client' (masi). The parties to an 'alliance' (hif) were formally equal, but when a single individual lived as an ally among a tribe or clan, he tended to fall into a subordinate or dependent position. 'Neighbourly protection' (djiwar), on the other hand, implied some superiority, at least of a temporary kind, in the person granting it; it could be either temporary or permanent. The status of a 'client' was acquired by a slave on his emancipation. Attached to the tribe were slaves; male Arabs could become slaves through being captured in raids when children; and there were also Abyssinian slaves. A man could be expelled from his tribe for killing a kinsman or for conduct harmful to the tribe, and might wander alone (as a samim) or else attach himself to another tribe as a guest.

There are strong reasons, however, for thinking that the traditional view that the members of the tribe or clan in the strict sense were patrilineally related is not a complete account of the matter, even though some tribes were so constituted. Firstly, there are numerous traces of matriline among certain Arab tribes in Muhammad's time, and some facts which suggest that it was being superseded by patriline. Though it is uncertain how extensive matriline was and what it involved in practice, there is sufficient evidence to cast doubt on the value of the purely patrilineal genealogies found in the works of the later Muslim scholars. It seems possible that, in some cases where matriline prevailed, the later
scholars, finding no patrilineal genealogy for a member of the group, argued that he must have been a halif; perhaps this is how to explain the fact that the head of the clan of Zuhra et Mecca was a halif (al-Akhnas b. Sharif).

Secondly, it has been argued that some of the tribal names were originally the names of groups with a local or political basis, and did not indicate common descent (cf. Nallino, Raccolta di Scritti, iii, 72-79). This has probably happened in some cases, and it is then the later genealogists who have transformed group names into eponymous ancestors; but some of the weaker tribes near Mecca had thus become largely dependent on Kuraysh. Some still weaker ones had banded themselves together and were known as the Ahlabah, probably meaning "mixed multitudes" (the view of Lammens that the Ahlabah were Abyssinian slaves contradicts statements in Ibn Hisham, 245, and Ibn Sa'd, ii, 81 and has little to recommend it; cf. Montgomery Watt, Muhammad at Medina, 81 and M. Hamidullah in Studi Orientalistici in Onore di Giorgio Levi della Vida, i, 434-47).

The affairs of a tribe were usually settled in an assembly or meeting (madjlis) of all the members. All might speak, but most weight attached to the words of men of recognised authority. The leader or chief of the tribe, the sayyid, was appointed by acclamation in the assembly. He usually came from the family considered most honourable, but there was no law of primogeniture. In the harsh conditions of the desert it was essential that the chief should himself be able to lead effectively and a minor could not have done this. The sayyid had certain duties, especially in respect of the relations of the tribe (or clan) to other tribes (or clans). He could make treaties which bound the tribe, and was responsible...
for ransoming prisoners and for seeing that blood-wit was paid. He usually also claimed the right to be present when people were being put to the test in order to establish his ascendancy over a number of other tribes, so that they entered into alliance with him and carried out his orders; but this was resented, and the alliance broke up on the removal of the forceful personality.

(d) Moral Outlook. The life of the Badw was set in natural conditions of great harshness. At most times the means of sustenance were less than sufficient for the population. Adult males were killed, and women and children captured and then held to ransom or sold as slaves. The lex talonis was universally recognised, and served to anent wanton and irresponsible killing, since it was a matter of honour for a tribe to protect or avenge its members and those attached to it. In the older days a life had to be avenged by a life, but in Muhammad's time there was a tendency, which he tried to develop, of substituting for the life the payment of a blood-wit (idya), normally a hundred camels for an adult male.

It was sometimes felt, however, to be unmanly thus to 'substitute milk for blood'.

The qualities admired by the Badw were those required for success in the hard life of the steppe. Loyalty to the kinship-group had a high place, and involved readiness to help one's kinsman against a stranger on any occasion. With this was coupled fortitude or manliness (kamasa), which denoted 'bravery in battle, patience in misfortune, persistence in revenge, protection of the weak and defiance of the strong' (R. A. Nicholson, A Literary History of the Arabs, Cambridge 1930, 79).

The poets played an important rôle in the life of the pre-Islamic Arabs. The ode (kasida) usually contained either majdhib, boastings, that is, praise of one's own tribe for its fortitude and other virtues, or matkhul, revilings (also hidja, satire), that is, disgraice of one's enemies. It was held that human excellence or the lack of it was to a large extent inherited. A hero's deeds showed the heroic qualities of his family, clan and tribe. Great store was thus set on the reputation of the group. The power of the poet to convince his tribe of its own worth and to lower the morale of the enemy was very great. Poets had probably more power in pre-Islamic Arabia than the press in modern times. The Arabs felt there was something supernatural or magical about them.

Although descent counted for so much, it is not clear (as noted above) to what extent this was reckoned patrilineally and to what extent matrilineally. Four types of pre-Islamic marriage are described by al-Buhãrî (67, 37, 1; translated in Montgomery Watt, Muhammad at Medina, 378); two of these, though provision for determining paternity is described by al-Buhãrî, seem to belong to a primarily matrilineal system. The sources, moreover, suggest that al-Buhãrî's account is not exhaustive. Certainly it was common for the woman to live with her kinsmen, and for her husband merely to ‘visit' her for short periods—for example, when their tribes happened to be camped close to one another.

(e) Religion. Pre-Islamic poetry suggests that for the nomadic tribes a quasi-religious dynamic was produced by a belief in the human excellence of the tribal stock. Regard for honour or reputation (hasab) was the driving force in much of their activity. In this sense it may be said that the real religion of the Badw was a tribal humanism. The widespread belief in fate among the Arabs was not so much a religious belief as a factual belief, viz. a belief that the world was so constituted that, as often as not, human efforts to avert disaster would be thwarted by circumstances. Fate was not worshipped as a deity. Apart from this there were a number of cults observed by the Arabs, each centred at a particular shrine (see arts. Al-Lat, Manat, etc.). Some of these were of social importance, since round the shrines was a sacred area (haram), while the institution of the sacred month was administered from the Ka'ba at Mecca. Such sacred times and places, in which blood feuds temporarily ceased, made it possible for many Badw to come together for trade and other purposes. On the whole, however, these cults seem to have little religious importance, properly speaking, in the life of the Badw.

Christianity had spread widely in Arabia when Muhammad began to preach, and some nomadic groups were at least nominally Christian. Judaism was also found, and some of those called 'Jews' in the records were probably Arabs who had adopted Judaism; but, though they had close relations with Badw, none of them appears to have been nomadic.


BAENA [see BAYYANA].

BAEZA [see BAYYASA].
BAGGĀRA — BAGHCE SARAY

BAGH [see BUSTAN].

AL-BAGHAWI, AS-ṢAḤHĀB MUḤAMMAD AL-ḤUSAYN B. 
MAḤMūD B. MUGHAL FIGHT-AprāH (or IBN AL-FARRĀH), 
a doctor of the Shafi‘ school, traditionist, and 
commentator on the Kur‘ān. His tābara was Rukn al-
Dīn and Muh’īy ‘l-Sunnah. He came from the village of 
Bāgh or Bāghshūr near Hārāt (cf. al-Sam‘ānī, 
f. 86a). Al-Farrāh (furrier) comes from his father’s 
occupation. He studied in the Madīnā at the kādot al-
Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad al-Mawr al-Rūdghī, becoming 
his favourite pupil, and heard traditions from a 
number of traditionists. He was noted for piety and 
asceticism, and observed ceremonial purity while 
teaching. Although he wrote on various subjects, 
the work for which he is most famous is his Masāhīb 
al-Sunnah (or al-Dudī). This consists of a collection 
of traditions arranged according to their subject-
matter. In each chapter he first gives traditions 
which are sound (ṣāḥīb) meaning these traditions by 
these traditions from the Shāhīfī school. He says he may 
include none which are spurious (mawdu‘).

The inscriptions are dispensed with, 
but the arrangement according to the degree of 
authority is a sufficient guide to what is accepted. 
Al-Baghawi declares that his purpose was to provide 
material for religious people which would help them 
to live a life pleasing to God. Editions have been 
printed; an English translation was published by 
A. N. Matthews (Calcutta 1809-10), and another, 
with some arrangement of the text, by Maulana 
Fazl-ul Karim with the Arabic and English in 
parallel columns (Calcutta 1958-9). Al-Baghawi’s 
other important works are listed in Brockelman. 
He died in Mawr al-Rūdghī in 516/1122, but Ibn Khallikan 
mentions also 510/1117. Al-Dhababi says he may 
have been eighty years of age, but al-Subki suggests 
that he may have been nearly ninety.

Bibliography: Dhababi, Tadh. al-buffa, iii, 52 f.; Subhī, Tabābī al-Shafī‘yya al-Hubra, iv, 
214 ff.; Ibn Khallikan, No. 177; Yāsūt, passim; 
Ibn al-Imām, Shabāb Shabā akhah, iv, 46 ff.; 
Brockelman, I, 447 ff.; S. L., 520 ff.; Sarks, 
Dict. encyc. de bibli. arab., 573 f.; Goldziber, Muh. 
Stud., ii, 263, 270 f. (J. Robson)

BAGHBUR [see FASGFUR].

BAGHČE SARAY [Turkish: *Garden Palace*], 
i in Russian orthography: BAGHČ-SARAJ, the capital of the 
Krim Tatar state throughout the whole 
(rule of the Giray dynasty 
[6th] from about 1423 to 1783, lies in lat. 44° 45' N. 
and long. 35° 35' E., 32 km. south-west of Simferopol*, 
in a narrow, 7 km. long, gorge of the Čerik Şu 
(“Foul Water”). Bāghče Saray arose between the 
old administrative centre of the Crimea, Eski Yurt, 
in the west, where the Krim Khans were buried 
until the 16th/16th century and the ancient Karaja 
settlement, Çufut Ka‘f (or “fort of the Jews”) in the 
east (in Karaja: Kirk Yer, “40 Places”); it developed 
from an extensive burial ground that the 
majority of the Krim Khans, Menglı Giray [q.v.] 
began in 1503-1504 (909 A.H., according to an
Baghdad is situated on both banks of the Tigris, at 33° 26' 18" Lat. N. and 44° 23' 0" Long. E. respectively. Founded in the 8th century A.D. it continued to be the centre of the 'Abbasid Caliphate till its fall, and the cultural metropolis of the Muslim world for centuries. After 1258 it became a provincial centre and remained under the Ottomans the centre of the Bagdad wilayet. In 1921 it became the capital of modern Iraq.

History.

The name Baghdad is pre-Islamic, related to previous settlements on the site. Arab authors realise this and as usual look for Persian origins (cf. Makdisi, al-Balad, iv, 101; Ibn Rusta, 108). They give different hypothetical explanations, the most common of which is “given by God” or “Gift of God” (or the Idol). (see Khatib, i, 58-9 (Cairo); Yâkût, i, 678-9; Abu 'l-Fida', i, 292; Ibn al-Djawzi, Manâkib, 6; Bakri, i, 169; Ibn al-Fakhr, Mashhad MS. i, 29 b). Modern writers generally tend to favour this Persian derivation (cf. Salmon, Introduction, 23-4; Le Strange, Baghdad, 10-11; Streek, Landschaft, i, 45-50; Herzfeld, Paikuli, 153; W. Budge, By Nile and Tigris, i, 178; JRIA., i, 46-94). Others tend to give the name an Aramaic origin meaning, “the home or enclosure of sheep” (Y. Ghanima and A.-Karmali in Lughat al-'Arab, iv, 27; vi, 748. Note Tabari’s reference to Sîk al-Bâkhr, “the cow market”, on the site of Baghdad (iii, 277). Delitsch favours an Aramaic origin without explaining the meaning (Delitsch, Paradises, 206, 238).

A legal document of the time of Hammurabi (1800 B.C.) mentions the city of Bagdadu (Schorr, Albabylonische Rechtsurkunden No. 197 I. 17.) This indicates that the name was in use before Hammurabi and definitely before any possible Persian influence. Bag and Hu are rendered by the same sign. However a boundary stone from the time of the Kassite King Nazimartush (1341-1316 B.C.) mentions the city Pilari on the bank of “Nah. Sharri” in the district of Bagdadi (De Morgan, Délégation en perse, i, 86-92). This with the mention of Bagdatha several times in the Talmod makes Bag the more acceptable reading (Obermeyer, Landschaft Babylonien, 1929, 147 ff.; Jewish Encyc., Baghdad). Another boundary stone of the reign of the Babylonian king Marduk-apaliddin (1208-1195 B.C.) mentions the city Bagdad (Délégation en Perse, iii, 32-39).

Adad-nirari II (911-891 B.C.) plundered places amongst which was Bagdadu (Synchronistic History, iii L. 12 = K BI, 200). In the 8th century B.C. Bagdad became an Aramaean settlement. Tigtalpîssar III (745-727 B.C.) mentions Bagdudu in connexion with an Aramaean tribe (Delitsch, Paradises, 238).

From this it is only fair to admit that the origins of the name are not clear. The fact that Bag was adopted by the Iranians about the 8th century B.C. to denote “God”, and that it figured in personal names does not change the situation (Reallexikon, i, 341.

Al-Mansûr called his city Madinat al-Salâm (city of peace), in reference to paradise (Kur'ân, vi, 127; x, 26). This was the official name on documents.
coins, weights etc. Variations of the name, esp. Baghdad and appellations such as Madinat al-Manṣūr, Madinat al-Khulafā’ and al-Zawrā’ were used (Ibn al-Fakhrī, f. 296; Yākūt, i, 678; Ibn Rusta, 108). Zawrā’ seems to be an old name as the Fakhri states (Ibn al-Fakhrī, f. 296). Fakhri 143. 5

After careful exploration, he chose the site of Baghdad for military, economic and climatic considerations. It stood on a fertile plain where cultivation was good on both sides of the river. It was in the middle of Mesopotamia, and enjoyed a temperate and healthy climate and was fairly safe from mosquitoes (Ya'qūbī, 235-8; Tabari, ii, 271-5; Yākūt, i, 679-80; Mandābā, 7-8; Muḥammad, Aḥsan al-Taḥāṣim, 119-120; Ibn al-Aḍhīr, v, 426-7; Ibn al-Djawzl, 7; Ya'qūbī, ii, 449; Fakhri, 143-5). Apocryphal stories about its merits and al-Manṣūr’s destiny to build it found circulation later (cf. Ya'qūbī, Buldān, 237; Fakhri, 144; Tabari, v, 234-5; Ibn al-Djawzl, Mandābā, 7-8).

Baghdād was to succeed Babylon, Seleucia and Ctesiphon and to outshine them all. Ya'qūbī (278-891), and Ibn al-Fakhrī (290-903), give early detailed descriptions of Baghdad by quarters, while Suhrawardī (c. 900 A.D.) describes the net of canals in the area. The city with its fortifications and its inner plan looks like a big fortress. There was first a deep ditch, 40 dhīrāt (- 20.27 m.7 wide, surrounding the city, then a quay of bricks, then the first wall 18 dhīrāt (- 9 m.), at the base, followed by a space 56.9 metres in width ( = 100 dhīrāt, see for measures Rayyis, Kharājī) left empty for defensive purposes. Then came the main wall of sun-burnt bricks—34.14 metres high, 50.2 metres wide at the bottom and 14.22 metres at the top—with great towers numbering 28 between each two gates except those between the Kufa and Baṣra gates which numbered 29. On each of the gates a dome was built to overlook the city, with quarters below for the guards. Then came a space 170.70 metres wide where houses were built. Only officers and loyal followers were allowed to build here, and yet each road had two strong gates which could be slammed. Then came a simple third wall enclosing the large inner space where only the caliph’s palace (Bāh al-Dhahab), the great mosque, the dużmads, houses of the sons of the caliph, and two saḥāfas, one for the chief of the guard and the other for the chief of police, were built. To ensure control of the city and to facilitate communications internally and with caravan routes externally, the city was divided into four equal parts divided by two roads running from its equidistant gates. The Khurāsān gate (also called Bāb al-Dawla) was to the N.E., the Baṣra gate to the S.W., the Syria gate to the N.W. and the Kufa gate to the S.E. To get to the inner circle, one had to cross the ditch and to pass five doors, two at the outer wall, two huge doors at the great wall and one door at the inner wall (see Ya'qūbī, Buldān, 238-45; Tabari, ii, 322-3, Ibn al-Djawzl, Mandābā, 9-10; Khatīb, 9-12; Ibn al-Aḍhīr, v, 427-8, 439; Ya'qūbī, ii, 449; Ibn al-Fakhrī, MS, f. 33a).

Ancient imperial traditions are also noticeable in the plan. The seclusion of the caliph from his people, the grandiose plan of the palace and the mosque to show the greatness of the new dawla, the division of the people in separate quarters which could be
locked and guarded at night—all testify to that.

Al-Mansur granted some devoted followers and captains tracts of land by the gates outside the city, and gave his soldiers the outskirts (arbad) to build and granted some of his kinsfolk outlying places (adrâj) (Ya'qubi, ii, 449-50; cf. Ibn Hawkal, i, 240). The glory of the Round City was the Green Dome, 48.36 metres high, towering over the palace with a mounted horseman on top. It fell in 329/941 on a stormy night, probably struck by a thunderbolt (Süli, Ridâ, 229, Ibn al-Djawzi, Muntazam, vi, 317-18; Mandkib, 11; Abu 'l-Mahasin, iii, 270; Khatib, 12). However its walls lasted much longer, and they finally crumbled in 633/1235 A.D. (Ibn al-Fuwati, 303, Sibt Ibn al-Djawzi, Mir'ât al-Zamân, viii, 67). Marble and stones were used in the building of the Bab al-Dhahab, and gold decorated its gate. It continued to be the official residence for about half a century, and though Rashíd neglected it, Ìml makes the distance between each two gates 800-915 (Ya'qubi, ii, table 161). Both traditions are reminiscent of the Shu'ubiyâ controversy. The city was built mainly of sun-burnt bricks.

Ya'qubî reports that the plan was drawn in 141/755 (Ya'qubi, Buldân, 238) but work started on 1 Jumâdâ 145/2 Aug. 762 (Khwarizmi's report in Khatibi 2; cf. Wiet, Ya'qubi, 12, n. 4). Four architects worked on the plan of the city. Hâdiyyâ b. Arât was the architect of the mosque (Tabari (Cairo), vi, 265, 237; Ya'qubî, 245). Al-Mansûr assembled 100,000 workers and craftsmen to work in the construction (Ya'qubî, 238, Tabari, iii, 277). A canal was drawn from Karkhâya canal to the site to provide water for drinking and for building operations (Ya'qubî, 238). It seems that in 485/673 the palace, mosque and dwâns at least were completed and al-Mansûr moved to Baghdad (Tabari, iii, 373, Khatibi, 2). By 149/766 the Round City was completed (Tabari, iii, 333; Khatibi, 2-3).

The 'Round City' of Al-Mansûr is a remarkable example of town planning. It was circular so that the centre was equidistant from the different parts and could be easily controlled or defended. Arab traditions consider this design unique (Ya'qubî, 238; Ibn al-Fâolith, f. 33b; Khatibi, 67; Dhahabi, Dâwash, i, 76). However, the circular plan is not unfamiliar in the Near East. The plan of Uruk is almost circular (V. Christian, Altertumskunde, ii, table 13). Assyrian military camps are circular enclosures. Creswell enumerates eleven cities that were oval or circular, amongst which are Harrân, Agbatana, Hatra and Dârâjdûr. Dârâjdûr bears a remarkable resemblance to the city of Mansûr in its plan (Creswell, Early Muslim Arch, (short), 171-3; Meissner, Babylonien und Assyrien, i, table 161).

It is likely that the architects of the Round city knew of such plans. Ibn al-Fâolith indicates that the choice of the plan was between the square and the circle and that the latter is more perfect (Buldân, MS, f. 33b). It is however more probable that the idea of the circular fort was responsible for the plan. Tabari states "al-Mansûr made four gates for (the city) on the line of military camps" (Tabari (Cairo), vi, 265).

There are different reports on the dimensions of the city of al-Mansûr. A report makes the distance from the Kûfâ gate to the Kûfâ gate 800 dâîrâ (= 405.12 metres) and from the Syrian gate to the Bahra gate 500 dâîrâ (= 303.12 metres). Both reports underestimate the size of the city. A third report given by Rabîh, one of the builders of the city, gives the measurement as one mile between each two gates (or 4000 dâîrâ mursalâ or 1848 metres: D. Rayyis, 278; Khatibi, 8). This estimate is given in Ibn al-Djawzi, Mandkib, 9; Yakût, i, 235; Abu 'l-Mahasin, i, 347; Irblî, Târîh, 54). It is confirmed by the measurement carried by the orders of Mu'tâdî and reported...
by Badr al-Mu'tadiid (Khaṭṭābī, 5; Abū 'l-Mahāsīn, i, 341). This makes the diameter of the city 2352 metres. Ya'qūbī's estimate of the distance between each pair of gates outside the khandaḳ (or 2534.5 metres) becomes probable in this light (Buldān, 238-9).

Various reports are given of al-Manṣūr's expenditure on the city. One report makes the cost 18 million, understood to mean dinārs (Khaṭṭābī, 5; Ibn al-Djāwzī, Manāšīb, 34; Yākūt, i, 683; Irībīlī, Tābrīz, 543). A second puts it at a hundred million dirhams (Abū 'l-Mahāsīn, i, 341). However, the official report based on caliphal archives states that al-Manṣūr spent on the Round City four million, eight hundred and eighty three dirhams (Tabārī, iii, 326; Muḥaddasī, Aḥsan al-Takabīsī, 121; Khaṭṭābī, 5-6; see also Ibn al-Athlīrī, v, 419; Ibn al-Djāwzī, Manāšīb, 34). This is understandable if we take into account the low cost of labour and provisions and the strictness of al-Manṣūr in supervising his accounts.

In 157/773 al-Manṣūr built a palace on the Tigris below the Khūrasān gate, with spacious gardens, and called it al-Khūlīd. The place was free of mosquitoes and noted for the freshness of its air. The name was reminiscent of paradise (Tabārī, iii, 379; Khaṭṭābī, 14; Yākūt, ii, 763; Ibn al-Djāwzī, Manāšīb, 12; Ibn al-Athlīrī, vi, 71; Ibn al-Fākhrī, i, 370).

Strategic considerations, al-Manṣūr's policy of dividing the army, and lack of space soon led the caliph to build a camp for his heir al-Maḥdī on the East side of the Tigris. The central part was the camp of al-Maḥdī (later called Rusāfā after a palace built by al-Rašīdī), where his palace and the mosque were built, surrounded by the houses of officers and followers. The commercial side was soon expressed in the famous sība of Bāb al-Tāk. The military side is shown by a wall and a ditch surrounding the camp of al-Maḥdī. Work started in 151/768 and ended in 157/773. Rusāfā was almost opposite the city of al-Manṣūr (Ya'qūbūlī, Bulūdān, 251-3; Iṣṭakhaṭī, 83-4; Khaṭṭābī, 23-5; Ibn al-Djāwzī, Manāšīb, 12-13; Muḥaddasī, 121; Abū 'l-Mahāsīn, ii, 16; Yākūt, ii, 78).

Baghdād expanded rapidly in buildings, commercial activities, wealth and population. People crowded into east Baghdad, attracted by al-Maḥdī's gifts, and later by the Barmakids who had a special quarter at the Shāmmsāyiyya gate (Ya'qūbūlī, Bulūdān, 251; Aḫkīnī [Būlāk], vi, 78, vi, 8; Ibn Khalīlīkīnīlī [Būlāk], ii, 317). Yaḥyā the Barmakīd built a magnificent palace and gave it the modest name Kār al-Tīn (Aḵkīnī, v, 8). Dafar built a great luxurious palace below eastern Baghdad, which was given later to al-Maḥmūn. At the time of al-Rašīdī, the eastern side extended from the Shāmmsāyiyya gate (opposite the Khaṭrabīlī gate) to Muḥšīram (its southern limit is the modern Maḥmūn bridge) (Ya'qūbūlī, Bulūdān, 253-4).

On the other side al-Amin returned from the Khūlīd palace, where al-Rašīdī resided, to Bāb al-Dhāḥab, renewed it, furnished it to suit a caliph and handed it to him (cf. Ibn al-Djāwzī, Muntahāṣīm, v, 144). Then in 280/893, al-Mu'tadīd rebuilt the palace, enlarged its grounds and added new buildings to it, and built prisons on its grounds (māṭāmīrī). He added a racetrack and surrounded the area with a special wall. It was to be Dār al-Khīlāfīn and remained, with additions, the official residence (Khaṭṭābī, 52; Ibn al-Djāwzī, Muntahāṣīm, vi, 53; Manāšīb, 15; Dafārī, Nīshārī, viii, 15; Abū 'l-Mahāsīn, iii, 85; Irībīlī, 173).

Then he laid the foundations of the Tāǧ palace on the Tigris nearby, but later saw much smoke from the city. He decided to build another palace, two miles to the north-east. He built the magnificent and
lofty al-Thurayya, linked it with an underground passage to the Kasr (al-Hasanl), surrounded it with gardens and a great expanse of water, it from the Mshah canal (see the description of Ibn al-Mu'taiz, Dinawar (Beirut ed. 1913), 138-9). He also ordered, in order to keep the air pure, that no rice and palm trees be cultivated around Baghdad (see Ibn al-Djawi, Munastar, V, 142). The Thurayya lasted in good condition till 497/1092-3 when it was swept by the flood and ruined (Ibn al-Djawi, Manastir, 155; Yakut, i, 808). The ruin of the Round City started now. Al-Mutanabdi ordered the demolition of the City wall; but when a small section was pulled down, the Hashimites complained, as it seemed Abd'alsid glory, so al-Mutanabdi stopped. People however gradually extended their houses at the expense of the wall and this led ultimately to the demolition of the wall and the ruin of the City (Tanukhi, Nighmar, i, 74-5).

Al-Mutanabdi (289-295/901-907) built the Tagd with halls and domes, and a quay on the Tigris. He built a high semi-circular dome on its grounds, so that he could reach its top mounted on a donkey. (Khatib, 48; Irbili, 175, Yakut, i, 80; Ibn al-Djawi, Munastar, v, 144). In 289/901 al-Mutanabdi pulled down the palace prisons and built a Friday mosque (Dami al-Kasr) which became the third Friday mosque, until the time of al-Muktafi. (Ibn al-Djawi, Munastar, vi, 3, Khatib, 62).

Al-Muktadir (295-320/908-932) added new buildings to the Royal palaces and beautified them fabulously; he paid special attention to the zoo (hayr al-awbakh) (cf. Khatib, 48, 53). Khatib's detailed description for the year 305/917-18 is striking. The strong wall surrounding the palaces and the secret passage from the audience hall of al-Muktadir to one of the gates were necessary defensive measures (see Khatib, 55). Among the wonders was dar al-sagghara, a tree of silver, in a large pond with 18 branches and multiple twigs, with silver or gilt birds and sparrows which whistled at times. On both sides of the pond were 15 statues of mounted horsemen which moved in one direction as if chasing each other (54). There was a mercury pond 30 x 20 dhird* with four gilt birds and around it was a fabulous garden. The zoo had all sorts of animals. There was a lion-house with its remarkable arms. Twenty three palaces were counted within the Royal precincts (cf. Khatib, 55-55; Ibn al-Djawi, Munastar, vi, 144).

Baghdad reached its height during this period. The eastern side extended five miles (1 mile = 1848 m.) from Shammiiyya to Dar al-Khilafa in the 4th/10th century (Istakhri, 83). Tayfur (d. 893) reports that al-Muwaqqaf ordered the measurement of Baghdad before 279/892; its area was found to be 43,750 gharb of which 26,250 gharb were in east Baghdad and 17,500 gharb in west Baghdad (Ibn al-Fakih, 144; cf. Ibn Hawkal, l, 243). Another version of Tayfur makes eastern Baghdad at the time of al-Muwaqqaf 26,750 gharb (1 gharb = 1366 sq.m.) and western Baghdad 27,000 gharb; this is more probable, as west Baghdad was still more important then. Another version puts the area at 53,750 gharb, of which 26,750 gharb were east and 27,000 gharb west (Khatib, 74). It is more likely that the last figure represents the period of al-Muktadir when much expansion took place in east Baghdad. In all these reports the length of Baghdad on both sides was almost the same. For the first figure, considering the length of Baghdad as stated by Istakhri and by Tayfur, Baghdad was, in 279/892, about 7½ km. in length and 6½ km. in width, while under al-Muktadir (320/932) it was about 8½ km. in length and 7½ km. in width.

Baghdad's geographical position, its active people (cf. Dhahab, Buchu, 39, Tanukhi, Faradji, ii, 11), the encouragement of the state to trade (cf. Ya'qub, 590) and the prestige of the caliphate, soon made Baghdad the great centre of commerce (see Duri, Tarikh al-Idrak al-Iltisadi, 143-157). Markets became an essential feature of its life, in Rusafa and esp. in Karb. Each trade had its market, and among those were the fruit market, the cloth market, the cotton market, the market of booksellers which had more than a hundred shops, the money-changers' market and the 'attarin market in Karb. Markets for foreign merchants were at Sük Bâb al-Shâm. On the eastern side, there was a variety of markets including Sük al-Tib for flowers, a food market, the goldsmiths' market, the sheep market, a booksellers' market, and a market for Chinese merchandise (Ya'qub, Bulût, 242, 246, 248, 254; Istakhri, 48, Khatib, 22, 65 ff., 36, 69; Ibn al-Djawi, Manastir, 26, 27-8; Ibn Hawkal, 242). Since the time of al-Manṣür a muhkkab was appointed to watch over markets, to prevent cheating and to check on measures and weights (cf. Khatib, 20; Sâbi, Rast'âlî, 114, 141-2; Mawardî, 141-2). The muhkkab also supervised baths and possibly watched over mosques (Khatib, 78). He also prevented subversive activities.

Each market or craft had a chief appointed by the government. In a craft there were the Šamis and the Usâd (cf. Ikhwân al-Šafa, i, 255; cf. Essays of Diähz (ed. Sandûbî, 126). Baghdad exported cotton stuffs and silk textiles esp. kerciefs, aprons, turbans, crystals turned on lathes, glazed-ware, and various oils, potions and electuaries (Hudaib al-Šâm, 174; Mukaddad, 128). Baghdad manufactured shirts of different colours, turbans of thin texture and celebrated towels (Dimashkî, Tîgârna, 62). Its thin white cotton shirts were peerless (Ibn al-Fakih, 254). The sahlašûn (silk stuff), the mulham and 'attâbi stuffs (of silk and cotton) of Baghdad were famous (Hudaib al-Šâm, 38; Nuwayrî, i, 369; Abu 'l-Kâsim, 35; Mukaddad, 352; Ibn Hawkal, 261). Excellent swords were made at Bâb al-Tîr (Arb., 56). It was famous for its leather manufacture and for the manufacture of paper (cf. Ibn al-Fakih, 251).

A great incentive to commerce and industry was the development of the banking system in Baghdad as shown in the activities of the sarrdfs and dijahhâds. The sarrdfs had their own markets esp. in Karb (cf. Diiahjijûrî, 228) and primarily served the people, while dijahhâds served mainly the government and its officials.

Baghdad grew international in population. Its inhabitants were a mixture of different nations, colours and creeds, who came for work, trade, as recruits for the army, slaves, and for other careers. It is noticeable that the populace began to play an important part in its life (see Ibn al-Ahwîr, viii, 85-6; Miskawiyh, i, 74-5; Isfahânî, Ta'rikh (Berlin), 130). On their revolt against the rise in prices in 387/997-98, the sarrdfs sought to protect their interests in the activities of the sarrdfs and dijahhâds. It was difficult to give an estimation of the population of Baghdad. Estimates of mosques and baths are obviously exaggerated (300,000 mosques and 60,000 baths under al-Muwaqqaf, 27,000 baths under al-Muktadir, 17,000 baths under Mu'izz al-Dawla,
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5,000 under A'ud al-Dawla, 3,000 baths under Baha al-Dawla; Khatib, 74-6; Ibn al-Fakhri, f. 59b; Hilal al-Sabili, MS. 79-30. Baths were counted in 383/993 and found to number 1500. Traditions stress that each bath serves about 200 houses (Ibn al-Fakhri, f. 59b, 60a; Hilal al-Sabili, MS. 29). If the average number is in a house was five, then the population of Baghdad was about one million and a half. Al-Mu'tadid ordered Sinan b. Thabit to examine doctors and to give licences only to those qualified, and the result was that 860 doctors were given licences (Ibn al-Athir, viii, 85; Ibn Abi Usaybi'a i, 221 f., 224, 310; al-Kifiti, 194 f.). If we add doctors serving in government hospitals and those who did not have licences, the number would probably reach a thousand. The number of people who prayed on the last Friday of the month at the mosque of Mansur and that of Rusafa were judged by measuring the area for prayer to be 64,000 (Ibn al-Fakhri, f. 62a; see also Tabari, iii, 1730). The number of bookshops about the end of the 3rd/9th century was calculated to be 30,000 (Ibn al-Djawzi, Manadh, 24). From those figures and the area of Baghdad we can estimate the population of Baghdad in the 4th/10th century to be a million and a half. Hilli, a contemporary, gives this estimate too.

There were aristocratic quarters such as Zahir, Shammasiya, al-Mumuniyya and Darb 'Awn. There were poor quarters like Kafi'at al-Kilab, and Nahr al-Ad-dadi (Abu 'l-Kasim, 36). Houses were of two stories, and those of the common people of one storey. Those of the rich had baths and were usually divided into three quarters surrounded by a wall—the ladies' quarters, the reception rooms, and the servants' quarters. Special attention was paid to gardens (Aghani, ii, 73, iii, 31, ix, 144, v, 38, xvii, 129; Hilal al-Sabili, Rusum, 32). Carpets, divans, curtains and pillows were noted items of furniture (Abu 'l-Kasim, 36). Fans and specially cooled houses and sarabbs were used in summer (see al-Mudawwar, Hadratul-Islam, 117, 30). Inscriptions and drawings of animals and plants or human faces decorated entrances (Ibid., 29; Abu 'l-Kasim, 7, 36). A special feature of the life of Baghdad is the vast number of mosques and baths as indicated.

Baghdad was the great centre of culture. It was the home of Hanafi and Hanbali schools of law. It was the centre of translations, in Bayt al-Hikma and outside, and of some scientific experimentation. Its mosques, especially Djami al-Mansur, were great centres of learning. The large number of bookshops which were sometimes literary salons, indicates the extent of cultural activities. Its poets, historians, and scholars are too numerous to mention. One can refer to the History of Baghdad by Khatib to see the vast number of scholars, in one field, connected with Baghdad. Not only caliphs, but ministers and dignitaries gave every encouragement to learning. The creative period of Islamic culture is associated with Baghdad. Later in this period, public libraries as centres of study and learning were founded, the most famous being the Dar al-Tkil of Abu Nasr Sibn b. Aradghil. When the madrasa appeared, Baghdad took the lead with its Nizamiyya and Mustanfuriyya and influenced the madrasa system both in programme and architecture.

Much attention was paid to hospitals, especially in the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries. Of these, the Bimaristan al-Sayyida (306/918), al-Bimaristan al-Mu'tadidi (306/918) and al-Bimaristan al-A'udhili (372/982) were famous. Ministers and others also founded hospitals. Doctors were at times subject to supervision (see above).

Under al-Rashid there were three bridges in Baghdad (Ya'qubi, ii, 510). The two famous ones were by Bâb Khurans and at Karh (cf. Ya'qubi, ii, 542; Djabshiyar, 254; Tabari, iii, 1232). Al-Rashid built two bridges at Shammasiya, but they were destroyed during the first siege (Ibn al-Djawzi, Manaddib, 20; Ibn al-Fakhri, f. 42a). The three bridges continued to the end of 3rd/9th century (Ibn al-Fakhri, f. 42a). It seems that the northern bridge was destroyed and Isâkhi talks of two bridges only (Ibn al-Djawzi, Manaddib, 20, Isâkhi, 84). In 387/997 Baha al-Dawla built a bridge at Sük al-Thaliha (al-Misr'atul-Kattanin) to become the third bridge. This indicates a shift of emphasis from N. Baghdad to Sük al-Thaliha (Ibn al-Djawzi, Munasa'm, vii, 171; cf. Ibn al-Djawzi, Munasa'm, 20; Khatib, 71-2).

Life in Baghdad was stable until al-Amin. The first siege brought out turbulent elements in the 'amma. Flood and fire also began to play their rôle from the last quarter of the 3rd/9th century. Flood in 270/883 ruined 7,000 houses in Karh. In 299/904 and 328/929 Baghdad suffered considerably from flood (Tabari, iii, 1103; Ibn al-Athir, viii, 371; Abu 'l-Mahasin, iii, 157 and 266). In 373/983 flood swept beyond the Kafa gate and entered the city (Sul, Radd, 278; Khatib, 16). The neglect of canals, especially during the 'Amir al-Umar period (324/935-945), was responsible for floods and for the ruin of the Bada'rar district (Miskawayh, ii, 1, 9; Sul, Radd, 16, 225, 137-8). Consequently, whereas scarcities and plague were rare before 330/942 they were recurrent after that (cf. Ibn al-Athir, vii, 177, 187, 338). The scarcity of 307/919 was a result of monopoly and was quickly overcome. Scarcess occurred in 323/934, 326/937, 329/940 (with plague), 330/941, 331/942 (with plague), 332/943, 337/948 and life became unbearable (Sul, Raddi, 61, 104, 236, 251; Ibn al-Athir, viii, 282, 311; Isfahani, Ta'rikh, 125; Abu 'l-Mahasin, iii, 170-1, 270, 274). In 308/920 and 309/921 Karh suffered considerably from fire (Ibn al-Athir, viii, 89, 95). In 327/934 the fire of Karh swept over the quarters of the 'atfarin (the drug sellers), the ointment sellers, jewelers and others and its traces could be seen years after (Sul, Radd, 68).

The Buwayhid period was rather hard for Baghdad. Muizz al-Dawla (in 335/946) first repaired some canals at Bada'rar and this improved living conditions (Miskawayh, ii, 165). A period of neglect followed and many canals which irrigated west Baghdad were in ruins. A'ud al-Dawla (367-372/977-982) had them cleared up, and rebuilt bridges and locks (Miskawayh, ii, 406; iii, 69; Ibn al-Athir, viii, 518). Then we hear no more of such activities.

Building activities were limited. In 350/961 Muizz al-Dawla built a great palace at the Shammasiya gate with a large Maydan, a quay, and beautiful gardens. For this palace he took the seven iron doors of the Round City and spent about a million dinars (2 million dirhams). However, it was pulled down in 418/1027 (Tanakh, Nishapur, 1, 70; Ibn al-Athir, viii, 397-8; ix, 256). A'ud al-Dawla rebuilt the house of Sabuktakin, chamberlain of Muizz al-Dawla, at upper Mukkarrim, added spacious gardens to it, and brought water to it by canals from Nahr al-Khalis at great expense. It became the Dar al-Imara or official residence of the Buwayhids (Khatib, 58-9; Ibn al-Djawzi, Munasa'm, vii, 77-8; cf. Miskawayh, iii, 124).


Baghdad found Baghdad in bad shape. He ordered that its houses and markets be renewed and spent much money in rebuilding its Friday mosques; he repaired quays by the Tigris, and ordered the cultivation of gardens in ruined places which had no owners. He found the central bridge narrow and decayed and had it renewed and broadened (Ibn al-Athir, vii, 558; Ibn al-Diawzi, Muntazam, vii, 114; Miskawayh, ii, 404-406). In 372/982 he built the 'Adud al-Dawla Hospitals, appointed doctors, supervisors, storekeepers to it, and provided it with plenty of medicines, potions, instruments and furniture. Wakhs were allotted to it for its upkeep (Ibn al-Diawzi, Muntazam, vii, 112-114).

However, Baghdad declined under the Buwayhid rulers (Tanbkh, Nigumur, i, 66 makes it in 345/956 one tenth of its size under al-Mukta'dir). The city of al-Mansur, was neglected and had no life then (Mukaddasi, 120). Most of the quarters of W. Baghdad were in bad shape and had shrunk. The most flourishing section of W. Baghdad was Karakh, where the merchants had their places of business. Thus the western side is now called Karakh (Ibn Hawkal, i, 241-2; Mukaddasi, 120).

The eastern side of the city was now more flourishing, and dignitaries generally resided there (cf. Ibn Hawkal, 240). Here, the brightest spots were the Bab al-Tak where the great market was, the Dar al-Imara at the Shammasiyya gate (near his palace), the other at Bab al-Tak and the Kalwada, Ibn Hawkal saw two bridges, one out of order (I, 241). It seems there were three bridges at the time related to their movement (cf. Ibn al-Diawzi, Tabis Ibars, 392; Kushayri, ibid, 113-4; Ibn al-Diawzi, Muntazam, vii, 77; Tanbkh, Faragji, ii, 105, 107-8). In 348/959, fights between the two groups led to destruction and fire at Bab al-Tak (ibid, viii, 44). Burdjum, a notorious 'Ayyar leader, practically ruled Baghdad for four years 422-445/1030-1053, and spread havoc (Ibid, 75-6). The government was powerless (cf. 49) and they were left to levy taxes and tolls to avoid their terror (ibid, 78). Many people left their quarters and departed for safety (ibid., 142). Their terror continued till the advent of the Saljuk forces in 451/1059 (Abu l-Fida', ii, 187). 

Baghdad suffered much from the turbulence of the 'Amma, from sectarian differences encouraged by the Buwayhids, and from the 'Ayyarun. Our sources talk much of the ignorance of the 'Amma, their readiness to follow any call, their good nature and their lawlessness (cf. Mas'ud, v, 81, 82-3, 85-7; Ghazzali, Fadli, i, 53, Ibn al-Diawzi, Manakh, 31-2; Baghdadi, Firaq, 141). In 279/993 many markets were ruined (Ibn al-Diawzi, Muntazam, vii, 671, Khathib, 53-4, Ibn al-Diawzi, Manakh, 21-2, Ibn al-Athir, ix, 48).

Ibn Hawkal saw two bridges, one out of order (I, 241). It seems there were three bridges at the time of Mu'izz al-Dawla (one at the Shammasiyya gate (near his palace), the other at Bab al-Tak and the third at Suk al-Thalaghah). The first was transferred to Bab al-Tak, making two there, then one went out of order (cf. Ibn al-Diawzi, Manakh, 20).

The 'Ayyarun kept people in constant terror for life and property. They levied tolls on markets and roads or robbed wayfarers and constantly broke into houses at night. They spread havoc by sword and fire and burnt many quarters and markets esp. Bab el-Tak and Suk Yabia (in east Baghdad) and Karakh, as those were the quarters of the wealthy. People had to lock the gates of their streets, and merchants kept vigil at night. Disorder and pillage were organised, and among the titles of their chiefs were al-Muta'addim, al-Khid, and al-Amiri, and they had special ceremonials for inauguration (see Muntazam, vii, 49, 151, 78, Miskawayh, ii, 306, Kushayri, op. cit., 113; Tanbkh, Faragji, ii, 109). However they were divided into Shi'is and Sunnis (Ibn al-Diawzi, Muntazam, vii, 78-9).

The 'Ayyarun kept people in constant terror for life and property. They levied tolls on markets and roads or robbed wayfarers and constantly broke into houses at night. They spread havoc by sword and fire and burnt many quarters and markets esp. Bab el-Tak and Suk Yabia (in east Baghdad) and Karakh, as those were the quarters of the wealthy. People had to lock the gates of their streets, and merchants kept vigil at night. Disorder and pillage were organised, and among the titles of their chiefs were al-Muta'addim, al-Khid, and al-Amiri, and they had special ceremonials for inauguration (see Muntazam, vii, 49, 151, 78, Miskawayh, ii, 306, Kushayri, op. cit., 113; Tanbkh, Faragji, ii, 109). However they were divided into Shi'is and Sunnis (Ibn al-Diawzi, Muntazam, vii, 78-9).

A preacher prayed in 421/1030 "O God! Save the state from the populace and the rabble" (Ibn al-Diawzi, Muntazam, vii, 44). Burdjum, a notorious 'Ayyar leader, practically ruled Baghdad for four years 422-445/1030-1053, and spread havoc (Ibid, 75-6). The government was powerless (cf. 49) and they were left to levy taxes and tolls to avoid their terror (Ibid., 78). Many people left their quarters and departed for safety (Ibid., 142). Their terror continued till the advent of the Saljuk forces (Ibid., 161).

In 447/1055 Tughril Bey entered Baghdad, and the Saljuk forces reversed Buwayhid policy and encouraged the Sunnis (cf. Abu 'l-Mahsin, v, 59). In 450/1058 Baghshir, a rebel, seized Baghdad in the name of the Fatimids (cf. Abu 'l-Fida', ii, 186; Ibn al-Kalani, 87). He was defeated and killed by the Saljuk forces in 451/1059 (Abu 'l-Fida', ii, 187-8). During this period Baghdad assumed a shape which thereafter changed but little. In 448/1056 Tughril Bey enlarged the area of Dar
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Friday mosques increased in Gharbiyya (W. Baghdad) at this period, indicating the semi-independent status of quarters each with a wall and separated by usable land of ruins. Hârbiyya, al-Ḥârîm al-Tâhîrî in the north, Câhâr Sodî with Nasîrîyya, 'Attâbîyyîn and Dîr al-Kazz south-west, Mâhawîl to the west, Kaşr 'Iṣâ to the east, and Kurayyâ and Kârkh in the south are the noted quarters.
Much attention was given to the founding of madrasas (colleges). This movement could be explained initially by the religious revival among Shi'is, and by political and administrative needs; but it was continued as a cultural movement. Ibn DIubayr saw thirty madrasas in east Baghdad (Ibn DIubayr, 229; see also M. DIawad, in Review of the Higher Teachers’ College, Baghdad, vol. v, 110 ff., vol. vi, 86 ff.). Other madrasas were founded after Ibn DIubayr’s visit (cf. Ibn al-Fuwati, 24-5, 53, 128, 308, Ibn al-Athir, x, 212). The most famous were the Niżamiyya founded in 459/1066, the madrasa of Abû Ḥanîfa found in the same year (Ibn al-DIaiwâl, Munâslâm, viii, 245-6, still existing as Kulliyat al-Sharî’i’â) and al-Mustansirîyya, founded by al-Mustanṣîr in 631/1233 and continued till the 17th century. All those madrasas specialised in one of the four schools of law, except the Mustansîrîyya and the Baghîrîyya (founded in 653/1255) which taught the fiqh of the four schools (see Ibn al-Fuwati, 508; Ibn al-DIaiwâl, Munâslâm, viii, 245-6, 246-7; Ibn al-Athir, x, 38; Ibn al-Fuwati 53-4, 58-9; cf. ‘Awwâd in Sumer, i, 1945). There was a maktûb (school) for orphans established by Shams al-Mulûk (son of Niżâm al-Mulûk) (Iṣâfâhânî, Selîm, 124-5). In 606/1209 guest-houses (dâr diwâl) were built in all quarters of Baghdad to serve the poor in the rūmâda (Ibn al-DIaiwâl, 286; other references, ibid., 184; Ibn al-Fuwati, 94).

Baghdad suffered at this period from fire, flood and dissension. In 449/1057 Karkh and Bâb Mubâwwal quarters and most of the markets of Karkh were burnt down. In 451/1059 much of Karkh and old Baghdad was burnt (Ibn al-DIaiwâl, Munâslâm, viii, 81; Ibn al-Athir, x, 3). The quarters and markets near the DIâdî canal and Dâr al-Khîlîfâ and the Nizamiyya market were burnt more than once (Ibn al-Athir, x, 35, 67, 318; Ibn al-DIaiwâl, Munâslâm, viii, 244, ix, 61, 148, 184, x, 35). In 551/1156 fire spread from neighbouring quarters to Shihâna and neighbouring suks (Ibn al-Athir, xi, 143; there were other fires in those quarters in 560/1164, 569/1173, 583/1187, 598/1199, 620, 621; Ibn al-DIaiwâl, Munâslâm, x, 212). The Sâyâdrîn were fairly active in Dâdîjîk days. They pillaged shops and houses and caused insecurity (see between 449/1057 and 557/1162 Ibn al-DIaiwâl, Munâslâm, viii, 139, 234; Ibn al-Athir, x, 204, 383, x, 29, 26, 59, 63).

The troubles of the ‘imâma and their sectarian fights (Ḥanbâl against Shî'is and Sunnis against Shî'is) continued to give rise to much bloodshed and destruction. Ibn al-DIâlîr reports a temporary conciliation in 502/1108 and adds “Evil came from them (i.e., the ‘imâmas’) (x, 395; see also x, 80, 259, 104, 180-109, 112, 117-8). This was short-lived, and quarrels and fights continued and became terrible under al-Mushta’i (Ibn al-Athir, x, 360, xi, 271, 344, xii, 213, 216). In 640/1242 fights took between the Ma’ṣîmîyya and Bâb al-Azadî quarters which involved the Nizamiyya market, and between Mughṭâra and Sûk al-Sulan quarters, and between Kaṭûtta and Kurayya (in W. Baghdad) quarters; many were killed and shops pillaged (Ibn al-Fuwati, 175-7; cf. Ibn Abî ‘l-Ḥadîl, ii, 554). By 653/1255 things had deteriorated considerably. Fights took place between Rusâfâ (Sunnî) and Khudayrîyyîn (Shî’is), and soon people of Bâb al-Brâṣra supported Rusâfâ while Karkh supported the others (Ibn al-Fuwati, 298-9). These quarrels also indicate the spirit of competition between quarters which increased by the lack of government control. When fights renewed between Karkh and Bâb al-Brâṣra, the soldiers sent to stop it, pillaged Karkh and that made the situation worse (ibid., 267-277). The climax came in 654/1256, when someone was killed by the people of Karkh, and the soldiers, sent to keep order, were joined by crowds of the ‘imâma and pillaged Karkh, burnt several places in it, killed many and took away women. Repraisal followed, but the tragedy was not forgotten (ibid., 314-315). The ‘âyârân were very active at this time. They pillaged shops, robbed houses at night and even the Mustansîrîyya was twice robbed (Ibn al-Fuwati, 378, 254, 260, 262).

The government was too weak to keep order. Floods recurred, indicating the weakness of government and the neglect of irrigation. In 641/1243 floods reached the Nizamiyya and its neighbourhood and ruined some quarters. In 646/1248 floods surrounded east Baghdad, destroyed a part of the wall, and reached the quarters of Ḥarîm. It also flooded Rusâfâ and many of its houses fell. West Baghdad was submerged, and most houses fell except part of Bâb al-Brâṣra and Karkh. Houses on the river collapsed. Floods entered Baghdad in 651/1253, and again in 653/1255 when a great number of houses collapsed and cultivation was damaged. The worst flood was in 654/1256 when both sides were surrounded by water and the flood even entered the markets of east Baghdad, Dâr al-Khîlîfâ and the Nizamiyya (Ibn al-Fuwati, 186-7, 267, 229-233, 277. 304, 311-19). Thus nature and man joined hands to eclipse Baghdad.

Two years later, Baghdad was invaded by the Mongols. On 4 Šafar 656/10 Feb. 1258 the Caliph al-Musta’sîm made an unconditional surrender. Its people were put indiscriminately to the sword, for over a week. Large numbers of the country people who flocked to Baghdad before the siege shared its tragic fate. Estimates of the numbers killed vary between 800,000 and two million, the estimate mounting with the lapse of time (Fakhri, 125; Ibn al-Fuwati, 281; DIahâbî, Duwa’il, ii, 121; Ibn Kaṭîfîr, Bidâyâ, xii, 202). The Chinese traveller Ch’ang Te stâtes (1259) that several tens of thousands were killed; his information is otherwise from Mongol sources (Bretschneider, Medieval Researches, i, 128-9). It is thus difficult to give any figure, but it probably exceeded a hundred thousand. Many quarters were ruined by siege, looting or fire, and the mosque of the caliphs, and the shrine of Kaẓîmañ were burnt down (Ibn al-Fuwati, 327-330; Ibn al-‘Irî, 27). Baghdad was however spared from complete devastation, and the jaṣâd extricated from the ‘ulama’ that a just kâfir is better than an unjust imâm probably helped. Before leaving, Hûlegû ordered the restoration of some public buildings. The supervisor of mawri rebuilt the Dîâmî al-Khulafâ and saw to it that schools and the ribâds were reopened (Ibn al-‘Irî, 475; Ibn al-Fuwati, 337). Culture suffered much, but it was not uprooted. Baghdad became a provincial centre in all respects.

Until 740/1340-40 Baghdad remained under the Ilkâhîs and was administered by a governor with a Shîkha and a military garrison (cf. Ibn al-Fuwati, 331). The Mongols registered the population of Baghdad in tens, hundreds, and thousands for the sake of taxation. A poll-tax was imposed on all except the aged and children; it continued to be levied for about two years (Ibn al-Fuwati, 339; cf. DIuwayzn, trans. Boyle, i, 34). Baghdad began to revive gradually, as its administration was chiefly entrusted to Persians; much of this is due to the policy of ‘Aṭâ’ Malik al-DIuwayzn, governor for about 23 years (657/1258-681/1282). Under him, the minaret of Dîâmî al-Khulafâ and the Niżamiyya market
were rebuilt, and the Mustansiriyya was repaired and a new water system added (Ibn al-Fuwati, 371). The mosques of Shaykh Mafrûz and Kâmâriyya were repaired (ibid., 408; Azzawi, Ta'rikh al-'Iraq, i, 267, 206).

Some of the old schools resumed work, especially the Ni'âmîyya and Mustansiriyya, the Bâshiriyya, the Tâtasjiyya and Madrasat al-Ashâb (cf. Ibn Baôtîta, Cairo 1918, i, 140-1; Ibn al-Fuwati, 182, 385, 396; Azzawi, Ta'rikh, i, 318). Djuwayînî's wife founded the 'Imâmatiyaya school for the four schools of law, and a reliqa near it (Ibn al-Fuwati, 377). The Ilîghan Takûdîr (881/1281) sent a message to Baghdâd asking for the return of endowments to schools, and mosques, as under the 'Abbâsîs, probably a pious wish (Karmalî, al-Fawz, 12). The Ilîghâns' policy led to outbreaks against non-Muslims. They patronised Christians, and exempted them from the jîrza. They rebuilt churches and opened schools. This led to an outbreak against them in 665/1265. The Jews rose to prominence under Arghûn (683-690/1284-1291) through Sa'd al-Dawla the Jewish finance minister, who appointed his brother governor of Baghdâd. In 690/1291 Sa'd al-Dawla was killed and the populace in Baghdâd fell on the Jews. Under Ghazzân, non-Muslims suffered through the imposition of the poll-tax and the attitude of the mob, and many adopted Islam (cf. 'Amr Ibn Mâtîf, Kiîdâb al-Madîdâb, 120-122, 125; Ibn al-Fuwati, 354, 465-6; 483; Wâsâfî, ii, 238; Karmalî, op. cit., 14-15, 21; 'Azzawi, i, 349, 513). Uldjaytu stirred up trouble when he vacillated between Shî'ism and Sunnism. The Ilîghâns tried to impose the lâw (paper money) (d.l.), but it was very unpopular in Baghdâd and was finally abolished by Ghazzân in 697/1297 (Ibn al-Fuwati, 477, 492).

During this period we have the accounts of three geographers: Ibn 'Abd al-Hâkkî (c. 700/1300), Ibn Baôtîta (727/1327 and Mustawfi (740/1339).

The author of the Mârdîdîd states that nothing remained of western Baghdâd except isolated quarters, the most populated of which was Karbâ (201). He mentions the Kuroyya quarter, the populous Ramliyya quarter, the Dar al-Kazî market, Dar al-Kazî standing alone where paper was manufactured, and the Bâb Muhabawu quarter which stood as an isolated village (Marâdîdîd (Caio ed.), 146, 201, 507, 773, 1088). He refers to the 'Aqûfî hospital, and indicates that nothing remained of al-Ḫârin al-Tâhirî, Nahr Taîbiq and Ka'fî's quarters, while Tâhî quarter looked like an isolated village (Marâdîdîd, 280, 837, 397, 1403). Of East Baghda'd, the Mârdîdîd states "when the Tartars came, most of it was ruined. They killed its people and few were left. Then people from outside came" (201). He states that the Hâlabî, Kuroyya and Ka'fî's al-Ḫârin were populous quarters (Marâdîdîd, 417, 1088, 1110). Ibn Baôtîta follows very closely after Ibn Djibayr. However he mentions two bridges in Baghdâd and gives new details about the excellent baths in the city (Caio ed. 1908, i, 140-1). He states that mosques and schools were very numerous, but they were in ruins (ibid., i, 140).

Mustawfi's data is significant. His description of the wall of East Baghda'd agrees with that of Ibn Djibayr. It had four gates, and encloses the city in a semi-circle with a circuit of 28,000 paces. Western Baghda'd, he calls Karbâ; it was surrounded by a wall with a circuit of 12,000 paces. He found life easy in Baghdad and people pleasant, but their Arabic was corrupt. He found Shî'is and Hanbalîs dominant in Baghdad, though adherents of other sects were numerous. Madrasas and rîbâjs were numerous, but he noted that Ni'âmîyya was "the greatest of them all" while Mustansiriyya was the most beautiful building, (Nuzha, 40-42). It is possible that the Sitt Zubayda tomb belongs to this period, and the lady concerned could be Zubayda, the granddaughter of the eldest son of Musta'sîm ('Azzawi, i, 406).

In 740/1339 Hasan Buzurg established himself in Baghdad and founded the Dîlîyârîd dynasty which lasted till 813/1400. The Mardîdîd mosque dates from this period. From its inscriptions, we know that Mardjân, a captain of Uways, started building the madrasa with its mosque under Hasan Buzurg and finished the building under Uways in 758/1357. This madrasa was for the Shî'is and Hanafs (text of inscriptions in Alûsî, Masâdîdîd, 45 ff.; Massignon, Mission, ii, 1 ff.). Only the gate of the madrasa—or mosque later—remains now.

Beyond this we hear of flood, siege or troubles which caused much damage and loss.

Baghdad was twice taken by Timûr, first in 795/1392-1393 when the town escaped with little damage, and second in 803/1401 when its population was indiscriminately put to the sword, and many of its public (Abbâsîs) buildings and quarters were ruined. This was the devastating blow to culture in Baghda'd. In 807/1405 Ahmad the Djuwayrîr in 928/1521 returned to Baghdad, restored the walls destroyed by Timûr, and tried to repair some of the buildings and markets, but his time was short.

In 813/1410 Baghdad passed to the Kara Koyunlu Turkomans who held it till 872/1467-8, to be followed by Âk Koyunlu Turkomans. Baghdad sank still deeper under the Turkomans and suffered considerably from misrule. Many of its inhabitants fled the city, and the ruin of the irrigation system accounts for the recurrence of flood with consequent devastation. Under the year 841/1437 Mâkîrî says "Baghdad is ruined, there is no mosque or congregation, and no market. Its canals are mostly dry and it could hardly be called a city" (Mâkîrî, Sulûh, iii, 100. see 'Azzawi, iii, 79 ff.; Karmalî, 61 ff.). In addition, tribalism spread and tribal confederations returned to play their turbulent rôle in the life of the country.

In 914/1507-8 Baghdad came under Shî' Isma'îl Șafawî, and a period of Perso-Ottoman conflict for the possession of Baghdad opened, typified in the Baghdad song "between the Persians and the Rûm, what woe befell us". On Shî' Isma'îl's orders, many Sunni shrines, esp. those of Abû Șâvia and Abî al-Kâdir Șîlî, were ruined, and many of the leading Sunnis were killed. However, he started building a shrine for Mûsâ al-Ka'âmî. He appointed a governor with the title Kâhâbîh al-Kâlûfî (Azzawi, iii, 336-343). Many Persian merchants came to Baghdad and increased commercial activity. After a brief space in which the Kurdish chief Dhu 'l-Faqrîr seized Baghdad and announced his allegiance to Sultân Sulaymân Șînî, in 928/1520. Shî' Șahtâmâşp seized the town again in 936/1520. In 941/1534 Sultân Sulaymân entered Baghdad. He built a dome on the tomb of Abû Șanîa, with the mosque and madrasa, rebuilt the mosque, tekke and tomb of Șîlî and had guest-houses for the poor at both mosques. He also had the shrine and mosque of Kâpîmayn, started by Shî' Isma'îl, completed (Sulaymân-name, 119; Ewlya Șebîlî, iv, 426; Alûsî, Masâdîdîd, 117; 'Azzawi, iv, 28 ff.). He ordered landed property to be surveyed and registered, and organised the administration of the province (Ewlya Șebîlî, iv, 41).
ament, and a Kādi. A garrison was stationed in Baghdad with the janissaries as its backbone. Few buildings were erected during the following period. In 978/1570 Murad Paşa built the Muradiyya mosque in the Maydān quarter. The Gīlānī mosque was rebuilt. Čiğalazâde built a famous inn, a coffee house and a market. He also built Dījamī al-Šaghā or Dījamī al-Khaṭāfān, and rebuilt the Mawlawī tekke, known now as the Aṣfāfiyya mosque (‘Aẓawā’, iv, 116, 128-32; cf. ‘Alī, Masāķīd, 301, 62-4). Hasan Paşa built the towers near Burdj al-Diawish (Ca’ush) and built Burdj al-Sabūm (1687). Mosques received some attention. Deli Husayn Pasha (1644) rebuilt the coffee house and a market. He also built Dījamī, (Gulshan-i Khuldsat al-WazIr, i, 383; ‘Alī, Masāķīd, 301, 62-4). Hasan Paşa built the mosque known after him, also called Dījamī al-WazIr (Gulshan-i Khuldsat al-WazIr, 66; Ewliya Celebi, iv, 419). He also made a rampart and a ditch around Karşeh to protect it from Bedouins.

Europeans begin to visit Baghdad at this period. They speak of it as a meeting place of caravans, and a great centre of commerce for Arabia, Persia and Turkey. Caesar Frederigo (1563) saw many foreign merchants in the city. Sir Anthony Sherley (1590) saw “excellent goods of all sorts and very cheap” (Purchas, viii, 384). It had a bridge of boats tied by a great chain of iron and when boats passed up or down the river, some of the boats of the bridge were removed until the traffic had passed (Ralph Fitch in 1583, Hakluyt, ii, 282-3). Rauwolf (1574) saw streets narrow and houses miserably built.

Many buildings were erected in the shape like the Paşa’s residence and the great bazaar or exchange were good. Its baths were of low quality. The Portuguese traveller Pedro Texeira (1604) estimated houses in east Baghdad at twenty to thirty thousand. There was a mint in Baghdad in which gold, silver and copper coins were struck.

Following the insurrection of Bakr the Subasht, Şah Abābāt conquered Baghdad in 1032/1623. School buildings and Sunri shrines, including the mosques of Gīlānī and Abū Hanifa, suffered destruction. Thousands were killed or sold as slaves and others were tortured (KŪţīb Celebi, Fadḥila, ii, 50; Khuldsat al-Adhr, i, 383; ‘Aẓawā’, iv, 178-182). In this period the Saray (government house) was built by Şafi Kuli Khan, the Persian governor. Baghdad was regained by the Ottomans in 1048/1638 under the personal command of Sultan Murad IV. He had the shrines, especially the tombs of Abū Hanifa and Gīlānī, rebuilt. On his departure, the Bāb al-Tillism was walled up and continued thus until it was blown up by the retreating Turks in 1917. His Grand Vizier put the Kal’a (castle) in good repair.

Further information comes from travellers of this period, like Tavernier (1652), Ewliya Celebi (1654) and Thevenot (1663). The wall around east Baghdad was almost circular in shape. It was 60 dhīrāt in width, with water drawn from the Tigris. At the north-western corner of the wall stood the Kal’a (inner castle), from the Bāb al-Mu’azzam to the Tigris; it was encompassed by a single wall with little towers upon which cannon were planted. Barracks, stores of ammunition and provisions as well as the treasury and the mint were there. The Saray, where the Paşa resided, stood below the castle; it had spacious gardens and fair kiosks. On the other end of the bridge at Karşeh stood a castle called Kūshlar Kal’aṣaf or Birds’ castle, with a gate on the bridge (Ewliya Celebi, iv, 416; Hāddījī Khalīfah, Dīhān-Nūmā, 457-50; Tavernier, 64; Thevenot, Voyage, ii, 211). Ewliya Celebi refers to the numerous mosques of Baghdad and mentions nine important mosques. Of the schools, two were the largest, the Mardjaniyya and Madrasat al-Khulfa‘ (Mustansiriyya). Of the many inns two were good. He mentions eight churches and three synagogues, and gives exaggerated figures for tekkes (700) and hajmims (500). The bridge of boats had 37-40 boats according to the height of the river, and some boats in the middle could be removed either for safety at night, or for river traffic, or as a military precaution.

Belgāhud was governed by 24 pašas between 1048/1638-1116/1704 and there was no room for real improvement. The pašas were semi-autonomous, and the power of the janissaries was great. The power of the tribes rose and gradually became a threat to the life of the city.

Little was done beyond repairs to the city walls or mosques. Kūţīb Hasan Paşa (1642) built three towers near Burgī al-Adżāmi. However, during the 10th to 12th century, the city of Baghdad was almost circular in shape. It was 60 dhīrāt in height and 10-15 dhīrāt broad, with holes for guns. It had large towers at the principal angles, of which four were famous at this period—and smaller towers at short distances from each other. On the large towers brass cannons were planted. The wall was completed on the river side for proper defence (the map of Naḥī_modifier in 1657, drawn for Sultan Sulaymān in 1537 already shows this wall. A Sousa, Atlas of Baghdād, 12). There were 118 towers in the wall on the land side and 45 on the river side (Hāddījī Khalīfah, Dīhān-Nūmā, 457 ff.; Ker Porter (1819) reports 117 towers of which 17 were large (Travels, 265); cf. Buckingham, Travels, 372).

The wall had three gates on the land side, (as the Tillism gate was walled up): Bāb al-Imām al-‘Arām in the north at 700 dhīrāt from the Tigris, Karṣakul Kapu (Bāb Kalwānq) or the dark gate in the south at 50 dhīrāt from the Tigris, and Aḵ Kapu (al-Bāb al-Wāṣfnā) or the white gate in the east. The fourth gate was at the bridge. Ewliya Celebi measured the length of the wall and found it 28,000 paces in slow walking or seven miles (1 mile = 4,000 paces), while Hāddījī Khalīfah makes its length 12,000 dhīrāt or two miles (Niebuhr and Olivier consider the length of East Baghdād two miles). Wellsted thought the circuit of the walls 7 miles. Felix Jones, who surveyed Baghdād in 1853, gives the circuit of the walls of East Baghdād including the river face as 10,000 yards or about 6 miles (Olivier, Voyage, ii, 379-80; Wellsted, Travels, i, 255; Felix Jones, 318; cf. Rousseau, 5 and Tavernier, 84).
Kamariyya mosque. Khāṣṣāki Muḥammad (1657) built the Khiṣṣa'iki mosque at Ra’s al-Karya. Šīlbdär Ḥusayn Paša (1671) rebuilt the Fadl mosque which became known as Džamih. Šīlbdär Ḥusayn Paša and surrounded the shrine of Ūmar Šuhra'awrd by a wall and brought water to it by a canal. Ābd al-Raẓmān Paša (1674) repaired the Džami' Šhaykh Ma'rūf and completed the dam started by his predecessor to protect A'zāmīyya from flood. Kaplān Muṣṭāfa (1676) rebuilt Džamih al-Šaykh al-Khaffāfī which became al-Kaplānīyya and nιyya. Ūmar Paša (1687) repaired the mosque of Abū Ḥanīfa and allotted new vakfās to it. Ibrāhīm Paša (1681) renewed Džamih Suyyid Sulṭān 'Ali, and Džami' al-Sarāyī. Īsmāʿīl Paša (1698) rebuilt Džamih al-Khaffāfī (Azsāwī, iv, 27, 64, 109, 116, 143, Gučkčioni-ı Khulafā, 102, 103, 105, 106, Alûd, Masādjjī, 37, 57-8). Ahmad Bugănāk (1678) built the famous Khiṣṣa Banī Sa'd, while Šīlbdär Ħusayn Paša built a new bazaar near the Mustaniṣiyā. The beginning of the 18th century saw the eyālet of Baghdad terribly disorganised, the janissaries masters of the city, the Arab tribes holding the surrounding country, and peace or security for trade non-existent. The appointment of Hasan Paša in 1704, followed by his son Ahmad, inaugurated a new period for Baghdad. They introduced the Mamlik (Kölemen) to check the janissaries and laid the foundation for Mamlik supremacy which lasted till 1831. The janissaries and Arab tribes were controlled, order was restored and the Persian threat averted. Hasan Paša rebuilt the Sarāy Mosque (Džadid Hasan Paša). He abolished taxes on firewood and on foodstuffs, and relieved quarters from exacting duties. He also built the Sulaymaniyya school and renewed the bridge. He organised an army of about 20,000 and in case of need it could be raised to 12,500.

Security made Baghdad a great commercial centre. An eye-witness wrote in 1774, "this is the grand mart for the produce of India and Persia, Constantinople, Aleppo and Damascus; in short it is the grand oriental depository" (Gaţester, i, 1243). Dissension and weak leadership among the Mamluks led to a period of troubles, of tribal chaos, and the Persian conquest of Baṣra. It ended when Sulaymān Paša the Great became governor (1193/1779) and combined Baghdad, Šāhhrizur and Baṣra. The tribes were checked, peace was restored and Mamlik power revived (Ta'rikh-i Dżewdet, ii, 145, 157, 158; Sûf, Ta'rikh al-Mamlik, 19 ff., 54 ff., S. Fā'ik, Ta'rikh al-Mamlik, f. 16-7). Sulaymān Paša repaired the walls of east Baghdad, and built a wall around Karṣ and surrounded it with a ditch. He rebuilt the Sarāy. He also built the Sulaymāniyya school and renewed the Kaplaniyya, Faţl and Khulafā' mosques. In addition, he built the Sûk al-Sarrādīn. His kahya started building the Ahmadiyya mosque (Džami' al-Maydān) to be completed by the kahya's brother (Uğmān b. Saνad, (abridg. ed.), 70-73, 76-7). His last year (1802) saw a plague in Baghdad.

He also built the Suk al-Sarrādīn. His kahya started building the Ahmadiyya mosque (Džami' al-Maydān) to be completed by the kahya's brother (Uğmān b. Saνad, (abridg. ed.), 70-73, 76-7). His last year (1802) saw a plague in Baghdad. In the palace there were houses, with teachers and instructors for exacting duties. They are given a literary education and training in the use of arms, the art of chivalry and sports, and finally some palace education, to create an élite for government (Sulaymān Fā'ik, Ta'rikh al-Mamlik; Dżewdet al-Wuzarda, 8). A governing class was formed, trained, energetic, and compact. But their weakness came from jealousies and intrigues. Sulaymān Paša subdued the tribes and assured order and security, and encouraged trade.

Āli Paša followed in 1715/1726 and Umar Paša in 1777/1764 (Ta'rikh-i Dżewdet, i, 339-40). In 1776 the establishment of a British residency in Baghdad was sanctioned by Bombay (Gaţester, i, 1225). In 1786/1772 a terrible plague befell Baghdad and lasted six months; thousands perished, others migrated, and commercial activities came to a standstill (Gaţester, i, 534).

The administrative system of Baghdad was copied on a small scale from that of Constantinople. The Paša held supreme military and administrative power. As the head of the administration was the kahya or kahya, who was also a minister. He was assisted by the defterdar, who was director of finances, and by the divān enfendisi or chief of the chancellor. There was the commander of the palace guards and the ağab of the janissaries.

The administrative system of Baghdad was copied on a small scale from that of Constantinople. The Paša held supreme military and administrative power. As the head of the administration was the kahya, who was also a minister. He was assisted by the defterdar, who was director of finances, and by the divān enfendisi or chief of the chancellor. There was the commander of the palace guards and the ağab of the janissaries.

The Paša called the divān which included the kahya, the defterdar, the bāsh, the commander and other important personnages, to discuss important issues. In the palace there were houses, with teachers and instructors (lilād) to educate the Mamluks (Dżewdet, ii, 287, iii, 204, Uğmān b. Saνad, 31-2, 56, 39; Rousseau, 25 ff.). The Mamluk army was of 12,500 and in case of need it could be raised to 12,500 and in case of need it could be raised to
30,000 by local levies and contingents from other parts of the wilaya (S. Fāhル, 611). Some notice that the walls were constructed and repaired at many different times, the old portions being the best (Buckingham, Travels (1827), 332; see Felix Jones, Memoir, 309). The enclosed area within the walls (east) according to Felix Jones' measurement was 591 acres (cf. Dr. Ives, Journey, London 1778, 20; Rousseau, Description, 5). The wall on the river seems to have been neglected and houses were built on the bank (Olivier, Voyage (1804), ii, 379). A large part of the city within the walls, particularly in the eastern side, was not occupied. The section near the river was well populated but even there gardens abounded so that it appeared like a city arising from amid a grove of palms (Niebuhr, ii, 239; Buckingham, 373; Wellsted, Travels (1840), i, 255). The Saray was spacious, enclosing beautiful gardens, and was richly furnished (Rousseau, 6; Ker Porter, 263).

The western side Karkh, was like a suburb with numerous gardens. It was defenceless at first, (Rousseau, 5; Ives, 28), until Sulaymân Pasha the Great built its wall. It had four gates—Bâb al-Kâzîm (N.), Bâb al-Shaykh Muárruf (W.), Bâb al-Hillâ (S-W.), and Bâb al-Krainât (S.). The walls were 52 feet. A yard long, enclosing an area of 246 acres (F. Jones, 309). (Ker Porter (1818) found it well furnished with shops along numerous and extensive streets (Ker Porter, ii, 255; al-Munshî al-Baghdâdî, Ribla, 31). Moreover it was not so populated as the eastern side, and generally inhabited by the common people (Niebuhr, ii, 244; Rousseau, 4). The bridge of boats was 6 ft. wide and people use it or use "guffas" to cross the river (Ker Porter, ii, 255; Niebuhr, ii, 243; al-Munshî al-Baghdâdî, 243).

The population gradually increased in this period. Rousseau (c. 1800) estimates it at 4,500, Olivier at 8,000, while the inhabitants put the figure at 100,000 (Rousseau, 8; Olivier, ii, 385; Buckingham (1816) made the estimate 80,000 (Travels, ii, 380). Ker Porter (1818) puts the figure at 100,000 (Travels, 262). Al-Munshî al-Baghdâdî, however, views in saying that there were 100,000 houses in Baghdad of which 1,500 were Jewish and 800 were Christian (Ribla, 24). By 1830 the estimate is brought to 120,000-150,000 (Frazer, i, 224-5 and Wellsted). There was a mixture of races and creeds. The official class was Turkish (or Mamluk), the merchants primarily Arab, and there were Persians, Kurds and some Indians (Buckingham, 387; Niebuhr, ii, 250; Ker Porter, ii, 265; Wellsted, i, 251). There were numerous bazaars in Baghdad especially near the bridge, and the grand ones were vaulted with bricks, while the others were covered with palm trees. There were many maâns, 24 hammâms, five great madrasas, and twenty large mosques and many small ones (Buckingham, 387; Ives, 275; al-Munshî al-Baghdâdî, 31; Niebuhr, ii, 230; Wellsted, i, 257; Olivier, ii, 382).

The streets were narrow, and some had gates closed at night for protection. Houses were high, with few windows on the streets. The interior consists of ranges of rooms opening into a square interior court usually with a garden. Sarâdsîs were used to avoid heat in summer, while open terraces were convenient for the late afternoon. In summer people slept on the roof (cf. Buckingham, 380). Baghdad had some industries especially tannery and the fabrication of cotton, silk and woollen textiles (Rousseau, 9-10).

From 1831 to the end of the Ottoman period, Baghdad was directly under Constantinople. Some governors tried to introduce reforms. Mehmed Rashid Pasha (1879) was the first to try to improve economic conditions. He formed a company to buy two ships for transport between Baghdad and Basra, the success of which led to the corresponding British project. Nâmîk Paşa (1853) founded the damir-khadîma which could repair ships (Chiha, 34, 38-9; Gazeteer, i, 1340, 1365-6, 1372). Midhat Paşa (1860-1872) introduced the modern wilâyêt system. The wilâyêt had a maârîzîn, or assistant, a mudir for foreign affairs, and a mebmân or secretary. The wilâyêt was divided into seven sandjaks headed by mulaşqarîs, Baghdad being one of them (Gazeteer, i, 1442, 1447-8). He abolished some obnoxious taxes—the tisâsîb (octroi duty) on all produce brought to the city walls for sale, the fâlsîbîya, a tax on river crafts, bâkuns halab, or 20% on fuel, and rûs 'bâkîr, a tax on irrigation wheels for cultivation, and replaced it by a 'âghtî on agricultural produce (Gazeteer, i, 1442). In 1870 Midhat founded a tramway linking Baghdad with Kâşîmâyân, and it continued for 70 years ('All Ḥaydar Midhat, Life, 51). He established (1869) the first to appear in 'Irâk as the official organ of the provincial government; it continued until March 1917 as a weekly paper ('Azzâwî, vii, 243; Ali Haydar Midhat, The Life of Midhat Pasha, London 1903, 47 ff.; Târîx, Arabic Press, i, 78; Handbook of Mesopotamia, i, 81).

With the exception of a few French Missionary schools, there were no modern schools in Baghdad. Between 1869-1871, Midhat established modern schools, a technical school, a junior (Rûkûdû) and a secondary (Fâdî) military schools, and a junior and secondary (Mudîrû) school in 1890 (Zâwa', vii, 21; Sânîmî-i Bagdadî (1900), 454; Chiha, 100-102). Midhat pulled down the city walls as a step towards its modernisation. He completed the Saray building started by Nâmîk Paşa (Chiha, 66).

The education movement started by Midhat continued after him. The first junior girls' school was opened in 1869 (Sânîmî, 138-39) and four primary schools were opened in 1890, and a primary teachers' school in 1900 (Sânîmî-i Ma'ârîzî, Istanbul 1900; S. Faydl, Ni'dîl, 129-30). In August 1910 Nazim Pasha constructed a bund surrounding east Baghdad to protect it from floods ('Azzâwî, vii, 165). In 1910 Nâzîm Pasha constructed a bund surrounding east Baghdad to protect it from floods ('Azzâwî, vii, 200-1). He was the last energetic wâlk.

Administration was headed by the wâlk assisted by a council, about half of which consisted of elected members, and the rest were appointed (ex-officio). About two of the elected members were non-Muslims. The wâlk was assisted by a kâ'em maâkâm (Zâwa', No. 1340; Sânîmî 1292 A.H.). Among important offices were the Ma'ârîzî council, the Tapû directorate, the registration office, and the civil
The Baghdad bazaars were covered, or uncovered like Sūk al-Qhāl. At the eastern bridgehead was the chief place for trade in the bazaars of the Sarksy, Maydān, Shordjā, and the cloth bazaar rebuilt by Dāwūd Pasha. Some bazaars had crafts with their own guilds and usually the bazaar was named after it, such as Sūk al-Ṣāfāfīr (coppersmiths) Sūk al-Sarrājdīn (saddlery), Sūk al-Ṣaghār (silver smiths), Sūk al-Khāfāfīn (shoemakers) etc. (Ewliya Čelebi, iv, 22; M.G.T.B., i, 22-3).

There were two important streets, one from the North Gate to near the bridge, and the other from the South Gate to the end of the main bazaar. In 1915 the North Gate was connected with the South Gate by a road, now known as Raghdī street (Handbook, 1, 377; Sānān (1318 A.H.), 599-600).

In 1922 Nāmık Paşa tried to repair some of the streets (Sānān (1318 A.H.), 60). In 1307/1889 Sirrif Paşa transferred the Maydān to an open square with a garden (see Sānān (1321), 76).

In 1285/1869 Midḥāt formed a municipal council by election and orders were issued to clear the streets. In 1879 municipalities were formed and orders were issued for achieving cleanliness and drainage (Zawrd, 231, No. 878, No. 817, No. 1774, Lughat al-'Arab, iii, 17; Sānān (1300), 135).

Lighting with kerosene lamps was adopted and given to a contractor, but in fact only streets with notable residents were lit (Zawrd, 490, no. 837) (see further Baladiyya.)

At the beginning of the 20th century the city of Baghdad covered an area of about four sq. m. The remains of the city wall on the East side demolished by Midḥāt formed with the river a rough parallelogram about 2 miles long with an average width of over a mile. About a third of this area was empty or occupied by graveyards or ruins, and towards the south much space was covered by date groves.

Karkh began further upstream than East Baghdad but it was much smaller in length and depth (Handbook, ii, 276). In 1882 there were 16,303 houses, 600 inns, 21 baths, 46 large mosques (djāmāʾ) and 36 small mosques (masdjād), 34 children’s madhk, and 21 religious schools, 184 coffee-shops, and 5,244 shops (Sānān (1300), 136). In 1884 the figure were: 16,426 houses, 205 inns, 39 baths, 93 djāmāʾ, and 42 masdjād and 36 children’s madhk (Sānān (1302), 335).

In 1903 Baghdad had 4,000 shops, 285 coffee-shops, 125 orchards, 145 djāmāʾ, 6 primary schools, 8 schools for non-Muslims and 20 convents (tekke), 12 bookshops, one public library, 20 madhk for boys, 8 churches, 9 tanneries, one soap factory, 129 workshops for weaving, 22 textile factories (Sānān (1321), 179). By 1909 houses reached 90,000 in number. There were 3 private printing presses, 6 churches and 6 synagogues (Sānān (1324), 223).

Sūkri al-Aṣbūl described 44 mosques in East Baghdad and 28 in Karkh (Ālūs, Masdjād; Masignon, Mission, ii, 63-5).

The temperature in Baghdad ranged from 114° to 121° F. in summer, and from about 20° to 31° F. in winter, but it sometimes rose to 123° F. in summer and fell to 20° F. in winter.

Baghdād produced some distinguished poets during the Ottoman period, like Fuḍūl (g.e.), Dhiḥīnī (g.e.), Alqāṣir and ʿAbd al-Bāsil al-Umāri; historians like Murtaḍā, Ghrābāt and M. Shukri Ālūs; jurists like ʿAbd Allah Sūwāydi and Abu ʿl-Thānā al-Ālūs (see Ālūs, al-Misk al-Abdār, Baghdad 1930).

Modern Baghdad has changed considerably, especially since the thirties. It has expanded to link...
up with A'zamiyya and Kāzimayn to the north, with the eastern bund to the east, with the al-Māţār al-Madāni and with nearby suburbs like Maţār and Maţmūn cities. There are 76 quarters in Karkh and Rusāfā, 8 in A'zamiyya, 4 in Karradh Šahrकییa and 6 in Kāzimayn (Sousa, Atlas Baghdad, 21-5). The population of the Baghdad municipality in 1947 was 466,73; it had mounted to 735,000 by 1957.

Traditional styles of building gave way to houses, built on western lines, in areas beyond the old city, while the old sections are being gradually transformed. The bridge of boats is gone, and four permanent bridges have been constructed.

The process of modernisation, both material and social, is too rapid to be recorded here.

Bibliography: Hafiz Abrii, Dhayl-i Djdmi*
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al-Baghätz (also called al-Baghätz-i, al-Baghdad), 498/1105. His father took him to Khurāsān where he soon after died. He was learned in literature as well as in law, principles, arithmetic, law of inheritance and theology. He left Nāḩīpur because of rioting by Turkmen and went to Isfara’in where he soon after died. He was learned in literature as well as in law, and his preparation both of drugs, and of charms and amulets. To see a mule in a dream was interpreted as a sign of a voyage, or of longevity, degeneracy, sterility, etc.

In addition to the other meanings collected by the Arabic dictionaries and Dozy, it is worth noting that the word baghla (pl. baghdālā) denoted in Egypt female slaves born of unions between Qurānī and another race (see al-Djahiz, Bighdāl, 66).

Bibliography: In addition to the usual works on zoology (in this category the dictionary of Damir is a fundamental work), pharmocopoeia, oniromancy, etc. (see for example the bibliography of the article ‘Am‘āk), which give a certain amount of information, particular attention is drawn to the fact that mules, doubtless because of their curious origin, prompted Djahiz to write a special study, al-Kauš fi l-Bighdāl (ed. Ch. Pellat, Cairo 1375/1955), which is a sort of supplement to the K. al-Hayawān, and in which the author quotes chiefly anecdotes and verses illustrating the character and usefulness of these animals.

Baghätz (also Baghätz, or Baghätz-i) [see Al-Baghätz, Al-Baghätz-i, Al-Khatib, Al-Khatib al-Baghdad].

Baghla, mule (pl. baghdālā, fem. baghdāla; but some think that baghla denotes the hybrid without distinction of sex, and that baghdāla is a singulative form which applies both to the male and female); the same word denotes both the hinny, the offspring of a stallion and a she-ass (cf. however kawdar in al-Mas‘ūdī, ii, 406; contra: al-Dīhāsī, Bighdāl 120; al-Damirī, s.v.; cf. al-Dīhāsī, Tarbī, ed. Pellat, index, s.v.), and the mule, the offspring of a he-ass and a mare, the morphological characteristics of the two varieties being midway between those of the he-ass and those of the stallion, with however a tendency to be influenced by the mother’s side. Kārin (Korah; see al-Damirī) or Tāhrūrah (see al-Tabarī/Bal‘amī, trans. Zoitenberg, i, 101) was the first to bring about this cross-breeding, but the Kārin (xvi, 8) naturally attributed the creation of the mule to God. Muhammad himself possessed mules (notably Duldul, which lived up to the time of Mu‘āwiyah), so that although the bahadīs forbidding the consumption of the flesh of the mule (like that of the ass) may be authentic, those concerning the interdict on the mating of asses and mares have less chance of being so; at all events, it was not observed, and the mule industry did not suffer by reason of it. The postal service used these animals, and eminent men and women of noble birth did not disdain to ride on them, in spite of their stubbornness and obstinacy, because their even gait and surefootedness made them valued mounts.

Men of an inquiring mind have been especially interested in this hybrid and its sterility; the Arab zoologists, however, thought that the mule was by nature fertile, but that it could not retain the male (lā ta’lak), or that it was too small-boned to give birth without losing its life; in order to prevent accidents of this sort it was sometimes “sewn up” (makhiṣa). But al-Damirī relates that in 444/1052 a she-mule gave birth to a black silly and a white mule.

The size of its head and penis, its longevity (due to continence), its sterility, its obstinacy and other characteristic traits of the mule are proverbial, and the words baghla and baghdāla enter into a large number of everyday expressions (for an account of the she-mule of Abū Dulāma, which became proverbial by reason of its defects, see M. Ben Cheneb, Abū Dolāmā, Algiers 1922; al-Dīhāsī, Bighdāl, 100 ff.). Certain parts of the body of the mule, notably its teeth, hair, hooves, and blood, were used in the preparation both of drugs, and of charms and amulets. To see a mule in a dream was interpreted as a sign of a voyage, or of longevity, degeneracy, sterility, etc.

In addition to the other meanings collected by the Arabic dictionaries and Dozy, it is worth noting that the word baghla (pl. baghdālā) denoted in Egypt female slaves born of unions between Qurānī and another race (see al-Dīhāsī, Bighdāl, 66).

Bibliography: In addition to the usual works on zoology (in this category the dictionary of Damir is a fundamental work), pharmocopoeia, oniromancy, etc. (see for example the bibliography of the article ‘Am‘āk), which give a certain amount of information, particular attention is drawn to the fact that mules, doubtless because of their curious origin, prompted Djahiz to write a special study, al-Kauš fi l-Bighdāl (ed. Ch. Pellat, Cairo 1375/1955), which is a sort of supplement to the K. al-Hayawān, and in which the author quotes chiefly anecdotes and verses illustrating the character and usefulness of these animals.

Baghätz (also Baghätz, or Baghätz-i) [see Al-Baghätz, Al-Baghätz-i, Al-Khatib, Al-Khatib al-Baghdad].

Baghätz, the ancient Pagrae, guarded the Syrian end of the Bayān pass on the road from Antioch to Alexandretta across the Amanus, and was thus a place of transit and a strategic position of importance. This region, which had been laid waste at the time of the first wars between the Arabs and the Byzantines, was furnished with colonists by Maslama; this initiated a recovery, and Hisgām built a small fort there; it was naturally included in the fact of its defects, see M. Ben Cheneb, Abū Dolāmā, Algiers 1922; al-Dīhāsī, Bighdāl, 100 ff.). Certain parts of the body of the mule, notably its teeth, hair, hooves, and blood, were used in the preparation both of drugs, and of charms and amulets. To see a mule in a dream was interpreted as a sign of a voyage, or of longevity, degeneracy, sterility, etc.
Crusaders. About the middle of the 6th/12th century it was captured by the Templars, but in 1188 was seized for a short time by Ṣalḥ al-Dīn, in 1191 was taken by the Armeno-Cilician Levant, and was only surrendered by the latter to the Templars in 1216. The Templars evacuated the town in 1268 following the capture of Antioch by the Mamlūk Sultan Baybars. From then onwards Baghrās protected the frontier of the Mamlūk state against the Armeno-Cilician kingdom, as long as the latter continued to exist, and formed a special military command depending on the province of Aleppo. Baghrās is still mentioned incidentally in the operations conducted by the Mamlūk sultans for the protection of their northern frontier up to the time of the Ottoman conquest, after which it fell into ruins. Only a small village exists there to-day. The fortress, which has never been the object of a proper archaeological investigation, was of average importance, and seems to have been the work of the Byzantines and Mamlūks rather than of the Templars or Armenians.

**Bibliography:** Baladhuri, Futūḥ, 148, 164, 167; Istakhri, i, 65; Yahyā of Antioch, Patrol. Or., xviii, 816; ʿīz al-Dīn b. Ṣhādād, al-ʿAǧāḥ etc., in al-Maqrīzī, 1935, in fine; Abu ʿl-Fīḍāʾ (Reinaud), 258; Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (Defrémery) i, 163 (= Gibb 104-5); al-ʿUmārī, Tarīq al-Ṣuyūṭī, Faqih wa-Wīssowā, xviii-2, 2315; M. A. Cheira, La lutte entre les Arabes et les Byzantins, Alexandria 1947, index; M. Canard, Les Hamdanides, i, 228; Dussaud, Topographie etc., 433-34; Cl. Cahen, La Syrie du Nord, 1940, index; M. Hartmann, in ZERd. Berl., xxix, 170, 513; Guides Blais, Syrî-Palestine, 189; P. Jacquot, Anticōche centre de tourisme, ii, 194 ff.

**Bagirmi,** name in the 19th century of a negro Muslim State, situated on the right bank of the Shari, S.E. of Lake Chad. In Barth's time (1852) the capital was Massenya. There were a certain number of tributary regions within its orbit, lying between 16° and 18° N. and 15° and 18° E. This historical name is no longer in official use to-day; only a district of Massenya exists, of other tributary regions having been either attached to the district of Bousso or to that of Melfi.

The regions which once bore the name Bagirmi form a vast plain at an elevation of 1000 ft., sloping gently away towards Lake Chad. The level expanse of alluvial soil is only broken by barren dunes and in the East, in the canton of Bakkare, by isolated regions having been either attached to the district of Bousso or to that of Melfi. The population is made up of very diverse elements: negroes (Bagirmese, Bornouese, Sara, Massa), Arabs (Yessié, Dekakiré, Ouled Moussa), Fulani and Bororo-Fulani as far as the Ati and Musoro districts. The semi-nomadic Arabs move between their villages, where in the rainy season they cultivate the ground, and the banks of the Shari, to which they resort at the end of the dry season.

With the exception of the Massa, cattle herders) live by crop raising, food gathering and fishing. The nomadic Fulani migrate as far as the Logone and Lake Chad, the Bororo Fulani as far as the Ati and Musoro districts. The Sedentary negroes (with the exception of the Massa, cattle herders) live by crop raising, food gathering and fishing. The nomadic Fulani migrate as far as the Logone and Lake Chad, the Bororo Fulani as far as the Ati and Musoro districts. The semi-nomadic Arabs move between their villages, where in the rainy season they cultivate the ground, and the banks of the Shari, to which they resort at the end of the dry season.

With the exception of the Massa and the Sara, who have remained animists, these peoples were converted to Islam three hundred and fifty years ago under the influence of Fulani missionaries and Hausa merchants. Islam, however, has only made a somewhat superficial impression.

The state of Bagirmi, founded in the 16th century, at the outset enjoyed considerable prosperity; then, at the beginning of the 19th century, as the result of wars with the Wadai, it began to decline. In 1870 the Sultan of the Wadai took Massenya and expelled the Sultan Abū Sektīne. The latter's successor, Gouaroung, threatened by Rabah (see Bornu), placed himself under the protection of France (1897), which resulted firstly for the Bagirmi in the terrible reprisals of Rabah, then, when the latter had been defeated and killed at Kousseri (22 April 1900), in the final pacification under French administration. The Sultan was retained for outward appearances, but his authority limited to the Massenya canton. Massenya, the capital, was an important town in Barth's time, enclosed by walls 7 miles in circumference. It was partly destroyed in 1870 and then abandoned at the time of Rabah's invasion. It was rebuilt once more 20 km. (121/2 m.) to the S.E. It is, however, no more than a large village with a population of 1,700 inhabitants. Indeed the whole district lies remote from the main currents of trade. Only a small proportion of the local produce—ground-nuts, butter, skins—is taken to the markets at Bongor, Bokoro and Fort Lamy.

**Bibliography:** Mohammed el Tounsi, Voyage au Wadai, trans. Perron, Paris 1852, v and vi; H. Barth, Reisen und Entdeckungen, Gotha 1858, iii, xi-xv; G. Nachtigal, Sahara und Sudan; E. Gentil, La chute de l'empire de Rabah, Paris 1902; A. Fournier, Deux années dans la région du Tchad, in Bulletin du Comité de l'Afrique française, 1904, Renseignements coloniaux, no. 5; Lt.-Col. Largeau, L'occupation du Wadai, in Revue de Paris, i (January 1910; Ferrandi, La colonie du Tchad, Paris-Nancy 1930; L. Massignot, Annuaire du monde musulman, 360. (R. Capot-Rey)

**Bāḥ,** one of a number of terms in the Arabic language denoting coitus. Fīṯāḥ, in the main, uses the term wāṭi’. In principle, bāḥ is bāḥām (as well as sexual indulgences of a minor character) if the partners are not married to each other, or united by the bond of ownership (master and slave-concubine); if this is not the case, the penal law intervenes to punish zināʾ—most commonly by death (see ḥadd, zināʾ, muḥšan), at least in theory. On the other hand, according to a celebrated hadīth, wāṭiʾ performed in a legal manner is an "alms" in the eyes of God. Fīṯāḥ considers most practices permissible for the married couple, with perhaps a restriction regarding wāṭiʾ fi ḍuburika. Bāḥ is, in principle, permitted at all times, except in certain circumstances of a ritual character (by day
during the month of Ramadān, or when one is in ṣaḥām during the baddhī (q.v.). On the other hand, a well-known text of the Kur'ān says: ‘Your wives are a tilth for you, so go to your tilth as you will’ (ii, 231), and the Kur'ānic prohibition (ii, 230) of intimate relations during the menstrual period is not enforced by penalties, at least not in this world. Fīkh does not forbid the sight of the partner’s nakedness, but on the other hand, according to tradition, the Prophet in the matter of wuṭūd behaved with the greatest modesty, both in this respect and in others. As regards the legality of contraceptive practices, see the article ‘Azl. Fīkh does not place any interdict on relations with a partner who has not reached the age of puberty provided that the act is physically possible. The schools are not in agreement on the question whether the wife can demand the performance of the conjugal duty: in the Mālikī school, the forsaken wife has the right to claim a divorce. On the other hand, the husband can always require his wife to be at his service, because wuṭūd constitutes the very essence of nikāh (q.v.); fīkh is here in agreement with etymology (nikāh—marriage, and coitus).

Bibliography: See bibliography to the article ‘Azl; add: O. Pesle, La femme musulmane.

(G. H. BOUSQUET)

BAHĀ’ ALLĀH. — Founder of the new religion which took the name of Bahā’ī from his own name (literally, ‘Glory, Splendour, of God’). In Persian it is known commonly as Amr-i Bahā’ī, ‘Bahā’ī Cause’, or Amr Allāh, ‘Cause of God’; the adjective amrī is used of publications, matters and facts pertaining to the Cause, e.g., nashriyyāt-i amrī ‘religious publications’, etc. Bahā’ī is generally called by his disciples Dīmāl-i Mubārak, ‘The Blessed Beauty’ and Dīmāl-i Kūdam, ‘The Ancient Beauty’. His name was originally Mirzâ Husayn ʿAll Nūr (from Nūr, in Māzandarān, the place of origin of his family). He was born at Tehran on 2 Muharram 1233/12 November 1817 of a noble family which had given several ministers to the Persian court. According to the Bahā’ī tradition, and to what he himself declares in his writings, he never attended any school. His was a profoundly religious personality, and he relates in one of his works (lawḥ-i Raḥi) how, right from infancy, he was moved to religious thinking after a performance of puppets which, after the show with all its ostentation was over and they had been redisposed in their box, suggested to him the thought of the fallibility and the vanity of human power. After the declaration of the Mission of the Bāb (q.v.) in 1260/1844, he was one of his first disciples, and shared the fate of the Bābis. Bahā’ Allāh never knew the Bāb personally and, to judge by a phrase in the Kitāb al-Shaykh, 122, he had never even read the Bayān, which he knew by heart. In 1852, after the attempt on Nāṣīr al-Dīn Shāh, he was arrested and thrown into the prison at Tehran known as Siyāh Čal (‘the black hole’), where he stayed from August of that year until 22 January 1853. In his work Kitāb al-Shaykh (‘book of the Shaykh’, known also as Lawḥ-i İbn-i Dīd (‘Epistle of the Son of the Wolf’) he narrates the story of his journey, fettered, from Niyaḵwarān to Tehran, and his interesting mystical experience in the prison in the long nights he passed without sleep on account of the heavy chains which fastened his neck, hands and feet. It seemed to him, he tells us, that he heard a voice which cried to him, ‘Truly, We shall succour Thee, by the means of Thee Thyself and Thy pen. Be not afraid . . . Thou art in security. Soon God will raise up the treasures of the earth, namely those men who shall succour Thee for love of Thee and Thy name, by which God shall bring to life the hearts of the Sages’. At other times it seemed to him that a great river was running from the top of his head to his chest ‘like a powerful river pouring itself out on the earth from the summit of a lofty mountain’. The Bahā’īs consider this experience as the first beginnings of the prophetic mission of their founder. Banished with all his family to ʿIrāq after all his possessions had been confiscated, he dwelt at Baghdaḍ, where his spiritual influence over the Bābis continued to increase, whereas that of his half-brother Mīrzâ Yāḥyā—known by the name of ʿSubh-i Āzal, which the Bāb had given him (v.s.v. bāb)—was on the decline. From 1854 to 1856 Bahā’ī Allāh took himself to Kurdistan, where he lived as a nomadic dervish on the outskirts of Sulaymāniyya. When he returned to Baghdaḍ, his growing influence, and the numerous visitors he received even from Persia, caused the Persian consul to request his immediate exile to Constantinople. A short while before his departure on 21 April 1853, in the garden of Naqīḇ Pāghā near Baghdaḍ—called by the Bahā’īs bičh-i ṭaḏdūn—Bahā’ī Allāh declared himself, to a select number of his followers, to be He Whom God Shall Manifest (mūʾin yuṣṭirah ʿilāh) as predicted by the Bāb. The exiles arrived at Constantinople in August, and after some months were sent to Edirne, where they arrived in December. At Edirne Bahā’ī Allāh openly declared his prophetic mission, sending letters (known, like all Bahā’ī Allāh’s letters, by the name of lawḥ, pl. alawḥ, ‘tablets’) to various sovereigns, inviting them to support his Cause. At this time the great majority of Bābis came out in his favour. The dissensions with the minority, who followed ʿSubh-i Āzal, gave rise to some incidents, which impelled the Ottoman government to banish those who henceforth called themselves Bahā’īs to Acre (ʿAkkā), and the others to Cyprus. In August 1868 Bahā’ī Allāh and his family arrived at ʿAkkā. A stricter imprisonment in the fortress lasted until 1877, after which Bahā’ī Allāh was authorised to transfer himself to a country house which he had rented at Mazra’ā. From 1288/1871 to 1290/1874 Bahā’ī Allāh was engaged on writing the fundamental book of his religion, Kitāb-i Aḥdāt, the “Most Holy Book”. About 1880 he was allowed to transfer to the neighbourhood of Bahdjī, not far from ʿAkkā, where he died, after an illness lasting some days, on 29 May 1892. In 1890 he had received at Bahdjī Professor E. G. Browne, the only European who met him personally and on whom Bahā’ī Allāh made a deep impression. For the doctrine of Bahā’ī Allāh see BAHĀ’.

Bahá’l Alláh — Bahá’l al-Dín Zuhrayr

Stuttgart 1916; Ma’dmú’í-a’i Malú’í-a’i Alvá’d-i Mu’á’dk-i Hádrat-i Bahá’l Alláh, Cairo 1338/1920 (containing important short works of Bahá’l Alláh); Kútháb al-Sháhíyá, Cairo 1338/1920; Kútháb Bahá’l Alláh ía’ l’-Súlimán Náyír al-Dín Sháh, Cairo 1330/1912; Súú-rí’í Malú’í, n.p., n.d.; Ad’úy-í Hádrat-i Mahbúb, Cairo 1339/1921 (various prayers written by Bahá’l Alláh, including the Obligatory Prayers). English anthologies: Shoghi Effendi (tr.), Gleanings from the writings of Hádú’úb’l-Akhrád, New York 1931 (prayers and meditations); Selected Writings of Bahá’í’l’Alláh, Wilmette 1943 (containing the translation of numerous minor works of Bahá’l Alláh and ‘Abd al-Bahá’).—On his life to 1853: Nabil Zarándíyá, Ta’ríhí-n Nábí, Eng. trans. by Shoghi Effendi, The Dawn-Breakers: History of the early days of the Bahá’í Revelation, New York 1932; for the following years, Shoghi Effendi, God passes by, Wilmette 1945. The death of Bahá’í Alláh is described in Nabil Zarándíyá, Ta’ríhí-n Shú’úíd-i Hádrat-i Bahá’l Alláh, Cairo 1342/1924 (with a Má’dmá’íi of the same author on the Bahá’í history; containing also Bahá’í Alláh’s testament, Kútháb ‘át’hí). (A. BAUSANI)

BAHÁ’í AL-DÁWLA [see BUWAYHÍD].

BAHÁ’í AL-DIN AL-’AMÍL [see AL-’AMÍL].

BAHÁ’í AL-DIN ZAKARIYYÁ, commonly known as Bahá’í al-Bakki, a saint of the Suhrwardí order, was born at Kót Karor (near Múlátan) in 578/1182-3, according to Firíghtá. He was one of the most distinguished mádlá of Shaykh Shiháb al-Dín Suhrwardí [q.v.] and is the founder of the Suhrwardí order in India. After completing his study of the Qur’án according to its seven methods of recitation at Kót Karor, he visited the great centers of Muslim learning in Khrúsán, at Búkhárá and Medina, and in Palestine—in order to complete his study of the traditional sciences. While in Medina he learnt hadíth with an eminent traditionalist, Shaykh Kamál al-Dín Yámní, and spent several years in religious devotions at the mausoleum of the Prophet. After visiting the grave of the Bahá’í saints in Palestine, he reached Búkhárá and became a disciple of Shaykh Shiháb al-Dín Suhrwardí. At this time he was, as his master said, ‘dry wood ready to catch fire’, and so after seventeen days’ instruction, the latter appointed him his successor and ordered him to set up a Suhrwardí kdnakdh in Múlátan. He lived and worked in Múlátan for more than a century and his kdnakdh—a magnificent building where separate accommodation was provided for all inmates and visitors—developed into a great centre of mystic discipline in medieval India. He died in Múlátan on 7 Šá’dar 666/21 December 1262.

Shaykh Bahá’í al-Dín’s order flourished most vigorously in Sind and the Panjúbí, though he had attracted some disciples from Hártá, Hamádán and Búkhárá. As a mystic teacher he was known for his nafs-i gtrá (intuitive intelligence) which helped him in apprehending and controlling the minds of his disciples. He differed from contemporary Cidír mystics in several matters: (i) He did not allow all sorts of people to throng round him. The Dáwá’íkhs and Kalandars seldom obtained access to him. “I have nothing to do with the generality of the public”, he is reported to have remarked. (ii) He lived in an aristocratic way and had granaries and treasures in his kdnakdh. (iii) He did not observe continuous fasts but ate and drank in the normal manner. (iv) While among the Cidírs the custom of samín-bás prevailed, he never permitted anybody to bow before him. (v) He believed in keeping close contact with the rulers and the bureaucracy. (vi) He did not believe in mystic songs (samá’).

Bahá’í al-Dín exercised great influence on mediaeval politics. He helped Itútumísh (607-633/1210-1235) in establishing his hold over Múlátan and accepted from him the honorific title of Shaykh al-Islám. In 644/1246 when the Mongols besieged Múlátan and the ruler of Hártá joined them, the Shaykh offered 100,000 dinár to the invaders and persuaded them to raise the siege.

The Shaykh lies buried in Múlátan in an imposing tomb, surmounted by a hemispherical dome and decorated with fine enamelled tiles.

Bibliography: No Suhrwardí accounts of Shaykh Bahá’í al-Dín Zakariyyá were available even in the early 16th century when Shaykh Dámmálí brought into his Síyár al-Áfíf, Delhi 1331 A.H. all he could get from the Cidír sources. For original sees, Húsain Sídí, Fáwú’d al-Fu’d, Newal Kísré 1302 A.H., 5, 6, 10, 29 ff.; Hamíd Kándár, Khayr al-Mádídís (ed. K. A. Nízhání), Aliyará 1356, 131, 137, 283; Mír Kúrd, Síyár al-Ásíyíyá, Delhi 1302 A.H., 77, 91, 158; Sayý b. Muhammád, Ta’ríhí-náma-i Hárdá, Calcutta 1943, 159-58; Dámmá, Náfáhdt al-áms, Newal Kísré 1915, 452. See also, ‘Abd al-Ááqí al-Múhádíh, Ahdáb al-Kdýyád, Delhi 1309, 26-7; M. Gáwshí, Guzáír ábrár (As. Soc. Bengal, Ivanaw 98 f. 18); ‘Abd al-Ráhím Cidtíl, Kitábí al-Ásrá’ (MS. personal collection 494-97); Gálám Mú’n al-Dín, Mú’dríjí al-Wlázíyá (Personal collection) Vol. 1, 389-98; E. D. Mállán, Gazetteer of the Múlátan District, Lahore 1902, 339 f. (K. A. Nízhání).

BAHÁ’í AL-DIN ZUKARÍYÁ, ABU ‘L-FAÐL b. MUHAMMAD B. ‘ALI AL-MUHALLAHÍ AL-AZDI (generally known by the name of al-Bahá’í Zúhrayr), celebrated Arab poet of the Ayyúbíd period, born 5 Dhu’l-Hidjád 581/February 1186 in Mecca. Whilst still very young, he went to Egypt, where at Éús (Upper Egypt) he studied the Korán and letters, finally settling at Cairo towards 625/1227. Al-Bahá’í Zúhrayr was in charge of the service of al-Ááqí al-Múhádíh, son of the sultan al-Kámíl, and in 629/1232 accompanied him on an expedition to Syria and Upper Mesopotamia. In 637/1239, whilst returning to Egypt after his father’s death, al-Sálíb was betrayed by his troops at Nábuls and handed over to his cousin al-Nášír Dáwdú, who imprisoned him. The poet remained faithful to his master in adversity and spent sometime at Nábuls. When al-Sálíb ascended the throne of Egypt, he appointed him wásr and showered honours upon him. In 646/1248, he is to be found at al-Manšúra at the side of his sovereign, who was fighting against the seventh Crusade (St. Louis). As the result of a misunderstanding, the poet fell into disgrace and, in the seventh of his master, went to Syria, where he addressed his best panegyrics to the sovereign of Damascus, al-Nášír Yúsuf, but without success. He returned to Cairo a disappointed man; there he experienced solitude and poverty, and died in 656/ 1258.

His Dáwá’ín, preserved in Paris (MS 3173 of the B.N.) and elsewhere, and edited in Cairo (1314), is known. Palmer produced a fine edition with an English translation. In this Dáwá’ín he is shown as being a poet very often sincere and a true musician in verse. His choice of words, of form, manner and metre, the effects of rhythm and harmony,
everything shows a very mature taste. Without rejecting the poetics of his time or his rhetoric with its numerous figures, the poet in him sacrificially allows a glimpse of the rhetorician.


**Bahaʾ al-Hakīm** (see Bahaʾ al-Dīn Zakariyya’).

**Bahaʾduʾr.** A word common to the Altai languages, equally well represented in Turkish, Mongol and Tungus dialects. Its adjectival meaning is "courageous, brave," but it is universally used as a substantive with the meaning "hero." It also frequently occurs as a surname and an honorific title.

The Chinese transcription 莫訥 mo-ko-to suggests a trisyllabic *baya'tur* which, transcribed Bayanto, was in use also among the Proto-BulgarS in the 9th century. An Uyghur runic ms. which could originate in the 9th or 10th centuries has bātu and it is this bisyllabic form which is general in Turkish dialects. e.g. Osmanī bātur, Kazakh, Bashkir bātir, Özbek bātir, Tuvin māddir, Chuvash pătăr, etc. Some Turkish dialects have the trisyllabic form, e.g., Coman bayatur, but it is possible to see in them borrowings from Mongol. Beside the form already mentioned, Özbek has also bātudīr.

The word is attested in the earliest Mongol documents (13th century), always in the trisyllabic form, though the Chinese sources of the Mongol epoch usually transcribe 海都 pa-tu for bātūr.

Classical Mongol has bayatur, and variants exist probably in all the dialects. e.g. Kalmuck bātur, modern literary Khalkha bātur, Mongol Bātur. Among Tungus forms one could mention Manchu bāturi, Evenki bahatr, Even bigtir and buktir.

It is impossible to state the directions in which borrowings were made, but it seems probable that either the Turkish or the Mongol trisyllabic forms were original, and that the Tungus forms are, originally, Mongol loan-words. Inter-borrowings within the same group must have been frequent.

Bahaʾduʾr is, clearly, a word of civilization. It travelled far into the north and can be met in various Samoyed and Finno-Ugrian languages, in Siberia as well as in Europe, e.g. Ostiak matur, Hungarian bātőr (11th century). These, and some of the Slavonic forms, e.g. Russian bogatir, are borrowings from Turkish or Mongol. Persian bahādūr, borrowed from Mongol, had a wide-spread use as a title or a surname among Muslim dynasties. As it was also used by the Great Mughals, it penetrated into Anglo-Indian, in the sense of a "haughty or pompous person," exercising his brief authority with a strong sense of his own importance" (Yule, Hobson-Jobson).

The word found its way into Western European sources. Roger, Canon of Vārad, writing in 1244, gives Bokcher as the name of one of the Mongol generals taking part in the campaign against Hun-gary. The Portuguese ambassador to Timūr, Claviro (1406), has Bahadur.

**Bahadur Khān** (see Fārūq).

**Bahadur Shāh** (see Nizām Shāh).

**Bahadur Shāh I.** Muhammad Muʿāẓẓām was the second son of the Emperor Awrangzīb ʿAlamgīr by his second wife Rāhmāt al-Nisāʾ? Nawāb Bāīt, daughter of Rādhī Rādū, of Rādīawī in Kashmir. She was also the mother of Prince Muḥammad Sulṭān, who died in prison, 1670/1676, and Bād r al-Nisāʾ Bega (1647-1707), who was a ʿAlītī. She died in 1649. Muʿāẓẓām was born at Bānghāpur in the Deccan on 29 Shau全面发展 1045/14 October 1643.

His full titles were: Abā Naṣr Sayyid Kutb al-Dīn Muhammad Shāh ʿĀlam Bahādūr Shāh Bādshāh.

From the time of his elder brother's defection to ʿĀlam Shudārī in 1686-1688 he was the prospective heir apparent, and was regarded as such on Muhammad Sulṭān's death in 1686/1687 in Shābān 1687/October 1675 he received the title of ʿĀlam.

From 1663 he was actively employed by his father in the Deccan and against the Kingdom of Bidjāpūr. In 1641/1683-4 he led an army through the Konkan to Goa, then being besieged by the Maratha Rādū Shambhādī. But having fallen out with the Portuguese, he found his supplies cut off and made a disastrous retreat. He was then employed against Bījāpūr and the Kūṭ Shāhī dynasty of Golconda. Awrangzīb, already suspicious of Prince Muʿāẓẓām's lack of rancour against his rebel son Akbar, interpreted an attempted mediation between his father and Abu l-Ḥasan of Golconda as a plot against himself. Muʿāẓẓām, now known as Shāh ʿĀlam, was arrested with his sons on 4 March 1687. At first treated with great rigour, the Prince found the severity of his treatment gradually relaxed, until in April 1695 he was released and appointed Shubādar of Agra. In 1699 he became governor of Kābul province which he held at the time of his father's death, his eldest sons holding Tarṭhā and Mālūn.

On receiving the news of his father's death on 18 Dhu l-Ḥijja 1126, 23 March 1707, Prince Muhammad Muʿāẓẓām moved with great speed. He proclaimed himself by the title of Bahādūr Shāh when near Lahore, offered to honour his father's will by leaving his brother Aʿẓam Shāh the Deccan provinces, and arrived near Agra on June 12. On 18 Rabīʿ I 1126/16 June 1707, Aʿẓam Shāh and his son Bāṣīr Bākht were killed in a great battle near Jajau and Bahādūr Shāh was master of the empire. Kām Bahāsh, the youngest son of Awrangzīb, was defeated and killed near Haydarābād, Deccan, on 3 Dhu l-ʿIʿadā 1127/13 January 1709.

The short reign of Bahādūr Shāh was occupied by three problems, the Marathas, the Rādīpūts and the Sikhs. On the advice of Dhu l-Ḥikār Kān, Shāhī, the grandson of Shīhwālī, was released and sent back to Māhārāshtra with a Mughal mānaqāb of 7000. His arrival there provoked a civil war between his supporters and those of Tār Bāl, the regent widow of his uncle Rādīā Rām.

In the cold weather of 1707-8 Bahādūr Shāh regulated the succession of Amber and reduced the Rādīpūt Rādū of Jodhpūr to submission. But while campaigning against Kām Bahāsh the revolt flared up again. On his return in 1710 the emperor found himself confronted with a Sikh rebellion and had to make a compromise settlement with the Rādīpūts. The last Sikh gūrā, Govind Singh, was a supporter of Bahādūr Shāh, but was murdered in the Deccan in 1708. The Sikh revolt in the north was then...
revived by a man known as Banda who killed Wazir Khan, seized Sirhind and terrorised the east Pandjab. Bahadur Shah stormed Lohagarh and defeated but did not capture Banda in 1710-11. The last few months of his life were spent in Lahore where he died on 20 Muhaarram 1124/27 February 1712. The throne was immediately disputed between his four sons, Mu’izz al-Din Qabābār Shāh, ‘Alī Shāh, Rafī’ al-Shāh and Dāhān Shāh, the first of whom was successful.

Irvine describes Bahadur Shah as “although not a great sovereign . . . a fairly successful one”. He was courteous, learned, pious, brave, capable and equable in temper. He was generous and found it difficult to refuse a request, a trait which earned him the nickname of bi-khabar or heedless one. Not much is known of Bahadur Shāh’s family life, but the names of three wives have survived: Mihr al-Nisa Begum, Aziz al-Nisa Khanum and Nur al-Nisa Begum.


BAHĀDŪR SHĀH I, the last Mughal Emperor of India. He reigned as titular sovereign from 1253/1837 to 1274/1857. He was in fact, a pensionary of the East India Company, his actual authority being restricted to the limits of the Red Fort or Kāāl’s-mū’alla of Delhi, Mughal authority, by virtue of which the British held Bengal from 1765, was never formally disowned by them, but the Charter Act of 1833 asserted British sovereignty over British held territories in India. On May 11, 1857, Delhi was seized by mutinous troops from Meerut who compelled the unwilling Bahadur Shāh, then nearly 82, to accept nominal leadership of the revolt. After four months of unenthusiastic headship he retired to Humāyūn’s Tomb on the assault of Delhi by the British in September. With his favourite wife Zinat Mahāl and their son Mirzā Dīwān Bakhsh he surrendered to Lieton. Hodson on a promise of his life. After much indignity and a trial of doubtful legality he was exiled by the British Government to Rangoon in Burma, where he died on 13 Dīumādā 1 1729/7 November 1862. Descendants of his are still to be found there.

Bahadur Shāh was born on 27 Shabrān 1189/24 October 1775. He was the second son of Akbar Shāh II (1221-1253/1806-1837) and Lāl Bālī. He was eleventh in direct succession from the emperor Babur. In 1827 he described as “the most respectable, the most accomplished of the Princes” by Charles Metcalfe, then Resident of Delhi. He had a tall spare figure, a dark complexion with strongly marked aquiline features. Like his grandfather Shāh ‘Alam, he was a poet of some note, using the pen-name of Zafar. The poet Dhawk was his literary preceptor and Shāhīb attended his Court. His plaintive ghazals were long current in Delhi. He was also a calligrapher and musician of merit, and showed taste in repairing buildings and laying out gardens. His full title was Abu ‘l-Muṣaffar Sirāj al-Dīn Muhammad Bahadur Shāh.


BAHĀDŪR SHĀH GUDJĀRATI, sultan of Gudjārāt, 1528-1529. Second son of Muṣaffar Shāh II (917/1511-932/1526). Bahadur Shāh, on bad terms with his elder brother Sikandar, left Gudjārāt in 931/1525 and, travelling via Čitor and Mewāt to the court of Ibrahim Lodī was present, as an onlooker, at the battle of Panipāt between the sultan of Dīlī and the Mughal Bābur. Hearing of the death of his father and the accession of Sikandar, Bahadur Shāh hastened towards Gudjārāt to be greeted at Čitor with the news of the assassination of Sikandar by Khwāsh Kādam, Ĭmād al-Mulku. Rapidly gaining support from the Gudjārātī Muslim nobles, Bahadur Shāh assumed the insignia of the sultanate at Anhalwāra-Patan on 26th Ramadān, 932/6th July 1526.

Bahadur Shāh was the last vigorous sultan of independent Gudjārāt. In 935/1528 he attacked Burhān Niẓām Shāh of Ahmadnagar in alliance with Muhammad II of Khānbaḏ and ‘Alā al-Dīn Ǐmād al-Mulk of Berār occupying Ahmadnagar in 936/1529. The Niẓām Shāh appears to have accepted the overlordship of Gudjārāt until 938-9/1532 at least, but statements in the Arabic and Persian histories that he read the Bāsīb and struck coins in the name of the Gudjārātī sultan have not found corroboraton in the discovery of such coins.

In 937/1531 Bahadur Shāh attacked Mālwa, occupying Māndā. In 938/1532-3 he captured the Rājdūp strongholds of Ujjain, Bhīsā and Rāfshān together with their chief Sīhālī. In Ramadān 941/March 1535 Gudjārāt forces, at the second attempt, captured Čitor.

Meanwhile however, in the autumn of 941/1534 war had broken out between Bahadur Shāh and the Mughal Humāyūn; Bahadur Shāh had given refuge to the Lodi Afghans and to Muhammad Zamān Mirzā son-in-law to Bābūr, who had escaped from confinement by Humāyūn in the fort of Bayānā. Defeated by the Mughals at Mandasār and Māndā, and with much of his treasure captured by Humāyūn at the fall of Čāmpānīr in Safar 942/August 1535, Bahadur Shāh turned to the Portuguese for help.

In 937/1537, the Portuguese under Nuno de Cunha, governor of Goa, had been defeated in their attempt to capture Dīw. In Dīumādā 941/
December 1534, however, in return for a promise to aid Bahadur Shah against the Mughals, the Portuguese obtained Bassein in 942/1535. The right to build a fort at Diw where Bahadur Shah himself had taken refuge. The nominal Portuguese assistance to the Gudjarat sultan did not prevent Humayûn from capturing Bahadur Shah's capital of Ahmadabad. Humayûn's withdrawal from Gudjarat in 942/1536 to face the threat from Bābur led to the transfer of the capital of Gudjarat to Ahmadabad. The nominal Portuguese assistance was not enough to secure Bahadur Shah's cooperation in the Great Vizier Humayûn's war against the Mughals, as it was under his rule that the Sultan Walid thought they would be able to do as they pleased with him. His subsequent vigour, and his firmness in resisting certain of their demands, gave the lie to this accusation. The favour which he showed to the Mewlî! and Khalwatt orders soon brought him into conflict with the orthodox religious party, which also objected to his approval of tobacco and coffee and his tolerance of the devotions, music and dancing. His fall, however, was due not to his efforts but to other causes. In Dārum, I 1061/April-May 1651, in the course of a dispute which arose out of a question of jurisdiction involving the British Consul and the Kâdî of Izmir, Bahâ' Efendi placed the British ambassador in Istanbul under house arrest. For this breach of diplomatic usage he was dismissed and exiled to Midli. He remained, however, at Gelibolu and Lampsaca, and was reinstated in Kam. 1062/Aug. 1653; he continued in office until his death, of a quinsy, on 13 Šafar 1064/3 Jan. 1654. He was buried in Fâtih.

Bahâ' was known both as a poet and as a scholar, and left a number of treatises and fetwas. His best-known ruling was that in which he pronounced smoking lawful, thus ending an old prohibition. He was a heavy smoker, and his contemporary Hadjdjî Khalîfâ remarks of him that had it not been for this indulgence he might have become one of the most eminent scholars of the country. Bahâ'îs' authorisation of smoking, however, was due, according to Hâdîjî Khalîfâ, not to his own addiction but to a concern for what was best suited to the condition of the people, and to a belief in the legal principle that the basic rule of law is licitness (ibâha ašliyya).


**BAHÀ’Í MEHMET EFENDI**

Ottoman jurist and theologian. Born in Istanbul in 1004/1595-6, he was the son of 'Abbâl Allah Efendi, a Kâdî-'asker of Rumelia, and the grandson of the historian and of which was founded by Baha’ Allah. The foremost authority on the Baha’i religion, and its disseminator in Europe and America, was 'Abbâb Efendi. He became the eldest son of the founder and was a better known among the Bahà’ís as 'Abbâl Bahà (Servant of Bahà). Born on 23 May 1844 at Tehran, he accompanied his father on his journeys and in his exile, and at his death was recognised by the Bahà’ís as the authorised exponent and interpreter of his father's writings. He wrote extensively, most notably the Centre of the Covenant and “Model of Bahà’í Life”. In accordance with Bahà’ Allâh’s will (Ku’dâ), this will, however, was contested by ‘Abbâl Bahà’s brother Muhammad ‘Alî, who set up a rival group within the Bahà’î organisation and contrived to compromise his brother with the Ottoman authorities, who were hostile to the Bahà’ís. He was released from prison in 1908 under the amnesty granted by
the new Ottoman Government of the Young Turks, and in 1910 began his three great missionary journeys. The first was to Egypt (1910), the second to Europe (Paris and London, 1911), and the third to America and Europe (1912-13). From New York he made his way across the entire United States in eight months to Los Angeles and San Francisco, stopping in the main towns and preaching in evangelical churches, synagogues, masonic halls, etc. In September 1912 he returned to Europe, and from England went again to Paris, then to Germany, Austria and Hungary. Finally at the end of 1913 he returned from Paris to Palestine. The first Bahá’í group in America had formed as early as 1894, and on 10 December 1898 the first American Bahá’í pilgrims arrived at Acre. ‘Abdu’l-Bahá’s journey, one of the objects of which had been to counter the propaganda of his brother’s supporters, also notably strengthened the community of American adherents. In addition to this he formed Bahá’í groups in the European countries he passed through. In 1920 the British Government appointed him Knight of the Order of the British Empire. He died on 28 November at Haifa and was buried beside the Báb, in the great mausoleum which was completed in 1957. In his will he had appointed Shoghi Effendi (Shawki Effendi) Rabbání, the oldest of his grandsons, (the eldest son of his eldest daughter) as “Guardian of the Cause of God” (Wali-yi Amr Alláh). Shoghi Effendi, who died on 3 Nov., was born at Haifa in the last years of the last century. He studied at Oxford and in 1936 married the American Mary Maxwell, who took the name Rúhíyyé Khánum. From 1923 onwards he lived in Haifa in Israel, the world administrative centre of the Faith. The Bahá’í religion, while it claims to be “scientific” and opposed to dogma, has more clearly defined theological, philosophical, and social doctrines and forms of worship than some Orientalists have thought. I give them briefly below on the basis of the sources cited in the bibliography.

Religious doctrines. 1. God. A completely transcendent and unknowable entity. “Every road to Him is barred”. The Bahá’ís are opposed to mystic pantheism. Mystics have only given form to their own imaginations. “Even the loftiest souls and the purest hearts, however high they may fly in the realms of science and mysticism, can never pass beyond that which has been created inside themselves” (majá al-‘ashâ fi an-fushshâ inân-fushshâm) (Lawh-i Salâm). 2. Creation. The unknowable essence of God makes itself manifest and creates that which is not God. The Bahá’í idea of the beginning of things falls between that of creation and that of emanation. We could speak of eternal creation, seeing that the Bahá’í texts tend to keep the term khalfr (creation), but at the same time maintain that since the attribute of khalfd (creator) is co-eternal with God, there has never been a time when the world did not exist. Thus the world is eternal (Lawh-i Hikmat). 3. A special form of the manifestation of God is that which features in the Prophets. (The Bahá’í technical term is masphir-i idhâyya, divine manifestations, rather than rusûd or anbiyây. Thus the concept of khalfr (creation in the full sense of the word) is not accepted. In this connexion the letter of Bahá’í Allâh to Nasir al-Dîn Shâh (Lawh-i Sultan) is particularly interesting, as is the Kitáb al-Shâhâ, in which he describes his own mystic experience in the prison of Siyâh Câl at Tehran. The Prophet has two differing conditions: he is a man, but also a very clear mirror in which God is reflected. Thus in a certain sense it is not wrong to call him God, by way of abbreviation. The status of such a being as could be called “prophetic” is radically different from that of man; it falls between man’s status and that of God. According to Bahá’í doctrine no man, however perfect he may become, will be able to attain prophetic status (or better, that of “manifestation”), just as no animal, perfect as it may be of its kind, can aspire to human status. The manifestation of God through the Prophets never ceases. The manifestations of the Divine are successive. The first prophet is Adam, then come the traditional prophets of Judaism, Christianity and Islam. Zoroaster also is considered a true prophet, though the Buddha and Confucius are seen rather as great masters of the spiritual life. After Muhammad come the Báb (considered by the Bahá’ís as a true independent manifestation of God whose specific mission lasted only nine years), and Bahá’ Allâh. The Bahá’ís allow that other prophets better adapted to advanced stages of human progress may come after him, but “not before a thousand years” (Ahdâs). The prophetic periods are grouped together in larger cycles; with the Báb the cycle begun by Adam ends and the Bahá’í cycle begins. The latter is destined, according to doctrine, to last at least 500,000 years. It is thus inexact to consider the Bahá’í religion as syncretistic. Although it accepts all the prophetic religions as essentially true, it claims that it is the one best adapted to the present time, and that it includes in itself all its predecessors.

4. Man. Bahá’í psychology is somewhat complex. ‘Abdu’l-Bahá’s (Mufdídat) distinguishes five types of “spirit”: animal spirit, vegetable spirit, human spirit, the spirit of faith, and the Holy Spirit. The spirit of faith is given by God, and alone confers true “eternal life” on the human spirit (we are thus a long way from a purely philosophical conception of the immortality of the soul). “Faith” is essential to Bahá’í spiritual life. The text of the first verse of the Ahdâs runs as follows: “The first commandment of God to his servants is knowledge of the Dawn of His revelation, and the Dayspring of His Decree (i.e., of the Prophet), who is his appointed Representative in the created world (p. ‘ilâm al-amr wa-hi, mahlk). He who has attained this knowledge has attained all good. He who knows it not is of the world of error, even though he performs all (good) works". Faith in God (which, God being by definition unknowable, can only be faith in His manifestation, the Prophet) confers immortality on the believer, who continues in the worlds beyond his eternal journey towards the unknowable Essence of God (excessive interest in these worlds on the part of Bahá’ís is discouraged; they are explicitly forbidden to take part in spiritualist meetings). Paradise and Hell are symbols, the first of which stands for the true believer’s journey towards God, and the second the fruitless path towards annihilation of him who knowingly rejects the Faith and performs evil works. In the context of this progressive view of the world beyond Bahá’ís are allowed, and advised, to pray for the dead. Equally, the idea of reincarnation in this world is firmly rejected.

On the phenomenon of evolution, which in any case Bahá’í doctrine accepts the theory of evolution, not, however, as pronounced by Darwin, but rather in the traditional mystic sense already present in the maqâmât of Mawlânà Diâlî al-Dîn Rûmî (q.v.). “Man was always man throughout his evolution”, even though.
he may have passed through a series of stages of development.

Moral and social principles. The Baha'Is accept the ancient formula attributed to 'Ali: “All private matters belong to the human sphere, all concerns of society to the divine”. Hence the great emphasis in Bahá'í doctrine on the improvement of society, a task which is the charge of the Bahá'í world administration (see below).

The moral and social tenets of the Bahá'ís are classified by 'Abdu'l-Bahá under the following twelve headings: 1. Unity of the human race. 2. Need for an independent search for Truth. 3. Essential unity of all religions. 4. Need for religion to promote unity. 5. Need for science and religion to be in harmony. 6. Equal rights and duties for the two sexes. 7. Opposition to all kinds of prejudice: national, religious, political, economic, etc. 8. Attainment of world peace. 9. Obligation to provide universal education, accessible to all. 10. Solution on a religious basis of the social problem, with the abolition of the extremes of excessive wealth and degrading poverty. 11. Use of an auxiliary international language. 12. Constitution of an International Tribunal.

The controlling bodies of the Bahá'í community are of two kinds, administrative and instructional, the first being made up of elected councils and the second of persons and associations appointed from above. The two types come together at the summit of organization in the person of the Guardian (Wá'íl-yi Amr Alláh). The administrative bodies are as follows:

1. The local spiritual assembly (Bašt-i 'Adí-i Mi'ham). These are formed wherever there are at least nine Bahá'ís. They are of nine members elected by universal suffrage.

2. The Hands of the Cause. These are appointed by the Guardian. They are of nine members, elected by universal suffrage. Elections are held each year during the period from 21 April to 2 May (Ridwán festival). At the present time there are local assemblies in more than 200 countries throughout the world. Where there is a sufficient number of local assemblies a “Convention” of 19 members elected by universal suffrage elects a national spiritual assembly (Bašt-i 'Adí-i Mi'ham or Marhali) also of nine members, not necessarily from among its own members but from all adherents of the faith. There are at the present time more than twenty of these. 3. When sufficient national assemblies have been formed their members will elect a universal spiritual assembly (not necessarily from among themselves but from all adherents) to which the Bahá'ís will be able to look for ultimate guidance.

The Baha'i religion has no public ritual, nor any sacraments or private rites of a sacred character. The only religious duties of the Bahá'ís are: 1. To assemble every 19 days on the first day of each Bábí month (the Báb's calendar was adhered to by Bahá'í Alláh) for a communal celebration, called by the Western Bahá'ís the “19th day's Feast”, and by the Persians gisbadát-i rúh-i násádahum. It consists of readings of prayers and sacred texts (and even of passages from the Bible, the Qur'án, and the ancient formula attributed to Abdu'l-Bahá), from 2 to 21 March, the Bahá'í New Year's Day. The fast is of Islamic type, requiring abstention from all food and drink, etc., from dawn till sunset. 2. To fast 19 days, i.e., the entire Bábí month of 'Aštár, from 2 to 21 March, the Bahá'í New Year's Day. The fast is of Islamic type, requiring abstention from all food and drink, etc., from dawn till sunset. 3. To practise complete abstinence from all alcoholic drink. 4. To pray three times a day, morning noon, and evening, according to short, set formulae. The obligatory prayers (written in Arabic by Bahá'í Alláh) may be recited in any language. Some are preceded by ablutions, which are much simpler than Islamic ablutions, consisting only of washing the face and hands and reciting two very short prayers.

Apart from this the Ádás lays down precise rules for the division of inheritances (a portion of which falls to the teachers), levies a tax of 19 per cent on revenues, and prescribes numerous other rules and penal, civil and religious laws, which are followed in part only by the eastern Bahá'ís. Marriage is monogamous: although the Ádás allows bigamy, the provision was cancelled by 'Abdu'l-Bahá ("Model of Bahá'í Life"). Divorce is allowed, but discouraged.

The controlling bodies of the Bahá'í community are of two kinds, administrative and instructional, the first being made up of elected councils and the second of persons and associations appointed from above. The two types come together at the summit of organization in the person of the Guardian (Wá'íl-yi Amr Alláh). The administrative bodies are as follows:

1. The local spiritual assembly (Bašt-i 'Adí-i Mi'ham). These are formed wherever there are at least nine Bahá'ís. They are of nine members elected by universal suffrage. Elections are held each year during the period from 21 April to 2 May (Ridwán festival). At the present time there are local assemblies in more than 200 countries throughout the world. Where there is a sufficient number of local assemblies a “Convention” of 19 members elected by universal suffrage elects a national spiritual assembly (Bašt-i 'Adí-i Mi'ham or Marhali) also of nine members, not necessarily from among its own members but from all adherents of the faith. There are at the present time more than twenty of these. 3. When sufficient national assemblies have been formed their members will elect a universal spiritual assembly (not necessarily from among themselves but from all adherents) to which the Bahá'ís will be able to look for ultimate guidance.
prototype of the ideal world government of the future, which will eventually arise after a long process of peaceful evolution. The Bahá'ís do not accept the separation of Church and State, but maintain that in the absence of priests and sacraments the Bahá'í fusion of religion and administration will take on a different character from that of the traditional theocracies. Every Bahá'í is thus formally forbidden to belong to a political party or to secret societies and obedience to due authority is obligatory. The Bahá'í religion having a strong pacifist trend, members of the Bahá'í community are advised to avoid military service, at least in lands where conscientious objection is recognised by law. We could also speak of a strong trend towards vegetarianism, based on the absence of priests and sacraments the Bahá'í is thus formally forbidden to belong to a political party or to secret societies, and we have no exact information on the present number of Bahá'ís. As the number of Bahá'ís exceeds three thousand.


Of the works of Shoghi Effendi, who writes in English as well as in Arabic or Persian, the most important in English is God passes by, Wilmette 1945. Noteworthy for its rich and elegant Perso-Arabic style is the Lâwâh-e Kârn, Bombay n.d., a letter sent to the eastern Bahá'ís on the occasion of the first centenary of the foundation of the Faith (1944).

On Bahá'í doctrine: J. E. Esselmont, Bahá'í Texts and the New Era, London 1923 (with several other enlarged editions, the last printed at Wilmette in 1946); R. Jochel, Die Glaubenslehren der Bahá'í-Republik, Darmstadt 1957 (cyclostyled), containing a very large bibliography of eastern and occidental works; Abu 'l-Fadl 'Alī Gulpaygân (or Abu 'l-Fadl Diárfâhčâni) has produced interesting and stimulating controversial work in Arabic and Persian. We may cite from his writings: al-Hujâj al-Bahá'íyya, Cairo 1343/1925 (English trans. by 'Ali Kuli Khân, The Bahá'í proofs); Majmú'a-yi Rasâ'il, Cairo 1339/1920.

The Mâ'du'da-yi 'Amânâni, Tehran 1914 (Bahá'í era/1947, (6 vols.), is a vast anthology of the Founders' doctrinal writings.

Miscellaneous statistics and information on the life of Bahá'í communities throughout the world are given in biennial publications sumptuously edited in America, The Bahá'í World (12 volumes published up to the present time, from 1925 to 1957).

BAHÁR (see KAYL).

BAHÁR, Muh. Ta'kî (1885-22 April 1951), Persian poet and politician, born at Mashhad of a family originating from Kashán. In 1904, on the
death of his father, the poet Şabūrī, Muṣaffar al-Dīn Shāh conferred upon him the lakab borne by his father: Malāk al-Sha'arānī, Asād-Allāh-i Radānī-i Māshhād. From 1906 Bahār joined the camp of the Liberals (abhrād) and his first works appeared in al-Hāl-i Maltūm, published in India; moreover he very soon started his own review Nām Bahār (1909), which quickly became famous, firstly at Māshhād and then in Tehran, where he established himself permanently after a short exile in Constantinople (1915-6). Upon his return, he founded a club (andrūman) bearing the name Dānimāghada, with the review of the same name. He was several times a deputy in the Majlis, but retired from political life after the coup d'état of 25 February 1921 and devoted himself to the study of the old poets. After teaching the science of style at the Teachers' Training College and then at the University, he retired to political life and was Minister for National Education in an ephemeral cabinet (1946); he was also elected President of the national section of the Stockholm Peace Movement.

He is considered in Persia to be the greatest poet of his time. He is extolled for the charm of his intellect, his brilliant qualities as a conversationalist and for his gift of impromptu oratory. He succeeded in reviving Persian poetry, dormant since the Mongols, and in discovering the masters of the Šaffārī and Sāmānī periods. He knew only his mother-tongue, but that he knew to perfection.

The work left by Bahār is rich and varied (his last works were published in the review Yazgūd between 1946 and 1951). It is greatly to be regretted, however, that his work on prosody, Tāsawwur-i Nāma, was not completed and that his diwān, written in his own fine calligraphy, has only been printed in part. His main work deals with style and was published in 3 volumes from 1942 to 1948. He also composed risālas on Firdawsi, Manī and al-Jabari; mañšūmas (Bahār kiṣāba, kārnāma-i sandān); translations from Pahlavi and a novel. In addition, he wrote a brief history of the political parties, of which the first volume alone has been published. Finally he collaborated in publishing linguistic works and manuals (dastār-i šāhān-i fārsī, 2 vols.) as well as in the edition of certain books, (Ta'rikh-i Sīstān, Muḍjāmal al-Tawārīkh wa 'l-Ḳisās, etc.).

Bibliography: Notice by M. 'Ali Māzhīrī giving a résumé of his lecture on Bahār; 'Abd-Allāh Afghānī, Naḥīr-i fārsī-i mūṣārī, 1320; Sir E. Denison Ross, La Prose persane, la poésie persane, 1933, Soc. des Ét. Iran.; T. Rypka, Dējīny Peršī, .... literature, Prague 1956, index. (B. Nikitīne)

BAHĀR—ĐĀNESH [see INAYAT ALLĀH KĀNOJ].

BAHĀRĪ, name of a Turkish tribe in Persia. In particular, the name refers to the ruling family of the Karā-Ḵoyūnlī federation of Turkmen tribes (also called Bahārī). It is most probable that the name ("those of Bahār") is connected with the village of Bahār (Ibn al-Athlr, x, 290: W. kān, read Vāhār) situated at 13 kms. north of Hamadān. According to Ḩamd Allāh Mustawfi, Nūshā, 107 (Eng. transl. 106) the castle of Bahār served as residence to Sulaymān-šāh b. Parçam Īwāl, who later became one of the three chief ministers of the caliph al-Mustawfi. He was executed by the Mongols of Hülegū kān (2 Safar 656/Feb. 6 1258), cf. Dānhān, (Annex), iii, 290. See especially the excursus in the famous Bahārī-shāh's connection with one of the basic Oghuz tribes: Īvā (or Iwā), see Mahmūd Kāḏḏgārī, Dīwān Lūghat al-Turk, i, 56. The reasons of Sulaymān-šāh's expatriation from his principality of Bahār to Baghdād are unknown, but there are definite indications that even before the arrival of the Mongols the Īvā had spread northwards towards Erbil and Marāgha. The Khwārazm-šāh Dīlāl al-Dīn had to repress their depredations on the roads leading to Tāribz (winter 623/1226), see Ibn al-Athār, ii, 302; Nasawī, 262. The presence of an Īwāl is mentioned even in Khāṣīr (627/1230). These stages lead us to the region where the Karā-Ḵoyūnlī federation of tribes was formed. Even the emblem on some Karā-Ḵoyūnlī coins reminds one of the tribal ṣamghā of the Īvā. On the other hand the connexion of the Karā-Ḵoyūnlī rulers with Hama-dān is confirmed by the survival of their epigons in those parts. For a long time the region of Hamadān was called Kalam-ram-i ʿAlī Shahar, after the name of the important Karā-Ḵoyūnlī amīr.

At present splinters of the Bahārī tribe are scattered throughout southern Persia, see Sykes, Ten thousand miles, 81, 302.


BAHĀWALPŪR, a town in West Pakistan with a population of 60,000, situated near the left bank of the river Sutlej, at a distance of about 500 miles north of Karachi, with which it is connected by means of a railway. It has a museum, a library and several educational institutions, and is the administrative, commercial and educational centre of the region in which it lies.

Formerly, it was the capital of the Bahāwālpūr state, which was founded by the Dāḏāpota family of Sind. The town itself was founded by the second ruler of the dynasty, Muhammad Bahāwāl Khan, in 1748. The ruling dynasty has sometimes been called ʿAbbasīyā after a certain local ancestor ʿAbbas; the name has nothing to do with the ʿAbbasids of Baghdād or Egypt. The ruling family became independent of the Afghan kings towards the end of the 18th century, and made a treaty with the British in 1838. The state had an area of 15,918 square miles and stretched for about 300 miles along the left bank of the Sutlej, the Punjab and the Indus, extending into the desert for a mean distance of 40 miles. The chief crops were then, as now, wheat, rice, cotton and millet, which were entirely dependent on irrigation from the boundary rivers. According to the census report of 1941, the total population of the state was 1,341,209, and the majority of the people were Muslims — Djas, Radjāpūts and Balucfs. The state of Bahāwālpūr ceased to exist as a separate political entity in 1955, when it was incorporated in West Pakistan.


BAHĀDĪL b. ʿĪsā b. WĀLĪ b. KUNAFA, belonged to the clan of the Banū Ḥarīta b. Dīnāb, which was also called al-Bayt or the aristocracy of Kalb. A Christian like the great majority of his tribe, his chief claim to fame is that he was the father of
Maysun, mother of Yazid I. His nomad clan lived to the south of the ancient Palmyra, whither the Umayyads reunited after the congress of Djibla and the battle of Marj Râhi. Bahdal was thus the founder of the great prosperity of the Kalbites while the Umayyad dynasty lasted, though he did not himself take an active part in politics. As one of his sons was accused of being a Christian under the caliphate of Yazid I, Bahdal must have died a Christian, probably before the battle of Siffin, in which one of his sons commanded the Kuda a, in which one of his sons commanded the Kud a of Damascus, and at an advanced age. His sons succeeded him and became the first members of the state; in consequence the partisans of the Umayyads were called Bahdaliyya. His grandson Hassân, guardian of the sons of Yazid I, after the death of 'Abdwiya II even dared to cherish the project of succeeding him. The undue preponderance of the Bahdalites and the Kalbites contributed largely to the division of the Arabs into two parties, that of Kays and that of Yemen, after the battle of Marj Râhi.

Bibliography: Tabari, ii, 204, 468, 471, 577; Ibn Durayd (ed. Wustenfeld), 316; Ilamâsa (ed. Freytag), 261, 318-319, 659; Ibn 'Abd Rabbâh, 'Tab, ii, 305; Dinawarî (ed. Guirgass), 184, 275; Mas'ûdî, al-Tambîth, 305; A. Musli, Kusair â'Amr, 153; (H. Lammens)

BAHDÎNAN, Bâdînân, the Kurdish territory to the north and north-east of the Mawsil plain. From the latter years of the 'Abbâsî Caliphate, circa 600/1200, until the middle of the 13th/14th century the area was a principality ruled from 'Amâdiyya (q.v.), Kurdish Âmidî. It included 'Akra (Kurd. ôjid), Shish and the Zab river to the east and Dahuk, and occasionally Zakhir, to the west. The principalities of Bôttân and Hâkûr bounded it in the north, and that of Sorân in the south.

The eponymous Baha' al-Dîn family came originally from Shams al-Dînân (Kurd. Shammânîn, q.v.). Sharaf al-Dîn Bilîc, Sharaf-nâma, i, 106 ff., relates the history of the principalities for two centuries from the time of the Timûrid Shâhrûkh to 1005/1596. The Amir Hasan, under the aegis of Shâh Ismâ'il Şafawnî, extended his rule to Dahûk and the Sindî area north of Zakhir. His son Sultan Husayn was confirmed in authority by Sultan Sulaymân the Magnificent. Husayn's son Kubad was deposed and killed by a Mizûrî tribal force, but his son Saydî Khân regained power with Turkish help. At the beginning of the 12th/17th century the ruler of Ar-dalan, under Shâh 'Abbâs, placed a governor in Amâdiyya for a short time. There is then little record of the state for another century. Under Ottoman suzerainty the family appears to have reached its zenith with the reign of Bahrân Pasha the Great, 1138/1726-67. Bahram's son Ismâ'il Pasha, 1181-1213/1767-97, had to cope with his rebellious brothers, who established themselves at various times in Zakhir and 'Akra. Murâd Khân, son of Ismâ'il, was driven from Amâdiyya by his cousin Kubâd, with the help of the Bûbân pasha of Sulaymânîyaa. Once again the Mizûrî tribe rose to bring about the downfall of a Kubad in 1219/1804 and 'Adîl Pasha, son of Ismâ'il, was confirmed in power by the Djalali pasha of Mawsil. He was succeeded in 1223/1808 by his brother Zayyân. In 1249/1833 Muhammad Pasha Kûrûa, the "Blind Pasha" of Rawandiz, captured 'Akra and Amâdiyya, deposing the ruler 'Abd Pasha, and proceeded to take Zakhir.

Although his sway only lasted a few years the Bahdânân family never fully recovered its power and in 1254/1838 the area was finally incorporated in the sandâq of Mawsil.

The name Bahdânân is still applied to the area occupied by the following great Kurdish tribes: Barwarî, Dâfûk, Gullî, Mizzûrî, Raykânî, Silawvânî, Sindî, and Zêbârî.


(D. N. MacKenzie)

Bâhila. A settled and semi-settled tribe in ancient Arabia. The centre of their territory, Sûd Bâhila (Saud? — "corrected" in Hamdânî by an uninformed copyist into Sawâd), extended on both sides of the direct route (described by Philby in The Heart of Arabia, vol. ii) from Riyadh to Mecca. It is sufficiently well defined by the localities al-Kuwayt, Dîjâlân = Juzaila, al-Hufâyra = Hufaira and the mountains al-Katîd = al-Djîfîd and (Ibn) Shamâmî = Idhnaín Shamal. The clan Dîjâwa (Dîwâwa) lived further westward at the western foot of the Thâhlan = Dhalan and in the south-east corner of the later Himâ Darîya near the Ghanî, another group further to the south in the oasis of Bîsha. To this group may have belonged the Banû Umâma, guardians of the sanctuary of Dhu 't-Khalasa near the neighboring Tabâla. An old verse (Âmir b. al-Tufayl, Suppl. 16.2) runs: "... I will ... not visit the fair, even though Jasr and Bâhîlah journey thereto to sell their wares" (Jasr also in the oasis of Bîsha). What kind of wares? Pottery? — clay was rare in Arabia.

The genealogy of the tribe is somewhat complicated: Bâhila is the mother of political leaders of the Malkî b. Âsur and, through nakhâl-al-mdâl with the other son, Ma'n by name, the mother of two of the latter's foster-mother of ten other sons. These other sons stem from two different mothers. Such artifacts are familiar to the genealogists. Here only their accumulation is remarkable. This accumulation points indeed to the local separation of the groups of the Bâhila and also to a certain political unity between the two greatest of their clans, the Kutayba and the Wa'il. The connexion with Âsur makes of the Bâhila, who are also called, moreover, Bâhila b. Âsur, brothers of the Ghanî. As we have seen above, they were in fact neighbours, of the Ghanî. Unfortunately, the period when the sobriquet Ibnâ Darbân for both these tribes originated is not certain. The Bâhila stood partly under the protection of the Kilab and partly under that of the Ka'b branch of the Âmir b. Sha'sâ'a. Only one warrior from amongst them is known, al-Muntaşhir, and this one because A'zâhâ Bâhila (no. 4) made an elegy over him. We know of another episode from al-Nâžim al-Dîjâlî, no. ix. Both instances lie shortly before the rise of Islam. Two documents of the Prophet have been handed down to Ibn Sa'd, i. 5, 33, the first for the Bâhîlites in Bîsha, the second for a chieftain of the Wa'il.

The history of the tribe becomes clear for the first time under Islam. Their exodus from Arabia was directed predominantly towards Syria (even the Bâhila in Khurâsân came there mainly with troops from Syria) and, for the rest, towards Bâjrâ. Bâhila (and Ghanî) tribesmen had a substantial share in the war of revenge fought by the Kays against the Kalb after the battle of Marj Râhi (cf. Wellhausen, Das arabisches Reich und sein Sturz, 126). The Bâhila also developed an abundance of talents of
all kinds. The most important are the philologist al-AsmacI and the general Kutayba b. Muslim. A second exodus of the Bahila from Arabia is to be distinguished from that of the muhaddisun — an exodus which brought a part of those who had remained behind in Arabia to the lower Euphrates, firstly towards al-Hufayr a short distance before Baṣra; from there they penetrated into the sandy tract of al-Ṭaff, which was situated over against the Batāḥal, and after the Zi'f had settled in (the Batāḥal) in 837, they began to infiltrate into the Batāḥal. In 872 the Bahila there suffered punishment from troops which were on the march to meet the Zandj. The result was that the Bahila took the side of the Zandj. Nothing more is known about them.

Hamdānī (p. 164) is the last who mentions the Bahila in their native territory; yet this passage is hardly earlier than the parallel passage about Sūd (Saud) Bahila (ibid., 147 ff.), the original source of which is set by de Goeje in about the year 250/864. Before that time there occurred the over-running of central Arabia by the NUMAYR. Only vague traces of a change of dwellings the Bahila in central Arabia are found in the literature.

**Bibliography:** Aḥzāb Bāhila, in *The Djeém of al-Aḥzāb*, ed. R. Geyer; Ibn al-Kalbī, Kiḍāb al-Absām, 36; Ibn al-Kalbī, Djamharat al-nasab, 36; Ibn al-Kalbī, *Aṣrār*, 1248/1831; cf. 147 ff.), the original source of which is set by de Goeje in about the year 250/864. Before that time there occurred the over-running of central Arabia by the NUMAYR. Only vague traces of a change of dwellings the Bahila in central Arabia are found in the literature.
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BAHİRÁ, the name of a Christian Monk. Ibn Sa'd and Ibn Hishám offer two parallel traditions, confirmed by al-Tabari (i, 1125 ff.), according to which Muhammad, when either nine or twelve years old, whilst accompanying the Mekkans' caravan to Syria, in the company of Abū Bakr or Abū Talib, found himself in the presence of a Christian monk or hermit, who is said to have revealed the young man's prophetic destiny, either by finding on him the stigmata of prophecy, or by the miraculous movement of a cloud, or the violence of the Rum (al-fabari, third tradition, ed. J. Sourdel-Thomine, Damascus 1924, 14, i. 17). Whilst Bahirá is a witness and a guarantor in the Kur'anic passages quoted above; it is said to be born dead then both partake of it. He will reward them for their attributing [these things to him] for He is wise and knowing.
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contemporaries, perverse Jews (ʿAbd al-Mastṭ), ed. A. Tien, 77-8, cf. ZDMG, xii, 699-708). The Apocalypse of Bahira, which dates in Syriac and Arabic, the textual history of which still remains to be established, and the chronology of which is disputed (cf. G. Levi della Vida and J. Bignami-Odier, op. cit. 132-3 and 139-48, M.-T. d’Alverny and G. Vajda, in-Andalusi, i, 1951, i, 118, 130 ffl.). But even before the Crusades, the main theme of the false prophet inspired by a “wise man” was known in the West, as is attested by the work in verse, directed to the monk in the centre of a pamphlet, which assembles the indications of the ancient Danielesques apocalypse of the Pseudo-Methodius (Kmosko, in Byzantion, 1931, 273-296), and cleverly combines them with the Christian arguments on the apocalyptic origin of the Qurʾān and with the various aspects of the doctrine of the Mahdi (Graf, Gesch. der Arab. Christ. Lit., Studi e Testi, Roma, 1933, 147-9). This work met with success in the Christian circles of the Orient, and up till the period of the Crusades, which even resulted in its being translated into Latin (Levi della Vida and Bignami-Odier, op. cit. 132-3 and 139-48, M.-T. d’Alverny and G. Vajda, in-Andalusi, i, 1951, i, 118, 130 ff.). But even before the Crusades, the main theme of the false prophet inspired by a “wise man” was known in the West, as is attested by the work in verse, directed against Islam, under the name of Historia Machu- meti, attributed to Hildebert (Guy Cambier, Embricon de Mayence (1010-1077) est-il l’auteur de la Vida Machumettii?, Patr. Lat., cxxii, 1343-1366, Latomus, 3, Brussels 1957 and U. Monnereit of Villard, Lo Studio dell’Islam in Europa nel xii e xiii secolo, Studi e Testi, ito, 110-34-5).


Baihlul (Amīr), the name of three notable Kurdish figures, according to M. E. Zakī (Masqūkhi, 1:42), 1. A member of the Sulaymaniyya family, amīr of the Mayyafarikin branch, son of Alwand Bey b. Shawkh Ahmad. He was for a long period in the service of Iskandar Pasha, the wali of Diyarbakr. Subsequently, he was for a time in command of the fortress al-Iskandariyya (between al-Hilla and Baghdād), and after that the sultan Yazw Selim entrusted to him the stronghold of Mayyafārīkhīn. A man of great personal bravery, he perished in a fight with Shahshuwar Bey. 2. Son of Amir Djamshīd, chief of the Dunbul, governor of Tabaristan and Daghāsiyān. A contemporary of Shawkh Ḥaydar Şafawi, and one of his most loyal supporters, he fell in the battle between Ḥaydar and Shawkh Ḥaydar Kūyulan in 880/1475-6. 3. A Banū Dunbul chief named Djamshīd b. Ismaiyl b. Bahral-Pasha who was the Turkish governor at Bayazīd up to 1326/1812. He was dismissed in that year, and died four years later. Wagner (ii, 297 ff.) devotes several pages to him in a commendatory vein.


Bahadur Lodi (see Delhi Sultanate).

Bahmani (see Taʿlabkī). A line of eighteen Muslim sultans who ruled, or claimed to rule, in the Deccan from 748/1347-1527, after a group of Muslim nobles led by Ismāʿīl Muḥḥ had successfully rebelled against the sultan of Dihīl, Muḥammad b. Tughluq. The more vigorous Hasan Gangu supplanted Ismāʿīl and was proclaimed Sulṭān ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Ḥasan Bahman Shāh. (On the latter’s origin see Major W. Haig, Some Notes on the Bahmani Dynasty, ASB LXXIII, Pt. 1 (Extra No.) 1904, 495; Proceedings of Indian History Congress, 1938, 304-8; H. K. Sherwani, Gangu Bahmani, in Journal of Indian History, xx, Pt. 1, April 1941, 95 ff.).

Table of the Bahmani sultans.

(a) Sulṭāns with their capital at Aḥsanubād-Gulbarga:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sultan</th>
<th>Reigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Ḥasan Bahman Shāh</td>
<td>748/1347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad I</td>
<td>759/1358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Muḥammad</td>
<td>775/1358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāwūd I</td>
<td>779/1359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muḥammad II</td>
<td>780/1359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauḍū Ḥaz̄ī al-Dīn Tāhmatan</td>
<td>799/1380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shams al-Dīn Dāwūd II</td>
<td>799/1397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāḍī al-Dīn Frīḍūr</td>
<td>800/1398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Sultans with their capital at Muḥammadubād-Bidrā:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sultan</th>
<th>Reigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shihāb al-Dīn Ahmad I</td>
<td>825/1422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Ahmad II</td>
<td>839/1436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Ḥumayūn</td>
<td>866/1458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niṣām al-Dīn Ahmad III</td>
<td>865/1458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad III</td>
<td>867/1459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shihāb al-Dīn Maḥmūd</td>
<td>887/1482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad IV</td>
<td>924/1518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn</td>
<td>927/1519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walī Allāh</td>
<td>929/1523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalīm Allāh</td>
<td>932/1526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Coins and inscriptions suggest the last named roi favinant may have lingered in exile claiming the throne until 943/1536-7. See E. E. Speight, Coins of the Bahmani Kings of the Deccan, in IC, ix, 1935, 168 ff.; and Inscriptions of Bidādūr, Mem. Arch. Sur. of India, No. 40).

During most of its history the Bahmani Kingdom was limited to the table-land of the Deccan. Geographically, the Vindhyā range may be said to be the northern edge of Southern India with the Nerbādā river flowing almost parallel to it. But the country south of this quasi-barrier may be divided into three distinctive parts: (i) Malāw, with its general slope towards the West; (ii) the Deccan table-land proper which, along with Berār, forms the pivot of the lavaic crescent where the ancient undisturbed rock begins to extend over the centre of the peninsula; and (iii) what is called “South India” which extends from the northern edge of the Mysore plateau and the line of the Tungabhadra southwards. The lavaic uplands end abruptly in the Western Ghāts which
have always tended to form a natural limit to the ambitions of the rulers of the Deccan table-land. Although the Bahmanis early managed to reach the sea at Dabul and Cowl they could never rule the coastal plain beyond the Ghâts effectively, and the south-western extremity of this lâvica country, Goa, had to be conquered and reconquered a number of times. While the table-land has a sheer fall of nearly 4,000 feet in the West, it has a very gentle slope eastward, and it takes more than 300 miles to reach the same level as the eastern coast line. It may be mentioned here that the importance of Golconda, which played such an important part during the later medieval period of Deccan history, and with it, of Ḥjaydarābâd, lies in the fact that Golconda and a part of Greater Ḥjaydarābâd stand on the last prominent spurs of the table-land before the undulating plain begins. The effective southern limit of the Bahmani kingdom was the river Tungabhâdra, the natural geographical limit of the Deccan, but it should be remembered that the Krîshna—Tungabhâdra Doab was always a bone of contention between the Bahmanis and their southern neighbours, the Râyas of Vidyâyanagar in much the same way as it had been a bone of contention between the Western Calukyas and Rashtrakutas, and between the Yâdavas and Housalas in ancient times.

The Bahmani sultans continually struggled to extend the area of their military and revenue paramountcy and this involved them in war against the sultanas of Malwâ and Gudjârât in the north and Vidyâyanagar in the south and in efforts, complicated by the intervention of Vidyâyanagar and the Hindu chiefs of Orissa, to assert their suzerainty in Telângâna, south and east of the Godavâri. In the north, a successful war between Shâhâb-al-Dîn Ahmad I and Hushâng Shâh of Malwâ over Kherla in 832/1428 followed in 834/1430-31 by an unsuccessful war against Gudjârât in alliance with the Radjâ of Jalâlâwar ended in stalemate. In 866/1451-2, Maḥmûd Khâldî of Malwâ, in alliance with the Gadjapati Radjâ of Orissa, Kapîlendra, succeeded in occupying Bidâr itself; the Bahmanis were saved by the intervention of Maḥmûd Shâh Bêgâda of Gudjârat. War again occurred in 872/1468 over Mahûr and Elîchpûr, but although Khêrla was temporarily occupied by the Bahmani forces, a peace, which proved to be lasting, restored the status quo ante, between Malwâ and the Bahmanis.

In the south, conflict over the fertile Krîshna-Tungabhâdra Doab with Vidyâyanagar was endemic. War occurred in 750/1349, 755/1354, 767/1365, 800/1398, 808/1406, 823/1420, 825/1422, 847/1443 and 880/1481 with varying fortunes, and the Doab region remaining a no-man’s-land between the two powers, until after the accession of the Vidyâyanagar ruler, Krîshna Deva Râya in 915/1509, when the region was virtually incorporated into the Vidyâyanagar dominions.

In the west, despite Bahmani claims to Dabul and Cowl, the Bahmanis were unable to control the coastal region west of the Ghâts and were impotent to prevent continuing depredations by the Radjâs of Khêrla and Sangameshwar, until the waṣîr, Maḥmûd Gâwân, succeeded in occupying Sangameshwar and Goa in 875/1471 and 876/1472.

In the east, the Bahmanis raided Telângâna successfully in the reign of Muḥammad I and again in 820/1417 and 827/1424 when Warangal was captured, and a Bahmani governor established, but the local Hindu chiefs could usually rely upon help from Orissa. The Orissan general Hamvîrâ captured Warangal in 864/1460, but succession troubles in Orissa enabled the Bahmanis in campaigns between 858/1457-8 and 885/1480, to extend their hegemony, though briefly, to the Bay of Bengal. Telângâna was then divided into two provinces centring on Warangal and Rajahmundry.

While ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn Ḥasan Bahman Shâh was the founder of the dynasty it was Muḥammad I who organised it. The central Government was divided into three main departments dealing with civil, military and judicial matters respectively. The civil department was centered in the waṣīlî sulṭanât or Prime minister who was assisted by waṣîrs or ministers and daḥîrs or secretaries. In the same way the judiciary consisted of the kâdîs or judges and the muṭellîs or interpreters of law, while peace and security of the cities was kept by the kîstâwîl or Commissioner of Police and muḥâbasî or the censor of public morals. On the military side the Commander-in-Chief had a number of subordinate officers at headquarters such as the officer at the head of bârârdîrân who mobilised irregular forces in times of emergency, the baḥshî or the paymaster, the officer in charge of the bâbîs bârdî or the body-guard of the sulṭân, a well-equipped and well-drilled force of 4,000 soldiers, and the officer in charge of 200 yakhas-djâwânsân or sîlîdârdâr who handled the sulṭân’s personal arms.

The whole kingdom was divided into four aṭrâf or provinces and each aṭrâf or province was placed under a ṣârafâ or governor. The ṣârafâ was originally responsible both for the civil and the military administration of the province and the bîlîsâdârs or commanders of the forts were placed under him. The four provinces of the kingdom centered round Daulatbâd, Berâr, Ahsânabad—Gulbarga and Muḥammadâbad—Bidâr (which included the small part of Telângâna which was under the Bahmanis in the beginning). Out of these the province of Gulbarga, which was centred round the capital of the state, was naturally regarded as the most important and its ṣârafâ was generally one who enjoyed the fullest confidence of the ruler.

The century which followed the establishment of the dynasty saw a great expansion of the kingdom which finally extended from sea to sea, and Maḥmûd Gâwân, who was now waṣîr, set to work not only on the redivision of the kingdom but also on the reform of the whole provincial administration. Firstly he redivided the kingdom into eight in place of four aṭrâf. Berâr was divided into two charges, namely Gâwîl and Mahûr, part of the area surrounding Junnâr was removed from Daulatbâd province and formed into a separate ṣârafâ, Radjâmmandâr was created a province distinct from the rest of Telângâna and Bîlджîpûr was carved out of the old province of Gulbarga. The power of the ṣârafâ was also greatly curtailed. A ṣârafâ was previously supreme in both civil and military affairs of his province and could not only appoint bîlîsâdârs but also increase or decrease the number of soldiers on permanent duty according to his will and thus spend or save as much money as he liked out of the dijaðîr set aside for military expenses. Maḥmûd Gâwân curtailed the power of the ṣârafâ considerably. It was decreed that in any province a bîlîsâdar would be appointed by the central government and a ṣârafâ was entitled to have only one fort under his direct command. Moreover every person who was responsible for the payment of salaries of soldiers was made accountable for the money he drew...
from the *dāḡār* or *mansâb* as the case may be.

Another method by which the sultan was brought in direct relationship with the work of the provinces was to set under his direct control a large tract of land set aside in every province as the royal demesne. Orders were also issued for a systematic measurement of land, fixing of boundaries all over the state and a general enquiry about the record of rights and assessment of revenue.

All these schemes however, proved to be still-born when Mahmud Gawan was murdered. Another attempt in the same direction was made twenty years later in 901/1495-96 by the minister Kasim Band, the progenitor of the Barid-shahis of Bijâr [q.v.]. Under these reforms the smaller *mansâbdârs* were ordered to enrol themselves in the royal bodyguard and were henceforth called *sârâbdârs* or *bawalâdârs*. This was only a half-hearted measure and affected only the small *dâḡârdârs* and *mansâbdârs* while the great nobles were left untouched. The great power and authority which the *târafârdârs* were left to enjoy after the nullification of earlier reforms was one of the causes of the disintegration of the Kingdom and its resolution into five succession states, namely Bidjâpur, Ahymadnagar, Golconda, Berâr and Bijâr [q.v.].

The large influx of Persians and others from overseas created a peculiar political problem in the Deccan, for it divided the Muslim population of the State into two contending groups, viz. the *dakhnâs* or the older colonists and the *dâ Ağâs* (sometimes called the *gârib al-diyyâr*) or the new settlers. Their struggles were largely responsible for the downfall of the Bahmani Kingdom.


(H. K. Sherwani)

**Monuments.** *Ālî* al-Dîn Ḥasân Bahman Shah's new kingdom at Gulbarga was open to attack from all sides, by the Râjdâs of Vîdjâyanagara, Telangana and Orissa, by the Gôndhas, and by the rival sultans of Khândesh, Mâlwâ and Gujârât; the first buildings of the new régime are consequently entirely military, surrounding the kingdom: to the north, Ečîpuru, Gâwîlgaft, Narmâl (Bahmani inscriptions, T. W. Haig, *EIM* 1907-8, 11) in Berâr, also Mâhâr; on the west, Parenda, Naldrug, Panhâl and Gulbarga itself; in the centre, Bijâr, Golkhânâ and Warangal; on the south-west, Mûdgal and Râyûtir. Many of these were existing Hichâs; often Gôndha, fortifications hastily occupied and modified; some were rebuilt later by Ahmâd Shâh Wâlî al-Bahmanî after his transformation of Bijâr [q.v.] fort, and during the reign of Muḥammad III in consequence of Mahmûd Gawan's policies. (References in Fèrîshâ, *passim*).

Gulbarga. The fortifications are well preserved, with double walls 16 m. thick, surrounded by moat up to 35 m. wide; well provided with bastions—many with barbettes added later for the use of artillery—and hornworks, large and compound crenellations, machicolations and barbizons. The one major structure standing intact within the walls is the *Dîmînî* Maṣjîd, built 769/1367 by a hereditary Persian architect, Râfî' b. Shâms b. Mansûr al-Kâshâfî (inser. *Haig, EIM* 1907-8, 2), of a type unknown elsewhere in India, with open but completely roofed over forming a pillared hall whose only illumination comes from the open side aisles and the clerestory of the central dome. The side aisles are characterised by their very wide span with unusually low impost, an arch pattern used elsewhere in Gulbarga. Two mosques of nearly the same period at Delhi [q.v.] are partially covered; but this type was not imitated, presumably since the *îltâsân* and *minbar* were obstructed from the view of most of the congregation. The other Bahmani monuments at Gulbarga are the two groups of tombs. The first, near the south gate of the fort, includes those of *Ālî* al-Dîn (739/1338), Muḥammad I, to whom the Shâh Bâdar Maṣjîd, an unpretentious building in the contemporary Tughlakian style of Delhi, is attributed (727/1327), and Muḥammad II (799/1397); the first two of these show the battering walls and weak semicircular dome of the Delhi Tughlakian style; that of Muḥammad II shows a similar dome, stilted below the haunch, to that of the *Dîmînî* Maṣjîd. To the east of the city is the *Gâft Gunbâb*, including the tombs of Muṣṭâhid and Dâdî c. 785/1380, Ghiyâth al-Dîn (c. 799/1397) and Fîrûz (c. 823/1420); some of these are two adjacent domed chambers on a single plinth. That of Ghiyâth al-Dîn shows some Hindû influence in the *mîhrâb*, and that of Fîrûz in the carved polished black stone exterior pilasters, the dripstones and brackets; the interior of the latter is quasi-Persian in its paint and plaster decoration similar to the contemporary Saiyîd and Lodî tombs at Delhi. Of other buildings, the *dârâgâh* of Banda Nawâz (Ranâdâ-i Biswarg), c. 816/1413, shows the characteristic wide arch with low impost.

Bijâr. The Bahmani tombs at Ašţûr, 1¼ miles east of the town, are on a larger scale, with loftier and sometimes more bulbous domes, than those at Gulbarga. None of these has battered walls, and none is double. The finest, that of Ahmâd Shâh Wâlî (d. 839/1436), shows the characteristic later Bahmani arch, stilted above the haunch, and is of great importance on account of its superb calligraphic decoration which includes two *şâfidârs* of the saint Ni'mat Allâh al-Kîrmanî [q.v.]. That of *Ālî* al-Dîn II (862/1458) shows striking encaustic tile-work and, unusually, some arches struck from four centres. That of Muḥammad, 924/1518, has its walls decorated with arched niches one above the other, more characteristic of post-Bahmani architecture. The *Dîmînî* Maṣjîd, called also Solah Khamba (=*sixteen pillar*) *masjîd* and *Zandât masjîd* (827/1423-4), of the reign of Ahmâd I but erected during Prince Muḥammad's vicegerency before the transfer of the capital — the earliest Muslim building at Bidâr — and the royal palaces (Tâshkî Mâbâl, etc.; cf. Saiyîd *Ālî* Tâbkîbâbâ, *Burhdn-i Mâtâr*, Persian MSS. Soc. ed., 70-1), and the *madrasa* of Maḥmûd Gawan, all works executed under the Bahmans, are, in view of their subsequent redecoration and rebuilding by the Bârdîs [q.v.], described under Bidâr [q.v.]. The *Când minâd* at Dâwlatbâd [q.v.] dates from the time of *Ālî* al-Dîn, and it may be observed that the earliest *Adil Shâhî* building at Bidâpur [q.v.], Asen Beg's *masjîd* (978/1572-3) bears an inscription indicating Maḥmûd Shâh Bahman as ruler — presumably still acknowledged as paramount in spite of Yûsúf's recent independence.
The walls of Bidar fort are Bahmani; those of the town date from the Band Shahis.


BAHMANYAR, ABU 'L-ḤASAN BAHMANYAR B. AL-MARZUBAN, a famous pupil of Avicenna, died in 458/1067. Avicenna's K. al-Mubahathāl mainly consists of philosophical questions raised by Bahmanyar and answered by the master. Since he was a Zoroastrian, Bahmanyar's acquaintance with Arabic was imperfect. His Māṣa' al-Ṭabit'a and K. fī-Mardāb were published in Leipzig in 1851 (and in Cairo in 1329 A.H.). His comprehensive interpretation of Avicenna's philosophy called K. al-Taḥṣīl (or al-Taḥṣīlād) and consisting of logic, metaphysics and physics plus cosmology, was also published in Cairo in 1329 A.H. An extract (fasi) also exists (see Brockelmann, SI, 828) from his K. fi-Mardāb. See also F. Rahman, K. al-Majātsil (or Baytash), Kaynas (or Kubays), al-Asamm, al-Maghrib, al-Djamalī at the end of the 5th/11th century. Ibn Baṭṭūta describes it as a great city surrounded by numerous gardens. Khālíl Zāhīr still speaks of it as a large town, but it is already suggestive to note that Ibn al-Dīlān, who knew the province, passes the town over in silence. Henceforth it was never anything more than an insignificant township, which, in the 19th century was included in the province of Bani Suf (Suwayf), before belonging to that of Minya. The sands had covered it: about the year 1890, debris of all kinds, granite columns, fragments of capitals, of sculpture, pottery and bricks could be seen lying on the ground there; it is now no more than a confused heap of ruins, according to a recently published guide-book.

This lamentable situation may well be the result of the progressive deforestation of the region. Under the Fātimids and the Ayyūbids, the forests, classed as domain, were exploited by a State administration to furnish wood for naval construction: Maḏrīzī is here relying on an account by Ibn Māmātī, but adds: "This has all completely disappeared and one no longer hears anyone speak of this organisation, as private persons have had the trees cut down." The town's prosperity was above all based on its own woven products. All kinds of cloths were manufactured there, from the most precious fabrics, such as silks figured with gold, down to the most ordinary wares: curtains, tent coverings, ships' sails. Fabrics of great size were woven there in wool, linen and cotton, with pictures in fast colours, portraying all kinds of beasts, "from the insect to the elephant". According to Idrīsī, fabrics originating from Bahnasa bore the name of the town and it is a fact that in the Museum of Muslim Art in Cairo there is preserved a piece of multi-coloured wool, with pictures of small hares framing a human head on which the name of Bahnasa can be read. Ibn Baṭṭūta still praises its excellent woolen cloth in the middle of the 8th/14th century.

Bibliography: Besides references given in this article, see also Nizānī Sāmākandī, Čahār Makāla (ed. Kazvīnī, 252, and Ibn Abī ʿUṣayyīfa, ʿUṣayn al-Anbāʾ) (F. Rahman), of Coptic origin. The Virgin and the Child Jesus are supposed to have stayed there during the Flight from Egypt. Certain Muslim exegetes have found a verse of the Kūran (xxiii, 52), to corroborate this tradition, which is of Christian origin.

At the time of the Arab invasion, it was a fortified place with thick walls; the Greek garrison seem to have exhibited great courage in its defence, which was long remembered, since their resistance inspired a popular romance, the Conquest of Bahnasa.

At first the capital of a pagarchy (kūra), the place enjoyed an astonishing prosperity in the Middle Ages. Bahnasa gave its name to a province at the time of the administrative reorganisation carried out at the behest of the Fātimids near Baḍr al-Djamaalī at the end of the 5th/11th century. Ibn Baṭṭūta describes it as a great city surrounded by numerous gardens. Khālíl Zāhīr still speaks of it as a large town, but it is already suggestive to note that Ibn al-Dīlān, who knew the province, passes the town over in silence. Henceforth it was never anything more than an insignificant township, which, in the 19th century was included in the province of Bani Suf (Suwayf), before belonging to that of Minya. The sands had covered it: about the year 1890, debris of all kinds, granite columns, fragments of capitals, of sculpture, pottery and bricks could be seen lying on the ground there; it is now no more than a confused heap of ruins, according to a recently published guide-book.

This lamentable situation may well be the result of the progressive deforestation of the region. Under the Fātimids and the Ayyūbids, the forests, classed as domain, were exploited by a State administration to furnish wood for naval construction: Maḏrīzī is here relying on an account by Ibn Māmātī, but adds: "This has all completely disappeared and one no longer hears anyone speak of this organisation, as private persons have had the trees cut down." The town’s prosperity was above all based on its own woven products. All kinds of cloths were manufactured there, from the most precious fabrics, such as silks figured with gold, down to the most ordinary wares: curtains, tent coverings, ships’ sails. Fabrics of great size were woven there in wool, linen and cotton, with pictures in fast colours, portraying all kinds of beasts, “from the insect to the elephant.” According to Idrīsī, fabrics originating from Bahnasa bore the name of the town and it is a fact that in the Museum of Muslim Art in Cairo there is preserved a piece of multi-coloured wool, with pictures of small hares framing a human head on which the name of Bahnasa can be read. Ibn Baṭṭūta still praises its excellent woolen cloth in the middle of the 8th/14th century.

Bibliography: Besides references given in this article, see also Nizānī Sāmākandī, Čahār Makāla (ed. Kazvīnī, 252, and Ibn Abī ʿUṣayyīfa, ʿUṣayn al-Anbāʾ). For the survey of Bahnasa see J. Maspero and Wiet, Materiaux pour servir à la geographie de l’Égypte, 51, 173-191, see Ibn Ḥawkal, 159; Idrīsī, al-Maghrib, 50-51; Ibn Māmātī, 81, 344-345; Yaḥyūbī, trans. Wiet, 186; Maḏrīzī, ed. Wiet, i, 92-93, 307, 310, 312; ii, 103, 108-109; iv, 126; Jean Maspero, Histoire des patriarches d’Alexandrie, 555 idem; Organisation militaire de l’Égypte byzantine, 40, 140; Harawi, Ziyāratā, ii, 43; trans. Sourdoul-Thomine, 26, 101; Kalkashandī, iii, 381, 397; Zāhīrī, 32; trans. 50; Isambart, Itinéraire de l’Orient, Égypte, 497; Baedeker Guidebook, Fr. ed., 1908, 199-200; ʿAll Pāḥa Mubāratāk, x, 2-5; EP, Fr. ed., supplement, 267; RECA, iii, no. 939. (G. Wiet)

BAHR (Ar.), sea and also large perennial river. — The articles which follow treat of the principal seas known to the Arabs, but it is convenient to note here that in Islamic cosmology, on the basis of a conception generally related on the authority of Kaṣb al-Aḥbār [q.v.], the mountain Kaṭf [q.v.], which encircles the terrestrial sphere, is itself surrounded by seven concentric intercommunicating seas; these seas bear respectively the following names: Maṣ (or Baytash), Raynas (or Kubays), al-Asamm, al-Sakin, al-Mughallīb (or al-Murīlīm), al-Muʿannīs (or Marmās) and finally al-Bākī. But it is probable that these names correspond to geographical realities;
in fact Niţas (and its variant form) is an orthographic corruption of Buntus (= Ṣīnāt = the [Atlantic] Ocean); for the other names, a tentative identification will be found in P. Anastase-Marie de St. Eille, Nuţaş al-Lugha al-‘Arabiyya, Cairo 1938, 83-4, and al ‘âlâti, Tarič (ed. Pellat), s.v. Buntus.

Bibliography: Kazwini, Cosmog., 104; Kisa, Kitaş al-Abya, Leiden 1922-3, 9; see also the bibliography to the article Ḳaf.

AL-BAHR AL-ĄBYAD [see BAHR AL-RUM].

BAHR ADRIYAS, name of the Adriatic in Arabic geographical works. (Ed.) AL-BAHR AL-ĄSWAD [see BAHR BUNTUS, KARA DENIZ].

BAHR AL-BANAT i.e., “the Maidens’ Sea”, a name given by the Arabs to the Archipelago off the west coast of the Persian Gulf. Idrisî calls it Bahr al-Khihr.

Bibliography: Ritter, Erdkunde, xii, 390, 589ff.

BAHR BUNTUS, the Pontus Euxinus, or Black Sea, for which BAHR Nîtas (Niţas) is a stereotyped error (same ductus of letters with different pointing and vocalisation). From the names of adjacent peoples or cities it was also called Bahr al-Khazar or Sea of the Khazars (Ibn Khurramadhibih, 105, perhaps by confusion with the Caspian, Bahr al-Khazar, [q.v.]), Bahr al-Rûs (Sea of the Russians), Bahr al-Burgah or Bahr al-Burghaz (Sea of the Bulgars), Bahr Tarâbabzunda (Sea of Trebizond), Bahr Niţas al-Armanli (the Armenian Pontus), Bahr al-Kustantîniyya (Sea of Constantipole) and Daryá-yi Gurziyân or Sea of the Georgians (only in Ḳudud al-‘Alam). The name al-Bahr al-Ąswad (Black Sea) appears only in later times.

According to Mas’udî (Tanbih, 66-67), writing in 345/956, it extends from Lazika (Greek Lazikâ) in the E. to Constantinople, a distance of 1300 miles, with a breadth of 300 miles. It is connected with the lake or sea of Mâuyûts (Sea of Azov, [see BAHR MÂUYUTUS]). Among the rivers which flow into it are the Ţanâis (Don) and the Danube. From Bahr Buntus issues Khalid al-Kustantîniyya (Strait of Constantinople), i.e., Bosporus, Sea of Marmora and Dardanelles, which issues in Bahr al-Rûs or Sea of the Greeks (Mediterranean). The length of the strait is 350 miles. In a parallel account written earlier (Mûrûdî, i, 260-262) Mas’udî gives the length of Bahr Buntus as 1100 miles and the course of the Don as about 300 ʾarasâs. The same general account is found in Ibn Rusta, 85-86 (about 909/910). It was thought by some, e.g., Ibn Khurramadhibih (105) that Bahr Buntus issued from Bahr al-Khazar (Caspian). Mas’udî denies this (Mûrûdî, i, 273), saying simply that the two seas are connected (Tanbih, 67). According to Mûrûdî, ii, 18 ff., the route from Bahr Buntus to Bahr al-Khazar was via Khalid Niţas (Strait of Kertch), the Don and the Volga, using the Don-Volga portage, i.e., the route called elsewhere the ‘Khazarian Way’. Mas’udî himself, who shows much greater interest in Bahr Buntus than geographers of the Balkhi-Istakhri school, speculated on a direct connexion between the Black Sea and the Atlantic. This view was later held by al-Birûnî (Kazwini, ʾAdîd’ib, 104).

The position of the Bahr Fâris has given it great but varying importance. Its history is very imperfectly known. A number of local chronicles are still in MS. and the story of the competition of the alternative trade routes through the Red Sea and across Central Asia has yet to be studied. Only the salient facts are given here; for further details see the articles on individual ports. Commerce was flourishing before the Arab conquest and Persians were already engaged in trade with China. The identification of the “Po ssu” of Chinese records with Persians has been questioned, as the name can also refer to a Malayan people. It is, however, established by a reference (Chow Ts’ang Sâw, viii, 29) to a Po ssu embassy of 1034/722, which brought lions as gifts; the lion is not found in Malaya. The revolt of Huang Ch’ao and his sack of Canton (264-8/828) dislocated the trade. Voyages from Persia to China appear to have ceased in the 4th/10th century. There is no indisputable evidence that Chinese ships came to the Bahr Fâris before the Ming voyages of the early 9th/15th century. In early Muslim times the chief port was Siraf, near Ṭâhirî. It declined under the 7th/13th century, for a time gave its name to the sea (Bahr Sûdûk). For Ottoman times, see KARA DENIZ.


(D. M. DUNLOP)

BAHR FÂRIS, the Persian Gulf, in which Mas’udî includes the Gulf of ‘Umân; Ḳâtsakhîrî and Ibn Ḫawal apply the name to the whole Indian Ocean (Bahr al-Hindi). The name Ḳudud al-‘Alam or Gulf of ‘Umân and the Persian Sea. Mas’udî gives its width at the narrowest place as 150 -carousel; the Strait of Hormuz is actually some 29 miles across. In the Muslim geographers the modern al-Abâsî was called Bahrayn, the name Uwâl being given to one of the islands now called Bahrayn. Hindarkhî was Abrûn, Kıshm was Lîft, Djafta Bani Kâwûn, or Barkûn, and Shâykh Shu’ayb was Lâwân, Lân or Lâr.

Mas’udî relates that one ʿAbd al-Mâshît, aged 350, told Khalîd b. al-Wâld that he had seen al-Nâdîq covered by the sea, and ships sailing to the mouth of the Euphrates below al-Ḥira. Mas’udî evidently believed the geographical fact if not the story. Most scholars have assumed that silt brought down by the rivers has been gradually filling up the Bahr Fâris. The history of ‘Abâbâdân seems to support this. Mukaddasî and the Ḳudud al-‘Alam speak of it as on the coast, Nâşir-i Khwârawz as 2 leagues from the sea at low tide, and Ibn Batîṭa as 3 miles from the sea; it is now over 30. It has, however, been claimed (G. M. Lees and N. Falcon, The Geological History of the Mesopotamian Plains, GJ, 1952) that, though the level of the land has risen locally and though rivers have changed their courses, (see DURA, PURAT, KÂRM), the area between the Arabian massif and the Persian mountains is one of tectonic subsidence, mitigated but-not counteracted by the deposit of silt. The Tigris and Euphrates leave most of their silt in the marshes above al-Ḳurna and the Bahr Fâris is materially affected only by the silt carried by the Kârûn. There is no geological evidence that the head of the Bahr Fâris has been N.W. of its present position since the Pliocene Age: it is even possible that it has been further to the S.E. in historical times. (See also correspondence in GJ, 1954).

The position of the Bahr Fâris has given it great but varying importance. Its history is very imperfectly known. A number of local chronicles are still in MS. and the story of the competition of the alternative trade routes through the Red Sea and across Central Asia has yet to be studied. Only the salient facts are given here; for further details see the articles on individual ports. Commerce was flourishing before the Arab conquest and Persians were already engaged in trade with China. The identification of the “Po ssu” of Chinese records with Persians has been questioned, as the name can also refer to a Malayan people. It is, however, established by a reference (Chow Ts’ang Sâw, viii, 29) to a Po ssu embassy of 1034-4722, which brought lions as gifts; the lion is not found in Malaya. The revolt of Huang Ch’ao and his sack of Canton (264-8/828) dislocated the trade. Voyages from Persia to China appear to have ceased in the 4th/10th century. There is no indisputable evidence that Chinese ships came to the Bahr Fâris before the Ming voyages of the early 9th/15th century. In early Muslim times the chief port was Siraf, near Ṭâhirî. It declined under the 7th/13th century, for a time gave its name to the sea (Bahr Sûdûk). For Ottoman times, see KARA DENIZ.


(D. M. DUNLOP)
later Buyids and hegemony passed to the Arab Banū Kaysar of Kays (originally Klš, Kis), afterwards subject to the Salghurid Atabegs of Pars. In 626/1229 the capital was moved from the mainland to the island of Djirun. Thus, as the commercial importance of ʿIrāq declined, the trading centre of the Bahr Fāris was displaced to the south. The importance of Hormuz, which was visited by Odoric of Pordenone and Marco Polo, among many others, was well known in mediaeval Europe. About 893/1488-9 it was visited by Coviňhâ, the agent of King of Portugal, who was collecting information about the trade routes of Asia. It is not known whether his report reached Lisbon (see Bahr Al-Kulzum). The Portuguese were more successful in the Bar Fāris than in the Red Sea, partly because it was nearer to their base in India, and partly because neither Persia nor the Ottoman empire controlled its coasts effectively. Even Başra was often semi-independent under Muntakfī shaykhs. Albuquerque received the submission of Hormuz in 913/1507, but the disaffection of his captains forced him to withdraw. He established effective control in 921/1515 when he murdered the powerful saʿir, Raʾs ʿHamid, and built a strong fort. The Portuguese intermittently held Başrayn and intervened in the affairs of Başra. After the Ottoman capture of Bağdad (941/1534) Turkish influence began to be felt in al-Absā, especially at al-Kaft. ʿAbbās I encouraged potential rivals to the Portuguese, and English and Dutch factories were founded during his reign. In 931/1525 he granted the English the permanent treaty the dominant personality on the coast was Zayd b. Khalīfah, the Banū Yās Shaykh of Abū Zābī; commercially the most prosperous port became Dubayy, belonging to the cognate Al Bū Falas. The other states were ʿAdīnīm, Umm al-Kuwayn, and after 1285/1868 ʿAtar. Kalbā and Fūjayrā on the coast of the Gulf of ʿUmān were for a short time recognised as having separate status; the former was incorporated in al-Šārīkā in 1951. In recent years the presence, or suspected presence of oil on land or under the sea bed has given significance to frontiers which have rarely been defined with precision.

Bibliography: The bibliography of the Bahr Fāris is very large and cannot be given in detail. To the Muslim geographers summarised by le Strange and Schwartz, Iran, should be added the Haddīyat al-ʿAlām. On sources for the mediaeval history of the Bahr Fāris, W Hin, Quellenstudien zur Geschichte der Timuriden, in ZDMG, 1936, 361-3, 379-81; J. Aubin, Les Princes d’Ormuz au XVth siècle, in JA, 1953, with many further references; and some extracts from the Maḏāba’-al-Ansāb of Muhammad Shabānkārī. The principal European travellers are mentioned in A. T. Wilson, The Persian Gulf, Oxford 1928, which summarises, rather inaccurately, the modern history of the region. For trade and navigation, G. Ferrand, L’éditement parisiens dans les textes nautiques arabes, JA, 1924; Instructions nautiques et routiers arabes et portugais; Hadi Hasan, History of Persian Navigation; G. F. Hourani, Arab Seafaring. The chief Portuguese sources are Barros, Castanheda, Correa, Barbosa, the letters of Albuquerque, the Commentario of Albuquerque the younger, Tome Pines, and (written in Spanish) Teixeira and Faria y Souza. On the Dutch, H. Terpstra, De Opkomst der Westerzeerwarten van de Oost-Indische Compagnie; H. Dunlop, Bronnen tot de Geschiedenis der Oostindische Compagnie in Persië. On pearlting and modern sailing conditions, A. Villiers, Sons of Sinbad. For general description in modern times, S. B. Miles, Countries and Tribes of the Persian Gulf, and Wilson, op. cit. On the first English traders, Sir W. Foster, England’s Quest of Eastern Trade, and much source material in The English Trade, in India. On the period of British power two valuable sources which have been somewhat neglected are Selections from the Records of the Bombay Government, New Series, no. xxiv, and the Annual Report on the Administration of the Persian Gulf Political Residency and Muscat Political Agency; the published reports cover the years 1874/5-1904/5. Subsequent reports were not made available to the public. For laws and treaties, C. U. Alchison, A Collection of Treaties, Engagements and Sanads relating to India and neighbouring countries, vol. xii, 137-186; Persian Gazette, vol. 1 no. 1, supp. no. 1, Oct., 1953. Some further geographical books in the Bibl. of Aš-
The Bahr al-Ghazal then became an object of European imperial expansion. Two expeditions from the Congo Free State entered Dár Faṛṭṭī in 1894 and the chief of the Farūṭī tribe accepted Congolese protection. Thereupon the Mahdist governor of Dár Für, Mahmūd Abīnd, sent al-Khāṭīm Mūsā to expel the Europeans, who had however already withdrawn since the Franco-Congolese agreement of August 1894 brought the Bahr al-Ghazāl within the French sphere of expansion. A French expedition under J.-B. Marchand crossed the region and reached the White Nile at Fashoda in July 1898, whence they withdrew in December in consequence of the Anglo-Egyptian reconquest of the Sudan. An Anglo-French agreement (21 March 1899) marked the relinquishment of French claims to the Bahr al-Ghazāl, the Congo-Nile watershed being the dividing-line between the two spheres of influence. The frontier was defined finally in 1924.

The re-establishment of administration began with the arrival of an expedition under W. S. Sparkes at Masgra at-Rik in December 1900. The following years saw the opening of communications as the sadd was cleared and roads made. Patrols for exploration and pacification were sent out and government posts established. Roman Catholic missionary activity began in the western Bahr al-Ghazāl in 1903; the Anglicans started work in the eastern areas in 1905. The missions laid the foundations of an educational system, which has been increasingly subject to governmental control since 1925. Sporadic tribal troubles occurred for many years, otherwise the recent history of the Bahr al-Ghazāl has been uneventful.

Bibliography: See R. L. Hill, A Bibliography of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, London, for material to 1937, and A Biographical-Dictionary of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, Oxford, for short notices of leading personalities. There are numerous articles, especially on tribes, in Sudan Notes and Records, Khartoum, 1928—. Annual

BAHR AL-HIND is the usual name amongst the Arabs for the Indian Ocean, which is also called Bahr al-Zandj from its W. shores or—the part for the whole—Bahr al-Ḫabash. The expression Bahr Fāris also sometimes includes the whole ocean.

According to Ibn Rusta, 87, its E. shores begin at Tīz Mūrnā, i.e. H. S. H. al-Ḫina. Ibn I♂-Fidād, Taḥbīm, transl. ii, 27 = text, 22, gives Bahr al-Sīn as its E boundary, al-Hind as the N. and al-Yaman as the W., while the S. is unknown.

The various parts of the ocean bear special names derived from various lands and islands. If we neglect the N. arms, Bahr al-Kulzum and Bahr Fāris in the narrower sense, which are dealt with in separate articles, we have first Bahr al-Yaman stretching along the S. coast of Arabia with the Khūrīn Murīn (Kuria Muria) islands and Sūḳūṭrā. On the African coast we have, beginning at the strait of Bāb al-Mandab, first the land of Barbār, i.e. Somaliland to the harbour of Marka, then the land of the Zandj [see BAHR AL-ZANDJ] with the towns of Barawā, Malīnā, Mūnbāsā and the island of Zanzibār, i.e. roughly Kenya and Tanganyika Territory as far as the island of Kānalū. Sufālā is joined tc Kānbalū, and finally at an uncertain distance is al-Wākgwā (Madagascar).

If one sets out from Bahr Fāris at Tīz Mūrnā, one comes to the coast of al-Sind with the delta of the Indus (Mīhrān) and the commercial town of al-Daybul. On the shores of Bahr Lārwā (i.e. the sea of Lār or Gudjarāt on the W. coast of India) lie the towns of Kānbāš (Cambay), Sūhārā, Saymōr and Sindābūra (Goa). The archipelago of al-Dībādj (the Laccadives and Maldives) separates Bahr Lārwā from Bahr Harkand (Bay of Bengal with the waters to the S.). 'Harkand' has been explained to show. This idea is supported by Idrīsī, according to whom the name is Indian (Jaubert, Introduction, p. 36). But trade relations seem to have recovered to some extent, and became active again under the Mongols, as Ibn Bāḍān’s account of his voyage shows.

The notion of the Arabs of the 10th century concerning Bahr al-Hind became more and more vague as one goes to the E. and S., and the interpretation of their statements more uncertain. In many cases they have merely followed their Greek predecessors. They have in addition utilised the accounts of their own voyages. Details from different sources were never properly assimilated to form a uniform picture. Sometimes Bahr al-Hind appears to pass into the ‘Sea of Darkness’, in which mariners driven out of their course are said to be tossed about for ever. Sometimes it is believed that it joins the ‘Black Sea’ or ‘Sea of Pitch’ (al-Bahr al-Zifti) on the N. of Asia. Sometimes again E. Asia and S. Africa appear to be connected, as the use of the name al-Wākgwā [q.v.] for Japan (or Sumatra, cf. Ḫudūd al-Ālam, 228) as well as for Madagascar shows. This idea is supported by Idrīsī, according to whom the Zabadj islands are opposite to the land of the Kandj.

The voyages of the Persians and Arabs, who availed themselves of the monsoons, had as their starting-place the Persian Gulf. Šrāf and Sūhrā are important harbours there. The most important commercial centres appear to have been the land of the Zandj, to which merchants sailed even from al-Zabadj—Madagascar was ultimately colonised from the Malay islands—and al-Zabadj itself, which had relations with China. The commerce of the Muslims with China came to a standstill in 2648/298 after the sack of Canton in the course of a rebellion (Abū Zayd al-Ḫasān al-Ḫrāfī in G. Ferrand, Voyage du marchand arabe Sulaymān, 75 ff.; cf. Masūdī, Murūdī, i, 302-308). But trade relations seem to have recovered to some extent, and became active again under the Mongols, as Ibn Bāḍān’s account of his voyage shows.

Bibliography: BGA, i, 28-36; ii, 35-47; iii, 41-59; iv, 10-19; v, 7, 9-16; vi, 60-72 (transl. 40-53); vii, 83 ff., 86 ff.; viii, 51-56; Ya’qūbī, i, 202 ff.; Masūdī, Murūdī, i, 302-44, 325-95; Buzurg b. Ṣhrāyīr, Ḫudūd al-Hind, (ed. van der Lith, with French transl. by M. Devic, Leiden, 1883-1886); Kāzwīnī, ed. Wünschfeld, 1, 106-123; Reinaud, Introduction, p. 34; J. Sauvaget, Relation de la Chine et de l'Inde, 34), while Šhāhī is S. Malacca. Voyagers sailing to China must have kept somewhat further N., for they touched at the islands of Lāŋkīvīlūs or Landjābīlūs (the Nicobars) to the N. of which are placed the Andamān islands, and from there reached Kālāh Bār (Kedah) on the Malay peninsula. The strait of Malacca is therefore called Bahr Kalah (Kalāh Bār), while Bahr Šhāhī, when it is distinguished from it, appears to be the sea adjoining it on the S. We have now reached the land of the Maharāḏī, the centre of which is the land of al-Ẓabadj. This name originally denoted Central and S. Sumatra, where Sūbuza (Ferrand’s reading) = Palengbang is to be sought for, then its use was extended to include Java (Diāba) and in its political application it includes a series of smaller islands and the coast of Malacca. Beyond these islands is Bahr Kardandj or Kardanjī, the Gulf of Siam, which is continued on the coast of Khūrīn (Kührīn = Cambodia) in Bahr Siān (Champa), the sea of Annan and the waters adjoining it on the S. Passing the island of Šundurfült (Hai-nan), we reach the Bahr Šankhāy (China Sea), where Khānūfū (Hang-Chu, Canton) is the great emporium for the trade with the West. The knowledge of the Arabs concerning al-Škilā, al-Sīlā (Korea) and the Wākgwā islands (?Japan) was vague and limited.

The last port on the Malabar coast is Kūlam Mall (Quillon), the outermost of its islands is Sarandāb (Ceylon). The route to the E. Indies appears to have lain straight across Bahr Harkand to the island of al-Rāmīn which is washed by the waters of Bahr Harkand and the Bahr Šhāhī. Al-Rāmīn (al-Rāml, al-Rāmīn = al-Lārmār), whence the sea there is called Bahr Lārmār is Sumatra, to be more accurate N. W. Sumatra (cf. J. I♂-Fidā, Taḥbīm, transl. ii, 27-30). The sea adjoining it on the S. is that of al-Ṣuljar and Sīla (Korea) and the Wākgwā islands (?Japan), which had relations with China. The commerce of the Muslims with China came to a standstill in 2648/298 after the sack of Canton in the course of a rebellion (Abū Zayd al-Ḫasān al-Ḫrāfī in G. Ferrand, Voyage du marchand arabe Sulaymān, 75 ff.; cf. Masūdī, Murūdī, i, 302-308). But trade relations seem to have recovered to some extent, and became active again under the Mongols, as Ibn Bāḍān’s account of his voyage shows.
The ranges of the Great Balkhān and Little Balkhān E. of Krasnovodsk, though not very high, are a conspicuous feature on the landward side. A modern estimate of the length of the Caspian is 760 miles. Al-Masʿūdī gives 800 miles in length, in breadth 600 miles or more (al-Tānīth, 60), but the latter figure is greatly exaggerated. Al-Masʿūdī is well aware of the fact that Bahr al-Khazar is unconnected with Bahr Māyyūtis (Sea of Azov) and Bahr Nītis (Black Sea) (Murādī, 1, 273-4).

For a long time the Khazars served as middlemen between the peoples of the North and the inhabitants of the lands of Islam. There is plenty of evidence of mercantile activity in both directions, for which the water-way was the Atīl (Volga) and Bahr al-Khazar itself. Eventually Russian warships began to make the descent of the Atīl through Khazar territory to the Caspian, and the presence of these marauders is a feature of the history of this part of the world for a considerable period from before A.D. 900. The Mongol invasions brought about the rise of new Muslim dynasties N. as well as S. of the Caspian. It is long since the Russian advance put an end to the power of the Khānates of the steppe, and at present Russia controls more of the coastline of the sea than did the Khazars at the zenith of their power.

north as Suez, but generally unloaded their goods at
Aden, Djidda or, in the 11th/12th century, at Moukhā. It was the caravan trade with Djidda that
gave Mecca its commercial importance in the 9th/10th century. Much merchandise, however, was
merely transshipped to smaller vessels; according to Abū Zayd the local craft used for this at Djidda
were known as Kulzum ships. Arab navigators thus had wide experience of the Bahr al-Kulzum and their
nautical treatises show sound practical knowledge; Ferrand considered the relevant sailing directions
in Ibn Mājīd’s Kitāb al-famā′id to be unsurpassed, except for their errors of latitude, by any European
directions for sailing ships for the area. The Muslim
geographers give the length of the Bahr al-Kulzum as 30 days’ sail, or as from 1400 to 1500 mil; this figure is
fairly accurate, but their estimate of the maximum
breadth, 700 mil, is more than three times too

The whole area within the strait of Bāb al-Mandab was thought to have once been a fertile country,
until a certain king cut a channel through which the
ocean could flow and destroy his enemy’s territory.
Another legend connected with the Bahr al-Kulzum is
that there is a magnetic mountain south of Kulzum, because of which local ships had to be constructed
without any iron parts. This is perhaps a fanciful
explanation of the fact that the local craft of the
Bah sak-Kulzum and the western part of the Indian
Ocean used to be made of planks, sewn, not nailed,
together; this practice is now confined to small craft
in the more remote places. The Bahr al-Kulzum was
also believed to contain an island inhabited by al-
Djassāsā, “the spy”, a creature which collected in-
formation for al-Djadidal. The sea in which Pharaoh
and his army were drowned was assumed to have
been some part of the Bahr al-Kulzum. According to
Yākūt the incident took place at Kulzum, according
to others, including Kāfkašandl, at Birkat al-
Gharandāl, on the coast between Kulzum and al-Ṭūr,
known as Surandala or Arandara to mediaeval
Christian pilgrims.

In spite of difficulties to navigation, the lack of
good harbours and the aridity of the littoral, the
position of the Bahr al-Kulzum and the Nile valley and the Mediterranean
was at one time facilitated by a canal, sometimes
called the Pharaonic, or Trajan’s canal, known to
the Arabs as Khilīj Amr al-Mumīnīn, which
entered the sea at Kulzum. Part of this canal, the
Wādī Ṭumlālāt, had once been a natural branch of the Nile extending to Lake Timṣāš; as the level of the
land rose it became useless for navigation. It
was cleared several times in antiquity and again by ʿAmr b. al-Ṭūr, who used it to send corn ships to
Ṭūr, then the port of Madīna, in the time of ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb. The Khalifā is said to have
refused to let ʿAmr dig a canal from Lake Timṣāš to
the Mediterranean lest it should enable Byzantine
ships to enter the Bahr al-Kulzum ʿAmr’s canal was
navigable only when the Nile was high; it was again
cleared in the time of al-Mahdī, but fell into disuse
soon after, though water sometimes flowed along it when there was an exceptional flood.

The trade of the Bahr al-Kulzum benefited from the
increased power of Egypt under the Fatīmids and the
concerning the decline of ʿIrāk. The Crusades,
stimulated the demand for oriental products in
Europe, and this transit trade became a factor of
great importance to Egyptian prosperity. In 578-9/1182-3 Renaud de Châtillon conveyed prefabricated
ships from the Mediterranean coast to Ayyālā where
they were assembled and launched to harry this
commerce. The Franks attacked ayyūba (g.v.) but
were defeated at sea by Ḥusām al-Dīn Luʾluʾ and
those who contrived to land in the Hijāz were
annihilated. According to Abū Shāma, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn
ordered that no prisoner should be allowed to
survive, so that there should be no one who could
give information about the passage of the Bahr al-
Kulzum. Later, attempts were made in Europe to
ruin this trade by an embargo, but in spite of Papal
injunctions, it was never applied effectively. In the
early 8th/14th century Guillaume Adam advocated
that a Christian naval force should occupy Ṣuḵṭra
g.v. and blockade the entrance to the Bahr al-
Kulzum. About 893/1488 Pero da Covilhā, who
sailed from al-Ṭūr to Aden and later visited Mecca and al-Madīna, collected information about the trade
route for the King of Portugal; he was himself
detained in Ḡaṣṣa and it is not known whether
his report ever reached Lisbon. Having reached India
by sea in 903/1498, the Portuguese attempted
forcibly to divert the entire transit trade of the Bahr
al-Kulzum and the Persian Gulf to the Cape route
for their own profit. In the ensuing war against first the Egyptians and then the Ottoman Turks they
secured naval supremacy in the Indian Ocean. In
919/1513 Albuquerque, who hoped to join the Abys-
sinians in an attack on Mecca, unsuccessfully besieged
Aden and then entered the Bahr al-Kulzum. His
fleet was becalmed at Ḳamarān and suffered very
heavy casualties. His successor had the same
experience and, although in 947/1541 D. Estevão da
Gama sailed within sight of Suez and landed a small
force at Maṣaqawa’ (Massawa) to assist the Abys-
sinians in an attack on Mecca, usually sailed in disguise on native ships. Early in the
11th/16th century English (1025/1616) ships began to trade at Mukhā; they did
not often sail further north. Though Mukhā g.v. attained temporary importance as an outlet for the
coffee of al-Yamān (see ʿArab al-Gharbiyya) and Arabian
travellers, mostly missionaries going to Abyssinia,
usually sailed in disguise on native ships. Early in
the 11th/17th century English (1025/1608) and Dutch
(1025/1616) ships began to trade at Mukhā; they did
not often sail further north. Though Mukhā g.v. attained temporary importance as an outlet for the
coffee of al-Yamān (see ʿArab al-Gharbiyya) and Arabian
travellers, mostly missionaries going to Abyssinia,
usually sailed in disguise on native ships. Early in
the 11th/17th century English (1025/1608) and Dutch
(1025/1616) ships began to trade at Mukhā; they did
not often sail further north. Though Mukhā g.v. attained temporary importance as an outlet for the
coffee of al-Yamān (see ʿArab al-Gharbiyya) and Arabian
travellers, mostly missionaries going to Abyssinia,
usually sailed in disguise on native ships. Early in
the 11th/17th century English (1025/1608) and Dutch
(1025/1616) ships began to trade at Mukhā; they did
not often sail further north. Though Mukhā g.v. attained temporary importance as an outlet for the
coffee of al-Yamān (see ʿArab al-Gharbiyya) and Arabian
travellers, mostly missionaries going to Abyssinia,
usually sailed in disguise on native ships. Early in
the 11th/17th century English (1025/1608) and Dutch
(1025/1616) ships began to trade at Mukhā; they did
not often sail further north. Though Mukhā g.v. attained temporary importance as an outlet for the

The deepest part of its bottom is 2000 feet below sea level. An isthmus (likeki "taught") running out from its east shore separates the southern, quite shallow part from the northern basin. While on the East and West shores the mountains rise up from the shore to a height of over 3000 feet, in the north, at the mouth of the Jordan the land is low-lying, and in the south, where on the east shore of the sabhā, Pentapolis (Genesis xiv and xix) is to be sought, it only rises slowly into al-Gha'em and al-'Araba. The composition of its water, so extraordinarily rich in salt, is unsuited to organic life and is even an impediment to navigation. On only a few places on the shore, inhabited oases of almost tropical character have survived.

Geology. The Dead Sea fills the deepest part of the Great Syrian system of depressions which was formed at the close of the Tertiary period. In the periods of alternate drought and rain of the diluvial epoch, the great floods filled the greater part of the Jordan valley and a part of the 'Araba with an inland sea; this was never connected with the Red Sea. There being no exit to this basin the water, which, to begin with, flowed partly from springs rich in minerals, came in course of time, by evaporation to contain a high percentage of salt of peculiar composition. In the dry period of historic times the sea has dwindled into the area it at present occupies. In the last century a gradual rising of the level of the sea has been definitely ascertained. Tectonic disturbances have affected the surrounding district down to the present day. It is one of the most recent of these that the origin of the southern basin is due.

The procuring of asphalt from the Dead Sea, as in antiquity (cf. the name lacs "asphalt") seems to have been an important business in the middle ages, also. The asphalt was used as a protection against insects in vineyards. It was also used for many medicinal purposes. To the waters of the sea itself, healing powers were also ascribed.

The rich products of the oasis of Zogrā (near the modern ghuwar al-Sáhiya) were borne across the Dead Sea. The Frankish Crusaders also sailed on it.

Bibliography: All earlier material has been collected and made use of in Meusburger, Das Tote Meer (Programme, Brixen 1907-1909); Arab accounts: Iṣṭāḥkhrī, i, 64; Ibn Hawšāl, 123 ff.; Mūkaddasī, 178, 184 ff.; Ibn al-Fakhīr, 123; Ibn Khurrāsatābī, 79; Yaʿāqūbī, 539; Masʿūdī, al-Tanbāʿ, 73 ff.; Masʿūdī, Murādī, i, 96; Idrīsī, ZDPV, vili, 3; Yaḥyā, i, 516, ii, 934; Dimashqī (ed. Mehren), 108; Abu ʾl-Fidaʿ, Talqīm, 228; Ibn Bayṭār (trans. Sontheimer, Stuttgart 1842), ii, 309 ff.; cf. also the Persian Nāṣīr-ī Khusrāw (ed. Scheler), 17 ff. and the Turkish Elvīyā Ṣelḥī, Suyūṭī-nāme, ix, 516, 519, and Ḥāḍidjī Khālīfa, Diḥān-numā, 555; the Muslim sources have been collected and translated in G. Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, 64-7, 286-92 and A. S. Marmardji, Textes géographiques arabes sur la Palestine, Paris 1951, 15-18. (R. HARTMANN)

BAHR AL-MAGHRIB [see BAHR AL-RUM].

BAHR MĀYUTĪS OR BAHAYRA MAZĪTII, the Classical Lake Maeotis, modern Sea of Azov. Other forms of the name are Māwīṭī (Māwīṭ). Bahar Māyutīs is constantly mentioned with Bahar Nītās, i.e., Bahr Buntus, [q.v.], to which it is joined by Khalīdī Nītās (Strait of Kertch).

According to Masʿūdī (Tanbāʿ, 66), Bahaya
Māyūṭis is 300 miles long and 100 miles broad. These dimensions, which are considerably exaggerated by Mas'ūdī, also states that it lies at the extremity of the inhabited world towards the N. in the vicinity of Tūlīya (Thule). The opinion which places Thule N. of the Sea of Azov is shared by Ibn al-Fāḍīl (8), according to whom one of the four principal seas (cf. article Bahr al-rūm, 4th paragraph) is that which lies 'between Rome and Khwarizm (as far as) the island of Tūlīya. No ship was ever placed upon it'. (Ibn al-Fāḍīl reckons al-Bahr al-Khazar or Caspian separately.)

Elsewhere Mas'ūdī says that the river Tānāis (Tanaïs, Don), which takes it rise in a great lake (unnamed) situated in the N., flows into Bahr Māyūṭis after a course of about 300 farsākhās through cultivated countries (Mūrūjī, i, 261). The great lake in the N., with which Bahr Māyūṭis is evidently confused, had already been mentioned by al-Kindī, his pupil al-Sarakhshī and others (Mūrūjī, i, 275).

It came to be identified with Bahr al-Warāŋk, properly the Baltic. Hence in a Syriac map of about 1150 A.D. the Sea of Azov is called 'Warang Sea' (A. Mingana, cited Hūdūd al-'Alam, 182; cf. 'Ali Kūnā al-Abbādīr, i, 100).

Mas'ūdī, who shows more interest in Bahr Māyūṭis and Bahr Nīṭas than geographers of the school of al-Balkhī (cf. supra p. 79), maintains that properly they form a single sea. He is concerned also to refute on the testimony of travelling merchants those who say that Bahr al-Khazar, i.e., the Caspian, communicates directly with Bahr Māyūṭis (Mūrūjī, i, 273). There is only the river route, via the Strait of Kerich, the Don and the At (Volga), using the Don-Volga portage, i.e., the so-called ‘Khazarian Way’ (cf. Murūjī, ii, 18 ff.).

His own account of Bahr Māyūṭis is by no means free from error, cf. above. He also appears to think that its waters are of greater extent and depth than those of Bahr Nīṭas or Black Sea (Mūrūjī, i, 273), which is the reverse of the case. Confusion is also introduced by the fact that Mas'ūdī occasionally speaks of Bahr Māyūṭis as Bahr al-Khazar (e.g., Tābīkī, 138), following popular usage.

In later times Bahr Māyūṭis was called Bahr Aẓāk, in Ottoman Turkish Aşak Denizi.

Bibliography: In addition to the references in the article, Hūdūd al-‘Alam, 180-183, and index.

(D. M. Dunlop)

AL-BAHR AL-MUḤĪT, i.e. ‘the Encircling Sea’, also called Bahr Uṣūlānūs al-Muḥīṭ, or simply Uṣūlānūs, the circumambient Ocean of the Greeks (‘Okeanos’). By some it was named al-Bahr al-Aḥḍār, ‘the Green Sea’. It was regarded as enclosing the habitable world on all sides, or at least on three sides, W., N. and E. (Mas'ūdī, Tābīkī, 26), since the S. boundary of the inhabited world was the equator. According to Kāb al-Abbār (q.v.) reported by Kāzwinī (Cosmography, ed. Wüstefeld, i, 104), seven seas encircled the earth, of which the last enclosed all the others.

There was general agreement that the principal seas were directly connected with al-Bahr al-Muḥīt, with few exceptions, notably the Caspian (Bahr al-Khazar), but not the Black Sea (Bahr Būṭūs or more usually Nīṭas, [q.v.]), which was supposed to be an arm or ‘gulf’ of al-Bahr al-Muḥīt, like Bahr al-Maḡrīb, Bahr al-rūm, Bahr Warānk (Botan), Bahr al-Zanjī, Bahr Fāris, Bahr al-Hūnd and Bahr al-Ṣīn (the last four corresponding to the Indian Ocean and part of the Pacific). In general, these arms or ‘gulfs’ were thought of as forming an Eastern and Western system (Yāḵūt, Buldān, i, 504), meeting or at least approaching each other at the isthmus of Suez. There was some doubt as to whether the ‘gulfs’ were supplied from al-Bahr al-Muḥīt (the prevailing opinion), or vice versa, given that nearly all the rivers of the world flowed into it.

But while in theory al-Bahr al-Muḥīt was the circumambient Ocean, it frequently signifies simply the Atlantic. From another point of view, the Atlantic adjacent to Spain and N. Africa formed part of Bahr al-Maḡrīb (Kāzwinī, Cosmography, i, 123). In the sense of the Atlantic al-Bahr al-Muḥīt is synonymous with al-Bahr al-Muẓūm or Bahr al-Ṣūlmā or al-Zulūmāt (Sea of Darkness), applied to the N. Atlantic as descriptive of its bad weather and dangerous character (Jaubert, Géog. d’Edrīsī, ii, 352-356, cf. Dimashqī, ed. Mehren, 124). Conceivable among the islands of al-Bahr al-Muḥīt, apart from Thule (usually taken to be the Shetlands), which the Arabs knew from translations of Prolemy, were the Fortunate Islands (Canaries) and Britain (Barthāniyya, with variants). A persistent tradition, which seems to go back to a Classical source, gives the British Isles as 12 in number (Nallino, Al-Battānī, text, 26; cf. Mas'ūdī, Tābīkī, 68).

The Arabic authors agree that al-Bahr al-Muḥīt is impassable for ships (e.g. al-Kindī, cited Yāḵūt, Buldān, i, 500, speaking comparatively of the Atlantic Ocean, cf. Mas'ūdī, Mūrūjī, i, 275; Battānī, loc. cit.; Yāḵūt, Buldān, i, 504; Ibn Khādūn, Berbères, T.I. Paris 1925, 187-8). Perhaps this assertion is to be taken as applying in principle to the mythical circumambient Ocean. It is in any case certain that Muslim ships sailed in Atlantic waters. After a descent of the Norsemen on Spain in 229/844 the Atlantic coast was patrolled by Umayyad squadrons, perhaps as far as the Bay of Biscay. In 355/966 the coast of Spain, at Lisbon and Ḵaṣr Abī Dānīs (Alcacer do Sal), was attacked by Danish Vikings, who were met and defeated at Silves by the Umayyad fleet. In 387/997 the fleet brought the infantry of al-Muṣūr [q.v.] from the Atlantic port of Ḵaṣr Abī Dānīs already mentioned to Burtakāl (Oporto) by sea. (For these events, see Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. Mus., i, Cairo 1944, 137, 218, 224, 393, 444.)

In these instances coastal operations are presumably intended. Therea re also some indications of ocean voyages in the Atlantic. Apart from the reported journey of Yaḥyā al-Ḡazālī to the court of the ‘king of the Norsemen’ after A.D. 848—variously localised in Jutland or Ireland—(refs. in Brockelmann, GAL., Sup. i 148; also H. Munis, Contribution à l’étude des invasions des Normands en Espagne, Bulletin de la Société Royale d’Etudes Historiques, Egypte, Vol. ii, fasc. 1, 1950), we read also of Khāshkhāsh of Cordova, who embarked in ships upon al-Bahr al-Muḥīt and returned with rich booty (Mas'ūdī, Mūrūjī, i, 258, cf. Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. Mus. iii, 342, n.), and of the Adventurers (al-muqarrirūn—so read) of Lisbon, who sailed for many days W. and S. into the Atlantic and after whom a street was named in their native town (Jaubert, Géog. d’Edrīsī, ii, 26-7, cf. i, 200). An account of whaling in the neighbourhood of Ireland (Kāzwinī, Cosmography, ii, 388, quoting the 11th century Spanish geographer al-‘Uḍhrī) may also be mentioned here.

(D. M. Dunlop)
the Muslim conquests extended, these names were applied to the whole Mediterranean, for which Bahr al-Rûm is still in use. The Mediterranean was also called al-Bahr al-Shâmî, or al-Bahr al-Shâm, ‘the Sea of Syria’, and al-Bahr al-Maghrib, ‘the Sea of the West’.

The sea thus variously named, began, according to Arabic geographers, considerably to the W. of the Strait of Gibraltar (al-Zukák) and was a gulf of the Western Ocean (al-Bahr al-Mubţî al-Maghribî). Legend had it that Bahr al-Rûm was originally formed in what had hitherto been dry land, after the Strait had been cut, by the Banû Dalûka, descendants of a Queen Dalûka who was supposed to have ruled Egypt after the Pharaoh of the Exodus (al-Masûdî, Murûdî, ii, 398), in order to interpose a barrier between themselves and the king of the Greeks (al-Kazwînî, ‘Aḍîd’îb, 123), or the Strait was cut and al-Bahr al-Rûm joined to al-Bahr al-Mubţî by Alexander the Great at the request of the original Spaniards (Ishbânînî), who wished to be separated from the Berbers (al-Nuwayrî, Nîkâyât al-‘Arab, i, 231-232). A detailed account of the fabulous bridge which Alexander built on this occasion, with diagrams, is actually given by al-Dînâshdî (Cosmographie, ed. Mehren, 137).

Descriptions of Bahr al-Rûm regularly begin in the W. and proceed E., usually along the S. shore from Salâm or even Tangia (Tanger) and Sâbta (Ceuta) to Tarabûlus (Tripoli) and Alexandria, then past the mouths of the Nile, N. along the Syrian coast to Antâkiya (Antioch) and its harbour al-Suwaydîyâ, on to al-Thughîr (the Frontiers), then continuing W.-wards along the coast of Bilâd al-Rûm (Asia Minor) to Constantinople, al-Ârâ’l-Sâhîrîn (‘the Little Land’, i.e., mainland Greece), Bâdhûnûs (the Peloponnese), Kallauriya (Calabria), al-Ankuawarda (Lombardy), Ifrânjia (France), and S. again towards al-Andalus (Spain) (e.g., Ibn Hâwîlî ed. Kramers, 100-1). It is understood that a man could in theory at least make the circuit of Bahr al-Rûm till he reached a point in Spain opposite to where he started from, and that the countries lying to the S. of the sea are Muslim, while those to the N. are Christian. The dimensions of Bahr al-Rûm are variously given. Al-Masûdî (cf. L6vi-Provencal, ‘Introduction’, in the ‘World’s Knowledge’), in effect the whole of the Mediterranea, divided Bahr al-Rûm into five seas. The dimensions of the Mediterranean, the Caspian, the Black Sea, and the Indian Ocean, called by Mufcaddâsî, 14, Al-Masûdî, c. 935, in the 7th/8th century (Abu ’l-Fida’, Tabûsîn, Introduct., cglxvii).

Bahr al-Rûm is always regarded as one of the earth’s principal seas. Al-Mu’âsadâsî says that he knows only two, a Western, i.e., the Mediterranean, and an Eastern, i.e., the Indian Ocean, called by him al-Bahr al-Sini, ‘the Chinese Sea’. He mentions that to these al-Bâlîkîî added al-Bahr al-Mubţî, ‘the Circumambient Ocean’, and al-Dijâhânî a fourth and fifth, viz., Bahr al-Khazar, ‘the Sea of the Khazars’ (Caspian) and Khalîdî al-Kustânînîyâ, ‘Gulf of Constantinople’, i.e., the approaches to the Black Sea. Al-Mu’âsaddaî points out that the Kur’ân (Sûra lv, 39 ff.): ‘He has left unconnected the two seas which meet. Between them is a barrier which they do not transgress etc.’ As al-Mu’âsaddaî, 16, puts it, the ‘barrier’ is the isthmus between al-Fârâmâ (Pelusium) and al-Kûzûm (Clyma, mod. Suez), and it divides Bahr al-Rûm from al-Bahr al-Sini. He mentions that some interpreted another Kur’ân text (Sûra xxvi, 26): ‘If the trees in the world were pens, and the sea were filled thereafter by seven seas etc.’ with reference to the five already mentioned plus al-Mu’âfîbû, ‘the Inverted (Lake)’ (Dead Sea) and al-Khwarîzmiyya, ‘the Khywarîzmiyya (Lake)’ (Aral Sea). Another more reasonable list of the ‘Seven Seas’ is: Green Sea or Eastern Ocean, Western Ocean, Great Sea or Indian Ocean, Mediterranean, Caspian, Black Sea and Aral Sea (‘Hûdâd al-‘Alâm, 51-3). Al-Masûdî in one place places al-Dijâhânî in giving five: Indian Ocean, Mediterranean, Caspian, Black Sea and Circumambient Ocean (‘Tanbîh, 50-241) and elsewhere says that most people reckon four (Murûdî, i, 271), Black Sea and Caspian presumably counting as one, but cf. Ibn al-Fâkhî, 4-8. However many the seas were taken to be, the general view was that the Kur’ânic ‘meeting of the two seas’ (maghîma’l-bahrûn) was at the isthmus of Suez, though some thought in this connection of al-Zukák (Strait of Gibraltar).

The different parts of Bahr al-Rûm had special names, e.g., Bahr Tirân, ‘the Tyrrenian Sea’ (al-Râdî); Dînn al-Bânâdîkîyyînî, ‘the Gulf of the Venetians’ (Ibn Hâwîlî) or al-Khâlîdî al-‘Abâdî, ‘the Venetian Gulf’ (al-Ibrîsî), in effect the whole of the Adriatic; Khalîdî al-Kustânînîyâ, the Gulf of Constantinople, the approaches to the Black Sea. The Black Sea itself was Nîtûs, a stereotyped mistake for Buntûs (Pontus), which perhaps survived in some MSS. The Sea of Azov was Mâyûtûs (Maeotis). It was correctly realised that the two last-named seas were connected with each other and Bahr al-Rûm, but uncertainty and error attended the attempts made to explain the relative positions of the Black Sea and the Caspian (Bahr al-Khazar). Ibn al-Fâkhî (cf. L6vi-Provencal, ‘The geographical names of Bahr al-Rûm’ and Al-Fâkhî, 7, 299) gives the boundaries between the Caspian Sea and the Black Sea and the Baltic (Bahr al-Wâranû, ‘Sea of the Warangians’) or the Arctic Ocean, of which the Arabs could scarcely have had direct information. The tendency to regard the seas last mentioned as connected with Bahr al-Rûm is illustrated in the maps of Ibn Hâwîlî.

Various islands of Bahr al-Rûm came to be known at an early date. Kubrus (Cyprus) and Arwâd (Aradus), the little island off the Syrian coast, were the first to be occupied, under Mu’âwiya, and before his death (60/680) Rhodes, Crete and Cyprus. Al-Î斯塔khri, 70, earlier had mentioned the same three, with the addition of a fourth, Diabâl al-Kâlîlî (cf. Ya’kût, i, 392), identified by Reinaud (Marâsad al-‘Itîlîî, ed. Juynboll, v, 27) with Fraxinetum, now Gerde-Freinet on the French mainland E. of Marseilles, from which between circa 894 and 972 the Arabs raided as far as Switzerland (cf. Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. Mus., chapter 5). This identification is confirmed by Ibn Hâwîlî ed. Kramers, 304, who mentions the place as being ‘in the territories of France, in the hands of fighters for
the faith (bi-nawdhi Ifrandj_a bi-aydi al-mudidhidin]. It appears on Ibn Hawkal's map as an island (al-waylā bi-barq, i.e. a large island, cf. also Murūdī, i, 99). For Bahr al-Rum, see also the map of Genoa also shown as an island.

Other islands in the sea are mentioned by al-Kazwini (‘Adīd-jab, 124-125). The best description which we have of them is in the text and maps of al-Idrisī (see Bibliography).

Features of Bahr al-Rum which attracted attention were the comparative absence of tides and the recession of the coast, both noted by al-Mas'ūdī (al-Tanbih, 70, 132), the latter phenomenon at Ephesus (unconfirmed). Al-Mas'ūdī notices the volcanic activity of Mt. Etna (Dīalab al-Burkān, Ṭūmara Sīkilkilyya, Murūdī, ii, 26; al-Tanbih, 59). He also tells us that Harūn al-Rashīd wished to join Bahr al-Rum to Bahr Kūlzūm (Red Sea), but was dissuaded from the attempt by Yahyā b. Khālid the Barmecide, who represented that if he did so, the Greeks would pass through and interfere with the pilgrimage to Mecca (Murūdī, iv, 98-99).

Though at first the Greeks retained command of the sea even after their defeats on land, this was soon lost to them by a series of Muslim naval successes following which the Battle of the Masts (Ḍaḥāt al-Šawwār) is the most famous (fought off the Lycian coast in 34/655). It appears that former Byzantine naval installations in Syria and Egypt, and trained personnel, were now employed against them, to secure the command of the E. Mediterranean for the Arabs. This they for the most part retained throughout the Umayyad and early ʿAbbāsid period, during which Constantinople was attacked repeatedly. There appears to have been some resurgence of Greek naval power in Harūn's Caliphate (cf. ibn Ṣawrān), when the Byzantine warships which brought Muslim prisoners for ransom to al-ʿĀlima, Lamu (Cicilia) in 188/805 made a considerable impression (al-Mas'ūdī, al-Tanbih, 189). In 311 or 312/923 or 924 a Muslim fleet with units from al-Baṣra and Syria sailed from Ṭarsūs under an admiral (mustawalli al-ghawr fil-bahr) and operated successfully in the N. waters of al-Bahr al-Rum, reaching Venetian territory and making contact with a detachment of Bulgars, some of whom returned with them to Ṭarsūs (al-Mas'ūdī, Murūdī, ii, 16-17; Ibn al-ʿĀthīr, s. anno 312). Yet later under al-Muqtadīr (Caliph 295/908-320/932) Greek ships regularly made extensive raids on the coast of Syria, and it was in his Caliphate that the command of the E. Mediterranean was lost (Ibn Ḥawkal, ed. De Goeje, 128-37; ed. Kramers, 190-205 with the maps facing pp. 8 and 66, as well as that on p. 193; Muḥaddasīs 14-19; Ṣawrān, i, 504-5; Kazwini, ‘Adīd-jab al-Mahdijāb, 123-7; Nuwairī, Nihayat al-Arāb, i, 231-236; Idrīsī, transl. Jaubert, i, 5-6; ii, 1-13, 16-19, 35-48, 68-135, 226-304, etc. (by far the fullest account, but less useful for the early period); for Idrīsī's maps, K. Miller, Mappae Arabicae, Stuttgart 1926 and later; Anonymous Chronicle of Sicily in Amari, Biblioteca Arabo-Sicula, text 165-176; transl. 70-74; P. K. Hitti, History of the Arabs, ed. 6, Princeton 1956, index.

(D. M. DowLO)

In the Ottoman Empire the Mediterranean was known as Ak-deniz, the Black Sea, whence the Persian Bahri Saifid and Dārāyī Saifid and, probably the colloquial Greek θάλασσα Θάλασσα. In Ottoman usage it included—and seems at times to have been restricted to—the Aegean sea, the islands of which were called Djecaer-i Bahr-i Saifid. The name, which appears to have no Greek, Byzantine, or Islamic precedents, is of uncertain origin. It may have arisen in contrast to Kar-daniz, the Black Sea, on the other side of Istanbul. A full cartographic treatment of the Mediterranean Sea will be found in the famous Atlas presented in 930/1523 to Sültan Sulaymān by Pirī Re'is [q.v.]. There are also descriptions in the travels of Ewliya Celebi (Seyyidatnâme, i, 40 ff. and vii, passim), in the maritime history of Hādīqī Khatīfī (Twāfat al-Kibar, 3 ff., English trans. by J. Mitchell, 3 ff.), and in his Dżehānnâme 76. [ED.

BAHR AL-ULÜM ("Ocean of the Sciences"), honorific title of ABB al-ṢAYYĀB ABD AL-ʿALĪ MUHAMMAD b. NIẒĀM AL-DĪN MUḤAMMAD b. KUṬB AL-DĪN AL-ANŠĀRĪ AL-LAŃKAWI, a highly distinguished Indian savant of the 15th century. He was a pupil of the famous Khwaḍīja Ṣabl Allān Anṣārī Harawī, whose descendant Shaykh Ṣubḥ al-Dīn (ʿAbd al-ʿAlī's tenth ancestor) came from Harat to India, and now lies buried at Barnāwā (between Muḥrār and Delhi). The next generation settled in Sihāl, a town near Lucknow. Under Awarangīzb, the family shifted to "Farangi Maḥālāt". Lucknow, (for which see Rahman A., Tadhkira Airtā, i, 231-236, 168; cf. al-Nadawī), ʿAbd al-ʿAlī's grandfather Mullā Kūtb al-Dīn (d. 1191/1780) and his father Mullā Niẓām al-Dīn (d. 1167/1754); Azād, who met him in Lucknow in 1148/1736 praises him highly, see Subḥat al-Mardawī, Bombay 1303, 94) were noted men of learning, and were the real founders of the fame of the family in India—a family in which learning had flourished for centuries, from generation to generation. Born in Farangi Maḥālāt in 1144/1731-32, ʿAbd al-ʿAlī studied with his father, and completed the usual course of Islamic studies with him at the age of seventeen. After the death of Sicily, where the Fāṭimids were now in possession (al-Dhahabī, Duwal al-Islām, s. anno). Thereafter the Muslim threat to Italy subsided.

Bahr al-Rum was never a Muslim lake, since even at the heyday of their power the Arabs never controlled its northern shores. From the time of Charlemagne onwards there is evidence of Christian maritime enterprise. This gradually increased in importance as the centuries passed, in spite of the decline of Byzantium and the renewed Muslim advance, when the Ottoman Turks in the 10th/16th century came to control the coast of Bahr al-Rum, by them usually called the White Sea (Ak Deniz), from the Peloponnesse to Algeria.

Bibliography: Ištakhrī 68-71; Ibn Hawkal, ed. De Goeje, 128-37, ed. Kramers, 190-205 with the maps facing pp. 8 and 66, as well as that on p. 193; Muḥaddasīs 14-19; Ṣawrān, i, 504-5; Kazwini, ‘Adīd-jab al-Mahdijāb, 123-7; Nuwairī, Nihayat al-Arāb, i, 231-236; Idrīsī, transl. Jaubert, i, 5-6; ii, 1-13, 16-19, 35-48, 68-135, 226-304, etc. (by far the fullest account, but less useful for the early period); for Idrīsī's maps, K. Miller, Mappae Arabicae, Stuttgart 1926 and later; Anonymous Chronicle of Sicily in Amari, Biblioteca Arabo-Sicula, text 165-176; transl. 70-74; P. K. Hitti, History of the Arabs, ed. 6, Princeton 1956, index.

(D. M. DowLO)
his father he continued his studies with Mulla Kamāl al-Dīn al-Sihālahī al-Fatḥpūrī (d. 1773/1776), a pupil of his father. He started his career as teacher and author in Lucknow, but because of a Sunni-Shī ḍī dispute, he moved first to Shāh-dīlahnpūr, where he stayed for twenty years, then to Rāmpūr (cf. Nadīm al-Qāhīrī, Abhār al-Ṣanādīd, Lucknow 1918, i, 600, 596), where he stayed for four years, later to Būhār (in Bārdwān, Bengāl), and finally to Madrās, at the invitation of the Nawwāb of Kamātāk (Nawwāb Wālādāg Mūḥāmmād Allā Khān=d. 1280/1765), originally of Gopāmā, near Lucknow. He went to Madrās accompanied by six hundred scholars (ridgāj al-ʿUlūm). The Tālādāg showed him high regard, and showered favours on him and his companions, built a large madrasa for him, and gave stipends to his companions and pupils who collected there from near and far. The Nawwāb’s successors continued to show him the same favour till the end of the rule of Wālādāg and the establishment of British rule in Madrās, and even then the monthly provisions and gifts continued to be offered him, as also to the other teachers and students of his madrasa. He never returned to Lucknow, and died in Madrās on 12 Rājab 1225/13 August 1810, and was buried close to the Mosque of the Wālādāgāh in that city. (For his children see Alātāf al-Rāhmand, Āhāwāl 64 f. and for his distinguished pupils, Ḥadāʾikh, loc. cit.). It was the Wālādāg who gave him the title of Bahr al-ʿUlūm as (usually stated, but cf. Alātāf al-Rahmand, Āhāwāl, 65, where it is stated that Shāh Wālā Mūḥāmmād allā ḥa (g.v.) gave him the title, also the title of Malik al-ʿUlām). The former is better known in North India, the latter in South India. Apart from teaching him, his father had initiated him into esoteric sciences also (Alātāf al-Rahmand). He belonged to the mystic school of Ibn al-ʿArabī and had complete faith in the truth of the Shaykh’s expositions as given in the Fusūs and the Futūḥāt. In fact his Fungūs in the light of the Shaykh’s above two above two works (see the Mūlla’s Arabic introduction to the Shāhk). He also wrote a Commentary on a section of the Fusūs (viz. al-Fusūs al-Nāši, Brockelmann S I 793). Even on his death-bed he stated he was realizing the truth of the Shaykh’s doctrines (Aghsān).

He is praised for his courage, generosity, self-denial and ascetic character. He spent most of his long life in teaching and writing, and wielded a profound influence on his contemporaries in India, whom he excelled in versatility of erudition and critical acumen. “The like of him was not to be seen in India of the later times” (Nūshā). His fields of specialised study were fiṭḥ and ṣuṣal on the one hand, and the philosophical sciences on the other. He wrote many works in Arabic—unusually good classical Arabic, and in Persian. As a rule they are, according to the fashion of his time, commentaries, glosses and super-glosses on most of the usual text books.

Some of his other more important works are given below:


c) Principles of Jurisprudence (Usūl al-Fikāh).

Fawūdī al-Rahmand (Shāhk of the Musallam al-Thūbāt of Muḥibb Allāh Bihārī, d. 1219/1707). Lucknow 1872, 363; Risāla al-Ārkān al-ʿArūs ‘a fiṭḥ (Brockelmann S II 652); Tanwīr al-Ṣanār Shāhk al-Mansūr (in Persian) (Brockelmann SII 264); Tabhīr-i ‘Abd al-Mahdī al-Mahdī (a Supplement to his father’s Commentary on Ibn Humām’s Tabhīr iṣ ‘Uṣūl al-Dīn (Zubayd Ahmad 385, JASB vii, 695); Shāhk Fikh ‘Abd al-Rahmand (Allīn ‘Allī, 123).

d) Ḥadāʾikh. Risāla ṭaṣābīḥ al-Ḥadāʾikh (Zubayd Ahmad, 385).


BAHR AL-ZANDJ. By the Bahr al-Zandj the Arabs mean the W. part of the Indian Ocean, Bahr al-Hind (g.v.) which washes the E. coast of Africa from the Gulf of Aden i.e., the Ḥalīdī al-Barbārī to Sufāla and Madagascar, which was as far as the scanty knowledge of the Arabs extended. The name is derived from the adjoining coast, which is called the Khalīj al-Barbārī to Zfīyya (or Ṣfīyya) Ḥalīj and Cosmas Iōnupelus of Ṣfīyya (or Ṣfīyya), but Herodotus mentioning in his inscription of the Sānādī Nāris Ḥanḍafīr Ḥalīj (Pāshūlī, I, Berlin, 1924, 119) is now not accepted (cf. W. B. Henning in Studies presented to Vladimir}
The name Bahrain or Vahram (from the Avestan Verethragna), was that of five emperors of the Sasanid dynasty (the 4th, 5th, 6th, 12th, and 14th). Very little is known about the reign of Vahram I (273-276 A.D.), son of the great Shapur II, who was a feeble prince, like his uncle and elder brother who had preceded him on the throne. In his great literary production he treats of theological as well as profane themes. Apparently original works are: Muwahib al-Kuddis fi Manadib Ibn al-'Aydarus (cf. Serjeant, Materials, 586; on this teacher of his see art. 'AYDARUS, No. 2); Hilayat al-Banadi wa 'l-Basirin fimda yawdhu ila yasbi min Amer al-Din; 'Ibad al-Durar fi 'l-Ma'ani bi 'l-Kudsi b, 'l-Jabbli' (ibid.); Il-hul al-Kawl bi 'l-Takhtu wa 'l-Tahsit; al-Tahsiri al-Ahmadiyya fi 'l-Sira al-Nabawiyya; Tarbit al-Suluk Islah Mulak (cf. Brockelmann, I, 444); al-'Urwa al-Wuthqa hadsa (Walik), with comm. al-Hadiqa al-Wakba (Brockelmann, II, 555). Abridgments: al-Ashril al-Nabawiyya < al-Akhbar al-Nawawiyya, i.e., Hilayat al-Abrir (Brockelmann, I, 397); Dakhkral al-Thawir < K. al-Israkh al-Karim (?); Mulq al-Azmad < al-Imad al-Akrim al-Samad of al-Aduwalli (Brockelmann, S. II, 27); he also abridged al-'Askari's K. al-Awali (Brockelmann, S. I, 194), al-Sakhawi's al-Mamadi al-Basana (Brockelmann II, 32) and the Mundhirit's al-Tarikh < 'l-Tarkib (Brockelmann, I, 629). Commentaries: al-'Ahdal al-Maddiya, on al-Yahi'is famous hadsa (Brockelmann, I, 228); Tuhayfat al-Akhbar wa Turjalt al-Akhbar on al-Hariri's Muhtal al-Ifrad (Brockelmann, I, 350); Nasr al-Atam q Brain Lamiyyet el-Ahdam (Sarkis, 533; in reality an abridgment of al-Safadi's comm.); on Ibn Malik's Lamiyyet al-Af'al (ibid., cf. Brockelmann, I, 300; S. I, 526). In minor risalitas he treated of arithmetic, astronomy and medicine. Specimens of his poetry are given by al-'Aydari and al-Sakka'f (v. infra).


BAHRAM (derived, via the Pahlawi nahr 'in, from the Avestan vehragna), the name of the Zoroastrian god of victory (cf. Benveniste and Renou, Vrtra et Veragna, chap. 1, particularly 6 and 31); from his name is derived that of one of the principal sacred fires of Iran, Vahrarn (more recently Vahram (ibid., 72); he presides over the 20th day of the solar month which bears his name and which has kept it in the Persian calendar recorded by al-Biruni (ibid., 83); al-Biruni, Cronol. 53). This name Bahrain or Vahram was that of five rulers of the Sassanian dynasty (the 4th, 5th, 6th, 12th, and 14th). Very little is known about the reign of Vahram I (273-276 A.D.); he gave the Zoroastrian clergy full powers against Mānī, who was executed, and died in 276 A.D. A bas-relief of Shāpūr depicts the investiture of Vahram (A. Christensen, L'Instr. sous les Sassanides, 226-7). Under his son and successor, Vahram II (276-93 A.D.), war again broke out between Rome and Iran; the sudden death of the emperor Carus, who had reached Ctesiphon, compelled the Romans to retreat; nevertheless Vahram ceded to them Armenia and Mesopotamia in order to obtain peace (283 A.D.) and free his hands to suppress the revolt of his brother who, as governor (khwānsād) of Khurāsān, had ambitions of carving out a great kingdom for himself; Vahram II appears on several bas-reliefs (Christensen, op. cit., 228 f.). His son and successor, Vahram III, was defeated by his great-uncle, during the four months of his reign (293 A.D.), Vahram IV was killed in Aden and found favour with its governor, the Amr Marājān. After the death of his patron in 327/328 A.D. he went to India and obtained the patronage of the sultan of Gujrat Mūsaffār Shāh, but he soon had to leave the court and died in Ajmadābād, perhaps in 'negro'.

Minorsky = BSOAS., Vol. XIV, 1952, Part 3, 515). The name itself has been explained as from Persian zandju (Zoroastrian Pahlawi, Zangik, Zang, Zangi = 'black' or 'nachro'), but perhaps it is of local origin. Nowadays it is applied to the island of Zanzibar and to a tributary of the Zambesi which bears the name of Zangue. The Arab notices of the coast and sea of the Zandj are more than scanty and partly contradictory. The sea was feared and avoided. Only the Arab travellers Mas'tudi and Ibn Bahri, sailed across it, but they tell us more about the land and its people than about the sea itself. Whales and whaling are sometimes mentioned, and it is remarkable that the word used for whale (wadi, wadd) resembles the form of the name in the languages of N. Europe (Sulaymān the Merchant, Arabic text edited by Langles, 4, 138-141, in Reinaud, Relation des voyages faits par les Arabes et les Persiens etc., Paris 1845, transl. G. Ferrand, Voyage du marchand arabe Sulayman, Paris 1922, 30, 132-133; cf. Mas'tudi, Muraddi, i, 234, 334). It is clear that the Arabs imagined the coast to run in quite a different direction from what it actually does. W. Tomaschek gave reconstructions of their cartographical notions in his Die topographischen Kapitel des indischen Szeispiegels Moḥīd (Vienna 1869).

Notices from the Arab geographers of the sea and land of the Zandj were collected by L. Marcel Devic (Le Pays des Zandis, Paris 1883). See also Ḥuwād al-ʿĀlam, 471 ff., and T. A. Shumovsky, Tr. neissoniye Lotisi Akhmad ibn Mādshīda, arabskogo Lomstana Vasko da Gamma, Moscow 1957. Navigation on this part of the Indian Ocean is regulated by the periodic monsoons, whence the ancient relations between S. Arabia and N.-W. India and the E. African coast. For further information see the articles Bahor al-hind and Zandj. (C. H. Becker-[D. M. Dunlop])

Bahr al-zulumât [see al-bahr al-mushif].

Bahrā (nība Bahrān), a tribe of the Kudā' group, sometimes reckoned a part of Djudhān, which emigrated northwards to the Euphrates and then to the plain of Hīmā. Like their Euphrates neighbours Tagihāb and Tanūkh, they became Christian but were converted after Tagihāb, probably about 380. A deputation came to Muḥammad at Medina in 9/630 and became Muslims; but the tribe as a whole remained hostile and attached to Byzantium. In 8/629 Bahrā' had been among Heraclius' Arab allies who confronted Muḥammad's Mu'ta expedition; in 15/635 they were summoned to help the people of Dumat al-Jandal when Khlīd b. al-Walid approached; and they were in the Byzantine military coalition of 13/634, along with Kalb, Salīb, Tanūkh, Lakhm, Djudhān and Ghassān. However, they were forced to become Muslims when Syria was conquered.

Bibliography: Hamdān, 132; Mufaddaliyyād, 417, 427; Tabari, i, 1611, 2060, 2081, 2114, 2122; Piellhausen, Sīrāzīn, iv, treaty no. 115; Wādīdī (Weißenauer), 325, 311; Ibn Khaibān, no. 46; R. Duussaud, Topographie historique de la Syrie, Paris 1927, 146. (C. E. Bosworth)

Bahrān [see al-bahrān].

Bahrāk, Dīmāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ʿUmar b. Muḥārab b. ʿAbbālān b. ʿAli al-Ḥīmīyār al-Ḥadramī al-Shafīʾi, S. Arabīān scholar and šīfi b. 869/1465 in Sayyūn, d. 930/1524 in India. After studies in Aden and Ṣabīr he was kādi of Shībār for some time, then settled in Aden and found favour with its governor, the Amr Marājān. After the death of his patron in 927/1521 he went to India
thrones; the feudal lords regained the initiative of which they had been deprived by Shapur II; under Vahram IV, Armenia was partitioned between Rome and Iran which kept the larger portion. Vahram V (420-38 A.D.), surnamed Gür ("the onager") on account of his vigour, after spending his youth in the care of al-Munshīr I, the Laḫmīd king of the Arabs of Hīrā, had to regain the throne, with the aid of this king, from the nobles who had put his elder brother to death and proclaimed ruler a prince from a side branch of the family; he made himself popular by his benevolence to all, his tax remissions his bravery, his love-affairs and his hunting exploits (commemorated by poets and illuminators of manuscripts); he left the great dignitaries a large measure of initiative in the direction of affairs (notably to Mihr-Narsa); he himself led an expedition against the barzarians of the Marw district; because of persecution, many Christians took refuge on Byzantine soil; this caused a short war, unfavourable to Iran, as the result of which freedom of worship was granted to Christians in Iran, by treaty (422 A.D.); it is not known whether Vahram V died a natural death, or as a result of a hunting accident.

In addition to these five kings, a usurper named Vahram Čūbin, who claimed to be descended from the Arsacid kings, became in 569 A.D. the leader of a formidable insurrection, during the reign of Hormīz IV, who was a distinguished prince, tolerant in matters of religion, but had set the feudal lords against him self because he firmly maintained his rights against them; Čūbin, who had gained military successes against the peoples north and east of Iran, but had been dismissed after his defeat by the Byzantines, rebelled, and seized power after the assassination of the king; the latter's son, supported by the Byzantines, the Armenians and a section of the Persians, broke the long resistance of Vahram, who took refuge among the Turks and was killed soon afterwards; his powerful personality ensured the perpetuation of his name: a popular romance, in the Pahlawi language, related his exploits, before the historians and poets of the Islamic period (see A. Christensen, Romanes Bahram Tschibten, Et Rekonstruktionsversuch, Copenhagen 1907). Several other personalities have borne this name (Christensen, Sassanides, index, s.v. Vahram).

**Bibliography:** Christensen's book supersedes earlier works, which he uses and quotes in the notes. For a history of Bahram Gür in verse, see Firdawsi, Le Livre des Rois, trans. J. Mohl, 1878, v, 442-856; vi, 1-64; Najmī, Al-Haṣf Pasargān, trans. C. E. Wilson, London 1924; on Bahram Čūbin, see Firdawsi, op. cit., vi, 460-568, vi, 1190. Photographs of bas reliefs in Dieulafoy, L'Art antique de la Perse, Paris 1884, v; Survey of Persian Art, iv, pl. 156, 157, 159, 162.

**BAHRĀM**, Christian. Armenian general who served the Fāṭimid[s in Egypt and was murdered by the sword from 529-31/1135-7 to the caliph al-Hāfīz (525-44/1130-49).

The circumstances and date of his entry into Fāṭimid service are unknown. Many Armenians, in the 5th/11th century, went to Egypt, taking advantage of the fact that the waqirate was on several occasions held by men of Armenian origin such as Bahram al-Dīmālī (466-87/1074-94), his son al-ʿAḍal (487-515/1094-1122), the latter's son (525-6/1130-1) and ʿYānis (526/1131-2). Perhaps these circumstances brought Bahram to Egypt. According to tradition, he came from a region where an important Armenian colony had been established, Tell Bāghir north-east of Aleppo. A nobleman of the Tell family, he was driven from there by a revolution and had to leave the country. It seems that he came from a noble Armenian family which claimed to trace its descent to the Pahlavuni, and was the brother of the Armenian catholics of Egypt, Gregory, who arrived in Egypt and was consecrated there in 1077 or 1078. At all events, Bahram followed a military career, and became commander of an Armenian corps, and then governor of the western province of the Delta (al-Gharbiyya).

As a result of the rivalry between the Caliph's two sons Haydara and Ḥasan, and the seizure of power by the latter in the capacity of waṣīr, a military revolt broke out, and Ḥasan, unable to deal with it, summoned Bahram to his aid. When Bahram arrived with his Armenian troops, Ḥasan had already been assassinated. The Caliph entrusted the waqirate to Bahram, although he was a Christian (Djiμmādī II 529/March 1135), and the curious situation then obtained of a Christian, who was waṣīr of the sword and absolute master in Egypt, bearing the titles of Sayf al-Islām and Tādā al-Dawla. The pro-Armenian policy of Bahram, who encouraged the immigration of his compatriots and secured their installation in important posts, provoked a popular reaction and a military revolt led by the governor of al-Gharbiyya, Riḍwān. Bahram, abandoned by the Muslim troops in his army, had to leave Cairo (Djiμmādī I 531/February 1137), and marched towards Kūs where his brother Vasāk was governor. Vasāk, however, had been assassinated by the populace, and Bahram, after exacting a bloody revenge for murder of his brother, left Kūs. Riḍwān, who had been appointed waṣīr, sent an army against him, but, by an arrangement to which the Caliph was doubtless not a stranger, Bahram was allowed to retire to a monastery near Iḵrāmīm where he remained until 533/1139. As the Caliph was displeased with Riḍwān, he recalled Bahram, who was by then a sick man, to Cairo, and installed him in his palace; he consulted him frequently, but did not give him the title of waṣīr. Riḍwān was then deposed.

Bahram died in the palace on 24 Rabīʿ I 535/7 December 1140, mourned by the Caliph al-Hāfīz, who followed his funeral cortège as far as the Monastery of the Ditch, outside Cairo, where he was buried.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Muyassar, Ann. d'Égypte, 78-80, 82-4; Ibn al-Kalānsī, Taʿwīh Dimagḥ, 262; Ibn al-Aḥbār, x s.a. 534; Abū Ṣāliḥ, Churches and Monasteries, ed. and transl. Evetts, 6a, 84a; Ibn Khaldūn, K. al-Jbar, iv, 72-3; Ibn Taghrībīrī, Cairo, v, 239-40, 241-2; Maktrīzī, i, 205, 357, ii, 502; Kalkashandī, Subh al-Aʿẓamī, vi, 457-63, vii, 260-2, xiii, 325-6; Suyūṭī, Itṣan al-Muhādara, ed. 1521, ii, 131; Michael the Syriac, French transl. Chabot, iii 240; Renaudot, History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, 505-7, 509; Wüstenfeld, Geschichte der Fātimidēn-Chalīfāt, 307; S. Lane-Poole, A History of Egypt in the Middle Ages, 168-9; G. Wiet, Précis de l'Hist. d'Égypte, 192-3, 327; idem, L'Égypte arabe (Hist. de la nation égyptienne, iv), 273-5; De Lacy O'Leary, A Short History of the Fatimid Khalifate, 224; Ḥasan Ibrāhīm Ḥasan, Al-Fātimiyūn fi Miṣr, 214-17, 293; M. Canard, Un mère chrétien à l'Époque fatimite, l'Arménien Bahram, in AIEO Algiers xi (1954), 84-113; idem, Une lettre du calife fatimite al-Hāfīz . . . , à Roger II, Atti del Convegno Inter-
BAHRAM SHAH b. Tughrud SHAH, the Sultán of Ghazna, was raised to the throne of Ghazna by the Atabeg Mulayyad al-Din Rayhán in succession to his father on the latter's death in 655/1155 but soon afterwards had to make way for his elder brother Arslán Shah [q.v.]. The two brothers thereupon fought with one another with varying success till the death of Bahram Shah in 575/1174-5.


BAHRAM SHÁH, AL-MALIK AL-AMDJAD, b. Farrúkh Sháh b. Sháhsháh Sháh Ayyubí, grand-nephew of Saláh al-Dín, was appointed by the latter to succeed his father at Baíbak when the latter died in 580/1182 (Imad al-Dín al-Ishâhání, al-Bark al-Shámi, Bodl. MS. Marsh 424, 946, followed by Abu Sháma, Rawdatayn, Cairo, 35; and kept Baíbak when the Ayyubid territories were divided up after the death of Saláh al-Dín. From then on he seems always to have been a faithful vassal of the Ayyubid ruling at Damascus (Ibn Wásíl, Músarratí, years 599, 603, 606, 618, 623). At the end of his life, however, he was forced to fight against those who wished to found up the ambitions of the Malik al-Ázíz Ulláman of Báníyás, son of al-Malik al-Ádí; al-Nâşir Dá'd of Damascus defended himself against him, but when al-Malik al-Kámil and al-Malik al-Ashraf settled their differences in order to seize Damascus from Dá'd, Bahramsháh was assassinated; after ten months of blockade, al-Ashraf annexed Baíbak, and Bahramsháh went to Damascus (606/1208); the following year he was assassinated by a slave who bore a grudge against him (Ibn Wásíl, years 625-627; Sibt Ibn al-Dhawi, Mir'ád al-Zamán, ed. Jowett, 441).

Among his contemporaries, Bahramsháh was famous less as a prince than as the most eminent man of letters among the Ayyúbíds; he had a small court of scholars, and himself composed a diván of poetry, which has been preserved but not published (J. Rikabi, La poésie profane sous les Ayyúbíds, 222 and n. 3).

Bibliography: For the secondary sources, cf. the article AYYÚBÍDS. Modern work: H. Gottschalk, al-Malik al-Kámil, 111 and 129-30, with the notes. (CL. CAHEN)

AL-BAHRAYN, "the Two Seas", a cosmographical and cosmological concept appearing five times in the Kur'án (once in the nominative, xxix, 12).

The two seas are described as being one sweet and one salt and bitter (xxv, 12; xxv, 53). Fresh meat and ornaments are taken from the two seas, and on them boats are seen (xxxv, 12). Tabarí (Tafsír, xxv, 55) says the fresh and sweet denote the waters of rivers and of rain, the salt and bitter the waters of the sea.

The two seas are divided by a barrier, called a barázah (xxv, 55), on the one side is a barázah (xxvii, 61). Muslim scholars provide several explanations for this concept, among which is the view that there is a sea in heaven and a sea on earth separated by a barzakh (xxv, 53). Others

BAHRAM — AL-BAHRAYN.
have the two seas meeting at Būb al-Mandah [q.v.],
at the connexion between the Sea of Jordan and the
Red Sea, or at the Straits of Gibraltar [e.g., Kurītbūl].
As Wensinck points out in "al-Khādir" in EI I,
"A far fetched explanation is that the union of the
two seas means the meeting of Mūsā and al-Khādir,
the two seas of wisdom'.

After the capture of Constantinople, Mehemmed II
assumed the title Sulṭān al-bahrāyin wa 'l-bāṭān
"Sulṭān of the two lands and the two seas", and
this was among the titles used by succeeding
Ottoman rulers.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the commentator,
J. H. Kramers, *Die grāfiyes in E1, Suppl.;
idem, Geography and Commerce, in *The Legacy of
Islam, Oxford 1947; idem, L'influence de la tra-
dition taimienne dans la géographie arabe and La
tradition geographique classique des Musulmans,
in *Analecta Orientalia, Leiden 1954; A. J. Wens-
inck, The Ocean in the Literature of the Western
Semites, Amsterdam 1918. (W. E. MULLIGAN)

**AL-BAHRAYN** (officially written Bahrain) is a
British protected state in the Persian Gulf consisting of
an archipelago of the same name lying between the
peninsula of Kātār and the mainland of Saudi
Arabia, as well as another group of islands, of which
Hūwar is the largest, just off the west coast of Kātār.
The Ruler of al-Bahrayn and the Ruler of Kātār
disagree regarding the status of a small area sur-
rounding al-Zubārā in north-western Kātār.

The variety of explanations, none of them convi-
cing, of the name al-Bahrāyin in the Arabic sources
indicates that its origin remains unknown. In pre-Islamic and early Islamic times the name applied to
the mainland of Western Arabia, embracing the
oases of al-Κaṭf and Ḥadjar (now al-Ḥasā) [97v.]; later it was restricted to the archipelago offshore
[cf. History below].

The largest island (Uwāl or Awāl in the older
Arabic sources; now called al-Bahrāyn) is about 30
miles long and 12 miles at its greatest breadth. The
capital, al-Manāma, on the northeastern coast,
is connected by a causeway 1 ½ miles long with the
town and island of al-Muḥarrāk to the northeast. Other
islands are Sītra, from which an oil loading wharf
extends to deep water; al-Nabīl Shālīb; Umm al-
Ṣiḥbān; Dūdā, once a quarry and now a peniten-
tiary; and Umm Naṣān (also called al-Nasān). The
climate is hot and humid, though rainfall
averages only about 7 cm. a year. A number of
flowing springs (kawdkib) also bubbles up through the salt water of the
imbayd. Alfalfa, and vegetables are the principal crops, and some
sheep are kept for milk.

Geologically the island of al-Bahrāyn is an elongat-
ed anticlinal dome of sedimentary rocks. The centre
of the island has a basin, 12 miles by 4, out of which
the hill of al-Dukhkhan rises to a height of about
450 feet. Oil is produced here by the Bahrain Petro-
leum Co. (Bapco), owned by American interests. Pro-
duction since 1937/1948 has averaged approxi-
mately 50,000 barrels a day, but the Bapco refinery
processes over 200,000 barreld a day, most of which
is crude oil shipped by submarine pipeline from Saudi
Arabia. Bapco's offices and residences for foreign
staff are at al-'Awāl.

Oil has replaced pearlimg as the principal industry
of al-Bahrāyn. About 500 pearling boats worked
out of al-Bahrāyn annually before the slump in
pearl prices in 1934/1929 caused by the world-wide
economic depression and the increasing use of Ja-
panese cultured pearls. Now only a handful of boats
are engaged in pearlimg, though fishing still affords
a livelihood to many people, with most fish caught in
tidal weirs. Boat building and repair and sail and
net making remain minor industries, along with the
manufacture of pottery, whitewash, and plaster.

A free port was opened in 1977/1958 to increase the
entrepôt trade fostered by a 5% ad valorem cus-
toms rate for all but luxury items. An excellent
natural harbour was created in 1975/1955 when a
channel was dredged from the deep water of Ḥwār
al-Kulay`a to the open sea. The airport on al-Mu-
ḥarrāk is served by scheduled international flights
and is the headquarters of Gulf Aviation Co., in
which the Government has an interest, and which
flies to many points in the Persian Gulf.

The population of al-Bahrāyn in 1396/1956 was
109,650, with 61% in the towns of al-Manāma
(39,648), al-Muḥarrāk, and al-Ḥidd. There are Per-
sonian, Indian, and Pakistani communities, as well as
over 2,000 Europeans and Americans. Muslims com-
prise 98% of the population, about half being Shi`is
(mostly Dā`īrli Twilvers, with some Shāykhis) and
the remainder, including the ruling family, Sunnis
(mainly Mālikīs, with some Ḥanbalīs). The Sunnis
are concentrated in the largest towns, and the Shi`is
in the agricultural villages. The Shi`is here, as in
al-Κaṭf and al-Ḥasā in Saudi Arabia, are called
Bahārī (sing. Bahārī). To avoid confusion, Sunni
residents of al-Bahrāyn ordinarily now use the nisba
Bahraini for themselves. The Shi`is appear to be
descendants of early inhabitants of the area, and
there seems to be no justification for the hypothesis
that they are of Persian origin. A good number of
the Sunnis of al-Bahrāyn are Arabs or the descen-
dants of Arabs once resident on the Persian coast;
such are known as Huwālā.

**History**

For nearly a century investigators have sought the
secrets of the early history of al-Bahrāyn in the
burial mounds scattered to the number of perhaps
100,000 over the northern half of the main island.
In 1296/1879 Capt. E. Durand opened one of the
largest tumuli and several smaller ones; others were
later probed into by Mr. and Mrs. T. Bent, F. Pri-
deaux, and F. Cornwall. E. Mackay excavated and
reported on a series of different types of tumuli.
Several mounds, one of which was probably a temple
complex, have been studied by members of a Danish
archaeological expedition which began work in
1973/1953 under P. Glob and T. Bibby. The early
excavators supposed that the tombs were of Phoe-
nician origin, but this theory is no longer generally
accepted. Materials found in the mounds, as well
as those found by the Danish party in other sites
such as near the ruined Portuguese fort of Kalat
'Adjādī and at Būrbār, include bronze and iron ob-
jects, seal stones, alabaster vessels, ivory fragments,
and bitumen-lined clay coffins. Similar tumuli occur
in central Naqrij and along the Arabian coast, where
a large one at Dīwān, north of al-Κaṭf, excavated in
1973/1954 by F. Vidal, has been dated c. A.D.
1100. The multitude of mounds spread over such
an area indicates the persistence of mound building
over a long period of time. Many of the mounds are
certainly much older than Dīwān.

Various scholars follow H. Rawlinson (JRAS
1880) in identifying al-Bahrāyn with Dilmun of

the Mesopotamian cuneiform records, but this identification has not been established with certainty; e.g., S. Kramer (BASOR 1944) considers southwestern Iran the most probable location of Dilmun.

Greek and Latin sources give meagre information on the ancient mainland coast of al-Bahrayn, where the port of Gerrha lay, the exact site of which remains undetermined. The few South Arabian inscriptions discovered so far contribute little to the history of the region before Islam.

Arab tradition speaks of some of the Lost Arabs in al-Bahrayn. Among the early historical tribes was al-Azd of Kahtân, many of whose members moved on to Oman; other members joined the confederation of Tanūkh, said to have been formed in al-Bahrayn. Among later emigrants were adherents of 'Admânî tribes such as Tamîl, Bakr, and Taghlib, the last two of which were receptive to Christianity. At the time of the Prophet, 'Abd al-Kays [q.v.] of 'Adnân had become the dominant element in the population.

The Šâsânîs, beginning with Ardâshîr I, intervened in al-Bahrayn, which was subject to a Persian marzân when the Prophet sent al-'Alî b. al-Hasrârî eastwards to secure the land. When the riṣâla broke out and a descendant of the Lakhmids in al-Bahrayn rejected the Caliphate, many of 'Abd al-Kays under al-Djrâd, a converted Christian, did not desert Islam, and al-'Alî defeated the rebels at Djùwâhâ in al-Ţâsâ. Muslim forces crossed over to the island of Dârîn opposite al-Kâtîf and possibly to Uwâl as well.

In the 1st/7th century the Khwârîdî under Nâdîd b. 'Amîr and Abû Fuâdîyq [q.v.] maintained a bastion of their power in al-Bahrayn, Christianity and Judaism had not yet died out completely; the Nestorians were still active enough to hold a synod at Dârîn in A.D. 676. 'Abbâsîd rule was introduced during the next century, but the Arabic sources fail to tell much about its extent or effectiveness.

'Alî b. Muhammad, the inaugurator of the revolt of the Zangî [q.v.], a man who may have stemmed from 'Abd al-Kays, embarked on his career of turbulence in al-Bahrayn before moving on to 'Irâq. In 281/894-5 Muhammad b. Nûr, the 'Abbâsîd Governor of al-Bahrayn, led an expedition against the Ibâdî Imamate of Oman.

The Kârmaţîn [q.v.] found devoted followers among both townpeople and Bedouins in al-Bahrayn. In 317/930 the Black Stone was brought from Mecca to al-Bahrayn, where it was kept for two decades. A victory by al-Muntâfîk in 378/987-8 revealed the weakness of the Kârmaţîn, but they were still in control when Nasîr-i Khusrâw visited al-Bahrayn 65 years later. In 450/1057-8 Abu 'I-Bahlûl al-Awâmîn Ibn al-Zâdîlîdî of 'Abd al-Kays defied them by reestablishing orthodox Islam on Uwâl in the name of the 'Abbâsîd Caliph. The tribe of 'Amîr Rabî'a of 'Ukkâyî [q.v.] guarded the islands for the Kârmaţîn, suffered defeat in a naval battle at Kâskûs, an island off al-Kâtîf. Within the next few years the final downfall of the Kârmaţîn came at the hands of a new dynasty indigenous to al-Hasâ, the 'Uyunîs [q.v.] of 'Abd al-Kays, aided by the Sağîlûqîs of 'Irâq.

Although no definite date can be set for the transfer of the name al-Bahrayn from the mainland to the nearby archipelago, from this point on it may be convenient to restrict the history of al-Bahrayn to the islands bearing this name today.

In the early period of the 'Uyunîs, who at times kept their capital at al-Kâtîf, the islands of al-Bahrayn came under their authority. When the unruliness of 'Amîr Rabî'a undermined the 'Uyunî power, al-Bahrayn became tributary to the Kaysârîs of Djarîzat Kays [q.v.] in the eastern Persian Gulf. In 633/1235 al-Bahrayn and al-Kâtîf were occupied by the forces of Abû Bakr b. Sa'id, the Sağîlûqîs Atâbog of Fars, but in 651/1253 al-Bahrayn regained independence under the 'Uyunîs [q.v.], a clan of 'Amîr Rabî'a.

The Tibbîs, merchant princes of Djarîzat Kays, brought al-Bahrayn back within the orbit of their island, but their supremacy soon faded with the rise of New Hormuz farther east. About 730/1330 Tahamtan II of Hormuz annexed both Djarîzat Kays and al-Bahrayn, and some 15 years later Turângshâh of Hormuz came to al-Bahrayn in person. The first mention of al-Manáma, the present capital, occurs at this time.

In the mid-9th/15th century 'Amîr Rabî'a produced a new dynasty, the Djarîzat [q.v.], the foremost of whom, Advâd b. Žâml, incorporated al-Bahrayn in his domains and promoted the ascendancy of the Mâlikt element over the Shî. The splendid reign of this Bedouîn prince carried the fame of al-Bahrayn as far afield as Egypt and Portugal.

The Portuguese reached al-Bahrayn from the Indian Ocean as early as 920/1514, but did not seize it until a few years later, when in alliance with Hormuz they overthrew Advâd's uncle Mukrîm. Their fitful rule of about 80 years placed much reliance on Persian Sunnîs as local governors. In the mid-10th/16th century the Ottomans challenged Portuguese hegemony in the Persian Gulf, but their admirals, better corsairs than administrators, won no permanent foothold in al-Bahrayn.

In 1011/1602 the Persians under Šâh 'Abbâs I took al-Bahrayn, which they retained, with certain interruptions, for over 150 years. Persian sovereignty was not always accompanied by strong Persian influence, as the instruments of policy were often chiefs of the Huwala or other Arabs settled on the Persian coast, such as Djarîrâz of Tâhîrî and Nasîr and Nasîr Āl Maḏâkhûr of Bûshâhr in the 12th/18th century.

In 1197/1783 Ahmad b. Khalîfâ of Banû 'Utbî (al-'Utbîb), Arabs who had migrated from Nagîd to Kuwait and thence to al-Zubârâ in 谔arâ, drove Nasîr Āl Maḏâkhûr from al-Bahrayn and inaugurated the rule of the House of Khalîfâ, which has endured to the present. The energetic merchants of al-Bahrayn, with their valuable pearl resources contested the primacy recently won by Muscat in the transit trade of the Persian Gulf, thus provoking attacks by the Ibâdî rulers of Muscat during the next 45 years. The first attack, in 1216/1801, brought Āl Sa'ûd of Nagîd to the defence of Āl Khalîfâ, but political domination by Āl Sa'ûd was not prolonged and the Mâlikt privileges of the Sunnîs of al-Bahrayn yielded little to the Haubahism of Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhâb.

Āl Khalîfâ in 1235/1820 concluded with the British Government the first of a series of treaties which by 1335/1914 placed al-Bahrayn fully under British protection, giving the British control of foreign affairs and exclusive rights in the development of natural resources. The growth of British influence has been the subject of repeated Persian protests for more than a century, and the Iranian Government still presses a vigorous claim to sovereignty over al-Bahrayn. Although the Ottomans occupied the Arab-
ian coast and Katar in the second half of the 13th/19th century and thus encircled al-Bahrayn until the First World War. In the presence of the British prevented them from absorbing the islands.

After an absence of over a millennium, formal Christianity returned to al-Bahrayn in 1310/1893 when missionaries of the American Dutch Reformed Church founded a station. In 1354/1935 to 1378/1958 al-Bahrayn was the principal British naval base in the Gulf, and in 1365/1946 the seat of the British Political Residency in the Gulf. The importance of the Bahriyya regiment lies in its existence. A short time after Aybak, one of the last one of them died in 707/1307. The name Bahriyya, already applied to various garrisons of the Syrian army, was given to this regiment because he stationed his members and the thinning of their ranks. A split tore their ranks which threatened their common name in Mamluk sources for that period, the fact that its formation had ultimately led to the


(De Rentez and W. E. Mulligan)

AL-BAHIYRIYYA, a Mamluk regiment in Egypt. Most of the Ayyubid sultans had mam-likâns in their service, but it was only Sultân al-Sâliḥ Naṣîr al-Dīn Ayyûb (637-47/1240-9) who recruited them in very great numbers. He seized the opportunity of the influx in the Muslim markets of Turkish slaves from the Kipčak steppes and neighboring areas who were uprooted from their homelands by the Mongol advance and created from amongst them a regiment of picked bodyguards numbering between 800 and 1000 horsemen. He called this regiment al-Bahriyya because he stationed its members on the island of al-Rawla on the Nile river (Bahr al-Nil).

The Bahriyya displayed at a very early date all the positive and negative characteristics of a mamlik military society, viz. exceptional military ability and valour and unity against outsiders on the one hand, and internal dissension on the other. It was they who won the battles of al-Mansūra (647/1250) and ʿAyn Džlît (658/1260), but six years before the last-named battle a split tore their ranks which threatened their very existence. A short time after Abyak, one of their number, became sultan they tried to dethrone him, but failed. As a result their leader, Ağāk, was killed and some 700 of them had to escape from Egypt and entered the service of various Ayyubîd rulers in Syria and of the Saljūq ruler of Asia Minor.

After the death of Abyak group after group of the exiled Bahriyya returned to Egypt, but they never regained their early position because of the ageing of their members and the thinning of their ranks. The last one of them died in 707/1307. The name Bahriyya, however, persisted up to the 9th/15th century, for it was applied to various garrisons of the Syrian fortresses, the reason being that the original Bahriyya performed garrison duties, especially in the reign of the Sultan Kâfûn.

The importance of the Bahriyya regiment lies in the fact that its formation had ultimately led to the creation of the Mamlûk sultanate. It is wrong, however, to call the earlier form of Mamlûk rule (648/1250-784/1382), in which the Kipčak element was predominant, by the name of "the Bahri period". The common name in Mamlik sources for that period...
is Dawlat al-Turk, to distinguish it from the Circassian period (784-922/1382-1517) which they call Dawlat al-Djarkas (see D. Ayalon, *Le regiment Bahriya dans l'Armée Mamelouke*, in REI 1952, 133-41).

(D. Ayalon)

**BAHRYYA, a group of oases in the Lybian desert.** The Bahriyya is the most northerly of the Lybian desert. The Wâhât Bahriyya (also singular), i.e., the northern oases, are distinguished from the Wâhât Khîlîyya, the southern oases, i.e., the Dâkhla (q.v.) and Khâurga (q.v.). Between these two groups lie the little oases of Farâfra (included in the Dâkhla by some), or al-Farâfîra, called al-Farârûn by al-Bakrî and al-Ya’lûkûbî. The three large oases are also distinguished as inner, middle and outer; the inner is the Bahriyya which is also called the small. It is sometimes also called the Bahmiyya as it used to be visited by the people of Bahnaasâ, Bahnasâ al-Šâ’d and Bahnasâ al-Wâhât are distinguished as early as al-Bakrî (Mughrib, 14). According to Boinet Bey’s *Dictionnaire Geographique*, the Bahriyya is a district of the province of Minia. It contains about 6,000 inhabitants, and consists of four townships: al-Bâwît (I), al-Šârî, Mandîsha, and al-Zabû, the Bahriyya, like the other oases, has the reputation of being exceedingly fertile and in the middle ages its dates and raisins were famous. Cereals, rice, sugar-cane and especially indigo were also cultivated there, and alum and green vitriol found, though the latter is not specially mentioned as being found in the Bahriyya, since all the notices of this sort refer to all the oases together. The fertility of the oasis is due to hot springs containing various chemicals.

Only scanty information is available for the history of the Bahriyya. In the year 332/943-4 the oases are said to have been under the rule of a Berber prince ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwân and to have been independent. Under the Fatimids we hear of an Egyptian governor Abû Šâlib. In the time of al-Mâqrîzî and al-Kâlîkhsâhî, that is, under the Mamluks, they were not governed directly by the state but by feudal tenants. At all periods the oases have suffered from the predatory raids of Arab and Berber nomads while the more southern ones (perhaps also the Bahmiyya?) were sometimes the object of forays by the Kings of Nubia. It is only in modern times that they have been in closer relationship to the Egyptian government. In the seventies they were visited by Schweinfurth and since then European travellers have often gone there.

In earlier times the oases must have been very much more important than they are now, as witness the remains of several ancient temples, built by the Romans, and of a church of the 6th century A.D. The Coptic Church appears to have been in a flourishing condition till a late period. We hear of solemn processions with the body of one of the disciples which was carried through the streets in a shrine (tâbût) by a team of oxen. No doubt St. Bartholomew is meant (al-Bakrî, 14 should no doubt thus be emended,) or perhaps also St. George or both.


**BAHRYYA, I. The navy of the Arabs until the time of the Fatimids** [see Supplement].

II. The navy of the Mamlûks. The Mamlûk sultanate came into being during a long time after Christian Europe had established its uncontested naval supremacy in the Mediterranean. Throughout that sultanate’s existence this supremacy had been much strengthened. Under such circumstances there was little chance for Mamlûk sea power to demonstrate its existence. Mamlûk naval activities occupy a prominent place in the sources, mainly in connexion with Sulţân al-Zâhir Baybars’ ill-fated expedition to Cyprus in 669/1270, with Sulţân Barsbây’s expeditions to the same island and to Rhodes in the years 827-829/1424-6, 847/1443, and with the expeditions against the Portuguese in 913/1507 and 921/1515. Otherwise such activities are mentioned only on very rare occasions. Thus it is impossible in the present state of our knowledge to write the history and describe the structure and functioning of whatever navies the Mamlûks possessed. Source references to some technical aspects of Mamlûk naval power will be given in the bibliography.

The deficiency of Mamlûk sources in technical information on the navy is, however, largely compensated for by the insight they give us into the socio-psychological factors which dictated the Mamlûk’s attitude towards the navy. As these factors have by no means been limited to Mamlûk society alone, their examination might be of benefit to the general history of Islam in the Middle Ages.

The two following and closely connected subjects will be briefly discussed here: (a) the attitude of the Mamlûks towards the navy and its consequences; (b) their policy towards their ports and coastal fortifications.

(a) As might be expected from a military society of horsemen the attitude of the Mamlûks towards the sea was extremely negative. Even Baybars I was no exception to this rule, in spite of his unusual grasp of wide strategic problems and in spite of the fact that he cared for the navy more than any other Mamlûk sultan and that in his days Mamlûk sea power had reached its peak. After the disaster which his flotilla suffered in 1270 off the coast of Limasol, he wrote a letter to the king of Cyprus in which he stressed the superiority of a victory on land won by horsemen over a victory on the sea won by oarsmen, and then he succinctly defined the essential difference between the might of Islam and the maritime powers of Christian Europe as follows: “Your horses are ships, while our ships are horses” (unctum bhyulukum al-marakhir us naḥnu marakhunâ al-bâhûyl) (Sulîkh, i, 594, note 3). Not less illuminating was his reaction immediately on receiving the tidings about that disaster. He thanked God for the light punishment He allowed the evil eye to inflict upon him after having won so many victories. For all he had to sacrifice in order to save his land army from the evil eye was a certain number of ships and their crews, which were composed of fellahin and of common people (al-falâdîn wa ‘l-sawâm) (Khiyâl, ii, 104, ii, 24-29; Sulîkh, i, 594, ii, 2-3; al-Nahj al-Sâdîd, in *Patrologia Orientalis*, xii, 542, ii, 2-5). There can hardly be any doubt that elements of higher social status than the two above-mentioned ones served in the navy as well,
but in all probability they did not include the Mam-
lûks, who occupied the highest rung in the social
ladder. When Baybars' flotilla was wrecked off
Limasol, the Franks succeeded in capturing the whole
naval command of the Mamlûk sultanate,
including the captains (rayyis) of all the three
Egyptian ports: Alexandria, Damietta and Rosetta.
A very long list of the prisoners' names had been
preserved in Ibn Șâhîddâ's famous bio-
ography of Baybars (Bahrîyya, Sing, 1557, chron-
icle of the year 673 A.H. cf. the Turkish trans-
lation by Şerefüddin Yaltkaya, Istanbul 1941, 46,
where however the list of names is omitted). This
list does not contain a single name of a Mamlûk.
Of all the prisoners not even one was considered
important enough to be honoured with a bio-
ography. Nor is that all: Mamlûk historical liter-
ature contains many thousands of biographies,
none of which is dedicated to a naval commander.
Al-Maṣrî's statement that the designation ʿustûlî
(“man of the navy”) was considered an insult in the
Ayyûbîd period after Saladin's reign (Khhâṣî, ii,
197, 1. 2-2) is true for the Mamlûk period as well.
The scarcity of wood and metals also greatly con-
tributed to the weakness of Mamlûk sea power.
The “forests” of Egypt, always covering only a
small area, practically disappeared under Mamlûk
rule as a result of neglect. In north-western Syria
and in the vicinity of Beirut there were small forests
which supplied wood for shipbuilding. From about
the middle of the 9th/13th century the Mamlûks
imported great quantities of timber from Ildjun in
south-eastern Anatolia, which they carried in their
own ships under the protection of heavy escorts
of Mamlûk soldiers. The contemporary sources hard-
yly mention imports of timber from Europe, which
must however, have been considerable.

The only source of iron-ore in the whole Mamlûk
sultanate was a small mine located near Beirut, the
output of which was mainly absorbed by the local
shipyard. Other metals were not to be found at all
within the sultanate’s boundaries.

Yet in spite of the great handicap caused to ship-
building by the scarcity of the necessary raw
materials, this factor was only of secondary importance
compared with the Mamlûks’ aversion to the sea.
As a matter of fact a permanent Mamlûk navy
did not exist at all. Whenever a flotilla was construc-
ted, it was only to exact reprisals for a very
damaging and humiliating act of aggression by the
Frankish corsairs. When a new flotilla was
built, the older one had already ceased to exist
for a very long time. Under such circumstances
it was impossible to maintain a naval personnel wor-
thy of its name. No wonder, therefore, that the
Franks attacked the coasts of Islam at will and got
away unscathed. The attacks usually caught the
Muslims unawares, and when they did sound the
alarm it was, in most cases, a false one.

With the advance of the years Mamlûk sea power
became even more insignificant, not only because of
the general decline of the realm, but also — and
mainly— because of the increasing employment of
firearms in sea warfare. In the Mediterranean the
pressure of the Franks on the Muslim shores was
greatly intensified. In the Indian Ocean small squad-
rons of a new type of ocean-going Portuguese ships
armed with superior artillery easily annihilated the
Mamlûk warships sent against them, and thus paved
the way for European domination of the sea routes
to India and the Far East for many centuries.

(b) The steadily deteriorating naval power of
Islam drove the Muslims after many hesitations
to the destruction of the Syro-Palestinian ports
and coastal fortifications. As a result of the Crusades,
the Muslims came slowly to realise that this was
their only alternative. The destruction was started
by the Ayyûbîds, but was mainly accomplished by
the Mamlûks. The turning-point was the battle of
Haṭṭîn (583/1187) and the events which followed it
in the next few years. These proved to the Muslims
that however decisive their victory over the Franks
might be on land, the Franks could always easily
turn the tables upon them by means of their naval
supremacy. ʿAskalân, destroyed by the personal order of
Saladin in 587/1191, was the first victim of that
policy, which was followed up after that with un-
swerving determination.

When the Mamlûks rose to power, they wiped
out one after the other the fortifications of the Syro-
Palestinian coast, and destroyed many of its ports
from about the middle of the 13th century and up
to the year 722/1322, in which Ayâs near Alexandret-
ta had been conquered. Of the numerous coastal
fortresses (kîlîs, sing. ʿalâs) none was left. A few
towers (burûḍî, sing. burûḍ) were constructed on the
ruins of some of them, mainly in order to keep watch
on the sea and resist the first onslaught of a possible
Frankish attack.

In addition, the Mamlûks tried to strengthen their
coastal defences by settling near the coast Kurds,
Khwarizmians, Turcomans, Oirats, etc., who
sought refuge in the sultanate and were called Wâ-
fiḍîyya. This attempt, however, failed, generally
speaking, for the Wâfiḍîyya soon assimilated with the
local population and disappeared as a separate
entity. Only the Turcomans are mentioned for quite
a long period as guardians of the coast.

The port-towns of the Syro-Palestinian coast
decayed very greatly. Some of them entirely dis-
appeared, others became small fishing ports and only
very few recovered fairly quickly.

The most thoroughly destroyed and the most
desolate part of the coast was the section stretching
from the south of Sidon and up to al-ʿAṣfâlān, i.e.,
roughly speaking the shores of Palestine. ʿAskalân,
Arshîf, Caesarea and ʿAṭṭâlîh, remained in ruins up to
recent times. The revival of Haifa started many
years after Mamlûk reign, whereas Jaffa and Acre
were only insignificant hamlets under Mamlûk and
early Ottoman rule. The nearness of that part of
the coast to Jerusalem and the flatness and com-
parative wideness of the plain adjoining it—which
make it an ideal area for landing troops from the
sea—were undoubtedly the main reasons for its
thorough destruction.

The only towns which recovered from the blow
fairly quickly were Beirut and Tripoli, but their
defences were far weaker than those which they
had had in the past. Thanks to the historian ʿAlîh b.
Yahyâ, we know much more about Beirut’s
system of defence than about that of any other
Syro-Palestinian port. The picture revealed of the
weakness of that system is very depressing indeed
(Ṭâʾrîḥ Bâyrûl, 28-42, 45, 67-9, 90-4, 100-112, 134,
168, etc.).

The Egyptian coast, on the other hand, was left
almost intact. In the first half of the 13th century
Tinnis was permanently destroyed, but Damietta was
very soon rebuilt after having been destroyed. The
reason for the preservation of the Egyptian ports
and coastal fortifications were: first, that Egypt was
invaded by the Crusaders only for very short periods;
second, that trade with the outside world was vital
for the country’s existence (economic considerations undoubtedly played a decisive rôle in the revival of Beirut and Tripoli as well); third, all the picked units of the Mamlûk army were concentrated in Egypt (or more precisely in Cairo). They could easily be rushed from the capital to any point on the Egyptian coast.

From the above it should not be concluded that the Mamlûks devoted much of their attention to the Egyptian coast. Alexandria and the other Egyptian ports were garrisoned by third-rate troops, including Egyptians from the hinterland, who could easily be rushed from the capital to any point on the Egyptian coast. From the mountain region of Syria and Palestine, the Mamlûks devoted much of their attention to the Franks in the last years of the reign of Mulk zur’u’s (died 1250). The first Ottoman sea-battle occurred in 819/1416, against the Venetians, the Ottoman Kaptan Pasha being Câlî Bey, sandîqâb bey of Gallipoli. In this battle, which took place between the island of Euboea, an important Venetian base, was taken in 815/1470, and the Ionian islands in the last years of the reign of Mulk zur’u’s, the Venetian admiral Pietro Loredano was wounded in the eye. The following year peace was made, through the mediation of the Byzantine emperor.

After this the Ottoman navy steadily progressed. First it brought under its influence some off-shore islands in the Aegean that had been colonised by the Genoese, and later, in 860/1456, it took the harbour of Enez and the islands of Imbros, Thasos, Samothrace, and Lemnos, and in 865/1458 Lesbos. Shortly after this date there began the series of hard-fought battles with Venice. The island of Euboea, an important Venetian base, was taken in 815/1470, and the Ionian islands in the last years of the reign of Mej’uddi in 1515. The Ottoman empire was already making its naval strength felt when Khâyr al-Dîn (‘Barbarossa’), the Bey of Algiers, entered its service. His skill brought it to the highest degree of maritime power, and with the battle of Preveza (4 Dîrâm, 1, a September 1538) it won the mastery of the Mediterranean. Defeat at Lepanto (970/1571) cost the Ottoman empire its fleet, but thanks to the odiaîkî system (whereby a given region was responsible for supplying an arsenal with
one particular ship-building commodity; e.g., the island of Thasos had to provide pine-wood for the ship-yards of Lemnos: see I. H. Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı devletinin merkez ve bahrıye teşkilâtı Ankara 1948, especially footnote to p. 449), a new fleet was created in so short a time as five months, and with the help of this the Venetians were compelled to make peace and sign a — for them — inglorious treaty.

Towards the end of the 16th century, the Ottoman fleet was weakened by the haphazard appointment of men with no naval experience to the kaplan-paşâhie, the command of the naval forces. From the beginning of the 17th century the Venetian fleet replaced its oar-driven galleys by sailing galleons, while the Ottoman navy persisted in the use of oars. Parity for this reason and partly because the ship's crews were pressed men with no interest in seafaring, it had so little success that the islands of Tenedos and Lemnos fell into enemy hands.

Eventually, in 1682, during the grand vizierate of Kara Mustafa Paşa of Merziyon (1676-83), the principle was accepted that sailing galleons should form the basis of the fleet (a principle that had long been applied by the navy of Algiers, an Ottoman dependency). Thus a balance was achieved with the Venetians in the Mediterranean, and in 1686-1695 the island of Chios was recovered from them. A fleet was destroyed in Navarino Bay in 1243/1827.

In 1244/1828 a naval academy was opened on Heybeliada. The Ottoman navy was opened in the reign of Selim III (1789-1807) great importance was attached to it, in consequence of the importance attached to it, of military engineering founded. In the reign of Selim III (1789-1807) great importance was attached to the discipline of the arsenal. The crews of galleons were called bałyomarı, and included ayılabîts (temporary sailors), marınaars (who were prisoners of war), gašbıars (who attended to the sails), san'aškarı (craftsmen: painters, carpenters, blacksmiths, caulkers), and suđaglıgıs (gunsers).

Next in rank to the Kaptaın Paşa in the Istanbul arsenal came the tersânî-kelâhıdadı and the tersânî eminı, and after them officers of the second and third rank. The accountant of the arsenal had the title of Dùnîb efendi. Till the introduction of sail, the tersânî-kelâhıdadı ranked as Vice Admiral and occupied himself with the disciple of the arsenal. The tersânî eminı was trained at the Bâb-i ʿAli and had control of supplies, income, and expenditure for the fleet and arsenal. This office was abolished in 1830 and its duties were entrusted to the Kaptaın Paşa.

In 1841 new ranks were instituted for both army and navy. In 1851 the Navy Ministry (bahrıyye nezareti) was created, with the charge of the financial and administrative functions formerly exercised by the tersânî eminı. The title of Kaptaın-i deryâ was abolished and a fleet command council was set up. In June 1776 the title of Kaptaın-i deryâ was restored. Finally, in 1881, the offices of minister and commander-in-chief of the navy were combined in one man, of the rank of muşabbir. This arrangement continued till the end of the Ottoman empire.

In 1922, after the establishment of the government of the Grand National Assembly in Ankara, the Navy Ministry (bahrıyye ve kaleı) was formed. In 1927, when this ministry was abolished, naval affairs were made the responsibility of the Ministry of National Defence, and have since been administered by a department headed by a permanent under-secretary (müsteşar).

1928; P. Wittek, Das Fürstenium Mentesche, Istanbul 1934, index (s v. korsaren); J. Deny, Riyâdî, in EI; Ubicini, Leit sur la Turquie, letter 90.

BAHSAL, ASLAM B. SAHÎL AL-MAJSHÎ AL-RÂZÂZÎ, author of a History of Wâsitî. Nothing is known of his life except the names of some of his authorities, among them Wâbî b. Bâkîyya (155-239/772-853), supposedly his maternal grandfather (but cf. al-Khâşîbî al-Bâhûtî, Târîkh Bâghdâdî, xi, 484).—(J. H. UZUNÇARSLÎ)

The History of Wâsitî has come down to us in an incomplete manuscript in Cairo (Taymûr, ta‘rîkh no. 1483) which had an interesting history and possesses considerable association value. It is the oldest preserved history intended to serve as an aid for hadîth scholars in evaluating the reliability of transmitters. Starting with a rather brief discussion of the early history of Wâsit and its environs, it deals with the religious scholars who had some connexion with Wâsit and were also linked to the author by an uninterrupted chain of transmitters. The biographies are arranged chronologically according to generations of scholars (here bârn, for the more common jababa “class”). They contain little personal information but restrict themselves as a rule to the name of the scholar, his authorities and students, and one (and, occasionally, more than one) of the traditions he transmitted. The work represents, if not the beginnings, at least an early simple stage of what was soon to become one of the most elaborate types of historico-biographical literature in Islam.

Bibliography: Yâkoûfî, Ibrâhîm, ii, 256; Dhehîbî, Misâ‘în, Cairo 1325, 9; Bâsîlî, Wâsîlî, Ibn Hâjîr, Lisîn, i, 388, cf. also his Mu‘jam al-Mu‘jaras, MS. Cairo, muṣfî al-bâdîth no. 82, 102; Brockelmann, S I, 210; F. Rosenthal, A History of Muslim Historiography, Leiden 1952, 83, 144 f., 406. (F. ROSENTHAL)

BAJH, infinitive of the Arabic root bâ-j-h; from its original meaning, “to rake, to dig, to turn over soil (in order to search for something),” there later developed its meaning of “to look for, examine, consider,” in the intellectual and speculative sense. Bakhtha became in this respect almost a synonym of nasâra, and, in fact, the two terms bakhth and nasar are often found in association (e.g., Mas‘îdî, Muruqî, vi, 368; ahl al-bâ‘îth wa-l-nasar, “specialists in philosophic inquiry and controversy”). A Khât al-Mukhtâr formed part of the corpus of writings attributed to Di‘bîr b. Hayyân, who dates from the 3rd/9th century (cf. Brockelmann, SI, 249). Since that time, bakhth, with its plural abîbat, appears in the titles of numerous works precisely in the sense of “study, examination, inquiry” (also in the form mahbîth, pl. mabîbit, which denotes not only the object of the inquiry but the inquiry itself) and in this strengthened form it is often used in modern Arabic, in the technical and scientific sense of “study”: e.g., Mabîbit ârabiyya of Bîyiбр Fârî, Cairo 1939. (F. GABRIELI)

BAHRAŞÎR [see AL-MAD‘ÎN].

AL-BAHUTÎ. SHA‘ÎKH MANŞÛR B. YÛNUŞ AL-BAHUTÎ, frequently referred to by the name of Al-Bahûtî al-Mudîrî, is usually considered as one of the most eminent doctors of Hanbalism in the first half of the 11th/17th century and also as the last major representative of this school in Egypt. A native of the village of Bahût in the Mudîrîyya Gharbiyya, al-Bahûtî belonged to a family which gave several other “ulamâ”, who enjoyed a certain notoriety, to Hanbalism. The following are cited among the best known of his teachers: Muhammad al-Mardawî (died 926/1520), also an Egyptian Hanballî, and the traditionalist and lawyer Abî al-Rahmân al-Bahûtî (Mukhtâsr, 104), who was reputed to be well versed in the four major schools of Fiqh. Mansûr al-Bahûtî also counted a Shâfi‘î among his teachers, Abî Allâh al-Danâwshârî, Little is known of his life, except that he devoted himself in Cairo to teaching Fiqh and that he gave numerous legal opinions (fatâwa). His biographers praise his devotion and his charitable disposition. His teaching appears to have enjoyed great success; numerous students came to him for their training, in fact not only from Egypt, but from Syria and Palestine as well. Among his chief disciples two members of his own family are cited, Muhammad al-Bahûtî and Muhammad b. Abî‘l-Surûr al-Bahûtî, and the Syrian Abî Bakr b. Ibrâhîm al-Shâhî. He died in Cairo in Rabi‘ II/105 July 1641, apparently at a very advanced age, and was buried in the tura of the Mudjâwurîn.

Mansûr al-Bahûtî’s work, which is still used today in Egypt for teaching Hanbalism, is devoid of any great originality on the part of the author. It stands, in the history of Hanbalism, as a prolongation of the work of Mûsâ al-Œdîjâwî (died 968/1560) (cf. Brockelmann, II, 325 and S II, 447) and that of Shâyi‘î Tâqi al-Dîn al-Futûhî, better known under the name of Ibn al-Nâdi‘îr (died about 980/1572) (cf. Brockelmann, S ii, 447). The Palestinian al-Œdîjâwî, who was muṣîfî in Damascus where he taught at the ‘Umâriyya and at the Mosque of the Umayyads, had composed a resumé of the Mukhtâsr of Muwafaq al-Dîn b. Khûdâmî (died 650/1252) under the title of al-Mukhtâsr, and a manual of Law, the Ihchâ, which has become a classic in Hanbalism of the late period. Muhammad al-Bahûtî wrote a commentary on the works of the title al-Rauq al-Murîh bi-Šârîf Zîd-d al-Mustanî‘î (Cairo 1352, 2 vols.). He also left a commentary on the Ihchâ (published in Cairo in three volumes). Shâyi‘î Tâqi al-Dîn al-Futûhî, who received his training in Cairo, had combined the Mâfîkhâr of Muwafaq b. Khûdâmî and the Tanbih of Hasan al-Mardawî (died 910/1504-5; Mukhtâsr, 77-78), in a single manual entitled al-Muntadhâ, which speedily achieved considerable success. We are also indebted to Mansûr al-Bahûtî for a šarîf on the Munathâh (Cairo 3 vol.) and for a khariya, gloss on the same text.

He also wrote a commentary on the Mu‘radât of Muhammad b. ‘Alî al-Mâkdisî (died 820/14217; Mukhtâsr, 65), a long poem in which the points of doctrine peculiar to Hanbalism are expounded. This commentary was published at Cairo, by the Salafiyya press, in 1343/1924 (and the actual text was again reprinted by the same publishers the following year, with brief notes taken from al-Bahûtî’s commentary). Lastly, a commentary on the Mu‘mîdî is attributed to him (cf. RAAD, xii, 631).

Bibliography: In addition to the references given in the body of the article: Mu‘ibbi, Khulûd al-Œdâr fi A‘yân al-Karn al-Hâdî ‘Aqâr, Bûlûk n.d., iv, 426; Djamîl al-Šâfi‘î, Mu‘mîdî Tsâhîb al-Œdârîl, Damascus 1339, 104-106; Brockelmann, II, 447; H. Laoust, Le Précis de droit d’Ibn Qudâmî, Beirut 1950, liii, and (H. LAOUSS)

BAHW, an Arabic word primarily designating an empty and spacious place extending between two objects which confine it, has acquired, in the architecture of the Western Muslim World,
somewhat varied meanings, which are, however, related to the initial meaning of the word.

To this primary sense of the term, the *Lisan al-ʿArab* adds the following apparently derivative meaning: *bahw* is a tent or pavilion chamber situated beyond the rest, which suggests the idea of a pavilion differing from that which it precedes both in situation and by its spaciousness and height.

One of the first examples of the use of the word which enables us to determine its meaning, is to be found in the description of the great mosque of Al-Kayrawan by Al-Bakri. He speaks of the *Kubbat bāb al-bahw*, which de Slane translates: “Cupola of the door of the pavilion”. We have no difficulty in identifying this cupola as the one which rises before the hypostyle chamber, in the middle of the narthex gallery opening on to the courtyard; it would, however, seem more appropriate to translate: “Cupola of the door of the central nave” and to recognise in *bahw* the term designating the axial nave leading to the *mihrah*, which differs clearly from the others by its spaciousness, its being closed by the largest door and preceded by the cupola.

The arrangement of the naves at right angles to the wall of the *kibla* and the adoption of a main nave occupying the centre, an arrangement which we are amply justified in considering as being inspired by pagan and Christian basilicas, is mainly encountered in the West, which explains why *bahw* almost exclusively belongs to the vocabulary of Western Muslim Architecture. Attested in Al-Kayrawan in the 5th/11th century, the term is still used at Tunis to designate the central nave of the great mosque. The name *Bāb al-bahw* given to the door preceding this nave is a most likely corruption of the original term.

In Spain, the term *bahw* seems to be less strictly used. It is to be found in the description given by Al-Makkarl of the Umayyad palace built by ʿAbd al-Raḥmān III at Madīnat al-Zāhirā. The main building of the palace comprised 5 naves extending lengthways. The central nave, larger than the other four, was closed by a door called *bāb al-bahw*. The throne of the sovereign was situated at the end of this nave and there he gave audience. There it was that Al-Ḥakam II received King Oundo IV and caused him to be seated before him. However, the adjoining naves, also comprised in the ceremonial chamber, seem to have been to some extent confused with the central nave and are also at times referred to by the term *bahw*.

This confusion is emphasised by Ibn Bagkkuwāl, quoted by Al-Makkarl in relation to the great mosque of Cordova. Ibn Bagkkuwāl applies the word *bahw* to the 19 naves of the great mosque as an exception, being careful to add that they are normally called *balāb*, which is in fact the term most usually applied to the naves of a mosque. Al-Makkarl, describing the mosque of Ucles, refers to the central nave by the expression al-*balāb* al-*aṣāṣ*.

The sense of a nave extending lengthways and playing a role of ceremonial chamber, as suggested by the description of the Umayyad palace, explains the use of *bahw* to indicate an audience chamber. There were two such chambers in the palace of Cordova to which Ibn Al-Khaṭīb applies this term. According to al-Tidjānī, at Gabēs, in the castle built by Ibn Makki, an audience chamber was provided with a *bahw* where the master of the palace was seated. We naturally identify this place of honour with the *mawṣ*, the central alcove, of Mesopotamian origin, which is to be encountered in the houses of Fustāṭ of the Tālibān period and which was likewise known to Eastern Barbary from the 4th/10th century. This deep recess, the place of honour, set into the back wall of a large chamber, still exists in Tunisian and Algerian houses: in Tunisia it bears the name *ḥbl*, in Algeria, however, the name *bahw* seems to be not unknown.


**BAIKAL,** in eastern Turkish (folk-etymology) *Bai kül*, ‘the rich lake’; in Mongolian *Dalai nor*, ‘the ocean lake’; the deepest lake (1741 m.), and the largest mountain lake in the world, between 51°39′ and 55°46′ north, and 105°44′ and 110°40′ east, surrounded by high mountain ranges, 635 km. long, and varying from 15 to 79 km wide, with an area of 31,500 sq. km. Flowing into it are the Selenga and the Barguzin and the upper Angara, and flowing out is the Angara at Yenisey. The Lake Baikal railway (307 km. long, with 40 tunnels) — a branch of the Trans-Siberian railway — was completed round the southern part of it (between the Angara exit and the Selenga delta) in autumn 1904.

It appears that Lake Baikal was not known to Muslim geographers in Mongol times. It is mentioned only by Rashīd al-Dīn, *Diwan* al-Tamūrīkh (ed. Berezin iii 180) (Trud Vost. otd. Imp. Arkeol. Ob-va XIII). Here, the people living on its shores are called Bārūt (+ is the Mongol plural ending), and the region around it Barūfūn (Tūkūm), which is recalled by the river Barguzin. The lake became known in Russia in the first half of the 17th century, and in western Europe shortly afterwards.


**BAILO** [see BÁLYÓS].

**AL-BA'ITH,** nickname of a satirical poet of Baṣra named Khidāsh b. Bīṣr al-Mudqāshī. Though held to be the greatest orator of the Tamīr, Ibn Sallām places him in the second class of the great Islamic poets. The critics, however, consider that his relative obscurity was only due to the renown of Djarīr; al-Ba’ith’s activity is in fact associated with that of the two rivals Djarīr and al-Farazdāk: for many years he exchanged invectives with the former, but was obliged to call the latter to his assistance, who, moreover, does not always treat him gently (he also refers to him by the nickname Ibn *hamsī* al-tidjānī “son of the woman with the red perineum”, an allusion to his mother’s humble origin; she was a slave from Sūdūstān). Yahūt places his death in 134/752, but as he adds: “during the Caliphate of al-Walīd b. ʿAbd al-Malik” (who reigned from 88 to 98/705-15), this date cannot be given credence.

**Bibliography:** Dābīt, *Bayān* and *Hayāwān*, index; Ibn Kūṭyāba, *Zahhār*, ed. Shakkīr, 472-5; Nakhdī Djarīr wa l-Farazdāk, passim; Dinēsil of Djarīr and Farazdāk, passim; Ibn Sallām,
\textbf{BA\textsuperscript{2}KAR, wa-FAN\textsuperscript{2}.} The Sufic terms \textit{fan\textsuperscript{2}} (passing-away, effacement) and \textit{bak\textsuperscript{2}} (subistence, survival), refer to the stages of the development of the mystic in the path of gnosis. These categories, partly antithetical and partly complementary, are more or less equivalents of such other pairs as \textit{sawr} (intoxication) and \textit{saww} (sobriety), \textit{gham\textsuperscript{2}} or \textit{wah\textsuperscript{2}} (unity) and \textit{tafr\textsuperscript{2}} or \textit{bas\textsuperscript{2}} (separation, plurality), and \textit{naf\textsuperscript{2}} (negation) and \textit{sq\textsuperscript{2}} (affirmation).

The doctrine has been developed especially since the execution, in Baghdad in A.D. 922, of al-Hallad\textsuperscript{2} who declared “I am God”, when the Sufis turned to the task of a more sober description of the mystic experience in an effort to exonerate al-Hallad\textsuperscript{2} from the un-Islamic idea of identifying the human ego with God and to demonstrate that Sufism was not only truly Islamic but is the true Islam. Even though some Sufis, in their moment of ecstasy, have not been able to guard against utterances similar to that of al-Hallad\textsuperscript{2}, especially in their poetry, they have usually categorically denied both the incarnation of God in man and the total mergerence of the individual and finite human ego in God. Two allied definitions have been offered of \textit{fan\textsuperscript{2}}: (1) the passing-away from the consciousness of the mystic of all things, including himself, and even the absence of the consciousness of this passing-away and its replacement by the perfect attributes of the consciousness of this passing-away and its replacement by the perfect attributes which He is manifested, however imperfectly. The Sufis generally regard this state of \textit{fan\textsuperscript{2}} as being more perfect than that of mere \textit{ba\textsuperscript{2}} and this is the most helpful account in any Western language is in R. A. Nicholson’s \textit{The Mystics of Islam}, London 1914, especially the last chapter.

According to al-Hudjwiri, the author of the doctrine was Abū Sa\textsuperscript{2}d al-Kharrās, but it was further developed by Dinayd and others no doubt under the criticism of the orthodoxy. A radical, forceful and lucid statement was developed, as a criticism of Ibn al-’Arabi, by the 17th century Indian Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī whose Persian Makhtūdī have not been studied at all in the West.

\textbf{BA\textsuperscript{2}KAR.} In medieval Arabic literature, the term is not confined to the prevalent meaning of \textit{cattle} (bos), in contrast to more recent usage and to the application of corresponding forms in other Semitic languages. Arab authors distinguish between the domestic kind, \textit{bak\textsuperscript{2}r ah\textsuperscript{2}lī} (= cattle), and the wild kind, \textit{bak\textsuperscript{2}r wâ\textsuperscript{2}hī}, the latter being variously identified, either with the \textit{māh} (Oryx beatrix; Nuwayerl, ix, 322) or the \textit{āyā\textsuperscript{2}} (esp.); so according to the description in Ka\textit{s\textsuperscript{2}}̄wîn) or with a group of animals (referred to by Lane, 234, as \textit{bovine antelopes}) which comprises, according to Damrî, in addition to these two species, also the \textit{yāh\textsuperscript{2}m̄r} (roodeer) and the \textit{ṭay\textsuperscript{2}yl} (bubale antelope). The distinctive epithet, however, is not always added, so that \textit{bak\textsuperscript{2}r} alone (or its nom. unit. \textit{bak\textsuperscript{2}ra}) may also stand for several wild animals. This applies, for instance, to ancient Arabic poetry (see, e.g., Dżāhīz, v, 218\textsuperscript{2}) and its commentaries, to the respective data in the dictionaries (Ibn Sida treats \textit{bak\textsuperscript{2}r} in the \textit{Ku\textsuperscript{2}d̄ al-Wa\textsuperscript{2}f\textsuperscript{2}̄d}) and even to zoological writings (e.g., Dżāhīz, ii, 1999; iv, 3993). In works on the solution of dreams, where \textit{bak\textsuperscript{2}r} holds an important place, it is difficult to determine the exact meaning in every case. Different traditions seem to have been intermingled also in pharmacological works. Here, the horns of \textit{bak\textsuperscript{2}r} are frequently mentioned, while some Arab authors describe the \textit{bak\textsuperscript{2}r ah\textsuperscript{2}lī} as a harmless animal. In the Kur\textsuperscript{2}ān, where the term mainly occurs in biblical tales, the meaning is always cattle or cow. In addition, the term is found in ancient proverbs and in the \textit{hadī\textsuperscript{2}h}.

\textbf{Bibliography:} ‘Abd al-Ghanî al-Nâbulûsî, \textit{Ta\textsuperscript{2}fîr al-Ah\textsuperscript{2}m,} s.v.; Abû Hayyân al-Tawâhîl, \textit{Im\textsuperscript{2}dā,} i, 160, 164-66, 169-70, ii, 30 (transl. L. Kopf, \textit{Osiris} xii [1936], 463 [index]); \textit{All} al-\textit{Tâbarî, Fir\textit{daws al-\textit{Ishm\textsuperscript{2}}} (Siddiqî),} 421 ff.; Damrî, s.v. (transl. Jayakar i, 315 ff., 327 ff.); Dżāhîz, \textit{Hâyawâsā,} index; Hommel, \textit{S\textsuperscript{2}aw\textsuperscript{2}thûr\textsuperscript{2}e,} index s.v. \textit{Rind\textsuperscript{2}vâlî;} Ibn al-‘\textit{Aw\textsuperscript{2}wām, Fida\textsuperscript{2}ha (transl. Clément-Mullet),} ii/b, 1 ff.; Ibn Kutayba, \textit{U\textsuperscript{2}y\textsuperscript{2}n al-A\textit{\textsuperscript{2}hâ\textsuperscript{2}b},} Cairo 1925-30, ii, 70, 75, 81, 94 (transl. Kopf, 43, 50, 57, 70); Ibn al-Baytâr, \textit{Dżāmîs\textsuperscript{2},} Bâlûk 1291, 105 ff.; Dâ’ûd al-\textit{A\textsuperscript{2}ntâk\textsuperscript{2}l, T\textit{adh\textsuperscript{2}k\textsuperscript{2}r,}} Cairo 1324, i, 74 f.; Ibn Sida, \textit{Ma\textit{\textsuperscript{2}h\textsuperscript{2}y\textsuperscript{2}\textsuperscript{2}s\textsuperscript{2} \textsuperscript{2}a,} viii, 52 ff.; Ibn Sînâ, \textit{Munâ\textsuperscript{2}h\textsuperscript{2}b\textsuperscript{2}h al-Kalâm,} bâb 33; Ibnshâhîl, \textit{Mustaw\textsuperscript{2}fîl,} bâb 62, s.v.; Ka\textit{\textsuperscript{2}wâlî (W\textsuperscript{2}ust\textsuperscript{2}nfeld),} i, 380 ff.; Malouf, \textit{Arab\textit{c Zool. Dict.},} Cairo 1932, index; Mustawfî Ka\textit{\textsuperscript{2}wâlî (Stephenson),} 4 f.; Nuwayerl, \textit{Ni\textsuperscript{2}k\textsuperscript{2}\textsuperscript{2}y\textsuperscript{2}r al-\textsuperscript{2}\textit{Ar\textsuperscript{2}b,} ix, 322, x, 120 ff., A. D. Car\textit{\textsuperscript{2}r\textsuperscript{2}h\textsuperscript{2}w\textsuperscript{2}t\textsuperscript{2}r\textsuperscript{2}h, Arabian Adventure to the Great N\textsuperscript{2}af\textsuperscript{2}d in Quest of the Or\textsuperscript{2}\textit{x\textsuperscript{2}y,} London 1935. (L. Kopf)

\textbf{BA\textsuperscript{2}KAR, 1D} [see \textit{BA\textsuperscript{2}KAR, wa-FAN\textsuperscript{2}}].

\textbf{BAKARGANDJ} (Backergunge), formerly a district in East Pakistan with headquarters at Bâr\textsuperscript{2}\textsuperscript{2}s\textsuperscript{2}l, (now itself a district comprising Bâkargandj), lying between 21° 54’ N and 91° 2’ E; Area: 4,092 sq. m., of which 51 sq. m. are covered with water. The
population in 1951 was 3,642,185, of whom 2,897,769 were Muslims. The area was known as Bâkla (Isfahan) and constituted a sârkhâ in Mughal times prior to its occupation by Âghâ Bâkra, a prominent person at the Mughal Court at Dacca, owing allegiance to the Nawâb of Murâshidâbâd, and a land-owner of Buzurgmumîlîpâr, in 1125/1714 when he successfully suppressed a revolt of the local Hindu landlords. He took as his headquarters a flourishing market-town which he named Bâkargânj (mârt of Bâkâr) 15 miles to the south-east of Bârkâl. On his death in 1167/1753 the entire estate passed on to Râja Ballabh Rây of Bikrâmpur, a divan [q.v.] of the Naib Naizim of Dacca. The area was also famous for its fruit orchards. In 1238/1828-9 flourishing market-town which he named Bâkargânj, later known as Bâkhra, was described by A. Musil in 1908, and, although the name is frequently deformed in the Arabic texts (especially into al-*Asr), is also famous for its form of Bengali, known as Musalmani, with a pronunciation still remains unexplained.


Bibliography: Mukaddasî 319; al-Fâkih 278 (Hamadhanî 318; Ibn Rusta 171; al-Ya'âkubî âirol (= Bâga III, V, VII twice); Yâkût, i, 458 (= Chier edition 1906: ii, 28), ii, 145, iv, 398 (= Bar de Meynard, Dict. de la Perse 74 f.); Muhammad Hasan Khân, Mirât al-Bulûdî, i, 150; 'Arfî, Lâbâb, i, 68, ii, 156; Le Strange, 357.

AL-BAHKARZî, ABU'L-HASAN (OR ABU'L-KÂSIM) 'Ali b. Hasan b. 'Ali b. Abî 'l-Tâwyîr, Arab poet and anthologist, a native of Bâkhra. After receiving a good education in his father's house, he studied in particular Shâfi'i fikr and, at Nisâbûr, attended the lectures of al-Djuywâni ('Abd Allâh b. Yûsûf [q.v.], where he made the acquaintance of al-Kundurî [q.v.]; the latter, when he became wâli, took him to Baghdâd as a secretary; previously, he had for some time been an official at Bâsha. Subsequently, he was admitted to the chancellery, and later returned to his native place, where he was killed by a sabre stroke in Dhu 'l-Ka'da 467/June-July 1075.

The most famous work of al-Bâhkârzî is a letter of solace addressed to his benefactor al-Kundurî, on the subject of his castration. His diwan is lost, and only a few muhaffîlî have been published as an appendix to his Dumaayat al-Kâsr wa 'U'srâl Ahl al-'Apr (Alleppe 1349/1930); the latter work is an anthology which is a continuation of the Yalîma f al-Thâ'âlibî [q.v.] and comprises seven sections: Bedouin poets and poets of the Hidjâz; Syria, Dîyârbakr, Âshârâyân, Djazrât and Maghrib; 'Irâk; Râyî and Djiblân; Durjdân, Astarâbâd, Dhihîstân, Kômîs, Khûrâzîm, Transoxiana; Khûrâzîm, Kuhîstân, Sidjîstân, Ghaznâî; adab authors. Among another selection of his poems, entitled al-Ahsân, is preserved in MS. in London. His poetry, which was but little appreciated at Baghdâd despite the flattering opinions of the contemporaries on the whole mediocre and artificial.

Bibliography: Introd. of the Dumaayat; Samâ'ânî, Anshâh, 57b; Yâkût, s.n. Bâkhra; idem, Iradjî, v, 121-28 = Muhaddisî, xiii, 33-48; Ibn Khallikân, Cairo 1899, ii, 58-9; Browne, ii, 355 ff.; Brockelmann, S I, 466; 'All Âl Tâhir, La Poésie arabe en Irak et en Perse sous les Seljoukides, Sorbonne thesis 1954 (unpublished), index.

(D. S. Markoliovitch)

AL-BAHKRA, ancient site of Palmyra, well known in the Umayyad period. Al-Walid II is known to have stayed there on several occasions and died there in 126/744. The Arab sources describe the military camp (fustûd) which the Persians are said to have erected there in former times and the inner castle (kasr) where the Companion al-Nu'mân b. Bâshir lived and in which the Caliph, besieged by the rebels, took refuge. The site has been identified with the ruins of al-Bâhhâra, standing 25 km. to the south of Palmyra, visited and described by M. S. Musil in 1908, and, although the name is frequently deformed in the Arabic texts (especially into al-
Bahra\' or al-Naghr\'a), the reading al-Bakhra\' is not open to doubt since it is "guaranteed by the etymological speculations of the chroniclers, who derive it from the root bakhara\" (H. Lammens). The traces of a vast walled enclosure, furnished with towers 159 m. by 105 m., are accompanied to the north and the south by remains of dwellings around numerous wells, bearing testimony to the fact that from Roman times here was to be found, if not an "ancient castle of the times\" as H. Lammens maintained, at least a "fortified watering place\" (A. Poidebard) on the Bosra-Palmyra desert road, which subsequently became an Umayyad palace. It was not long before the site was abandoned and those mediaeval authors who still indicate the existence of a fortress (k\'shn) of al-Bakhra\', are no longer able to place it exactly.

Bibliography: A. Musil, Palmyrena, New York 1928, 86, 142-43, 234, 486-87, 290-96, fig. 38 (plan); A. Poidebard, La trace de Rome dans le désert de Syrie, Paris 1934, 54, 59, 66-67; L. Caeansi, Chronographia islamica, 1505; Tabari, index; Aghmih, Tables; Mas\'ud\(b, al-Tamib\(h, 324; idem, Murt\(d\(i, vi, 2; Y\(k\(t, i, 523; Bakré, Das geographische Worterbuch, ed. Wüstenfeld, 141.

(J. SOURDEL-ThOMINE)

BAKSHISH, a word figuring from Mongol times (13th century) in Iranian and Turkish literature, particularly in historical literature. Like the Ughuric original, it begins by denoting the Buddhist priest or monk (= Thibetan: Lama). During the time when the Ilkh\(g (q.v.) were favourably disposed to, or gallawers of, Buddhism, the number and influence of the bakshish in Iran was considerable.

In Iran, central Asia, India and the Crimea — after the suppression of Buddhism in Iran (in 1295) — bakshish denotes only a scribe who wrote Turkish and Mongol records (which were kept to begin with in Ughur script = generally bijukh). In the 16th century doctors (surgeons) were called by that name. Where lamas exist, i.e., among the Kalmucks, Mongols, and Mandjurs, the name bakshish retained its original meaning of 'Buddhist priest' up to the 20th century. Amongst the Turkomans — and in the 15th and 16th centuries also amongst the Anatolian Turks — the name bakshish came to mean a wandering minstrel; in Kirghiz it came to mean conjurer (Shaman), as also in the dialect forms baksi and baksha.

The etymology of the word bakshish is disputed: it used to be almost generally accepted (e.g., by W. Barthold and E. Blochet) as deriving from the Sanskrit word bh\(kh\(a\(, but this view has been opposed by P. Pelliot and others, who would derive it "almost certainly" from the Chinese po-cho (po-cho 'wise', 'well read').

Bibliography: Cf. excursus in Rash\(d\( al-Din, Histoire des Mongols de la Perse, edited by M. F. Quatrem\(e\(re, 3 (1905) 258-332); in IA II (1944-45), 233-38 (with bibliography); B. Spuler, Die Mongolen in Iran 1, Berlin 1955, 184, 547 (with a bibliography concerning the etymology); W. Radloff, Proben der Volksliteratur der türkischen Stämme Südsüdasiens, vol. iii/text, 46 ff.; R. Karutz, Unter Kirgisien und Turkmenen, Berlin, no date (19287).


**BAKHTAWAR KHAN**, a favourite eunuch, confidant and personal attendant of Awrangzîb [q.v.] who entered his service in 1665/1664 while the latter was still a prince. In 1680/1669 he was appointed Dâ'dîgî Khwâsudiân. He died after a short illness at Ahmadnagar on 15 Ribâ'î I, 1669/1665 after faithfully serving Awrangzîb for 30 years. His death was personally mourned by the Emperor who led the funeral prayers and carried the bier for some time 1085/1674 with the task of ensuring, through legal rules, that the royal astrologers would not prepare horoscopes and almanacs any more.

Towards the end of the Mir'ât al-Álâm (1078/ 1667), a general history rich in biographical material, the writer, who is none other than Bakhtawar Khan, gives a detailed account of his achievements. He claims the authorship of the following: (i) *Câr Á'îmî* or *Á'îm-i Bakht* (1068/1657), containing an account of the four battles fought by Awrangzîb which won him the throne (Browne, Supp. 145); (ii) *Riyâd al-Álsmiyâ* (1090/1679), lives of Muslim saints and notables in four *čamans* (Rieu iii, 985a; *Áshîyâna* 1: 320 No. 115; Browne Supp. 278 (Corpus 120); (iii) Selections from: *Hadhâka* of Sana'â, *Manbîl al-Áyâr* of Á'îrât, *Mahuwâl* of Rûmî and *Tâ̄rîhk-i Álî*. His bayâd, which contains select verses of eminent poets with their biographies and extracts from the writings and compilations of celebrated divines and mystics, is preserved in the Archaeological Museum of the Delhi Fort. He is also the author of *Tâ̄rîhk- Hindi*, a history of India from Bâbûr to Awrangzîb (Princeton 468, Storey 517). A book of Fâtâwâ, a compendium of Hanâfi law and a literary *pot-pouri*, called *Hamadân-i Bakht*, were compiled for him by different authors. Among the works of public utility founded and erected by him, he mentions the township of Bakhtawârpûra, a number of mosques, caravanserais, including that of Bakhtawarnârgâr, on the way to Faridâbâd, some bridges and cubicles for students. He also laid out gardens, one in Lahore near the Shâlimâr and the other in Agharâbâd, three miles from Shâhdijâhânâbâd (Delhi).


**BAKHTIGÂN**, the largest salt lake in the province of Fârs, Iran. It is located ca. 50 km. east of Shîrâz at an altitude of ca. 1550 m. The size of the lake varies with the seasons, but at the greatest it is ca. 100 km. N-S, and 30 km. E-W. The water is very salty and the lake is exceedingly shallow. The lake is the basin of the Kurr or Bandi Amir River.

In mediaeval Arabic geographical literature we find scant mention of Lake Bakhtigân. Ibn Khûrâdadbihî, 53, refers to it as Lake Dîshânîn, Ištâkhîrî, 122, gives a variant Bâyikân, and an alternate name Badfîz, while Ibn Hâwkal (ed. Kramers), 277, has al-Bakhtîkân. The five lakes (bâhâyâtâ) of Fârs province are listed by Ibn Istakhîrî, Ibn Hâwkal and Mu'âddasî, 446, as follows: 1. Bakhtîkân, belonging to the district of Ištâkhîr; 2. Dâshî Arzan in the district of Sâbûr; 3. Tawwaz in the Sâbûr district at Kâzârân; 4. Djânkân near Shîrâz, Lake Mûr in Ibn Hâwkal; 5. Barnâhîyâ (Mukh.: Bâshîfûya, Ibn Hâwkal has al-Basfariyâna) in the Ištâkhîr district.

At the present Lake Bakhtigân is called Nirzî. The other lakes have been identified by Herzfeld as: 2. Lake of Dâshî Arjan; 3. The Lake of Fârâbîn or Shîrîn or Kâzârân; 4. The Lake of Shîrâz or Mâhîrî. The name Bâshîfûya is probably the name of part of Lake Bakhtigân and perhaps identical with Badfîz. This lake has always had several connections by narrow arms of water, and the northern part was called Bâyikân or Dîshânîn, while the south was properly Bakhtigân or Nirzî. The lake has been surveyed by Capt. H. L. Wells. (A. S. BAZMEE ANSARI)

**BAKHTISHÔ** [see bâsîfûya?].

**BAKHTIYAR**, prince, son, heir apparent (344/ 955) and successor (356/967) of Mu'âzz al-Dawla in 'Irâq, with the lâkab of Ízz al-Dawla. He appears to have had little talent for government, which, unlike his father, he entrusted to wâžûs (chosen without any great discernment) so as to be free to amuse himself, though he still impeded the conduct of affairs by his impetuous verbal or active inter-vention. At the beginning of his reign he continued his father's policy of hostility to the Hamândîd Abû Taghîlî of Mâwîlî and to the autonomous chieftain
of the Battha, ʿImran b. ʿShāhīn. Furthermore, confronted with the new problem of Fāṭimid expansion in Syria, he drew close to the ʿārāmīṣa, who now sought to counter it. Bakhtiyar, however, was incapable of maintaining discipline among his troops, a prerequisite for the stability of the regime. Quarrels between the Daylamites and Turks became embittered and ended in an open breach between Bakhtiyar and the latter, which was further complicated by popular struggles in Baghdad between Sunnīs and Shīʿīs, in which the ʿayydrūn (s.v.) intervened. He was then obliged to appeal to his cousin in Fars, ʿAḍud al-Dawla, who noting the incapacity of the prince whom he had saved, conceived the idea of taking his place and was only temporarily prevented from doing so by the opposition of his father, ṫukan al-Dawla, head of the Būyid family; upon the latter’s death, he was able to revive his plan and Bakhtiyar, who had ranged against him, was defeated and slain (366-7/967-8); the account of their struggles has been given in the article ʿAḍud al-Dawla. During the course of the struggle, the Caliph al-Muʿtādī was replaced by al-Ṭāḥā, a protegé of the Turks, for which reason he did not support Bakhtiyar in earnest.

*Bibliography:* cf. the articles BUWAYHIDS and ʿAḍud al-Dawla. The chief source is naturally Minawawī, Taḍāmūs al-ʿImām, which is based on the lost History of Hīlāl al-Šābī; among the secondary chronicles, special mention must be made of Yāḥyā of Antioch, *Patrol. Or. XXIII*, especially 354 f. An exceptional place, furthermore, is also occupied in our documentation by what has been preserved of the letters of al-Šābī (Abū Ishāk), partial ed. Şabkī Arslan, Caliphal point of view) and of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Yūsuf, analysed by C. Cahen in *Studi Orientalistici… Levi della Vida*, i, 83-98 (point of view of ʿAḍud al-Dawla); cf. also that of Ibn ʿAbbād, ed. ʿAbd al-Walḥāb ʿAzām and Shawkī Dayf, 1947, i, no. 7. (Cahen)

**BAKHTIYAR KHALDJ** [see MUIJAMAD BAGHTIYAR KHALDIJ].

**BAKHTIYAR-NAMA** [see MUHAMMAD BAGHTIYAR-NAMA].

Bakhtiyar-Nāmā, also known as the History of the Ten Viziers, Muslim imitation of the Indian history of Sīndbād or of the seven viziers [see Sīndbād]. Like its prototype, the book consists of a story in the framework of which other tales are inserted, which are here closely connected with the basic story. The subject is brief; the son of King Aẓādbakht is abandoned on the road, shortly after his birth, by his parents, who are fleeing; found and brought up by brigands, in the end he is taken prisoner by the king’s soldiers. The King, who likes him, takes him into his service under the name of Bakhtiyar. When finally he has raised him to a high position, the King’s viziers who are jealous, take advantage of an accident to slander him before the King; whereupon Bakhtiyar and the queen are thrown into prison. To save herself, the queen explains that Bakhtiyar wanted to seduce her. For ten days each of the ten viziers in turn tries to persuade the King to have Bakhtiyar executed; the latter, however, is constantly able to gain respite from execution by means of a story appropriate to his situation. As finally it is to take place on the eleventh day, the leader of the brigands who had reared Bakhtiyar, appears and informs the King that Bakhtiyar is his son. Thereupon the viziers are executed and Bakhtiyar becomes king in his father’s place, who abdicates in his favour.

Originally the work was composed in Persian. Nöldeke (see Bibliography), in the course of examining the various versions and their chronology, which had already been established by R. Basset, published and translated extracts from the oldest known Persian version (MS. dated 695/1296)—composed in a masterly and resounding style, the author of which asserts that he composed the work for a prince of Samarkand, not so far identified, but who lived, according to Nöldeke, during the second half of the 6th/12th century. The later versions, Arabic (one of which is inscribed in the One Thousand and One Nights) and Persian, more simplified in style, differ in the order of the stories and the narrative details. With these can be placed the Uygur version (ms. of 838/1435) and the Persian version in verse by Panāhī (9th/15th century; see Bibliography: Bertels). The Malay version and the Persian version in verse by Katkhuḍa Marzubān (1210/1795; Ėṭē, Cat. Persian MSS. India Office, no. 1726) are more recent. The purpose of the stories, taken as a whole, is to demonstrate the disadvantages and dangers of hasty decisions. Magical factors and the supernatural make virtually no appearance. The prose is generally free from excesses and prolixity.

*Bibliography:* Chauvin, *Bibliographie*, viii, 13-17 (editions and translations) viii, 78-95 résumés of the stories); A. Jaubert, *Notice et extrait de la version turque du Bahkhtyār Nāmā, d’après le ms. en caractères ouïgours* (IA 1872); Ėṭē, *Cat. Persan MSS. India Office*, no. 1726 are more recent. For ten days each of the ten viziers in turn tries to persuade the King to have Bakhtiyar executed; the latter, however, is constantly able to gain respite from execution by means of a story appropriate to his situation. As finally it is to take place on the eleventh day, the leader of the brigands who had reared Bakhtiyar, appears and informs the King that Bakhtiyar is his son. Thereupon the viziers are executed and Bakhtiyar becomes king in his father’s place, who abdicates in his favour.

Originally the work was composed in Persian. Nöldeke (see Bibliography), in the course of examining the various versions and their chronology, which had already been established by R. Basset, published and translated extracts from the oldest known Persian version (MS. dated 695/1296)—composed in a masterly and resounding style, the author of which asserts that he composed the work for a prince of Samarkand, not so far identified, but who lived, according to Nöldeke, during the second half of the 6th/12th century. The later versions, Arabic (one of which is inscribed in the One Thousand and One Nights) and Persian, more simplified in style, differ in the order of the stories and the narrative details. With these can be placed the Uygur version (ms. of 838/1435) and the Persian version in verse by Panāhī (9th/15th century; see Bibliography: Bertels). The Malay version and the Persian version in verse by Katkhuḍa Marzubān (1210/1795; Ėṭē, Cat. Persian MSS. India Office, no. 1726) are more recent. The purpose of the stories, taken as a whole, is to demonstrate the disadvantages and dangers of hasty decisions. Magical factors and the supernatural make virtually no appearance. The prose is generally free from excesses and prolixity.
Being a gregarious people, they live "on the country," trekking long distances twice a year in search of grass, and hence they are called also the grass-folk. The wealthy khan's or chieftains have their own residences in town. They possess also summer resorts where they live during the hot season. Although destitute of any bookish education, they maintain their mirads or clerks. Nevertheless, they have recently awakened to the great importance of education, and are now sending their sons to Europe for an academic education; this tendency seems to be growing.

The Bakhtiyarí woman is unenlightened and goes about freely within the tribal area. As a khan's wife, she will attend to certain tribal cases during the khan's absence, and her findings and decisions are lawful and binding.

The tribe's women weave their tents and also hülms, while their characteristic foot-gear, called gülwa, is made by the tribesmen. Each tribal subdivision has its own so-called "healing man," who administers some herbs and in certain cases has recourse to incantations.

The Bakhtiyarís have their own customs relating to birth, marriage, and death; divorce is practically unknown to them. They have their own particular poems, love songs and dirges, and also interesting games and a great variety of delightful folk-stories.


(V. MELKONIAN)

BAKÎ, MAHMUD 'ABD AL- Turkish poet. Born in Istanbul of modest family (933/1526). His father Mehmed was a mürdâdik at the Fatih mosque. After working as an apprentice to a saddler, Baki began his regular studies in a madrasa where he had long cherished. The new sultan Mehemmed III of Anadolu and later of Rumeli, and then was retired to Istanbul after a period of office as fcddi asker of Istanbul, appointed him again of Rumeli, recognising without becoming Shaykh al-Islam, his skilful use of onomatopoeic effect achieve a fascinating musicality which caused him to be recognised, by both his contemporaries and successors as the greatest ghasal writer of Turkish literature. In his hand the Turkish of Istanbul found its best expression in classical poetry. His great popularity and influence never diminished, and his pure and fluent style paved the way for Yahya and Nedim. In his prose works Baki avoided fashionable precious and ornate language, producing some of the best specimens of natural, unadorned, well-balanced style.


(V. M. MELKONIAN)

BAKÎ B. MAKHLAD, 'ABD 'ABD AL-RAHMÂN, celebrated traditionist and exegete of Cordova, probably of Christian origin, born in 201/817, died in 276/889. Like many Spanish Muslims, he visited the principal cities of the Ottoman Empire before he was entrusted, by the Sultan al-Mustâsîr, of his time. The aging poet, whose ambition grew at the chance of reaching his goal, the highest office of his profession, took part in embittered court intrigues.

The Grand Veizir Khâdim Hasan Paşa strongly recommended Baki for the office of Shaykh al-Islâm, but the Sultan preferred his own tutor Khodja Sa'd al-Dîn. Baki's death in 956 was widely mourned and he was given a State funeral, the Shaykh al-Islâm leading the funeral prayer.

Serious, dignified and with a keen sense of justice in his professional career, Baki was, in his private life, a man of the world, gay, a bon vivant, sociable, extremely witty, fond of jokes, repartee and the exchange of satire, even with friends. These characteristics made him many enemies and rivals, but also secured many powerful friends and protectors, thus smoothing the way to rapid progress in his career.

Apart from a few treatises, mostly on religious matters, Baki's main work consists of his divân. Unlike most poets of the classical period he wrote no mathnâws. The easy and happy life of the upper classes of the 10th century Istanbul, the colourful landscape, the gay and picturesque scenes of the pleasure resorts in and around the Capital are vividly reflected in Baki's poems. In his ghasals, minutely tooled with the care of a jeweller, he turns constantly to a favourite theme of divân poets: In this dream-like and swiftly changing world all is ephemeral: The beauties of nature, youth, happiness, high estate are all doomed to perish. So, love, drink, and be merry while you can. "Forgo not this opportunity, for the pleasures of this world are as fleeting as the season of roses". Unlike Fu'dûl, Baki's temperament was not inclined towards religious enthusiasm and his lyrics do not lend themselves to mystical interpretation, although he often makes use of Şûfi terminology. Baki is the unequalled master of form. His perfect versification, meticulous choice of words, skilful use of onomatopoeic effect achieve a fascinating musicality which caused him to be recognised, by both his contemporaries and successors as the greatest ghasal writer of Turkish literature. In his hand the Turkish of Istanbul found its best expression in classical poetry. His great popularity and influence never diminished, and his pure and fluent style paved the way for Yahya and Nedim. In his prose works Baki avoided fashionable precious and ornate language, producing some of the best specimens of natural, unadorned, well-balanced style.


(FAHİR İZ)
(some count him however as a Shafi'i and he is regarded as having doctrines the Zahirîs introduced into Spain) and opposition to akhlaq, that he so found himself recalled with hostility by the Mâlikî jurists?; he was even nearly condemned to death on a charge of heresy, and owed his escape solely to the intercession of the amir Muhammad I (238-73/852-86), who allowed him freely to dispense his edictic teaching. His chief works, all of which are lost, are a commentary on the Kur'an, which Ibn Hazm considered superior to that of al-Tabari, and a msûnad in which the traditions were classified according to their subject under the names, themselves arranged in alphabetical order, of the Companions who had handed them down. Bâkî, whose biography was written by the prince 'Abd Allâh al-Zâhid, enjoyed at the end of his life a reputation for piety bordering on holiness, and Ibn Hazm considered him in the sphere of the Traditions, the equal of al-Bukhârî and al-Tabari.

Bibliography: Ibn Bashkuwal, no. 277; Dabîl, no. 584; Ibn al-Faradî, no. 281; Ibn 'Asâkir, Ta'rîkh Dimashq, iii, 277-82; Ibn Hazm, Risâla (French trans. Pellat in al-Andalus, 1954, §§ 17, 35); Ibn 'Idhârî, Bayân, ii, 112 ff.; Nubahi, Markab, passim; Kûshânî, Kudîd, index; Makârî, Anasîtes, index; I. Goldzâher, Muh. St., ii, 260; idem, Zahirîn, 115; M. Asîn Palacios, Áben-masarrasen y su escuela, 29, n. 2, 4; E. Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. Mus., index; Brockelmann, S.1, 271, and the references in H. Laoust, La profession de foi d'Ibn Ba'tha, Damascus 1958, xx, note.

(Ch. Pellat)

Khwâja Bâkî Bîllâh, Abu 'l-Mu'ayyid Ra'fî al-Dîn, also called 'Abd al-Bâkî or Muhammađ Bâkî b. 'Abd al-Salâm Uwaysî Nakshbandî, was born at Kâbul on 5 Dhu l-Hijjah 977/26 Dec. 1563 and died at Delhi on Saturday, 25 Dhu'mâdî II 1017/2 July, 1603. He received his early education from Sâdîk Balâhî, in whose company he went to Samarkand to pursue his studies further. It was during his stay there that he cultivated a taste for ta'awwûf. On the invitation of some of his friends, who held high posts in India, he left for that country, but instead of entering the Imperial army, as intended, he began to search for mystics and sufis. After a short sojourn in India he returned to Mâ Warâ' al-Nahr to receive formal initiation into the Nakshbandî order from Khwâja Muhammađ Amkângî, a great sufi of his times. Back in India again in 1008/1599 he decided to settle down at the south-east end of the town, at a short distance from the Prophet's tomb, outside the town-wall, now demolished, through which a gate-way, Bâb al-Bâkî, gave admittance to the cemetery (see the map of Madina in Caetani, Annales, ii, 173). The first to be buried in al-Bâkî, from among the muhâjadîn, was 'Ummân b. Ma'âfîn (a Companion of the Prophet) who died in 5/626-7. The bramble-growth was cleared and the place consecrated to be the future graveyard of the Muslims who died at al-Madinah. The Prophet's daughters, his son 'Abd al-Mâlik and his wives (ummâhâdîn al-mâminîn) and his descendants, with the exception of al-Husayn are also buried here. The burial-place of Fâ'tima al-Zohra' [q.v.] is, however, disputed. Among the other notables buried here are 'Ummân b. 'Affân, Malik b. Anas [q.v.], his teacher Nâfî', 'Alî, Hâlîma al-Sâ'diyya (the Prophet's wet-nurse) and al-'Abbâs, an uncle of the Prophet. It gradually became an honour to be granted a last resting-place here among the akl al-bayt [q.v.] the Imãms and Saints. The graves of the famous dead had grand cupolas and domes built over them; the domes of Hâsân b. 'Alî and al-'Abbâs for example, rose to a considerable height, as Ibn Dîbahy tells us. When Burckhardt visited the place after the invasion of the Wahhâbîs, he found it one of the most wretched cemeteries of the East. Like the grave of Nâsir al-Dîn al-Hâfiz, the first mosque in Islam was built there, and the present mosque is a Median suburb, al-Bâkî is one of the sacred places which the pilgrims to al-Madinah consider it an act of piety to visit.

During the life-time of the Prophet al-Bâkî was a very small place; the graves of 'Ummân b. 'Affân and Hâlîma al-Sâ'diyya not being within its precincts. 'Ummân b. 'Affân was buried originally in Hâshî, Kawkab, which was included in al-Bâkî by the Umayyads much later. Even the enclosure where some of those killed during the Umayyad occupation of al-Madinah were buried fell outside its present...
boundaries. The domes and mausolea destroyed by the early Wahhabis in 1221/1806 were restored by ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd II (r. 1806–1813). This action of the Saʿūd monarch gave rise to a serious agitation in India, and a deputation was sent to Mecca to lodge a strong protest. The king, however, did not yield and the graves are still without any tombs; they have insignificant head-stones without any inscriptions or epitaphs. Rutter, who saw it in 1926, shortly after the second Wahhabi occupation, compares it with the ruins of a town affected by an earthquake. In 1954 cemented pathways were laid, by the orders of King Saʿūd b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, all over the cemetery for the use and convenience of visitors.


(A. J. Wensinck-[A. S. BAZMEE ANSARI])

**BAKŠI** [BAKHSHI] KULI AĞHĪ, better known under the Russian form of the name, Bakhshi, and his literary pseudonym Kudsi, Aḏḡarbayjānī historian, poet and philosopher, son of Mirzâ Mamed Khân, ruler of Baku, driven from his throne by his brother Muḥammad Kuft Khân. He was born on 10 June 1794 in the village of Emir-Ḥajdīn in the Khumāt of Bakū, and died in 1847 at Kuba. After a thorough education in Persian and Arabic, in 1820 Bakhšīkhānī was appointed officer interpreter at Tiflis in the headquarters of General Ermolov, Commander in Chief of the Russian armies in the Caucasus. There he learned Russian, through which language he became well acquainted with western literature. Shortly afterwards, he undertook a long journey which led him to Shīrāz, Armenia, Daghstān, Georgia, Turkey and Persia. During the Russo-Turkish and Russo-Persian wars, Bakhšīkhānī, who was a convinced advocate of rapprochement with Russia, was a staff officer at General Paskievich’s headquarters. In 1833 he made a second journey, visiting the Northern Caucasus, Russia, the Baltic States and Poland. From 1834 onwards he devoted himself to literature and published a large number of works in Aḏḡar, Persian and Arabic. His most important work is: Gūlīstān-i İrem (1841) which traces the history of Daghstān and Shīrāz from ancient times down to the treaty of Gulistān. A Russian translation of this valuable work was published in 1906 by the Association for the Study of Aḏḡarbayjān in Bakū, with a preface by S. Slomev and a biography of the author by M. G. Balkhārī; the Aḏḡar text appeared in 1951 at Baku (Edition of the Academy of Sciences of the Aḏḡarbayjān SSR).

His other works are: Riyāḍ al-Kudsi (in Aḏḡar), abridged biography of the principal Saints of Islam; Kūnūn-i-Kudsi, Persian grammar; Kūŷ al-Gharšād (in Persian), containing a description of the discovery of America; Taḥkīk-i-ʾAbd al-ʿAzīz (in Persian), treatise on Ethics and Moral Philosophy according to Arab, Greek and European authors; Aṣrār al-Malakāt (in Persian and Arabic), treatise on astronomy, published at Tiflis; Naṣḥatnamā (in Persian), collection of moral precepts.

Finally several poems in Arabic, Aḏḡar and Persian, some of which have been published in the newspaper Feyyāzat of Bakū (no. 28 of 1907), as well as a translation of Křlov’s fables into Aḏḡar.


(A. BENVIGEN)

**AL-BAKILLANĪ** (i.e. the greengrocer), the kāfiʿ Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ṭavyīb b. Muḥammad b. Daʿfīr b. al-Kāsim, in most of the sources Ibn al-Bakillānī, but in popular usage (and Ibn Khalikān) simply al-Bakillānī, Aḏḡārī theologian and Mālikī jurisprudent, said to have been a major factor in the systematising and popularising of Aḏḡārī-ism.

The date of his birth is unknown. He died on 23 Dhūl-Qaʾda 403/5 June 1013. Born in Baṣra, he seems to have spent most of his adult life in Baḥdād. Visits to Shīrāz and the Byzantine court are mentioned, and for a time he exercised the office of kāfiʿ outside the capital. He studied ʿāṣāf al-dīn under disciples of al-Aḏḡārī and is said to have attracted many to his own lectures. Various anecdotes are related to illustrate his skill in disputatio. Kāfiʿ, writer, disputant, lecturer—these headings sum up his life as we know it from our rather inadequate sources.

A list of his works (to which the editors add three titles) is given by the kāfiʿ ʿĪyād. Six of these fifty-two works are known to be extant. The Ḥikāyāt al-Kur’dān, printed several times, is regarded as a classic work on the subject. The Tamḥīd is the earliest example we have of a complete manual of theological polemic. The Inṣāf contains two parts: a version of the Sunnite creed with brief explanations, and a detailed discussion of the incorporation of the Kur’dān, the Ḥikāyat, the vision of God, and intercession (gofāʾīs). The Minākshī (incomplete) is a defence of the Sunnite position and the Imāmate (Caliphate). The Inṣīqār (incomplete) is chiefly concerned with textual integrity of the Kur’dān. The theme of the Bayūn (incomplete) is the apological miracle which vindicates the claim to prophethood.

Study of these works does not enable us to define precisely the author's contribution to the development of Aḏḡārī ʿalām. For we do not know enough about the work of his contemporaries and predecessors, e.g. Ibn Fūrūk, Abū Ḥāshim al-İsfārānī, and al-Aḏḡārī himself. Thus it is now clear that much of what once might have been attributed to al-Bakillānī already existed in al-Aḏḡārī's Khalâl al-
al-Bakrāʾ, Ibn Taymiyya called al-Bakrālī “the best of the Ashʿarī muhaddithun, unrivalled by any predecessor or successor” (Shāhārūdī, iii, 169), but this praise is not disinterested. Ibn Khaldūn’s assertions (Muhadditha, iii, 40), and the affirmations of Macdonald (Development of Muslim Theology etc., 200-201), seem to be unwarranted, since al-Bakrālī certainly did not introduce the doctrines of atomism and accidents. There is evidence of some originality in his discussion of the apologetic miracle. But the main virtues of his works appear to be those proper to careful and industrious compilation. His metaphysic is not profound, but he was clearly aware of the cardinal apologetic importance of such questions as the validity of tradition and the possibility of the apologetic miracle. Undoubtedly he did much to propagate Ashʿarism, and he is mentioned fairly frequently by later writers.


(R. J. McCarthy)

al-Bākīr (a.) the Splitter, i.e. the Investigator, a name of the Imām Muḥammad b. ʿAll [i.e. Bākīr].

bakkāʾ, pl. bakkāʾun, bukkāʾ, “weepers”, ascetics who during their devotional exercises shed many tears. Older Islamic asceticism and mysticism are characterised by a strong consciousness of sin, by austere penance, humility, contrition and mourning. Laughter was denounced. An outward sign of this attitude is the act of weeping. The Kūrān (Sūra xvii, 109: “and they fall down on their chins, weeping”, and Sūra xix, 58: “when the signs of the Merciful were recited before them, they fell down, prostrating themselves, weeping”), and then, above all, the ḍāhīd acknowledge and comment the shedding of tears during devotional exercises. The Prophet Muḥammad is said to have wept audibly at times in the course of the ritual prayers. A similar behaviour is reported of the first Caliphs Abū Bakr and ʿUmar. Of weeping ascetics or those who at least commended the practice of weeping, a long list might be compiled from the Ḥiyāt al-Awliyāʾ of Abū Nuʿaym. To this class belonged such well-known names as Ḥasan al-Baṣṣīf, Ibn Sīrīn, Mālik b. Ḍūnāz, Abū ʿl-Dārādāʾ (who even wrote a special work called Kādīʾ al-Rīḥāʾ wa l-Buḵāʾ), Ḥabīb al-Naḥḥāʾ, Abū Sulaymān al-Dārānī, Ḥaḍī al-ʿAbdānī, Abū ʿl-Walīd b. Zayd, Sufyān al-Thawrī, Ḥabīb al-Mīṣrī, ʿAbd b. Muḥād al-Rāzī etc. Yet there were but few who in fact bore the by-name of al-buḵāʾ or were at least designated as weepers, amongst them being ʿAbdāl-Buḵāʾ (in Ǧaṣrā; Ḥiyāya 2,347), Abū Saʿīd Ṭāfīr b. Muḥammad al-Buḵāʾ (Ḥiyāya 7,369), Muʿṭarīl b. Ṭarfī, Muḥammad b. Sīḥa, Abū ʿl-Malīk b. Ṭabīʿ, Abū Sinān Dīrās b. Murāza (these four in Ḥiyāya 3,347 and 5,385), Sayyār al-Nabūjjī (designated as ḥādī; Ḥiyāya 10,166), Ḥaytham al-Buḵāʾ, Saffān b. Muḥīr (Dībīḫ, Buḵkāʾ, 5), Ḥishām b. Ḥassān (Wensinck, Some Semitic Rites of Mourning, 85 f.), ʿAbd al-Buḵāʾ (Ṣulamī, Ṭabākāt, 87). Famous for their weeping are also Ṣāḥīḥ al-Murūj, Ghālīb al-Dateṣāmī, Ḥāfīz al-Ḍaḥṣāmī, Khāmil, Muḥammad b. Wāṣlī. These buḵāʾun did not, however, represent a special “class”, as R. A. Nicholson (F.E.E. 2, 100), A. J. Wensinck (Some Semitic Rites, 66), L. Masséne (Essai, 167), H. Lammens (L’Islam, 152), Ch. Pellat (Le milieu basrien et la formation de Gāḥīs, 94) and R. Dozy (Suppl., s.v. buḵāʾ) seem to suppose. Buḵāʾ continued rather to be an appellative term applicable to all those who wept copiously, and given to an individual only occasionally as a by-name; it is comparable to some degree with the term ḥamād found in Ḥiyāya 5,69 as a designation for one who in joy and sorrow sings the praise of God. Therefore mention is also made of buḵāʾun amongst the ancient Israelites ( Ibn Kūṭayba, ʿUyān al-ʿAḫẖār, 2,284; Ḥiyāya, 5,164). Muḥammad b. Wāṣlī, himself a great weeper, deemed it absurd to call himself buḵāʾ (Ḥiyāya, 2,347).

Abū ʿl-Dārādāʾ gives three reasons for his weeping: fear of the fate that awaits us directly after death, the impossibility of striving further towards one’s own salvation, and the uncertainty as to the verdict that will be made on the Day of Judgement (Dībīḫ, Bayān, 3,151; var. Ibn Kūṭayba, ʿUyān, 2,359). Yaḥṣūb b. Maysara enumerates in general seven reasons for weeping: joy, sorrow, anguish, pain, hypocrisy, gratitude to and fear of God (Ḥiyāya, 5,235). Abū Saʿīd al-Khāzāz enumerates seven reasons, all of them subordinate, however, to three kinds of weeping: away from God, towards God, and with God (Ṣārāḏī, al-Lūmāʾ fi l-Taṣawwuf, ed. Nicholson, 229).

In the centre of the weeping of the buḵāʾun are the fear of God (ḥāghayl Allāh), the Day of Judgement, doubt as to the verdict of God, the tortures of Hell. Often there is weeping over one’s own sins, over specific personal weaknesses, over the wasted bygone years or the irrevocable past during the period of probation on earth; it can also arise from compassion for others, for those who err in their religion and for the dead who are no longer able to better their fate, or it arises from yearning for one’s abode in Heaven, for God, and so on. They often wept in the expectation — and here too the ḍāhīd, in a certain measure, could be adduced as an authority — of God’s indulgence and kindness, of His protection on the Day of Judgement, of safeguard from Hell, of remission of one’s own or even of other people’s sins, of the attainment of Paradise, and of reward. Just as the beggar who can weep has a greater chance of success ( Kādīʾ al-Rīḥāʾ wa l-Buḵāʾ), Ibn Ḥadād, Die Mundarten von Khunsdr, etc., cix), so too the spiritual beggar, through weeping, hopes to arouse the compassion of God and thus, perhaps, to undergo...
here and now some part of his future punishment. “Between Hell and Paradise”, one text has it (Hilīya, 7, 149), “there lies a vast desert that only the bakkārūn can traverse”.

Prayer (including ritual prayer), thinking of God, reciting Kurān and hadith, sermons, edifying stories, pious discourses, meditative contemplation — these constitute the occasions for weeping. We learn that the pious Muslim would pass the night and weep until morning in solitary meditation over one or the other of those passages of the Kurān that deal mainly with the punishment of the sinner.

At times there is weeping in prayers of supplication, often at the Ka’ba, clinging to the kiswah or before the Black Stone, frequently too in burial grounds at the sight of the tombs. Kurān-readers (burrā’), reciters of the hadith preachers and narrators of edifying stories (bussādī, sing. bāsī), during their performance give free course to their tears, and often incite their audience to weep, or they just make them shed tears. One bāsī is said to have asked his audience, before each discourse: “Lend me your tears!” (Hilīya, 5, 112). Special gatherings (mahkādir, sing. mahādir) were held, in which there was much weeping, followed by a meal (Hilīya, 2, 347). Two pious Muslims, encountering each other, might enter into a discourse about religion and shed tears over it. Muḥammad b. Sūkra and Dārā b. Murra are said to have met regularly each Friday for this purpose (Hilīya, 5, 4 and 5, 91). Badī‘, Shumayt and Khamas came together on one occasion in the house belonging to one of them and said: “Let us weep today over the cool water (that we shall be lacking on the Day of Judgement)” (Hilīya, 6, 213). The long lament of a weeper (with the characteristic wāyīkh) can be found in Hilīya, 4, 255-266, the mucūm sharīf of a supposed Israelite in “Uyām, 2, 284, and a religious discussion between three weepers in Hilīya, 10, 163.

The most incredible stories are reported concerning the amount of tears that a weeper was able to shed: one of them wept at times for three days and nights on end, others cried until their beards or their cushions were soaked, others again drenched entire sacks of sand with their tears. The tears of one weeper were hearded by angels; another, after weeping, sat in such a puddle that he was thought to have carried out his ablutions there. One of them, pouring out tears on the ground, caused grass to sprout; another wept on purpose into a dram (sarrāb). In some weepers the flow of tears furrowed deep lines in their cheeks, others had their eyelashes and eyelids fall off, others again had their ribs deformed, and their eyes became weak-sighted or blind. Cases of fainting and even of death are mentioned.

The ability to weep was held to be a special privilege (fatūla) and a sign of true religious fervour and divine grace. “Not every seeker can weep” (‘Abd Allāh Anṣārī Harawi, RAūdū, Tehran 1315, 51). Ābū Bakr, at the sight of some Yemenites who were weeping at a recital of the Kurān, called out: “Thus were we too, until our hearts were hardened” (Džāibīs, Bayām, 3, 153). Āmir b. ‘Abd Kays once struck himself in despair on the eyes and exclaimed: “Dry, paralysed, never to be wet again!” (Bukhālā, 5). Dārānī, the inability to weep is a sign of abandonment by God (Sulaml, Tābādāl-āl-Sśliyha, Cairo 1933, 82). Yūsuf b. Ḥusayn al-Rāzī saw in the fact that he no longer wept during the reading of the Kurān a sign that his countrymen might perhaps be right to call him a ṭilīh (Hilīya, 10, 240). On the other hand, Ṣāḥib al-Bunārī regards the gift of weeping as a sign that God grants his prayers (Hilīya, 2, 323). Muḥammad is said to have asked God to grant him “two raining eyes that weep a flood of tears” (Hilīya, 2, 296 f., and 2, 280; Wensinck, Some Semitic Rites, 89). In this connexion, the hadith al-tabāḥī: “Weep or at least attempt to weep (or: at least pretend to do so)” enjoys general acceptance.

Among the ascetics four objections or, at least reservations have been raised against the practice of weeping, or at least to its performance as an action. Secondly, it could be considered as relieving the load of grief and an unburdening of the heart and as such was rejected. In this connexion Ṣufyān b. ‘Uyayna is said to have developed the technique of holding back the tears in his eyes by raising his head and thus, he said, retaining his sorrow longer within him (Hilīya, 9, 327). Thirdly, weeping was something outward and could therefore be simulated. The false tears of Joseph’s brothers (Surā 12,16) are mentioned as an example of this danger. Reference was also made to the supposed hadith: “The believer weeps in his heart, the hypocrite in his skull”. Since weeping is an outward manifestation, it never receives in the Sūf manuals a chapter to itself, but is treated only in passing in the chapters on sadness (ṣawān), contrition (ḥawām) and the like. The 27th chapter of ‘Abū’l-Muḥsin’s Muḥādharnāma (dar ṣifāt-i girkātan) is a special case, which does not necessarily belong here. Fourthly, many later Ṣūfīs have held it to be a sign of weakness to let themselves be overpowered by their feelings to the point of weeping.

This is not the place for a full account of the weeping of the Sūfis in the same at and at the tombs of saints, the shedding of tears amongst pilgrims at the sight of Mecca, in ‘Arafa and at the tomb of the Prophet in Medina, the weeping of the Sūfīs over their Imāms or at their tombs, the weeping of the tauswālūn (those addicted to repentance) or of the Khawāridjī, etc. But it may be indicated here that the weeping of the bakkārūn is one of the most evident links that bind together the pious asceticism of the Muslims with that of the Christians. From the early-Christian gratis lacrimarum, through the Coptic and Syrian monks and the Monks of Ephesus, Isaac of Nineveh, etc.), a direct line runs to the Islamic bakkārūn — an instance of the well-known bifurcate development: a common root in early Christianity, with, thereafter, one branch in Western Christendom (Augustine, Cassian, etc.), and the other in the East. The eastern current divides thereafter into three branches: one represents the Eastern Christian continuation through Thomas of Marga down to Barbe- braeus, etc., the other is the Jewish offshoot (Wensinck) and the third constitutes the weeping in Islamic asceticism. Islam has, it is true, overladen and indeed absorbed within itself other oriental forms of weeping (cf. the “weeping of the Magians” over Siyāwush, in Narsākāhī’s Ta’rihib-i Būhkārā, ed. Scheler, 21; the weeping over Tammuz?). Nonetheless, the Muslims themselves were well aware that their pious weeping had its origin in the Jewish-Christian sphere and illustrated it with such examples as the tears of Adam, Noah (Nūh: etymology nāḥa), Jacob, David, Solomon, John the Baptist, Jesus and numerous monks. The hadith al-tabāḥī might even go back to an utterance of Isaac of Nineveh (translated by Wensinck, 235): “If thou art no mourner in thy heart, let at least thy face be clad with mourning”. The bakkārūn mentioned by Ibn Hīšām, Sīra, ed.

BAKKÂL, etymologically "retailer of vegetables", this word has become the equivalent of the present English "grocer" taken in its widest sense. With the latter significance it has passed into Persian and Turkish, and, from Turkish, into the Balkan languages. In its etymological meaning, the word was known in the Spanish Arabic of Valencia in the 7th/13th century, glossed by olerum venditor. But in the dialect of Granada (end of the 9th/15th century), it corresponded to the Castilian regatón (= regatier), "retailer of foodstuffs in general", which was also rendered by hâddâr.

At the beginning of the 20th century, the bakîl of the Moroccan towns was essentially a retailer of fats: oil, preserved butter, meat preserved in fat; he sold, in addition, honey, soft soap, olives in lemon juice, tea sugar and candles.

It is doubtful whether this extension of the word bakîl is of long standing. Nearly everywhere, before the 20th century, the grocer (sansu lato) was named either after the basic foodstuff which he sold (with or without vegetables), or after certain methods of his trade.

Algerians had its sakikîri "sugar-seller"; Tunis its 'sarfîr [q.v.], literally "perfume-seller". As regards the Cairo of the first half of the 10th century, E. W. Lane only knew the sâyîd "seller of oil, butter, cheese, honey, etc.". In Syria, the usual term was sakînî 'seller of preserved butter'. Elsewhere, the grocer of the towns (sensu lato) was often considered as being the "shopkeeper", the fundamental "seller". At Granada, bakîl and hâddâr were equivalent to sâbîh "market-seller"; and the feminine sâbîhîn had as its Arabic synonym hâddâra and as its Castilian equivalent: kausera "seller of beans". In earlier days, in Constantinople and Tunis, the sâbîh used to sell oil, preserved butter, honey, dates, pickled olives, etc.

Considered as being the "shopkeeper" par excellence, the grocer also received the name of hâuwînî (with variants) among the rural populations of Algeria and Constantinople. The East, sporadically, used the terms dákîhînî and dukhîngî (Mystic Treatises by Isaac of Nineveh (ibid. xi, (1936), 54 ff.; F. MEIER).

In Arabic-speaking Spain had mu'âlîdî, lit. "treating, developing", with the sense of "retailer of fruit and vegetables". Dozy's translation, in his Supplement, should be corrected on this point.

The retailer of vegetables is called, according to the country, hâddâr, hûdrî or hâmîdrî. Spices are, in general, sold by the 'sarfîr, in addition to perfumes ('îfîr) and drugs; his trade comprises also small items of stationery, haberdashery and hardware.

For various reasons, the calling of grocer is often followed by people having the same ethnic origin. In the towns of Morocco (except at Tetuan, until recently), the bakîl is almost exclusively a Berber (pl. jûlhûk) of Sûs, of the Ammeln tribe. In Algeria, the people of the Mzaû enjoy the same de facto monopoly. In the East, the modern bakîl is often a Greek.

Bibliography: W. Marçais, Textes arabes de Tanger, 233; Dozy, Suppl., under words mentioned in the article. (G. S. COLIN)

BÂKKÂR, (A.) Sappan wood, an Indian dye-wood obtained from the Caesalpinia Sappan L. Al-Dinawari remarks that the word frequently occurs in ancient Arabic poetry, although the tree concerned (in Lewin's ed read hâddâr instead of hâddâr according to later quotations) is not found in Arabia. It is a native of India and the country of the Zandji. Its stem and branches are red being used, in decoction, as a dye.

The word is said to derive from Sanskrit pattaunga and probably entered Arabic through the Persian. Its foreign origin was recognised by the Arab philologists who based their view on the assertion that the paradigm concerned was not otherwise attested in the language. As an Arabic equivalent they generally indicate 'andâm which, however, rather denotes the dragon's-blood, a red gum exuding from certain trees. The wrong identification can be attributed to the fact that both bakkâm and 'andâm were used as a red dye.

Muslim pharmacologists indicate several medicinal applications of the sappan wood. It brings about the cicatrisation of wounds, desiccates ulcers and stops bleeding. Its juice makes the skin tender and embellishes its colour. The root yields a poison which works quickly.

Bibliography: 'Abû Hanîfâ al-Dinawari, The Book of Plants (Lewin), no. 80 and p. 23; Dâ'îd al-Aštâkî, Taghkira, Cairo 1324, i, 74; Ghâfîlî (Meyerhof-Sohby), no. 123; Ibn al-Baytâr, Dhîmû'î, Bâlik 1291, i, 103; Ibn Sida, Muhassass xi, 212; Löw, Aram. Pflanzennamen, index s.v.; idem, Die Flora der Juden iii, 128 f.; idem, ZS 1 (1922), 145 f.; Tuhfat al-Abhâb (Reinau-Coin), 139f. (L. KOPP)

BAKKÂR, a fortified island in the river Indus lying between the towns of Sukkur and Rohri. Its importance was noted by Ibn Bâşîqî who visited it during the reign of Muhammed b. Tughîk. In 1522, Shâh Beg, the founder of the Arghun dynasty, made
it his capital. When, in 1540, his son, Shâh Husayn, refused to grant an asylum to the fugitive emperor Humâyûn the latter unsuccessfully attempted to capture this island fortress. In 1574, in the time of Akbar, it was annexed to the Mughal empire. The best and fullest account of the Mughal conquest of Sind is to be found in Ta'rikh-i Ma'sûmî of Mir Muhammad Ma'sûm, an inhabitant of Bakîr. In 1736 Bakîr was captured by the Kâhlora rulers of Sind. It later fell into the hands first of the Afghans and then of the rular of Khayyurp. It was occupied by the British in 1839 and became their chief arsenal in Sind during the First Afghan War (1839-42). From 1865 to 1876 it was used as a jail.

**Bibliography:** A. W. Hughes, Gazetteer of Province of Sind (1876); E. H. Attken, Gazetteer of Province of Sind (1907). (C. COLIN DAVIES)

**BAKÎR, BAKKAR.** Arabic-speaking nomads of the Sûdân, occupying territories from Lake Chad to the White Nile between 9° and 13° N. Their livelihood is the herding of cattle (bakar), whence their name. The dry season is spent in the southern river-lands. With the rains, they move northwards to the seasonal grasslands. Grain sown on this journey is harvested on the return. Bakkara origins are obscure; the genealogies reflect existing groupings rather than give evidence of descent. They are probably connected with the Djibaya, with whom they brought into Nubia from Egypt in the 14th century. From the Nile, nomadic groups apparently made their way by the 17th century to the lands between Waddâl and Lake Chad. Fusion with other elements from North Africa may account for the tradition of a Hilîl origin among some Bakkara. Penetrating southwards into regions unsuitable for camel-breeding, they turned to cattle. Groups pushing eastwards, to the south of the cultivated areas of Waddâl, Dâr Fur and Kordofan, (which were under Islamised dynasties) formed an Arab wedge between these sultanates and the pagan tribes who retreated southwards. The Bakkara were uneasy vassals of these sultanates to whom they paid tribute, migrating on occasion beyond the power of their overlords. Slave-raids on the southern pagans and consequent intermittent war have affected the physical type of the Bakkara. During the 18th and 19th centuries, the powerful Rizayká Bakkara were under the suzerainty of Dâr Fur. Their quarrel with the Sudanese slave-trader, al-Zubayr Rahma Mansur, led to the Egyptian conquest of Dâr Fur in 1874. The Bakkara assisted Muhammad Ahmad al-Mahdi [q.v.] to overthrow Egyptian rule but proved refractory to the Mahdist administration. The Khalifa 'Abd Allah b. Muhammad [q.v.], himself a Bakkârî of the Ta'isha tribe, used the Bakkara as troops and selected from them his chief assistants. In 1888-9 he compelled the Bakkara of Dâr Fur to migrate to Omdurman and its vicinity, both to support his regime and to assume. It was refused, and an army from the nearest loyal province, Diyarbakr, marched on Baghdad to restore legitimacy and order. It was then in the hands of some of the loyalist forces which were the last to return, after which Bakr decided, with cynical treachery, to invite Shâh 'Abbâs of Persia to re-occupy Irâk, thus compelling Hâfiz Ahmad, of Diyarbakr, with great reluctance, to confirm him as Pasha of the province, since he alone could now prevent a shameful cession of Ottoman territory. The loyalist forces withdrew, those of Persia approached the city. Bakr refused to open the gates, and after negotiations full of callous duplicity the Shâh reduced it by siege. This was ended by the treacherous surrender of the city by the Sâ bâsît's own son. Baghdad was sacked, hundreds massacred and Bakr put to a terrible death; Irâk remained under Persian rule until its reconquest by Sultan Murâd in 1048/1638.

**Bibliography:** S. H. Longrigg, Four Centuries of Modern Iraq (1923), 51-7, and authorities quoted by him (p. 51 footnote): especially Murta'ah Naqizzâda, Gushân-i Khulâfa (Longrigg, 327).

**BAKîR B. WÂ'L, BAKR B. WÂIL,** ancient Arabic group of tribes in Central, East, and (later) Northern Arabia. The Bakr belonged to the same people—later known as Rabîʿa—as the 'Abd al-Kays [q.v.]. Their place in the tribal genealogy is three grades lower than that of these. The Taʿlabá (b. Ṭâlabá) are to be re-
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garded as the core of the Bakr. Joshua Stylites (§ 57) mentions them under the year 503 as being the leading tribe of the northern Arabian Kinda Empire, and shortly afterwards they appear in a South Arabian inscription (Ryckmans 510, Le Mouton 1953). In the genealogy of Bakr, the Thâlaba are on a level with the tribes of 'Idlî and Hanîfî b. Lughaym, with the Yâshkur b. Bakr three grades above them. The Thâlaba were themselves subdivided into the Banî Shaybân, Dhûhlî, Taymîllâh (Taymîllâhî), and Kaysî. The Bakr tribes lived in the area of al-Yâmâma. At that time, this embraced al-'Ird = Wâdî Hanîfâ, and its tributaries Luhâ (Shaib Ha on the maps), Nisâb, and al-Sulâyy, the district of al-Khârdjî to the south, and the district of al-Witr with its tributaries north of the watershed. Al-Ḥadîr, the capital of al-Yâmâma (near al-Riyâḍ of today) was originally in the hands of the Hanîfâ. Later on, members of other Bakr tribes settled there too. The second largest town, Diâwî (Diâwî al-Yâmâma, later al-Khârdjîma), south-east of al-Ḥadîr, was also largely inhabited by the Hanîfâ, who likewise owned the oases Kurârn and Malham on the far side of the watershed. Colonies of the Hanîfâ could be found further to the north-west in the regions of al-Wâshîm and al-Sudâyâr. The Dhûhlî b. Thâlaba lived, in (Karyat Banîl) Sadûs, named after one of their sub-tribes, on a wâdî which runs into the Witr, the Kays b. Thâlaba among other places, in Manîfâ, to the south of Riyâḍ. There is also evidence of villages of the Yâshkur, 'Idlî and Shaybân. Diâwî and al-Ḥadîr were sites of an ancient culture, which is linked with the vanished tribes of Tasmî and Dîdîs in later legends. Pâityles (obelisks) could still be seen in Ḥadîr in early Islamic times, but in 1245 these had been destroyed during the raid by a member of the southern Arabian dynasty of Hassân (al-A'shâ, no. 13, 16-21).

Date palms were cultivated in all oases, but in the 'Ird valley and in al-Khârdjî grain was grown. In good years corn was sent to Mecca, but in bad years it was not even sufficient for local consumption (Mutâlammîs, ed. Völlers, no. 5, 8; al-A'shâ, no. 19, 24; ed. Gn. Hanîfâ, no. 1953). In the above-cited book. The Bakr villages were rather close together, there were sometimes feuds between them during which the palm groves were burned down (al-A'shâ, no. 15, 56-57; 38, 9-11; Yâkût, s.v. al-Mubarraka, (below Sadûs). Some Bakr escaped these conditions by leaving and becoming mercenaries ( Aws b. Ḥagîjîr, ed. Geyer, no. 14; Mutâlammîs, ed. Lyall, no. 170), many took up the nomadic life—which was later on embraced by considerable parts of their tribes.

It is possible that this movement was started by the appearance of the Kinda in the second half of the 5th century (amend art. ʿAbd al-Kays, line 13: from 6th to 5th century). We have no definite information about the routes which the nomadic Bakr followed at that time, although later sources (Ryckmans 510; Mufaddalîyyâ, 430, 13) indicate that they went to the west (and east?) of al-Yâmâma. During this period there was a long feud between the Bakr and their brother tribe, the Taghîb, which only came to an end in the middle of the 6th century, in a peace concluded under the patronage of Mecca, in Diçu l-Madâjas, outside the Haram (al-Kârizî b. Hâlîzâ, ed. Arnold, 66). The Yawm Kulâb 1 (a battle between two heirs of the Kinda empire, in about 530, at Thâlaba, S.W. of Duwâdâmî) is rightly regarded as an episode in

that feud. Shortly afterwards, the Taghîb—whose zone of migration was then from Sâdîr in the upper Sirr, to Naftû near the Persian Gulf (Mufaddalîyyâ, 430, 13; Hârîfî, Mu.îsî, 79)—left central Arabia, and settled in the steppes on the near side of the lower Euphrates. These, where they were overwhelmed by the Bakr, which followed them, but they stopped before Čaţa Falâj. Place names mentioned then and afterwards by the poets seem to show that the routes taken by the nomadic Bakr in the following decades ran from north to south. The area which was later vacated by the Taghîb and Bakr on the near side of the Tuwayk bend was probably before 530 inter-}

spersed with Tamîl, whose home was along both sides of the Taarrt. After 530, they spread over the Tuwayk to eastern Arabia. Since the nomadic routes of both groups crossed, peace had somehow to be maintained, and there is in the next decades in fact little mention of fights between the Bakr and the Tamîl.

A number of outstanding Shaykh families emerged in the period in which the changing relationships between the Bakr and the Taghîb, the Tamîl, and the kings of the Kinda and of al-Hira, demanded leaders of political experience. The hero of E. Brâûnlîch's Bestâm ibn Qais (Leipzig 1923) is a member of one of these families, the Dîçu l-Dhîdûs. Connexions with al-Hira were responsible for an early development of poetry, especially amongst the Kays b. Thâlaba, as witness the works of al-Murâkkîsh (the legend concerning him appears for the first time in Tarâfa, Six Poets, no. 13, 14-19, an imitation by a later poet of al-Hira; N. B. the 'younger Murâkkîsh' never existed, as is evident from al-Parâzad, Nine Poets, 200, 15, to mention only one witness), those of Amr b. Kâmûfa (q.v.), who never journeyed to Byzantium with Imrâb b. Kays, those of Tarâfa, and those of al-A'shâ, who lived on into the 7th century. Poetry also flourished among the Yâshkur, whose home was the city of Bâlîlîa, belonging to the region of the middle Euphrates.

The nomadic Bakr entered a new period when the Taghîb vacated the steppes on the lower Euphrates, migrating up the river, afterwards living in the area of al-Ḥadîr, where, possibly, Kulhûm had killed the king of al-Hira, Amr b. Hind in 569-70. About 580, a poet says (Muf., no. 41, 1): 'And Bakr—all 'Irâk's broad plain is theirs : but if so they will, a shield comes to guard their homes from lofty Yamama's dales'. Some ten years later, the Tamîl, and especially the Yarbûb, began to press forward, in order to pitch their tents in al-Ḥarn during the spring. This gave rise to mutual raids, some of which, taking place between 605 and 615 have been described by Brâûnlîch (in the above-mentioned book). A great deal is known concerning the tribes of the nomadic Bakr at this period, and also something about the area they covered. The tribes concerned were the Shaybân, 'Idlî, Kays, and Taymîllâh b. Thâlaba. The 'Idlî went as far as what later became the Kufan pilgrim route in the west, and as far as Tukây, in the east; the Shaybân pitched their tents to the north and south of the line al-Kârima (near the Bay of Kuwayt)—Ra's al-'Ayn = al-Busayya (?)—Salâmân, and the Kays b. Thâlaba south-east of these, between al-Musannah (Yâkût, erroneously al-Muhabînna) and Ra's al-'Ayn (al-A'shâ, no. 14, 20, 29). The Taymîllâh, Kays, and 'Idlî formed the confederation of Lahazim, in order not to be overwhelmed by the Shaybân. It is not exactly known where the northern Bakr wintered, but the Kays b. Thâlaba appear...
to have alternated—at least in the eighties—between al-Yamama and the north (al-'A'sha, no. 32, an early poem, especially v. 48). The Shaybān occasionally went as far as the oases of Bahrayn in eastern Arabia, whilst the 'Idjl appear to have remained in the north. During the summer, the tribes congregated where water could be found on this side of the Ta'if between 'Ayn Sayd and Abū Ghar. It is in this area that the famous battle of Dhu Kar, in which the Dhuhl b. Shaybān repelled the advance guard of the Persian knights of Hāmzār (q.v.) was fought around the year 605 (al-'A'sha, no. 40). In spite of this, the Bakr soon came under Persian influence again. At the same time, the hostility between Bakr and Tamīm in the north spread to Central Arabia, where the prince of Djiaw, Hawdha b. 'All, of the Banū Ḥanifa, a vassal of the Persians, was hard pressed by the Tamīm. The prince of Djiaw was quite different: the case of the former Ghazū (see al-Aṣnam, no. 39, 47, later poets, unless one counts al-Aṣnam), the caliph Thumama b. Musaylima, was hard pressed by the Tamīm. Their last remarkable personality was the general and statesman Ma'n b. Zā'da (q.v.), of the Dhuhl b. Shaybān.

Whilst the Bakr disappeared early from the steppes of Basra, they remained for a longer time near Kūfā. The 'Idjl retained their nomadic area, and later extended it towards the northeast; the Shaybān, however, migrated towards the north-east, as far as the waters of al-Laṣaf, not far from Kūfā, and later moved largely to the area of Mosul, in the north, where they settled along both banks of the Tigris. Three verses that have strayed into the irdās of 'Amr b. Kāmi'a (no. 16) describe the homesickness of a girl on this trek into foreign lands, to the Sātdāmā (possibly the Djabal Makūb, opposite the town); and reports of Abū Mīkhnafl (Tabari, ii) concerning the noble leader of the Khārbitītīs, Shubāb b. Yazd (of the Dhuhl b. Shaybān; killed in 629) describe between Bedouin life and urban civilisation at that time. The Bakr spread thence to the north as far as Diyar Bakr (a late name) and Adharbājdijān.

The Shaybān developed once again into a large nomad tribe. In spring and summer, they pitched their tents between the Upper and the Lower Zāb, in winter they moved as far as the area below Kūfā. During the 9th century, they carried out frequent raids into the plain of Mosul, which resulted in a campaign against them in 893, led by the caliph al-Mu'taḍid. In the 11th century, they advanced into the cultivated land of Irāk, but disappeared at the beginning of the next century. The name Rabi'a began to supplant the tribal names Bakr and 'Abd al-Šays in Basra and in Kūrāsān, and the names Bakr and Taghlib in the eastern Dijāra = Diyar Rabi'a. This also happened in Arabia. The royal family of Āl Su'ūd traces its family tree back to the Rabi'a.

earliest biography devoted to him is to be found in al-Dhahabi, Misa, Cairo 1325, 1, 53. Al-Dhahabi indignantly describes al-Bakri as a liar and inventor of untrue stories, whose books were available at the booksellers (and, presumably, enjoyed good sales). Considering the additional facts that a MS. of one of his works (Vatican Borg. no. 125) is dated in the end of the thirteenth century are quoted in the Verzeichniss biographie of al-Bakri in the Biographie des Arab. Hss. (or Berlin, no. 9624), al-Bakri would seem to have lived in the latter half of the thirteenth century. While this conclusion must remain highly speculative for the time being, there exist no cogent reasons for doubting the historicity of al-Bakri’s elusive personality. If the occasional epithet of “Basran Preacher” can be relied upon, he was active in Iraq.

It is by no means certain that all the works attributed to al-Bakri go back to one and the same author. For instance, the biography of Muhammad quotes actual books and authors, while the other works are vague and confused in their references to sources and prefer fictitious names in the rare cases where transmitters are mentioned. Furthermore, it apparently was not yet known to al-Dhahabi, and a reference to it was added by Ibn Hadjar. Lisân, i, 202, in the biography he copied from al-Dhahabi. The relationship of the various works or recensions to each other has not yet been investigated, and in order to reach safe conclusions, it will be necessary to study all the numerous MSS. preserved in widely dispersed libraries.

**Bibliography:** Knowledge of al-Bakri in the West begins with L. Marracci, cf. C. A. Nallino, Raccolta di scritti, ii, 115. Cf., further, R. Pare, Die legendäre Maghātī-Literatur, Tübingen 1930, 155-58; Brockelmann, i, 445; S I, 616 (basic but disfigured by many mistakes). A fatwâ forbidden the reading of his biography of Muhammad, by Ibn Hadjar al-Hayyamī, al-Fatwâl al-faddithīyya, Cairo 1335/1934, 116. See further Magāzīl and Tabīrī.

**AL-BAKRĪ, ABU ‘L-SURUQR, name of two Arab historians of the notable family of Egyptian shaykhs of the Bakriyya farīqa (of the Shāhīdī order).**

1. **MUHAMMAD b. ABI ‘L-SURUQR, b. MUHAMMAD b. ʿALI al-ṢIDDĪQI al-MISQID, d. 1026/1619.** His works include an addition to a universal history in two parts (Qayrān al-ʿAbhr, Nuhat al-Ābhr, also abridged under the title of Tuhfat (or Tāghīra al-ṣūrat Offline (this work is sometimes attributed to his uncle Muhammad b. Zayn al- ʿĀlidīn b. Muhammad b. ʿAll, Shams al-Dīn Abu l-Ḥasan, d. 1087/1676: cf. Muḥībī, 1st, ii, 453), a biography of the Shīʿī shaykh al-ʿAdjamī al-Kurānī (al-Durr al-Dīmanī) and a Sūfī treatise (Durūr al-ʿAʿlī)

**Bibliography:** Brockelmann, ii, 383; S II, 409; Wüstenfeld, Geschichtsschreiber, no. 365; Baiblinger, 188; works mentioned in the article.


**Bibliography:** ʿAlī, F. Fatḥī Ḥubūr al-Khitāt al-Tawḥīyiyya al-Dījāla, Bālāk 1306, iii, 127; Wüstenfeld, Die Geschichtsschreiber der Araber, no. 520; Brockelmann, ii, 334, 382, S II, 481-2. (C. Brockelmann)


**Bibliography:** ʿAlī, F. Fatḥī Ḥubūr al-Khitāt al-Tawḥīyiyya al-Dījāla, Bālāk 1306, iii, 127; Wüstenfeld, Die Geschichtsschreiber der Araber, no. 520; Brockelmann, ii, 334, 382, S II, 481-2. (C. Brockelmann)
(Oct. 1722) to Istanbul and reached it on 17 Sha'bân/24 May 1723. Four years later he returned to Jerusalem. After making the pilgrimage to Mecca in 1148/1735 which he had planned as early as 1129/1721 but had given up on account of a quarrel with his uncle, he went to Istanbul for the second time in 1148/1735. Four years later he returned by ship, via Alexandria and Cairo. In the following year, in connexion with a second pilgrimage, he went to Diyar Bakr where he stayed eight months. After spending another eleven months in Nablus, he again returned to Jerusalem in Shawlân ii/24 May 1740. He died on 18 Râbi'â I 1152/8 April 1749 in Cairo when on his third pilgrimage. His numerous mystic treatises, prayers and poems which are given by Brockelmann (see infra, cf. also al-Ihliyâm al-Ihdiyya wa'Mawârid al-Bakhîyya, see Vollers, Katalog der islam. u. hebr. Handschriften in der Universitätsbibliothek zu Leipzig no. 850 f. and al-Wâstîyya al-Djâdidât lil-Sâlihîn Tar`kh al-Khawâsînîyya, ibid. iv; E. Littmann, A List of Arabic MSS. in Princeton University Library, no. 351 b.) are all still unprinted except a Madjîdî Salâwât wa`l-Awrâd (Cairo 1308). He also wrote an account of his first journey from Damascus to Jerusalem in 1122/1711 entitled al-Khmrâ al-Hastîyya fi 'l-Ri`ba al-Kudîyya (Abiwardî, Verzeichnis der Handschriften, no. 6149). A journey to Damascus and his stay there were described in his al-Mudâma al-Shâmiyya fi 'l-Madhâma al-Shâmiyya (ibid. 6148).


(C. BROCKELMANN)

BAKRÎYYA, a Dervish order which, according to d’Ohsson, took its name from Abû Bakr Walfâ, who died in Aleppo in 902/1496 or 909/1503-4. According to Rûn, Marabouls et Khouan, 271, they are a branch of the Shâhdîyâ (pet).

BAKRÎYYA, a collective noun denoting all those who claim descent from Abû Bakr. In Egypt, the head of this family, the Shâkh al-Bakrî, has, since 1811, been the nabi of the descendants of the Prophet: (shâkhî), and, since 1906, the shâkh al-mahdiyyâh, that is to say, the shâkh of all the religious orders. See Pârû, iv, 42 ff.; L. Massignon, Annuaire du monde musulman*, 1934, 274.

BAKÔ, lat. pactum, hell. máxítov. In the Hellenistic world used both for a compact of mutual obligations and its connected payments. The Arabs designated with this expression what they regarded a tribute yielded by Christian Nubia. This country, because of its geographical situation and the bellicosity of its inhabitants, withstood the first impetus of the Muslim conquest, and after hard fighting under `Amr b. al-`As (20 or 21/642-3), who ultimately had to recall his troops, his successor, `Abd Allah b. Sa`îd b. Abî Sarh, `Uthmân’s governor over Egypt, made a treaty with Nubia (31/652) on a bilateral basis, falling outside the normal sulh treaties known by the jurists. The two contracting parties agreed on bestowing free passage through their respective countries, while the right to take up fixed abode was to be prohibited. The Nubians bound themselves to repatriate fugitive coloni, slaves, and poll-tax paying dhimmis. Besides they agreed to defray the costs of the maintenance of a mosque to be built in Dunkûla (Dongola). Moreover they were to deliver annually 360 slaves, originally at least their own prisoners of war, and the custom developed that they paid a further 40 head for the Arab officials taking care of the transaction. The Muslims, on the other hand, were obliged to yield a corresponding amount of wheat and other cereals, and textiles. The Muslim jurists of a later time could not fit this into the frame of the system, and a tradition—or at least an interpretation of an existing one—sprang up that the Muslim quota originated from the restitution of the 40 slaves, after having been exchanged for wine and other supplies, as appears from the exposition of Ibn `Abd al-Hakâm (Futûh Misr, ed. C. C. Torrey, 189). The political state is otherwise called a hûdma, true. Malik b. Anas thought it a juridical sulh, but a majority of his colleagues knew that it was only a treaty of non-aggression, and that the Musulmân were not bound not to defend Nubia against any third party. The treaty was confirmed by subsequent rulers; al-Tabarî makes special mention of `Umar II (Annales, v, 2593). Later the Nubians seem not to have paid their part very punctually, probably because of lack of prisoners of war, with the consequence that they had to replace the wanting number with their own countrymen. The animals for zoological gardens and for medical experiments which are included in the quota in later times may have made up for such deficiencies. Under al-Mahdi and al-Mu’tasîm we hear of readjustments; under the latter, when Nubia was on the verge of breaking the contract, it was found out that the tribute of the Nubians fell below what was paid by the Arabs. That the latter could not muster the force for altering this radically is seen from the fact that a lenient course was followed, allowing the Nubians to pay the stipulated quota every third year only. On the other hand, the request to have the garrison in al-`Aṣr on Nubian territory withdrawn was not granted. That was the place where the quotas were handed over. It was only under Baybars al-Bundûkîdar (674/1276) that Nubia was subjugated for good, and part of it came fully under Muslim rule, while native petty princes managed a more or less free position. After that time Islamisation went on rapidly, and no doubt the term bašt fell into desuetude, having lost its meaning under the altered circumstances.


(F. LENKKEGAARD)

BAKÛ, a town and district on the W. shore of the Caspian Sea, on the peninsula of Aspheron (Abâh- râk). The name is currently said to be from Persîan bakhshâb, ‘wind-beaten’, which is appropriate to the local conditions, but this derivation is not certain. The form Bâkû appears already in the 4th/10th century (Hudud al-Âlam). Another early, authentic pronunciation is Bakûyâ (Abû Dulaf, al-Bâkûwî). Other forms (Bakû, Bâkûh) are found in the Arabic geographers.

The early history of Bâkû is obscure, though the locality seems to be mentioned in antiquity (cf. J. Marquart, Erinnâr, 97). It is perhaps to be identified with the Gangara or Gaetara of Ptolemy (Geographia, ed. C. Müller, i, ii, 292). Bâkû is not apparently mentioned in accounts of the early Muslim conquests, nor by Ibn Khurrahâd al-bihî (3rd/9th century), but thereafter it comes fairly into view
and is known by name to the 10th century Muslim geographers, being mentioned by Abū Dulaf in his Risāla al-Thānīyya (cf. V. Minorsky in Oriens, v, 1914, 423). Abū Ḥasan Abū l-Balad, who has to have reached Baku by 967, as he calls it, from the S. and found there a spring of petroleum, the lease (badīla) of which was 1000 dirhams a day, with another well adjacent producing white petroleum, which flowed unceasingly day and night and whose lease (damān) was also 1000 dirhams. These details are repeated in several much later accounts, notably those of Yākūt, i, 477, and al-Kawākib, Abū l-Balad, 389. About the same time, Abū Dulaf, al-Masʻūdī several times mentions Baku. He gives an account of a Russian raid on the Caspian littoral circa 301/913-914, in the course of which the invaders reached "the naphtha (or petroleum) coast in the country of Shirvān, which is known as Baku" (Murūd, ii, 21). Al-Masʻūdī also speaks of Baku as a place from which ships went back and forward from Dīl (Dīlkan), Daylam, etc. on the Caspian, if not also from Atīl (q.v.), the Khazar capital on the Volga (ibid., 25). In the Tamž, a later work (written in 345/956) he again speaks of Baku, its "white naphtha" and its volcanoes (fatḥm) (BGA., vii, 60).

The Ḥudād al-ʻAlam (written in 372/982 but making use of earlier sources) knows of Baku as a small town, lying on the coast near the mountains. All the petroleum in the Daylamān country came from there (Ḥudād al-ʻAlam, 145, cf. 411: the Daylamites used it for a kind of flame thrower). In another passage (ibid., 77) the waters of the Kur and Aras rivers are said to "flow between Mūkān and Baku to join the Khazar sea (Caspian)" where regions rather than cities are perhaps intended. Since it lay N. of the Aras, Baku was usually reckoned as in Shirvān, but according to al-Mukaddasī, 376, in 375/986, who appears to be the first to mention its excellent harbour, Baku was distinct from Shirvān and both were included in Arrān, to which al-Mukaddasī gives a much greater extension than most Muslim writers (ibid., 51, 374). Al-Īṣāqī (cf. Cairo Second Risāla) (circa 340/951) mentions Baku and already knows of its troleum (190).

The best description of mediaeval Baku is by a native of the place, ʻAbd al-Raḥīm Baku’i, who wrote in 806/1402, shortly after the campaigns of Tīmūr in this quarter. The town was built of stone, actually on rocks, close to the sea, which at the time of writing had carried away part of the walls and reached the vicinity of the principal mosque. The air was good, but there was shortage of water. Since in consequence the district was infertile, provisions had to be brought from Shirvān and Mūkān, though there were gardens situated at a distance from the town, producing figs, grapes and pomegranates, to which the inhabitants went in summer. There were two well-built fortresses in the town, of which the larger, on the seaward side, had resisted the attacks of the Tatars, although the other, which was very high, had been partially destroyed during the sieges. Day and night, in winter, high winds blew, sometimes so strongly as to sweep men and animals into the sea. At Baku there were petroleum wells from which daily more than 200 mule-loads were drawn. A by-product in the form of a hard yellow substance was used as fuel in private houses and baths. At a jārāq from the town there was a perennial source of fire, said to be a sulphur-mine, near which was a village inhabited by Christians, who made and sold lime. There were also salt-mines, the produce of which was exported to other countries. Nearby was an island to which people went to hunt sharks. The skins when suitably prepared were filled with petroleum, after which they were loaded on ships to be taken to the different countries. There was also a considerable trade in silk. In some years a great fire was seen emerging from the sea, visible for a day's journey. The inhabitants were Sunni Muslims.

Politically, Baku at most times appears to have been subject to the Shirvān Shāhs. The last dynasty of Shirvān Shāhs came to an end only in 957/1550, when the Safawī Shāh Tāhrār occupied Shirvān. After vicissitudes in the course of which it belonged for a short time (1583-1606) to the Ottoman Turks, Baku finally became a Russian possession in 1806. Bibliography: V. Minorsky, Abū Dulaf Mis'ar b. al-Muḥāfīl's Travels in Iran (containing the Arabic text and translation of his Second Risāla), Cairo 1955, 35, cf. 72; al-Bakuwī, Talḥīs al-ʻĀkār wa-ʻAdīsī al-Makāl al-Ḵakhār, transl. D. Guignes, Notices et extraits, ii, 509-510; Le Strange, 1801.

(D. M. Dunlop)

Baku under Russian domination, was at first very slow to develop. In 1807 the town had only 5,000 inhabitants, grouped in the old citadel. The naphtha deposits, the exploitation of which was a monopoly of the former masters of Baku, became Crown property and the first drilling took place in 1842 on the Apsheron peninsula. In 1872 exploitation became free and the deposits were sold by auction. This period marks the beginning of the town's rapid growth. This development was favoured by the building in 1877-78 of the pipe-line connecting Baku with the oil fields of the Apsheron peninsula. In 1883 the town was connected by railway with Transcaucasia and the interior of Russia. Finally in 1907 the pipe-line was completed linking Baku with Batum on the Black Sea. In 1859 Baku had only still only 13,000 inhabitants, but in 1879 the "oil rush" brought the number up to 112,000. On the eve of the Revolution, Baku, which provided 95% of all Russia's oil, had already a population of 300,000.

During the Revolution, Baku achieved the status of capital of independent ʻAḏharbayjān (31 July 1918 to 28 April 1920). Taken by the Red Army on 28 April 1920, it was henceforth the capital of the ʻAḏharbayjān Soviet Socialist Republic. Under the Soviet régime, the town continued to grow. In 1939 it was the fifth town of the Soviet Union with 809,300 inhabitants, but in 1979 the "oil rush" brought the number up to 112,000. On the eve of the Revolution, Baku, which provided 95% of all Russia's oil, had already a population of 300,000.

Baku is also an important University centre, the seat of the State University and of the ʻAḏharbayjān Academy of Sciences.

(A. Bennigsen)

BA'KUBA, more correctly (but not now currently) Ba'kūbā, from the Aramaic Baya'qūbā, or Jacob's House, a town situated 40 miles N.E. of Baghdād (40° 37' E, 33° 45' N), on the site of a very ancient pre-Islamic settlement, was in Caliphate times described as on the west bank of the Nahrawān-Diyālā (q.v.) main canal. It formed an important station on the Baghdād-Khurāsān trunk road, and served as chief town of the Upper Nahrawān district. Under ʻAbbāsid rule the place was highly prosperous, its date and fruit gardens famous, and the surrounding country fertile and populous, with scores of villages. Modern Ba'kūba is an Irākī provincial town with an Arab mixed Sunni and Şī'ī population of some
8,000. It is the headquarters of the liwa of Diyala with dependent fradds of Mandali, Khalis, Khanlpin, and Ba'koba itself; the last-named ba'la contains the important nakhayas of Rīmān and Makdādiyya (formerly Shahrubān). The town is prosperous, partly transformed by modern buildings, streets and services, and good communications; the Baghdad-Irbil line of ʻIrāq Railways here crosses the Diyala by a high-level bridge.


BAKUSAYA, a town and lesser administrative district under the 'Abbasids. With four others it formed part of the rich and populous circle (astān) east of Tigris, that of Bāţiyan Khusrav, in which the town of Bandāndān (now vanished without trace) was a principal headquarters. Bākusaya is usually grouped with the adjacent district of Bādarsaya (q.v.) (the modern Badra) by the Arab geographers, and like it enjoyed good water from the hills which mark the present Persian frontier. A modern village, within Persia, known as Baksaiyyeh, a few miles S.E. of Badra, almost certainly marks the site of Bākusaya. The latter name strongly suggests the Syriac Bā-Kussaya, and would indicate the home or district of the Kussaye, the Greek κοσσάθια of the Babylonian inscriptions. The domicile of these people was entirely in the Zagros range, and this identification is tempting. Nothing remarkable is recorded regarding the town or its inhabitants, in which (as in modern Badra) Lurish or other Iranian strains doubtless prevailed. The district is malarial, but in modern times produces a race of famous weight-lifting porters.

Bibliography: BGA, passim; ʻYākūt, i, 477; M. Streck, Babylonien nach d. Arab. Geog., i, 15; G. Hoffmann, Auszüge aus Syrischen Aheiten persischen Märtyrers (Leipzig, 1880), 61, 91; Nöldeke in ZDMG, xxviii, 101; idem, Geschichte der Perser u. Araber zur Zeit der Sassaniden (1879), 239; G. Westphal, Untersuch. über die Quellen u. die Glaubwürdigkeit der Patriarchenchroniken Mari tbn Sulaiman etc., Strassburg 1905, 121; Le Strange, 63, 80.

(M. Streck (H. Longrigg))

BA'L, an old Semitic or even Proto-Semitic word with the central meaning of “master, owner” and has been widely used in the sense of “local god” (fertiliser of the soil) and “husband” (in a society predominantly masculine). In the last century attention was vigorously drawn to the importance of this last meaning by W. R. Smith, Kinship and Marriage in early Arabia, Cambridge 1885 (2nd. ed. London 1903); but his thesis that the term itself had been borrowed by the Arabs from the Northern Semites could not be substantiated. The various meanings of the word have continued to exist in Classical Arabic with, however, a very variable vitality according to sense, period and area.

1.—In the sense of “master (of)”, ba'li was ousted in Arabic by various synonyms, so that, unlike the Hebrew ba'ali, it does not make an appearance in numerous compounds. It has survived better in the sense of “husband, spouse (of)”, thanks most probably to the use made of it in the Kur'ānic passages (ii, 228; xi, 72; xxiv, 31 twice) in the singular and in the plural (bu'ala; subsequently Classical Arabic usually uses bu'ali or bi'dil). The meaning “master” was still strongly felt: ba'li “my spouse”, in x, 72, renders the Biblical adōnî (in the mouth of Sarah, Genesis, xviii, 12; Targum Onkelos: ribōnî). For the feminine, Classical Arabic has the forms ba'lâ or ba'lat. Several verbal forms developed from this nominal meaning.

a.—The Kur'ān, xxxvvi, 125 (story of Elijah; cf. I Kings xviii, and the art. Ilyād) has contributed still more definitely to perpetuating the memory in Islam of Ba'la as a pagan deity, in spite of all the confusion and reticence of the commentators. This meaning of the word, it is true, could not hope to enjoy much success in Muslim thought as such; it is to be encountered incidentally in the medieval authors in connexion with the etymology of Ba'al-bakk (q.v.) with fictitious details concerning an ancient idol at this place. What is more remarkable is the unconscious survival of the idea of the god Baali in the two following cases:

a) The verb ba'ilu and the adjective ba'li, “(to be) lost in astonishment”, that is to say originally, as Nöldeke has shown (ZDMG, 1886, xi, 174), “(to be) possessed by Ba'lat”.

b) The terms ba'lî and ba'li to convey the idea of unwatered tillage; in a verse attributed to 'Abd Allāh b. Rawāhā, a Companion of the Prophet, (L.A., xiii, 60), we read: hānīlā lā ubālī nahlā ba'līn, wa lā sākyin .... In an expression of this kind, ba'li may retain something of the original meaning, not understood by the author of the Sūra: that of the god (male) fertilising the land (female) by rain or sub-soil water. The contrast between watered land (with terms from the same root as sīky) “dwelling or field of Baal” is well attested in the Targum and the Talmud (Jastrow, Dict. of the Talmud, b 4' and sh b y; W. R. Smith, Lectures on the Religion of the Semites, London 1927, see Index; G. Dalman, Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina, Göttingen 1932, ii, 32-33).

In Classical Arabic of the early centuries of the Hijjra, however, the term ba'li is to be encountered on several occasions meaning on its own —and not in a compound expression open to several interpretations—“unwatered cultivated land”—. In the works on jurisprudence, it is to be found with this meaning, mainly in relation to the prescribed tithe (sakīl, jindāba) on agricultural produce. Muslim Law, both Şafī and Sunnī, does in fact reduce this impost to a half tithe or a twentieth where the crop is dependent on artificial irrigation requiring some exertion; in contrast, the zakāl is actually a tenth when the produce of a ba'li is involved. In this connexion, the term appears in various recorded hadiths from the Munāṣṣa of Mālik (2nd/8th century) onwards (see Bādji, Munāṣṣa, ii, 157-158), repeated in the 3rd/9th century in works on fiqh, such as the Şāfi'ī K. al-Umm (ii, 32) and the Mālikī Mudawwana of Sahān (ii, 99, 108). In an almost identical form, these hadiths are to be found in Abū Dāwwūd (Sunan, no. 1596-1598) and in the early specialists on fiscal and land law (3rd/9th-10th centuries): Yāḥyā b. Adam (K. al-Kharāji, Cairo ed. 1347 AH., no. 364-395, where an illuminating variant, no. 381, has “that which Ba'la has watered”, thus reproduced in Baladhuri, Futūh, 70); Abū 'Ubayd b. Sallām (K. al-Ammāl, Cairo ed. 1355 AH., no. 1410-1412),
Kudam b. Dja'far (K. al-Kharāḍjī, part 7, ch. VII, apud De Goeje, Glossaire to Baladhuri, Futūḥ, 14; the Madīth al-'Ulama of al-Dharmizī on that point is merely a résumé of this work). Likewise in the Fāṭimid ḏīb already established in Ifrīqiyah (4th/10th century): kāḍil al-Nu'mān, Daʿūdīm al-Īṣlām, Cairo ed. 1951, i, 316; and naturally also in many later books.

These texts evoke, as regards the use of baʾi, the two ensuing comments: a) the word seems to be linked with Madīne and perhaps also Yemenite traditions, but appears to be unknown to the oldest īrākī traditions (probably because īrāk is primarily a land of irrigation); Ḥanafism, of īrāk origin, does not normally employ the word, though on this point it states the same rule as the other madāhiḥ.

b) The badīḥīs containing this term insert it in an enumeration in which the baʾi appears to be distinct from lands watered by spring water, rain or surface drainage. Among the commentators and lexicographers, some nevertheless maintain that baʾi applies to all unwatered cultivated lands; others, influenced by the letter of the badīḥīs and perhaps by dialectal usages, offer a series of rather more restrictive interpretations revolving round the idea of an unwatered land under dry cultivation: for some, it only applies to cases where plants obtain water through their roots beneath the surface alone (detailed argument in L.A., loc. cit.; see also W. R. Smith, Lectures ..., 98-99 and Løkkegaard, Islamic Taxation, Copenhagen 1950, 121).

Among words possessing the same or an adjacent meaning which frequently replace or accompany baʾi in the enumeration mentioned above, particular attention should be paid to the term āthīḥārī (for example in the Ṣāḥī of al-Buḥārī, K. al-Zakāt, chap. 55), which it would be difficult to refrain from explaining by the name of the deity āṭhāṭar (= Astarte, Ishtar): a male stellar god in the Arabian and South Arabian pantheon, āṭhāṭar exercised an influence on the fertility of the land and was at times qualified by the name baʾal (Lagrange, Études sur les religions sémitiques, Paris 1903, 133-136; Nielsen, Handbuch der altara., Alieniumkunde, Copenhagen 1927, i, ed. Banqueri, Madrid 1802, 367; G. Ryckmans, in L'Acad. Lincei 1948, 85-100; R. G. Rockymans, in Atti Accad. Lincei 1948, 367; idem, Les religions arabs préislamiques, 2nd. ed. Louvain 1951, i, 41 and passim; Jamme, in Le Muséon, 1947, 94-150; idem, Hist. des Religions [1956], iv, 264-5). The assimilation ūth > ūthī is attested in Classical Arabic and the semantic parallelism with baʾil here is striking.

The occurrence of baʾi, still with the same meaning, must also be noted in some versions of the stipulations which the Prophet is stated to have imposed as a land code in the year 9 AH, either on the basis of Dūmat al-Djindāl (through their leader Ukaydir b. ʿAbd al-Malik), or on the neighbouring Kalbit tribes (through their leader Ḥāritha b. ʿAta); see Caetani, Annales, ii, 1, 259-269 (event discussed by Musil, Arabia Deserta, New York 1927, appendix VII, and by W. M. Watt, Muhammad al Medina, Oxford 1956, 362-3).

It is again to be met with, in connexion with the land tax (ḫarāḍjī), in the great treatises on public law of the 5th/11th century: al-Āḥād al-Sultaṇīyya by the Ḥanbalī Abū Yaʿlā (Cairo ed. 1938, 151) and by the Shāfiʿī Mawardi (trans. Fagnan, Algiers 1915, 314). In calculating this tax, they recommend that account be taken of the source of the water: this envisages four categories of cultivated land, among which the baʾi is very closely defined, approximately as above, in contrast to land irrigated or adequately watered by rainfall.

The geographer al-Mukaddasi, in the 4th/10th century, uses the term on three occasions (BG, i, 197, 574), dealing with agricultural production near Ramla, Alexandria and in Sind, always in the phrase ʿalaʾ-ʾabatu; this, however, does not suffice as a proof of the use of the term outside Syria-Palestine, the author's country of birth. In this geographical area where, "in spite of the the illusion of an abundance of water, dry cultivation constitutes the basis of traditional agricultural exploitation" (J. Weulersse, Paysans de Syrie, Paris 1946, 144), at the present day we find: arbaʾi contrasted as in former times with ṣabī (G. Dalman, op. cit., 30; already mentioned by E. Meier in ZDMG, 1863, xvii, 507).

Here is a special case of the use of this term in medieval Egypt: in Cairo under the Mamluks, perhaps already under the Fāṭimids, a park near the Khalīḍi, which subsequently became a public promenade, was called busṭān al-baʾi, then ard al-baʾi; see Mākri, Ḫāṭarat Būlāk ed. 1270 AH., ii, 129, who takes baʾi here expressly in the geographical sense.

The Muslims of Spain, "exactly like the Spanish peasants of today ... made a distinction between secano (Ar. baʾi) land and regadío (Ar. ṣabī) land, the former being especially reserved for cereal cultivation" (J. Levi-Provencal, Hist. Esp. mus., Paris 1953, iii, 270). The famous agronomist of Seville Ibn al-ʿAwwām (6th/12th) confirms this distinction (K. al-Fūlāba, ed. Banqueri, Madrid 1802, i, 5). It appeared in contracts, especially those of plantation leases or mughārāsa: the notorious formula of Ibn Salmān for example, K. al-ʿīd al-Munāṣṣam, Cairo ed. 1302 AH., ii, 21-22, in the 6th/14th century, has the two adjectival forms baʾī and ṣabī(a)ī.

These two forms do in fact appear to have had a tendency in modern times to become nouns, perhaps in certain regions because of the model provided by ʿathīḥārī. Baʾī has been noted alongside ʿathīḥārī in the dialects spoken in Southern Arabia: Landberg, Glossaire Dalinois, Leiden 1920, i, 156, where ʿathīḥārī must almost certainly be emended to ʿathīḥ(i)ārī. At a first glance it is not always easy to determine whether baʾī is at present used as an adjective or a noun in the East and in North Africa. It is frequently attached—more so than its opposite sakwī—to the name of a vegetable or a fruit: in such a case it stresses the good quality. At Fez, the feminine baṭīyya is applied to a succulent fig, whereas baʾī describes a man, avaricious, dry and hard as the land bearing the same name (information by L. Brunot).

As in the case of so many other elements of the vocabulary of spoken Arabic, it is to be regretted that we are far from knowing with sufficient exactitude the areas in which the words baʾi and baʾī, unknown to extensive Arabic speaking districts, are in fact used. The precise distribution of these words would be informative from various points of view.

BAʾL (Persian "height, high") I. — Since 1262/1846 the term for a grade in the former Ottoman Civil Service, to which the Secretary of State (mustaqāhār) and other senior officials belonged; he was addressed in correspondence as ʿutūsfāl ʾefendīm ḥadaretli (Further details in the article by M. Cavid Baysun in IA, ii, 262 ff.).

Bibliography: in M. C. Baysun (see above).
II. — Originally the name of a ḫaḍḍ in the ṭulayṭ and ṣanāǧ of Ankara (Central Anatolia) with the village of Karall (Kara 'All, now written Karail) as its centre. It is now the name of the new chief town of the ḫaḍḍ, 39° 35' N. Latit.

The name of the ḫaḍḍ is principally Yürük and refugees (muhāđir) from the Caucasus and the Balkans.

**Bibliography:** Ali Cevad, Cevad Ceylal, 149; Kânumür ad-Dîm. II. 1206; Sâlimâne of the Vil. Ankara 1325/1907; I. A. ii. 283 (by Besim Darkot).

(FR. Taeschner)

**Bâlâ-Ghâṭ** ("above the ghâṭs or passes"), a name given to several elevated tracts in central and southern India. It was usually applied to the highlands above the passes through the Western Ghâṭs. On the east side of the Indian peninsula it was the term used to distinguish the Carnatic plateau from the Carnatic Pâlūghâṭ or lowlands. In Berar it was the name of the upland country above the Adijana pass, the most northerly part of the table-land of the Deccan. It was also applied to the hilly country of western Hadarâbâd. In 1867, the name was given to a newly formed district of the Central Provinces. Today it forms a district of Madhya-Pradesh (area: 3,614 square miles; population (1951) 693,370).

**Bibliography:** Imperial Gazetteer of India; C. E. Low, Balaghat District (1907).

(C. Collins Davies)

**Bâlâ Ḥisâr** ("High Castle"), in the popular tongue Ball Ḥisâr ("Honey Castle"), village in Central Anatolia, in the Sivrihisar ḫaḍḍ, ṭulayṭ of Eskişehir, 14 kms. south of Sivrihisar, having only 363 inhabitants in 1935. Ruins of Persians in the neighbourhood with a Roman temple to Cybele.

**Bibliography:** Ch. Texier, Asie Mineure, 473-479; G. Perrot, Souvenirs d'un voyage en Asie Mineure, 198 ff; I. A. i, 288 f. (by Besim Darkot).

(FR. Taeschner)

**Bâlâ Ḥisâr**, a general term applied, in Pakistan and Afgânistân, to citadels built on archaeological mounds and often commanding a panoramic view of the settlement, whether town, city, or village, around. Among the most famous are the fort at Peshawar (Pakistan) and that in Kabul, the capital of Afgânistân.

The fort at Peshawar, lying on the northern outskirts of the present city and covering an area of 44,000 sq. yds., with double thick walls and strong bastions, is of considerable antiquity. It was first built on the present site in 925/1519 by Bâbur during his incursions into India through the Khyber Pass. It served as a halting-place for the Mughul Emperors on their way to and from Kabul, where another fort of the same name already existed. Soon after its construction by Bâbur the fort was destroyed by the neighbouring wild Afgân tribes, who considered it a threat to their age-long freedom. It was, however, rebuilt by Humâyûn in 966/1553 under the supervision of Pahlâwas 'Omar, the Superintendent of Lands, and Sikandar Khân Uzbek was appointed as its commander. It was, the same year, attacked by the Dalazk Afgâns but they were repulsed by Sikandar Khân. In 994/1586, during the reign of Akbar, it was the scene of a great fire which consumed a huge quantity of merchandise. It remained in the possession of the Mughâls till 1679-1688 when it was captured by the Afgâns under Ayaal Khân, but they were soon expelled by the Imperial forces and the fort was regarrisoned.

It was captured by Nadir Shâh Afgâr [q.v.] in 1152/1738 but on his death in 1160/1747 the Sîd-dîr, under Ahmad Shâh Durrân [q.v.], became its master. His son Timur Shâh made the fort his place of residence. When the Sikhs captured Peshawar in 1840/1824 the fort was dismantled and the rubble was sold. Harf Singh Narwa, the Sikh general, realising its strategic importance rebuilt it in 1834 with cob and mud and named it Sumârgah. In 1846 the British occupied Peshawar and constructed a stronghold in its place. It is now garrisoned by Pakistani troops.


(A. S. Bârmâr-Ábâr)
a treaty we know of from al-Baladhuri, and it later became part of the Umayyad "gund" of Damascus, then passed into 'Abbadid control until the Fātimid caliph al-Mu'tizz installed a governor in 361/972. Temporarily occupied by the Byzantine emperor John Tzimiskēs in 363/974, and by the prince of Aleppo, Śāliḥ b. Mirdās, in 416/1025, it fell into the hands of the Sulayhids Ṣutuḥ and his sons in 468/1075, and during the domestic struggles of the Burid period belonged in turn to the governors Gunushatkīn, Būrī and his son Muḥammad, then finally to the celebrated Onor, from whom Zenkl seized it for a time and entrusted it to Ayyūb, the future father of Šalāh al-Dīn. Nūr al-Dīn succeeded in reconquering it in 549/1154, and had to rebuild its walls after the devastation caused by the terrible earthquake of 565/1170. Šalāh al-Dīn in his turn seized the fortress from his old master's successors, in 570/1174, and gave it in fee successively to various members of his court or family, notably to his grand-nephew al-Malik al-Amidjad Bahrām-shāh, who held it from 578/1182 until 627/1230, in which year it was seized from him by al-Malik al-'Aṣghāf Muṣā, the master of Damascus. After various Ayyūbid ha had again contended for its possession, it was conquered by the Mamluks after the Mūzzafarid period, in 658/1260. Then, under the Manūlkūs, it became the chief town of an area in the third northern border district of the province of Damascus, and its governor, whose authority did not extend over the entire Bika', was in a position of direct dependence on the na`īb of Syria, who himself confirmed his appointment. The town seems to have become less important from that time onward, and the main Manūlīk mail routes, Damascus-Ḥimṣ and Damascus-Tripoli, thenceforward passed it by in favour of the Kalamān route, as the commercial roads of the modern era were also later to do. In 922/1516 it passed under Ottoman control, together with the whole of Syria, and remained in the hands of petty rulers, notably of the Harūfī family, until the Porte set up a regular administration in 1850.

The struggles for its possession in the Būrid, Zengid and Ayyūbid periods, when to hold the town seems to have been the pre-requisite for control of southern Syria, explain why Arab building there consisted chiefly in continually improving a system of defences set up mainly to fill the original gap at the south-west corner, between the pades of the two ancient temples. Of the four periods of work which have been distinguished, the second is characterised by a shifting of the fortified entrance from the west side to the south, and can be dated either in the reign of Muḥammad b. Būrī, who effectively defended Ba‘labakk, or in that of Zenkl, who according to inscriptions and written documents took measures to improve the state of the citadel. In the reign of Bahrām-shāh new towers reinforced the new facade. Lastly the time of Ka‘alānūn was marked by work in a more advanced style, in particular the massive tower at the south-east corner of the small temple and the barbican round the old south gate.

Inscriptions, studied in conjunction with the archeological remains, allow us to date with certainty various features of an ensemble which must be considered among the most interesting relics of Arab military architecture of mediaeval Syria. From the same period date also the small mosque at Ra‘s al-‘Ayn and notably the large mosque in the town, built not far from the citadel with materials from an older building, and characterised by its prayer hall with its four naves and its imposing minaret. Both mosques are inscribed with texts from Mamlūk decrees. Other monuments which have now disappeared, madrasas, ribāts, hospices, convents and hadith schools, are mentioned in earlier descriptions of the town.


J. Sourdét-Thommé

AL-BALĀDHURI, AHMAD B. YARĪĀ B. DIĀHIR B. DAWŪN, one of the greatest Arabic historians of the 3rd/9th century. Little is known of his life. Neither the year of his birth nor that of his death is directly attested. From the dates of his teachers, it is evident that he cannot have been born later than the beginning of the second decade of the 9th century A.D.; for the date of his death, Muslim authors suggest, as the latest and most likely date, ca. 892 A.D. As he is said to have been a translator from the Persian, Persian origin has been arbitrarily assumed for him, but already his grandfather was a secretary in the service of al-Khaḍīf in Egypt Djiāshiyārī, fol. 162a). He probably was born, and certainly spent most of his life, in Bağhdād and its environs. His studies led him to Damascus, Emesa, and Antiōch, and in Irāq he studied, among others, with such famous historians as al-Madīnī, Ibn Sa‘d, and Mus‘āb al-Zubayrī. He was a boon companion of al-Mutawakkil; his influence at the court appears to have continued under al-Musta‘in, but his fortunes declined sharply under al-Mu‘tāmid. The statement that he was a tutor of the poet, Ibn al-Mu‘tazz, appears to be the result of a confusion of our historian with the grammarian, Thā‘lab, and the story that he died mentally deranged through inadvertent use of ba‘labakk (Semecarpus Anacardium L., marking-nut), a drug believed beneficial for one's mind and memory, is meant to refer not to him but to his grandfather, but even so, it constitutes a puzzle for which no satisfactory explanation is offered by the sources.

The two great historical works that have survived have won general acclaim for al-Baladhurī’s reliability and critical spirit.

1. His History of the Muslim Conquests (Futūḥ al-Buldān) is the short version of a more comprehensive work on the same subject. The work begins with the wars of Muhammad, followed by accounts of the riddā, the conquests of Syria, the Īgāzīrā, Armenia,
Egypt, and the Maghrib, and lastly, the occupation of 'Iraq and Persia. Remarks of importance for the history of culture and social conditions are interwoven with the historical narrative; for instance, al-Baladhuri discusses the change from Greek and Persian to Arabic as the official language in government offices, the quarrel with Byzantium concerning the use of Muslim religious formulas at the head of letters originating in Egypt, questions of taxation, the use of signet-rings, coinage and currency, and the history of the Arabic script. The works, one of the most valuable sources for the history of the Arab conquests, was edited by M. J. de Goeje, *Liber exspanisorim regionum*, Leiden 1863-66, and reprinted repeatedly later on. English translation by P. K. Hitti and F. C. Murgotten, *The Origins of the Islamic State*, New York 1916 and 1924; German translation (continued to p. 239 of de Goeje's edition) by O. Rescher, Leipzig 1917-23.

2. His *Ansab al-'Ashraf*, a very large work which was never completed, is genealogically arranged and begins with the life of the Prophet and the biographies of his kinsmen. The *Abbasids* follow the *'Alids*. The *Abd Shams*, among whom the Umayyads claim a disproportionate amount of space, follow the Banu Hashim. Next, the rest of the Khawarij and other divisions of the Muhallabites are dealt with. The *Kays*, in particular the *Thakif*, occupy the closing portion of the work; the last biography of any size is that devoted to al-Hadjjaj. Though a genealogical work in outward form, the *Ansab* are really *takabāl* in the style of Ibn Sa'd, arranged genealogically. This method of arrangement is not rigidly adhered to; for the most important events of the reigns of individual rulers are always added to the corresponding chapters. The *Ansab* thus are one of the most valuable sources for the history of the Khawarij. A portion of the work was discovered in an anonymous MS. and identified and edited by W. Ahlwardt, *Anonyme arabische Chronik*, Bd. XI, Leipzig 1853. A complete MS. of the work was discovered by C. H. Becker in Istanbul, MS. 'Ashar Etfendi 1579-98 (table of contents by M. Hamidullah, in *Bull. d'Et. Or.*, vi, 1894, 197-211). Of the edition of the work sponsored by the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, Vol. ivB (ed. M. Schlossinger, 1938-40) and Vol. v (ed. S. D. Goltein, 1936, with an important introduction) have been published. O. Pinto and G. Levi della Vida have translated *Il Califfo Ma'dinayn I*, Rome 1938. Cf. also F. Gabrieli, *Le Rivolta* di al-Baladhuri, Rome 1938. Additional references can be found in the late works of M. de Goeje and the editions of al-Baladhuri sponsored by the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, Vol. ivB.

3. In 1247 the office of Commissioner of the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople, was abolished; some of its functions, relating to the care of public buildings, were transferred to the newly established Directorate of Buildings in the Domain (*Emniye-i Khāsia*), (Lutfi, ii, 105; Mecidiye-i Umur-i Belediyye, 1901, i, 980 and 1935, quoting the decree in the official gazette, *Taḥsīm-i Wāḥid* vii, 1247, no. 2).

The next phase began in the year 1271/1854, when two changes were initiated. The first of these was the creation of a new *Şehremnuri* for Istanbul. Despite the name, this bore little resemblance to the earlier institution; it was rather an adaptation of the French *préfecture de la ville* and was chiefly concerned with the supervision of the markets, the control of prices, etc. The prefect was to be assisted by a City...
Council (Şekir Medjd) drawn from the guilds and merchants. The İhtisdb Nezdreti was abolished and its duties handed over to the prefecture. This change in nomenclature seems to have had little immediate effect, and complaints were made about official neglect of municipal problems. A few months later, therefore, another decision was taken by the High Council of Reform (Meqlis-i 'Ali-i-Tanzimli), to establish a municipal commission (İhtisam-i Şekir Komisyyonu). A leading spirit in the commission was Antoine Allion, a member of a rich French banking family that had settled in Turkey at the time of the French Revolution. The other members were drawn chiefly from the local Greek, Armenian and Jewish communities, together with some Muslim Turks, including the İshemsâqşî Mehemmed Şâli Efendi, one of the first graduates of Sultan Mahmad's medical school. The Commission was instructed to report on European municipal organisation, rules and procedures, and to make recommendations to the Sublime Porte.

A number of factors had combined to induce the Ottoman government to take these steps. European financial and commercial interests in Istanbul had been growing steadily, and a new quarter was developing in Galata and Beyoglu (Pera), with buildings, apartment houses, shops, and hotels, in European style, and with increasing numbers of horse-drawn carriages of various kinds (see ARAKA). All this created a demand, which was put forward by the European residents, with the support of the Europeanised elements among the local population, for proper roads and pavements, street-cleaning and street-lighting, sewers and water-pipes. The presence in Istanbul of large allied contingents from the West during the Crimean War gave a new impetus and a new urgency to these demands, and in the new phase of reform that began in 1854 some attention was given to the problems of municipal organisation and services in the capital. A good example of the attitude of the Turkish reformers to these questions will be found in an article, published in the newspaper Tasev-i Eýkar, by the poet and publicist Ibrahim Shinâş (q.v.) on the lighting and cleaning of the streets of Istanbul (repr. in Abû 'I-diýâ [Ebugziya] Tewlîk, Numâne-i Edebiyat-i 'Othmânîyye, [1st ed. Istanbul 1296/1878], 3rd ed. Istanbul 1306, 227-235.

The record of the proceedings of the High Council of Reform on these matters reflect clearly the various preoccupations of the Ottoman government. The creation of a city prefecture, under the recently created Ministry of Commerce, was in part an attempt to meet a real need by installing the relevant European apparatus. There was also the usual desire to impress Western observers.

The Commission sat for four years, and reported to the High Council of Reform. Its chief recommendations were for the construction of pavements, sewers, and water-pipes, regular street-cleaning, street-lighting, the widening of the streets where possible, the organisation of separate municipal finances, the imposition of a tax for municipal purposes, and the appointment of the commission to apply municipal laws and regulations (mâdbata of 27 Safar 1274/9 Oct. 1857, in Medî. Um. Bel. 1, 1402-3). In 1274/1857 the High Council decided to accept these recommendations, but to limit their application for the time being to an experimental municipality, to be established in Beyoglu and Galata. This district, though the first to be organised, was officially named the sixth district (ailândî dâ'ire), possibly, as 'Othmân Nûrî suggests (Medî. Um. Bel. 1, 1415, n. 93), because the sixth arrondissement of Paris was believed to be the most advanced of that city. The reasons for this step are set forth in a mabâda of 21 Rabî' I 1274/9 Oct. 1857 (Medî. Um. Bel. 1, 1416-8). Municipal services and improvements were badly needed, and should be provided; the cost should not fall upon the state treasury, but should be met by a special levy from the townspeople who would benefit. It would be excessive and impracticable to apply the new system to the whole of Istanbul at once, and it was therefore decided to make a start with the sixth district, consisting of Beyoglu and Galata, where there were numerous properties and fine buildings, and where the inhabitants were acquainted with the practice of other countries and were willing to accept the expense of municipal institutions. When the merits of these institutions had been demonstrated by this example and had been generally understood and recognised, a suitable occasion would be found to apply them generally. The mabâda refers explicitly to the large number of foreign establishments and the preponderance of foreign residents in the district.

The constitution and functions of the municipality of the sixth district, also known as the model district (numâne dâ'ire) were laid down in an trâde of 24 Shawwâl 1274/7 July 1858. The Municipal Council was to consist of a Chairman and twelve members, all appointed by Imperial trâde, the Chairman indefinitely, the others for three years. The Council would elect two of its members as vice-Chairmen and one as treasurer. All were to be unpaid. The permanent officials were to be an assistant to the Chairman, a Secretary-General, two interpreter-secretaries, a civil engineer, and an architect. All these were to be appointed by the Council and receive salaries.

The terms of reference of the Council were defined generally as "all that concerns cleanliness and public amenities (nedâset ve müskel-i ummîyye)", and more specifically as roads and streets, sewers, pavements, street-lamps, sweeping and watering the streets, widening and straightening the streets, water-supply, gas inspection and condemnation of ruinous and dangerous buildings, inspection and control of food supplies, control of prices, inspection of weights and measures, supervision of public places such as theatres, markets, hotels and restaurants, schools, dance-halls, coffee houses, taverns, etc. The Commission was further given the power to assess, impose, and collect rates and taxes, and raise loans, within limits laid down, and also to expropriate property in certain circumstances. The Chairman was to submit his budget to the Commission for discussion and inspection, and then to the Sublime Porte for ratification, without which it would not be valid.

From this it will be seen that the measures of 1271/1854-5, while accepting the principle of the discharge of certain new responsibilities in relation to the town, hardly represent an approach to the European conception of municipal institutions. There is still no recognition of the city as a corporate person. for such an idea remained alien to Islamic conceptions of law and government; nor was there any suggestion of election or representation. What was created was a new kind of administrative agency, appointed by and responsible to the sovereign power, but with specified and limited tasks and with a measure of budgetary autonomy. Such special commissions were by no means new in Ottoman administration (see EMIN). The novelty lay in the kind of function entrusted to it.
The municipal commission of the model sixth district seems to have done good work. Among other achievements, it made a land survey of the district, laid out two municipal parks, opened two hospitals, and introduced many improvements for the health, security and convenience of the residents. All of which did not prevent the official historiographer Lutfi Efendi from condemning it in the most scathing terms (cited by 'Og‘hän Nâbi in Şekerlih, 1279). The movement towards the introduction and extension of Western-style municipal services continued, however. In 1285/1868 a municipal code of regulations (belediyye nizâmînamesi) was issued, the intention of which was to extend the commission system to the rest of the 14 districts of Istanbul. Each was to have a municipal committee of 6-12 members, who would choose one of their selves as Chairman. A general assembly for all Istanbul (Diemîşyet-i ‘Umâmîyesi) of 56 members was to be formed, consisting of 3 delegates from each district, as well as a Council of the Prefecture (Meldî-i Emânât) of six persons, appointed and paid by the Imperial government. These two bodies were to function under the Prefect (Şehremnî), who was to remain a permanent official. The elaborate provisions of this code seem to have remained a dead letter until 1293-4/1876-7 when, under the impetus of the constitutional movement, new codes were issued for the capital and for provincial towns. The Istanbul code of 1293/1876 was in effect a rearrangement of the earlier one, with a few changes, the most important of which were the increase in number of districts from 14 to 20, and the change in the property qualification of members from a tax payment of 5,000 piastres to an annual tax payment of 250 piastres. Perhaps the most significant innovation in the new code was less in its provisions than in the fact that it was promulgated, not by the Sublime Porte, but by the short-lived Ottoman parliament. However, the wars and crises that followed caused it to be as ineffectual as its predecessors. (An exception was the Princes Islands, where a seventh district was constituted: Sa‘id Pasha, Kâdirî, Istanbul 1281, i, 5; Medî, Um. Bel. i, 1457). Finally, in 1296/1879, a new and more realistic version was published, which in time was put into operation. This divided the city into ten municipal districts. The elaborate apparatus of councils and committees provided by the earlier codes was abolished. What was left was an appointed Council of Prefecture to assist the Prefect, and a government-appointed director (müdîr) for each of the 10 districts. This system remained in force until the revolution of 1324/1908.

In the provinces the policies of the reformers were much the same. The earlier authority of the aşîyan and the Şehir hâkûbasî [qq.v.] had been abolished. The mukhtar system, introduced by Mahmûd II, was introduced into the urban districts of most of the large towns, and the wîlâyêt law of 1281/1864 laid down regulations for their election (chapters iv and v). In the wîlâyêt law of 1287/1870, provision was made for the establishment of municipal councils in provincial cities, along the same general lines as in the code for Istanbul. There is no evidence that anything much was done about this. Some attempt, however, seems to have been made to implement parts of the provincial municipal code (wîlâyêt belediyye hânûmu) of 1294/1877. According to the law, every town was to have a municipal council, consisting of 6 to 12 members, according to the population. They were to sit for four years, with elections every two years to choose half the members.

The doctor, engineer, and veterinary surgeon of the region were ex officio advisory members. Membership was restricted to those paying 100 piastres a year in tax. One of the members of the Council became mayor (belediyye reisi), not by election but by government appointment. The budget and estimates were to be approved by a municipal assembly (Diemîşyet-i Belediyye) meeting twice yearly for this purpose. This assembly was responsible to the General Council of the province (Medî-i ‘Umâmî-i Wîlâyêt) (Medî, Um. Bel. i, 1664 ff.).

After the Young Turk Revolution a new attempt was made to introduce democratic municipal institutions. The law of 1293/1876, with some amendments, was restored, and a serious attempt made to put it into effect. The experiment was not very successful. The personnel of the district committees, though enthusiastic, were inexperienced, and there was little co-operation between districts for common purposes. In 1328/1912 a new law finally abolished this system. In its place a single Istanbul municipality, called Şehremnâmet, was established, with nine district branch offices (Şau‘be), each directed by a government official. The Prefect was assisted by a 54 man general assembly, to which 6 delegates were elected from each of the nine districts. In this as in so many other respects, the new régime was returning to a more centralised system of government. Despite many difficulties, some important progress was made by the Young Turks in improving the amenities of Istanbul. A new drainage system was planned and constructed, improvements were in policing and fire-prevention, and the famous packs of dogs that had for long infested the Turkish capital were finally removed.

The first municipal measure of the republican government was a law of 16 Febr. 1924, setting up a prefecture (Şehremnâmet) in Ankara (Kauwânîn Meşêmû‘asîî ii, 218). The first prefect was Ali Haydar, and he was assisted by a general assembly of 24 members. The constitution followed broadly that of Istanbul, but with some changes, the general purport of which was to restrict the autonomy of the municipality in financial and security matters and place it more strictly under the control of the Ministry of the Interior.

On 3 April 1930, a new law of municipalities was passed (Reşmi Gazete 1471, 1250: OM, 1930, 551). The old names of Şehremnêmet and Şehremini, abolished, and replaced by Belediye and Belediye reisi, usually translated mayor. Under Sultan 'Abd al-Hamîd, the offices of Prefect and Governor of Istanbul had in fact been exercised by the same person. The Young Turks, by a law of 1325/1909, had formally separated the prefecture from the government. The new law laid down that in Istanbul, though not elsewhere, the office of mayor should be combined with that of Vâli, the vilâyêt and belediye administrations, however, remaining separate. Under the law, municipalities, like villages, have corporate legal identity and legally defined boundaries. The 165 articles of the law provided a systematic code of rules for the election and functioning of municipal bodies, and with some modifications remained in force to the present day. Under these rules, municipalities are administered by a Mayor, a Permanent Commission, and a Municipal Council. The Mayor is elected by the Council, which itself is elected directly by universal suffrage for a term of four years. Towns with from 2,000 to 20,000 inhabitants are called kasaba, those with more than 20,000 are called şehir. The size of the
Council depends on the number of inhabitants, the minimum being 12 members, for fewer than 3,000 inhabitants. The Council meets three times a year, at the beginning of February, April and November. At other times it is replaced by a permanent commission (daimi encumen) consisting of three of its own members reinforced by the permanent officials of the municipality. The functions of the municipality include public health (hospitals, dispensaries, preventive medicine, sanitary and food inspections, etc.), public services (trams, buses, gas, electricity), town planning and engineering (roads and bridges within the town, public parks and gaz dens, street-lighting and cleaning, sewage, water-supply, etc.); in times of shortage, it is also entrusted with the distribution of commodities in short supply. It has its own enforcement agency (sahla). The municipality imposes taxes and has its own budget; its permanent staff, however, are civil servants.

Bibliography: the richest collection of material for the history of municipal institutions in Turkey will be found in "Olgmân Nürî (= Osman Ergin), Mezgelle-i Umur-i Belediyeye, 5 vols., Istanbul 1330-1338; the first volume contains an elaborately documented history of municipal institutions in Islam and in Turkey, the second reproduces the texts of Ottoman Laws and edicts on municipal matters, the remaining three deal with specific topics such as municipal contracts and privileges, health, public works, etc. For a brief general introduction to the subject by the same author, see Osman Ergin, "Turhiyede Şehrîcüsûn Tarhi İnkılapî, Istanbul 1336. The texts of laws relating to municipal matters will be found in the General and provincial yearbooks (sândâmî) of the Ottoman Empire, the last of which appeared in 1328/1912. On the municipal laws of the republic see La Vie Juridique des Peuples, vii, Turquie, Paris 1939, 57 ff.; Albert Gorvine, An Outline of Turkish Provincial and Local Government, Ankara 1936. (B. Lewis)

(2) Arab East.

Town councils of the earlier period of reform, such as the mûfîs Dimashq which Ibrahim Pasha established during the Egyptian occupation of Syria, 1832-40 (A. J. Rustum, al-Mufrsídî al-Malâhiyya al-Misritiya: Bayân bi-Wâlahî Shâm Beirut 1940-43), and a council appointed by Nûr al-Dîn Pasha, a reforming mûfîsî, at Sawâkîn in 1854 (J. Hamilton, Sinai, 1857), were unrelated to any legislative policy and were short-lived. The Ottoman municipal legislation of 1281-94/1864-77 was applied throughout the Arabic-speaking provinces of the Empire except in certain frontier regions and in Egypt where municipal development was following a different course. The new municipalities flourished where the wilâ'î of the province was sympathetic to the tanâmîlî and languished where he was not. Thus, under the guidance of Ahmad Midhat Pasha, Baghdad in 1869-72 and Damascus in 1878-80 experienced an intensive if brief period of urban development involving the demolition of city walls, re-arrangement of streets and construction of covered markets and other public buildings. Participation of public-spirited local notables furthered urban reform. Mosul under its seigniorial families had a continuous municipal history since 1869. Sectarianism hindered the smooth working of several municipalities in the communes (nâhiya) of the autonomous sandjâk of Mt. Lebanon, and in Jerusalem where the complicated religious situation demanded that the chairman of the municipal council should be a Muslim. A weakness in all Ottoman provincial municipalities was the ineffectiveness of the municipal police (bezîdîyye lãwghâlî, Ar. ġurtal al-balâdiyya).

In spite of its shortcomings, which the consuls of the Powers were quick to report in their despatches, the Ottoman municipal organisation showed a remarkable ability to survive the disintegration of the Empire after the world war of 1914-18 when the withdrawal of Ottoman rule left a vacuum in local government in the Arab lands. To preserve continuity during the transitional period, the British in 'Irâq, Palestine and Transjordan, and the French in Syria and Lebanon, continued to administer the Ottoman municipal code for several years until they introduced changes which reflected the influence of the Mandatory Powers. In 1922 a mûfîsî was appointed for Baghdad which was not the case in the other municipalities. The chairmen of the municipalities of Damascus, Beirut, Baghdad and Amman are styled amin al-dîjma to emphasise their particular importance in relation to the seat of the government; elsewhere the original designation, ra'îs al-balâdiyya, is retained. In the capitals the chairman is appointed by the council of ministers. In other municipalities he is chosen either by the municipal council or by the minister of the interior who usually has a department (mâlsâka, mûdîrîyya) in his ministry which supervises municipal affairs. In Egypt and the Sudan special ministries of town and rural affairs have been created.
Egypt developed its own local government tradition. Owing to the presence of the European consuls and a European merchant community, Alexandria possessed the beginnings of municipal government as early as about 1835 when a consultative majlis al-tanzim (conseil de l'ornano in Levantine parlance) was formed. This was followed in 1869 by a municipality having an appointed president and a partly elected council. The Khedive Ismail and his successors withheld municipal privileges from Cairo until 1940, though municipal commissions with restricted powers had long existed in the Egyptian provinces.

An ordinance of 1901 empowered the governor-general of the Sudan to establish municipal councils, but this measure was not implemented. In 1921 a consultative council was founded in the neighbouring towns of Khartoum, Omdurman and Khartoum North, with regional committees in each town. The formation in 1942 of the first municipal council at Port Sudan was followed in other towns. In 1945 the three regional committees at the capital were replaced by municipal councils, and a bill containing provision for further decentralisation became law in 1951.

In Arabia municipalities were established by the Ottoman Government in Madina, Jedda, Ta'if and Yanbu about 1870. In Mecca the maintenance of the simple public services was divided between the Ayn al-Zubayda water board (ta'mirat komisyonu) and a general-purposes council. These institutions had no roots in the Hijaz and disappeared in the war of 1915-19. In 1926 the Saudi Government issued an administrative instruction providing for elected municipal councils of notables and merchants in Mecca, Madina and Jedda, with technical management boards in each of these towns composed of the director of the municipality and his heads of department.

A municipal authority was in existence in Aden by 1855, and an Aden local authority was established in 1900, though the elective element was not admitted to the Fortress until 1947. In 1953 the Fortress township authority was reconstituted as the Aden municipality with an appointed president and an official majority on the council, but with a broadened electoral basis and control over its own budget. Bahrayn municipalities have each a muddar responsible to the ra'is al-baladiyya appointed by the Ruler, a partly-elected council, and a permanent director (mu'darwin, sibrisyari). Kuwait municipality is managed by a muddar responsible to the ra'is al-baladiyya, a member of the ruling family. The Arabic-speaking communities of Mu'assawa and Ḥarar have taken only a small part in town management. By decree of 1893, rescinded in 1901, the Italian Government instituted a municipal board at Mu'assawa with an insignificant representation of appointed natives and a narrowly limited competence. Two measures passed by the Ethiopian Government: Administrative Decree no. 1 of 1942, extended by Municipalities Proclamation no. 74 of 1945, provided for elected town councils.

Municipalities in the Arab East do not usually exercise direct control over electricity and water supply, and rarely over urban transport, undertakings which are operated either by concessionary companies, now mostly in process of nationalisation, or by boards under the authority of the central government, or without municipal representation. Municipal councillors are chosen by direct suffrage of the electors, not by inferior councils in towns wards as in two-tier systems of municipal representation. Municipalities vary in the degree of publicity in which they pursue their activities. Those in the more politically advanced centres, such as Damascus, Beirut, Bagdad, Cairo and Alexandria, disclose their budgets and explain their policies; others are less communicative. The press is excluded from council meetings, and the somewhat negative attitude of the citizens to local, in comparison with national, affairs results in relatively small polls at council elections, though the inhabitants of Palestine under British mandate, denied an active part in national affairs, frequently vented their feelings in municipal politics. Municipalities also differ in the strictness with which they enforce building restrictions and traffic control, and in the importance which they attach to welfare and public amenities. Only in Egypt have women the right to be municipal electors and to be elected on municipal councils; women municipal employees are everywhere few.

In no state is there a nation-wide local government service with its own traditions existing parallel with the national civil service. Local government is considered as a regional branch of the central government, having no juridical or real financial independence. Yet the growing wealth and technical complexity of the larger municipalities, as well as their record of administrative maturity and good government, have in practice increased their civic autonomy.
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In Tunisia the first baladiyya appeared in the reign of Muhammed Bey, who set up by a decree of 30 August 1858 a municipal Council to administer the affairs of the town of Tunis, composed of a president, a secretary and twelve members chosen from among the foremost people in the land, a third of whom gave up their seats each year. The chief responsibilities of this council were to do with public moneys, roads, the acquisition for the public benefit of land needed for widening roads, and the issuing of building permits. The council received its administrative authority, which was only vaguely defined, from the sovereign. The constitution of the Tunisian municipal council was altered after the setting up of the French protectorate, by a decree of the bey dated 31 October 1883. Two years later a decree of 1 April 1885 promulgated a municipal charter for the whole of Tunisia, and was soon followed by another decree (10 June 1885) which determined that all municipal councillors in Tunis were to be appointed by the government, listed the matters the municipal councils were competent to deal with, and organised the administration of the country through these bodies. Two subsequent reforms have been made, one by a decree of 10 August 1898 which relaxed the rule whereby consent had to be granted for all deliberations by the municipal councils, and the other by a decree of 15 September 1945, which provided for an elected municipal council in Tunis, composed of an equal number of Tunisians and Frenchmen.

But the institution as a whole was profoundly modified by the bey's decree of 20 December 1952, which defined the commune: a collective body under public law, with civil status and financially autonomous, responsible for the conduct of municipal affairs. The deliberating body of the commune is the municipal council, elected for six years by direct suffrage by two electoral bodies, who appoint the Tunisian and the French councillors respectively. Half the members vacate their seats every three years. Of 64 communes in all, 39 appoint an equal number of Frenchmen and Tunisians to their municipal councils, the others appointing a majority of Tunisians, or Tunisians alone. The elections are held on a general basis of universal suffrage, with the proviso that Tunisian women, unlike Frenchwomen, do not have the right to vote. The municipal council holds four ordinary sessions annually. Its competence is restricted and does not extend to all the business of the commune. There is still administrative supervision centrally and locally, which is exercised by the Ministry of the Interior, and by the governors respectively. The system of municipalities was reformed in 1953 by the dahir of 18 September, which abolished the special organisations at Fez and Casablanca. The number of communes was raised from 94 to 977. The municipal councils are now elected directly in one ballot from a list of candidates, for three years, the electors being Tunisians of both sexes aged twenty and over. The minimum age for candidates is 25. Frenchmen can no longer be members of the municipal councils, but the law provides that Frenchmen and foreigners who have the right to vote may be appointed by the Tunisian government, which will fix the number of such persons for each commune.

Administrative supervision is exercised by the Minister of the Interior, and by the governors centrally and locally. Two other important innovations must be mentioned: the president and deputies are now elected by the council. But the president of the commune of Tunis is still appointed by decree of the Prime Minister, the president of the council, on the nomination of the Minister of the Interior. On the other hand the municipal councils now deal with all the business of the commune.

(Ch. Samaran)

(3) NORTH AFRICA — (ii) MOROCCO

Before 1912 there were no municipalities nor municipal life in Morocco in the sense these words have had in some European countries since the Middle Ages, a sense inherited from Roman tradition. The towns had no finances of their own; the expense of public services was met in large measure by the revenue of religious foundations or ḥuḍās, and building or improvements were dependent on the good will of the prince, who would levy the required sums on the public treasury. Nor were there any representative assemblies of citizens; the governor or ʿāmil held his power directly from the sultan, and the muḥāfas was not "the merchants' provost", as is often stated, as they did not elect him. A Muslim governor would take the advice of prominent people in his area, but was not bound to do so.

The first modern body set up by the French Protectorate was that of Fez (al-muḍājiṣ al-baladī), instituted by the dahir of 2 September 1912. It comprised a council of fifteen members with right of vote, seven officials appointed on special grounds and eight other prominent men elected for two years. This organisation survived until the municipal charter of 1917.

A dahir of 1 April 1913 set up "municipal commissions in the ports of the Sharifian empire". It was recapitulated and clarified by the dahir of 8 April 1917. Nineteen towns were given the status of municipalities (1,521,476 inhabitants according to the census of 1911-12). The dahir determines the municipal authorities: the pasha or governor, still appointed by the central authority, and under the direction of a senior municipal services official, then from 1947 of an urban affairs delegate; and a municipal commission with right of discussion only, appointed and not elected, and made up of one French, one Moroccan section (one Muslim, one Jewish). The municipalities provide services under the direction of the Head of municipal services: administrative, public works, sanitary and fiscal. They have budgets drawn from their own resources (direct and indirect taxes, revenues from land and excise, a share in the profits from services given).

Casablanca, like Fez, was given a special organisation, but only in 1922. The municipal commission, though still appointed, now had power to vote, and the French section now elected a French vice-president with special powers.

The system of municipalities was reformed in 1953 by the dahir of 18 September, which abolished the special organisations at Fez and Casablanca. The
main change it introduces is to set up elected, not appointed, municipal commissions, still of Moroccans and Frenchmen equally. The commission manages the affairs of the city, though approval of its decisions by the central supervising authority is required.

The administrative provisions of this statute have been given effect, but not those relating to elections. This was prevented by the political crisis of 1953. The old appointed commissions remained, and were dissolved when Morocco became independent.

The government of independent Morocco has made no change in the legislation on municipalities. Only French control and the commissions have gone, naturally enough. A new representative system is being prepared. It will relate not only to the towns, but envisages the setting up throughout the country of rural communes which would replace the old tribes or divisions of tribes, and would be run by elected councils. At the time of writing this law has not yet been promulgated. It seems to be inspired in large measure by the dahir of 6 July 1951, which set up elected "djamā'as" with power of vote, usually within the framework of the tribe or tribal division.

In Algeria, the municipal organisation reproduces, in the towns and villages, the system in force in France. The old "mixed councils" administered by officials appointed by the government and subordinate to the sub-prefects have everywhere been replaced by "communes with full powers".

Bibliography: Emmanuel Durand, Traité de droit public marocain, Paris 1955. (A. Adam)

(4) PERSIA

In the 19th and early 20th century the chief city official after the governor was the beglerbegi; under him were the dārāgha and balintar; and over the quarters in the larger cities was a hadkhudā. In the bazaar the craft guilds enjoyed a considerable degree of autonomy in internal affairs. The streets of the city were narrow, mostly unpaved, muddy in winter, dusty in summer, and unlit at night. There was, however, little demand for municipal reform and even after the grant of the constitution in 1906 little attention was paid to the establishment of municipalities on modern lines. A Municipal Law was passed on 20 Rabī' II 1325/2 June 1907 but remained largely in abeyance owing to the fact that inadequate financial provisions had been made for municipal development. In 1919 during the premiership of Sayyid Diya'd al-Dīn Tabātabā'i a commission was set up to evolve a scheme for a municipality for Tehran on modern lines but proved abortive (J. M. Balfour, Recent Happenings in Persia, London 1922, 240). In 1922 Dr. Ryan, an American, was engaged as municipal adviser to Tehran; he died in 1923 and was not replaced (A. C. Millsbaugh, The American Task in Persia, New York and London 1925, 21, 212). During the reign of Rīdā Shāh (1925-41) considerable development took place in municipal affairs, and by 1927-8 there were some 134 municipalities in existence. By the Municipal Law of 1330 P./1950 the head of the municipality (ra'is-i sīdār-i baladīyya) was designated by the Ministry of the Interior. He was responsible for the execution of projects for municipal development and municipal administration; his duties included the supervision of weights and measures, control of the guilds, and the regulation of food supplies, prices and rents. The law also provided for an elected municipal council of 6-12 members. Its term of office was two years; its duties were to supervise the activities of the municipality, approve the municipal budget, and propose through the head of the municipality to the Ministry of the Interior the levy of municipal dues. Much progress was made in the field of town planning under Rīdā Shāh but the high degree of centralisation and the close control of the Ministry of the Interior over municipal affairs meant that the local communities had little real responsibility for or control over municipal affairs. In 1328 P./1949 new legislation increased the size of the municipal council so that it was composed of 6-30 members and extended its term of office to four years. Its main functions were unchanged but its powers were somewhat increased. The head of the municipality was appointed by the Ministry of the Interior from among three candidates submitted by the council; he was dismissed in the event of the municipal council passing a vote of no confidence in him. The increase in the power of the municipal council was, however, offset by the fact that in the event of a disagreement between the governor-general and the municipal council the former could have recourse to the Ministry of the Interior whose decision in such a case was final. Subsequently modifications were made in the position of the municipality and the municipal council by Administrative Orders (idvān-i hādā) dated 11 Abān 1331 P./1952 and 21 Khurāsa 1332 P./1953 issued during the premiership of Dr. Muṣaddīk, and the Law of 11 Tir 1334 P./1955. In some respects the position of the municipal council was strengthened, but its freedom of action was limited by the fact that its dissolution could in certain circumstances be demanded by the Ministry of the Interior; in the event of there being no municipal council the Ministry of the Interior could appoint the council's successor. Under the Second Seven-Year Plan Law, approved in March 1956, Persia was divided into three areas for municipal development, for each of which a firm of consultants was allotted responsibility (F. C. Mason, Iran, Economic and Commercial Conditions in Iran, August 1957, HMSO 1957, 74-5). The baladīyya became known during the reign of Rīdā Shāh as the shahrārd and the ra'is-i baladīyya as the shahrādār (A. K. S. Lambton)

(5) INDIA

The indigenous village communities of India controlled by village councils or pandāyas represented a form of local self-government, but they had practically ceased to function during the anarchy accompanying the decline of the Mughal empire. Albuquerque, the Governor of the Portuguese possessions in India between 1509 and 1515, had retained the existing village communities in his administration of Goa. In 1674 Gerald Angier had also made use of the ancient pandāyas in Bombay. To a certain extent the pandāyas system had survived in the territories of the Maratha Peshwa and traces were discernible elsewhere. This led Mountstuart Elphinstone in Bombay and Thomas Munro in Madras to advocate the preservation of these village councils where possible. Their representations however were little attended to and the institutions of local self-government introduced by the British in the middle of the nineteenth century were of a foreign type. Until the introduction of the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms in 1919 they resembled the French rather than the British system, for the district officer of British India like, the French prefect of a department, rigorously controlled the provincial authorities,
There was far too much official interference and British administrators aimed more at efficient local government under official control than any genuine system of local self-government under popular control.

The development of municipal institutions under British rule began in the three Presidency towns of Madras, Bombay and Calcutta. As early as 1687, by order of the Court of Directors of the East India Company, a municipal corporation and mayor’s court were established in Madras. Similar bodies were set up in Calcutta and Bombay in 1726. These courts however were intended to exercise judicial rather than administrative functions. By the Charter Act of 1793 the governor-general was authorised to appoint justices of the peace for the municipal administration of the Presidency towns. In addition to their judicial duties they were to appoint watchmen and scavengers and levy a sanitary rate for this purpose. This worked with a certain amount of success in Bombay but not in Calcutta or Madras. The justices of the peace were government nominees and it was not until 1872 that the ratepayers of the Presidency towns were allowed to elect their own representatives.

Between 1842 and 1863 a series of regulations extended municipal institutions to other towns. After the 1861 Councils’ Act municipal government was remodelled by the local legislatures. The need for associating Indians in local self-government was laid down by a resolution of Lord Mayo’s government. The governor-generalship of Lord Ripon (1880-84) witnessed a great extension of local self-government which it was hoped would be a means of political education for Indians. At the same time rural boards, similar to the municipal boards, extended the system to the rural areas. It was not until the introduction of dyarchy under the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms that local bodies were handed over to popular control and elected ministers became responsible for the administration of local self-government.


(6) MALAYA and SINGAPORE

The municipalities in Malaya, as in other parts of the British Commonwealth, are adapted from the local government system of England. The first appearance of such institutions in the area took place in the Straits Settlements of Malacca, Penang and Singapore. In 1827 the genesis of municipal institutions in the Straits Settlements was introduced in the form of a Local Committee concerned with the management of roads and drainage in Penang. This was soon followed by similar Committees in Singapore and Malacca. In 1856 the Government of India (East India Co.) enacted a law for the establishment of Municipal Commissions of the three ‘stations’ of Singapore, Malacca and the Prince of Wales Island (Penang). In 1858 the meetings were held twice monthly and were open to the public. The Municipal Commissions of the station of the Prince of Wales Island (Penang) became the Municipal Commission of George Town in 1888. By the turn of the century there were three Municipal Commissions for the town of Singapore, George Town in Penang and the town and fort of Malacca. Each Commission had a full time president appointed by the governor and a number of official members and non-official members who were chosen in the early stages by electoral procedure. This procedure was later restricted to only half the commissioners leaving the other half to be nominated by the governor. By 1913 when the Municipal Ordinance of the Straits Settlements was enacted electoral procedure was completely abandoned and all the commissioners were nominated to represent local opinion, business associations and religious or racial groups. The system of nomination continued until after the Second World War when the electoral procedure was re-introduced first in Singapore (1949) and later in Penang and Malacca. At this stage only two thirds of the commissioners were elected by general adult suffrage. By 1957 the Municipal Commissions became City Councils (Madjilis Bandar Ra‘aya) in Singapore and George Town which had become cities with fully elected councillors who in their turn elected their president who is styled ‘mayor’ (dato* bandar).

The Municipal Ordinance of the Straits Settlements stipulated that a member of a Municipal Commission must be able to speak and read English since it was the language officially recognised. This stipulation together with the system of nominating commissioners tended to reduce public interest in the affairs of the Council. After 1957 the Chinese, Tamil and Malay languages were recognised as official languages together with English for the purposes of the Sintapore Council meetings. In Malacca and Penang Malay, the national language of the Federation of Malaya, was also recognised with English. This helped to break the barriers between the public and the Council and it opened the door to the non-English educated members of the community to stand for election with accompanying tendencies towards radicalism.

The Municipalities of Singapore, George Town and the town and fort of Malacca have always exercised all functions expected of a local authority. In addition to this they were allowed to own undertakings for the supply of water, gas and electricity.

With the spread of British administration into the Malay States and the peninsula another type of local government emerged. This was called the Town Board. It was first established in the Federated Malay States of Perak, Negri Sembilan and Pahang. The non-federated Malay States adopted similar institutions with local modifications in nomenclature and powers. It must be noted that the Town Boards were less of a local government and more of a central government functioning locally. They were totally dependent upon the authority of the State and all their employees were officers of the State. Unlike the Municipal Commission they were not legally independent of the central government but agents of it. The president and the members were appointed by the central authority for an indefinite period and not for four years as was the case with the Municipal Commission. Again at variance with the Municipal Commissions Town Boards extended their authorities beyond the boundaries of the towns to the neighbouring villages.

The first attempt at the creation of municipalities
in the true sense within the Malay States came after the establishment of the Federation of Malaya in 1948. The Municipal Ordinance of the Straits Settlements was enacted for the whole Federation which by now comprised the nine Malay States together with the Settlements of Penang and Malacca. Singapore was left out of the Federation. In the same year the Town Board of Kuala Lumpur, the Federal capital, was transformed into a municipality. It retained its former responsibilities including those of the administration of the outlying villages around it. A distinction however was made between an inner municipal area and an outer municipal area. The former referring to the town proper and the latter to the villages around it. From then onwards changes began to take place. Town Boards became Town Councils (Majlis Bandaran). Electoral Procedure was introduced. Greater authority was vested in these Councils and great interest in local affairs became apparent. In fact local elections in Malaya have become equal in importance to their counterparts in other highly developed countries in the sense that they have become a testing ground for the opposing national political parties.

At present Municipalities (Berbandaran) in the Federation of Malaya are still in a state of transition. The Municipal Ordinance is not fully implemented all over the Federation. (Apart from George Town City Council and the Municipalities of Kuala Lumpur and Malacca 27 of the larger towns in the Federation have elected Town Councils, 12 of which are financially autonomous and the others are moving in the same direction.) It is expected that the Ordinance will be amended to give greater scope for local variations retaining however the basic essentials of a modern municipality.


(M. A. Zaki Badawi)

(7) Indonesia

We do not know much about political life or the kind of government in the ancient pre-Islamic cities and towns of Indonesia, either in such royal centres as the capitals of old Mataram or later Majapahit, or in commercial urban centres like Tuban, Gresik or Palembang.

There is no evidence, up to now, that there ever was any form of really local government or autonomy vested in locally-rooted public institutions. When, from the 7th/13th century onwards, Islam gradually penetrated almost the whole of Sumatra and Java and in many other regions of the archipelago, this lack of local public institutions in the towns and cities (neither big nor numerous) continued. Both European and non-European sources of the 16th and 17th centuries tell us that the inhabitants of cities or urban emporia were ruled by servants of the sultans or princes and that their towns never were considered to be a juridical entity. Neither in remote past nor in more recent times did the indigenous towns of Indonesia have any creative influence on the development of law as did the towns and cities of Western Europe, through their law-giving authorities or special municipal courts.

In towns that came to be ruled by the Dutch East Indian Company or were founded by this chartered body (as Batavia) some urban institutions of 17th century Western type were created, of which the weeshamer (council for the affairs of orphans) perhaps may be mentioned because it has survived the Company itself. It reappears in the general legislation of the 19th and 20th century on the civil law of Europeans and non-Indonesian inhabitants of the archipelago.

When after the downfall of the Company and after the end of the British interregnum these islands became a part of the new kingdom of the Netherlands (1816) a highly centralised and exclusively official system of government was introduced. This system remained unaltered until the end of the 19th century, when under the influence of prominent colonial specialists some ideas of "decentralisation" began to carry the day. Though in 1894 and in following years several bills were conceived—which did not pass the parliament—it was not before 1903 that the so-called "Indische decentralisatiewet" (Act for decentralisation) was promulgated.

This act had a double aim: first, to pave the way for the creation of local and regional public councils; secondly to procure the financial means to be used by these councils. (The regional councils will not be dealt with here). So this act did not aim at reforms in the great diversity of Indonesian rural and truly indigenous institutions: in that field everything continued to be founded on customary law ('adat) and special legal regulations made for it. This new chapter of the legislation prescribed (inter alia) how to set up urban municipalities.

Large cities, like Batavia (now Jakarta, Djakarta), Surabaya, Semarang, Bandung and many other places of urban character as well, were westernised in many respects. The great majority of Europeans and Chinese, and several other non-Indonesian groups lived there; even the Indonesian inhabitants often were of different origin, 'adat and language. Western business and industrial activity had its headquarters there. In these great half-western, half-eastern agglomerations the usual problems that are to be found in big cities everywhere were encountered. They
could be better served and solved by municipal authorities and services than by the general civil service officials of the central government. Further legislative measures, issued by the governor-general in 1905, carried out what the fundamental act aimed at, and Batavia became a municipality. In its initial phase the members of its municipal council were appointed by the govern-general and not elected.

Since 1925 every male citizen of an urban municipality in Java who had attained his majority, had a yearly income of at least 300 guilders, and could read and write in Dutch, Malay or any vernacular, was given the vote. In the outer provinces other rules might be in force. These new urban municipalities were made corporate bodies. The rather limited activities of urban municipalities comprised such items as roads, streets, parks, sewage-systems, fire-service, public utility works, public health service and so on. Municipal regulations could be made. In 1916 a new ordinance enabled the government to appoint burgomasters (burgemeesters) for those cities or towns that were deemed to need such an official (as in the Netherlands, the burgomaster was to be appointed by the central government). Their salaries were paid by the central government; a percentage of it was to be reimbursed by the municipal treasury. As these urban municipalities were considered western-type enclaves in the territory of 'ddat law it seemed convenient, at least during the first two decades of their existence, to appoint only European burgomasters. The werkouders (aldermen) were chosen by the council from among its own members. They formed under the chairmanship of the burgomaster the executive committee of the council. Only in the last decade before the second world war did the government start appointing Indonesians as burgomaster.

In the present Republic of Indonesia the principle of decentralisation as well as that of autonomy and local government is maintained in article 131 of its provisional constitution. New legislative measures however to give practical effect to this principle are not yet in force. For Java at least, an act of 1948 (nr. 23) promulgated by the former republic of Indonesia (vulgo: the Jogya-republic) has systematised the autonomous parts of the territory in three ranks: 1) provinces; 2) kabupaten or regencies and big cities; 3) small urban municipalities and rural units. As a consequence of article 142 of the above-mentioned provisional constitution (undang-undang dasar Republik Indonesia, promulgated 17 August 1950) all earlier regulations not explicitly abolished or altered are to be considered as decrees or regulations of the republic. So the essentials of the pre-war legislation as to urban municipalities are still in force, although the burgomasters are now officially called walikota, and the municipal council has influence on the appointment of these magistrates while the members of the councils are to be elected by all inhabitants of both sexes who have passed their 18th birthday or married at an earlier date. (The special and temporary situation in Jakarta where the 24 members of the council are appointed by the government, need not be discussed here).


BALĀGHĀ (a.), Abstract noun, from balāg, effective, eloquent (from balāgha “to attain something”), meaning therefore eloquence. It presupposes fasāh, purity and euphony of language, but goes beyond it in requiring, according to some of the early definitions, the knowledge of the proper connexion and separation of the phrase, clarity, and appropriateness to the occasion. Even though those definitions are not infrequently attributed to foreign nations such as the Persians, Greeks or Indians, the demand for skill in improvisation and the recurring references to the khadh (or orator) in connexion with the discussion of the concept make it abundantly clear that it originated in the Arabian milieu. The transfer of the concept to the written word and hence to literary criticism and, beyond this, its widening to denote a three-pronged science are the essential facts in the rather complicated history of the term.

Grammar and lexicology, the primary concerns of the early critic, became in the course of the nineteenth century, when stylistic perfection had been accepted as a desideratum in official pronouncements, integral parts of the education of the kāthi. The period appreciated systematisation not excluding the analysis of aesthetic experience. Acquaintance with the conceptual apparatus of Greek thought assisted in the articulation of critical insights even though the impulse toward a theory of balāgha, or aesthetic effectiveness on the verbal level, seems to have been germane to the Arab tradition which was then stimulated by an increased interest in structure and development of poetry and by the need to rationalise the aesthetic implications of the theological postulate of the uniqueness (isddā`ā) of the Kurʾān. The motivation for the first work exclusively devoted to certain formal characteristics of artistic expression, the Kitāb al-Badīʿ of Ibn al-Muʿtāz (written in 887/88; ed. I. Kratchkovsky, London 1935), was the justification of the ‘new’ or ‘modern’ tazz (written in 887/88; q.e.), of which the second half of the ninth century had witnessed the victorious surge. This justification Ibn al-Muʿtāz sought to accomplish by means of the proof that the figures of speech whose generous employment appears to have been the most prominent (and hence the most frequently criticised) feature of the modernistic style in the eyes of the public, were without exception traceable in the Holy Book as well as in classical literature. The reason why Ibn al-Muʿtāz divided the eighteen figures of which he furnishes examples into the two categories of badīʿ (five kinds) and maḥāsīn (thirteen) still eludes us. We know, however, that the second part of his work (which deals with the maḥāsīn) was added by the author after the first had encountered a certain amount of criticism. (W. Caskel, in OLZ, 1938, 146-47, sees the rationale for the distinction in the fact that it was only in the employment of the badīʿ figures that ‘modern’ poetry differed from the classical tradition.)

The use of the notion of the ‘rhetorical figure’ in the interpretation of the Kurʾān antedates the work
of Ibn al-Mu'tazz; the method is fully developed in Ibn Kayyim al-Jawzi's (d. 1324) *Talkhis al-Muharrar* (ed. A. Saqr, Cairo 1933); this fact may help us to understand why the doctrine of tropes and figures was the earliest aspect of *Balagha* to attract systematic investigation.

Kudama b. Dia'tar's (d. 927) *Nabu al-Sirr* is inspired by another tendency; Kudama searches for an objective standard in the evaluation of poetry. Rhetorical figures are only one of the elements with which the poet and his critic have to deal. Like many of his Arab and Greek predecessors Kudama was led, especially in his discussion of the defects of poetry, into problems that to our mind come within the purview of grammar and logic. The orderly fashion in which he coordinates the several viewpoints may have contributed to the three-fold structuring of the *'im al-balagha* at which the scholastic age of Muslim critical thought was to arrive. Not much later than Kudama one Ishâk b. Isha'bân b. Wadh, a *kîthâb*, wrote (in or after 335/946-7) the *Kitâb al-Burqân fi wa'dyâb al-bayân* (identical with the *Kitâb Nabu al-nâhâr* that had been attributed variously to Kudama and to Abû 'Abdallâh Muhammad b. Ayyûb al-Ghâfiqân, d. 1282; it awaits publication; it is known only through an arabic abridgment by 'Abd al-Kâdir al-Hamawi, RAAD, 1949, 73-81; cf. the discussion of the problem by S. Bonebakker in the introduction to his edition of *Nabu al-Sirr*, Leiden 1956, 15-20). Ishâk continues the discussion of 'the various ways of expressing things which Dâhîz, *Kitâb al-bayân wa'l-tabyin*, had initiated; he criticises the limitations of his predecessors and, from our point of view, indicates one of the directions in which the final systematisation of *Balagha* was to occur. This system slowly takes shape in works like the *Kitâb al-sinâ'atayn* of Abû Hilâl al-'Afsarî (d. 1005).

The struggle between the Ancients and the Moderns which dominates literary life from the middle of the ninth to the close of the eleventh century kept the interest in stylistic analysis alive. Toward the end of this period, 'Abd al-Kâhir al-Djurjânî (d. 1078) refined to a degree never reached by any Arab (or Persian) critic before or after him the comprehension of the psychological roots of the aesthetic effect. In his *Asrâr al-Balaghâ* (ed. H. Ritter, Istanbul 1954) his principal concern is with simile, metaphor and analogy—later to become the domain of the *'im al-balagha*. Djurjânî succeeded in explaining (the logical and) psychological foundations of the aesthetics implicit in the aspirations especially of the later phases of Arabic (and Persian and Turkish) poetry. His is the merit of having been the first to investigate the 'fantastic aetiology', the very life of Persian poetry in particular (although its technical designation, *hüsna al-lla'il*, is found only more than a century later in Sakkâki). Djurjânî's other important work, *Dalâ'îl al-figâs*, unquestionably spurred the rise of the *'im al-ma'ânî* as an integral part of rhetoric.

After Djurjânî the scholars hold the field. In the third part of his encyclopaedia of the sciences, *Miftâh al-wuslah*, Sakkâki (d. 1226 or 1229), gives the *'im al-balagha* the organisation which it was to retain to the present. In his treatment it comprises three branches: the *'im al-ma'ânî*, 'notions', dealing with the different kinds of sentence and their use; the *'im al-balagha*, 'modes of expression', with the art of expressing oneself eloquently and without ambiguity—both are concerned with the relation of thought to expression and with the different ways to express the 'same' idea which the poet or writer has at his disposal; one must never forget that the *'im al-balagha* as all Arab literary theory such as a Kunstlehre, an *ars dicendi*, and not an aesthetics in Plato's or our own sense, i.e., a Schönheitslehre. (At this point a distinct analogy may be drawn to Muslim treatment of political theory which, conspicuous exceptions such as Mawdûd's (d. 1058) *'Albâh al-sulâmîyya* notwithstanding, is concerned with the conduct of the ruler and his administrators rather than with the nature of kingship and administration.) The third branch is the *'im al-badi* which deals with the embellishment of speech and defines a large number of tropes classifying them in general to our mind in the model in *Syriac* diavolos, *ma'ânî*, and légeos, *lafî*.

A tendency to proliferation of the figures identified is unmistakable. Where Sakkâki (and his commentators al-Kawwâl, better known as *Musa Dimaghâ* (d. 1338), and al-Tâfzârî (d. 1389), whose works *Talkhis al-Mi'âlîlah*, and *Muhkhasar al-Talkhis*, have come to supersede Sakkâki's as the standard textbooks of rhetoric list thirty *ma'ânî* figures (some subdivided further) and seven *lafî*, Ibn Kayyim al-Jâzûyyî (d. 1350), *Kitâb al-Fau'dîd* has eighty-four *ma'ânî* alone.

The *Mu'adjâm fi ma'âsir aghâr al-'Adjam* of the Persian Shams-al-Kays (l. 1204-30) is the first and a fairly successful attempt to apply Sakkâki's system to a literature other than Arabic.

A contemporary of Sakkâki's commentators, Šâfi al-Dîn al-Hillî (d. 1349), inaugurated the fashion of the so-called *badî'yya*, a poem composed to illustrate the various figures of speech. The genre whose most celebrated representative is perhaps the *'Badî'yya* of Ibn Hîdîgî al-Hamawî (d. 1454) has been cultivated down to quite modern times. It is difficult to find the Hellenising strain in the theory of *Balagha* its proper place in this presentation; for with the significant exception of Kudama (cf. Bonebakker, *op. cit.*, 46-48) it has always remained on the edge of the developmental sequence. Both the *Poetics* and the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle found translators; the translation of the *Poetics* by the Nestorian, *Abû Bûgrâ Mâkî b. Yûnus* (d. 484) has found three editors (Margoliouth, Oxford 1887; Tkatsh, Vienna 1928-32; 'Abd al-Rahmân Badawî, Cairo 1953), that of the *Rhetoric* has remained unpublished. Concern for these works has been confined to the *fâ'âsîYa*, Avicenna included an abridgement of the *Rhetoric* in the section on logic of his *Ši'āl* (ed. S. Sâlim, Cairo 1954) and Averroes summarised the *Poetics* (edd. F. Lâsînîo, Pisa 1872; 'Abd al-Rahmân Badawî, Cairo 1953). But the literary background that served as the vantage-point for Aristotle's ideas remained alien to the mediaeval Muslim. Respect for the protophilosopher rather than a desire to influence Arab literature or the reduction to theory of its techniques and aspirations motivated such occasional studies as were accorded those much misunderstood works.

What Averroes observed with regard to Greek epic narrative in metrical form (in connexion with the *Poetics* xxii), that "all this is peculiar to them (i.e., the Greeks) and nothing like it is to be found among ourselves", could fairly be extended to the tradition of Greek literature and its theory as a whole—even though a good many motifs, conventions and definitions of tropes did find their way (in contrast to the other Greek bequests) apparently not through the mediation of the Syriac tradition) into Arabic literature and theory.

Bibliography: A. F. von Mehren, *Die Rhetorik*
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(A. Schaefer-[G. E. von Grunebaum])

Balak, Nūr al-Dawla Balak b. Bahram b. Artuk, one of the first Artuksids, known chiefly as a tough warrior. He appears in history in 489/1096 as commander of Saruḏ on the Middle Euphrates. This locality being taken from him by the Crusaders in the following year, and his uncle Ilghāzī having been appointed governor of Īrāk by Sulṭān Muḥammad, he accompanied him, and is found in the following years struggling vainly for the little towns of ʿĀnā and Hadījā, against Arabs, or protecting the Baghdad-Iturids' road from the Turks and Turkmans. After Ilghāzī's disgrace in 498/1105 he returned to Diyar Bārak, the headquarters of the family, as did his uncle, and in 1110 accompanied him on an expedition in Syria in which Sukmān al-Ḵūṭṭī of Akhlat also took part. On Ilghāzī and Sukmān's quarrelling he was carried off a prisoner by the latter. He was soon set free on the death of the latter and his ally Gavras, the Byzantine duke, and called on Joscelin for assistance. He defeated Joscelin, but was killed by an arrow during the siege (518/1124).

After his death Khartpert soon passed into the control of his cousin Ībrāhīm al-Ḫan-Ḵayfā, whose son married Balak's daughter and only heiress. Balak is hardly known except for his martial exploits. The most one can add is that he lessened the effect of his predicaments on enemy lands by making forced transplantations of peasants, who brought the conquered lands back to productivity again. He was still basically a Turkomān chief, but endowed with a striking personality which made him in his last days one of the first champions of the Muslim revival against the Crusaders.

Bibliography: The sources are the same as those for the general history of Syria and Mesopotamia in the period in question, and more particularly for Īrāk Ibn al-Ṭahlī, for Upper Mesopotamia the same writer and Ibn al-Azraḳ (unpublished), for Syria Ibn al-Kalānsī and Ibn Ābī Ṭayyīf (in Ibn al-Furūtā, unpublished); apart from these, the Francish historians of the Crusades, particularly for Irak Ibn al-Athir, for Upper Mesopotamia the same writer and Ibn al-Kalamsī and Ibn al-Azraḳ (unpublished), for Syria Ibn al-Kalansī and Ibn Ābī Ṭayyīf (in Ibn al-Furūtā, unpublished); apart from these, the Francish historians of the Crusades, Ordarcy Vitalis (éd. le Prévost), the Armenian Matthew of Edessa and the Michael the Syrian (éd. trans. Chabot). Among modern works see the histories of the Crusades, esp. Grousset, i; C. Cahen, Syrie du Nord à l'époque des Croisades, 1940 (with study of sources), and by the same scholar, Diyar Bahr au temps des premiers Iraniades, in JA, 1935. See also J. Sauvaget, La tombe de l'Artouheid Balak in Arti Islamica v-2, 1938, and the article Artuksids. (C. Cahen)

Balak b. Sāfūn. [see ʿĀnak b. ʿānak]

Balaklava, in the Tatar language Balaklava (with the folk-etymological meaning of "fishery", "fishing-place"), a small port in the Crimea, on a deep inlet of the Black Sea. Balaklava, which is not visible from the open sea, lies 16 km. south of Sevastopol'.

The town was known to the Greek geographers (Strabo, etc.) under the name of Palashon on the sea-inlet Ἱωμηθῶν λιμήν and was inhabited by Taurians, who used it also as a place of refuge. It came later under Roman and Byzantine rule and during the 9th-13th centuries acted as the centre of a modest exchange-trade with the Russians. The Genoese settled here in about 1360 and founded a Roman Catholic bishopric; the entire southern shore of the Crimea as far as Kaffa (Feodosiya) was made over to them by Byzantium in 1380. The town, at that time, bore the name of Cembalo (probably from Symbolon) and was strongly fortified; remnants of the walls were still to be seen in the 19th century. An attempt of the Greek inhabitants, in 1433-1434, to rid themselves of Genoese rule miscarried.

Balaklava fell in 1475 under the onslaught of the Crimean Tatars and remained so until 1753, forming the southern limit of their lands over against the territories under direct Ottoman rule (cf. Muḥammad Riḍā, ed. Kazem-Beg, q2: with reference to a date c. 1540). The town, during this period, was only of commercial importance. The Tatars, who had gradually settled in the town, left it after its subjection to Russia (1753) and were replaced by Greeks from the Aegean Islands who, from 1768-1774, had joined the Russians. These people
formed a battalion of their own from 1795 to 1859. A
engagement was fought near Balaklava on 25
October 1854, during the Crimean War. Today
Balaklava is a small market-town occupied with
fishing and vine-growing.

Bibliography: P. Köppen, Krimshey Borshch, St.
Petersburg 1837, 210-227 (with a plan); V.
Smirnov, Krimshey Khabar..., St. Petersburg
1887, index; E. S. Zevakin and N. A. Pencho, Iz
istorii sotsial'no-kul'turnoy zhizni v genetskom hol-
odyzisnym Sen. Preobrazhenskaya v XV xe., in Istoriches-
kiye Zapiski, 1940, no. 7; Brockhaus-Yefron, Enci-
lopediatskaya Slovart, vol. 4 (11 A), St. Petersburg
1891, 783 ff.; Bol'shaya Sotsiotskaya Enciklipediya,
v (1930), 102 ff. Cf. on Balaklava in ancient times
Pauly-Wissowa, xvi/2 (1942), col. 2498 (Ernst
Diehl) and 2nd Ser., vol. iv A i., (1931), col.
1097 (E. Oberhammer) with a full discussion
about the site). Cf. on Balaklava under Genoese
rule B. Spuler, Die Goldene Horde, Leipzig 1943,
240 ff., 267, and 395 ff. (with further bibliog-
raphical references).

BALSAM b. BAL'AM b. Beor of the Hebrew Bible. The Kor'an does not mention him, unless perhaps in an allusion in vii. 175 [174], 176 [175]. The commentator and historians keep the main elements of the Biblical story in their acc-
counts of him (Num xx, 8) and following the Jewish Aggada which likewise has given other features of his portrait, make him responsible for the formation of the Israelites with the daughters of Moab and Midian (Numbers xxvi, 6) and the opinion of al-Ma
kub al-Naysaburi. In this year he was at Ashtarabid (Ibn al-A'lhir,
vii, 96), and is thereafter mentioned repeatedly (Ibn al-A'lhir, vii, 196, 207, al-Mukaddasi, 377), till he was
replaced by the younger Djayhali in 340/957-958
Istakhri (276) mentions his houses at Marw, and a
gate in Bukhara was named after him, Báb al-
Shaykh al-Djalal (ibid., 307), the same apparently
as that in later times was called 'Shaykh Djalal'. The sources agree as to his capacity, and he
was a patron of men of learning. He is said by
Sam'ani (fol. 262 verso) to have considered the poet
Rüdagi without a peer among the Arabs and Persians. He died, according to Sam'ani (fol. 300 r.), in the night of 10 Safar 329/14 November 940.

(2) ABU 'AMIN MUHAMMAD B. MUHAMMAD AL-
BALSAM, son of the foregoing, was appointed wa'asir to
'Ibn-al-Malik I b. Núb (343-350/954-961) towards the end of his reign through the influence of the hādīb Alptagln (Gardizi, Zayn al-Alqhir, ed. M. Nā'imī, E.
G. Browne Memorial Series, 1928, 42). He did not
inherit his father's practical ability. Mukaddasi (338)
calls him Amirak Bal'am, with the diminutive, and
mentions that he was twice wa'asir to 'Abd al-Malik's successor al-Manṣūr I b. Núb (350-356/961-976), from whom he received instructions in 352/965 (cf. Rieu,
Catalogue of the Persian MSS. in the British Museum, i, 69) to compose the translation of Tabari which has made him famous. This is one of the earliest prose
works in modern Persian and inaugurates the long
and brilliant series of Persian historical works.

Bal'am did not attempt to bring the history
down to his own time. He omits the 'sīnādis (chains of
authorities) and alternative versions of the same
event characteristic of Tabari, presenting a con-
tinuous account derived from these. The same method
was followed by later Arabic historians such as Ibn
al-A'lhir (cf. G. Weil, Geschichte der Caliphen, iii,
X ff.). The result is a work substantially shorter than
the original (4 volumes in Zotenberg's French
translation and one volume in the Lucknow edition,
as against the 15 volumes of the Leiden Tabari). Yet
Bal'am's History is not simply an abbreviation of
Tabari. Occasionally he gives substantial additional
information, as in the case of a series of episodes in
the fighting between the Arabs and Khazars from
1047/961 onwards (text in B. Dorn, Nachrichten
über die Chasaren, see Bibliography), the source of
which appears to be the Kiāb al-Futūh of Ibn A'īsham al-Kufi (cf. Akdes Nimet Kurat, Aba Mu-
hammad Ahmad bin A'īsham al-Kufi'oñ kīāb al-
sūlah, Ankhara Üniv. Dil ve Tarh-coğ. Fak. Der-
gisi, 1949, 255-282; D. M. Dunlop, History of the
Jewish Khazars, 58). Most surviving MSS. of Bal'am
represent a later redaction, the approximate date of
which is indicated by a short appendix, giving a
curt account of the 'Abbasid Caliphs down to the
death of al-Musta'ir and accession of al-
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According to B. Spuler (The Evolution of Persian Historiography), the translation of the passage into Persian under the Samanids served no mere cultural purpose, but was intended to show the Persians that the destiny of their nation was linked with orthodox Islam.

Bal'ami died, according to Gardizi (ed. M. Nāsim, 45), in Djamād II, 363 (February 27th-March 27th, 974). The much later date for his death indicated by 'Ubāb (Tārīḥ al-Yaminī, ed. Cairo, A.H. 1286, i, 170), which says that he was appointed by Nūh II b. Mānsūr for a short time after the fall of Buhārā in Rabī 1/382 May 992, seems less likely.


(D. M. Dunlop)

BĀL‘ANBAR. [See TAMIM].

BALANDJAR, an important Khazar town, lying on a river of the same name, N. of the pass of Darband, i.e., Bāb al-Abwāb [q.v.], at the E. extremity of the Caucasus. Its site is probably to be identified with the ruins of Endere near Andreyeva. Balandjar appears to have been originally the group-name of its inhabitants (cf. Tābarī, i, 694-96, and 'Barandjar' below). According to Mas'ūdī (al-Tanbih, 62), Balandjar was the Khazar capital before Atil [q.v.] on the Volga, but in the accounts which we have there is no evidence that this was so. Balandjar was the subject of repeated attacks by the Arabs in the first Arab-Khazar war, and in 32/652 underwent a full-scale siege, which ended disastrously for the assailants. It was again besieged by the Arabs under Dīrādh b. 'Abd Allāh al-Hakami in 104/722-723, and this time was captured. Most of the inhabitants are said to have emigrated. It is readily understandable that many of them moved N. Two hundred years after this the traveller Ibn Faḍlān (310/922) came across thousands of 'Barandjar' among the Volga Bulgars. According to the figures given by Ibn al-Aṯīr (sub anno 104) for the amount of the booty distributed after the siege—300 dinārs per horseman in an army of 30,000—Balandjar at the time of its fall must have been a place of great wealth. From this point its importance appears to have declined, and after the close of the second Arab-Khazar war in 119/737 it is scarcely mentioned.


(D. M. Dunlop)

BALANSIYA (VALENCIA), a town in Spain, the third in size as regards population, which exceeds 500,000, lying on the east of the Peninsula, 3 miles from the Mediterranean and from its port, el Grao. It is connected with Madrid by two railway lines, one via Alaceta, 306 m. (490 km.) in length, the other via Cuenca, 251 m. (402 km.) in length, and by road (218 m. = 350 km.); the distance as the crow flies is however only 188 miles. Valencia is the capital of the province of the same name and the diocese of an archbishop. Its situation is a striking one, in the centre of the fertile Huerta de Valencia, which is watered by the Turia or Guadalaviar (Ar. Wādī ʾI-ʾAbayd, the ‘White River’) and is the site of part of the lake of Albufera [see BUKHAYRA]. Unlike Cordova or Toledo, the old capital of Valencia has seen its importance grow with the years and it remains the capital of the Spanish Levante, the Shark al-Andalus of the Muslim period. It is still known officially as Valencia del Cid in memory of the part played in its history by the celebrated Castilian hero.

Valencia was founded by the Romans in 138 B.C. After the death of the rebel Viriathus, the consul D. Junius Brutus established a colony there of veterans who had remained faithful to Rome. The inhabitants later took the side of Sertorius and in 75 B.C. Pompey partially destroyed the town which began to return to prosperity under Augustus. It was taken by the Visigoths in 413 and became Muslim in 714, when Tārīf [q.v.] established himself there and at Saguntum, Jativa and Denia.

In the political history of Umayyad Spain, Valencia seems only to have been a place of minor importance. The country of which it was the capital soon became arabised by the settlement of Ḥāṣṣa colonies: the capital of Spanish Levante thus was one of the most active centres of Arab culture throughout the whole period of the Muslim occupation; on the other hand in the mountains along the Valencian littoral there were little islands of people of Berber origin. Valencia at this time was the capital of a province or hāra, as we know from the eastern writer al-Muḳaddāsī and the Spaniard al-Raḍī (see Yāḳūt, s.v.) and the residence of a governor (audīl) appointed by the caliph of Cordova. It is only from the 9th/10th century, with the break up of the caliphate, that, becoming the capital of an independent Muslim state and very soon one of the principal objectives of the Christian reconquista, Valencia began to occupy a more and more important place in the Spanish and Arabic chronicles of the mediaeval history of Spain that have come down to us.

The Muslim kingdom of Valencia was founded in 401/1010-11 by two enfranchised ʿAmyrids, Mubārak and Muṣaffar, previously in charge of the irrigation system of the district who declared themselves independent and shared the power. After a very short reign Mubārak died and Muṣaffar was driven from Valencia; the inhabitants of this town then chose another "Slav" [cf. ʿAmyrids] to rule them, called Lahlū, who placed himself under the suzerainty of the Christian count of Barcelona. The principality of Valencia soon passed into the hands of a grandson of al-Ḥānsūr Ibn Abī ʿAmyr [q.v.], ʿAbd al-ʿAzzī b. ʿAbd al-ʿRāmīn who, like his grandfather, assumed the lakab of al-Ḥānsūr; he had previously been a refugee at the court of the Tughilid Muṣaffar b. Yāḥyā at Saragossa. The reign of ʿAbd al-ʿAzzī, which lasted till his death in 452/ 1061 brought an era of peace and prosperity to Valencia. He recognised the authority of the caliph of Cordova, al-Kāsim b. ʿAbbās, who gave him the right to bear the titles al-Muʿtamin and Dhu ʾl-Sabikatayn, and kept on good terms with the caliph of Cordova. It is only from the 5th/6th century, with the break up of the caliphate, that, becoming the capital of an independent Muslim state and very soon one of the principal objectives of the Christian reconquista, Valencia began to occupy a more and more important place in the Spanish and Arabic chronicles of the mediaeval history of Spain that have come down to us.

The Muslim kingdom of Valencia was founded in 401/1010-11 by two enfranchised ʿAmyrids, Mubārak and Muṣaffar, previously in charge of the irrigation system of the district who declared themselves independent and shared the power. After a very short reign Mubārak died and Muṣaffar was driven from Valencia; the inhabitants of this town then chose another "Slav" [cf. ʿAmyrids] to rule them, called Lahlū, who placed himself under the suzerainty of the Christian count of Barcelona. The principality of Valencia soon passed into the hands of a grandson of al-Ḥānsūr Ibn Abī ʿAmyr [q.v.], ʿAbd al-ʿAzzī b. ʿAbd al-ʿRāmīn who, like his grandfather, assumed the lakab of al-Ḥānsūr; he had previously been a refugee at the court of the Tughilid Muṣaffar b. Yāḥyā at Saragossa. The reign of ʿAbd al-ʿAzzī, which lasted till his death in 452/ 1061 brought an era of peace and prosperity to Valencia. He recognised the authority of the caliph of Cordova, al-Kāsim b. ʿAbbās, who gave him the right to bear the titles al-Muʿtamin and Dhu ʾl-Sabikatayn, and kept on good terms with the Christian kingdoms of Spain. His son ʿAbd al-Mallik succeeded him and took the title al-Muṣaffar. He was still a youth at his accession and the vizier Ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzzī acted as regent. Very soon afterwards, Ferdinand I of Castile and Leon attacked Valencia and almost captured the town, after
inflicting a severe defeat on the Valencians who made a sortie to attempt to drive off the besiegers. ʿAbd al-Malik sought the assistance of the king of Toledo al-Maʿmun b. Dhu ’l-Nun [q.v.] but the latter came to Valencia and soon dethroned the young king (457/1065). The principality of Valencia then was incorporated in the kingdom of Toledo and al-Maʿmun left the vizier Abū Bāk r b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz there to govern it. When al-Maʿmun died in 457/1065 he was succeeded by his son Yahyā al-ʿKādīr, whose great incapacity soon became apparent. Valencia then gradually recovered its independence; al-ʿKādīr sought the help of Alfonso VI, king of Castile, to bring the town under his authority again but he ended by having to surrender his own capital to him in 478/ 1085. For the course of events and part played in them by the great Castilian hero Rodrigo Díaz de Vivar, the Cid of history and legend, cf. the article on his life and times.

On their arrival in Spain, the Almoravids tried to regain the kingdom of Valencia for Islām but their efforts against the Cid were fruitless. When he died in 492/1099 his widow Ximena was still able to offer some resistance to the attacks of the Almoravids, led by Māzdāll. But in the end she abandoned Valencia after first of all setting fire on it and the Muslims entered it on 15 Radjab 495/ May 1102.

Governors appointed by the Almoravids succeeded one another at Valencia until the middle of the 6th/12th century when the town gradually began to resume its independence in the troubled period which preceded the coming of the Almohads into Spain, and it linked its fortunes with those of Murcia whose series of ephemeral rulers it recognised. In 542/1147, Ibn Mardinān was proclaimed king of Valencia but four years later his subjects rebelled against him. Under the nominal suzerainty of the Almohads, Valencia continued in the hands of local princes until it finally fell into Christian hands, two years after Cordova, when James I of Aragon took it on 28 Sept. 1238.
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**BALASÂGHUN** or Balasakhon, a town in the valley of the Çu, in what is now Kirghizia. The medieval geographers give only vague indications as to its position. Barthold, *Olelî o poyysëde s Srednyiya Assiya*, St. Petersburg 1897, 39, suggests its identity with Aq-Pëshin in the region of Frunze. A. N. Bernshtam, *Cuyshkaya dolina in Materiâli i issledovaniya arkeologii S.S.S.R.*, No. 14 (1950), 47-55, agrees with Barthold and gives a description of the site. The town was a Soghdian foundation and in Kâshghâr's time, i.e., in the second half of the 11th century, the Soghdian language still survived alongside Turkish. According to Kâshghârî Balasaghun was also known as Kuz-Ordu or Kuz-Ulûgh. The former name is also found in the Chinese account of the Kara-Khitay, and a variant of Kuz-Ulûgh — Kuz-Balîgh or Ghuz-Balîgh, *balîgh* like *sîdâgh* meaning "town" — was according to Djûwaynî still current in the 7th/13th century.

According to a story in the *Siyasat-nâmâ* (ed. Schefer, 169) a religious war was planned about 1301/942-3 against the "infield Turks" who had conquered Balasaghun. These must have been the Kara-Khânîds immediately prior to their conversion to Islam. Balasaghun afterwards became the headquarters of the first Kara-Khânîd invasion of Mâwarî al-Nahr under Bughra Khân b. Mûsâ (d. 382/992). Shortly after 416/1025-6 the ruler of Balasaghun, Toghan Khân, brother of the Kara-Khânîd ruler of Mâwarî al-Nahr, 'All Tegin, was driven out of his territory by other members of the dynasty ruling in Kâshghâr (Bayhaqi, ed. Morley, 98 and 653, ed. Ghânî and Fâyyâd, 91 and 526). Balasaghun seems afterwards to have belonged to the same ruler as Kâshghâr. The poet Yûsuf Khâş-Hâdjîb, author of the *Kudadgî Buît*, the oldest poem in the Turki language, was born in Balasaghun (462/1070-7; the Bughra Khân to whom it is dedicated must be Bughra Khân Hûrnûn, who ruled over Kâshghâr, Khotan and Balasaghun, first with his brother Toghîr Khân and then, for 29 years till 496/1102-3, alone.

About 1130 Balasaghun was conquered by the Kara-Khitay [q.v.] and the ruler of the town, who had appealed to their leader (the Gûr-Khân) for help against the Kâshghâr and Karîlgîh nomads, was deposed. The real seat of the Kârâ-Khitay still remained the territory on the Çu while native princes ruled as vassals of the Gûr-Khân in Mâwarî al-Nahr and Kâshghâr as well as in the districts of Semirechye north of the Ili.

When the army of the Gûr-Khân was defeated by Muhammad Khwarazm-Shâh in Rabî’ I 607/ August-September 1210, on the Talas, the inhabitants of Balasaghun, expecting the speedy arrival of the victor, refused the defeated army admittance to the town. After a 16 days' siege it was taken by the Kara-Khitay and plundered for three days, during which time, according to Djûwaynî, "47,000 of the chief notables were counted among the slain."

Balasaghun is seldom mentioned during the Mongol period. Barthold's assumption that it was taken without resistance by Cîngir-Khân's general Diebe in 1215, in the course of his operations against Kûtlûg, the Naysan ruler of Kara-Khitay, is based on a misreading of its name. *Ghuz-Balîgh* or *gho balîgh* "good town". In the account of Timur's campaigns Balasaghun is never mentioned; like all the towns on the Çu, Ili and Talas it must have been destroyed during the endless wars and struggles for the throne in the 8th/14th century. Muhammad Baydar, writing about the middle of the 10th/16th century, knew about Balasaghun only from books; of the town itself no trace was then to be found.


**BALAT** (Ar.), a town with a number of varied meanings due to its dual etymology, Latin or Greek as the case may be. Deriving from *palatium* it means "palace" (Mas‘ûdi, *al-Tânîh*, 167; Ibn al-‘Adîm, *Zûbûda*, ed. Dahan, i, 142 and 145; Mu’kaddasî, 147, and Ibn Hawkâl*, 195, mentioning the Dâr al-Balât at Constantinople; cf. M. Canard, *Extraits des sources arabes*, ap. A. A. Vasiliev, *Bysance et les Arabes*, ii/4, Brussels 1950, 412, 423 and n. 2). Deriving from *kathedrâl* (through the intermediary of Aramaic), it has two principal meanings corresponding to those of the Greek term, denoting "a paved way", an old Roman road for example (see Ibn al-‘Adîm, *Zûbûda*, i, 144), "flagging" or, in the form of the noun of unity *balâta*, a "flag-stone" of any kind of material serving to pave the ground or to bear a memorial or memorial inscription (see for example, Mugîrî al-Dîn al-Ulâyînî, *al-Ins al-Djâlîlî*, Cairo ed. 1253 AH., 372), whence the meaning of "stele", or "portico" or "colonnaded gallery", more especially the "nave" of a mosque (see for example Ibn Djûbayr, *Rîhîla*, ed. de Goeje, 190).

The word Balât occurs in various rural and urban toponyms, both in the Muslim West (see infra) and East, where it is especially frequent in Syria-Palastina. The following are the main occurrences: the town of al-Balât in Northern Syria, which was adjacent to a Roman highway (M. Canard, *Histoire des Hamdanides*, i, Algiers 1951, 218), — the al-Balât quarter of Aleppo, the name of which recalled the old monumental thoroughfare (J. Sauvaget), — the former village of Bayt al-Balât in the Ḥûda of Damascus, — the village of Balatça or Bulatî in Palestine (the name of which could also derive from the Latin *platanus*), — the Bûb al-Balât in Jerusalem (cf. J. Sauvaget, *Les peres choisies*, Belrut 1933, 99 n. 1), — the paved square of al-Balât in Medina, — the quarter of Balat in Istanbul [q.v.], — the village of Balat, adjacent to the ruins of ancient Milet in Asia Minor and corresponding to the Saldjukid town of Palatia (see Fauly-Wissowa, under *Miletos*).


**BALât**, now a small village on the site of the ancient Miletos in Caria. The word Balât derives from "Balatça", the name used for this locality at least from the first years of the 13th century. Balât
came under the control of the Beys of Menteshe (q.v.) towards the close of this century and, because of its favourable situation near the mouth of the river Mianandros (Büyük Menderes), served them as a point of departure for their raids into the Aegean Sea and, later, as a commercial centre of some importance. The Venetians had a church and a consulate there by 1355. Balatlı flourished at this time on the traffic in such commodities as saffron, sesame, wax, alum from Kütahya, slaves from the islands of the Archipelago, etc. The Ottoman sultan Bayezid I confirmed to the Venetians their privileges at Balatlı, when, in the winter of 791-2/1389-90, he took over the coast-lands of Menteshe. Timur Beg, after his defeat of the Ottomans at Ankara in 804/1402, set on the throne Ilyas, a member of the local dynasty. This prince was forced, however, to become a vassal of Sultan Meşmed I in 818/1415 and by 829/1425-6 Menteshe had been absorbed once more, and this time definitively, into the Ottoman state. Balatlı, during the course of the 15th century, began to sink into a long and slow decline, due in no small measure to its fever-ridden climate and to the gradual silting of the river estuary. None the less, the active, although no doubt diminishing commerce was still associated with Balatlı, when Ewliya Celebi passed through this region in 1671-72. Balatlı, now assigned to the kaza of Söke in the province of Aydın, lies today approximately 9 km. from the sea and had in 1945 a population of about 700 people.


**Balat**. In Spain, of the various meanings of the word *balat*, the most general seems to be "pavement"; it was thus used to denote the Roman roads of the Peninsula, as the vocabulary attribute to Raimundo Martín. The now ruined town of Albalat, on the border of Roman gondo, adjoining a ford across the Tagus, near the Almaraz bridge, must take its name from one of these roads. The battlefield of Tours and Poitiers, called Balat al-Shuhada (q.v.) after the Roman road, would seem to confirm this meaning. But it is extremely doubtful whether such a concrete meaning applied to the whole *bilm* which, according to al-Idrisi, comprised a large part of present-day Spanish Estramadura, with Alange, Medellín, Trujillo and Caceres, in addition to the Balatlı already mentioned. On the other hand, the numerous Spanish place-names, Albalat, Albalato and their derivatives and diminutives, Albadalejo, Albalatillo, could better be explained by *al-balad, or *balard* "place, terrain or locality"; thus, Albalat de la Ribera, near the river Júcar, Albalat dels Sorells, near Valencia, and Albalat dels Tarongers, in the Sagunto region, do not seem to have any connexion with Roman roads, and seem only to be names of hamlets or villages; the numerous Albalates which exist in the provinces of Teruel, Huesca, Guadalajara, Ciudad-Real, Toledo and the Ajarafe of Seville, must be interpreted in the same way. The derivation from *platea* or *palatium*, applicable to place-names in Jerusalem, Syria and Medina, is not found in al-Andalus.

In addition to the *bilm* of al-Balat in Muslim Spain, there was another *bilm* in the Portuguese zone, al-Balata, situated in the Faqṣ Balatlıa, a huge plain between Lisbon and Santarem; this *bilm* contained, apart from these two towns, the town of Cintra, and its territory corresponded to present-day Ribatejo. The name given to it by al-Idrisi coincides with that of Vallada, a small town in the commune of Azambuja; el-Campo de Vallada, a translation of Faṣṣ Balatlıa, is also quoted, although its extent is less than that attributed to it by al-Idrisi; its etymological derivation from *plata* or *vallata* appears to be neither well-founded nor acceptable.

**Bibliography:** Idrisi, text 175-6, translation: 211, 225-6; Yâlût, i, 709; E. Saavedra, *La Geografía de España del Edrisi*, 52-3; David Lopes, *Estudo dos nomes geográficos do territorio mululmano, que depois foi português*, 47.

(A. Huici Miranda)
Arab and especially European, has mainly been to explain the term Balāt al-Shuhadāʾ and to determine the exact site of the battle. Balāt [q.v.] is borrowed from the Graeco-Latin and appears to render both plateia: “wide paved road, paved public square,” and palatium: “palace”. It has been rendered, as regards the Battle of Poitiers, by “pavement” and by “highway”.


In conclusion, it is perhaps of interest to note that al-Tabarî (d. 310/923), is absolutely silent on the Battle of Poitiers (there is nothing in his Ta’rikh al-Umam wa‘l-Mulâk Annâles, sub anno 114, or in the two or three preceding or following years); likewise Ibn al-Kūtîyya (died 367/977), in his Iṣṭīḥā al-Andalus.

Balātunus, medieval name of a Syrian fortress now in ruins and called Kāl’at al-Muhanna, which was built on one of the first spurs of the Djabal Anšariya, and, with the castle of Sāḥyūn, commanded the plain of al-Lādhiqiyah and guarded the road from the Orontes to Djabala, “its port” according to al-Dimashqī.

According to the Arabic sources, it is supposed to have been begun by the clan of the Banu ‘l-Abmar, then continued by the Byzantines who inhabited possession of it and, in the time of Basil II, based the protection of the coastal region, in which they had taken up their quarters, partly upon it. It again passed under Arab control, but after the First Crusade, was to fall into the hands of Roger of Antioch, who bestowed it on the lord of Sābne as a fief, and it remained in the hands of the Franks from 1122/1128 to 1248/1252. In this latter date, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn made himself master of it and in the ayyubid period it became temporarily part of the Kingdom of Aleppo of al-Malik al-Zahir. After the Mongol invasion which had encouraged the efforts of a local family to establish their independence, it was obliged to surrender to Baybars in 697/1298 and became in the Mamlūk period the centre of one of the six districts of the miṣyāḥ of Tripoli.

It is not known when it fell into ruins and relinquished its ancient name (derived from the Latin Platanus) for the present term, which for a long time prevented its identification.

Balātunus, medieval name of a Syrian fortress now in ruins and called Kāl’at al-Muhanna, which was built on one of the first spurs of the Djabal Anšariya, and, with the castle of Sāḥyūn, commanded the plain of al-Lādhiqiyah and guarded the road from the Orontes to Djabala, “its port” according to al-Dimashqī.

It is not known when it fell into ruins and relinquished its ancient name (derived from the Latin Platanus) for the present term, which for a long time prevented its identification.


Balāwāt. This is a small village lying some 16 miles south-east of Mawšil on the Dayr Mūr Bihām-Kara Kosb road. It is mentioned by Yāḳūt under “Balābāḥij”, which he describes as follows: “It is a village situated east of Mawšil in the province of Nineveh and can be reached by a short journey
from Mawṣīl. It is frequented by caravans and there exists in it a Khan for travellers. It lies between Ṭīgš and the Ṣabīr rivers. Balāwāt is one of the villages in the Ḥamdānīya mākiya in the Mawṣīl Līwā of ʿIrāk. The majority of its inhabitants are of the Ṣhābak faith (cf. Ahmad Ḥāmid al-Ṣarrāf, al-Shaḥaḥ, 10). Balāwāt’s only claim to fame is the existence of a historical mound some few steps from it. This mound is known as “Tell Balāwāt”, and is one of the Assyrian historical sites excavated in the 19th century; Hormuzd Rassām, of Mawṣīl, discovered there in 1878 the bronze gates of the palace of the Assyrian king Shalmanessar III (859-824 B.C.). These gates were taken to the British Museum, London. The inscriptions and scenery contained thereon illustrate the first third of the reign of this king, and also clarify some of the conditions prevailing in the 9th century B.C. From some of the Assyrian texts, it appears that the ancient name of Tell Balāwāt was Imguur-Enlīt.


BALAWHAR [see BILAWHAR WA YUDASAF].

AL-BALAWĪ, ʿABD MUḤ. ʿABD ALLĀH B. MUḤ. AL-MADĪNĪ, Egyptian historian; the dates of his birth and death are not known, but we can reasonably assume that he lived in the 4th/9th century. He belonged to the Arab tribe BALAJ, a branch of the Kudās, who were scattered in different parts of the Ḥidjāz, Syria and Egypt.

The earliest biographical notice is that given in the Fihrist, which names several books. All of them are lost, but Al-Balawi’s Sirat ʿAbd al-Dāyā b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥ. al-Madīnī was discovered in about 1935 by the late Muḥ. Kurd ʿAlī. It seems more likely that both of them depended mostly upon the same main source, which was the official documents preserved in the first chancery office (Diwan al-Inqāḥ) founded in Egypt by Ahmad Ibn Tulūn (see the Sirat of Al-Balawi, 100-1, 111, 122, 224, 228-9).

The Sirat of Al-Balawi is an invaluable source for many reasons. One of the oldest Muslim historical works written in Egypt, it sheds new light on the history of institutions, such as the ḥārdjī, the police, justice, espionage, the post, etc. It also contains a number of official documents relating to that period.


BALBAN [see DELHI SULTANATE].

BALDJ B. BISHR ʿĪYĀD AL-KUḤAYRĪ, an Arab military leader, of a brave but haughty disposition, commanded the Syrian cavalry in the army sent against the Berbers in 1227/747 by the Caliph Ḥaḍīḥ, b. ʿAbd al-Malik, under the leadership of ʿUqayb b. Ṣuqaym, Baldj’s uncle. After their arrival in Ibrīkiya (in Rāmaḍān 123/20 July-18 August 741), the violence and arrogance Baldj and his Syrians earned them the bitter hostility of the African Arabs, especially the Anṣār, who had fled westwards in a body after the battle fought in the Ḥarā in 65/683. So it was that when near Tillmsān the Syrian army was united with the African army (together amounting to some 60,000 men), they all but came to blows through the arrogance of the Syrians and a quarrel which arose between Baldj and the commander of the African contingent from Ḥabīb b. Ṣuqaym, Baldj’s uncle. After the arrival in Ibrīkiya (in Rāmaḍān 123/20 July-18 August 741), the violence and arrogance Baldj and his Syrians earned them the bitter hostility of the African Arabs, especially the Anṣār, who had fled westwards in a body after the battle fought in the Ḥarā in 65/683. So it was that when near Tillmsān the Syrian army was united with the African army (together amounting to some 60,000 men), they all but came to blows through the arrogance of the Syrians and a quarrel which arose between Baldj and the commander of the African contingent from Ḥabīb, who was well-versed in Berber fighting methods, but whose counsel was arrogantly rejected
by Baldj, and entrusted it to two Syrian officers, a measure which still further increased the resentment of the Africans. As a result, the Arabs suffered a complete defeat at Bakduara (or Nabduara on the Sebū to the North of Fās, comp. Fournel, Les Berbers, i, 294, rem. 2). Baldj himself, by his over-confidence and the impetuosity of his attack, which resulted in his becoming separated in the action from his foot-soldiers, was the real cause of the disaster (in Dhu l-'Hijja 124/1347 October 14 November 741). At the head of some 7,000 horsemen, he fought his way through to Ceuta, where he withstood a protracted siege by the Berbers, until the day when the governor of Cordova, Abd al-Malik b. Katan [g.v.], an Anšārī, brought him over to Spain with his Syrians to use him against the Berbers who were in revolt there. Precautions, moreover, were taken on both sides: Baldj undertook to leave Spain as soon as the Berber revolt had been repressed; he was to give hostages as a guarantee. On his part, the governor Abd al-Malik promised the Syrians that when the time came for them to depart, they would be taken back to North Africa all together and not in separate groups, which would make them extremely vulnerable; and that, furthermore, they would be landed at a point on the coast of the Maghrib, where the hinterland was effectively under Arab control. The intervention of Baldj and his horsemen was decisive; the Berber rebels had formed themselves into three columns. Baldj counteracted swiftly and scattered the first group in the direction of Medina-Sidonia. The second band was dispersed in the Cordova region. The third and most numerous column, engaged in laying siege to Toledo, was severely defeated at the battle of Wad Salit (the arroyo of Guzaleta, a small tributary of the left bank of the Tagus). Thenceforth, the governor Abd al-Malik's only desire was to send his too burdensome auxiliaries back to Africa. But he did not adhere to his word, and tried to interpret the stipulations of the agreement contracted with him in the manner least favourable to the Syrians. When he sought to re-embark them for Ceuta the enraged governor of Narbonne, who mortally wounded Baldj with his own hand.


BÅLHARA (see HARITH B. KÂ'AB).

BÅLI, one of the Muslim trading states in southern Ethiopia. It lay to the east of Lake Awasa and the Ganale Doria, and extended to the Webi Shabelle near longitude 40 E., with a narrow piece stretching north of the Webi Shabelle to the edge of the Danakil lowlands, the railway marking approximately the northern boundary. The first mention of Bålī seems to be in the epinikia in honour of 'Amda Šyon king of Ethiopia, 1312-42 (I. Guidi, Rend Lin, 1839, nos. vii and ix) where Bålī is described as part of the king's dominions. In the middle of the 14th century al-'Umarī described Bålī as being 20 days' journey in length and six days in breadth, under a king who was tributary to the king of Ethiopia and possessed an army of 40,000 horsemen. A century later al-Maqrizi repeats al-
Umari’s account, including the statement that the people of Bah’ were Hanafis. Till about 1542 the state remained tributary to Ethiopia, when ‘Abbas the ruler made himself independent of Gallawdewos king of Ethiopia.

**Bibliography:** Umari, Masdik al-Abîdîr, tr. Gaudreay-Demobnbynes, 1927, 2, 18; Makrizi, ed. Rücker, Leyden 1790, p. 15; Perruchon, Les Chroniques de Zar’a Yâqoub et de Bah’eda Mâryâm, Paris 1893; Conselma, Le Chronique de Gallawdewos, Paris 1859. (G. W. B. Huntingford)

**Bali [see also Baliabarda]**

**Baliabarda.** Turkish name for Patrai, Patras (fourth largest town on the Greek mainland and the largest on the Morean peninsula), situated on the gulf of the same west of the entrance to the Gulf of Corinth (Turkish Kordos, [q.v.]), capital of the Nomos Achaea, seat of a bishop. It had about 85,000 inhabitants in 1951. The name Baliabarda comes from Παλαιαί Πάτρας, or rather Παλαιά Πάτρα (Pâtra is even today the colloquial name for the town), i.e., Old Pâtra(i), apparently because from the 14th century onwards New Pâtra(i) denoted the fortress under whose protection the old settlement was. Nikiphoros Gregorios (IV.9.4) describes it explicitly as φρούριον το των Νέων Πάτρων ἐπικεχλημένον. The adjective would not, therefore seem to have been added to distinguish Old Pâtra(i) from Νέα Πάτρας, a place near Lâmia (Turkish Zitun, conquered by the Ottomans in 1393, which was itself more usually known as Patratzik (Πατράτζικ, from the Turkish Badradjik) although today, as in antiquity, it is once again known as Hypatia. In the west, Old Pâtra(i) is known as Pâtras (from ζης Πάτρας compare the Italian Patrasso). In addition data concerning its pre-Ottoman history can be found in the works of A. Bon, E. Gerland, Wm. Miller, D. A. Zakythinos, cf. bibliography at the end of the article. Only the following facts need be mentioned here: at the division of the Byzantine Empire in 1204, the town became the seat of the Latin duchy of Achaea, and also the seat of an archbishop. In 1408, it became Venetian. On 1 July 1428, the town was taken by surprise (cf. Sfakianoglou ‘Ou’râsso) and captured—by Palaeologue princes who were quarrelling amongst themselves. On 20 March 1429, the despot Constantine repeated the attack on the town. During the course of this attack, the population turned away from the Latin archbishop Pandolfo Malatesta, and their notables swore an oath of allegiance to the Greek despot on June 5th in the Church of St. Andrew. The fortress continued to hold out, and did not surrender to the Greeks until May 1430 (Zakythinos, i, 206 ff.). At the time, Sultan Murad II objected to the taking of Pâtra, asking the Greeks to refrain from occupying it, as the inhabitants desired to pay their tribute to him. Sphrantzis, the first governor of Pâtra (later a historian), negotiated with the Porte, and eventually succeeded in obtaining the Sultan’s consent (Sphrantzis, 152-3). It was, apparently, not until 17 years later that Murad II made an attempt to gain Pâtra for himself. According to Dukas (ed. Vas. Grecu [Bucharest 1958], 278,14), he advanced in the winter of 1446/7 “as far as Pâtra and Klarenta” (the Kyllini of today), on which occasion he may have succeeded in taking the open town by a surprise attack, but it is hardly likely that he also overcame the almost impregnable fortress under whose protection the town was laid waste at the time, and some 60,000 people were led off into slavery. When the despot Constantine became Emperor of Byzantium in 1448, his brother Thomas took possession of north-western Morea, that is to say, of the whole of Achaia, including Pâtra and Klarenta, where he may well have held court (cf. Zakythinos, i, 242). Mehmed II, the Conqueror, went in person to Pâtra, in summer 1458, arriving from Mouchli (cf. E. Darkó in the Praktikó of the Academy of Athens, vi, Athens 1931, 22-29). He found it deserted and derelict. The inhabitants had fled to Venetian possessions on the Morean peninsula. This time, the fortress surrendered after a short resistance (cf. Kritoboulos, in the edition of C. Müller, FHGræc, V, Paris 1870, 123, also F. Babinger, Mehmed der Erbberger und seine Zeit, Munich 1953, 176 ff. (French edition 1954, Italian edition 1957)). The sultan considered Pâtra a suitable place for his commerce with the West, and he therefore invited the population to return, granting special privileges and tax reductions (cf. Kritoboulos, in the above mentioned book, 123; and Zakythinos (see above), i, 258). Later, early in 1459, there were Greek attempts to regain the town, but these failed (cf. Chalkokondyles, ed. I. Bekker, 457 f.). Pâtra remained, now as Baliabarda, an Ottoman possession for more than 350 years, without, however, regaining the great position it had once held in the times of the Roman Emperors, when there was a flourishing trade with Italy. Baliabarda became a Turkish provincial town and administrative centre, but was without any commercial significance. Attempts made by Venice to regain the town repeatedly failed. In summer 1464, Iacopo Barbarigo, Provveditore of Morea, made an ill-fated attempt on the town, which was successfully repulsed by Turâkhan-oghlu ‘Umar-Beg (cf. s.v. and also Hammer-Purgstall, ii, 84 ff.). In September 1522, however, the imperial admiral Andrea Doria captured the practically unprotected Pâtra without fighting, but the re-occupation was only temporary (cf. J. W. Zinkeisen, Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches, ii, 734 f.). In 1685, the Venetian general landed in Pâtra (with an army which largely consisted of German mercenaries) in order to drive the Turks from Morea. On 24 July 1687, it was threatened—but not captured—by Palaeologue princes who were by the Ottomans and partly blown up by them) fell into the hands of F. Morosini’s troops, after a heated battle (cf. Zinkeisen, v, 132); but this reoccupation, again, did not lead to any permanent re-establishment of Venetian rule in Morea. In the middle of April 1770, the town was taken by surprise by a horde of Greeks, who were shortly afterwards either killed or taken as slaves by the Albanians and Turks. At that time, Baliabarda once again went up in flames, and only a few families saved themselves and their possessions, fleeing to the Ionian islands (cf. Zinkeisen, v, 931). The first big Greek rebellion against Turkish rule in Pâtra started on 6 April 1821. On this occasion, the architect of Pâtra (since 1806) Germanos (1771-1826) led the battle for liberation. On 15 April 1822, the Ottomans stormed the town for the last time under the leadership of Yusuf Mukhîb Paşa (from Serres), who razed the town to the ground. French troops came to the assistance of the Greeks and took possession of Pâtra in 1828, being relieved by the Bavarians in 1833. Since then, the town has been rebuilt in a regular checkerboard plan and has once again developed into a flourishing port, linked more recently with Athens (cf. Aris) by the Peloponnese railway (1920). Until the middle of the 18th century, whilst Baliabarda was under Ottoman rule, it had only once been described by a western traveller, viz.
Master Thomas Dallam (1599-1600), see Early Voyages and Travels in the Levant, ed. by J. Theod. Bent (London 1893; Hakluyt Society, vol. lxxxvii), 86. The first such description dates from 1740, when Richard Pococke (A Description of the East, ii/2, London 1745, 176 f.) mentions it as an unhealthy town in a swampy plain, seat of a Greek archbishop, with 12 parish churches, each with 50 Christian families. Some 20 Jewish families and roughly 250 Turkish ones, "who are not the best sort of people". At that time there were an English Consul General, a French Vice-Consul (the Consulate was in Modon), and a Venetian and a Dutch Consul in Pátrai. The description of the town by Dr. Richard Chandler (Travels in Greece, Oxford 1776) is much the same. The description by the Ottoman globe-trotter Ewliya Celebi (Seyyehetnâme, vii, Istanbul 1928, 288-292), who was there in 1080/1669, is much more extensive. He noted a mosque near the market (carşî), donated by Mehemmed II, and one of Bâyazîd II in the citadel (iç ka'â), also the mosque of the Kyaya (Kethkudâ Dî), and not far from this, the mosque of Sheykh-Efendi, that of İbrahim Câevû, and finally the mosque at the Dâbbâgh-khane (i.e., tannery). Furthermore there were at that time three smaller houses of prayer (masdjid), four Dervish monasteries (that of Sheykh-Efendi amongst them), and three baths (hamam), Ewliya Celebi mentions places of pilgrimage near Baliabadra, amongst these the one of Şâfî Şâltû Baba [i.e., "Sveti Nikola"], and the one of "Jovani-Baba"—doubtless old Christian places of pilgrimage. In his description, Ewliya Celebi calls Baliabadra "ballu (ball!) Baliabadra", i.e., "Baliabadra rich in honey"; compare "ballu Badra" ("Anonymous Giese", 141 f.). Hâdîdît Khâlîfâ (Rumeli und Bosna, translated by J. v. Hammer, Vienna 1812, 124 f.) gives only a few details concerning the port and administration in Baliabadra.

The fever-ridden, swampy plains to the north, east and south-east of the town (cf. R. Pococke), in the above mentioned book, ii/2, 176, have long since been dried up. Commerce is largely concerned with currants, oil, and wine, as well as silk (which was already cultivated in Ottoman times, as is also described by Pococke), and this has made Pátrai into a flourishing trading centre. According to Ludwig Steub, Bilder aus Griechenland, Leipzig 1885, 230, in 1822, Pátrai consisted solely of the ruins of five mosques, fallen down churches, derelict houses, and only a few repaired and inhabited dwellings. Bibliography: E. Thomopoulos, Ιστορία τῆς πόλεως Πάτρων, Athens 1888; E. Gerland, Neue Quellen zur Geschichte des lateinischen Erzbistums Patras, Leipzig 1903; Emile de Borchgrave, Croquis d'Oriens: Patras et l'Achaie, Brussels 1908; Wm. Müller, The Latins in the Levant, London 1908, passim, especially 299 ff.; 363 ff.; 378 ff.; 414 ff.; Wm. Müller, Essays on the Latin Orient, Cambridge 1921, passim, especially 40 ff., 53 f., 100 ff., 418 ff.; D. A. Zakythinos, Le Despotat Grec de Morée, I/II, Paris 1932/1953; Ant. Bon, Le Péloponnèse Byzantin jusqu'en 1204, Paris 1953, concerning frequent descriptions of the town in the 10th century, cf. S. H. Weber, Voyages and Travels in the Near East made during the XIX century, Princeton 1952, 245, Patras. L. Steub, see above, gives a vivid picture of Pátrai and its inhabitants in the year 1846 on 209-249.

(B. Babinger)

Bâlîgh (a), major, of full age; bulâgh, puberty, majority; opp. şâhîr, minor, sabî, boy, şûghr, minority. Majority in Islamic law is, generally speaking, determined by physical maturity in either sex (the Şâhfî's explicitly lay down a minimum limit of nine years); should physical maturity not manifest itself, majority is presumed at a certain age: fifteen years according to the Hanafis, Şâhfî's and Hanbalis, eighteen years according to the Mâlikis (various other opinions are ascribed to the old authorities). Within these limits, the declaration of the person concerned that he or she has reached puberty, is accepted. Majority is one of the conditions of full legal capacity; the minor is subject to a legal disability (badr) and to the guardianship of his father or other legal guardian (cf. WILAYA). The major who is of sound mind (şâhid), is muqallal, i.e., obliged to fulfill the religious duties, and therefore also responsible in criminal law. But majority (together with soundness of mind) does not by itself produce contractual capacity, the capacity to dispose of one's own property; in order to have this effect, it must be accompanied by rwâd, discretion or responsibility in acting. The father or other legal guardian must not only encourage the minor to fulfill his religious duties regularly, but test his rwâd when he approaches puberty, and hand over his property to him only when he shows that he possesses it (cf. Kur'ân iv, 6). The other schools of religious law do not lay down a time limit for this, but the Hanafis fix the age at which his property must be handed over to him in any case, at 25 years, an obvious adoption of the legitima acta of Roman law. The Mâlikis, in the case of a woman, make this kind of capacity dependent, in addition to majority and rwâd, either on the consummation of marriage, or on a formal act of emancipation by the father or other legal guardian, or on becoming an "old spinster" (şâmis); a somewhat similar opinion is also held by some Šâhfîs. Islamic law envisages a gradual transition from the status of minor to that of major, as exemplified by the mumayyis, the "discerning minor", and the murâšíb, the "minor on the point of reaching puberty".


Bâlîk, Turko-Mongol word for "town" = or "castle" (also written Bâlîk and Bâlîği); appears frequently in compound names of towns, such as Bâlbâlik ("Five Towns", at the present day in ruins at Guden in Chinese Turkestan), Khânîbâlik (the "Khân's Town"), Turko-Mongol name for Pekin, (also frequently used by European tellers in the middle ages in forms like (Cambalu), Ilîbâlik (on the River Ili, the modern Iliysk) etc. As the town of Bâgbâlik is mentioned as early as the Orkhan inscriptions (2nd/8th century), Bâlik, in the meaning of town, is one of the oldest of Türkî words, as is the word Bâlik ("fish"); which is similarly pronounced and is common to all Türkî dialects.

Bibliography: R. Rahmeti Arat, IA (s.v.), (W. Barthold)

Bâlikesrî, Bâlikserî, a town of north-western Asia Minor, in the region known in ancient times as Myisia. The name Bâlikesrî derives from the Greek "Παλαιόκαστρον", Al-'Umârî, in his Masâlîk al-
Absär, refers to this locality as “Aklra” (= “‘Oxupa”, a name current in the period of the Comneni). The Roman Hadrianus is believed to have been situated in this same district. Bâlikespî was one of the chief towns in the emirate of Karâsu [q.v.], which came into being when the Turks wrested this area from the Byzantines in the years around 699-700.

Tobûta, who travelled through Asia Minor c. 730-1/1330, judged Bâlikespî to be a beautiful and well-populated place. The amirate of Karâsu was soon absorbed into the Ottoman rule, a process which began in about 715-6/1315 and appears to have been gradually completed during the reign of Orkhan Ghäzî. Karâsu, under Ottoman rule, long remained a sandik in the eydel of Anadolu, until in the reign of Mahmûd II it was attached to the wâlîyet of Khuwädëngîr. It is now a separate province with Bâlikespî as its administrative centre. Bâlikespî, situated at the foot of the YÎlan-dagh (“mount of the serpent”), confronts a fertile plain noted for its production of cereals, vegetables and fruit. Its population was estimated in 1945 to be a little less than 34,000.


With regard to Apollonius of Tyana, there are considerable contradictions in the various sources, and the tradition about the şâhîb al-îlâmîdî, as he is usually called (beside al-hâkim), even to a certain degree, influenced the reports concerning Apollonius of Perge. Our oldest source, Ya’ûbî, i, 165 rightly relates that Apollonius lived under the reign of Domitian (81-96), and the same is related by Ibn Abî Usâyiña, i, 73, and Barhaebraeus, i, 265. But the same Ya’ûbî speaks on p. 134 of “Bâlînüs al-nâjdîr who is called the orphan, and he is the şâhîb al-îlâmîdî, etc.” The confusion lies not only in the use of the epithets of both Apollonius for one and the same person, but also in the addition “the orphan”: in the preface of the Sirr al-Khalika (see below), Bâlînüs calls himself “an orphan inhabiting Tyana” (cf. Kraus, op. cit., 273 n. 3). In the Dhakkhat al-Iskandarî, Aristotle tells Alexander that he had received the book from Apollonius of Tyana in J. Ruska, Tabula Smaragdina, 1926, 72. Here Apollonius appears as a contemporary of Philip and his son Alexander, and so he does in al-Bal’mi’s Persian version of Tâbarî (cf. Zotenbery’s French translation, i, 110 f.; the whole passage is missing in the Arabic Tâbarî) and in Nisâmî’s Ishandar-nâmâ (cf. W. Bacher, Nisâmî’s Leben und Werke, 1871, 67 ff. and Persian text, 28; W. Hertz, Gesammelte Abhandlungen, 1905, 45). This anachronism with regard to Apollonius the talisman-maker has, in its turn, influenced Ibn al-Khîlî’s dating of Apollonius of Perge; his article about the latter begins (p. 61): “Apollonius the carpenter, mathematician of ancient time, much earlier than Euclid; he wrote the book Conica.” And in his article on Euclid, 63, Euclid, a carpenter of Tyre, explains and accomplishes for an unnamed Greek king two books of Apollonius on irregular polyeders (this is in fact the subject of Euclid’s Elements). On 65 he speaks, on the contrary, of a commentary on Euclid’s 8th book by an ancient (baðisîm) Greek man named Bâls (the variant readings show with almost absolute certainty that he speaks of Apollonius). Now, Apollonius of Perge lived about 80-100 years after Euclid. (Kapp, op. cit., 161-168 does not even point out this confusion!). In Hûnayn b. Išhâk’s Addâ al-Falâsîf, an Apollonius appears in two places: in part i ch. 5 the saying engraved on his seal is reported, and of part ii the whole ch. 17 is dedicated to his apophthegms. None of these dicta is characteristic of either of the two Apollonius; but Abû Sulaymân al-Mantîkî points to Apollonius of Tyana, when he, in the first paragraph of ii, 17 (“The pen is the most powerful sorcerer”) substitutes “tâlîsmân” for “sorcerer”.

Also the six sermones in the Turba Philosophorum
attributed by Steinschneider (Europ. Übers. aus dem Arab., II, SBAk. Wien, 1905, 67 ff.) and Ruska (T. Ph., 1937, 23 ff.) to Apollonius of Tyana are no more characteristic of him than do the other alchemic sermons of their respective orators.

Of the Arabic books connected with the name of Apollonius of Tyana the following are preserved in this language either in full or partly in or quotations of some length:

1. K. al-'Ual or Sirr al-Khalika, parts of which were edited and translated by Silvestre de Sacy ( Notices et Extraits, iv, an. 7 (1798-99), 108 ff.) and J. Ruska (Tab. Sm., 124-163). The latter also proved that the famous alchemist text known as Tabula Smaragdina has its original place at the end of this book; and P. Kraus, op. cit., 303 has shown that the whole book is to be a commentary of that text. About the Latin translation by Hugo Sanctallensis, cf. Ruska, 177 ff. The analysis of the book by Kraus, 270-303 led to its dating in the time of the Caliph al-Ma'mun and shew its close relation to the Syriac Book of Treasures by Job of Edessa (ca. 817 A.D.), dem Arab., attributed by Steinschneider (Europ. Übers., II, SBAk. Wien, 1905, 67 ff.) and the Arabic books are published or analysed in the Lapidario del rey D. Alfonso X, reproduced and partly edited by J. F. Montanà, 1881, are translations of Arabic books attributed to Apollonius; cf. the full list in Sarton, ii, 857. Here belong: 1. Abola (never deciphered, cf. G. O. S. Darby, in Ostr. i, 1936, 251 ff.), 4. Yluz, 5. Belyenus and Ylus, 6. Flinius and Hermuz (Hermes). A comparison of these names with the forms of the name of Apollonius in Arabic at the beginning of this article will furnish sufficient evidence.

The Greek Apotelesmata Apollonii Tyanensis, simultaneously edited by F. P. Nau, Philologia, Syriaca, I, 1907, 1363 ff., and F. Boll, Codices astrologorum Graecorum, vii, 1908, 175 ff. contains passages of which the Latin translation from the Arabic can be traced in Brit. Mus. MS. Royal 12 C XVIII (Cardomy, 73), and even an English translation in Sloane 3826. For another Latin (Vatican) MS. cf. Cardomy, Ie. Similar texts also translated from Arabic, in Sloane 3848. The name of the disciple of Apollonius to whom the Greek text is dedicated has been identified with that of the author of a text edited in Syriac and Arabic by G. Levi della Vida, La Dottrina e i Dodici Legati di Stomathalassa, Atti Acc. Naz. Linc., Cl. Sci. mor. stor. fil., vii/lII, fasc. 8, Rome 1951.

Another pupil of Apollonius is the famous Arteius (not Arlesius, as in Brockelmann, S I, 429, nor Arteius, as in the additions in vol. iii, 1208), the author of Claus sapientiae, the Arabic original of which, Misfak al-Ihsana, has been discovered by Levi della Vida, and described in Speculum, xiii, 1938, 80-85; cf. Kraus, 298 ff.


BALIS, former town in northern Syria, which was both a port on the Western bank of the Euphrates and an important stage, 100 km. from Aleppo and at the entrance to the Dżaira, of the road from Antioch and the Mediterranean leading, via al-Rakka, to Bagdad and 'Irāk. The commercial and agricultural prosperity of the town was doubtless due to its situation at a point of intersection of river and land highways, and in a warm valley where the irrigation possibilities favoured the development of husbandry.

Known in antiquity under the Aramaic and Greek names of BYT BLS and Barbalissos, indicated both in the Table de Ptolémée and the Notitia Dignitatum and, after the administrative division of the province of Syria which took place towards the middle of the 11th century A.D., belonging to the Augusta Euphratensis, it played the rôle of a
frontier town which was to continue in the Byzantine period, when it was several times pillaged by the Persians. It suffered particular damage during the campaign of Khusraw II Anughirwan and was rebuilt by the efforts of Justinian. Previously, the hagiographers had made it the site of the martyrdom of Bacchus, a famous saint of the area, whose relics are said to be preserved there.

Occupied by the Arabs as the result of a treaty concluded with Abd al-Ubayda after the capture of Aleppo and abandoned at that time by certain elements of the population, in the Umayyad period Balis formed part of the ājund of Kinnasrin and was subsequently, under al-Raṣḥīd, attached to the territory of the ʿAwāṣim [q.v.]. It continued to retain its strategic importance for a long time in the vicinity of the Byzantine territories. The famous general Mamlama b. ʿAbd al-Malik took an interest in it to the extent of having a canal excavated and improving the production of the land. He established himself there and it was to remain the property of his descendants. In 245/859 the town suffered from an earthquake which affected the whole of Northern Syria; subsequently it shared the fate of the cities of the area, escaping from Caliphal control and entering the orbit of the Tūlūnīs, then that of the Ḥamdānīs, until the Sājdūqīs, in their turn, extended their authority to the region. Its economic decline, according to Ibn Hawkal, who, however, still mentions rich grain harvests, dates apparently from the end of the reign of the Ḥamdānī Sayf al-Dawla; but the brief information given by the geographers should not make us forget the signs of prosperity, borne out by archaeological remains, right into the Ayyūbīd period. At the time of the Crusades, it was subject especially to indecisive incursions by the Franks, after which it continued to pass from hand to hand of various Muslim masters, among whom can be cited at the end the Ayyūbīd al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Ghāzī and al-Malik ʿAḍīl Bakr (who seems to have held it at least from 607/1210-11, the date inscribed on the minaret which he had erected). At this time various indications seem to show that the population of Balis, where several mashhads were venerated in connexion with the memory of ʿAli and al-Ḥusayn, was mainly Shīʿī. Subsequently the destruction wrought by the Mongol invasion destroyed the locality, which did not even appear in the administrative organisation of Mamlūk Syria.

At the present day the ruins of Balis lie five km. from the small modern village of Meskene on a plateau overlooking the valley of the Euphrates which flows at quite a distance from the site. The fortified enclosure can still be identified, with its monumental doors, the remains of a brick praetorium doubtless dating back to the times of Justinian and the site of the great mosque, indicated by the beautiful octagonal brick minaret, erected on a rectangular base and bearing four series of ornamental inscriptions. The numerous mounds where abundant potsherds are to be found, have never been systematically excavated, but trial soundings carried out about 1925 revealed interesting sculptured plaster decorations with inscriptions dated 464/1072 and 469/1076-77.

BALISH, Belesh, Span. Velez, a toponymic of Berber origin encountered on the coast of the Rif and at various places in the Iberian peninsula with the spellings بليش بلش and بلش. Al-Bakri mentions the port of Balish after those of Bādis and Būkuya, opposite Peñon de Vélez de la Gomera, on the Rif coast. Another Balīh, unidentified, is to be found beside the Guadalquivir after leaving Cordova in the direction of Tudmir and Murcia. Al-Idrīsī gives the name Balīh to the Mar Menor of Murcia, a large lake formed by the waters brought down by various swift streams, situated 57 miles from Alicante and which is navigable by shipping. The Vélez, which the same author includes in the șeblm of Bādīdāna (Pechina), with Almeria, Berja and Purchena, is Vélez-Rubio, 105 km. from Almeria and 42 from Lorca, in the valley of the Guadalentín, a tributary of the Sangronera. A prehistoric cemetery, rock paintings and numerous coins, art objects and Roman inscriptions have been found amongst the ruins of its fortifications. It formed part of the abara of Tudmir and revolted with Ibn Hāfsūn [q.v.] against the amīr ʿAbd Allāh, being subsequently subdued by ʿAbd al-Rahmān III in 313/925. When the Infante, the future Alfonso X the Wise, took Lorca, it marked the frontier of the Kingdom of Granada. It was captured by Alfonso Yáñez Fajardo in 1437, but again passed into the hands of the rulers of Granada in 851/1447, and the Naṣrī ruler al-Zaghall Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muhammad XII resided there; it was finally taken by Ferdinand III in 893/1488, who, at the beginning of the 10th/16th century, ceded his overlordship to Pedro Fajardo, the first Marquis of both the towns of Vélez, el-Rubio and el-Blanco. Situated 5½ km. from Vélez-Rubio is Vélez-Blanco, a town of some 10,000 inhabitants, belonging to the same marquisate of the Vélez; on the ruins of the Roman citadel and the Moorish alcazaba rising on the hill above the two towns of Vélez, Pedro Fajardo erected a magnificent castle of imposing proportions and elaborateness, the shell of which is still preserved.

Another Vélez is that of Benaudalla (Ibn ʿAbd Allāh, J. HELL-[CH. PEYRAT]), in the province of Granada (ward of Motril), on the left bank of the Guadalfeo river, on the side of a small hill called el-Castillo, and possessing some 5,000 inhabitants.

Finally in the province of Málaga, 34 km. from the capital and three km. from the sea, on the left bank of the river Vélez or Benamargosa, is the town of Vélez-Málaga, with some 30,000 inhabitants. Very little is known to us, however, of its history in the Muslim period. Alfonso el Batallador, in his expedition through Andalusia in 519/1126, after reaching Granada and crossing the Sierra Nevada, advanced up to Vélez-Málaga, without being able to take it.

Then in 283/896, the amīr ʿAbd Allāh was besieging one of these Vélez—it is not known which—one of a number of infantrymen and cavalrymen of the regular Umayyad army, attracted by the inducement of better pay held out to them by Ibn ʿHafsūn, went over to the rebel's service. Dozy, who refers to this event without citing his source, confuses Bildi (now Vilches) with Belesh (Vélez), and situates it at Vélez-Rubio. The toponymic has passed to Latin America and is to be found at various places in Colombia, Uruguay and the Argentine; it is also a fairly common surname in Spain.


BALIYYA (Ar. pl. baldyā', a name given, in the pre-Islamic era, to the camel (more rarely the mare) which it was the custom to tether at the grave of its master, its head turned to the rear and covered with a saddle-cloth (see al-Dāḥirī, Tārīkh, ed. Pellet, index), and to allow to die of starvation; in some cases, the victim was burnt and, in other cases, stuffed with thumām (Ibn Abi) l-Hadīd, Sharh Nahj al-Balīgha, iv, 436). Muslim tradition sees in this practice prove that the Arabs of the dijīhiyya believed in the resurrection, because the animal thus sacrificed was thought to serve as a mount for its master at the resurrection, while those who rose from the dead without a baliba, and were therefore of inferior status, went on foot. According to another tradition, however, the same term also denoted a cow, a camel or a ewe which was hung on the grave of the deceased and allowed to die of hunger; in this way, it appears, the primitive symbol of belief in the resurrection seems to have become a funereal sacrifice, which paved the way for the funeral feast (wadadma).


AL-BALKĀ', name given by the Arab authors either to the whole of the Transjordanian territory corresponding approximately to the ancient countries of Ammon, Moab and even Gilead, or to the middle part of it, having, depending on the period, Amman, [q.v.], Husbān or al-Ṣalt as its chief town. Although a certain lack of precision still persists to-day in the use of the term, its geographical meaning is usually restricted to the limestone plateau (average altitude from 700 to 800 m.), comprised between the Wādi i-Zarkā (or Jabbok) in the North and the Wādi i-Mudjib (or Armon) in the South. This is a region of tabular relief on the desert side, but the ground is considerably broken along the subsidence zone of the Dead Sea and the Jordan (peak of Nabi Usha' (1,096 m.) near al-Ṣalt in the North, Mount Nebo (835 m.) in the vicinity of Mādābā), where the erosive action of rain has promoted the escarping of especially deep ravines; as a whole it is an arid plain, but at the bottom of depressions and on the plains it affords possibilities of cultivation, which explain the praise bestowed on its fertility and the abundance of its villages in bygone times.

In the Hellenistic period the provincial divisions were Peraea, on the Western fringe, with Gadara (near al-Ṣalt) as its metropolis, the territory of Philadelphia (ʿAmmān), a town attached to the Decapolis, and the northern end of the Nabatean kingdom. Under Trajan, in 106 AD., the new province of Arabia extended over it, taking in Nabataea, which had also extended northwards to Bostra. On the other hand in the Byzantine period, the Arnon acted as the boundary between the province of Arabia, which then included the bishoprics of Philadelphia, Esbus (Husbān) and Mādābā, and the new Palestina Tertia, created in the Southern part of the country.

This region, conquered by Yazid b. Abi Sufyān
shortly after the fall of Damascus and the peaceful surrender of 'Amman, retained its former prosperity under the Umayyads, and numerous caliphal and princely residences were situated there (al-Muḥaddith, al-Zita, al-Kaṣṭal, Umm al-Walid, for example, without counting the castles scattered further towards the East such as ʿUsayr ʿAmrāl, al-Ḳharānī, Kašr al-Ḥallabāt or Kašr al-Ṭiḥāb). At this period the term al-Balka had a wide connotation, still attached later by Yaḥyā, and the reports of the chroniclers also included in it towns of the ʿAgūlūn like Arbad (Irībid), where Yazīd II died (al-Tabarī, ii, 1464), or of the Maʿāb like al-Muʿta [q.v.]; the corresponding administrative district was provided with its own ʿāmil and was in direct dependence on the ǧund of Damascus before experiencing a variety of fortunes throughout the Middle Ages. The testimony of al-Yaḵbū, who distinguishes two sections, the Ghawr (main town: Jericho) and the Ẓahir (main town: ʿAmmān), in this “canton of the colony of Damascus”, may in fact be contrasted with that of al-Muṣkaddasī, a century later, for whom al-Balka was dependent on the territory of Fīlasīn; likewise, in the Ayyūbid period, Abu ʿl-Ḥasāʾid connects it with the Ṣharāt, whilst al-Haḍrawī deals separately with this country and the Balad Maʿāb. Finally, during the period of Mamlūk domination, the district of al-Balka (main town: Ḥusba) belonged in principle to the southern march of the province of Damascus, though sometimes it was recognised as possessing a second ʿdmūya, that of ʿal-Ṣaṭ, and it appears to have depended temporarily, in entirety or in part, on the misr of al-Ḥak.

The favourite etymology of the Arab geographers, who link the name of al-Balka, in which, however, the feminine of the adjective ʿalāb “variegated” can be perceived, with that of an eponymous hero, a descendant of the Ban ʿAmmān b. Lūṭ, evokes the Ammonites of Biblical tradition and the memories of Lot, localised in a region where the “town of the Giants” of the Kurʿān, v, 25/22, (identified with ʿAmmān) and the Cave of the Ṭābūk al-ʿAbl (q.v.) were also placed.

Bibliography: F. M. Abel, Geographie de la Palestine, Paris 1933-38, i, 68, 90, 277-281, 379-84, ii, passim; G. Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, London 1895, 30; A. S. Marmardjī, textes géographiques . . ., Paris 1951, 22; M. Gaudefroy-Demombynes, La Syrie à l’époque des Mamelouks, Paris 1923, part. 67-68 and 180; Balāḏūrī, Fisḥā, 113 and 126; ʿAbd al-Hamīd, index; Yaḵbū, i, 47; ǦB, indices, Yaḵūṭ, i, 728; Bakrī, Das geographische Wörterbuch, ed. Wüstenfeld, i, Göttlingen 1876, 160; Harawī, K. al-Ẓiyārī, ed. Souredel-Thomine, 18; Abu ʿl- Ḥasāʾid, Ṭabarī, 237. (J. SOUREDDEL-THOMINE)

BALKAN, the Balkan peninsula. The word Balkan means mountain or mountain range and, in the form of Balkanh, rugged zone in Turkish. The etymology of the word is now linked with Balk, mud, and the diminutive suffix, an in Turkish (according to H. Eren). There is a mountain called Balkhan in Turkmenistan. The word Balkan was used first by the Ottomans in Rumeli in its general meaning of mountain, as in Koğja-Balkan, Çatal-Balkan, and Üzinkus-Balka (the Carpathians). But specifically it was applied to the Haemus range of the ancient and mediaeval geographers, who thought that it separated the barbaric north from the civilised south. When considered as a historical and cultural entity the Balkans can be given different boundaries in the north. The Romans built their main defence line on the Danube with the exception between Trajan's Danube and Constanza in the Dobrudja. The boundary of the Byzantine empire in the north reached as far as the Danube and the Drava rivers (under Justinian I and Basil II). Finally by the treaty of 848/1444 the Ottomans and the Hungarians agreed reciprocally not to cross over the Danube, and up to the 17th century this river remained as the northern boundary of the Ottoman province of Rumel, which included the whole peninsula south to this river. Both the Roman and Ottoman empires tried also to establish their control over the flat country on both sides of the Danube. Its lower part always became a passage for the Turco-Mongol peoples who invaded the Balkans one after another from the 5th up to the 13th century A.D., namely the Hunns, Avars, Bulgars, Pečeneks, Kumans and Tatār-Kipcaks. The Avar invasions are thought responsible for the penetration and settlement of the Slavs in the Balkans in the 6th century. Then the native Vlachs and Albanians had to retire to the mountains and lived there a pastoral life for many centuries to follow. Toward 680 A.D. the Bulgars, a Turkish people from north of the Black Sea, settled on the lower Danube and, as a military aristocracy ruling over the Slavs, they created the first powerful state to rival the Byzantine empire in the Balkans. Their conversion to Christianity (864) had far-reaching consequences for the history of the peninsula because the Byzantine church and the Byzantine concept of the state gave definitive shape not only to Bulgarian Czardom but also through it to the states that emerged subsequently in the Balkans (see F. Dölger, Byzans und europäische Staatenwelt, 261-283).

The first Muslim geographers who spoke of the Balkans are contemporary with these important developments. Ibn Khurradāḏibī, whose information, like that of others, was derived from the reports of the three observers of the the end of the 3rd/9th and the middle of the 4th/10th centuries (see Z. V. Togan, Balkan, in I. A. D). said that the country west of the Byzantine themes of Taifa, Trakya, and Moldavia was the bilād al-Sabāṭība and that in the north the ard Burdjan (Bulgars). In the Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam the Danube is called Rūd-i Bulghari and the Balkan range Kūh-i Bulghari.

It seems that Islam first appeared in the Balkans with the Anatolian saint Sarl-Saltuk [q.v.], in 682/1284. After the invasions of the Anatolian Turks of the Ghāri principalities in Western Anatolia in the first half of the 8th/14th century, the Ottomans finally settled firmly on the European shores of the Dardanelles in 755/1354. Even in the first period of the Ottoman expansion distinction must be made between the activities of the ghāzi leaders who made continuous warfare in the ʿUḏ, the frontiers, and the Ottoman central government which was also concerned with the welfare of its subjects.

Perhaps the most important factor of the Ottoman conquest was the strong immigration movement into the Balkans from Anatolia in the 14th century which turcised Thrace and Eastern Bulgaria (see Studia Islamica, ii, 103-129). At that time the small Ottoman state was regarded rather as a useful adjunct in the complicated struggle among the small Balkan states, but, growing in power, the Ottoman sultan soon became the suzerain of his former allies. When later these attempts to form a common front or called on Western Christendom for help, they were disappointed (Cermanon 773/1371,
Kossova 791/1389). Bayezid I inaugurated a new policy by establishing direct control over the vassal countries. He had the ambition of establishing a unified empire in the Balkans. He conquered the whole of Bulgaria, Macedonia and Thessaly between 1393 and 1396, and attempted to seize Constantinople, the traditional capital. The victory of Timur over Bayezid (804/1402) had important consequences for the Balkans. Abandoning most of their Anatolian possessions, the Ottomans then considered the Balkans as their real homelands, and, Adrianople (Edirne) became the real capital city of the sultans from then on. A fresh exodus of the Anatolian Turks on the Balkans followed Timur's invasion. The successors of Bayezid I abandoned his imperial policy and Serbia and Byzantium enjoyed some freedom of action until Sultan Mehemmed II conquered Constantinople (857/1453), and resumed the policy of unification with energy and success. In 864/1459 Serbia, in 865/1460 Morea and in 867/1463 Bosnia came under direct Ottoman rule. But these Ottoman successes were due to more important factors than the military ones.

In the struggle against the Ottoman conquest and centralisation policy, the feudalised princes and local lords in the Balkans had turned their eyes to the West, with a readiness to make concessions not only from their territories but also on religious matters. Thus in the first half of the 15th century, while Hungary was establishing its suzerainty over Bosnia, Serbia and Wallachia, Venice had seized the most important points on the Albanian coasts, in the Aegean Sea and the Morea, and, after taking Salonica, she coveted Constantinople. Representing Catholicism and seeking political and economic domination, the Western powers and their feudal sympathisers in Byzantium and the Balkans were regarded with hostility by the masses at large and by the Orthodox clergy. The Ottomans profited from the alienation of the common people from their Western or native lords. They assumed the role of protector of the Orthodox church and tried to drive Catholicism out of the Balkans. Even before the installation of Gennadius as oecumenical Patriarch in Constantinople in 1454, the Orthodox priests were recognised of being a Muslim state and more careful in the application of the laws. Thus it was no wonder that the Christian peasantry remained indifferent to the fate of their lords in their struggle against the Ottomans and until the 11th/17th century no serious rebellion is recorded among the Balkan peasants. It must also be noted that the Ottomans followed a conservative policy towards the previous social classes in the Balkans by adapting their status to the Ottoman system. The pre-Ottoman upper aristocracy, who mostly possessed promoa, were included by the Ottomans in the timar system, and, later, taken into the sultan's court to become high officials. The members of the lower aristocracy, especially voimkhs (in Turkish voynufr), who previously were the backbone of the empire of Stephen Dushan, were reorganised in bılıaks in greater part of the Balkans by the Ottomans and formed a section of the Ottoman army up to the 16th century, when they lost their usefulness and were made simple re'dyâ. Other military groups, nomad Eflabs, and Martolos were incorporated into the Ottoman forces in the provinces (see my Faith Devri, i, Ankara 1954, 145-184). Even the re'dyâ had access to the ruling class through the Divshirme institution. In the classification of the re'dyâ (q.v.)—that is, the peasants, Muslim Christians, a system similar to the pre-Ottoman system seems to have been followed and the Byzantine parotokoi, who were divided into sevogarate and bòldion as well as the ledh, appear to have survived under the Ottomans with different names, and several Byzantine taxes actually continued in the Ottoman taxation system as rusum-i 'urfyya or ied-i kadima. These taxes were assigned to the Milat-holders and to the Ottoman timar system which was the foundation-stone of the empire in the first period acquired its final form in the Balkans. In conclusion we can speak of a continuity of Balkan history in its basic forms under the Ottomans. It was true that national cultures lost their former centres of development, but the peasantry and the church remained in existence and became the foundations of the national states in the 19th century.

During the 10th/16th century the Balkan peninsula enjoyed one of the rare periods of peace and prosperity in its history; everywhere new lands were brought under cultivation, the population increased (5 million about 1535), cities developed, as we can observe in the regular Ottoman land and population surveys, defters, preserved in the Turkish archives (see Ikhisat Fuhullesi Memuas, Istanbul, no. 4, 11, 15). After Greek, Turkish became a common language of civilisation in the Balkans.

As Sir T. W. Arnold has already emphasised (The Preaching of Islam, London [1st ed. 1896] 3rd. ed. 1935, 145 ff.) conversions to Islam in the Balkans were not in general the result of a state policy or the use of force. However, three periods in this respect should be distinguished. Up to Bayezid II's time the Ottoman state followed a very liberal policy in the matter of religion. In this period voluntary conversions took place among the nobility incorporated in the Ottoman 'askhari (q.v.) class especially among the Bogomils in Bosnia. After Bayezid II, the Ottoman state became more conscious of being a Muslim state and more careful in the application of the ghurtca. From the 11th/17th century onwards, to begin with as a result of the activities of the Franciscan missions in the Balkans, which were supported by the Hapsburgs and the Venetians.
for political purposes, the Ottomans had recourse to certain coercive measures against the Christians in Serbia, Albania and Danubian Bulgaria. This brought about some mass conversions in these countries. In 1690 the Patriarch of Peć took refuge in southern Hungary with 37,000 Serbian families. Large-scale conversions took place among the Albanians during the subsequent centuries [see ARNAWUT]. The third important islamised area is found on the Rhodope region where Bulgarian-speaking Muslims are called Pomaks (q.v.).


**BALKAR**

**BALKAR**, a Muslim people of the Central Caucasus, whose origins are the subject of contradictory hypotheses. For some the Balkar are descendants of Bulghar driven back towards the mountains in the 11th-13th century; according to others, their ancestors were the Khazar pushed back towards the upper Terek in the 11th century; finally, others see in the Balkar Ibero-Caucasians or indeed Turkicised Finns. The Balkar traditions say that their ancestors, once living on the steppes of the Kuban, were driven back towards the mountains by the Cerkes tribes (Adighes), whence in turn they drove away and partially absorbed the Ossets.

Prior to 1946, the habitat of the Balkar, on the northern slopes of the main range of the Caucasus, included the high valleys of the tributaries of the Terek lying between the Elbruz to the West and the Ossete country to the East. The Balkar people (numbering 33,307 in 1926, of whom only 2% were urban dwellers, 42,666 in 1939), are divided into 5 tribes.

In the 16th century the Balkar were subdued by the Kabard and thenceforth adopted the forms of material civilisation of their sovereigns, copying their feudal structure, which persisted practically intact until the Russian conquest. It had five classes: 1. the princes, taawbi (analogous to the pasha of the Adighes); 2. the nobles, uden (worn among the Adighes); 3. the free peasants, karakash (il'ikabashaw among the Abaza); 4. the serfs liable to corvee duties, targar (og among the Kabard); and 5. the slaves, kazakh (unmaet among the Kabard).

Sunnī Islam of the Hanafi rite was introduced among the Balkar in the end of the 18th century by the Crimean Tatars and the Nogai of the Kuban, but pre-Islamic survivals (Christian and animist) still persisted at the beginning of the 20th century. Russian penetration of the high valleys of the tributaries of the Terek, begun at the end of the 18th century, was completed in 1827 by the conquest of the Balkar country, but was not followed, as in the case of the Adighes, by rural colonisation; the Russian authorities preferred to favour the setting up of villages of Kumlik, Ossets and mountain Jews in the midst of the Balkar country.

**Soviet Balkaria.** — The Soviet régime, temporarily proclaimed in December 1918, was finally established in March 1920. By a decree of the All-Union Central Executive Committee dated 21 January 1921, the Balkar okrug was attached to the Soviet Socialist Republic of Mountain-dwellers (Gorskaya ASSR). On 1 September 1921, the Balkar country, joined to the Kabarda, became the Autonomus Kabardino-Balkar Region of the RSFSR, and on 5 December 1936 became the Kabardino-Balkar Autonomous SSR. Balkaria was briefly occupied by the German armies during the second world war, was suppressed as an administrative formation by decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR of 25 June 1946, and the Balkar people was deported to Central Asia. A part of it (the valley of the Balkan) was attached to the Georgian SSR and the remainder to the Kabardinian Autonomous SSR. A new decree of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR of 9 January 1957 re-established the Kabardino-Balkar Autonomous SSR and authorized the deported Balkars to return to their country. The Balkar language is a dialect of Karaçai which belongs to the Kipčak group of Turkish languages. It has been strongly influenced by Ossetic and the neighbouring Ibero-Caucasian languages: Kabard, Čečen and Abaza.

Balkar-Karaçai, previously not a written language, was endowed in 1920 with a slightly modified Arabic alphabet (ξ = ʟ, ɬ = oppins), replaced in 1925 by the Latin alphabet; the first works were published in Balkar-Karaçai in the following year: a collection of poetry by 'Umar 'Aliev and a Chrestomathy (Bilim) by Askhat Bidjiev. Also in 1926 the first newspaper, Karakhal, of the Kabardino-Balkar Autonomous Region made its appearance at Nal'ik, with alternate pages in Balkar and Karakhal.

In 1931 the first daily, Tawlu-Djarak, in Balkar-Karaçai was published at Mikoian-Shakhar, the administrative centre of the Karaçai Autonomous Region (now Klukhori). Finally in 1938 the Latin alphabet was replaced by the Cyrillic alphabet.

Bibliography: S. S. Anisimov, Kabardino-Balkariya, Moscow 1937; Ibrahimov, Les Balkari, Bulgares musulmans du Caucase, in KMM, vii, June 1909, 206-218; L. Dobruskin, Kabarda i Balkariya v prošlom, in Revolyutionnii Vostok, no. 3-4 of 1933, 196-222; 'Umar 'Aliev, Natsional'nyi vopros i natsional'naya kul'tura v Severo-Kavkazkom Krae, Rostov on Don, 1926; Korentsitsva Aparata v Kabardino-Balkari, in Revolutsiya i Natsional'nost', no. 6, 1936, 36-91; A. Karaulov, Karakal' oeprik grammatiki i yazyka balkar, and Kratkii slovar' balkarskogo yazyka in Shormik materialov dlya opisaniya mestnosti i plemen Kaukaza, Tiflis 1912, xlii; Saadet Çagatty, Karaçayca bir kał mevin, Ankara Universitesi Dîl-Tanîh Cofrâya Fakültesi Dergisi, 1951, 277-300 (where further references are given).

(A. Bennigsen)

**BAKAYN** [see KAYN].

**BAKHK**, an important city in ancient and mediaeval times, now a village, located in what is today northern Afghanistan, ca. 67° E. Long. (Greenw.) and 30° 45' N. lat. It was located on the Balkh river, now dry.
Ancient Bactria was the name of a province of the Achaemenid Empire as well as its chief city. In the Old Persian inscriptions of Darius, we find the form Bāxtrā, in the Avesta Bāxtū, and in Greek Bakttra. Perhaps the original form was *Bāxtrū, from the name of the river (cf. Markwart, *Catalogue*, 34). Balkh after the conquests of Alexander the Great was a centre of the Greco-Bactrians, then of the Kushans and Hephthalites. In pre-Islamic times the city was a Buddhist centre with a famous cloister, the Nawbahār, the head of which, Barmakī (p.v.), seems to have exercised political control over the city. Balkh was also famous in Zoroastrian tradition and there must have been five temples there before Islam. The city, at least from the time of Alexander the Great, was protected by great walls. The various traditions on the founding of Balkh, as found in Arabic and Persian sources, are discussed by Scheler and Schwarz (refs. below), where it is apparent that the Arabs knew of the antiquity of the city.

In 32/653 the Arab commander al-Abnafer b. Kayn (p.v.) raided Balkh and obtained tribute (Balkhur, 408). The area was not conquered until the war between 'Ali and Mu'āwiya was decided in favour of the latter. In 43/663-4 Balkh was recaptured by Kayn b. al-Hayyān or 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Samura (cf. J. Marquart, *Erinnerungen*, Berlin 1901, 69). On this expedition, or the first one of al-Abnafer, the Nawbahār shrine is said to have been destroyed by the Arabs (Le Strange, 422). During part of this period a local prince, called Nēţak Tarkhān, occupied Balkh and caused much trouble to the Arabs (cf. Markwart, *Wehret und Arang*, 41-2). Unfortunately, the events and chronology of this area under the early Umayyads are confused in the Arabic sources. There were frequent revolts against Arab rule and it is not until the time of Kuṭayba b. Muslim (d. 66/275) that Balkh could be considered subdued. The city seems to have suffered considerably from warfare, and there are indications in Ta'bari that the city was in ruins about 705 A.D. (Schwarz, 436). The Arabs did not reside in Balkh but maintained a garrison at Barūkān, two faraqs from Balkh until the governor of Khurāsān Asad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Kasīrī moved the garrison to Balkh rebuilding the city in 107/725. In 1157/336 Asad transferred the capital of Khurasan from Marw to Balkh with the result that Balkh prospered. Ābū Muslim had to capture and recapture Balkh from the Syrian troops of the garrison loyal to the Umayyads who were helped by local troops, but his lieutenant Ābū Dā'ud al-Bakrī finally secured Balkh and Ṭūkhāristān for the Ābāsids.

Under the Ābāsids the governors of Khurāsān became practically independent, and in Balkh the descendants of the princes of Khūṭṭāl held sway (cf. Erkhard, 301). One of them, Dā'ud b. 'Abbas al-Bānīgūrī, succeeded his father as governor of Balkh, and was driven from his capital by Ya'qūb b. Layth in 256/870. In 287/900 'Amr b. Layth was defeated and captured near Balkh by 'Isā b. Ahmad, and Balkh passed under Sāmānūd rule. It is Balkh in the 4th/10th century which is described by the geographers in Arabic as umm al-bilād: "the mother of lands". The later Sāmānūd governors of Balkh such as Fālāḥ, Altāf, and Subuktakān were virtually independent. During the rule of Ṣāmūd al-Ghaznavī 387/1217-1230, Balkh was captured once by Ilāk Khaṇ in 397/1006, but Ābūl Mū'mīn immediately recaptured it. Although Balkh was in the centre of the arena of warfare between the Saljuqs and the Ghaznavīs, and was threatened with capture by the former after their victory at Dāndānān in 431/1040, it was not until 451/1059 that they definitely occupied the city. The city changed rulers several times during Saljuq rule and at the end of Sāmūd's reign it fell into the hands of the Ghuz Turks, and was destroyed by them in 550/1155. The Karā Khiṭāy rulers then included Balkh in their domains from about 560-1/1165 A.D. In 594/1198 Bāhā' al-Dīn Sām of Bānīyān occupied Balkh for the Shāhīs and in 603/1206 Muḥammad b. Farazmāghī captured it. Shortly thereafter, in 617/1220, although Balkh surrendered to Čingiz Khaṇ, the city was destroyed and its inhabitants massacred. It took long to recover from this blow, for Ibn Batūta in the early 8th/14th century describes the ruins of the city.

Balkh regained some of its past splendour under the Timūrids, and some of the masterpieces of Timūrid architecture were erected in Balkh. The citadel of Balkh which had been razed by Timūr was rebuilt by this son Shāh Rukh in 810/1407. The end of Balkh as a great centre, however, was forecast by the discovery (ca. 1480 A.D.) of the "so-called" grave of Allāh in the vicinity of Balkh. In 886/1481 a shrine was erected at the site ca. 20 km. to the east. By the 19th century around this shrine had developed the present city of Mazar-i Sharif. On 26 May 1347 Cingiz Khan, the city was destroyed and its inhabitants massacred. It took long to recover from this blow, for Ibn Batūta in the early 8th/14th century describes the ruins of the area.

The importance of Balkh came in great measure from its geographical position on a fertile plain, the meeting place of trade routes from India, China, Turkistan, and Iran. It was natural that a great centre should exist between the Oxus River and the Hindu Kush Mountains. At the present time the ruins of Balkh occupy a large area, and the site of so much promise actually has been very disappointing to archeologists. At the present day the village of Balkh has only a few thousand inhabitants. The visible monuments of Balkh include the ruins of extensive walls (ca. 10 km. perimeter) enclosing the modern village, and two shrines on the square of the present village. One is the Green Mosque in Timūrid style, and probably built at the end of the 16th century A.D. by an Ozbek Khaṇ, 'Abd al-Mu'mīn. Facing it is the tomb-shrine of Khūṭṭāl Ābū Naṣr Parsa, a Sūfī of the 16th century. A nearby madrasa, erected by Sa'īd Subḥān Kūlī Khaṇ (d. 1702), has only one arch left. In the northeast section inside the walls, there are the ruins of the shrine of Khūṭṭāl 'Abkābī Wall from the late Timūrid period. In summer the area of Balkh is very hot and dusty, and in the winter the area is almost a swamp.

Bibliography: The information of the Arabic geographers is gathered by P. Schwarz, *Bemerkungen zu den arabischen Nachrichten über Balkh*, in Oriental Studies in Honour of C. E. Pavry,
BALKHAN, two mountain ranges east of the Caspian Sea, which enclose the dried-out river-bed of the Ozboi (cf. Amu Darya). To the north of this river lies the Great Balkhan, a high plateau of limestone, difficult of access, with steep slopes; the highest elevation is at the Dünne Ashkal, about 1880 metres. The Little Balkhan, south of the Ozboi and cut with numerous ravines, attains (in the west) a height of no more than 800 metres. These mountains, where according to Muckaddan, 85, 1. e. f., wild horses and cattle lived, were searched for iron by the surrounding peoples. The area became, in about 420-2/1029-31, a place of retreat for Turkmen tribes coming from Khurasan (cf. Ibn al-Asfih, ed. Tornberg, ix, 207). During the following centuries the region was thickly settled with Turkmen and lost more and more its economic importance. Its development began in the 17th and the first half of the 18th century. The name "Balchas" occurs with a Mongol name of Balkhash. They did in fact dominate in these regions in the 17th and the first half of the 18th century. The name "Balkhas" occurs with a reproduction of the lake, very exact for the period, on a map by the Swedish non-commissioned officer J. G. Renat, who spent seventeen years in the country of the Kalmuks, from 1716 to 1733. Comp. carte de la Dsongarte dressée par le soudan Renat pendant sa captivité chez les Kalmouks de 1717 à 1733, ed. Russ. Imp. Geog. Society, St. Petersburg 1851.

The appearance of the neighbourhood of Balkhash is extremely desolate and arid and until the October Revolution the lake had never played a rôle of any economic importance. Its development began in 1936 with the building of a large industrial city, Balkhash, on the bay of Bertis on the Northern shore of the lake. (W. Barthold-[A. Bemigsen])

AL-BALKH, Abu'l-Kasim ("Abd Allah b. Ahmad b. Mahmod"); also known as Abu'l-Kasim al-Kab' al-Balkhi, the Mu'tazilite. Born at Al-Balkh, he lived for a long time at Baghdād, where he was the disciple of the Mu'tazilite Abu'l-Husayn al-Khayyat. He founded a school at Nasāf, converted to Islam a number of the Khorāsān tribes, and died at Balkh at the beginning of Sha'ban 319/August 931. Among his disciples were Ibn Shihāb (Abu'l-Tayyib Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad), who died after 350/962, and al-Abāb (Abu'l-Husayn). Among his works are mentioned the Kād al-Ma'ūlād and the K. Mahāsin Khurāsān, in which he speaks of Ibn al-Rawandi.

He defended the optimistic Mu'tazilite thesis which states that God cannot abandon the better for that which is less good. Man, he says, can and must do that which is better, whereas God cannot, because there is nothing superior to Him to oblige Him to do better than that which He has done. In agreement with the Mu'tazila, he did not recognize in God attributes distinct from His essence. He held that non-existence capable of existing is a well-determined thing outside existence, namely a simple essence. He considered the atom as an inextensive and devoid of qualities of its own; the qualities of the body derive from the aggregate of the atoms, which are therefore not essential but accidental. He distinguished between sensation and impression: man, he says, perceives by his reason the sensible objects which affect his different senses; but the senses by themselves can perceive nothing; they are the routes by which organic impressions reach the reason. The voluntary act, he says, presupposes hesitation and decision, which are characteristic of Man, an imperfect being, whereas in God such an act is totally absent. —The imāmāt, he says, must return to the Kuraybih, but if a conspiracy is suspected, a non-Kuraybih can be elected imāmA.

AL-BALKHI, Abū Zayd Abū Ahmad b. Saḥl, a famous scholar known today principally for his geographical work, was born at Ṣamāṭiyān, a village near Balkh in Khurāsān, about 236/850. He died upwards of 80 years old in Dhu 'l-Ka‘āba 322/October 934. His father was a schoolmaster from Sijistān. As a young man, wishing to study the doctrine of the Imāmīyya sect to which he belonged, al-Balkhī travelled on foot to Irāk with the pilgrim caravan. He remained there for eight years, becoming a pupil of the celebrated al-Kindī and visiting the neighbouring lands. In later life he refused to cross the Djayhān (Oxus) to go from Balkh to Buhkhārā, when invited by the amir of the latter place.

During the years which al-Balkhī spent in Irāk his studies included philosophy, astrology and astronomy, medicine and natural science (Yākūt, Irshād, i, 145-6). For a time he was torn between his earlier sectarian religious allegiance and the tenets of judicial astrology then much in vogue, but he finally became strictly orthodox in his opinions, and pursued the study of the religious sciences side by side with 'philosophy'. He is cited as an almost unique example of one who was equally expert in both, and he is named by Shahrastānī (Mī‘āl, ed. Cureton, 348) among the philosophers of Islam. He himself relates that he lost his patron, the general Husayn b. Abū al-Marwān al-Rūḍī, through the publication of one of his books and Abū Ali al-Djayhānī, also his patron, the wa‘iz of the Sāmānīd Naṣr b. Abū Ahmad, through the publication of another, though the general was a Karmatī (Khitaj, ed. Bulak, i, 115). His work is cited also by Maqritī (Khitaj, ed. Bālīk, i, 155). It has been suggested that al-Balkhī's influence in geography may have been due to his teacher al-Kindī, for whom a translation of Ptolemy's treatise on the subject was specially made (Fihrist, 268), and another of whose pupils, Ḍār al-Ṭayyib al-Sarakhī, wrote a Kūdāb al-Masālik wa ‘l-Mamālik (Tanbih, 67), apparently the first of several geographical works in Islam with that title. Though Maqritī observes that al-Balkhī did not travel widely, he admits that he was an expert, especially for his own province, mentioning in particular his familiarity with the diwānīs (i.e., registers of taxes) of Khurāsān (ibid., 307). This is consistent with what we read elsewhere of al-Balkhī having acted as a secretary (kātib) to one of the Sāmānīds (Irshād, i, 147). His work is cited also by Maqritī (Khitaj, ed. Bulak, i, 115).


BALJADJI: a name given to men composing various companies of palace guards under the Otto-
man régime down to the beginning of the nineteenth century. The term was used alternatively with the equivalent Persian tabârdar, both words meaning, literally ‘axe-man’, and hence ‘woodcutter’, ‘pioneer’, ‘halberdier’.

It would appear that originally the balâdji, whose corps was recruited from the ʿAdîjînî Oghlanîs [q.v.], were employed in connexion with the army in the felling of trees, the levelling of roads, and the filling of swamps, but that even before the conquest of Constantinople some of them were posted as guards to the imperial palace at Adrianople. Thereafter, with the foundation at Istanbul in turn of the ‘Old’ and ‘New’ Sarays, Galata Saray, and the saray of İbrahim Paşa, other companies of balâdji were formed for each. The men of all these companies except that of the New, later called the Topkapı Saray, were admitted, after a certain length of service, to the edîş of the Janissaries, whereas those of the Topkapı Saray enjoyed the privilege of entry into the Șâiph and Șîâhâdar bâltûks [q.v.] of the standing cavalry. The men of this privileged company were known as zûlitîyâ balâdji-an—that is to say “binkered” balâdji—for the curious reason that, since one of their duties was to carry the wood required for heating the imperial harem into that forbidden precinct, on the occasions of their performing this duty, in order to prevent their inadvertently catching sight of the ladies of the establishment, they were “binkered” made of cloth or gold lace hanging down on either side of their faces from their tall pointed caps (the Persian sul signifying ‘a lock of hair’), as well as special jackets furnished with exceptionally wide upright collars.

Upon the closure in 1675 of the sarays of Galata and İbrahim Paşa, their balâdji companies were abolished. By this time also recruitment by derekâr had all but ceased. The remaining companies were mostly recruited therefore from free-born Anatolian Muslims, though the relatives of palace servants were also sometimes admitted into them. The zûlitîyâ Balâdji-an were suppressed by Mustafa III but revived by ʿAbd al-Ḥamîd I, and remained in being until the palace service as a whole was reorganised by Mahmûd II. They were commanded by a kâyya (kêdêkûa) responsible to the sultan’s principal page, the Șîâhâdar Âğha.

Twelve balas of the Zûlitîyâ Balâdji-an, distinguished by their literacy, had various special duties. Thus they would bring out, and stand behind, the sultan’s throne at his accession and upon bâyârmas [q.v.]; guard the Prophet’s Standard (sandqâği-shîrî) and read the Kûrân beneath it on campaign; take charge of the belongings of the harem ladies every year when the sultan and the sultan removed to one of the summer kêkîks; and—from the seventeenth century—present officiants of the Sultan Âğham mosque with sherbet, rose-water and incense at the yearly celebration of the Prophet’s Birthday (Mewlûd). Each of the chief officers of the palace, moreover, had one or more Zûlitîyâ Balâdji-an in attendance upon him; and two important offices in the palace service were filled by balas of the corps: that of the head cook of the Kush-khânî (the imperial kitchen) and his second in command.

The Balâdji-an of the Old Saray, which from the late fifteenth century was the residence of the sultans’ mothers, were responsible down to the seventeenth century to the Kapî Âğham [q.v.] and thereafter to the Kîšar Âğhasî [q.v.], to whom those who could acquire enough learning in the Bayâzîd me-

dresses might act as confidential secretaries or as clerks for the ʿawāfî of the Holy Cities, whereas other senior members of this corps might serve the Wâlide Sultan and other princesses as chief coffee-makers (bahevedji-başî). A number of Grand Viziers were former balâdji-an, of whom perhaps the best known are Balâtâdji Meḥmed Paşa, who defeated Peter the Great on the Pruth in 1711, and Newshehriî İbrahim Paşa, the last minister of Âğmed III.

Bibliography: Koçu Bey, Risâlè (Istanbul, 1303) 26; D’Ohsson, Tabâlân de l’Empire Ottoman, viii, 30–3; Tâşyâhrâzâde Ahmed-i ʿĀlî, Tâşhi-i ʿÂlî, i, 290–293, 297, 299, 305–7; IA, art by I. H. Uzunçarşîî; Gibb and Bowen, Islamic Society and the West, i, part i, index. (H. Bowen)

BALTISTÂN, known to Muslim writers as Tibbon-i kuhrud or Little Tibet, lying between 34° and 36° N and 75° and 77° E between Gilgit and Ladâkh, extends some 150 miles on either bank of the Indus, covering an area of 8,522 sq. miles. A mountainous country, it has some of the highest peaks in the world: Godwin Austen (K 2), 28,250 ft., conquered in 1953; Gasherbrum, 26,470 ft., conquered in 1958, and Haramosh, 24,000 ft. Skârdû the chief town, was electrified in 1951. It has an airstrip, a modern hospital and a number of schools. A new bâsitân has recently been built.

The Balâs were converted to Islam in the 8th/9th century partly by Sayyid ʿAll Hamadânî of Sînarâg (Kâshmir) and partly by his khalîfâ, Sayyid Muḥammad Nûr Bakhsh. They are polygamous and of the Shiʿîe persuasion. Their neighbours, the Hunzâs, are followers of the Âğhâ Khân. The language used by the Balâs is a mixture of Ladâkhî and Tibetan but has a sprinkling of Arabic and Persian words, indicative of the influence of Islam.

The old rulers of Baltistan are known as Râdjîs or Gâlpô, the most famous being ʿAll Shîr Khân who flourished in the 10th/11th century and also built a fort at Skârdû. His expeditions to neighbouring regions still form the theme of many a native folk-song. In the early 12th/13th century another Gâlpô, ʿAll Mir, chief of Skârdû, invaded and conquered the home-land of the Balâs. The last of the Gâlpôs, Ahmad Shâh, lost his independence to the Dogra general, Zörâwar Singh in 1840, when Baltistan was annexed to the Kâshmir State, then ruled by âlî Mir, chief of Skârdû, and thereupon the Pakîstân Government to take over control of the area. Since then it is being administered by the Chief Adviser, Kâshmir and Baltistan. It has made general progress; almost the entire area now has a net of pony tracks. Skârdû is linked with Rawalpindi by air. An airmail service has also been introduced between Baltistan and Pakîstân.

Improved educational, medical and other facilities have been provided raising the standard of living of the people. Large amounts have also been sanctioned for the economic development (especially the construction of roads) of the area. Bibliography: Imp. Gaz. of India (new ed.) vi 261–5; R. C. Arora, The Land of Ladâkh, Kashmir and Gilgit, Aligarh 1940, 194–218; Kashmir Gazetter, Calcutta 1909; G. M. D. Sufi, Kashmir, Lahore 1949, i, 219, ii, 556, 764, 777; A. H. Franchet, History of Western Tibet, London 1907; I. Stephen, Horned Moon, London 1953,
BALČISTAN (BALČIŞTAN), land of the Balč.  

A. Geography and History. The exact boundaries of Balčistān are undetermined. In general it occupies the S.E. part of the Iranian plateau from the Kirmān desert east of Bām and the Bāshāgīrd Mts. to the western borders of Sind and the Pāndjāb. This arid and mountainous country with a predominantly nomadic population is divided between Irau and Pakistan. At present Balč are also found in Sind and the Pāngjāb, in Sīstān and a few nomads in the USSR near Marw (see above).

The rivers of Balčistān are small and unimportant. One may consider the country a plateau with the rugged Sulaymān range in the East and several mountain ranges in the West, the most spectacular peak of which is the volcano Kūh-i Tātān (1,550 ft.). The town of Irāngāhār (formerly Fahrādīj) is the capital of Persian Balčistān with Kālāt the most important centre in the East. The seaports, such as Gāh, Tī, Pāmīr and Gwādār, formerly active, now have lost their importance.

The population of the area, including Brahūs, is uncertain, hardly more than two million today. Although the Balč are the majority of the population, with the Brahūs the largest minority, there are also Džāts and other Indian elements on the eastern coast, and negroid people in the port towns especially in Persian Balčistān. The Balč are divided into two groups separated from each other by the Brahūs in the Kālāt area which accounts for the two major dialects.

The earliest mention of the area, called Maka, is in the Old Persian cuneiform inscription of Darius at Behistūn and Persepolis. Other names occur in classical sources, but very little is known of the country in pre-Islamic times. It is probable that Iranian speakers were late in coming to Balčistān and the southern and eastern parts of Balčistān were predominantly non-Iranian until well after the Islamic conquests. The Balč probably entered Makrān (i.e., western Balčistān) from Kirmān about the time of the Saljuq invasion of Kirmān.

Kirmān was conquered by the Muslims in 23/644 in the caliphate of Umar. In the mountains of Kirmān they met Kufs or Kūš and Balūs or Balč who were marauding nomads. At this time the Zuṭṭ or Ŀīāš were in Makrān, which was not conquered by the Arabs. In the time of Muʾāwiya, ca. 44/664, the towns of Makrān were occupied and war was waged with the Māds of the coast, while raids extended as far as Sind. In the time of al-Ḥaḍīddi b. Yūsuf (86/705) in the inter-Arab struggles the ʿAlāʾ Arab faction was driven into Sind to be followed in 89/707 by Muḥ. b. Kāsīm with an Arab army. It is difficult to identify the places he captured but Muslim rule was extended by him through Balčistān to Sind. It is probable that the Arabs maintained their influence only on the coast, but we have very little information about the entire area throughout the ʿAbbāsid caliphate. Muḥammad of Gāzīn maintained authority over Kuschār (the Kālāt plateau) acc. to the Ṭubālā-r-i Nāṣirī.

The Balč and the Kūc tribes during the Umayyad and ʿAbbāsid caliphates raided from Kirmān, spreading into Sīstān and Kirmān. According to Yākūt the Balč were decimated by ʿAḍud al-Dawla the Būyid (338-372/949-982). They continued their depredations until Muḥammad of Gāzīn sent his son Masʿūd against them, who defeated them near Khabīs. Shortly after this time the eastward movement of the Balč began, for they left Kirmān and went into Makrān. It is possible that the strong centralised government of the Saljuqs made raiding unprofitable for the Balč who consequently moved eastward. Two centuries later the Balč are found in Sind. In the Kālāt highlands the Brabōi confederacy, including some Balč and Afghan tribes, kept the main body of Balč from inundating the area, and the Balč then moved into Sind and the Pāndjāb. No permanent kingdom was established but each tribe was under its own chief and inter-tribal fighting was common.

The first tribes of which any records have survived are the Rinds under Mir Čakur and the Dōdās under Mir Sohrāb who appeared at the court of Shāh Husayn Langāh at Mūltān, who ruled from 874-908/1467-1502. The tradition is that Mir Čakur and his Rinds came from Sībi and took service with Shāh Husayn. Other Balč followed and, according to ballads, there was war between the Rinds and the Dōdās. In these legends the memory of the migration of the Balč to India is preserved.

The Dōdās and Hōts, another Balč tribe, spread up the Indus valley and Bābar met them as far north as Bherā and Kusāḥ in 1519. The towns of Dīra Ismaʾīl Khān and Dīra Ghuṭ Khān were founded by the sons of Sohrāb Dōdā in the time of Shēr Shāh, who confirmed their possession of the lands of the lower Indus valley. According to tradition these Balč aided Humayūn in his reconquest of Dīlū and were in the good graces of the Mughal rulers.

The only history we have of Balčistān in the later period concerns the Brabōi confederation. The Brabōi confederation began to expand in the 17th century under the Kāmbarānī chiefs. At the end of the century one of these rulers, Mir ʿAbd Allāh extended his power west throughout Makrān and south to the sea. Nādir Shāh of Persia regarded the Brabōi Khāns with favour, for after his Indian conquests he awarded them lands in Sind taken from the Indian Khāns.

Ahmad Shīr Durrād established his authority over Makrān, and the Brabōi Khān recognised him as his suzerain. This Brabōi, Nasır Khān, extended his rule over Las-Bīla including Karākūl. He organised
the Brahils into the two main groups of Sarawdn and Lishlshw. Each tribe had to supply the Khan with troops at the Khan's request but were otherwise free from taxes.

Nasir Khan became so powerful that he defined his suzerain Ahmad Shah who defeated him in 1727/1738 and besieged him in Kalat. Peace was made on condition that Nasir Khan retain his independence free from taxes with his suzerain Ahmad Shah who defeated him in 1727/1738 and was succeeded by his son Mahmud Khan who was unable to retain the extensive dominions of his father. Western Makran was lost and some Baluchi tribesmen took Karak. Mahmud died in 1821 and was succeeded by his son Mihrab Khan. The latter mixed in Afghan affairs which brought him in conflict with the British. In 1838 a force under Gen. Wiltshire was sent against Kalat which was stormed and Mihrab Khan was killed. After much confusion and disorders which followed his death, the years until 1876 when Capt. Sandeman brought about a treaty which recognised Kalat as a protected state in the Turco-Persian Empire. The establishment of Quetta as a military centre and the building of a railroad in Balochistan in the 1880's kept the country pacified.

The boundary between Kalat and Persia was laid down in 1872 and revised in 1895-6, but for the most part the Baluchi tribes disregarded the frontier.

Much less is known of Persian Balochistan. Although the Baluchi tribes owed allegiance to the Safavids and Qajars in fact they were independent. Raiding parties of Baloch terrorized the settlements of Kirmahn and Khurasan until the 1930's. The Nahrri tribe today is perhaps the most important in Persian Balochistan and Sistian, but it is difficult to obtain information about the various tribes, who perhaps know very little themselves about their history and present status.

There are many ballads and stories on Baloch history, many apocryphal, though some, telling of eponymous ancestors, may contain actual history.

Bibliography: For travellers' accounts, see the literature in A. Gabriel, Die Erforschung Persiens, Vienna 1932, 137-140, 175, and passim. On ethnography, cf. M. Longworth Dames, The Baloch Race, London 1904, and Mockler, The Origin of the Baloch, in JRAI, 1895. History is poor; for the early periods the sources are only scattered notices in the standard Arabic histories and geographies; for later history see Elliot and Dowson, The History of India, London, 1867-77, esp. vols. 1, 2 and 5; H. Raverty, Tabakat-i Naseri, transl. and notes, London 1881; Thornton, Life of Sir R. Sandeman, London 1895. (R. N. Frye)

B. Language. — § 1. Linguistic history.

Within the main division of Iranian languages, based on the treatment of the simple Ido-(European) palatalts k and g into a Western, Persic, and an Eastern group, Bal(di) belongs to the latter, cf. ask 'gazelle': N(ew) P(ersian) dhu; san- 'to know': NP dnn-; buRz 'high': NP buland. The Baluch are thought to have migrated from their present habitat from the shores of the Caspian Sea. One therefore looks for orientation on the ancestor of Bal to the two of the known Middle Iranian languages which are nearest to that area, viz. M(iddle) P(ersian) (belonging to the Western group) and F(arthian) (belonging to the Eastern group), whose meeting point lay to the South of the Central Caspian region.

Bal ranges with F not only in the treatment of the simple IE palatals (cf. also the special development of IE *h in d*h in Iron 'iron': P 23Hw: MP 33Hw), but also, e.g., of O(ld) Ir(anian) j (fan- 'to strike': P jn-: MP jm-), d- (pad 'foot', gidan 'tent': P d'd, ud'w: MP p'Y, wYn), r- (sird 'heart': P yrzd: MP ykl), sc- (pas-tara 'later': P ps: MP ps), dy- (pits other': P bkg: MP dvey), and wkl- (w(h)ad 'sweet, happy': P wks: MP xvd); it agrees with MP e.g., in the development of Ofr. y (fiid 'separate': MP yyd: P yyd; see now W. B. Henning, Mitteliranisch (Handbuch des Orientalistik), 89 ff., note Khwarizmian la- < fra-, ibid., 114.)
§ 2. Dialects.

Bal. dialects are divisible geographically and linguistically into two great groups: Western and Eastern, separated from each other by a strip of territory inhabited by Brahui-speakers, extending from Quetta in the North to Las Bela in the South.

A) Western. The Western dialects (also called 'Southern' or 'Makrani') are spoken principally in the Makrān, their territory extending from Biyābān north of Cape Jāsk in Persian Balūcīstān (abt. long. 57°) eastwards to Ras Malān in the Sind (abt. long. 66°), thence northwards to the Afghan frontier, and thence along this frontier westwards into Kirmān. The map in the LSI, x, 327 (v. bibl.) shows a territory where there live mixed Balūchī and other language speakers, extending from the north-west corner of the Makrān along the Persian-Afghan frontier northwards into Russian Turkestan, in the province of Marw. Details of these Marw Balūchīs remained obscure until 1927-28, when I. I. Zarubin first investigated their language. They number about 10,000 (mainly in the regions of Volotan, Bārām 'Allī, and Kubyshev.)

B) Eastern. The Eastern dialects (also called 'Northern') are spoken by tribes in an area extending from Karafī northwards through the Sulayman mountains approx. to Dera Ismā'īl Khan. This dialect has been strongly influenced by the Brahui language. They number about 10,000, especially Gladstone, Dames, and Mayer. Add to the LSI list:


B) Eastern.

I. The purest E. dialects are spoken in an area stretching from Quetta through Loralai to include Dera Gāhī Khan and south to include Marri and Bugtī territory, into the Upper Sind Frontier.

II. The Karakān dialect, north of Dera Gāhī Khan up to Dera Ismā'īl Khan. This dialect has been strongly influenced by the Brahuis, as a technical term, through the numerous German loanwords (principally Sindhi and Labakā).

III. The dialects of Sind, south of Jacobabad. These are much more mixed with and influenced by the Sindhi than the others; typical of them is the Kāččāli-Bollī, spoken by about 100,000 in a district north of Karakān. In it all θ becomes ɔ, ɔ: becomes ə, ə: cerebralisation is a general rule, voiced stops are usually aspirated, and final vowels are affixed to words ending in a consonant.

The E dialects have been much better studied than the W, and reference to the bibliography must suffice here for them.

Bibliography: G. A. Grierson, Linguistic Survey of India, Vol x, 327 ff. The bibl. given on p. 335 is complete up to 1921. See, on E dialects, especially Gladstone, Dames, and Mayer.

BALYEMEZ, the name given to a large calibre gun. The term is encountered in Ottoman chronicles and other works and is still to be found occasionally in relatively late sources (down to the 19th century). Balyemez cannon were first introduced into the Ottoman army in the time of Sultan Murad II. Mehmed II the Conqueror, who undertook regular large-scale military operations, made great use of such guns. He caused the Transylvanian Urban, a noted cannon-founder, to construct a special siege gun of the Balyemez type, for the purpose of breaching the walls of Constantinople. The technique of gun-casting became available to the Ottomans through Western and, above all, German specialists. The production of a Balyemez gun was described in some detail by Kritobulos, the Greek panegyrist of Mehmed II. Since guns were at that time employed only in siege warfare, the Turks, as a rule, used to cast them on the spot; there is but seldom any reference to the transport of guns already cast. The name Balyemez ("that eats no honey") is in all probability a jesting and popular transformation of the German "Faule Metze" (the famous cannon of the year 1411 which, together with the "Faule Grite", altered the entire course of war, as it stood at that time). The word came to the Ottomans, as a technical term, through the numerous German gun-
founders in the Turkish service. It passed also, from the Turkish, into various languages of south-east Europe. The nickname Balyemez, occasionally given to Ottoman army commanders, is a secondary derivation from the name of the gun.

**Bibliography:** H. J. Kissling, *Balyemez*, in *ZDMG*, 101 (1951), 333–340, where further bibliographical references will be found [see also *Marud* and *Top*]. (H. J. Kissling)

**Balyos,** Balyoz (originally Baylōs), the Turkish name for the Venetian ambassador to the Sublime Porte—in Italian, *baio* (Venetian ambassadors at Byzantium had borne this name since 1082; other *basili* were at Tyre and Lajazzo/Payas near Alexandria). The Venetians, immediately after the conquest of Constantinople, sent off as *baio* Bartolomeo Marcello, who on 18 April 1454 made with the Porte a commercial treaty which renewed the agreement already existing with the Ottomans since 1408. Under this new treaty Venice had the right to maintain at the Sublime Porte a bailo with his seat in Pera and with the power to issue passes for Venetian merchants and to exercise in relation to those merchants certain legal functions. The representatives of Venice sat in Constantinople, except in time of war, until the fall of the Republic in 1797; their tenure of office lasted, during the 17th and 18th centuries, in principle for three years. There were moreover special ambassadors to the Porte who also bore the name of *baio*. The *basili* played, in the 16th and 17th centuries, an important rôle politically; several amongst them, in times of tension or of war, were thrown into prison (as a rule in Yedikule). The reports (*relazioni*) which they submitted to the Signoria bear witness to their perspicacity. These reports have been published in two series: (i) E. Alberi, *Relazioni degli Ambasciatori Veneti al Senato*, ser. iii: Turchia, 3 vols., Florence 1840–1855; and (ii) N. Barozzi and G. Berchet, *Le Relazioni degli Stati Europei lette al Senato dagli Ambasciatori Veneti nel secolo decimosesto*, ser. V: Turchia, Venice 1866, 1872.

**List of the Baili:** Cf. (i) Barozzi and Berchet, op. cit., i, 9 ff.; and (ii) B. Spuler, *Die europäische Diplomatie in Konstantinopel*, Pt. iv, in *Jahrbiicher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, i (1936), 289–247 (with additional references).

With the generalised meaning of European diplomatic or consular agent, the word is also encountered in some Arabic dialects and in Swahili.

**Bibliography:** W. Andreas, *Staatskunst und Diplomatie der Venezianer im Spiegel ihrer Gesandtenberichte*, Leipzig 1943; H. Kretschnay, *Geschichte von Venedig*, 3 vols., Vienna 1905–1934; G. N. Curzon, *The History of Persia from the Beginning of the XIXth Century to the Year 1875*, 1201/1795: in order to celebrate his success the Kâdîr erected a pyramid there consisting of the skulls of 600 of his adversary’s followers (R. G. Watson, *A History of Persia*). In those days the citadel, which was in the centre of the town, contained part of the bazaars. The houses were of sun-dried brick. There were a number of baths, the best known being in the street or lane of the willows (*zāhleh al-bīldi*).

In 1131/1719 Mahmūd, the Qazī or leader, captured Bam, but abandoned it some months later owing to a revolt in Kandahār. In 1134/1721 he captured the town again and it remained in Afghan hands until their power was shattered by Nādir [q.v.] in 1142/1739–39. It was, indeed, in order to guard against possible future attack from the east that Nādir greatly strengthened the defences of the town.

It was at Bam that Aghā Muhammad Khān captured the gallant Lutf ‘All Khān, the last of the short-lived Zand dynasty, in 1256/1840–1 Bam came into prominence again, when Aghā Khān Mahallatī occupied it during his revolt. In the old town, which is now almost entirely in ruins, the only building of interest, apart from the striking citadel, is the shrine of the Imam Zayd which in-...
junction of the two navigable stretches of the river, at the end of the Dakar-Niger railway, served by an important aerodrome. Formerly a trading post on the routes between the Sahel and the Southern region, and between the Sudan and Senegal, Bamako occupies a central position in French West Africa which is the reason for its flourishing state: the population of the town, numbering 800 in 1883, had risen to 37,000 in 1945, and today (1958) has reached 100,000 (of whom 4,000 are Europeans). It owes its importance to its administrative and political rôle.

Bamako was founded by a Bama hunter and named by his Niaré successor, who came from Kaarta, Bama-ko = "after Bama" (the etymology "river of the crocodiles" is incorrect). The size of the original village increased as there came to it first fishermen, and then men from Draa (the Drâvé) and Touat (the Touré) who brought with them Islam; the town thus comprised four quarters: Niarela, Tourelé, Bobo, and Dravéla, the basis of the present city.

In a short time Bamako, a bridgehead on the Niger, became a French political objective; after the war of 1870, a move was made in its direction, and it was occupied in 1883 by Col. Borgnis-Desbordes. From then on, as a base for French operations in the Sudan, its population was constantly swelled by groups of Senegalese and Sudanese. In 1904, the railway reached the town, which became in 1907 the chief-town of Upper Senegal and Niger: a large administrative, military and medical (Institutes of Leprosy and Tropical Ophthalmology) centre grew up, and the town also tended to become a university (Federal School of Public Works) and cultural (French Institute of Black Africa) centre.

Bamako is an Islamic city, but its Islam is afro-cultural, lax, and often tainted with animist survivals. Far from being a centre of religious expansion, the city has always been under the influence of the ancient Muslim towns in the region and of families of Moorish marabouts. The Kâdiriyas and the Tidjâniyas have long been established there; at first in the majority, the Kâdiriyas were supplanted by the Umariyyas; between the two wars, Hamallism, in a more sober form, developed there; at the present time there has come into being a reformist group which proposes to purify the local form of Islam. It is possible to foresee Bamako, following its present bent, seeking to assume a leading rôle in an Islamic revival. In conclusion, it should be noted that Bamako has a small Christian community and is the seat of an archbishop.

The town, originally built of mud, does not possess any ancient historical monuments.

Bibliography: Scanty. Information should be sought in official publications and in historical works on the Sudan. (M. Chailley)

BAMBARA [see Mande and Sudan].

BÂMIYân, in the Arabic sources frequently called Bamiyan, a town in the Hindu-Kush north of the main range in a mountain valley lying 8,480 feet above sea level, through which one of the most important roads between the lands of the Oxus watershed and the Indus leads; the town is therefore naturally important as a commercial centre and was important in the middle ages as a fortress also. Although the valley, that of the Kunduz river, really belongs to the Oxus watershed and is separated from Kabul by high mountain passes, e.g., the Shibar and Unmai, its political association has often shifted from north to south. In recent centuries Bamiyân has tended to belong to Kabul and Ghazna rather than to the Oxus territories, and the pass of Akribatt, to the north-west of Bamiyân, has marked the boundary between Kabulistan and Afghan Turkistan.

The early history of Bamiyân is obscure. Rare coins of the Kushâns have been reported there but no monuments or other remains of that period have been discovered (J. Hackin, in JA 1935, 287 ff.). The Chinese sources, of which the earliest are scarcely earlier than the 6th century A.D., century, usually transcribe the name Fan-yen-na or Far-yanh (see J. Marquet, Erdmenger, 21 ff.; and P. Pelliot's note in J. Hackin, Les Antiquités Bouddhiques de Bâmiyân, Paris 1928, 75). According to Marquet the "Older Middle Iranian" form was Bâmiyân. The valley and town at this date are described by the Chinese pilgrim Huan-Cuang who found there a great centre of Buddhism with more than ten monasteries and over a thousand monks. He noticed that the language, coinage, script and religious beliefs current differed but little from those of Turkistan. The royal town was on the cliff above the valley, south-west of the great Buddha figures. These two colossal figures, which have for centuries excited the wonder of travellers, both Arab (cf. especially Yâkût, i, 481) and European, have recently been described in detail, together with many of the associated caves and fresco paintings.

Their age is still uncertain but the weight of evidence indicates that the early work, including the two great figures, dates from the latter half of the 6th or early 7th century A.D., and that the excavation and painting of caves continued well into the 8th. During this period Bamiyân appears to have been ruled by a dynasty, perhaps of Hepthalite origin, but certainly subject to the prince (Yaôghû) of the Western Turks. This dynasty was still ruling in the first quarter of the 2nd/8th century and still professed Buddhism (cf. E. Chavannes, Documents sur les Tou-kieu [Turcs] occidentaux, St. Petersburg, 1903, 291-2, and Hackin, loc. cit. 1928, 83).

The prince of Bamiyân bore the title Shîr or Shâr which Yaôghû (Buddân 289) erroneously translates "lion"; the word means "king" and is to be derived from the old Persian khshathriya (Marquet, loc. cit.,). Islam was first adopted by these princes in the time of the Abbâsids, according to Yaôkûbî's geography (loc. cit.) in the reign of al-Mansûr, according to the same author's history (ed. Houtsma, ii, 479) in that of al-Mahdî. The relations of this dynasty to the lands south and north of the Hindu-Kush are not quite clear. According to Yaôkûbî Bamiyân belonged to Tukhûristân, i.e., the lands of the Oxus territory, which is probably confirmed by Tâbarî's statement (ii, 1630.1) that about 119/737 a foreigner from Bamiyân ruled in Khûttal (north of the Oxus); on the other hand Išâkhîrî (277) says that the district (tamâl) of Bamiyân on the lands south of the Hindu-Kush with the towns of Parwân, Kâbul, and Ghâzna. Under the later Abbâsids the members of the dynasty of Bamiyân, like many Central Asian princes, held influential positions at the court of Baghchâd; Tâbarî (iii, 1335) tells us that a Shâr of Bamiyân was appointed governor of Yaman in 229/844. There was still a large Buddha temple in Bamiyân in which there were also idols in the 3rd/9th century. This temple was destroyed by the Sañfârîd Yaôkûb and the idols brought to Baghchâd in 251/862 (cf. the comparison of Tâbarî, iii, 1851 and Fihrist, 346, by Barthold in Oriental Stud. (Nidelke-Festschrift), i, 187).

The native dynasties seem to have been finally
BAMIYAN—BANAKAT
overcome by the Ghaznavids. A branch of the house of the Ghurids ruled in Bamiyan for half a century (550-669/1114-1212). Bamiyan was then the capital of a kingdom which controlled some districts north of the Oxus, and stretched to the north-east as far as the borders of Kâshghar. Like the other lands of the Ghurids, this kingdom also was incorporated in the kingdom of Muhammad Shâh of Khwarizm in the beginning of the 7th/13th century; Bamiyan was granted with Gha'na and other lands to Djalâl al-Dîn the eldest son of the Khwarizmghân (Nasâ'î, ed. Houdas, text 25, transl. 441). Soon afterwards followed the destruction of the town by the Mongols (618/1221). Mütügen, a grandson of Cîngiz Khân, fell at the siege of the town; in revenge for his death the conqueror razed the town to the ground and exterminated its inhabitants; the place received the name of Mo-balik (evil town) or, according to Râshd al-Dîn, Mo-kurghân (evil fortress) and was still uninhabited 40 years later in the time of the historian Djuwayni. For the past few centuries Bâmiyân has always been combined with Gha'na and Kâbul; like these towns it belonged, down to the 14th/18th century, to the empire of the Mughals, and afterwards to the newly formed Afghan kingdom of which it is still a part.

At present Bâmiyân is a district town connected by motorable roads with both Kâbul and Kunduz. The population of the valley belongs mainly to the Hazâra stock, but there are also villages of Tadjiks. The inhabitants speak two languages, Persianian and Pashtû (Afgân), but the former is the more widely spoken. The modern settlement lies immediately beneath the cliff with the great images. About two miles south-east lies the ruined fortress of Gulgula, situated on a prominence on the south of the valley. This has been generally recognised as the town built on a hill which Cîngiz Khân destroyed, and is probably also the strong fortress referred to by Yakût and Ya'kubî. Whether it is also the site of Huan-Cuâng's royal town is not clear, as the pilgrim states that it lay on the cliffs south-west of the images. No remains have been reported in this direction.


BAMPUR, a district and small town in the VIIIth ustân of Persia (corresponding approximately to the province of Kîrmân and Persian Balûcîstân). For administrative purposes, Bampûr and its district come under Irânghîbî (formerly Fârâbî), situated 23 kilometres to the east. Bampûr, which has a population of 5,000, is chiefly remarkable for its citadel which crowns an eminence 100 feet in height. The inhabitants, who are Sunnîs and all Balûcî-speaking, are mostly engaged in agricultural and pastoral pursuits. The surrounding district, which is well supplied with water, is very fertile and produces corn and dates.

After the assassination of Nâdir Shâh in 1160/1747, Nafr Khân, the Governor of Balûcîstân, transferred his allegiance to Ahmad Shâh Durrânî [q.v.], of Afghanistan, but later became independent. Persian authority over Bampûr was not restored until 1183/1767.


BÂN (A. and P.), the ben-nut tree ( _Moringa apera Gaertn._). Dioscorides knew of its existence in Arabia and other neighbouring countries. Galen, speaking of a remedy obtained from the tree, says that it was imported from the Arabs. Abû Ḥanîfa reports that the fruit, called _sâh_ (sah), was a commodity greatly in demand which was bought and paid for in advance even before being ripe. The wood, because of its lightness, was used for tent-poles. On account of the high and slender growth of the _bân_ and the softness of its wood, Arab poets used the word as a simile for a tender woman of tall stature.

The fruit, known to the Greeks as _bakxinos _μορφίας κατά τον Ρωμαίον για τάς ἐνυγνειαστικά τα χάριτα, was put to various medicinal uses. Especially the fine oil, extracted from the seeds, was applied against several skin diseases. The juice of the fruit, mixed with vinegar and water, was given to horses as a remedy for cardialgia. In addition to its application in medicine, the oil of the _bân_ was much used in the manufacture of perfumes.

being either slain or else carried off to serve as assault troops in further sieges; there is no mention that its buildings were destroyed (Eliuayni, i, 70-74; Mtkh)*änd, ed. Jaubert, 140).

It is clear that, during the following centuries, Banakat fell into decline, for in 794/1392 it was “rebuilt” by Timur and named, after his own son, “Shahrulikhvva” (Sharaf al-Din ‘Ali Yazdi, Zafar-

The place is mentioned in the period from the 13th to the 17th century as a strong fortress, but later it sank once more into decay. Ruins (now bearing the name “Sharkiyva”) are still to be seen and were examined for the first time in 1876 by a Russian expedition.


**BANAKITI**, (for the vocalisation, see the preceding article), FAKHR AL-DIN ABU SULAYMAN DAWUD b. Abi‘-Fadl Muhammad, Persian poet and historian (d. 730/1330). According to his own account, he was made malik al-shur‘a*, or “king of poets”, in 701/1301-2 by the Mongol ruler of Persia, Shahrul Khvva. He wrote at least one poem of his historical work, entitled Rawdat al-burda fi Tawdrikh al-Akhbar wa l-Ansab, was written in 717/1317-8, under the Ilkhán Abu Sa‘id; the preface is dated 25 Shawwá 717/31 Dec. 1317. Apart from a few very brief remarks on the events of recent years, it is a résumé of the Djam‘i al-Tawdrikh of Rashíd al-Din, the arrangement of the subject matter being different. According to E. G. Browne (iii, 101), the range of the second half of the work affords evidence not only of a wider conception of history (probably under the influence of Rashíd al-Din), but also of a spirit of real tolerance towards non-Muslim peoples and of a real knowledge of these peoples, doubtless promoted by the position which the author held at the court of the Ilkhans. Blochet, “Introduction à l'Histoire des Mongols ...”, Grib. Mem. Series, xii, 98) seems to assert that the Chinese sources of the Djam‘i al-

The poem consists of 58 verses, and in its general features conforms to the usual pattern of the pre-Islamic Arabian ode. Numerous commentaries have been written on it. It was first published by Lette at Leiden in 1740, and subsequently by Freytag with a Latin translation (Halle 1823), and by Th. Nödeke in his Delectus Veterum Carminum Arabiscorum, Berlin 1890, 110 ff. R. Basset edited it with a French translation and two commentaries, Algiers 1910. An English translation will be found in R. A. Nicholson’s Translations of Eastern Poetry and Prose, Cambridge 1922. There is also an Italian translation by G. Gabrieli in Florence 1901, and a German translation by O. Rescher (Istanbul 1910).

The poem of Ka‘b inspired another famous hymn in praise of the Prophet, viz., the kasidat al-burda (“Mantle Ode”) of al-Busti* [q.v.].

Bibliography: Ibn Hisham, 67 ff., 887-93 (= A. Guillaume, The Life of Mohammad, Oxford 1955, 507 ff., and Well’s translation ii, 253 ff); Ibn Kutayba, al-Shi‘r, ed. De Goeje; ed. A. M. Shakkir, Cairo 1906; A. C. C. 106-107; Aggú, xv, 147-51; Ibn Hadjar, Isba, s.v.; W. Muir, Life of Mohammad* 456-7; Caetani, Annali, ii, 223-4; G. Gabrieli, al-Burdatin, Florence 1901; J. E. Sarkis, Dictionnaire de Bibliographie Arabe, col. 1562; Brockelmann, I, 32-33: S 1, 68-70, where other editions, translations, and commentaries are listed. (SH. INAYATULLAH)

**BANBALČNA**, Pampeluna, Span. Pamplona, a town in the north of Spain, chief-town of the province of Navarre, with a present population of about 80,000. No Arab geographer has left us an accurate description of Pampeluna in the late Middle Ages. The Raad al-Mi‘yár, which devotes most space to it, depicts the town as the capital of the land of the Basques (Vascones, Ar. Baskunak [q.v.]), a group of mountain tribes established on the southern slopes and at the western end of the Pyrenees, not far from the Atlantic Ocean. Their territory bounded, in the West, the land called al-Alaba wa l-Kid* [q.v.], i.e., of Alava and the Castles (the original Castille); in the East, it reached the mountainous regions inhabited by the Gascons (Ar. Glaqhiyin) and the people of Gercy or Cerdagne. Pampeluna was taken by the governor Qubba b. al-Hadidjá in 121/739; it rebelled against Cordova and, in 161/779, was taken by the Franks in the course of Charlemagne’s expedition. It passed under the sway of the Franco-Gascons for a number of
years and, from about 825 A.D. onwards, became the capital of an independent principality with Inigo II in close connexion with the powerful Mosá b. Mosá, who was his maternal uncle and at the same time his brother-in-law and father-in-law. In 927/984, ‘Abd al-Rahmán II led the Umayyad forces as far as Pampeluna, which was sacked. In 1343/859, bands of Scandinavian pirates, the Norsemen, penetrated as far as Pampeluna and took prisoner the king Garcia Iliguez. ‘Abd al-Rahmán III succeeded in taking possession of the town for a time in 1329/924, in the course of his campaign against Navarre, and demolished it. Other attempts by Muslim armies against Pampeluna were made in 1322/924 and during the dictatorship of the two ‘Amírídádárás al-Mansúr [q.v.] and al-Mu’azzafar [q.v.].


(E. Lévi-Provençal-[A. Huici Miranda])

BAND ("bend"), a Persian word denoting an area which is used to bind, attach, close or limit, both literally and figuratively (e.g. sadness, preoccupation); it has also passed into Arabic and Turkish. In Persian, it has various meanings when used in compounds (e.g., band-i anqútí, the phalanx; band-i pd, ankle-bone; dar-band, defile, inlet; dast-band, bracelet; ru-band, head-veil; band-i shahryárd, the name of a musical air). It denotes in particular dams (e.g., band-i dáb) built for irrigation purposes: for instance, the Band-i Kayásr, built across the river Kárn at Shustár by order of the Sásáníd king Sháhárd I (3rd century A.D.), several arches of which were carried away by floods about 1880; on the other side of Shustár, on the way from Ahváz, the Band-i Gárgar (the Masjurán of the Arab geographers), on a lateral drain of the Kárn, which was excavated during the Sásáníd period (Band-i Míyán ["middle dam"], constructed during the same period and several times restored, notably at the beginning of the 10th century by a son of Fath ‘All Shá’íhd [hence its other name: Band-i Múhammad ‘All Mirzá]; some 40 kms. downstream from Shustár, near Band-i Kír ["bitumen dam"], are the ruins of a great dam of the same period (on these dams, see EI, s.v. Káryn, 825-826, and Guide Bleu, Moyen-Orient, 1956, 718-721). In addition to these, the Band-i Amlár (or Band-i ‘AdúlI) on the Kurr (formerly the Cyrus; Barbier de Meynard, Dictionnaire de la Perse, 477, n. 2), about 80 km. north of Shíráz, was constructed in the 4th/10th century at the order of the amir ‘Aş lud al-Dawla of the Búyíd dynasty; on the same river were built the Band-i Hámádúr and the Band-i Kásárir ["the fuller’s dam"], which were restored by Fákhár al-Dawla Cawlí, atabak of Fars under the Adud al-Dawla of the Buyid dynasty; on the same river was built the Band-i Kásárir ("the fuller’s dam"), which were restored by Fákhár al-Dawla Cawlí, atabak of Fars under the Saljúqs (on these three dams, cf. the interesting passage in Ibn al-Balbíl, Fárs-níma, Gibb. Mem. Series, 151-152). Near Káshán, in a mountain gorge, is situated the Band-i Kúhrád, built under the Safavids (Band Alláh Mustawfl, Núsha, 721; de Sercey, La Perse en 1839, 230). In Turkey, nine dams contribute to Istanbul’s water supply: on the heights overlooking Búyúkdere (on the European side of the Bosphorus), north of Başheçkёy, the bend of Mámúd (Mahmut bendı), built in 1732, and the bend of the mother of Selim III (Valide bendı), 1796; some five km. further away, in the neighbourhood of the forest of Belgrad, four other bends from which water flows, as required, into the Bâsh Hâvuz (Baş Havus) or cistern of Pyrgos, and thence towards the city via two aqueducts—the most notable being the Búyúk bend ("great dam") built in the 6th/12th century by Andronicus I and restored by several sultans, and the Paşâderesi bendı, the work of the same Byzantine Emperor (details of these dams: Guide bleu: Turquie, 1958, 171-2).

Bibliography: Dieulafoy, L’art antique de la Perse, 105-112, fig. 97 and 98 (Shusha, Dizful); Survey of Persian Art, i, 570 (bridges), and ii, 1226 (id.); Polakan, Persien, i, 161; E. G. Browne, A year among the Persians, 186; Binning, A Journal of ... Travel in Persia, ii, 365-6; R. Walsh, Voyage en Turquie, 16 (map of the reservoirs); Andréossy, Constantinople and the Bosphore de Thrace, 416; P. de Tchikatcheff, Le Bosphore et Constantinople, 49.

(B. Huici Miranda)

BÁNDÁ, town in Uttar Pradesh (India), situated in Lat. 25° 28’ N and Long. 80° 20’ E; headquarters of the district of the same name. Pop. (1951) 30,347. The town, otherwise unimportant, attracted notice during the Sepoy Revolt of 1857 when its last ruler, Nawáb ‘All Bahádúr II, put up a hard fight against the British. The town, however, finally surrendered in April 1858. A mere village till the end of the 18th/19th century, it began rapidly to expand when Shamshír Bahádúr, said to be a natural son of the Péghwá Bádj Ráo I (1130-53/1726-40), by one of his concubines who had adopted Islam, made it the chief town of his estate conferred on him by the Péghwá, Shamshír Bahádúr, who fought on the side of the Marathas in the Third Battle of Panipat (1761), was seriously wounded and subsequently died at Bharatpúr. His son, ‘All Bahádúr I, subjugated many places in Bundhelkhand, with the help of the Sindhí of Gwalior. He was succeeded by his son, Dhu ‘l-Fákhr Bahádúr, who entered into an agreement with the British in 1827/1828 and was awarded the title of Nawáb and confirmed into his dídhr of Bándá. An ill-built town, it has a very large number of places of worship, both Muslim and Hindu. The congregational mosque, the largest in the town, was built by the last Nawáb. ‘All Bahádúr II. A patron of learning, he has been praised by the Indian poet in Urdu and Persian, Mírza Ghalib. The islands, however, played an important part in the history of the struggle between Islam and Christendom, as the nutmeg trees which are grown there attracted the Portuguese. They arrived in 1511 in Malacca whence they sailed to the Banda Islands a year later, thus transplanting the Iberian war, which had ended a few years earlier, to South and South-East Asia. The Dutch appeared on the scene in 1599. From 1619 to 1942 the islands were under Dutch control, from 1942 to 1945 occupied by the Japanese.

(B. C. Berg)

BANDA NAWÁZ, SAYYID MUHAMMAD [see SAYYID MUHAMMAD].
**BANDAR** (Bender), a Persian word which has passed into Turkish, denoting a seaport or port on a large river; it has passed into the Arabic of Syria (Barthélémy) and Egypt in the sense of marketplace, place of commerce, banking exchange (Bochtor, Volters) and even workshop (Cuche). *Şah-bandar*, in Persian, means customs officer, collector of taxes; in Turkish, it means consul and, formerly, a merchants' syndic. In compounds, it occurs in Persian geographical nomenclature: on the Caspian Sea (southern shore), Bandar-Pahlavi (formerly Enzel); Bandar-Gaz, the safest harbour in the region; some 50 kms. to the north, Bandar-Şah, the terminus of the Trans-Iranian railway—the other terminus being Bandar-Şahpur, on the Persian Gulf; other ports on the shores of the Gulf are: Bandar-Daylam, Bandar-Rig, Bandar-Būghir ([see *Būghir*]), Bandar-Majām, Bandar-Linga, Bandar-ʿAbbās (see following article).


**BANDAR ʿABBĀS,** a Persian port situated in the VIIIth, usṭān (which comprises part of Fārs and Khorāsān). The town, which is on the coast of the mainland 16 km. north-west of the island of Hormuz (q.v.), stands on bare, sandy ground rising gradually to the north; it has a frontage of 2 km. along the shore. The position of Bandar ʿAbbās at the entrance to the Persian Gulf and the fact that it is the terminal point of trade-routes from Yazd and Kirmān to the north and Lār, Ṣahrāz and Isfahān to the north west has made it a place of some strategic and commercial importance. Owing to the shallowness of the sea, large vessels cannot berth alongside the quay or jetty and have to anchor some distance offshore and load or discharge their cargo by means of lighters.

There are grounds for believing that the town is situated on or near the site of the small fishing village of Ṣahrāz (see ʿĪṣākhr, 67) or Ṣahrāzvā (see the Hudūd al-ʿĀlam, 124 and 375). When the neighbouring island of Djarūn (or Djarrūn) ceased to be so called and was given instead the name of Hormuz at the beginning of the 8th/14th century, the former name was transferred to Ṣahrāz. When Hormuz developed into a great commercial centre, the importance of Djarūn as the point of transhipment for goods in transit between the island and the mainland gradually increased. Early in the 10th/16th century the Portuguese established themselves on Hormuz and subsequently also on the adjacent stretch of mainland, and Djarūn, or Gamru, as it then came to be called, thus passed into Portuguese hands. In 1615 the Persians recovered Gamru from the Portuguese and seven years later, with the naval aid of the English East India Company, they also drove the Portuguese out of Hormuz. In gratitude for its services, ʿĪṣākhr ʿAbbās I allowed the Company to set up a factory in Gamru (or Gombroon, as the English usually called it) and not only exempted it from customs dues there, but also gave it the right to receive half the customs dues. An additional reason for the granting of these privileges was the ʿĪṣākhr's desire that the town should become the chief port in his realm: it was in token of this desire that he named the port Bandar ʿAbbās after himself. The ʿĪṣākhr's hopes were soon realised; with the advent not only of the English East India Company, but also of the Dutch East India Company and the French, the port became the most important in Persia. When Chardin was there in 1674, he stated that the town contained between 1,400 and 1,500 houses; he also remarked upon the bad climate and its deadly effect upon the European residents (*Voyages*, Paris 1811, viii, 508, 511-512).

The overthrow of the Safavid monarchy by the Ghulāzī Afghāns in 1722, followed by the Russian and Turkish invasions and numerous internal revolts, paralysed the trade of the country and brought stagnation to Bandar ʿAbbās. The expulsion of the Afghāns led to a temporary revival of prosperity, but this was soon nullified by ʿĀdīr's exorbitant tax-collectors. Furthermore, his creation of a naval base at Būghir ʿAbbās (q.v.) dealt another blow at the supremacy of Bandar ʿAbbās, and it was not long before the former port became the leading one of the country. When Plaisted was at Bandar ʿAbbās in 1750, he found that nine out of every ten houses were deserted (*Journal from Calcutta . . . to Aleppo in the Year MDCCCL*, London 1758, ii, 11). A few years later the Dutch and English East India Companies abandoned Bandar ʿAbbās, thus causing it to decline still further. In 1793 the town, together with a coastal strip 150 km. in length, was leased to the Sultan of ʿUmān, in whose hands and those of his descendants it remained until its reversion to Persian control in 1868.

In recent times Bandar ʿAbbās has recovered something of its former prosperity, thanks to the construction of motor roads from Kirmān and Yazd and also from Ṣahrāz. The modern town has a population of some 11,500 (this total undergoes quite considerable seasonal fluctuations). Living conditions have improved with the provision of a piped water supply from ʿĪṣān, 16 km. to the north-west. The main thoroughfare, the Khīyābān Ṣaḥīḥ ʿAbbās-ī Kabīr, runs through the town approximately parallel with the shore, at a distance of some 200 m.; the governmental and most of the municipal buildings are in the central part of this avenue. The chief mosques are the Masjīd-i Djami ([for the Shiʿa]) and the Masjīd-i Galla-Dān (for the Sunnis). Modern industry is represented by a fish-canning plant.


**BANDAR PAHLAWI,** principal port (bandar) of Iran on the Caspian Sea, situated at 37° 28' N and 49° 27' E. Formerly called Enzel, the town was
renamed in honour of the Pahlawi dynasty by its founder Riāa Shah who came to the throne in 1926. Bandar Pahlawi itself lies on a tongue of land to the west of an inlet between the Caspian Sea and a freshwater lake called Murdab. To the east of the west of an inlet between the Caspian Sea and Bandar Pahlawi itself lies on a tongue of land to the west of an inlet between the Caspian Sea and a freshwater lake called Murdab. To the east of the

In the early 19th century there were only a few hundred houses at the site, in the first decade of this century about 9,000 people, and the present population is given at 48,500. Persian, Gilaki (a local dialect) and some Turkish are spoken. The inhabitants are Shi'a. There are no monuments of any interest or real antiquity in either Bandar Pahlawi or neighbouring Ghāziyān.

During the second quarter of this century the inlet mentioned above has been developed into a shallow, but sheltered, harbour. In the period March 1951-March 1952 some 298 ships entered or left the port. Between 1930 and 1940 there was considerable transit traffic of goods and passengers from Bandar Pahlawi through the USSR and to Europe, but in recent years nearly all the trade has been directly with Russia.

Owing to its proximity to Russia the port town has been the scene of international incidents. In 1722 Russian troops landed on the south side of the Murdab and again in 1804 another force landed at Enzeli. In March 1920 Soviet troops, following a British force retreating from Baku, landed at Enzeli and later gave support to the establishment of a short lived Soviet Republic of Gilān. During the Anglo-Soviet occupation of Iran Bandar Pahlavi sheltered a Soviet garrison from 1941 until May 1946.

**Bibliography:** Ritter, Erdkunde, viii, 652 ff.; Mas'ūd Khayān, Diogrāfiyā-i Muwāṣṣal-i Iran, Tehran 1932, ii, 276-7; Rāhanāmā-i Iran, Dā'ira-i Diogrāfiyā-i Sulād-i Arāsh, Tehran 1951, part 3, 50; Annual Account of Trade between Iran and Foreign Countries. Year 1330/1951 (in Persian), Tehran 1952. (D. N. Wilber)

**Bandirma,** a port on the Sea of Marmara, near the site of the ancient city of Paphrad. The mediaeval Greek name for the town was Panormos. Villehardouin mentions a castle called “Palermo”, which the Latin Crusaders fortified in 1204. It was used thereafter as a base for their operations against the Greeks in north-west Asia Minor. Under Ottoman rule Bandirma was included in the sandjak of Karass. According to the evidence of travellers who visited the town in the 16th-17th centuries, most of its inhabitants seem to have been not of Turkish, but of Greek or Armenian descent. Much of Bandirma was burnt down in 1874. It now forms part of the province of Bursa and is an active commercial centre, exporting the varied products of the hinterland—cereals, sheep and cattle, boracite, sesame, etc. The population of Bandirma in 1950 stood at a little less than 19,000.


**Bandjamasin,** town on the southern coast of Kalimantan (Borneo, Indonesia), at Lat. 3° 18' S. and Long. 114° 35' E. It has been known from the 14th century onwards as a centre of inter-island trade and capital of a small principality. It was the capital of a residency in the Dutch period (1859-1942) and the centre of the Japanese occupation. The population of approximately 300,000 is Muslim, though the influence of the Javanese civilisation is considerable, especially among the members of the nobility.

(C. C. Berg)
BANGALA, a geographical term, derived from the word Bang, originally denoting a non-Aryan people of this name and later applied to their homeland in the southern and eastern parts of Bengal, now in East Pakistan. Abu 'l-Fadl, in his Ḩāfiʿī al-Ahsāʾī, remarks "The original name of Bengal was Bang. Its former rulers raised mounds measuring ten yards in height and twenty in breadth throughout the province called Al (Sanskrit—Āḷ). From this suffix the name Bengal took its rise and currency". But both the words, Bang and Bangāla (or sometimes Dhahgalā) were used in Sanskrit records. It is generally supposed that Bangāla was a smaller division, limited to the southern districts of East Bengal, while Bang was a wider unit. This distinction is purely hypothetical. Among the early Muslim historians, Minhādī al-Sirājī, in his Taḥdīḥ-i Naṣīrī, uses Bang, and Diya al-Dīn Barānī, in his Taʿrīkh-i Firuzshāhī, employs Diyār-i Bangāla, or ʿArāṣa-i Bangāla, for the same region of East Bengal—a geographical division which maintained its integrity till about the middle of 14th century A.D.

Shamsī Sirājī ʿAbī, in his Taʿrīkh-i Firuzshāhī, gives to Shams al-Dīn Ilyās the title of Shāh-i Bangāla (the king of Bangāla), and Shāh-i Bangāliyān (plural of Bangāli) meaning the king over the whole group of people of Bengal. As Ilyās Shāh united for the first time both the kingdoms of eastern and western Bengal under him, he well deserved the titles, given by ʿAbī, and it is after him that Bangāla came to denote a wider geographical region, comprising the whole Gangetic Delta; and this is the sense in all subsequent writings, Persian chronicles, Chinese travel accounts, and European works. But the Hindus began to use the older term Gawḍā for this whole region.

From the middle of 16th century A.D., the city of Bangāla is mentioned in some of the European accounts, and also marked in their maps. But no local tradition or record speaks of such a city. Its position in the old maps is never identical, nor do the descriptions of different authorities tally with one another. Probably the important ports, or the country, visited by the Europeans, were variously called the city of Bangāla by different authorities. The mint "Gawr-Bangāla", occurring in the coins of the Mughal emperor Akbar, may refer to the city, or the country of Gawḍā in Bangāla (or ʿArāṣ Bangāla), more probably the latter.

The kingdom of Bangāla grew out of the original Muslim conquest of Lakhnawtī (north-west Bengal) to which were added Satgāon (part of south-west Bengal) and Sonārāgon (east Bengal). Ilyās Shāh integrated these three regions into an independent Muslim Sultanate in A.D. 1352. His descendents ruled, with occasional revolutions, till A.D. 1484, when they were supplanted by their Abyssinian rulers. The city of Bangāla by different authorities. It has the distinction of being the solitary State south of the Tungabhādra ruled by a Muslim chief in this case belonging to the Shīʿī persuasion. In 1352 it had an area of 275 sq. m. and a population of 44,631. The State lay between latitudes 15° 3' and 15° 29' N. and longitudes 77° 59' E. and 78° 22' E.

Banganaṇpaḷḷi has had a chequered history. The ruling family claims descent from a minister of Shāh 'Abbās II of Persia on the paternal, and from a minister of the Emperor ʿAlāʾīdīr on the maternal, side. The ancestor of the family, Mīr Ṭahir ʿAll, migrated from Persia to Bīḍājpūr. A number of family quarrels arose there resulting in his murder. His widow and four sons sought refuge with the Mughal āʿlāʾīdīr of Aroct. One of these sons married the grand-daughter of the āʿlāʾīdīr of Banganaṇpaḷḷi, and thus came in contact with what was to be the home of the family.

Banganaṇpaḷḷi itself changed hands a number of times. In 1643 it became subject to Bīḍājpūr along with a large part of the Vijayanagar territory; but soon the Bīḍājpūr hegemony gave place to Mughal rule and the rule of the Aṣaf Dīāhs. The āʿlāʾīdīr of Aroct, Husayn ʿAll, paid allegiance to Ḥaydar ʿAll of Mysore and fought many a battle under his banner. But when Tipū Sulṭān succeeded his father he resumed the āʿlāʾīdīr on a mere pretext. On Husayn's death his widow took refuge with the Nīẓām of Ḥaydarābād, and one of the representatives of the family is said to have defeated Tipū's āʿlāʾīdīr in 1790 and taken possession of the town. The āʿlāʾīdīr came under British supremacy by the Treaty of Seringapatam in 1800. It remained under the Madras Presidency till 1839 when it was taken over directly by the Government of India.

By the sanad of 1862 the British Government guaranteed succession according to Muslim Law in case a ruler died childless. In 1867 the hereditary title of Nawāb was conferred on the āʿlāʾīdīr. In 1897, on the occasion of the Silver Jubilee of Queen Victoria's reign, the Nawāb was addressed as 'Your Highness'. The last ruling Nawāb, Mīr ʿAffīdī ʿAll Khān, died soon after the merger, and the title now devolves on his eldest son Mīr Ghulām ʿAll Khān.

Bibliography: A. Vadiivelu, The Aristocracy of Southern India, Madras 1903; Imperial Gazetteer of India; The Indian Year Book and Who is Who, 1948; Banganaṇpaḷḷi State, its Ruler and Method of Administration.

BANGIRA, island in Indonesia near the East coast of southern Sumatra, between Lat. 1° 34' S. and at Long. 106° E. It owes its fame to its tin mines and tin trade which attracted foreign merchants from early times. The economically weaker part of the population is Indonesian and Muslim of the normal Indonesian type. The most important part of the population consists of Chinese immigrants.

BANHA, a town in the Nile Delta, situated on the Damietta branch, one of the main stations on the railway between Cairo and Alexandria and
45 kilometres north of Cairo. In mediaeval times, it formed part of al-Sharkiyya province and is today the chief town of al-Kalyubiyya province, with some thirty thousand inhabitants. The Arabic name is a transcription of Coptic Panahê.

The locality occupies a place in the traditional history of the diplomatic relations between the Prophet and the enigmatic Mukawṣîs, the so-called sovereign of Egypt. Among the presents which the latter sent to Muhammad, honey from Banhâ is mentioned, and it is the recollection of just this detail which its nickname Banhâ al-‘asal, "Banhâ of the honey", is supposed to evoke. The story may also well be an embellished explanation of an actual fact, for one of the earliest geographers, al-Ya‘kûbî, states plainly that the village of Banhâ produces famous honey. Yâkût, in turn, extols the quality of this honey, which was one of the glories of Egypt. The description given by al-Idrîsî seems to allow of the following translation: "Banhâ al-‘asal forms an extensive domain, its lands planted with trees and producing much fruit; the cultivated fields succeed one another without a break; opposite, on the Western bank of the Nile, stands the main centre, which has given it its name". Banhâ does not appear to have played a rôle in history. At the end of the last century, "it was exporting considerable quantities of the commodity to which it owed its name, as well as oranges and mandarins, which were highly esteemed".


**BANÎ SUWAYF** (Béni Suf, Beni Sœuf) a town in Egypt, on the west bank of the Nile, 75 m. (120 km.) south of Cairo. According to al-Sâkhûwî (902/1497) the old name of the town was Binum-suwây, from which popular etymology derived the form Banî Suwayf (the مهنسة of Ibn Dîfîân, al-Tuḫûr al-Saniyya, 172, and the منصفة of Ibn Dukmâk, Islîsîr, v, 10, ought probably to be read منصفة). In still more ancient times the capital of this district was Heracleopolis Magna, 10 m. (16 km.) west of Banî Sufî, which only attained importance under Muhammad al-‘Alî.

From the time of the division of Egypt into provinces (mu‘âdîrîyâ), Benî Sufî became the chief town of the second province of Upper Egypt, comprising three districts (markâs), and gave its name to this province. The town, numbering to-day 70,000 inhabitants, is an agricultural centre of considerable importance, with a certain amount of commercial and industrial activity. Situated on the railway and the main road which follow the Nile, it is linked by a track to the Coptic monasteries on the Red Sea. The mašîh of the Shaykha Hûrîyya, situated in the oldest mosque, Dîmâsî al-Bahr, is venerated locally.


**BANKA** (plur. banâ‘îâ), an Arabic word which has been subject to considerable semantic evolution. In early Arabic, its meaning is disputed by the lexicographers (cf. Ibn Sîda, Muḥammad, iv, 84-85; TA, s.v.). The primitive meaning seems to have been "any piece inserted (rušâ) to widen a tunic (hamîs) or a leather bucket (dalî‘ electrical") in the case of the hamîs, according to some authorities, banka were "snippets" of material, in the form of very elongated triangles, inserted vertically below the armholes, along the lateral seams of the garment, to give greater fullness. According to others, they were pieces inserted on both sides of the fore-part of the collar (fawîq) to take the buttons and button-holes. As equivalents, the dictionaries give libâna, dîrîqî and ḏâr-ḥâm; banka (and its variant bounka), like the two latter words, may be of Persian origin.

In the Arab West, banîka is at times employed for a kind of man’s tunic, though more frequently it is applied to an element of women’s hair-covering. Spanish has retained albanega "a hair-net for gathering and covering the hair" and the Arabic of Tetuan still uses the word with a very similar meaning. At Algiers, it is a kind of square head-dress, provided with a back flap, which women use to cover their heads to protect themselves against the cold when leaving the hammâm (= bounka).

In its final development, the word, in the towns of Morocco, has come to mean "a small cell, a closet serving as an office for a ‘minister’, in the old maḥzen [q.v.]; a dark padded cell (in a prison for the insane); a small room or lumen-room (in a flat). According to oral tradition, the bounka was originally a silk scarf in which all ministers coming to the Council carried their documents.

For the semantic evolution, compare with that of the French “poinç” and also (ministerial) portfolio and cabinet.

**Bibliography:** For the Moroccan ministerial bounkas, cf. Aubin, *Le Maroc d’aujourd’hui* (= 1903), chap. XI. (G. S. Colin)

**BÂNIYÂS** (or Bâluniyâs), the ancient Balanea, which also bore the name of Leucas; attempts have several times been made to identify it with an “Apollonia which never existed on this site” (R. Dussaud). It is today a small township on the Syrian coast situated some fifty kms. to the south of Latakia. This ancient Phoenician settlement, which became a Greek city minting its own coinage and, later, the seat of a bishopric, was incorporated in the dioclese of Hims at the time of the Arab conquest. It was, however, especially at the time of the Crusades, that its small harbour, protected by a fortress and dominated by the mighty castle of Markâb [q.v.] on its rocky spur, was for a long period a scene of activity. Occupied by the Franks in 1098, but abandoned after 1109, the position of which was strengthened by the taking of Markâb in 1122, was one of the important fiefs of the principality of Antioch, at the extremity of the county of Tripoli and, after it was entrusted together with Markâb to the Hospitals in 1572, remained one of the last centres of resistance to the Muslim conquest. The attacks to which it was subjected, especially by Śalâh al-Dîn, until its conquest by Kâlû ‘în in 684/1285, so completely ruined it that during the Mamlûk period it entirely lost its administrative role to the advantage of Markâb, and its site and gardens alone retained the attention of the Arab geographers.

The present town does not even possess archaeological remains evocative of its ancient prosperity.

index (see under Banyas); G. Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, London 1890, especially 424 and 504; Baldhór Petri, *Büga*, indices; Ibn al-Aḍīrī, *ṣūra* 334 (which already has Bāniyās); Yaḥyā ibn ʿAbd al-Fadl, *Tabākim*, 255; Dimašqī, em. Mehrn, 209.  

(J. Sourdel-Thomine)

**Bāniyās**, the ancient Paneas, owed its name to the presence in the vicinity of a sanctuary of Pan, established in a grotto and sanctifying one of the main sources of the Jordan. The present place, situated 24 km. north-west of al-ʿAyna, on the road running along the southern frontier of the Syrian Republic, occupies a pleasant site, with plentiful water and rich vegetation, in a smiling valley of Mt. Hermon. Its neighbourhood, moreover, has always been praised by Arab writers for its fertility, and especially for its lemons, cotton and rice cultivation.

The town, though doubtless possessing an older history, is only mentioned since the Hellenistic period. It was established by Herod the Great and especially by his son Philip, who bestowed on it the name of Caesarea in honour of Augustus. It was then called Caesarea Philippi (to distinguish it from Caesarea in Palestine), then Caesarea Paneas. Later on the second part of the name survived alone. In the 4th century A.D. it became the seat of a bishopric, dependent on the province of Phoenicia, and the Arab conquest, when it is known to have served the army of Heraclius as a base before the battle of the Yarmūk, made it the chief town of the district of al-Ḥdawān. Somewhat later al-Muqaddasī emphasized the prosperity of the township and the surrounding villages, into which inhabitants of the Ḥdawān had emigrated. At this period, the Crusades, however, when the position of Bāniyās, lying at no great distance from Byblos, between Damascus and the Kingdom of Jerusalem, acquired strategic importance, its history became more eventful and its successive masters applied themselves to fortifying the castle of al-Ṣubayya, whose ruins still dominate the town today.

Ceded in 520/1126 by Tughtakin, Atabek of Damascus, to Bahrām, sultan of the Iskandils, who were then active in Syria, it was handed over to the Franks in 524/1129, following the death of Bahrām and the violent action undertaken at Damascus against the followers of the sect. Recovered by force of arms by Būrī in 527/1132 and delivered up to Zanjī, it was then besieged by the Franks who, with the help of the Damascenes, reincorporated it in their possessions in 534/1140. Nūr al-Dīn, after being repulsed twice in succession, Baldwin III and his army coming to the assistance of the threatened garrison on each occasion, finally made himself master of Bāniyās and its citadel in 559/1164 and his adversaries, in spite of their efforts, never succeeded in setting foot there again.

Bāniyās then played the role of a frontier stronghold between the countries of Islam and the territory of the Franks who, in Ibn Dhūbiyar’s time (580/1184), peacefully shared the exploitation of the surrounding plain with the Muslims. It was presented by Sālāḥ al-Dīn to his son al-Āḍal and then passed into the hands of various Ayyubid princes, who improved its defences, as is still born out by several extant inscriptions. Baybars, in his turn, was able to carry out the restoration of a fortress, the continued importance of which is emphasized by the Mamlūk authors, who even make it the residence of an amir, independent of the governor of the place.

At this period, Bāniyās was the chief town of a wilāya forming part of the niyya of Aḍājn, in the south of the province of Damascus. It was, however, soon to decline to its present state of a small town.
After the fall of the kingdom of Bosnia (in 1463) the Hungarians acquired the area of Jajce. It is probable that Banjaluka was built at that time (it is mentioned for the first time in 1494) to serve as a fortress for the newly built Jajce-Banates. Immediately after the fall of Jajce, Banjaluka was conquered by the Turks (in 1527 or 1528). Under Turkish rule Banjaluka gained in importance, especially after the residence of the governor of the sanjak of Bosnia was moved from Sarajevo to Banjaluka in the middle of the 16th century. The quick rise of the town was largely due to the merits of the first governors who resided in Banjaluka, in particular Ferhād Sokolović, a cousin of the Grand Vizier Mehmed Paša Sokolović (Sokollu). Ferhād Sokolović was governor of Bosnia from 1574, and became Beglerbeg of the newly formed Pashalik of Bosnia in 1580. Banjaluka remained the seat of the Beglerbeg of Bosnia until it was moved to Sarajevo in 1638.

In 1661, when Ewliya Celebi visited Banjaluka, it was a flourishing town with two fortresses, 45 mahallas, 45 mosques, and several madrasas and baths, with 300 shops and a Bezistan. The town itself (which numbered 3,700 houses) was then the seat of the representative (kā'īm-mahām) of the Vizier of Bosnia.

Banjaluka was conquered for a short time in 1688 by the Austrians under the Margrave of Baden, and they burnt down some parts of the town in their retreat. During the 17th-18th century, Banjaluka was besieged by the Prince of Hildburghausen, but was relieved by the Bosnian Vizier ʿAli Paša Hekimoğlu as the result of the victory of August 4th. This war was described by ʿOmar Efendi of Novi (Babinger, 276-277). Since then, Banjaluka has developed more or less unhindered, although it could not regain its former greatness until the end of Turkish rule. There were 32 mahallas and 1,126 houses liable to taxes in Banjaluka in 1851. From then on it was the capital of one of the six Bosnian sandjak (districts).

At the time of the Austrian occupation of Bosnia (1878), Banjaluka capitulated (without offering resistance) as early as 31st July. Nevertheless, there was a battle with the Bosnian Muslims on 14th August. The town remained under Austrian rule until 1918, when it became part of Yugoslavia.
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(B. Djurđević)

**BANKING [see DIJAMBEH and SAVRAFI]**

**BANKJUR,** the Western suburb of the city of Patna, the ‘Azimabād of the Muslim historians, situated in 25°37' N. and 85°8' E. on the right bank of the Ganges. The great landmark of Bankur is the brick-built beehive-shaped silo or grain storehouse constructed by Warren Hastings after a terrible famine of 1769-70. In Oriental circles the town is famous for its fine collection of Arabic and Persian manuscripts, some of which are extremely rare. The Bankjur library, called in the Trust Deeds “The Patna Oriental Public Library”, and also known as the “Khudā Bahksh Library”, contains many valuable books on Islamic literature. The founder, Mawlānā Khudā Bahksh, (d. 1908) an advocate by profession, was a native of Chaprā (Bihar) who dedicated his entire life to the collection of rare manuscripts from such ancient centres of culture as Cairo, Damascus, Beirut and places in Arabia, Egypt and Persia. It was Lord Curzon, Governor-General of India (1899-1905) who commissioned Sir Edward Denison Ross to reorganise the Library and to prepare a systematic catalogue. So far 31 volumes, describing some 4,000 MSS. out of a total number of over 6,000, have been published, as a result of sustained and patient collaboration between Sir Edward Denison Ross, ʿAbd al-Muḥtadī, ʿAṣīm al-Dīn Ahmad, ʿAbd al-Ḥāmid and Masʿūd ʿAlām Nadwi.

**Bibliography:**
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**BANNA’ [see BINA’], AHMAD B. MUHAMMAD [see AL-DININ ĪRĀF]**

**BANNA’; Ėsān, founder and Director-General of al-Ikhwān al-Muslimūn, was born in the year 1906, the son of Ahmad b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad al-Banānā’ al-Sāʿīṭī. In addition to carrying on his trade of watch-maker, his father was a keen student of the traditional Islamic sciences and the editor of the Masāʾid of Ibn Ḥanbal.**

Paternal influence was of the greatest significance in shaping the formative years of Ėsān al-Banānā’ and his early education followed the ancient pattern of that of the sons of the ‘ulāmā’—the memorising of the Qurʾān and the study of ḥadīth, fiqh and lugha. In addition to his conservative religious upbringing he appears to have possessed an innate spiritual bent, for at an early age he became drawn towards Śūfism and was initiated into the Ḥaṣāfiyya order when he was fourteen years of age.

After a period at the Junior Teachers’ School at Damanhūr he entered the Dār al-ʿUlumm in Cairo, at that time an independent teachers’ training College. Even at Damanhūr his precocious capacity for organisation and impulse towards active proselytising had shown themselves in his founding of al-Djam’īyya al-Ḥaṣāfiyya al-Ḵhāṭīrīyya. At the Dār al-ʿUlumm he developed further his thesis that the sicknesses of Islamic society could only be cured by a return to the regenerative springs of the Qurʾān, ḥadīth and sira. Together with a group of fellow-students he began to spread the Islamic mission by preaching in the mosques and meeting-places of Cairo.

On completing his course of training in 1927 he was posted to Ismāʾīliyya as a government schoolteacher and in the following year founded the Muslim Brotherhood. He remained at Ismāʾīliyya until 1933, preaching, lecturing, pamphleteering and perfecting the organisational structure of his movement on the cell principle. During this period he travelled indefatigably up and down the Canal Zone and offshore of the Ismāʾīliyya headquarters sprang up between Port Saʿīd and Suez.

Following upon his transfer to a teaching post in Cairo, Ėsān al-Banānā’ entered upon a period of intense activity and the movement rapidly gained ground throughout Egypt. Subsequent to 1936, when he espoused the cause of the Palestine Arabs, he became increasingly involved in the political arena, lobbying successive prime ministers with pleas for action and reform. The years of the Second World War saw a hardening of the attitude of the government towards Hasan al-Banānā’. Under both Sirrī Pāsha and al-Nukrāshī he was arrested for
brief periods and the activities of the Brotherhood severely curtailed. In the immediately post-war period tension between them and the government increased, culminating in their suppression following the murder of al-Nufum in December 1948. A few months later, in February 1949, Hasan al-Banna was himself assassinated.


(J. M. B. Jones)

Banna, Kamâl el-Dîn Shîr 'Ali Banna!, Harawi, Persian poet, the son of a mason (banna?) of Harât, hence his choice of the pseudonym "Banna!". He spent his youth in the entourage of the famous poet and Maecenas of the period 'All-Shîr Nawâyi (q.v.), but fell into disgrace on account of his bitter jests, and had to take refuge at the court of the Aq Koyunlu (q.v.) prince Sultan Ya'qub (884-916/1479-1500), at Tabriz. After a reconciliation with 'All-Shîr, he returned to Harât, but he had to leave his company once more in order to go to Samarkand, to the court of the Timurid prince Sultan ‘All (902-952/1497-1546), son of Sultan Ahmad (823-896/1418-1491), son of Sultan Abû Sa’îd (855-873/1451-1468), who ruled over Transoxiana. He composed in his favour a hasida in the dialect of Marw, with the title of Majdîm al-Kâryâb. He was also the court poet of Sultan Muhammed, who ruled over this region between 899 and 900 (1494-5). In 906/1500-1, when Abu l-Fath Muhammad Shaybânî Khân (q.v.) (Shaybak Khân: Shâhî Deg Özbek) occupied Samarkand, he remained for a time in prison and later became the official poet of his court and chief military judge (kâfi ‘askar), and at the same time one of the favourites of his son Muhammed Timûr. After the death of Shaybânî Khân on 30 Shabân 916/2 December 1510, he returned to Harât, his native town, but he was slain during the massacre at Kârâbi, perpetrated in 918/1513 by Nadîm el-Dîn Yâr Ahmad Isfahânî, known as Nadîm-i Timûrûn, on the orders of Shâh Ismâ’îl the Safawî. Bannâ!’ tried his hand at all types of poetry. He wrote at first under the pseudonym Hâfîz, and in addition to his divan, still unpublished (in which he constantly tried to imitate Hâfîz), he has left two epics: 1) Shâbânî-nâma, on his patron’s campaigns; 2) Bûgî-i Iram or Bahram-û Bihrid, a poem several times incorrectly attributed to the great Sôr poet Sanâ?” (as a result of the word Bannâ!’ being corrupted to Sanâ”) and published in a collection with the works Afzal al-Tîghâr Dâhir al-Shurûr wa l-‘A‘ûrîh and the Taftizm of Nawâ!, at Taqhtak in 1336/1918. He was also a musician, a composer, the author of two small works on music and a fine calligraphist.


Banna, also al-Banna!, name of a family of Jewish converts to Islam of Fês (Fas), which from the 12th/13th century has produced a number of eminent religious scholars and still belongs, together with a few other families of Jewish extraction, to the aristocracy of Islamic learning in Fês. Its most important members are:

(1) Abû ‘Abd Allâh Muhammîd b. ‘Abd al-Salâm b. Hâmîdîn (d. 1166/1750). He is considered the last great representative of the older school of Fês in which he occupies a key position, uniting in his person the main traditions of Mâlikî scholarship in the Maghrib (cf. J. Berque, in Revue historique de droit français et étranger, 1949, 88), combining with them the Mâlikî traditions of the East where he also studied, and forming a great number of disciples. His Fakhras (q.v.) is an important source on the legal studies in Fês in his time. His commentary on the al-hizb al-kabîr of al-Shâhîlî (q.v.) testifies to the lasting connection of his family with the Shâhîlî tarika. His main work is a commentary on the K. al-Ikhwan (q.v.) of al-Kalâf, on the military expeditions of the Prophet and of the first three Caliphs. His son Abû al-Karîm composed a biography of him.


(2) Abû ‘Abd Allâh Muhammîd b. Hasân b. Mas’ûd (d. 1194/1780). He wrote a gloss (completed in 1175/1759-60) on al-Zurîkî’s (q.v.) work on the Muhkassar of Khâlîl b. Isbâhî, a commentary on the Muhkassar al-Manîfî of al-Sanûsî (q.v.), a commentary on the Sullam of al-Âthîrî (q.v.), often printed, and a reputed Fakhras.


Bibliography: Sarkîs, i, 590; Catalogue Cairo*, ii, 181; Brockelmann, i, 355, S 1, 518.
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(5) Muhammîd, called Fir’awûn (d. 1261-2/1845-6), author of a K. al-Wâhîbî which was printed several times, also with the commentary of Abû al-Salâm b. Muhammîd al-Hawârî (d. 1328/1910).

Bibliography: Berque, in Revue historique de droit français et étranger, 1949, 102; Sarkîs, i, 590.

(6) For other members of the family Bannânî, see Ben Cheneb and Lévi-Provençal, Essais de répertoire chronologique des éditions de Fês, in R. Afr., 1921 and 1922 (index by H. Pérès and A Semperé, in Bull. Études Arabes, no. 32, 1947, s.v. Bannânî); Sarkîs, Mu‘âlam al-Ma‘âbîdî, i, 589-597; Muhammîd b.
Muhammad Makhlûf, Shadjarat al-Nûr, i, 431; ʿAbd al-Ḥâfs al-Fâṣ, Riyâḍ al-Djanna, ii, 20 ff., 100 f.

(7) Not to the family Bannâni belong ʿAbd al-Rahmân b. ʿAbd Allâh al-Bannânî (d. 1198/1784), who derives his niche from a village in the neighbourhood of Monastir (Muhammad b. Muhammad Makhlûf, Shadjarat al-Nûr, i, 342; Sarkis, i, 591; Brockelmann, II, liv, 109, S II, 105), and Abu ʿl-Kâsim ʿIrâshâm al-Warrâk (earlier than 900/1495), whose niche is uncertain (Brockelmann, S I, 585).

**BANû, town and headquarters of the district** of the same name in West Pakistan, situated in 33° 0′ N. and 70° 36′ E. Population in 1951 was 27,516 for the town and 307,393 (district).

The present town was founded by Lt. Edwards Herberts in 1848 on a strategic site and named Edwardesâbâd. The name, however, did not become popular and soon fell into disuse, giving place to Bannû, the old name of the valley derived from the Banûwâds, an Afghan tribe of mixed descent. The valley, strewn with ruins of great antiquity, was, according to local tradition, overrun by the armies of Mâhmûd of Ghâzna, who razed all Hindu strongholds to the ground. A century later the valley was peopled by the surrounding hill-tribes, the Banûuds, the Marwats and the Nîzâs. For two centuries thereafter it remained under the loose sway of the Mughals. It was conquered in 1738 by Nâdir Shâh Afsâr and subsequently over-run by Abîmâd Shâh Durrâk. In 1823, the Sikh ruler of Lahore, Randjît Singh, occupied the valley to be constantly harried by the Afghans. It was, however, formally ceded to the Sikhs in 1838. After the first Sikh War (1845-49), the valley came under the British influence. In 1847-48, Lieut. Edwards, as a representative of the Sikh Durbar of Lahore, marched on the valley along with a large army under Gen. van Cortlandt. In 1849 with the annexation of the Panjâb, Bannû passed on to the British. Contrary to expectations, it remained absolutely peaceful during the military uprising of 1857.

The valley has yielded finds of great archaeological value, among them being coins with Greek or pseudo-Greek legends. The Akra mound near the town is reputed to be of great antiquity.

After its construction in 1848 the Bannû fort was named Dallîgâh, after Maharadja Dalîpsingh, a grandson of Randjît Singh. As usual a town soon grew up around the fort. It is now the centre of considerable trade. The town is expanding fast and large sums have been recently sanctioned by the Government for the economic development of the area.

**Bibliography:** S. S. Thorburn, Bannû or Our Afghan Frontier, London 1876; Imperial Gazetteer of India, Oxford 1908, vi, 392-402; Bannû Gazetteer, Peshawar 1907; T. L. Pennell, Among the Wild Tribes of the Afghan Frontier; E. Herberts, Punjab and the Frontier, 2 vols., London 1852; H. L. Nevill; Campaigns on the North-West Frontier, London 1912, index; George Dunbar, Frontier, London 1912, 49-69; Biibar-nâmâ (transl. A. S. Beveridge), index. (A. S. Babeme Ansari)

**BANMÔ or BANTEN [see DJAWA].**

**BANû ŸISRAEL, “the Children of Israel”.**

1. This designation of the Jewish people occurs in the Kurân about forty times. The terms Yâhâd, Jews, and its derivatives as well as Nasâra, Christians, appear only in the Medinese period, although they had been widely used in pre-Islamic poetry and certainly were familiar to every Arab townsman (Joseph Horovitz, Kanzlische Untersuchungen, 144 ff. and 153 ff.). On the other hand, Banû Isrâîl never occurs in authentic pre-Islamic poetry (ibid., 91). It would therefore seem to follow that the exclusive use of this term during the Meccan period has something to do with the Prophet’s original knowledge of, and attitude towards, the monotheistic religions preceding him.

In most of the Meccan verses, the Banû Isrâîl appear in connexion with Moses and the stories which are paralleled in the Biblical book of Exodus or its aggrandic amplifications; they are, in chronological order according to Noeldeke-Schwally: xx, 47, 80, 94 (dissensions among the Banû Isrâîl, see below); xlv, 30; xxvi, 17, 22, 59; xvii, 2, 103; x, 53; xxxii, 23-24; x, 90; vii, 105, 134, 137, 138. This explains also the form of the name: “the Children of Israel”, as in the book of Exodus, and not “Israel”, as was common usage in Jewish literature in the period preceding Muhammad (with few exceptions; see Tarîb 3(1932), 413, n. 15a).

However the Banû Isrâîl were more than the “people of Moses” (vii, 147, 158; xxxviii, 76). In Sura xvii, which bears the name of Banû Isrâîl (but also al-Isrâ’il), 4-5, the First and the Second Temple is described as the fulfilment of a heavenly decree included in the “Book” (perhaps an allusion to Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28), while lii, 59 makes Jesus appear among the Banû Isrâîl.

Finally, there are a number of Meccan passages which clearly indicate that the Banû Isrâîl were also understood to denote persons living in Muhammad’s own time. Doubtful is xlv, 10: “If a witness from the Banû Isrâîl testified about (a message) similar to this [Revelation (Muhammad’s or another part of the Book) and believed]—a verse generally regarded by Muslim tradition as alluding to the Jewish convert ʿAbd Allâh b. Salâm (see the sources collected in Tabari’s commentary, vol. 26, 6-9). For as the word “(a message) similar shows, the reference is probably to “the book of Moses” (xlv, 12), as indeed Tabari himself thought possible, although he rejected that interpretation.

However xxvi, 197 “Is it not a proof for them (the Meccans) that the scholars (or: knowledgeable men) of the Banû Isrâîl know it (the content of Muhammad’s message)?” hardly makes sense without the assumption that the persons referred to were known to his hearers; the more so as the following verses, xxvi, 198-9, allude to missionary activities of non-Arabs. Likewise xvii, 101 “Ask the Banû Isrâîl” is to be compared with such passages as x, 94 “If you (M.) are in doubt concerning what We sent down to you, ask those who read the Book before you,” cf. xxi, 7; xvi, 43; xxv, 59; ii, 211 (xlviii, 45 is no proof to the contrary, as in xxi, 7 and xvi, 34 the Meccans are addressed).

In any case, the Banû Isrâîl must be regarded as contemporary with Muhammad in those Meccan verses in which reference is made to their dissensions, which will be settled either by the Kurân xlvii, 76, or on the day of resurrection, xxxii, 23-5; xlv, 16-17; x, 93. This use of the term is even more evident in al-Madîna, where the Banû Isrâîl are admonished to believe in Muhammad’s message and warned of the consequences of their disbelief (ii, 49 f.), or where they are censured for their behaviour, obviously actually observed (ii, 83-85: they fight one another, but ransom those that were taken captives).
In order to establish which group of contemporary monotheists were meant by Banū Isrā'īl, one has to bear in mind that already in the Meccan Sura xlix, 59 (seebelow) Jews appear among the Banū Isrā'īl, and this does so rather frequently in Medinese passages 3, 49; 5, 72-74, 78; 11x, 6. In 11x, 14 it is said explicitly that one group of the Banū Isrā'īl believed in him and another did not. Cf. also 110, where God protects him against the Banū Isrā'īl.

However, when in v, 12-13 the Banū Isrā'īl are opposed to “those that say we are Christians”, v, 14; or are censured in v, 70 that say with “Those that say the Messiah, son of Maryam, is God”, v, 72, it seems indeed that the Kur'ān, where addressing Muham-mad’s contemporaries as Banū Isrā'īl, meant Jews. To this interpretation point also the references to the dietary laws in iii, 93 and the quotation from the Mishna (Sanhedrin 4, 3), which is introduced as an injunction imposed by God on the Banū Isrā'īl. The Muslim commentators indeed explained the Kur’ānic diatribes against the Banū Isrā'īl as directed against the Jews of al-Madīna, with whom Muhammad had so many dealings.

From this use of the name Banū Isrā'īl it does not follow that the word or the ideas connected with it had come to Muhammad from Jews. On the other hand, the form of the word (‘Isrā’īl, not ‘Yisrā’îli) does not prove that it is derived from Syriac, for the Hebrew spelling with Y and S was merely traditional, while the pronunciation of initial Y as s was as common among Jews as among some other Aramaic-speaking peoples.

In any case, it is most likely that the term Banū Isrā'īl became known to Muhammad together with the general ideas on revelation and prophecy centering around it: there was only one true religion and the idea that these two had their common origin in the religious teachings of the ancient Banū Isrā'īl, the numerous stories about them and the belief that the various religions should rightly be one, are too specific to have come from this source. As only the term Banū Isrā'īl or other general designations for the earlier book religions occur during the whole of his Meccan period, it seems most probable that this use of the term is to be traced to a monotheistic tradition which emphasised the common rather than the dividing aspects of the monotheistic religions.

2. In the hadith, Banū Isrā'īl denotes both the old Israelites, e.g., when ‘Umar is compared to a king of the Banū Isrā'īl (Hezekiah), Ibn Sa’d iii, 1, 257, l. 2 ff., or when David’s Araonah (Samuel ii, 24, 21) is referred to, Ibn Sa’d iv, 1, 13, l. 23, and also the Jews and Christians in general, e.g., in the chapter “What was said about the Banū Isrā'īl” in Bukhārī (60) Anbiyā’, 50. Although, by chance, only Jews are mentioned there separately, Christians are referred to in connection to a story about a rāḥū, which normally denotes a monk. A story about Dhūrayd, “who was a monk among the Banū Isrā'īl” is reported by Abu’l-Layth al-Samarqandî in his Tânhîh al-ghâafilîn 260.

The question why the ancient Banū Isrā'īl, the chosen people, Sūra ii, 2, 47, 122; xlv, 32; xlv, 16, should have disappeared, considerably occupied the mind of the Muslims. Their answers to this question echoed of course their own tribulations, such as deviations in the fields of theology and religious law (“the Banū Isrā'īl” perished, because they practised dā‘y [see Åqāh al-Râ‘y], or public morals “because their women indulged in wigs” (Bukhārī 50) Anbiyā’, 54) or “in high heels” (Fâ’ilî, ii, 366, quoted by Doyx, Suppl. ii, 391 a).

For the Muslims regarded those Banū Isrā'īl as their brothers, as in the famous hadith Farkhād-Hudhayfa: “What excellent brothers are the Banū Isrā'īl to you: They (experienced) the bitterness and you the sweetness,” quoted e.g., by Abû Nu‘aym, ibn Hâlij Lāsilîysâ’î, 50, l. 5. The saying obviously refers to “the burden and the chains”, i.e., the many religious obligations which were incumbent on the Banū Isrā’īl (both Jews and Christians according to Sûra vii, 157), cf. Ibn Kuttayba, Mukhtalaf al-Hadîth 142, ult.

In a hadith quoted by Sahil al-Tustari in his Ta’ṣīr al-Kur’ān, 57, the Muslims even identify themselves with the Banū Isrā’īl: “We are the Banū Isrā’īl, we, the sons of Nadr b. Khânâ. We do not follow our mother (who was the wife of both Khânâ and his father Khûrayma, see Ibn Hishâm 1-2) nor our fathers (i.e., Nadr, Khânâ, Khûrayma); with ‘we’ the Arabs are meant.”

However, as in the Kur’ān, Banū Isrā’īl denotes in the hadith also contemporary Jews and Christians and is thus synonymous with An- al-Kûdâb and similar expressions. Cf. the very often quoted saying of Muhammad: “hadithhū ‘an Banî Isrâ’îl wâlî hara’dî “‘Relate traditions which come from the Banû Isrā’îl without scruples”, cf. Concordance et Indices de la Tradition Musulmane, i, 445 b, s.v. íyâ‘, and Wensinck, Handbuch, 231a; al-Shâfi‘î, Risâla, Cairo 1310, 101 (1312, 105).

Again, as in the Kur’ān, when used of contemporaries, Banû Isrâ’īl mostly means Jews. Cf. the characteristic story about the wigs of the women of the Banû Isrâ’îl which is given in Bukhārī (50) Anbiyā’, 54, the first time (ed. Krehl ii 376) with a general reference to the Banû Isrâ’îl but a second time (Krehl ii 380, l. 10) in a detailed story about the Caliph Mu’âwîya, who, while visiting al-Madīna, was disgusted to find the women there wearing wigs (a habit which they might have adopted from their Jewish neighbours). “I have nobody seen doing this”, the old Caliph said, “except the Jews”. Thus the familiar picture of the Habr min abhâr Banî Isrâ’îl (e.g., Abû Nu‘aym, ibn Hâlij ii, 372, l. 22 = Ibn Kuttayba, ‘Uyân i-1-Abbâr ii, 359, l. 13) is to be understood as describing a rabbi; and when Magîd al-Dîn Ibîr al-Anûsî, Nihâyû, s.v. íyâ‘ i 136 refers to “the rabbis, abhâr, of the Banû Isrâ’îl, after Moses “who compiled the Mishnâ (al-mathnâ)” he means of course Jews.
It is from this usage of Бану Israeli that the word Israeli, Israelite, was derived as a more polite designation for a Jew than Yahudi. We find this term already in full use in the third/ninth century, e.g. Mas'^udl. Tanbih 79, 7 (the Israelites in 'Irak); 113, 3 (Israelite translators of the Bible); 219, 9 (Israelites divided into three sects), cf. also ibid., 105, 7; 112, 18; alongside with Yahud 113, 9; 184, 14. Similarly, Muslim scholars and men of letters refer in this way to their Jewish colleagues, e.g., Ishâkh al-Isra'ili, the famous doctor and author (M. Steinschneider, Arab. Lit. d. Juden, Frankfurt 1908, 38-45); Jewish converts to Islam also, such as the poet Ibn Sahl al-Isra'ili of Seville (Brockelmann S. I, 483) were styled thus.

A later, scientifically minded, age tried to distinguish with more precision between Banu Israeli and Yahad. Al-Kâkshândi xviii, 253, quoting 'Imâd al-Din (i.e. Abu'l-Fidâ'), states that Banu Israeli are the ancient Jews by race, while the term Yahad includes also the many converts to Judaism from Arab, Rûm and other stocks. This statement is not without foundation in the usage of ancient sources. Thus Ibn Sa'd, viii, 85, l. 27 says with regard to Sâfiyya, the Jewish wife of Muhammad, that she was from the Banu Isra'ili i.e., from pure Jewish stock, a descendant of the high priest Aaron.

As is natural, to an ancient people such as the Banu Isra'ili things were ascribed which originally had nothing to do with them. Thus a Maghribi handbook on agriculture advises against doing farmwork on certain days, because they were the days of punishment (ridâq, cf. Sûra 7, 162) inflicted on the Banu Isra'ili, see J. M. Millâs-Vallierona, in Andalus 19 (1954), 132.

The most important aspect of the image of the Banu Isra'ili in Muslim literature is the piety attributed to them. "The pietists (hâdd, mula'ab'dân) of the Banu Isra'ili" is a common expression, e.g., 'Abd al-Kâdir Djjâli, Qumâyra ii 62, 'Abu Nu'aym, Hilal al-Awilyâ'ii 373, l. 4 ff. Of a man who devoted himself to worship and asceticism it was said that he was like the Banu Isra'ili, Sâkhâwi (d. 902/1497), al-Dâwi al-Lâmi' ii, 146, 20-22. Many of the stories about the pious men of the Banu Isra'ili—quite a number of which have found their way into Al Layla wa-Layla—can be traced in the Talmud and the Midrashim, such as the beautiful parable about the pious Häyy of the Banu Isra'ili in Ibn 'Asâkhr's Ta'rîh Dimashq, vii, 23, which is an almost literal rendering of Babylonian. Talmud, Ta'nîh 23. Cf. Isrâ'îlyyâr, where also an attempt is made to explain, why piety was connected with Banu Isra'ili.

Bibliography:—in the article. See also S. D. Goitein, The Banu Isra'ili and their Controversies, a study on the Koran in Hebrew, Tarbiz iii, (1932), 410-422; J. Horovitz, Enc. Jud. 8, 506 ff. and the literature noted there. (S. D. Goitein)

BANû, an ancient town (East Pandjab, India) situated in 30° 34' N. and 76° 47' E., 9 miles from Ambâla and 20 miles from Sirhind. The old Sanskrit name was Vahnyûr which became, during the course of centuries, Banlyûr and finally Banûr. The ruins extend right up to Chât [q.v.] (another ancient town, now in ruins) 4 miles away. It was first mentioned by Bâbur when it was, and still continues to be, famous for its white jasmine flowers and the otto distilled from them.

Another ancient name of Banûr, according to tradition, was Pushpâ Nagâr or Pushpâwâli (lit. city of flowers) but it bears no resemblance to its present name. During the rule of the Sayyid dynasty (817-1541-51) the town seems to have gained in importance and even just before the establishment of Pakistan (1947) was probably inhabited by people who, like the sayyids of Bilgrâm, trace their descent to Abû 'l-Farah of Wâsi't, said to have migrated to India after Hâülüq's sack of Baghûd (665/1268). The tomb of Malik Sulaymân Kâhh, father of the Sayyid ruler Khâdir Kâhn (817-24/1414-29) existed till 1947 when the local Muslims migrated en masse to Pakistan. Sayyid 'Abd al-Banûr, [q.v.] (d. Madina, 1053/1643) one of the leading khâlîfât of Ahmad Sîrîndî [q.v.] was a native of this town. It was overrun early in the 12th/18th century by the Sikh adventurer Banda Bahârî, and passed into the possession of the Singhpûriyâ Sikhs. It was occupied in 1777/1763 by Ålā Singh, the chief of Patiala and remained in the possession of his descendants till 1956 when the State was eventually merged into the new province of East Pandjab. It was defended by two forts, Mudgal and Sikh, which are still extant as ruins.

Bibliography:—Memos of Baber, trans. Leyden and Erskine, 301; Imp. Gaz. of India, 1909, vi, 414; 'Alâmdâr Husâyn Wâsîtî, Hadîkî-i Wâsîtîyya (MS. Rampur State Library); Abu'î-Abdâr (transl. H. Blochmann), i, 393-4. (A. S. Bazme Ansari)

AL-BANûR, Mu'izz al-Dîn Abû 'Abd Allâh 'Adam b. s. Ismâ'îl, one of the premier khâlîfât of Ahmad Sirhindî [q.v.], was a native of Banûr [q.v.]. He claimed descent from Imam Musa al-Kâzîm [q.v.], but it was disputed on the ground that his grandmother belonged to the Mashwâni tribe of the Afghâns and he too lived and dressed after the fashion of the Afghâns. His nasâb was again questioned when in 1052/1642 he was in Lahore accompanied by 10,000 of his disciples, mostly Afghâns, by 'Abîlânî Sâ'd Allâh Khân Chinyûti, the chief Minister of Shâhjâhân, and by 'Abî al-Hâkim al-Siyûlikî [q.v.], who had been deputed by the Emperor to ascertain from the saint the reason of his visit to Lahore in the company of such a large force. Not satisfied with the explanation of the Shaykh, the emperor ordered him to quit Lahore, go back to Banûr and proceed on pilgrimage to Mecca and Madînâ.

During the early years of his life he served in the Intelligence branch of the Imperial army but gave up service after some years having felt a strong urge to take up a life of piety and spirituality. He first became a disciple of Hâdidî Khâhid Rûgâhî, Buhûtîpûrî and on his advice later contracted his beya with Ahmad Sirîndî. During the transition period he visited a number of places including Multân, Ambâla, Pânpat, Shâhâbâd, Sirhind, Lahore and Sâmâna in search of derwishes and mystics.

There are conflicting statements in the Nikât al-Asrâr, a collection of his mafi'lât, and the Manâbîh al-Nâhârî, his authentic biography, regarding his educational attainments. While the Nikât describes him as an "ummi dimmî" the Manâbîh records that he read primary books like the Misân al-Sûrâ and Munsâbîh with Mullâ 'Tâhir Lâhawî, a well-known scholar of his days. His military assignment, however, suggests that he was fairly well educated.

He died at al-Madinâ on Friday, Shâwwal 13, 1053/December 25, 1643 and was buried in al-Bâkî near the tomb of 'Ughâm b. 'Abî. During his life-time he wielded great influence and at the time of his death more than 400,000 persons owed spiritual
allegiance to him. His meagre religious education, rigid attitude and contempt for State dignitaries was not confined to Al-Bakri, but he remained steadfast in his mission and won over to his side both scholars and laymen like Muhammad Amin Badakhsh, 'Abd Khālik Ḍaṣṭ, Shaykh Abū Naṣr Ambālāwī, his brother Masūd and Shaykh Muhammad also of Ambāla. Among his ḍalilī'ī are counted more than a hundred persons, including Ḥāfīz 'Abd Allāh of Akbarābād, spiritual guide of Ṣaḥḥ 'Abd al-Rahmān, father of Wali Allāh al-Dihlawī [g.r.], and Sayyid 'Alām Allāh, one of the ancestors of Ahmad Barā'ī [g.v.].

An incidental reference in the Nikāt al-Aṣrār reveals that he was 46 when the book, as internal evidence shows, was compiled during his sojourn in the Hijāz in 1052/1642-3. This means that he was born c. 1005-6/1506-7. His youngest son, Muhammad Muḥsin, was born at Gwalior in 1052/1642, while he was on his way to Mecca, a fact which further supports the view that he died at no very advanced age.

He has written: i) Nikāt al-Aṣrār, dealing with abstruse mystical problems and their Śūfī exposition, interspersed with personal experiences of the author in the spiritual field and casual biographical references; ii) Khudāṣat al-Muḍārī (in 2 vols.) is more or less a continuation of the former. The entire work is in Persian and is still in MS. He is also the author of a commentary on al-Faṣīḥa which forms the first part of the Naktādīj al-Haramayn, compiled by Muhammad Amin Badakhsh, who claims to have lived for fifty years in the Hedjaz and also accompanied Ahmad al-Banūrī on his pilgrimage to the holy cities.

Bibliography: Badr al-Dīn Sirhindī, Ḍaḍarāt al-Kuds (in Persian, still in MS.), Urb, Venet. Libr., Lahore 1923; Muhammad Amin Badakhsh, Manābkī al-Hadhārī, (being the third part of Naktādīj al-Haramayn), (MS. in Persian in the possession of Shaykh Yūsuf al-Banūrī of Karachi); Ahmad al-Banūrī, Nikāt al-Aṣrār (MS. in the possession of Yūsuf al-Banūrī; Maẓhar al-Dīn al-Fārsī, Manābiṣt al-Ḥaḍārī, (in Persian, still in MS.), Urdu trans. n.l-Kuds (buhayra) elsewhere. The lake exacted by the Arabs holding the countryside, as a tithe, Banzart became virtually indefensible for men of piety and a refuge for the local people, when they feared a Christian landing.

Following the invasion of the nomadic Hilāl and the abandonment of al-Kayrawān by the Zirid sultan al-Muẓīz, Banzart became virtually independent; soon, however, it was forced to pay tribute exacted by the Arabs holding the countryside, as a guarantee against being pillaged by them. Taking advantage of the rivalries which existed between the principalities of the North of Africa, the Arab chieftain Ward al-Lajmī entered Banzart and there set himself up as the ruler. He endeavored his capital with the requisites in hand and made the town relatively prosperous. His son succeeded him and the Banū 'Umar 'Ashārī dynasty continued in Banzart until the Almohad invasion (1154/1159). The seventh of this line, the amir al-Fārī, made his submission to 'Abd al-Muṭtin.

At the beginning of the 7th/13th century, Banzart was occupied by the Banū Ghāniya Almoravids and from that time entered on a decline, confirmed at the beginning of the 16th century by Leo Africanus. However, it received some Muslim emigrants from Spain, who founded the "suburb of the Andalusians" and, like all ports of the Barbary coast, it turned its attention to privateering. Having repudiated the Knights of Malta and bombardments, that of H22/1785 by the Venetians almost completely destroying the town. The Banyar territory corresponds, roughly speaking, to that of the MDHY in inscriptions (cf. art. MARSHAD). The Banyar once more or less a continuation of the former. The entire work is in Persian and is still in MS. He is also the author of a commentary on al-Faṣīḥa which forms the first part of the Naktādīj al-Haramayn, compiled by Muhammad Amin Badakhsh, who claims to have lived for fifty years in the Hedjaz and also accompanied Ahmad al-Banūrī on his pilgrimage to the holy cities.

Bibliography: Badr al-Dīn Sirhindī, Ḍaḍarāt al-Kuds (in Persian, still in MS.), Urb, Venet. Libr., Lahore 1923; Muhammad Amin Badakhsh, Manābkī al-Hadhārī, (being the third part of Naktādīj al-Haramayn), (MS. in Persian in the possession of Shaykh Yūsuf al-Banūrī of Karachi); Ahmad al-Banūrī, Nikāt al-Aṣrār (MS. in the possession of Yūsuf al-Banūrī; Maẓhar al-Dīn al-Fārsī, Manābiṣt al-Ḥaḍārī, (in Persian, still in MS.), Urdu trans. n.l-Kuds (buhayra) elsewhere. The lake exacted by the Arabs holding the countryside, as a tithe, Banzart became virtually indefensible for men of piety and a refuge for the local people, when they feared a Christian landing.

Following the invasion of the nomadic Hilāl and the abandonment of al-Kayrawān by the Zirid sultan al-Muẓīz, Banzart became virtually independent; soon, however, it was forced to pay tribute exacted by the Arabs holding the countryside, as a guarantee against being pillaged by them. Taking advantage of the rivalries which existed between the principalities of the North of Africa, the Arab chieftain Ward al-Lajmī entered Banzart and there set himself up as the ruler. He endeavored his capital with the requisites in hand and made the town relatively prosperous. His son succeeded him and the Banū 'Umar 'Ashārī dynasty continued in Banzart until the Almohad invasion (1154/1159). The seventh of this line, the amir al-Fārī, made his submission to 'Abd al-Muṭtin.

At the beginning of the 7th/13th century, Banzart was occupied by the Banū Ghāniya Almoravids and from that time entered on a decline, confirmed at the beginning of the 16th century by Leo Africanus. However, it received some Muslim emigrants from Spain, who founded the "suburb of the Andalusians" and, like all ports of the Barbary coast, it turned its attention to privateering. Having repudiated the Knights of Malta and bombardments, that of H22/1785 by the Venetians almost completely destroying the town. The Banyar territory corresponds, roughly speaking, to that of the MDHY in inscriptions (cf. art. MARSHAD). The Banyar once more or less a continuation of the former. The entire work is in Persian and is still in MS. He is also the author of a commentary on al-Faṣīḥa which forms the first part of the Naktādīj al-Haramayn, compiled by Muhammad Amin Badakhsh, who claims to have lived for fifty years in the Hedjaz and also accompanied Ahmad al-Banūrī on his pilgrimage to the holy cities.
silting up of the harbour brought about Banzart's ruin. Bizerta, now no more than a wretched village, was taken by the French in 1881. Considerable works were undertaken, which made it a great port, accessible to the largest ships, equipped with a military arsenal and defended by modern forts.


(G. Marcais)

Bäuoli, Urdu and Hindi word for step-well, of which there are two main types in India, the northern and the western. The northern variety is the simpler, consisting essentially of one broad flight of stone steps running from ground level to below the waterline, the whole width of the site; subsidiary flights may run opposite and at right angles to these below water-level, thus constricting the cistern itself into successively smaller squares, and these may be supplemented by cross-flights reducing the final cross-sectional area of the cistern to an octagon. The sides other than that composed of the main flight are vertical, of stone or, less commonly, of brick. The whole site is usually rectangular—the bäuoli outside the Buland darwaza at Fatehpur [sic] Sikri, associated with Shaykh Salim Chāhtī is a notable exception, the nature of the terrain having made an irregular polygon the only shape possible—with apparently no consistency in orientation: e.g., the bäuoli at the dargāh of Nizām al-Dīn Awleya, near Humāyūn's tomb, Delhi, runs north and south in alignment with the shrine, while that at the dargāh of Khwāja Kūṭh al-Dīn Bakhtīyār Kākā at Mahrawll, near Lālkot, Delhi, runs east-west and is not aligned with any major structure. Such bäuolis are functional structures, from which water may be drawn and in which ablutions may be carried out, and into which men dive, often from more than 20 metres, to recover alms cast in by pilgrims. They are usually unadorned, but often of a monumental beauty on account of their size: e.g., that of Nizām al-Dīn is 37.4 m. long by 16.2 m. broad, and some 20 m. deep from ground level to average water-level. Bäuolis are found at the principal shrines associated with Chāhte piras; besides the examples already noted, a fine rock-cut bäuoli is at the dargāh of Shaykh Mu'in al-Dīn Chāhtī at Ajmer. The reason for this particular association is not clear. Other bäuolis, smaller but of similar type, are not uncommon at other Islamic sites in N. India, concerning which there is no reason to suppose any Chāhtī connexion. Pre-Islamic examples are not recorded.

The western variety, generally known by the Gujāratī word wāv, is of high artistic and architectural merit as well as functional; it is more elaborate than its northern counterpart, consisting of two parts: a vertical circular or octagonal shaft, from which water may be drawn up as from an ordinary well, and a series of galleries connected by flights of steps, with pillared landings on the lower galleries supporting the galleries above; passages from each landing run to the shaft, where there are frequently chambers which form a cool retreat in the hot season. Such structures are known in Gujāratī from pre-Muslim times: Mātā Bhāvānī's wāv near Ahmadābād, the best preserved Hindu prototype, is probably 11th century A.D. (Burgess, ASWI, viii, i-3); Bāl Hari's wāv in Ahmadābād, which bears a Sanskrit inscription of A.D. 1490 and an Arabic one of 8 Djamād 1 I 906/30 Nov. 1500, has ornament very similar to that of the tracery in the niches of the minarets of local mosques. The wāv at Adalāji (ibid., 10-13) is cruciform, with three main flights down to the first landing. Other wāuos occur scattered throughout Gujarāt from Barawā (Baroda) northwards; one of these, at Māndvā on the left bank of the Vātrak, of peculiar construction, having a brick circular shaft with chambers in three storeys on one side reached by spiral stairs within the wall of the shaft itself.

The northern bäuolis are not dated; that at the dargāh of Nizām al-Dīn is said (Sayyid Ahmad Khān, Aṭār al-Sandād, Lucknow edition 1900, 42) to have been built by the Shaykh (1265-725/1238-1325) himself, and it is probable that other examples date from the same approximate period.


(B. Burton-Pace)

Bāoni, former a petty Muslim state in the Bundelkand Agency of Central India, is now administered as part of Madhya Pradesh (area: 122 square miles; population: 25,256, of which only 12% are Muslims). Its rulers were descended from Ḥmād al-Mulk Ghāš al-Dīn, the grandson of Asaf Džāh, the Nizām of Haydārābād. About 1786 Ghāš al-Dīn came to terms with the Marātāhs who granted him a ḡājar of 52 villages, the name Nizām being derived from bīwān (fifty-two). This grant was later recognised by the British. Because of his loyalty during the 1857 revolt, the nawāb was granted a sanad 1862 guaranteeing the succession. In 1884 the nawāb ceded lands for the Betwā canal and received the usual compensation. There is little else of historical importance to record.

Bibliography: C. U. Aitchison, Treatises, Engagements and Sanads, v (1929); Imperial Gazetteer of India. (C. Collins Davies)

Al-Bāra, place in northern Syria, belonging to what is called the region of the "dead towns", in the centre of the limestone plateau, some fifteen kms. west of the important township of Ma'arrat al-Na'-mān. In the Middle Ages, as attested by the Arabic and Western texts, it served as a fortified cathedral town and its site is still marked today by extensive ruins, among which the modern villages of al-Kafr and al-Bāra (names corresponding to the ancient Greek and Syriac terms, Kaproprob and Kpr'd Br'Y) rise on both sides of a wādī. In bygone days, local trade as well as the olive oil and wine industries ensured the growth of this "town of Apamea, situated between the two dominant massifs of the Djabal Zāwia, at a point which had to be passed through" (G. Tchalenko) and, in the Byzantine period, contained a complex assembly of churches, monasteries and living quarters. It continued to flourish
after the Arab conquest. But at the time of the Crusades, it was coveted from many sides, being taken in succession by Tancred and Raymond of St. Girons. Gilles in 1052–1053, reconquered by Riddan in 1066, then left to the Franks by the treaty of 1071 to be reoccupied in 1081 by Balak and again by Nur al-Din in 1094. Sorely tried by the Franks, it was finally taken by Nur al-Din in 1095, who died there in 1118. After his death it was reoccupied by the Franks in 1096 and again in 1102, then left to the Franks by the treaty of 1103. It was finally conquered by the Mamluks in 1260.}

**AL-BARA** — BARA SAYYIDS, the descendants of Sayyid Abu 'I-Farab of Wasi near Baghda, who with his twelve sons emigrated to India in the 7th/13th century and settled in four villages near Patiala in the sūba of Dihli. The four main branches of the family were named after these four villages. Sayyid Dā'ūd settled in Tihaṇpur; Sayyid Abu 'I-Fadl in Chatbanūr or Chatrauri; Sayyid Abu 'I-Fadlūn in Kūndī; and Sayyid Nazm al-Din Husayn in Jagni or Jhaīj. From this area they later migrated into the Muṣaffar nāvar district of the Ganges-Jumna doūb. The Kannīwār branch settled in Majher; the Chatbanūr branch near Sambalpur; the Jagni branch in Bidauli and Patī; and the Tihaṇpur branch in Dāḥār and Kunhera. The derivation of the term bārta is uncertain. Some derive it from bārta (outside), because the Sayyids, disgusted with the debaucheries of the Mina bārta at Dihli, preferred to live outside the city. Others derive it from the fact that the Sayyids, being Shī'īs, were followers of the twelve (bārta) Imāms. The authors of the Tabābād-i Akbari and the Tāsik-i Dāhārūtī derive the name from the twelve villages in which they settled in the district of Muṣaffaranagar. This is the most probable explanation. The contention of H. M. Elliot and M. Elphinstone that one of the Sayyid settlements was named Bāra has been shown to be incorrect (see W. Irvine, in *JASB* 1896, 175). Sayyid settlements in the district of Muṣaffaranagar can be traced back to the middle of the 8th/14th century. From the reign of Akbar onwards the Akbar Sayyids took part in every important campaign and became renowned for their courage. The Tihaṇpur branch was the most important. To this branch belong the famous Sayyid brothers, Ḥasan 'Ali and Ḥusayn 'Ali, the king-makers of the first two decades of the 18th century. They rose to prominence in the service of 'Aṣīm al-Shāh, the son of Muʿṣarrām al-Dīn who became the emperor Bahādūr Shāh. For their gallantry at the battle of Jālū (1707), which gave the throne to the father of their patron, the elder brother, Ḥasan 'Ali, afterwards known as 'Abd Allāh Khān, was entrusted with the government of Allāhābād and the younger brother with that of Fāra. On the death of Bahādūr Shāh in 1712, distrustful of the power of their enemies at Dihli, they overthrew Dājhānīr Shāh and replaced him by Farrukh-siyar. As his ministers they enjoyed the highest dignities that the emperor could confer. 'Abd Allāh Khān was appointed wazīr of the empire with the title of Kutb al-Mulk. Ḥusayn 'Ali became first bākhshū with the title of amīr al-ulāmī. They are generally given the credit for being the first to abolish the ghūṣa after the death of Arangzhīb, but the latest researches disclose that they were merely continuing the policy already introduced by the wazīr Dūl 'I-Fikr Khān (see *Jiyah* in the *Post-Aurangzeb Period* by S. Chandra, in *Proceedings of...*
BARA SAYYIDS — BARAA

The Indian History Congress, Ninth Session, 320-326.

Famikh-siyar was an ingrate who plotted against his benefactors. His efforts came to naught and eventually, in the seventh year of his reign, he was deposed, blinded, and finally executed by the infuriated Sayyids. The Sayyids next raised two miserable puppets to the throne, Rafi al-Daradiat and Rafi al-Dawla, both of whom were consumptive youths who died in the year 1719. In the same year the Sayyids crowned Muhammad Shah as Emperor. The administration of the six Deccan provinces was entrusted to Husayn 'All, the younger Sayyid brother, but he was soon recalled to Dihl by 'Abd Allâh, whose position was being undermined by court conspiracies in which the Emperor was involved. It was at this juncture that Nişâm al-Mulk, leader of the Turânî nobles and for that reason opposed to Sayyid predominance at Dihl, deemed it advisable to abandon Mâlîwâ, of which he was governor, and establish himself in the Deccan. This naturally alarmed the Sayyids who took immediate steps to coerce him, but before their forces had marched many miles beyond Ægra, Husayn 'All was assassinated and in a very short time 'Abd Allâh was overthrown by a powerful combination of Turânî and Írânî nobles at Dihl. This took place in 1720. In 1737 the descendants of the two brothers were slaughtered or dispersed when the Rohillas sacked Jansath. From this date their power rapidly declined. After the establishment of British paramountcy many Sayyids returned to their former villages only to fall victims to the wily money-lenders.


BARAA. I. — This substantive is derived from the Arabic root br', which is frequently used to denote the general idea of "release, exemption" (from a duty, from an accusation—therefore "innocence", from risk, from responsibility), a meaning to be found repeatedly in the Kur'ân. With this is connected the notion of "freedom from disease, cure", which is equally expressed by this root in classical Arabic. There is undoubtedly good reason to distinguish, as a borrowing from North-Semitic, the meaning, also Kur'ânic, of "create", when speaking of God (Jeffery, Foreign Vocabulary of the Kur'ân, Baroda 1938, 76).

The word barda itself occurs twice in the sacred book. In Sûra liv, 43, it means without doubt "immunity, absolution". On the other hand its interpretation, when it occurs as the first word of Sûra ix (and one of the titles given to this Sûra) is a matter of some difficulty: "Bara'at" of Allâh and his prophet towards those polytheists with whom you have concluded a treaty". The following verse, which accepts a sacred truce of four months, might give rise to the supposition that the reference here is to an immunity. But the traditional interpretation explains this barda on the basis of verses 3-5, according to which Allâh and his prophet will be "unbound" (barda) in regard to the unbelievers, whom the Muslims will then be able to kill with impunity (see the translation and notes of Blachere). The barda, refers then to the "breaking of the ties"—the religious and social ties,—a kind of dissociation or excommunication, the dire consequences of which are exactly the opposite of an immunity. Bara', indeed, is the term used for a person or persons who have broken off all relations with an individual or a group, mainly with fellow-tribesmen; the term barda enters into those phrases which mean "to exile or to remove from the protection of the law" (for the tabria, an Íbâdi penal sanction, see below), and the yamin al-barâ is the oath, condemned by the hadith (notably Abû Dâwûd, Sunan, no. 3258), but still in evidence today, by which a person renounces on his own behalf, if he should swear falsely, adherence to Islam or the protection of God. The Shi'îs advocate the "repudiation" (barda) of the 'Awliya' and his descendants, as opposed to the "attachment" due to this line; contra the whole practice of barâ-a-waliya, see the condemnation of the Êlbânî school apud H. Laoust, La profession de foi d'Ilm Bâbîa, Damascus 1958, 162. The evil implications of the barda, thus understood, justify, in the view of certain Muslim scholars, the exceptional absence of basmalâ at the beginning of Sûra ix.

In legal terminology, bâr'at al-hâmma, or simply barda is the "absence of obligation". Bayâ al-barâ, for example, is the sale without guarantee wherein the seller is freed from any obligation in the event of the existence, in the sale-object, of such a defect as would normally allow the sale to be rescinded (see Santillana, Institutions, ii, 149, for a striking resemblance of formulae in this regard between Muslim Egypt and Christian Tuscany). Hence the term tabria is variously used for all sorts of declaratory or constitutive acts which absolve from responsibility. One may cite the tabria of the present-day Moroccan Bedouin. This is an "indemnity paid by the parents of the murderer to those of the victim for continuing to live within the tribe" (Loubignac, Textes arabes des Zaïre, Paris 1952, 359); see the similar use of barda < barha noted in the Bethlehem region (Haddad, in ZDPV, 1917, 233).
The following derived technical terms may be noted here.

1. Mubdra'a: a form of divorce by mutual agreement where husband and wife free themselves by a reciprocal renunciation of all rights (Bergras-Schacht, Grundzüge, 85; Santillana, Istituzioni, i, 272; cf. Averroes, Biddya, ed. Cairo 1933, ii, 66, who gives an accurate definition by way of comparison with some similar forms of talāb).

2. Istibra* or "confirmation of emptiness", with two quite distinct connotations: a) temporary abstinence from sex-relations with a slave-girl, in order to verify that she is not pregnant, on the occasion of her transfer to a new master or a change in her circumstances [see ʿAmn], and b) an action of the left hand designed to empty completely the urethra, before the cleaning of the orifices or istidig* which must follow satisfaction of the natural needs (L.A., i, 25; Abu ʿl-Hasan on the Rīdā of Ibn Abī Zayd, ed. Cairo 1930, i, 144).

Proceeding now to the general theory of law as found in the classical works, the notion of barā'a is there to be found in the maxim, generally accepted by orthodoxy and vindicated by Ashʿarī doctrine: al-ʿaṣī barāʿat al-ḥishma, "the basic principle is freedom from obligation". This means, according to the standpoint one adopts: "exclusively obligations to which man is subject are those defined by God", or: "in the absence of proof to the contrary the natural presumption is freedom from obligation or liability".

In its first sense this barāʿa ʾaṣīyya embodies a theological notion: it contradicts the Muʿtazilite thesis which is founded upon the rationality of the legal values (akkhām) of human acts, and which holds that, before the promulgation of the revealed law, all those other acts which do not admit of a rationalist assessment are all illicit (according to some) or all permissible (according to others) or unqualified (according to a third group). See Ghaṣālī, Mustaṣṣāf, ed. Cairo 1937, i, 40-42, 127-132; or better: ʿAmīdī, ʿIkhām, ed. Cairo 1924, i, 130-135. Both these works refute the Muʿtazilite thesis. But for almost the totality of the orthodox scholars (two exceptions are indicated, for the Mālikīs, by Bāḍīʿ, ʿIshbārī, ed. Tunis 1351 A.H., 123, 130-131:—the work of Lapanne-Joinville in Travaux Semaîne Intern. Droit musulman, Paris 1932, 85, calls for certain corrections), the legal values are based, absolutely and exclusively, upon the revealed law; before this law and outside it, human acts have no ʿuḥm; and this kind of fundamental indiscernence, which must not be confused with permissibility, denies the notion of any obligation.

In its second sense, which, however, the authors do not attempt to distinguish from the first (the confusion is obvious in the Shafiʿī and Ḥanafi works entitled al-ʿAqīdā wa l-ʿNaṣīrī: Suyūṭī, ed. Cairo 1936, 39; Ibn Nūḍayyim, ed. Cairo 1298 A.H., 29), the barāʿa ʾaṣīyya, whether combined or not with the principle of the "continuance of facts" (istīshāb kāl), comes to support in theory innumerable solutions—whether strict legal rules or legal presumptions—throughout the whole field of fīsh (Lapanne-Joinville, op. cit., 82-88; Brunschvig, in Studi . . . Lenti Delia Vida, i, 75).

However, the word barāʿa has been increasingly employed in a concrete sense to denote written documents of various kinds (pl. barāʿāt or barāṣādāt) by virtue of a semantic development which starts from the idea of "discharge", or doubtless, to be more precise, "financial, administrative discharge"

(Shaṣrānī, ʿAbdī al-Qānim, ed. Cairo 1930, 37; Løkekgaard, Islamic Taxation, Copenhagen 1950, 159; Spuler, Iran in frühislam. Zeit, Wiesbaden 1952, 338, 458). This first sense is to be found, in the context of transactions concerning customs duties, in the treaties concluded with the Christian powers since the Middle Ages, notably by the Hafṣīds (14th-15th centuries); the Latin or Roman versions have: albarā, or arbara (Mas-Latrie, Traité de paix et de commerce, Paris 1866-72: refer to the glossary). Equally, one can see there the sense of "official licence" which the word had come to acquire. It was by now quite readily applied to what we would term a "licence, certificate, diploma", to various written documents originating from administrative bodies or addressed to them: for example "a demand for payment or a billeting order", "a passport" (Dozy, Suppl., i, 63), "a label to be attached by the amīr" to a piece of merchandise (Sakāṭī, Manuel de Hisba, ed. Colin and Lévi-Provençal, Paris 1931, 61), "a request or petition to the sovereign" (Brunschvig, Berbèrie Orientale, ii, 144, n. 3). The languages of the Iberian peninsula have collected and preserved meanings of the same kind: the Catalan albard, the Castillian albará, the Portuguese alvarā.

Neo-classical Arabic knows the term barāʿat al-ʾalańfīdā for the consular exequatur, and barāʿat al-ʾaṣīka for the diplomatic "credentials" (the dictionaries of Bercher and Wehr).

In the colloquial Arabic of N. Africa, barāʿa > brā is widely used, often in the diminutive form brāyya, with the meaning of a simple "letter, missive, note"; (whence the Berber brāṛi, with the same meaning). At Fez, semantic development has led to the name of brāyya being given, in Arabic, to a pastry consisting of a pâté enclosed in a pastry-case which is folded in the same way as a letter (Brunot, Textes arabes de Rabat, ii, Glossary, Paris 1952, 40).

Finally we must note the expression, very common in the East, "night of the barāʿa" (Arabic: layḥāt al-ḥishma, Turkish: berat gecesi, Persian: ḡābi-ʾi bārdā) to describe the night of mid-Shaʾbān, a religious festival (see the paper by H. H. Erdem, Berat Gecesi kakhindā bi rādāth, Ankara 1953). Here the precise meaning of barāʿa escapes the author, since none of the explanations offered by traditional interpretation or by Western scholarship are convincing: "immunity" (for those beings whose lot is favourably cast on that night), "revelation" (to Muhammad of his prophetic mission by the archangel Gabriel), "creation" (of the world: referring to the Hebrew berāʾa, Plessner, art. RAMĀDĀN in EL). It would first be expedient, in order to orientate etymological research, to determine, with such precision as is possible, the antiquity of the expression and the circumstances of its origin, for it is not commonly encountered in the mediaeval texts which deal with the mid-Shaʾbān celebration.

Under the Ottoman Turks the administrative use of the term was particularly developed in the form berāṭ [q.v.] (bārdā), which they distinguished from berāt, (berādāt).

Bibliography: in the text of the article.

(R. BRUNSchVIG)

II. — The theme of the barāʿa was particularly developed by the Kharījītes with their religious zeal and their emphasis on separation. In opposition to the wīlāya, which is the dogmatic duty of solidarity and assistance to the Muslim, the barāʿa was for them the duty to repudiate all those who did not deserve this title. Throughout the heresiologists can be found the particular applications given by
the numerous sects to the principle of barada. It is only by means of the Ibadi catechists that we can arrive at a direct and full exposition. The oldest text which has come down to us, that of Abū Zakariyya al-Džannawun (6th/12th century), imposes on a man who has reached puberty, and is in his right mind, repudiation of a) all the kafırin of both worlds, living and dead, known or unknown; b) the unjust šādūm; c) those who are censured (madžmūmūn) in the Kurʾān and acknowledged rebels (mahḍyūfūn bi l-maṣaṣṣa); d) the man who, personally known, has committed a grave sin.

A decision concerning the children of persons subject to the barada was postponed until they attained their majority. The barada was cancelled in respect of the sinner who had carried out the taʿwa.


**BARABA,** steppe of Western Siberia, situated in the oblast of Novosibirsk of the Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic, between lat. 54° and 57° North, and bounded on the East and West by the ranges of hills which skirt the banks of the Irtish and the Ob'. This steppe, which extends for 117,000 sq. km., has numerous lakes, most of which are salt; the biggest is Lake Cani. The ground, which is partly marshland, also has some fertile zones, but it is essentially a cattle-rearing region. It has only 6 to 9 inhabitants per sq. km. in the central and southern part, does not exceed 1 to 1.8 in the North. It is made up of a majority of Russian and Ukrainian colonists, with a Tatar minority, some of whom have emigrated from the Volga at a recent period, whilst others are autochthonous.

The latter, whom the Russians call "Baraba Tatars" or Barabintsl, form a small community near to the other Tatar groups of Western Siberia (Tobol Tatars, Tümen Tatars [q.v.]), which, however, shows signs of disappearing. Their very complex ethnonogenesis gives rise to contradictory hypotheses. It appears that they issued from autochthonous Ugrian peoples who became partly Turkised when they made contact with the Turkish tribes who emigrated at the time of the foundation of the Siberian Empire. This Turkisation, which continued during the 16th/17th centuries, was completed in the 19th century with the large-scale influx of Tatar immigrants from the Middle Volga.

From the conquest of the Siberian Empire by the Russians under Ivan IV until the time of Peter the Great, the Baraba steppe separated Russia from the Empire of the Kalmuks. The frontier region contained between the towns of Tara (on the Irtish) and Tomsk (to the East of the Ob') was then called "Baraba district" (Barabinskaya volost'); the indigenous population, in addition to speaking their own language, spoke Kazan Tatar and Kalmuk, and initially paid tribute to the Russians and the Kalmuks, though later to the Russians only. In the 18th century a large number of exiles from European Russia were settled in the Baraba as colonists. At the end of the 19th century, when the Trans-Siberian railway had been built, the steppe was systematically developed with the help of a new wave of Russian and Ukrainian colonists.

The autochthonous Tatar population, which in the 17th century was established in villages, was pushed back at the end of the 18th century towards the sterile zones of the steppe. Since then, its numerical importance has steadily declined. According to the data collected by Radlov in 1865, there were then 4,635 "Baraba Tatars" in existence. At the census taken in 1897, 4,433 were counted and, in 1926, only 39, the remainder having had themselves re-classified as "Kazan Tatars".

The Baraba Tatars at present occupy a small number of villages (wholly Tatar or Tatar-Russian) near the lakes Sabrali, Yurtush and Manglish and in the basin of the river Om', especially in the Kuybyshev district (formerly Kainsk), along the Trans-Siberian railway.

The Islamisation of the Baraba, which commenced in the 10th/11th century with Central Asia (Khwarezm and Bucharah) continued as the result of the activities of the Tatar merchants and missionaries of Kazan, who made their way up the Irtish. However, it seems most probable that it was only in the 17th century, after the Kazan Tatar colonists had established themselves in Western Siberia, that the majority of the autochthonous Tatars adopted Sunni Islam of the Ḥanafi rite.

Radlov saw several old men who remembered their fathers making pagan sacrifices in the manner of the inhabitants of the Altai and being dressed differently from the Muslims.

The Baraba Tatar dialect, which has not been studied much as yet, possesses certain phonetic peculiarities: (is in the place of i for example). It has almost entirely given way to Kazan Tatar and Russian.

Like the Russians, the Baraba Tatars live by agriculture, stock breeding and fishing; trapping animals for fur has greatly diminished.


(W. BARTHOLOM- [A. BENIGNES])

**BARABRA** (for Barabira; sing. Barbir): Nubian-speaking Muslims inhabiting the Nile Banks between the First and Third Cataracts. The term includes the Kunüz, Sukkût and Maḥas. The name Barбра is not commonly used by these peoples of themselves, and is stated by Lane (i, 177, col. 3) to be a late and modern application of the term used by earlier writers for the Berbers of the Maghrib. The Danakla (q.v.), who live above the Third Cataract, are linguistically and physically allied to the Kunüz but do not regard themselves as Barabra. The territory now inhabited by the Barabra formed the northern part of...
the Christian Nubian kingdom of Makurra, which entered into treaty-relations with 'Abd Allāh b. Sa'd in 31/652. Arabian settlement began with the migration of Rabī‘a into the Aswān region in 869. After the defeat of Abū Rakwā (396/1006), the Fātimid al-Ḥākim is said to have conferred the title of Kalān al-Dawlā on the Shaykh of Rabī‘a at Aswān (al-Makrī, al-Bayān wa'īl-‘īrab, 3:244, 4:202). After setting out peacefully on its course, the Danī plain, receiving the waters from many springs which meanders over the gentle slope of the Zabādate, making up for the lack of adequate regular rainfall (Damascus receives only about 200 mm.). It imparts humidity in the area. After setting out peacefully on its course, the Danī plain, receiving the waters from many springs which meanders over the gentle slope of the Zabadanī hollow at the foot of a limestone cliff over 1,000 m. high, the Western side of the Zabadanī hollow at the foot of which are formed of pliocene and eoo-23

century is fully described in J. L. Burckhardt, A Description of the Country of the Haurâ and the Ghuta: at Hama, on the left bank, the Nahr Thawra. At Dummar, on the right bank, N. Mizâwi carries water to the market-town of Mazza; then, still on the same bank, the Dārān which supplies Kāfār Sūs and Dârāyā; after that, on the left bank, the N. Thawra, of Aramaean origin, which by itself irrigates nearly 10,000 hectares of orchards and gardens, has pushed back the desert to a distance of 20 km. from the mountains; beyond the Ghūṭa, the Mardj is covered by extensive cultivation and from December to June displays a carpet of green meadows.

Water not absorbed by irrigation passes on towards the steppe where, in a trough devoid of outlet, it becomes stagnant in the marshes of Uthayba.

Going downstream the following canals lead out of the Baradā: at Hamā, on the left bank, the Nahr Yazid, of Nabatean origin, restored by the Caliph Yazid I, goes to swell the Nahr Thawra. At Dummar, on the right bank, N. Mizzawi carries water to the market-town of Mazza; then, still on the same bank, the Dârân which supplies Kāfār Sūs and Dârâyâ; after that, on the left bank, the N. Thawra, of Aramaean origin, which by itself irrigates nearly half the oasis. On the threshold of Rabwa, two canals, in the main urban, diverge: the Kanawāt, of Roman origin and restored by the Umayyads, swells the older watercourse: the N. Bânis (literary form) or Bâniyâs, an Aramaean creation. About 670, Arnulf mentions magna IV flumina, which are those existing in 724 under Hishâm b. ‘Abd al-Malik: Yazid, Thawra, Bânis and Kanawât, and in the 6th/12th century, in Ibn Asâkir’s time. According to a plan of Damascus prepared by German travelers in 1572, the Baradā is shown as a navigable waterway.

In the town, the Kanawāt, the Bânis and the Baradā itself provide water for hammâms, mosques, fountains and houses (drinking water has only recently been piped from ‘Ayn Fidjā to pass on again into the countryside. A most ingenious system of irrigation has made possible the creation of an artificial oasis of exceptional fertility. The manifold canals diverted from the Baradā weave a close network watering the villages and the vegetation of the Ghūṭa. The Baradā plays a major rôle, making up for the lack of adequate regular rainfall (Damascus receives only about 200 mm.). It imparts humidity...
to the atmosphere, gives rise to the autumnal and spring mists and renders plant and animal life possible and thus, the human habitat.

Yakkut (i, 369) designates a village with the name of Barad to the East of Halab. Lammens recognised it as Barad in the Diabul Sim'an. He also indicates (i, 69) a canal called Barad, excavated at al-Ramlah by the Umayyad Sulayman b. 'Abd al-Malik.


BARADAN or BARADAN, the ancient Cydnus, now Djayhan, a river rising in Cappadocia, which flows towards the West, irrigates the gardens near Mar'a and those of Tarsus, brings down alluvial deposits to the low-lying plain of Clicia and empties into the sea on the Western side of the Gulf of Alexander. In ancient times, small ships sailed up it as far as Tarsus.

Bibliography: Mas'udi, Muraddi, i, 264; Yakkut, i, 369, iii, 526; Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, 63, 378, 419; Cl. Cahen, La Syrie du Nord, 146-151. (N. ELISSEEVF)

BARADAN is a town in 'Irak in 'Abbsid times. According to the Arab geographers it was situated some 15 miles north of Baghdad on the main road to Samarra and at some distance from the east bank of the Tigris, a little above the confluence of the Nahr al-Khalis and the latter. The Khalis canal, a branch of the Nahrawan (or Diyala) received immediately north of the town. The caliph al-Manqur held his court here for a brief period, before he definitely resolved on building a new capital on the site of the modern Baghdad (cf. Yakkut, Buldan, 256). There was a bridge in Baghdad, a street and a gate (after this a cemetery also) in the eastern half of the town called after Baradan which was two post stations distant; cf. Le Strange, Baghdad during the Abbasid Caliphate (1900), 360 (index). When the author of the Marajisid made his account from Yakkut (about 700/1300), Baradan was quite desolate and unknown. It is doubtful to be sought for in the present mound of ruins at Badran, the position of which agrees admirably with the statement of Arab authors. Arab sources suggest that the name Baradan is arabised from the Persian barad-dan ("the place of the prisoners"), which suggests the possibility of a Jewish colony settled here presumably by Nebuchadnezar.


BARADUST or BARADUS, name of two Kurdish districts. The first in the south, between Ushnu, Rayat and Rawanduz, with Kani Reah as its chief town, perched on a crag, at an altitude of 4,372 feet. In the north it borders on Girdi (Shamdun), in the West on Shurwan and in the East on Biblas. The massif of Kandil (C. J. Edmonds, 252, 305, 313, 315, 356). Among the main tribes of Baradust, that which bore this
name has lost its importance. At present, the Bålaki tribe is the most powerful in the South, numbering some ten thousand families. Their territory in the massif of Kandil is difficult of access. Its centre is

the township of Rayat. Formerly, the amir Sohran Khalifa Hayran Emirdji. A story preserved by Yazidiloglu Bufrid of Tokat (the head of Braham (or Brahim) which signifies Nature and that they are thus regarded as the choicest part of mankind. Tahânawî, op. cit., asserts that they claim descent from Ibrâhîm, the Prophet, a doctrine which possibly reflects a much later Hindu opinion which wanted to claim this Judaic-Christian-Islamic figure as its own.

The only authentic source is undoubtedly al-Birûnî, who, although he wrote his work in ḥazna (about 1030 A.D.), had stayed in the north-western part of the Indian sub-continent, learnt Sanskrit, translated many works from that language and had acquired an intimate knowledge of Hindu philosophy, religion, law, literature, society and sciences, such as astronomy. In the preface he complains that no reliable work on Hindu India existed, that even Abû l-ʻAbbâs al-Îrânshâhîrî who had written accurately about Judaism and Christianity had failed to do so with regard to Hinduism and that he himself undertook to write this work at the instigation of his master Abû Sahl ʻAbd al-Munîm b. ʻAli b. Nûh. (Al-Mas'ûdî mentions the works of Abû l-ʼKasîm al-Balîkî and al-Ḥasan b. Mûsâ al-Nawbâkhîîtl. Al-Birûnî first narrates the difficulties which beset a foreign student: the difficulty and artificiality of the written Sanskrit, the utter difference between Hinduism and Islam and the almost total social Hindu taboos against foreigners, etc. Then follow six sections on Hindu Religion and Metaphysics and so on. The author gives a detailed description of the manners of the Brahmans in their way of life, etc.

In the works of Muslim travellers in India it is usually the yogis, their practices and way of life that gains prominence; there is little about Hindu philosophy or the Brahmans. The practices of Yoga, as a way of attaining spiritual bliss or knowledge, have sometimes aroused curiosity, but have generally been regarded as suspect if not altogether damnable.

(F. Rahman)
BARAK BABA — BARAKAT

In the Kur'ān, the word is used only in the plural: barakāt, like rahma and salām, are sent to man by God. It can be translated by "beneficent force, of divine origin, which causes superabundance in the physical sphere and prosperity and happiness in the psychic order". Naturally, the text of the Kur’ān (ba’dul-mu‘ādh) is charged with baraka. God can implant an emanation of baraka in the person of his prophets and saints: Muḥammad and his descendants are especially endowed therewith. These sacred personages, in their turn, may withhold his baraka and his father fled to Syria.

The last Sharīf of Dhawū Barakāt was cAbd Allah b. Husayn, a nephew of Barakat IV, whose potential to ordinary men, either during their lifetimes or after their death, the manner of transmission being greatly varied, sometimes strange. God, however, can withhold his baraka.

Among agricultural peoples, a baraka is recognised in cereals, causing them to multiply miraculously. Baraka is to be met with, here and there, attributed to the most diverse objects. Already in the Kur’ān, the olive tree and the 27th Ramadan are used only in the plural: barakāt, and the word ended up by taking the secular meaning of "very adequate quantity": mubdrak. The word has been studied by M. F. Köprüli, who sees in his...
reign was almost as brief as his uncle's. Placed in power in 1184/1770 by Muhammad Abū Dhabab, the general sent to the Hijārā by 'Abd Bāy [g.n.] of Egypt, he lacked the strength to maintain himself after Abū Dhabab's withdrawal. From then on the Sharifate remained the exclusive property first of Dhuwān Zayd and then of Dhuwān 'Abd Allāh.


**BARAKZAY** [see AFGHANISTĀN].

**AL-BARMAK** or **AL BARMAKI** (Barmakids), an Iranian family of secretaries and wazirs of the early 'Abbasid Caliphs.

1. Origins. — The name Barmak, traditionally borne by the ancestor of the family, was not a proper name, according to certain Arab authors, but a word designating the office of hereditary high priest of the temple of Nawbahar, near Balkh. This interpretation is confirmed by the etymology which is now accepted, deriving the term from the Sanskrit word *pārmaḥ* — “superior, chief”. The term Nawbahar, moreover, likewise derives from Sanskrit (*nāva vihara*—“new monastery”) and evokes the name of the famous Buddhist monastery, visited in the 1st/7th century by the Chinese pilgrim Hiuan Ts’ang, at Po-Ho, another name for Balkh (Hiouen Thsang, in *Weststätische Abh. Tschudi*, Wiesbaden 1954, 159 and 168). There Khalid seems to have been the first to be converted, followed by his brothers Sūlaymān and al-Ḥasan.


(W. BARTHOLD [D. SOURDUP])

2. Khalid b. Barmak.—Practically nothing is known of Khalid's activities until the moment he appeared, towards the end of the Umayyad period, in the ranks of the Hāshimite movement; he then entered with the distribution of the plunder in Khaṭṭābāb’s army. Shortly after that, the new Caliph al-Saffāh entrusted the management of the *dawān* of the army and land-tax (**al-джунд wa'il-šārādī**) to him, and then the control of all the bureaux, so that, as one chronicler says, he played the role of a wāriz; attached to the personal service of the Caliph, he had the honour of seeing his own daughter suckled by al-Saffāh's wife whilst his own wife acted as foster-mother to his sovereign's daughter. Under al-Maṣūr, Khalid continued to play an important role, without however being, as is so frequently averred, the right hand of the Caliph. He seems to have remained for at least a year director of the office of land taxation, though he was soon ousted from the central administration by the intriguer Abū Ayyūb. Appointed governor of Fārs, he appears to have stayed there for about two years. Later we see him at Baghdād persuading the Caliph, according to a well known tradition, to refrain from destroying the Iwān Kīrs, participating in 147/764-65 in the manoeuvres which led to 152/771, Mūsā agreeing to renounce his rights to the succession, proffering advice to Abū 'Ubayd Allāh Muʿāwiya, who was returning from al-Rayy. Subsequently appointed governor of Tābarīsān, he remained there for about seven years (coins struck in his name between 150/767 and 154/771 are known), took possession of the fortress of Ustunawand near Damāwand and made himself popular with the inhabitants of these regions, where he founded the new town of al-Maṣūrā. It was probably about this time that his grandson al-Faḍl b. Yahyā became the “foster-brother” of Hārūn, the son of al-Mahdī. Finally in 158/775, shortly before al-Maṣūr’s death, a heavy fine seems to have been imposed on Khalid, but he was pardoned and appointed governor of the province of al-Mawṣil, where a Kurdish revolt had broken out. At the beginning of the Caliphate of
Mahdi, we find him in Pars and, in 163/779-80, he appears to have further distinguished himself, at the same time as his son Yahyā, during the siege of Samalū in Byzantine territory, though he died shortly afterwards in 165/781-82, approximately in his 75th year.


The *Wisārā* and the fall of the Barma-kids.—When Yahyā b. Khālid was chosen as *wāzir* by Hārūn al-Rashīd, he already had a fairly long career behind him. After assisting his father in his various governorships, Yahyā had been appointed in 158/775 governor of *Ahdharbāyājān*. He was still at Khālid's side in Pars at the beginning of al-Mahdi’s Caliphate, and in 161/778 he had become secretary tutor to Prince Hārūn, in the place of Abū b. Sa’dāka, and had accompanied the Prince on the Samalū expedition, on which he had been especially entrusted with the commissariat of the army. A little later, when his pupil had been acknowledged as the second heir and appointed governor of the western provinces as well as of Ahdharbāyājān and Armenia, Yahyā had administered this part of the empire. After the death of al-Mahdi, through he was confirmed in his office, he found himself the object of the hostility of the new Caliph al-Hādī, who accused him of supporting Hārūn against him and of encouraging him to maintain his rights to the succession, which very nearly brought about his downfall. The very night, however, when Yahyā, who had been thrown into prison, was, we are told, to have been executed, al-Hādī was found dead and certain reports suggest that the Queen-mother al-Khayzūrān, who supported Hārūn, was not unconnected with the occurrence.

In any case, as soon as Hārūn had been hailed as Caliph, he hastened to summon Yahyā and entrusted him with the direction of affairs, investing him, according to tradition, with a general delegation of authority. The able secretary received the title of wāzir and from the outset associated his two sons al-Faḍl and Diāfar with his administrative and governmental duties. They frequently presided with him and also appear to have been styled *wisār*. Yahyā remained in office for seventeen years, from 170/786 to 187/803, this period being referred to by some authors as “the reign of the Barmakids” (*sulṭān Āl Barmaḵ*). Engaged in “righting wrongs” in the name of the Caliph, he was likewise empowered to choose his own secretaries, who acted as his delegates, and was in practice head of the administration; even the office of the Seal, initially withheld from him, was soon placed under his control. Tradition likewise has it that al-Rašjud handed his personal seal over to him, a symbol of the new authority enjoyed by the *wisār*. This seal, entrusted to Diāfar, subsequently returned to Yahyā, who relinquished it when he set out to stay in Mecca in 181/797; it was then entrusted to al-Faḍl and afterwards to Diāfar, being taken back by Yahyā after his return.

Yahyā’s two sons, al-Faḍl and Diāfar, were not satisfied with merely seconding their father. They likewise enjoyed important responsibilities. Al-Faḍl who was the eldest and, moreover, Hārūn’s “foster-brother”, played a major rôle in the early years. In 176/792 or perhaps even earlier, he was placed at the head of the Western provinces of Iran and was sent by the Caliph against the ‘Alid Yahyā b. ‘Abd Allāh, who had revolted. He obtained the latter’s submission by negotiation. In the following year he was appointed governor of Khurāsān, where he played the rôle of a conciliator and a builder. He pacified the country of Kābul and recruited a local army, part of which, we are told, was sent to Bagh-dād. Upon his return to Court, he left a deputy in his province, which he retained until 180/796. In 181/797, he appears to have been in charge of the government during his father’s absence. Nevertheless, he was the first to lose the Caliph’s favour. He gravely displeased Hārūn and was deprived of all his offices, except his appointment as tutor to the two princely heirs-apparent, for whom he had obtained recognition as heir-apparent in 178/794.

As for Dīafar, whose eloquence and legal erudition the authors are fond of stressing, in 176/792 he received the governorship of the western provinces, though he remained at Court, which he only left in 180/796 in order to suppress the risings in Khurāsān. He was next appointed temporarily governor of Khurāsān and was placed in charge of the caliphal bodyguard as well as being entrusted with the direction of the Post Office and of the offices of the Mint and textile manufactures (in fact his name appears on the coins struck in the East from 176/792 and, subsequently, also on those of the West). He was likewise tutor to Prince ‘Abd Allāh al-Ma’mūn, who was proclaimed second heir in 178/798. But above all he was the Caliph’s favourite, if not his Ga’nymede as has often been supposed, and willingly took part in his pleasure parties, of which his brother, on the other hand, disapproved.

Thus with Yahyā’s two sons entrusted with the tutelage of the two princely heirs-apparent, between whom an actual division of the empire was contemplated, power might have remained in the hands of the Al Barmaḵ for a long time, had al-Rašjud so permitted. The Caliph, however, on returning from the Pilgrimage which he accomplished with his suite in 186/802, suddenly decided to put an end to their domination; during the night of Saturday the 1 Safar 175/28-9 January 803, he had Dīafar executed, al-Faḍl and his brothers arrested, Yahyā placed under observation and the property of all the Barmakids (with the exception of Muḥammad b. Khālid), confiscated. Dīafar’s remains were left exposed in Bagh-dād for a year. Al-Faḍl and Yahyā himself, whose wish had been to share his sons’ fate, were conducted to al-Raḵka as prisoners; there Yahyā died in Muḥarram 190/November 805, 70 years of age, and al-Faḍl in Muḥarram 193/November 808, aged 45 years.

The brutal fall of the Barmakids came as a surprise to their contemporaries, who had no satisfactory explanation to account for it and therefore invented various fictitious reasons, such as the story of “Abbasā [*q.v.*],” which have too long been given credence. The origin of their fall still remains partly a mystery for modern historians; but it can hardly be seen as the result of a sudden caprice on the part of the Caliph. Even if it was not “prepared well beforehand”, as W. Barthold said, it was at least contemplated long in advance by a sovereign who had come to endure the tutelage of his ministers with increasing impatience and who at times accused them of pursuing a policy contrary to his own interests.

The vizirate of the Barmakids was not really the period of perfect harmony which came to be portrayed in later legend. In spite of what has been said on the matter, causes for disagreement did exist.
between the Caliph and his former tutor, whose hands were never completely free to govern. Not only was he obliged in the early years, as W. Darmesteter has pointed out, to render account to al-Khayzuryan, who, nevertheless, constantly gave him her support as long as she lived, but later he was often forced to come to terms with al-Rashid's wishes and to resort to that cleverness for which he was so highly reputed. In some cases he was not even successful in imposing his views, and the man appointed to replace al-Fadl in Khurshid in 180/796 was appointed against his advice. At other times he found himself having to plead highly compromised causes. Thus we see him hastening from Baghdad to al-Rakkà in 183/799 to divert the sovereign's ire from al-Fadl and succeeding only at the cost of condemning his son's behaviour. Very easily on also, intrigues had contributed to weaken his position and the Caliph, upon the death of his mother, had been eager to bestow honours on the accomplished courtier al-Fadl b. al-Rabi', in whom he had for long begun to take an interest and whom, furthermore, he appointed baghdîb in 179/795 in the place of the Barmakid Muhammad b. Khalid; the new dignitary exercised a growing influence at Court, where he stigmatised the shortcomings of his enemies and provoked the resentment of al-Rashid against them.

The Caliph's relationships with Yahyâ's sons were similarly not always harmonious. Al-Rashid did not think well of the pro-'Alid policy of al-Fadl, who does not seem to have been endowed with the same flexibility as his father. He was removed from power in 183/799, four years before the final disgrace of his family. Even Dja'far, who apparently enjoyed the Caliph's complete confidence, retaining his influence with him the longest, was not secure from the suspicions of a restive master and was reproached upon occasion for abusing his powers.

It was, of course, quite normal for the attitude of al-Rashid towards the Barmakids to become modified during the seventeen years of their supremacy. The Caliph, at his accession, when he was 23 years old, was content to follow his mother's advice and to delegate himself of certain responsibilities, by entrusting them to Yahyâ. Later, however, this humiliating situation began to weigh upon him, the more so since the desire to impose his own will increased with the years, whilst the Barmakids, filling the most important posts with their relatives and clients and preparing themselves to institute some kind of hereditary vizierate, constituted an actual State within the State. At the same time, they had amassed great wealth, which excited the cupidity of the sovereign and to which their proverbial generosity continually called attention. Yet if the different reasons are adequate to explain their fall, nevertheless the brutality of the treatment inflicted on Dja'far was doubtless the reason for the affections which was bestowed on him by the Caliph and which may perhaps have postponed the inevitable outcome.

On the other hand, imputations of impiety, which are sometimes levelled at the Barmakids during the period of their ascendancy, do not seem to have contributed to the disgrace which befell them. Such accusations do not even appear to have had any basis in fact. These secretaries of Iranian origin did, it is true, display a special interest in the literary masterpieces which came from Iran and India, as well as in the various philosophical and religious doctrines, which they liked to hear discussed; but these were tastes widely disseminated in Baghdad society of the period and were not necessarily accompanied by heterodox opinions. The Barmakids, moreover, had completely adapted themselves to the usages of the 'Abbasid Court at which they lived; they thought highly of Arabic poets and writers and, like so many other maâdil, displayed an ostentatious generosity, inspired by ancient Bedouin traditions. Though they frequently assumed a conciliatory attitude towards the inhabitants of the provinces or of certain tributary states, they appear to have made no attempt to favour al-Ma'mun, the "son of the Persian woman", at the expense of his brother. They seem primarily to have served the Caliphate effectively and loyally, pacifying Eastern Iran, repressing the risings in Syria and even Irtikâ, obtaining the submission of rebels, including 'Alids, directing the administration in an orderly fashion, guaranteeing to the State important resources, undertaking works of public interest (canals of Kâtûl and Sîhân), setting wrongs aright with equity in accordance with the requirements of Islamic law and reinforcing the judicial administration by the institution of the office of the great kâdî. Doubtless by their behaviour they accentuated the process of iranisation which became evident from the beginning of the 'Abbasid regime, imparting to the vizierate a style which did not fail to attract subsequent imitators; in spite of their new prerogatives and exceptional prestige, however, their influence was a highly personal thing, as was the tragedy which terminated it. It does not appear that they ever sought to transform the vizierate in accordance with a hypothetical Sasanid model.

The activity of the Barmakids was not merely political and administrative. An important cultural and artistic achievement is also due to them. Indeed they acted as patrons of poets, distributing rewards for their panegyrics through the intermediary of a special office created specifically for the purpose, the diwân al-ghîr; they favoured scholars and gathered theologians and philosophers in their home, in assemblies (maâdîl) which have remained famous. They encouraged the arts, and as great builders, left numerous palaces in Baghdad, the most famous of which, that of Dja'far, subsequently became the Caliphal residence.

Neither did the influence of the Barmakids disappear with their fall. It continued to be exerted during the ensuing years through the medium of the wâzîrs and secretaries who came to power under al-Ma'mun and who, for the most part, were their former clients and dependants, as in the case of the famous al-Fadl b. Sahî. It is actually known that, at the time of their ascendancy, the ministers of al-Rashid had gathered around themselves a group of especially competent kûlîb, whom they had trained in their methods, and the following Caliphs were unable to dispense with them.

Finally adâb literature laid hold of the Barmakids, stressing their edifying and remarkable traits of character, often with some exaggeration (Yahyâ's "wisdom" and his gift for foretelling events, al-Fadl's haughtiness and ostentatious generosity, the elegant language of Dja'far) whilst some stories, such as those later to be incorporated in the collection of the Thousand and One Nights, popularised the figure of Dja'far, the wâzi and intimate companion of al-Rashid.
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4. Other members of the Barmakid family.

—Yahya had a brother, Muhammad b. Khalid, who was asked by his father to join his army in 795/1393 and was the only one spared by the Caliph when they fell.

In addition to al-Fadl and Dja'far, he had two other sons, Muhammad and Mūsā, whom less brilliant, nevertheless played a role at Court. The latter, known for his military bravery, was governor of Syria in 176/792. They were thrown into prison in 187/803 with their father and brother, but were released by al-Āmīn who showed them generous towards them. Mūsā remained in Ṭīrāk and fought in the Caliphal army, subsequently rallying to al-Ma'mūn, who later appointed him governor of Sind. He died in 221/835, leaving a son `Imrān who succeeded him and distinguished himself in several expeditions. Muhammad, on the other hand, had joined the Court of al-Ma'mūn at Marw, where he had been preceded by his son Ahmad and his nephew al-Abbās, the son of al-Fadl.

Of the numerous descendants of the Barmakids, one especially was famous as a musician and father of letters: Ahmad b. Dja'far, surnamed Dja'hsa [q.v.], grandson of Mūsā b. Yaḥyā and intimate companion of the Caliph al-Muqtadī.

Bibliography: L. Bouvat, Les Barmécides, 101 ff.; Dja'hshyārī, K. al-Wuṣūrī, Cairo ed., 297-98. The nīsha al-Barmakī—This nīsha was also born by persons not belonging to the Barmakid family. A first category comprises their clients and their manumitted slaves with their descendants. Others were natives of the quarter of Baghdād which had received the name of al-Barmāmī. They included the singer Daḥnār, the man of letters Muhammad b. Dja'[h]m, an astrologer who was present at the siege of Samālū, a wazīr of the Sāmānīs and an envoy of the Ghaznawīs.

A number of dynasties, both in Iran and North Africa, were later to claim descent from the Barmakids (Sarbadārān in Khūrāsān, Barānūk at Touāt). Finally a tribe, from whom the dancing-girls called Ghawāzī were recently still being recruited in Egypt, obtained the permission to use the word barmaḵī the pejorative sense which it sometimes assumes in modern Egyptian.
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BARANI, an old name for BULAND-SHAR (q.v.).

BARANI, Diya' al-Dīn, historian and writer on government under the Delhi sultanate. Born not later than 684/1285, (and probably earlier as he was old enough to remember witnessing convivial parties and to have read the whole of the Kur'ān in the reign of Djiālāl al-Dīn Khālīlī (689-91/1290-6), Barani was well connected with Delhi ruling circles. His father, Mu'ayyīd al-Mulk, was nābū to Arkālī Khān, second son of sultan Djiālāl al-Dīn Khālīlī, becoming nābū and Khādjiā of Bara in the first year of the reign of 'Alā' al-Dīn Khālīlī. Barani's paternal uncle, Malik 'Alā' al-Mulk was kōwāl of Delhi under 'Alā' al-Dīn Khālīlī and a prominent royal counsellor. His maternal grandfather, siyāh-sālrī Hūsān al-Dīn, wakālī-dār to Malik Barbak, was appointed to the shahmaḵī of Lak'hnawtī by Sultān Balban.

Barani himself became, for seventeen years and three months, a nādim of Sultan Muhammad b. Tughluq (752/1351-757/1351). The Siyar al-Awliyā describes him as an entertaining conversationalist and as having been a friend of the poets Amir Khusrū and Amir Ḥasan.

At the beginning of the reign of Frīrū Shāh Tughluq (752-90/1351-88) Barani was banished from court and, according to his own statement in the Fatīmāt Muḥammādī, was imprisoned for a time in the fortress of Pāhtēz. It is a possible hypothesis that he was associated with the attempt of Khwādja-Djahan Ahmad Ayāz to place a minor son of Muhammad b. Tughluq on the throne while Frīrū Shāh Tughluq and the army were extricating themselves from Muhammad b. Tughluq's expedition against Thattā in Sind.

Barani spent his remaining years in penurious exile, writing both in the hope of being restored to favour and of atoning for the sin to which he ascribed his misfortunes. He died not long after 728/1327 and was buried near the grave of Nizām al-Dīn Awliyā at Ghīyāhpūr. Four of Barani's works, the Ta'rikh-i Frīrū Shāhī, the Fatewā-yi Djiāhndārī, the Na'ti Muḥammādī and his translation of anecdotes on the Barmakids, the Akhbār-i Barmakīyyān, are known at present to be extant.

Barani is a significant (though in the total context of medieval Islam, not original) figure in Indo-Muslim thought on government. Holding the first four caliphs to have been the only truly godly rulers in the history of the community, Barani aimed in the Fatewā-yi Djiāhndārī, a work of the Fürstenspiegel type and in the Ta'rikh-i Frīrū Shāhī, to educate the de facto rulers of the day, the sultans, in their duty towards Islam in a corrupt age. In the form of dicta by Sultan Mahmūd of Ghazna, the Fatwā-yi Djiāhndārī advises sultans to enforce the shari'ā, to curb unorthodoxy (sci. especially falsafā), to abase the infidel, to employ only pious servants and to remain inwardly humble towards God though governing with the pomp and circumstance of pre-Muslim Persian kings, that is, in opposition to the ascetic sunna of the Prophet and the orthodox caliphs, as Barani, under Šūfi influence, conceived them.

The avowedly didactic Ta'rikh-i Frīrū Shāhī, dedicated to Frīrū Shāh Tughluq, shows what happens in history when the precepts in the Fatewā-yi Djiāhndārī are disregarded. It covers the period from the beginning of the reign of Balban (664/1266-87) to the sixth year of Frīrū Shāh Tughluq. The account of each sultan of Delhi is treated as a parable in which success or failure is explicable in terms of the sultan's adherence to or deviation from Barani's politico-religious theories. For example, Sultan 'Alā' al-Dīn Khālīlī is depicted as a successful sultan in so far as he subjugated the Hindus, overcame sedition, forbade strong drink and reduced the cost of living, but as an impious one since, Barani says, his motives were worldly, he neglected his own religious observations, wished to become a prophet, appointed low men to office and avoided the company of the religious— in particular of Shaykh Nizām al-Dīn Awliyā whose muṣāfīn and barakhdār were the true cause of the glory of the reign. Thus 'Alā' al-Dīn Khālīlī dies of suspected poisoning and within four years his family is exterminated. Barani's Ta'rikh-i Frīrū Shāhī is not an annal or chronicle; it is an important example of didactic historiography in Islam. (See further Ta'rikhī.)
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BARÁNIS, name of one of the two groups of tribes which together constitute the Berber nation [q.v.], that of the other being the Butr. It represents the plural of the name of their common eponymous ancestor: Burnus; for a possible origin of this name see Butr.

According to Ibn Khaldûn, the Baranis comprised five great peoples: Awraba, 'Agilha, Azdajja, Mašmūda-Ghumār, Kutama-Zawāwa, Sanḥādja, Hawwāra. Whether, however, the last three belong to this group is a matter of controversy; they are considered by some to be descendants of Ḥimyar and therefore non-Berbers. Neither they nor the Mašmūda will be dealt with here.

The most ancient habitat of the Baranis in the true sense of the term is the massif of the Awrās, the northern province of Constantine and the two Kabylia where they used to live as sedentary mountain dwellers. At the time of the first Arab invasion, in the first quarter of the 1st/7th century, the Awraba of the famous Kusayla [q.v.] had to abandon the Awrās, after the defeat and death of their chief. They went to northern Morocco, where they established themselves from the massif of the Zarhūn to the river Wargha; the names of some of their old tribes are to be met with today along the banks of this river: Ludjaya, Mazyat(a), Raghiwa. Whether, however, the last three belong to this group is a matter of controversy; they are considered by some to be descendants of Ḥimyar and therefore non-Berbers. Neither they nor the Mašmūda will be dealt with here.

The most ancient habitat of the Baranis in the true sense of the term is the massif of the Awrās, the northern province of Constantine and the two Kabylia where they used to live as sedentary mountain dwellers. At the time of the first Arab invasion, in the first quarter of the 1st/7th century, the Awraba of the famous Kusayla [q.v.] had to abandon the Awrās, after the defeat and death of their chief. They went to northern Morocco, where they established themselves from the massif of the Zarhūn to the river Wargha; the names of some of their old tribes are to be met with today along the banks of this river: Ludjaya, Mazyat(a), Raghiwa. Whether, however, the last three belong to this group is a matter of controversy; they are considered by some to be descendants of Ḥimyar and therefore non-Berbers. Neither they nor the Mašmūda will be dealt with here.

The Baranis-Awraba participated in the expeditions launched from Morocco against the Iberian Peninsula; some of them settled there and bequeathed their name to the Diābał al-Baranîs, now the Sierra de Almadén, to the North of Cordova.

Some of the Baranîs (from the North of Taza) in contact with the kingdom of Nukur which some of the Baranis arrived and established which contains a sub-group called the Werba, the present tribe (in dialect '1-Branes, ethnic '1-BarndvSi) which some of the Baranis and Awraba indications some of the Baranis and Awraba.

The role they played in connexion with Idrîs I [q.v.] is known.

We possess no information on the conditions in which some of the Baranis arrived and established themselves to the North of Taza. At all events, al-BAKîl indicates some of the Baranis and Awraba in contact with the kingdom of Nukûr [q.v.]. In the present tribe (in dialect '1-Branes, ethnic '1-Barnes) which contains a sub-group called the Werba, the memory of the prince of the Awraba who received Idrîs I (at Walîlî) has been retained and even the remains of his palace are shown there.

The Baranis-Awraba participated in the expeditions launched from Morocco against the Iberian Peninsula; some of them settled there and bequeathed their name to the Diābał al-Baranîs, now the Sierra de Almadén, to the North of Cordova.

Some of the Baranîs (from the North of Taza) formed part of the "Rif" contingents who took Tangier (1684). A village of the Ḥarkî of this latter town bears their name.

As for the Azdajja (and Misṭâsha) Baranîs, nothing is known of the reasons for their establishing themselves in the region of Oran; some of the Misṭâsha still live in the region of Bādis [q.v.]. There is the same lack of information concerning the Kutama of Morocco.

BARANTA — BARBA
central administrative organ (VTSIK) studied the
system of baranta in connexion with offences against the
customary law in the Republic of Kazakhstan
and the Oyrat Autonomous Region, under three
heads: simple, armed, and tribal.

Bibliography: Apart from works mentioned
in the text, see V. Barthold and A. Inan in IA
(art. Baranda); Raddoff, Wb. (1893-1912), Budagov,
Sram. slov. tur.-lat. nar., Petersburg 1869; Bukin,
Russ.-Krig. slov., Tashkent 1863; Ganizade,
Russ.-lat. slov., Baku 1902; K. K. Yudkina,
Karag. sloboda (Turk. tr. in A. Tayrany, Ankara
1945); A. N. Çudinov, Spraw. slov., Petersburg
1901; N. V. Goryaev, Sram. etimol. slov. russ.
yaz., Tiflis 1869; I. Y. Pavlovsky, Russko-nemetsk.
slov., Leipzig 1911; Kovalevsky, Mong.-russ.-
frans. slov., Kazan 1846; I. J. Schmidt, Mong.
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BARATHA, the name of a residential quarter
on the western side of ancient Baghdad to the
south of the quarter of Bāb Muhawwal, originally
some 3 kms. from ancient Baghdad. There used to be
in Barathā a mosque, designed for the prayer of the
Shi'ite sect, which Yakut (ed. 1806/1228) mentions as
being totally demolished. He also remarks that
the quarter itself was destroyed without trace. This
mosque was built in 329/941, later on it was pulled down by the 'Abbāsid Caliph Al-Rādi b. Billāh;
later still, it was reconstructed and maintained its
normal function until after 450/1058, when it was
finally abandoned.

Prior to the building of Baghdad, Barathā was a
village where, as the Shi'īs claim, 'All b. Abī Tālib passed by and performed prayers on the site of
the mosque. The name Barathā, derived from the
Syriac word Baraythā, has the meaning of "outer".
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BARAWA (Brava), a coastal town of Italian
Somaliad. The inhabitants, c. 9000, are mostly of
the Tuni tribe of the Digī Somali, who displaced the
Adīuran and are mingled with Boran Galla. The
soil is comparatively fertile; rice, grain and butter
are marketed and leather is worked. Barawa is perhaps
Yakūt's Bāwarī, which exported amber, and İdrīsī's
B'rwa (var. M'rwa) on the pagan frontier; other
Islamic geographers do not mention it. Barros,
following a Kilwa chronicle now lost, says Zaydīs
from Al-Aḥṣā' founded it soon after Māḏīghāh;
Stigand's informant attributed it to the Khalla
of Al-Makhādī b. Mawwād (1750-8). In the 8th/14th
century it was subject to Fata. The Chinese visited
"Pu la wa" about 821/1418. In 908-9/1503 12 shaykhs
captured by Rui Lourenço Ravasco made Barawa
tributary to Portugal. In 192/1517 Tristão da Cunha
and Albuquerque stormed and burnt it; Barawa
mustered 4-6000 defenders and afforded rich booty.
It recovered temporarily but decayed after the rise
of the Galla. Portuguese suzerainty was recognised
intermittently. Portuguese writers describe it as a
republik, governed by 12 shaykhs; Guilain mentions
a council constituted by the heads of 5 Somali and 2
Arab tribes with a monarch elected for 7 years, whom,
he was told, it had once been the custom to kill after
that time. Barawa was nominally subject to the
Al Bā Ṣa'īd [q.v.] who asserted their authority against
the Mazrūi c. 1238/1822, but tribute was sometimes
paid to Somali chiefs. For about 2 months in 1292/
1875-6 it was occupied by the Egyptians. The Anglo-
German declaration of 1930/1886 recognised Bā Ṣa'īd
rule. Three years later Italy announced a protectorate
over the coast and Barawa was subsequently leased
to her (see SOMALILAND). Harbour works were begun
in the hope of making it the port of the Diub (Juba)
region but were later abandoned.
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BARBĀ, a name given by the Egyptians to all the
temples and ancient monuments. This statement by
Ibn Djbayr is corroborated by Yakūt, according
to whom barbā, "which is a Coptic word", is applied
to solidly constructed ancient buildings of pagan
times, which served as laboratories for magic: they
were wonderful buildings, full of paintings and
sculptures. Abd al-Latif, in turn, noted the excel-
lence of the construction of these temples and the
balanced proportions of their forms, the prodigious
volume of the materials employed, and was astounded by
the great multitude of inscriptions, figures, sunk
carving and relief sculpture. In the eyes of some
Arab writers, these various representations served
a utilitarian purpose, namely to reproduce the
techniques and tools of various crafts and to
preserve a description of the sciences for future
generations.

The Christian historian of the Patriarchs of
Alexandria, Severus of Ashmūnayn, employs the
word barbā in the very precise sense of pagan temple,
in contrast to the buildings of the Christian cult.
The Arabic word barbā is, in fact, a transcription of
the Coptic p'rbād "temple", and usage has
endowed it with a classical plural barbā. The
expression barbā is also reported by Leo Africanus.

Many authors recount impossible stories concerning
these temples, either that they tell of the means of
defending the country against external enemies by
means of talismans or that these talismans help in
discovering treasures, which they take a greater
delight in elaborating.

The only relatively serious description, from the
pen of Ibn Djbayr, concerns the temple of Alkūmān,
which no longer exists.

Bibliography: Fihrist, i, 355; ii, 188; Ṣa'īd,
Al-Barbahari, Al-Hasan b. Ali b. Khalaf Abū Muhammad al-Barbahari, a famous Hanbali theologian, who died at Baghdad at a great age. He was both a traditionist (fakih), being above all, one of those prominent preachers (wāqif), who, in the history of the Caliphate during the 4th/10th and 5th/11th centuries, played so important a role in the struggle of Sunnism against the Shi'ī missionaries (dā'ī) and who, without exhibiting the least spirit of compromise, successfully managed to oppose the progress of Mawdudiite and semi-Mawdudiite-inspired theology (khalid).

Al-Barbahari was schooled in Hanbali doctrine by Abū Bakr al-Marwazī (died 275/888) (cf. Ta'īrīkh Baghdādī, iv, 423-425; Tabāhādī al-Hanbiliya, i, 56-63; Iḥāyār, 32-34) who was supposed to have been one of Ibn Hanbal's favourite disciples and one of the most assiduous reporters of the great imam's (khalīf) sayings, both in the field of jurisprudence (fikr) and, more generally, in that of moral theology (taṣawwuf), the rules of civility (aḥād) and of religious beliefs (fākhadīd). The famous mystic Sahl al-Tustarī (died 283/896), who founded the Sūlimiyah school (cf. EI1, iv, 119) and who was to exert an influence on several other major representatives of Hanbalism, was likewise his teacher.

Al-Barbahari is the author of a profession of faith, the Kūdūl al-Sunnah, the text of which has been transmitted to us in great measure by the kādī Abu l-Husayn in his Tabāhādī (ii, 18-43), and which recalls that composed by Ahmad Ghulām Khalīl (died 273/888), an opponent of the extremist Sufism of Abū Ḥamza and al-Nūrī (died 297/910) and himself an author with Hanbali affinities (cf. L. Massignon, Textes indéchiffrés, 212-213). Abu l-Hasan al-Aghārī (died 329/941) is held to have composed his own Iḥāya after a discussion with al-Barbahārī. An assertion which a comparative study of the two professions of faith does not show a priori to be inadmissible.

Al-Barbahārī's profession of faith is primarily a polemic denouncing the multiplication of suspect innovations (bid'at) and energetically enjoining a return to the precepts of the "old religion" (din 'ulūlī), as it was understood at the time of the first three Caliphs, before the schism which followed the assassination of 'Uthmān b. 'Affān and the succession of 'Ali b. Abī Tālīb. The principle underlying this restoration resides in imitation (takāhid) of the Prophet, of his companions and their pious successors, among whom al-Barbahārī frequently cites, with Ibn Ḥanbal, Mālik b. Anas (died 179/795), 'Abd Allāh b. al-Mubārak (died 181/997), Fudayyl b. Qīyād (died 182/903), and Bishr b. al-Hārith (died 227/842). Al-Barbahārī does not condemn the use of reason (ṣabīl); on the contrary he perceives therein a grace diversely distributed by God among his creatures and necessary to final salvation. Neither does he entirely reject what is bid'at as opposed to what is šāhīr, that is to say, what is inward and profound in contrast to what is outward and in conformity with the letter of the text, provided this bid'at has its basis in the Kur'ān and the Sunna. What he condemns above all else are the pernicious deviations, which result from the personal and arbitrary use of reasoning (ahadīr, ra'y; biyād) in the domain of religious belief. His theodicy, on the problem of the divine attributes (piyād), is limited to an attempt to reproduce the data of the Kur'ān and the Sunna.

Politically, he appears as an energetic defender of the rights of Kuraysh to the Caliphate, though he none the less reminds believers of the duty incumbent on them to obey all established authority, except where disobedience to God is involved. He is particularly severe in his condemnation of all attempts at armed revolt (khuradī bi 'l-sayf), considering in fact that the re-establishment of the Law should be effected by appeal to public opinion, by the duty of missionary preaching (da'wā), of enjoining the Good (amr bi 'l-maḥrūf) and of proferring good counsel (ṣawā'if). This re-establishment of the Law, in a world in which Islam had split up into numerous sects, was incumbent especially on the "people of the hāдж", on the ahl al-sunnah wa l-jamā'ī, whose triumph God had definitely assured. True to his doctrine, al-Barbahārī conducted so vigorous a personal action against bid'at and against the sects (jirka), especially against Mu'tazilism and Shi'ism, that he was at times accused of entertaining political ambitions.

Indeed, al-Barbahārī's influence is to be discovered behind several popular demonstrations and insurrections which broke out in Baghdad between 309/921 and 329/941. He was not unconnected with the opposition encountered by al-Tabarī who, in 309, had to be buried at night in his own house because of the hostility of the mob (cf. on these incidents, especially Bidāya, xi, 132 and 145-146).

In 317/930 there was a brawl in Baghdad involving considerable bloodshed between al-Barbahārī's followers and their adversaries, arising from the interpretation given to verse xvii, 81: "Perchance thy Lord will send thee to a sojourn worthy of praise (al-bid'a), thereby he conceals himself, though a number of the Hanbali theologian's disciples were exiled to Basra (Kur'ān, viii, 204; Bidāya, xi, 172). The measures then taken by the Caliph al-Kāhir for the re-establishment of morality were designed in some degree to appease the Hanbali critics.

Although the supporters of al-Barbahārī do not seem to have played a direct rôle in 322/934 at the time of the trials of al-Shāhmaghānī and of Ibn Mūsim, nevertheless the Kur'ān reader Ibn Shahnābdī, likewise accused of publicly teaching Kur'ānic readings divergent from those of the recension of 'Uthmān, was brought to trial by the
was"r Ibn Mu'kla and sentenced (cf. al-Suli, trans. M. Canard, i, 109 and 145), apparently as the result of a noisy demonstration by the Hanbals of Baghdād. The agitation by al-Barbahārī's supporters resurfaced its activity in 323/939, at the beginning of al-Rāḍī's Caliphate, still under the viserāte of Ibn Mu'kla, on the eve of Ibn Rādū's appointment as amīr al-umārā. Muslim historians (al-Suli, i, 114; Kāmil, viii, 229-231; Bidāya, xi, 181-182) depict the Hanbals' looting shops, intervening in commercial transactions to impose the prescriptions of the Law, attacking the wine-sellers and singing-girls, smashing musical instruments, pushing their way into private dwellings and denounced to the Prefect of Police any man found in the street with a woman, not being her mabrām (cf. K. V. Zettersteen, EI, iii, 1169, s.v. Rāḍū). The Caliphal authorities then prohibited al-Barbahārī's supporters from meeting and teaching and the Muslims from praying behind an imām following the Ḥanballī doctrine. As the ardour of al-Barbahārī's supporters did not diminish, a decree by the Caliph al-Rāḍī (text in Kāmil, viii, 230) was issued in 323, condemning Ḥanbālīism and excluding it from the Muslim community; it accused it of developing an anthropomorphist theodicy (taṣbīḥ) and of forbidding the visiting of the tombs of the great imāms (ziyārat al-kubūr). This condemnation only prevented Ḥanbali demonstrations for a while.

Al-Barbahārī's supporters resumed their agitation with violence in 327/940 under the amīr of Baḍjakm; they molested people going to the mawṣūl festival, that is to say the ceremonies organised in some mosques during the night of the 14th/15th Sha'ban (cf. al-Suli, i, 204 and 205). The Prefect of Police issued orders for al-Barbahārī to be found, but once again he concealed himself, though one of his lieutenants, a certain Dalla 3, was executed.

The likelihood of disarming the hostility of al-Barbahārī's supporters was further diminished by the fact in 328/941 that the amīr Baḍjakm had the mosque of Bārāqā rebuilt. This mosque had been demolished under the Caliphalate of al-Muqtādīr and was considered by Sūnnis as the "nest of Ṣḥīḥism" (cf. al-Suli, i, 142 and 208). When in 329 the amīr Baḍjakm was assassinated by a band of Kurdish brigands, the Hanbals of Baghdad, who had not been satisfied, attempted to demolish the mosque of Barāqā and also attacked the quarter of the money-changers and bankers, in the Dār 'Awn, which was at the heart of the financial and commercial life of the ʿAbbāsid metropolis (al-Suli, ii, 16 and 19). The Caliph al-Muṭṭakīr was obliged to have a number of Ḥanbals arrested and to place the Shīʿī fiqh mosque under a heavy guard.

At this juncture, in Rādjab 329/April 941, al-Barbahārī died in the house of Tāzūn's sister, where he had hidden himself and where he was buried (Tabābāt al-Ḥanābīla, ii, 44-45; Bidāya, xi, 201). Al-Barbahārī's influence also manifested itself in several contemporary Ḥanbalī doctors, especially Ibn Baṭṭaṭ al-Ukbarī (died 387/997), who met him at Baghādād on a number of occasions and who drew instruction in his ʿAbū l-Baṭṭaṭ, where his influence is likewise to be encountered, through the medium of Ibn Baṭṭaṭ, on the kāfī Abū Ṭa'lī b. al-Farrāʾ (died 458/1066) and several of his disciples, especially Ṣhāfī al-Abū Ẓafar al-Ḥāfīm (died 471/1080), who instigated several violent popular demonstrations against bid'atān.


BARBAROSSA [see KEHAR AL-DIYN]

BARBAŠTURU, an ancient city on the R. Vero, a tributary of the Cinca, N.E. of Sarkansta (Saragossa), in the approaches to the Central Pyrenees (modern Barbastro). It lay 50 km. almost due E. of Washka (Huesca). Barbasturu is stated by Ibn Hayyān to have become Muslim at the time of the conquest of Spain, and to have remained in Muslim hands continuously thereafter for upwards of 360 years. It became a bastion of the defences of al-Thāqīf al-ʿAṭlā (the 'Upper Frontier'), in which system it formed a link between Sarkansta and Lērida (Lérida).

In an account of the expedition of ʿAbd al-Malik al-Muṣaffar in 396/1006 against Pampluna, Barbasturu is mentioned as the last place in the lands of Islam (Ibn ʿAbīr, iii, 12). At the time of its capture in 456/1064 (see below) it belonged to the Banū Ḥūd of Sarkansta, and evidently contained a large population and substantial wealth, though the figures given by the Arabic historians who, following Ibn Hayyān, describe this event, appear to be exaggerated. In the summer of 1064, a Christian force estimated at 40,000 men presented itself before Barbasturu. These included Normans under Robert Crespin — the name is given by a Latin chronicler — and others, who with Papal support were engaged in what has been described as una crusada antes de las cruzadas, 'a crusade before the Crusades'. After a siege of more than a month they succeeded in taking the town. Though the part played by the Christians of Spain is obscure, and though Barbasturu was retaken after a year, its fall marked a stage in the reconquest of the country. It was spoken of by contemporaries as an event without parallel, the greatest disaster which had ever happened in Muslim Spain, and Ibn Hayyān's painful reflections on the state of al-Andalus were prompted by what had taken place there (cited in Ibn ʿAbīr, iii, 414-255).

It was characteristic of the disunity among the Spanish Muslims that the ʿAbbadīd al-Mūṭṭaqīd sent only 500 horsemen to al-Muqtādīr b. Ḥūd of Sarkansta, his nominal ally, then assembling forces for a counter-stroke, though urged to march in person by al-Hawzānī, a noble of Seville (Ibn Saʿīd, Al-Mughrīb fi ḥulū al-Maghrīb, ed. Sh. Dāyf, i, 234). Thanks to a corps of crossbowmen, al-Muqtādīr b. Ḥūd succeeded in retaking the town. Yet Barbasturu was not destined to remain much longer in Muslim hands. It was finally taken for the Christians by Pedro of Aragon in 1101, an event which seems to have been known to Yakūt (cf. Muḥjam al-Buldān, s.v.).


BARBAT [see DAVES]

BARCELONA [see BARSALONA]

BARDASIR [see KIRMAN]

BARDESANES [see DJOYANN]

BARĐA'A, an Armenian Partav, modern Barcha, a town S. of the Caucasus, former capital of Arrān, the ancient Albania. It lies about 14 miles from the
BARDHA'SL — BARDJAWAN

R. Kür (2 or 3 farsakhs according to the Arabic geographers; Mas'ūdī says inaccurately 3 miles, Moriṣij, ii, 75) on a river of its own (Mukaddasī, 375), the modern Titter (Tabarrir, Yākūt, i, 560). It was built, according to Baladhurī (194), by the Sasanid Kubād (ruled A.D. 488-531). This is varied by Dimishqī (Cosmographie, ed. Mehren, 189), who mentions as founder a mythical Bardhā'a b. Amrīn (?), earlier than Kubād. The Arabs attempted to explain the name as from Persian barda-, 'place of captives', from the original purpose to which it was put.

Bardhā'a served the Sasanids and the Arabs later as a frontier fortress against invasion from the N. and W. At the time of the Arab conquest it was taken after a short resistance by Salmān b. Rabī'ā al-Bāhili (Baladhurī, 201), probably before 32/652, the date of the Arab debacle at Balāngīar (q.v.). Thereafter Arrān, the province of which Bardhā'a and its territory formed part, was usually joined with Armenia, sometimes with Armenia and Adharbaydījān, under a single governor. In the Caliphate of 'Abd al-Malik its fortifications were reorganised by 'Abd al-'Azīz b. Hātim (Dhahabi, Dīwān al-Islām, i, 40, sub anno 867/975) and perhaps further improved by Muhammad b. Marwān a little later (cf. Baladhurī, 203). After this Bardhā'a was well fitted to be 'the spearhead of Muslim domination and policy in those parts' (V. Minorsky) and is mentioned repeatedly during the second Arab-Khazar war and later under the 'Abbasids. As late as the 10th century the population retained their own Arrān dialect (Iṣṭaqhrī, 192).

When Iṣṭaqhrī wrote (circa 320/932), Bardhā'a was at the height of its prosperity, though decline was soon to set in. It covered an area of several miles in length and breadth in a fertile and well-watered region, and in mere size challenged comparison with Rayy and Isbahan. In the district of Andarab, beginning a mile or two from the town, gardens and orchards extended continuously in every direction for a day's journey or more. Hazel-nuts and chestnut-nuts of the finest quality and a local fruit resembling that of the service-tree were to be found in abundance. Bardhā'a also produced superior figs, and especially those of the service-tree were to be found in abundance. Hazel-nuts and chestnut-nuts of the finest quality and a local fruit resembling that of the service-tree were to be found in abundance. Hazel-nuts and chestnut-nuts of the finest quality and a local fruit resembling that of the service-tree were to be found in abundance. Hazel-nuts and chestnut-nuts of the finest quality and a local fruit resembling that of the service-tree were to be found in abundance. Hazel-nuts and chestnut-nuts of the finest quality and a local fruit resembling that of the service-tree were to be found in abundance. Hazel-nuts and chestnut-nuts of the finest quality and a local fruit resembling that of the service-tree were to be found in abundance. Hazel-nuts and chestnut-nuts of the finest quality and a local fruit resembling that of the service-tree were to be found in abundance. Hazel-nuts and chestnut-nuts of the finest quality and a local fruit resembling that of the service-tree were to be found in abundance. Hazel-nuts and chestnut-nuts of the finest quality and a local fruit resembling that of the service-tree were to be found in abundance.

When the town was attacked by the Russians in 332/943, the Russian occupation continued for many months (a year according to Yākūt, ii, 834), and they were only dislodged with the greatest difficulty, after an epidemic had decimated their numbers.

Ibn Hawkal mentions the ill effects of the Russian invasion but, as is now clear from the second edition of his work (see Bibliography), he does not ascribe the catastrophic decline of Bardhā'a in his time, illustrated by a report that there are now only five bakers in the town where formerly there were 1200, mainly to devastation caused by the Russians. Rather this was due, he tells us, to 'the injustice of its rulers and the management of lunatics' (1st ed., 241), phrases which are amplified and explained in his second edition (336) as fiscal molestations which have 'eaten up it and its people', and to 'the neighbourhood of the Georgians (al-Kurdj)' (2nd ed. 337, 339). The latter appears to have reference to interference from the direction of Gandja (Djanza), later Elizavetopol, only 9 farsakhs distant from Bardhā'a (Yākūt, i, 559), where the Shaddādīs ruled in the 2nd half of the 4th/10th century. Otherwise the misgovernment and excessive taxation of which Ibn Hawkal speaks must probably be ascribed to the Daylamite Musafirids, unwilling to see Bardhā'a recover its former position to the detriment of Ardabil. Bardhā'a may have revived somewhat, since an attack upon it by a king of the Abagārs is said to have provoked reprisals by the Saltik Alp Arslān in 661/1067. But it is scarcely mentioned in the Mongol period and the long interval which has elapsed since then can hardly have been much more than it is today, a village in the midst of ruins.


(D. M. Dunlop)

BARDJAWAN, ABDU'L-FUTŪH, a slave who was for a while ruler of Egypt during the reign of al-Hākim. He was brought up at the court of al-'Azīz, where he held the post of intendant (Kaḥīrī, ii, 5; Ibn Tağhrībdīr, Cairo, iv, 48; Ibn Khallikān, ii, 201). He was a eunuch, and was known by the title Uṣṭādī [q.v.]. His ethnic origin is uncertain—Ibn Khallikān calls him a negro, Ibn al-Kalānīst simply a white (abyād al-lawn), al-Maqrīzī either a Slav or a Sicilian, the readings Şaşlabī and Şiklī both occurring in the MSS. of the Kaḥīrī (cf. S. de Sacy, Chrestomathie, i, 130).

Bardjawān was appointed guardian of the young heir to the Caliphate by al-'Azīz, and on the latter's death in Rāmāḍān 386/October 996, he proclaimed
his ward as the Caliph al-Hākim. His rôle was at first limited to the guardianship of the young sovereign, the effective power in the state resting with the Wāsita [q.v.]. Ibn 'Ammār al-Kutāmī, the leader of the Berber troops and faction. Ibn 'Ammār's power was no doubt irksome to the young Caliph and his guardian; the supremacy of the Berbers undoubtedly angered the Turks and other Easterners in the army, and probably also the general Egyptian population. Bardjawan threw in his lot with the Easterners, and in 386/996 wrote to Mungutakin, the Turkish governor of Damascus, inviting him to come with his army and save Egypt and also the person of the Caliph from the tyranny of the Berbers. Mungutakin, with Turkish, Daylamite, Negro, and local Arab support, advanced against Egypt, but was defeated near 'Aškalān by a Berber force sent by Ibn 'Ammār and commanded by Suyaymān b. Dā'far b. Fahlāb. Bardjawan was compelled for the moment to submit to Ibn 'Ammār, but a little later the support of Dāyāb b. Sāmsāma, a disaffected Berber officer, enabled him to challenge Ibn 'Ammār again, this time successfully. In an open clash Ibn 'Ammār was defeated and driven into hiding, while Bardjawan took his place as wāsita and effective master of the state (28 Ram. 385/2 Oct. 997). Bardjawan dealt leniently with the defeated Berbers in Egypt, but the breaking of their power proved to be permanent. In Damascus the Berber governor was dismissed and his Kutāmī troops massacred. A period of disorder followed in Syria, which was ended by vigorous action on the part of Bardjawan. Arab rebels were suppressed in Palestine and Tyre, and Byzantine attacks by land and sea repelled. Diplomatic negotiations ended with a ten-year truce between the Byzantine and Fātimīd Empires. In the West, Bardjawan conquered Barka and Tripoli, both of which were placed under eunuch governors. The latter conquest was of brief duration.

Emboldened by these successes, Bardjawan adopted a high-handed attitude to the Caliph, even going so far, according to some sources, as to restrict his riding on horseback and his expenditure on gifts (Nuwayrif, Bar-Hebraeus). Nuwayrif tells a revealing story, according to which Bardjawan used to call al-Hākim 'the lizard' (inajda), and when al-Hākim summoned Bardjawan to his death, the message ran: 'Tell Bardjawan that al-Hākim is an obvious error; Ibn Khallikān, 1, 110 (Eng. tr. i, 253) and ii, 201; Ibn al-Āthir, ix, index; Ibn Khaldūn, Ibar, iv, 57; Bar-Hebraeus, Chronographia, Eng. tr. 160, 182; Ibn Ṭaḥārībīrī, Cairo, iv, index; Yahyā b. Saʿīd al-Anṣārī, Annales, ed. Cheikh, 180, ed. Kratschko and Vassiliev, 453, 462. The fullest account is given by al-Makrīzī, Kihat, ii, 3-4; cf. ibid. 285 (= Silvestre de Sacy, Chrestomathie arabe 1, Paris 1826, 32 ff. and 94 ff. of the translation). See also Silvestre de Sacy, Exposé de la Religion des Druzes, i, Paris 1838, cclxxxiv-cxxcv; S. Lane-Poole, History of Egypt in the Middle Ages, 224-5; G. Witt, L'Égypte arabe, 197-5; A. 'Iqān, Al-Hākim bi'amrillāh, Cairo n.d., 44-9; I. Hrbeck, Die Slaven im Dienste der Fātimiden, Aro, xxii, 1953, 575-6.

BARDJAWAN — BAREILLY

BARDJAWAN (Barell) a district town in the Uttar Pradesh, India, situated in 28° 22' N. and 79° and 24° E. stands on a plateau washed by the river Rāmganga. Population (1951): 194,679. Founded in 944/1537, the town derives its name, according to tradition, from Bās Dō, a Barīlā Rādjpūṭ by caste. It is popularly known as Bāns Bareilly, partly to distinguish it from Rām Barell, the birth-place of Sayyid Ahmad Bārīlī [q.v.], and partly due to the proximity of a bamboo (bāns) jungle.

During the reign of Akbar, a fort was built here to check the depredations of the Rādjpūṭ tribes of Rohilkhand. As usual a town gradually grew round the citadel, and, by 105/1556, it had developed into a pargāna head-quarters. It remained of little importance till the reign of Shāh Dāhān when it was made the capital of Kēthēr (the old name of Rohilkhand). In 108/1675, a new city was founded by Makhrand Rāy, who was appointed governor in place of 'Ali Kullān, who had held the office since 1038/1628. During the Mughal period the city was ruled by a governor. After the death of Awrangzīb in 1119/1707 the Hindus of Bareilly turned out the Mughal governor, refused to pay the tribute, and assumed power. They, however, were soon out among themselves, and invited 'Ali Muhammad Kān, the Rohillah chieftain, to assume the reins of power. He soon extended his sway right up to Almārā in Kumaun but in 1158/1746 Muhammad Shāh, King of Delhi, marched against him and took him a prisoner to Delhi. He, however, soon won back his freedom and returned to the governorship of Bareilly in 1160/1748. On his death in 1162/1749 he was succeeded by Hāfiz Rāhmat Kān, who after some sharp encounters with Awadh forces, strengthened by Mahrratta contingents, became the unquestioned ruler of Rohilkhand. In 1184/1770 Nāgīlā al-Dawīla defeated Rāhmat Kān with the help of Mahrratta troops under Sīndhīa and Holkar. Shudījāl-Dawīla,
however, came to the rescue of the Rohillas but soon afterwards fell upon them, killing their chief, Rahmat Khan. In 1186/1773 Sa'dat Yar Khan was appointed governor of Bareilly under the Nawabs. In 1719/1814 the town was attacked by a Berber confederation, led by the Masmuda group, and had to pay a high tribute. In 1821/1861 the town was again attacked by a Berber confederation, but was defended with heavy losses. In 1832/1816 the residents rose against the imposition of a local tax but were dealt with an iron hand. In 1253/1837 and 1257/1842 serious Hindu-Muslim riots took place.

The town was badly disturbed during the "Mutiny" of 1273/1857 when Khan Bahadur Khan, grandson of Hafiz Rahmat Khan, was proclaimed governor. After the fall of Delhi in September 1857, Tafqul Husayn Khan, Nawab of Farrukhabad, Nana Sahib from Bihar and the Mughal prince, Firuz Shah, the rebel leaders, made the city their stronghold. They were, however, defeated, and the city was re-occupied by the British on 5 May 1857. In 1287/1871 a Hindu-Muslim riot again took place and since then several religious riots have occurred. With the establishment of Pakistan in 1947 the bulk of the Muslim population migrated from Bareilly.

'General' Bahkt Khan [q.v.] of the Bareilly Brigade, who was appointed Commander-in-Chief of the rebel forces during the "Mutiny", was a native of this town. Ahmad Raju Khan (d. 1340/1921), a theologian and scholar whose followers formed themselves into the Hizb al-Ahmd, popularly known as the Barilevis, also belonged to this town. The Hizb al-Ahmd is a sub-sect of the Hanafis, who, contrary to other Sunnis, believe that the Prophet possessed prescience or knowledge of the future. It is an article of faith with the Barilevis and has occasioned much strife among the 'Ulama' in the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent.

The only building of note is the tomb of Hafiz Rahmat Khan, constructed by his son, Dhu'l-Fakar Khan, in 1265/1847. This tomb has been repaired several times, the last in 1902-3 by the British Government.

Bibliography: Gulsarî Lâî, Tawârîkh-i Barelí (MS); Imperial Gazetteer of India, Oxford 1908, vi, 3-13; Ahtf 'Ali Barilevi, Hayât Hafiz Rahmat Khan, Badayûn 1333/1913; JRAS, 1897, 103; also see the article Hafiz Rahmat Khan; Al-'Ilm (quarterly), Karachi, iii, 28-32; al-Bâdâuni (Bib. Ind.), index. (A. S. Bazmee Ansari)

Bârûrûsh, formerly Bârûrûsh ("the village where loads are sold") and renamed Bâbul in 1927, is the chief commercial town in the second Ustân (Mâzdârân). It is situated four miles to the east of the Bâbul river, midway between the foot of the Elburz range and the coast; it is also 12 miles from Bâbul-i Sar (formerly Maqâhîd-i Sar), the port of the mouth of the Bâbul river.

The town was founded at the beginning of the 16th century on the site of the ancient city of Mâmtir or Mâmârî (see Melgunov, Das südliche Ufer des Kaspischen Meeres, Leipzig 1868, 177). Shâh 'Abbâs I used to visit the town and he laid out a garden to the south-east called Bâghi Shâh or Bâghi al-Iram. Bârûrûsh remained a place of little importance until the reign of Farah-i Diwârhây-yi Irân, ii, 36, 37.

(L. Lockhart)

Bârghâsh b. Sa'id b. Sultân, sultan of Zanzibar, succeeded his brother Ma'jid, 7 Oct. 1870, and reigned till his death, 27 March 1888. He tried to seize power on his father's death in 1876, and again in 1879 when he was defeated by British intervention and sent to Bombay for two years. The British supported his accession but he at once resisted their efforts to suppress the Slave Trade, for he relied partly on the Ibâdî Mlawa faction which was hostile to all European intervention in such affairs. In 1873 Bârghâsh was obliged to suppress all slave markets and prohibit all export of slaves, even to other parts of his realm; he was then invited to London. In 1876 the movement of slave caravans on land was forbidden. To enforce this policy Lloyd Mathews began training African troops in 1877. The British agent Kirk won Bârghâsh's confidence and became the dominant personality in Zanzibar till he left in 1886. In the African hinterland Bârghâsh had inherited wide claims and some prestige but very little power. In 1877 the failure of negotiations with Sir Wm. Mackinnon for a concession for the development of the country between the coast and Victoria Nyanza ruined Bârghâsh's best chance of enforcing his authority in the interior. In 1881 his proposal that Britain should guarantee the throne to his family and should exercise a regency if he died leaving a minor as heir was rejected. In 1884 the German agent Peters concluded twelve treaties with chiefs whose suzerain Bârghâsh claimed to be; their territories lay along the trade route to Tabora and Ujiji. In 1885 Germany took them and the Sultân of Witu under her protection. Bârghâsh's protest was met by the visit of five German warships and an ultimatum which lack of British support forced him to accept. A commission of British, German and French representatives then met to determine the extent of territory over which his authority would be recognised. Under British pressure Bârghâsh accepted their decision (for details see 80 Sa'id).

His health was now broken and he died immediately on his return from a visit to 'Umân. Bârghâsh was an able and energetic ruler who did much for Zanzibar, supplied it with pure water, organised the import of cheap grain and worked hard to restore the clove industry after a cyclone in 1872. Contemporary Europeans often called him xenophobe but his position was extremely difficult. Britain, whom he was powerless to resist, especially after the collapse of France in 1870, forced him to adopt an anti-slavery policy highly unpopular with his subjects and at the same time gave him no support against the Germans.

Bibliography: R. N. Lyne, Zanzibar in Contemporary Times, 1905; Emily Rüte (Bârghâsh's sister who eloped with a German), Memoiren einer arabischen Prinzessin, 1886; R. Coupland, The Exploitation of East Africa, 1939, giving references to British official sources and the private papers of British officials.

(C. H. Becker—C. F. Beckingham)

Bârghawâtâ, a Berber confederation belonging to the Masmuda groups, established in the Tâmânsâ (q.v.) province, extending along the Atlantic coast of Morocco, between Salé and Safi, from the 2nd/8th to the 6th/12th century.
They were an important confederation, able, according to the Andalusian geographer al-Bakrī, to put more than 12,000 cavalry into the field simultaneously. They appear to have played a certain political role up to the arrival of the Almoravids (second half of the 5th/11th century). Prior to this time, our information on the Barghawātā is almost exclusively due to the Eastern traveller Ibn Ḥawkal (second half of the 11th/16th century); several subsequent chroniclers merely reproduce the latter’s narrative with slight variations of detail (see Bibliography). Al-Bakrī says that he derived his information from statements, evidently preserved in Spain, made by a Barghawātā emissary to the Umayyad Caliph al-Hakam II, who came to Cordova on a mission in 352/963-964. Indications of the rôle played by the Barghawātā at the time of the conquest of Morocco by the Almohad Ṭab al-Muʿmīn are to be found in the memoirs of al-Baydhak (Doc. inéd. d’Hist. almohade) and in the History of the Berbers of Ibn Ḥalda, (see bibliography). In addition to the political importance of the Barghawātā confederation, they practised a special religion, which was nevertheless clearly derived from Islam; al-Bakrī alone gives us some meagre information on this subject, and the other chroniclers confine themselves to reproducing this.

Undeniably the Barghawātā’s appearance in history is connected with the Khāridjīte revolt of Maysara; the populations known under the name Barghawātā (several chroniclers affirm without adequate proof that this was not their contemporaneous name) embraced the Khāridjīte cause and in 127/744-745, if we are to believe a number of them, grouped themselves around an individual called Ṭarīf, whose origin is much disputed: some introduce him as a chief of the Zanāta and Zuwāgha Berbers, some as deriving from a Berber group in Southern Spain (Barbāt, the distorted pronunciation of which was supposed to give Barghawātā), whilst others even accord him a Jewish origin. The Sunni authors, it should be noted, sometimes display a tendency to attribute such an origin to the strongest personalities of the dissident sects: e.g. the Shīʿī Mahdi ʿUbayd Allāh (see Goldziher, Muh. Stud., i, 204). Nobody, however, says that Ṭarīf was descended from a family established in the Tāmāsna in early times. Whether or not he was the promoter of a doctrine derived from Sunni or Khāridjīte Islam, he certainly does not seem to have professed it. His son Ṣāliḥ may perhaps have been the progenitor of the new belief after living and studying in the East. If we accept the chronology of al-Bakrī, completed by Ibn Ḥalda, Ṣāliḥ came to power about 131/748-749 and transmitted it to his son al-Yasāʾ about 178/794/795. It was only the latter’s son Yūnus who, openly professed and spread the new doctrine during his 43 years reign, from 228/842-843 to 271/884-885. We possess no information on the relationships which must have existed at this period between the Idrīsīs and the Barghawātā; nobody mentions any conflict between them. Nevertheless, there is an indication of a bloody battle supposed to have been won near the Wādī Bāḥt by Abū Ḥufayl, Yūnus’s nephew and successor (271-300/982-913).

The Barghawātā would thus appear to have attempted to take advantage of the decline of the Idrīsīs to expand their domination and propagate their doctrine.

In the mid-12th century, they appeared to Ibn Ḥawkal as infidels against whom the Sunnis tended to conduct a holy war from the redāts of the region of Sād, since they could have been prosperous, as they maintained commercial relations with Fās, Aghmāt, Sūs, and Sidjilmāssa. They attempted to open diplomatic relations with the Caliphate of Cordova. Soon, however, they were subjected to a series of attacks by Sayf al-Andalusī, a client of the Umayyads, in 367/977-978, by Buluggn b. Zirī, viceroy of the Fatīmids in Ifrikiya, from 368 to 372/978-983, and by Wadih, the manumed slave of al-Mansūr b. ʿAbd Ṭūnīr, in 393/998-999. The decline of the Caliphate of Cordova enabled them to recover their breath, but after 420/1029, they were subjected to attacks by Abu ʿl-Kamāl Tamīm, chief of the Banū Ḥfrān, who conquered them. His death in 424, gave them a new respite until the arrival of the Almoravids in 451/1059. After putting up a fierce resistance, which cost ʿAbd Allāh b. Yāsīn, the spiritual leader of the new conquerors, his life, the Barghawātā were completely defeated and destroyed. Some, however, still remained in the Ťāmāsna when the Almohad ʿAbd al-Muʿmīn undertook the subjugation of Morocco after the conquest of Marrakesh (541/1147). Since they had embraced the cause of rebels against the new authority, the Almohad chief sent several expeditions against them and finally got the better of them in 543/1148-1149. From that date their group ceased to exist and gradually their name disappeared: Leo Africanus (beginning of the 10th/16th century) no longer quotes their name, though he knows that the Tāmāsna was formerly inhabited by “heretics”.

Their doctrine, according to the glimpse which al-Bakrī affords of it, appears as a Berber distortion of Sunni Islam with a number of Shiʿī infiltrations and an entirely Khāridjīte austerity as regards morals. Ibn Ḥawkal stresses the ascetic life and good morality of the Barghawātā. Moreover, the institution of numerous prayers (five during the day and the same number at night) frequent fasts, very complete ablutions, the harshness of punishments inflicted on thieves (death), fornicators (stoning) and liars (banishment) can be ascribed to Khāridjīte strictness. On the other hand, the fact that Ṣāliḥ promised that he would return when the seventh chief of the Barghawātā had assumed power and declared that he was the Mahdi who would fight against the Antichrist (al-dajīd) at the coming of the end of the world with the help of Jesus, can be considered a sign of Shiʿī influence. The month’s fast in Radjab or Šawwāl, the communal prayer instituted in Thursday, the food taboos (no heads of animals, no fish, eggs or cocks), and the rules of marriage are merely distortions of Muslim Law, as was the existence of a Kurā in the Berber language of 80 sūras, bearing names of prophets, animals etc. The continual use of the Berber language, the frequent resort to astrology and magic, healing by means of applications of the saliva of members of the family of Ṣāliḥ) bear witness to the influence of the Berber milieu on the faith of the Barghawātā. It is to be regretted that apart from a few ritual expressions and the beginnings of a sūra cited by al-Bakrī, we possess no original documents on this religion. In such circumstances it is impossible to arrive at an accurate idea of it.


(R. Le Tournear)

BARHEBRAEUS [see Ibn al-'Ibri].

BARHût (also Barahût or Balahût), a wâdi in Hadramaut, in one wall of which is the famous Bi'r Barhût, now known to be a cave rather than a well. The wâdi, which lies east of the town of Tarim, empties into al-Masila, the lower stretch of Wâdi Hadramaut, from the south. At the mouth of Barhût is Kabr Hud [see Hud], the most sacred shrine in southern Arabia, which is the object of a ziyâra every Shâbân.

Early Islamic traditions describe Bi'r Barhût as the worst well on earth, haunted by the souls of infidels. Barhût probably came to be known throughout Arabia because of its association with the tomb of Hud, rather than vice versa (cf. Wensinck, citation von Kremer, in El 2, i, 328); it is unlikely that a mere cave would have acquired such notoriety. The true nature of Bi'r Barhût was first revealed by D. van der Meulen and H. von Wissmann, who explored it in 1931. About 300 feet above the floor of the valley they found "a typical limestone cave, with nothing whatever volcanic about it. The curious but innocent smell inside does not come from sulphurous vapour; it is probably due to the dust from the weathering of the rock or, perhaps, to bats". An examination of the main corridor and various side corridors failed to disclose any noteworthy remains.

Bibliography: For the old erroneous beliefs regarding Bi'r Barhût, see the references cited by J. Schleifer in El 2, i, 654, to which should be added C. von Landberg, Études sur les dialectes de l'Arabe méridionale, i, Leiden 1901, 432-47, 481-4. For the cave, see D. van der Meulen and H. von Wissmann, Hadramaut, Leiden 1932.

BARID, word derived from the Latin verusdi/ Greek herodes (of uncertain origin, perhaps Assyrian) "post horse", usually applied to the official service of the Post and Intelligence in the Islamic states, and likewise to the mount, courier and post "stage". The institution of the state postal service was known to the Byzantine and Sasanid Empires, from which it would appear the first Caliphs only required to borrow it, its foreign origin being confirmed by a partly Persian terminology. The barid operated from the Umayyad period and 'Abd al-Malik is considered as having strengthened its organisation, once he had re-established internal order. From the beginning of the 'Abbasid regime, the Post was one of the most important governmental services and its direction was entrusted to intimates of the Caliph, such as al-Ja'far the Barmaid, or to Palace eunuchs. The various Caliphs developed the system of stages which, in the middle of the 3rd/9th century, covered the whole Empire.

The actual organisation of the post in the 'Abbâsîd period is sufficiently well known thanks to the works of Ibn Khurraḍādhîb and Kudâmâ, composed for the use of the secretaries of state in the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries, which provide lists of stages. The Empire contained no less than nine hundred and thirty stages (sikka, also called ribât in Iran and markaz al-barid in Egypt), theoretically, situated two farsâkhs (12 km.) apart in Iran and four (24 km.) in the western provinces; officials (muwaṭṭâbûn) were responsible for ensuring the transport of the post (al-kharâj) within the times allotted. The messengers (fuyûdî, furdûshî) used mainly mules in Iran and camels in the West, but sometimes horses as well. The organisation, however, remained flexible and several times a Caliph, a wâsr and even an ordinary governor were to be found temporarily strengthening the postal service on a particular route for political or military reasons. Pigeons were also employed for sending urgent news. The Post being an official service, it only transmitted private letters as an exception to the rule. The mounts also served to carry men, when these were agents of the State, and we even find the new Caliph al-Hâdî availing himself of the services of the barid to return to Baghdad from Djurâdân after the death of his father (al-Tabari, iii, 547 and al-Dhâlibîjâbûrî, K. al-Wuzârâ', Cairo ed., 185).

The Postmasters (wâshi al-barid), who came under the authority of the director of the department of the Post (sikka diwân al-barid) were not restricted in their duties to the transmission of official letters emanating either from local officials or from the central services. Thanks to a text of al-Tabari relating to the Caliphate of al-Manṣûr and to a diploma of investiture preserved by Kudâmâ, we are acquainted with the duties of these officials. They had to provide the central government with all necessary information on the state of their province and agents' activities, on the attitude of the commissioners for land taxation and Crown lands and that of the kâdis, and on the monetary and economic situation. Their supervision extended also to the governor of the district, as is shown by the episode of Tahir's [q.v.] autonomy. In addition, they were also entrusted with the duty of redressing grievances (Miskawayh, Eclipse, i, 25). In Baghdad the reports assembled by the director of the diwân were communicated directly to the Caliph, at least in the early period. In addition, there was a director of intelligence (Îkhabâr), entrusted with the supervision of the officials and officers of the capital, including the wâsr himself when necessary (Miskawayh, Eclipse, i, 24); this office, which seems to have been independent of the Postal Service properly so-called, was entrusted to eunuchs or amirs enjoying the sovereign's confidence.

If we are to credit the account in the Ta'rif of al-'Umâr, the Buwayhids "cut off" the barid so as to deprive the Caliph of his means of gaining information, thus bringing him more surely under their tutelage. It was in fact in their time that "runners" (su'dî) first appear in the East. Gradually the postal service seems to have become increasingly disorganised until its suppression by the Saldûkîs (455/1063), after which extraordinary "emissaries" alone were used. At the time of the Crusades, the Zangids and Ayûbîs had no real postal service at their disposal, but made use of runners, swift cameleers and pigeons.
In the Mamluk State, the postal service for a time recovered its former importance, and its workings are known to us through texts and archaeological remains. Its reorganisation was the work of Baybars, who not only drew upon the example of the 'Abbasid Caliphs, but also on that of the Mongol Empire, with which he had to contend. The Mamluk barid, an organ of the State closely linked with the Holy War, therefore, assumed primarily a political and military rôle, although later it was adjusted to favour commercial traffic. Directed initially by the sultan himself, it later passed into the hands of the secretaries of state, recruited from the famous family of the Banu Fadl Allah, who imparted to it a bureaucratic character, before passing back to the amir dawddar. In addition to couriers (baridi) commanded by a mubaddam al-baridyya and recruited among the mamluks of the sultan's household, the personnel included stage grooms (tāḥā) and "outriders" (sawaḍā). The postal service first operated in Egypt and on the Cairo-Damascus route (a distance normally covered in a week) and was subsequently extended to the towns of the Syrian coast and the fortresses on the Taurus borders. The stages for changing horses, theoretically four jarrabāgh apart, were first established in public caravanserais. Then special buildings were erected for this purpose, of which the almost universal type, apart from architectural improvements, corresponded to the requirements of "stabling the sultan's horses and housing the small number of men in charge of them" (J. Sauvaget). The routes were then adjusted to ensure a quicker and more regular service. At the same period, the reception of the couriers by the sultan was surrounded by a special ceremonial and their badge of office, known from its employment in Mamluk heraldry, was given a more sumptuous appearance. Pigeon post and a system of visual signalling were also developed. The invasion of Tmūr (803/1400), however, destroyed this organisation, and was known to us through texts and archaeological remains.

The institution of the Post existed in the various Muslim states, where it met practical requirements and harmonised with the essential principles of the Qur'ān, the inviolability of letters and state secrets; its form, however, was not always very developed. In Muslim Spain in the 14th/15th century, the State postal service had not the same importance as it possessed in the East; it employed messengers mounted on mules and Sudanese runners (raṭḥās), which reveals the sketchy character of the organisation, and was directed by a jāḥīb al-burud, a high official, who seems also to have had a network of agents at his disposal to provide intelligence. In the Ḥafṣid state in eastern Barbery, the Post assumed a more rudimentary aspect; the couriers had to provide their own mounts, and there were no fixed stages where they could change them. The Post also existed in Ṣafawid Iran as well as in the Ottoman Empire (see further POSTA, KAYKĀS, TARAR, ULAB).

resources and he did not hesitate to have his brother Abū Yusuf assassinated in Safar 332/November 943 for the simple purpose of possessing himself of his wealth. However, he himself died shortly afterwards in Shawwal 333/July 944 and was replaced by his son Abū 'l-Kāsim. The latter had to protect himself against the intrigues of his uncle Abu '1-Husayn who, seeking to obtain the governorship of al-Baṣra for himself, was in the end condemned to death and executed in Bagdad at the end of 333/944. He was then obliged to fight the Buwayhid Mu'taz al-Dawla who, in 356/967, expelled him from al-Baṣra. Forced to flee to the Carmathians of al-Bahrāyn, his political rôle came to an end. He died in 349/960. Abū ‘Abd Allāh had four other sons, to whom incidental references are made in the chronicles.


(D. Sourdel)

BARĪD SHAHĪS. A dynasty founded by Kāsim Barīd, who was originally a Turkish slave sold to Muḥammad Shāh III, the 13th of the line of the Bahmanids [q.v.]. A man of outstanding personality, a good calligrapher and musician, he also proved his mettle on the battlefield and rose to be the kotwal in the reign of Mahmūd Shāh, and after the death of Mālik Ḥasan Nizām al-Mulk, arrogated to himself the office of chief Minister of the tottering Bahmani State. He had often to contend with the more powerful fiefholders of the Kingdom who had become virtually independent at Bīdāpzūr, Ahmadnagar and Golkonda, but his chief strategy lay in his bring always at the capital, Bīdar [q.v.]. Kāsim died in 949/1542 and was succeeded by his son Amīr Barīd. The authority of the Bahmanī Sultāns had been shattered by Kāsim, and what was left of it was now put an end to by his successor, till, after the flight of the last titular monarch, Kālīm Allāh he became supreme at Bīdar. But he had to cope with the power of ‘Alī ‘Ādī Shāh of Bīdāpzūr who actually occupied Bīdar after routing the Barīdī ruler. The citadel was restored after a while, but only after the forts of Ḵāndār and Kāryānī had been annexed to Bīdāpzūr. Amīr Barīd tried to bring at least the small fiefholders under the direct control of the centre, much as Māḥmūd Gāwān had done [q.v.], but he was not successful. He died in 950/1543 and was succeeded by his son ‘Alī ‘Ālī Barīd was a lover of literature, art and architecture. However, the Rangī Mahal within the fort at Bīdar and his own well-proportioned mausoleum are two outstanding monuments to his taste. He was blessed with a long reign. He was the first of the Barīdīs who adopted the royal title, although for the simple purpose of possessing himself of his wealth and then by Kāsim II who was succeeded by his infant son known as ‘Arīrī ‘Alī Barīd Shāh. A relative, known as Amīr Barīd Shāh II put him aside and occupied the throne. He was succeeded by a ruler who is called in a bilingual inscription Mirzā Wāli Amīr Barīd Shāh. It was in his reign that the Barīdī dynasty came to an end and Bīdar annexed Bīdāpzūr in 1028/1619.

Very few Barīdī coins have been found. Although Ferištā, an historian of the late Bahmani period (pp. 151-60). The tomb of Bīdāpzūr is incomplete on his sudden death in 949/1542, without any date. These are all in the Haydarābd Museum.


(H. K. Sherwāni)

II. — Monuments. All the monuments of this dynasty are in the town of Bīdar [q.v.]; as successors to the well-established Bahmani dynasty they inherited many fine structures, and their building activity was more a matter of adaptation and rebuilding than of the erection of any major structures. The progress of the Barīdī style is well illustrated in their tombs, which form a royal necropolis some 6 km. west of the city walls, and occupy a large area on account of the vast garden-enclosures of each tomb. Page references in the following account are to G. Yazdani, Bīdar: its History and Monuments, Oxford 1947.

The tomb of Kāsim I, d. 910/1504, is a small insignificant building with a plain conical dome. The fortunes of the dynasty came quickly to a close after ‘Alī Barīd. He was followed by ‘Ībrāhīm and then by Kāsim II who was succeeded by his infant son known as ‘Arīrī ‘Alī Barīd Shāh. A relative, known as Amīr Barīd Shāh II put him aside and occupied the throne. He was succeeded by a ruler who is called in a bilingual inscription Mirzā Wāli Amīr Barīd Shāh. It was in his reign that the Barīdī dynasty came to an end and Bīdar annexed Bīdāpzūr in 1028/1619.
but is incomplete and presents surfaces of lime-laid masonry. Carved corner jambs show the Hindu ishta as part of their decoration (pp. 160-1). Both these tombs have a large dome, not stilted but recurved at the base to form a three-quarter orb, which appears somewhat top-heavy for the structure. This constriction of the dome is characteristic of the contemporary buildings of the Kutb Shāhī and 'Adil Shāhī [q.v.] dynasties at Golconda and Bijapur also. The single opening is reverted to in the tomb of Kasim II, which is better proportioned, but the open design is apparent in the dome over the mihrab of the Kāli (‘black’) masjid, pp. 166-7. The Džāmi' Masjid of the town (see Bīdar), a late Bahmani building, was restored during the Baridi period (chain-and-pendant motif in spandrels of the façade), pp. 103-4.

From the time of All Barid the buildings become more ornate in their minor detail, and the influence of the Hindu mason becomes more apparent; in some Baridi buildings—e.g., the Kāli masjid—the forms used in stone often seem more appropriate to wood-work. Much of the later work shows that meretricious character often apparent in the buildings of a dynasty in decline.

Bibliography: Fuller details of many of the above buildings are given in the article on Bīdar, [q.v.]. See particularly Yazdani, op. cit., for full references, extensive plates, drawings, plans, etc., and bibliography given in article Bīdar. (J. Burtou-Pagc)

BĀRĪH (Ar.), a term applied to a wild animal or bird which passes from right to left before a traveller or hunter; although opinions differ on this point, this is generally interpreted as a bad omen, because, it is said, it presents its left side to the hunter who does not have time to take aim at it; an animal which passes from left to right (ṣābī) is on the contrary of good omen. The nāṭḥ approaches from the front, and the kād from the rear.

Bibliography: Freytag, Einleitung, 165; Wellhausen, Kest 2, 202; Doutté, Magic at religion, 359; Džābih, Tarbī, ed. Pellat, index; L.A. s.v.; Maydanī, under mai ibi-sābīḥ kād al-barīḥ. (Ed.)

BĀRĪMMĀ [see Hamrīn, Džabāl].

BĀRIRĀ, a slave woman who had arranged to buy her freedom in nine (or five) annual instalments, appealed to Ašīṣa who agreed to pay the whole sum. The owners were willing to sell her, but insisted on retaining the right of inheritance from her. When the Prophet heard this he told her to buy her, for the right of inheritance belonged to the one who set a person free. Ḥārīm therefore paid the money and set Barira free. She remained as Ašīṣa’s servant and is said to have died during the Caliphate of Yazid I (60-64/680-683). In the tradition of the Ile she was consulted regarding Ašīṣa (cf. Bukhārī, Sahāhāl, 15). Three sunnās are connected with her: (1) The Prophet said the right of inheritance belongs to the one who sets a person free. (2) She was given her choice about staying with her husband Mughlīh who was a negro slave, and when she refused in spite of the Prophet’s plea for Mughlīh she was told to observe the sīdā period appropriate for a divorced woman. Mughlīh is said to have followed her in the streets of Medina weeping. (3) Once when the Prophet came in when meat was being cooked and was given something else to eat he asked the reason. On being told that the meat was sadaqa given to Barira, he said it was sadaqa to Barira but a gift to him, meaning that one who had received sadaqa could give some of it as a present to another. Barira is said to have warned ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwân that if he became ruler he must avoid shedding innocent Muslim blood.


BĀRKA, a word applied by the Arab writers both to a town—now al-Margj—and to the region which belonged to it, that is to say Cyrenaica, a broad African peninsula jutting out into the eastern Mediterranean between the Gulf of Bomba and that of the Great Syrtis, situated, therefore, between long. 20° and 30° east of Greenwich and the parallels 30° and 33° of latitude. To the east begins the Marmarica, whilst the vast eastern Libyan Sahara stretches away to the south.

The relief is made up of plateaux, resulting from the folding, in the Miocene age, of thick layers of Cenomanian limestone and lower Tertiary; they slope gently towards the south, where the Sahara table has not been raised up, giving way to low alluvial plains and falling away to the sea in graded levels. The high plateau, the Dżabāl Akhdar (Green Mountain) rises from 500 to over 600 metres, reaching its highest point at 868 to the south of the ruins of Cyrene. An intermediate plateau, from 250 to 400 metres, narrow in the north, then widens out to the west and south-west; it contains al-Margj and dominates the coastal plain of Benghāzī, which is also of limestone. That Cyrenaica is not a desert like its vast hinterland is due to the influence of sea and altitude: its temperatures are moderate in summer and it enjoys relatively high rainfall. January and July-August temperatures are 13.5° C. and 25.8° at Benghāzī, at sea-level, 10.4° and 23.9° at al-Margj at an altitude of 285 metres, and 8.4° and 22.3° at Cyrene, situated at 621 metres, where snow is not unknown. Rainfall, slight on the western littoral (266 mm. at Benghāzī) and inadequate for almost all cultivation without irrigation as the local soils are often heavy, increases in the northern parts of the first plateau with 471 mm. at al-Margj, and especially on the second, where more than 500 and even 600 mm. fall in the region of Cyrene. In contrast, rainfall declines towards the east (300 mm. at Derna) and, very rapidly, towards the south-east and the south. Likewise, the wādī running down towards the Sahara only have water after the heaviest rains and end in vast enclosed depressions; of the very short and deeply embanked Mediterranean tributaries, only the wādī Derna has a perennial flow of water. The waters filter away into the limestone of the plateaux and only reappear in a few “Vauclusian” springs at the base of certain escarpments. The plateaux have a “carstic” relief, with swallow-holes, sink-holes, extensive areas without surface drainage and grottos. The high plateau, the Dżabāl Akhdar, still supports, to the south of al-Margj and Cyrene, several fine forests of horizontal cypress (Cupressus sempervirens, var. horizontalis), green oaks, Aleppine pines and Phoenician junipers; in the main, however, it is covered by low forest and a scrub of mastics and wild olives. Cyrenaica comprises 110,000 hectares of forest and scrub. The clearings, extended by man, afford good pasturage and fertile brown and grey land for cultivation. This very limited good region quickly passes on the coast and to the south into scanty heathdominated by a few junipers and broken
by increasingly extensive stretches of steppe. The large rocky outcrops enclose somewhat narrow areas of red clay soils, relatively fertile, but for the most part requiring additional water for so slight a rainfall. 55 kilometres to the south-east of Benghazî and 60 to the south of Derna, begins the Sahara, with its very scanty pasturages and light soils.

"Serviceable" Cyrenaîca, a narrow fertile region and one favourable to sedentary life, isolated by the steppes of the Marmarica and Syrûtica and by the vast Libyan desert, has always been a dependency of the East. A land of nomadic Libyans, it became the sole African dependency of the Greek world with the five colonies of the Pentapolis founded between the 7th and 5th centuries B.C.: Cyrene, the first to be created, and admirably situated in the heart of the Diabal Akhdâr, its port Apollonia (Mârsâ Sûsî), Barkê (al-Mardjî), Euhesperidis (Benghazî) and Teuchira (Tocra). It was subsequently attached to Ptolemaic Egypt, at which time Ptolemâis (Toûlmeta) and Darnîs (Derna) originated. As a Roman province, it was beset by frequent disturbances and was far from prosperous. In the 4th century A.D., it was attached to the Eastern Empire and formed part of the Byzantine Empire down to the 7th century, without ever recovering its activity of the Greek period. On the eve of the Arab conquest, its agriculture was receding before the advance of pastoral life. Cyrenaça was occupied by the Arabs after two campaigns conducted by 'Amr b. al-Àsî in 22/642 and 643. Subsequent expeditions crossed it, gradually reaching and conquering the Maghrib. Thus it became a major thoroughfare, both military and commercial, from Egypt westwards, either via the southern depression and oases such as Awgjila or by the detour of the northern plateaux. The Berber tribes, the Lawată, the Hawâra and the Awriga, intermingled with Arab elements, took increasingly to stock-breeding, which spread at the expense of agriculture: exports to Egypt then consisted of live-stock, wool, honey and tar Bâkî, trans. de Slane, 153; Barbà remained the only considerable centre. The region, linked to Egypt, was, like the latter, dependent in turn on Damascus, Baghdât and then the Fâtimids. The Banû Hilál and Banû Sulaym invaded, who, in the 9th/10th century left Egypt and spread over the Maghrib, crossed the Barbà region, which gradually became completely bedouinised. In Ibn Khaldûn's time, in the 9th/10th century (Histoire, trans. de Slane, i, 164-165), its towns and villages were ruined and the population was made up entirely of semi-nomadic and nomadic herdsmen, living only in tents. The tribes formed two main groups, the Mrâbûtîn (Murâbûtîn) and the Sa'âdîf. The Mrâbûtîn are thought to have a Berber origin and comprise two groups: the Barbâthîn to the west, whose main tribes are the Maghârâba (Syrîtica), the 'Urfa and the 'Abbåd (al-Mardjî), and, on the other hand, the Harâtî, who include the Dorsa, on the littoral, the Hasa, the 'Aylet Fâ'îd and the Brà'âsà north and south of the central Diabal Akhdâr and especially the 'Abedât on the plateaux south of Derna and the Gulf of Bombà. As regards the Sa'âdîf, they lay claim to purely Arab origins: they are the Frâghyâr and the Awâghîrî on the steppes of the south-west, the minor tribes of the Marmarica and the nomads of the Awgjîlâ-Djâlî region. Outside the urban centres, the entire population were Sunnî Muslims of the Mâliîf rite; all spoke Maghribî type Arabic dialects, except the inhabitants of Awgîlâ in the south, the first Berber-speaking locality to be encountered going westwards.

It was not until the end of 1911, after determined resistance by the Beduin and Sanûsîyya, that the Italians became masters of the whole of Cyrenaîca with its hinterland. They did their utmost to colonise it. The first colonists settled, in rather hazardous conditions, on the unpropitious Benghazî plain and in the vicinity of al-Mardjî. Systematic effort, however, was directed towards the exploitation and settlement by Italians of the Diabal Akhdâr, where, between 1934 and 1939, a dozen villages were founded. "Demographic" and then "mass" colonisation was extended over a total of 80,000 hectares, producing wine and olive oil. On the 9th January 1939, Cyrenaîca, like Tripolitania, was integrated with its hinterland in Italian territory. By this time, the Italians had begun to provide Cyrenaîca on a large scale with the equipment and services of a colonial country in the course of modernisation: a railway line from Benghazî to al-Mardjî and Solûk (164 km.), a network of roads in the west and the north, ports (especially at Benghazî), aerodromes, educational establishments and hospitals, postal services, works to supply water, notably a pipe-line over 200 km. with pumping stations, reservoirs and branch conduits to serve the villages of the Diabal Akhdâr, etc. Cyrenaîca entered the war period in full development. But all Italians left the country in the face of the final victorious offensive of the British Eighth Army in November-December 1942 and it then came under British Military Administration. The British then placed Idris, the leader of the Sanûsîyya, at the head of the amirate of Cyrenaîca and, in 1949, assisted him to accede to the throne of the Libyan Federal Union, which, with Cyrenaîca, comprises Tripolitania and...
Barka. Nothing remains of the agricultural work of the Italians; the country has reverted to pastoral life, with a little barley being grown, and the villages have fallen into ruins. The wretched survivors supported the few industrial undertakings (fish canning-factories, breweries and distilleries, boot and shoe factories), which they had set up at Benghazi. Exports now only include a few products derived from stock breeding, salt and sponges harvested by the Greeks in the Gulf of Bomba and the Great Syrits. Cyrenaica, prolonged by its immense Saharan hinterland, stretching to lat. 26° and embracing the oases of Kufra, covers 855,400 km² (out of a total of 1,759,500 for the whole of the Federal Union of Libya), though it contains only 291,350 inhabitants, almost all in the North (out of a total of 1,091,800).

Its average yearly production is 360,000 quintals of cereals (barley and wheat), and it has a stock of between 450 and 500,000 sheep, 350 and 400,000 goats, 30 and 35,000 head of cattle and 20,000 camels. Sparsely populated, very poor in spite of the fertility of some of the regions in the north, deficient in financial resources and administrative personnel, Cyrenaica is dependent on the financial and technical help provided by Great Britain, by the United Nations and the United States.


Barka'Id, in 'Abbásid times one of the sequence of small towns on the main route between Nisibín and Mawsil, in the Djazira province, the others being Adhrama to the west, and Bā'aynatha and Balad (where the Mawsil-Sindjar road bifurcated south-westward) to the east. Barka'Id, of which the modern Tall Rumaylan, north of the railway line (and near to Tall Kokhe station thereon) may possibly mark the site, was probably just inside the Bet de Canard (eastward extremity of the modern Syrian province of Djazira), and lay some 55-55 miles from Nisibín, and 80 from Mawsil. It is described by a number of Arab geographers as a place of considerable size, especially in the 3rd/13th century, with its walls and three gates, excellent springs, 200 shops (largely wine-shops) and busy traffic. It was, in its best days, the country-town of the district of Baḥá', which covered most of the country between Mawsil and Nisibín. It continued as a recognised staging-post until the 7th/13th century, but much diminished in scale by reason of the natural decay of travellers and caravans to avoid a place always notorious—indeed proverbial—for its population of thieves and robbers; Barka'Id declined, therefore, to mere village status while its better reputed neighbours (notably, it is said, Bābahluz, on an alternative route) increased.

Bibliography: BGA, passim, particularly Vol. vi, 214, Note I. (also 164); Vâkıût, i, 57 f., 701; Abu 'l-Fida', Tabākim, ii, 294; Harțel's 7th. Mahāmā: Le Strange, 99; K. Ritter, Erdkunde, ix, 162-3; F. Tuch in ZDMG, i, 62-64; M. v. Oppenheim, Vom Mittelmear zum Persisch. Golf (1900), ii, 149-144, 167-8 (de Goeje's Note). (M. Streck-S. H. Longrigg).

Barqūk, al-Malik al-Zahir Sayf al-Din, Mamlūk Sultan of Egypt. He was the first of a new series of rulers, to whom history refers as Circassians in memory of the country where they were originally purchased as slaves, and as Burjūl (see Burjīyā), because Barkūk was the first to have belonged to a regiment with their barracks in the dungeons (burdū) of the Cairo Citadel.

Barkūk provided the link between the two dynasties of Mamlūk sultans: before ascending the throne, he ruled Egypt as Marshal of the Armies, al-bāḥāk al-asākir (q.v.), during the turbulent reigns of two sultans, both minors, of the line of Kālāwūn. Purchased in the Crimea, Barkūk, unlike the rest of the Mamlūks, was no son of an unknown father but could state in his monumental inscriptions that he was the son of Anas; the latter was invited to come to Egypt, where he occupied a position of some standing.

Sold to the all-powerful Ylbūghā 'Umarī, the Marshal who had succeeded in breaking the ill-fated Malik Nāṣir Ḥasan, Barkūk was for a short while imprisoned after the execution of his master. He passed into the service of the Court, but was soon involved in the conspiracy which ended in the assassination of Malik Ashraf Shābān in 783/1377.

He was then promoted to be Marshal of the Armies by Malik Mansūr 'Ali, a seven-year-old child. He had to contend with the ambitions of his fellows, and there was continual warfare, from which he finally emerged the victor. He was then able to gather a group of clients round himself and, when the Sultan died of plague in 784/1382, Barkūk began by placing a brother of the late ruler on the throne, the eleven year old Ħājīdīl. In the end he threw off the mask and, on the pretext that an energetic ruler was needed for the protection of the country, at the end of the same year had the crown offered to himself by a council of the magistrates presided over by the Caliph.

Barkūk was soon up against serious difficulties, which were momentarily to make him lose power. They started with the revolt of the governor of the province of Aleppo, Ylbūghā Nāṣirī, who was joined by a dismissed Mamlūk named Minṭāsh. The rest of the Syrian governors joined the movement, including the governor of Shīb, on the remotest part of the frontier. When the Sultan, after causing his principal officers to renew their oath to him, made up his mind to take action, Ylbūghā already held the whole of Syria and it was beneath the walls of Damascus that he defeated the legitimate army, which came to bring him to his senses, in Rabī‘ I 791/March 1389.

The sultan raised a second army corps, making his preparations in some haste, for Ylbūghā's troops had penetrated into Egyptian territory at Katya and were encamped at Ṣālibiyā. The Sultan set out to take up his position at Manama, but returned to Cairo in despair, for the majority of his officers, guessing who would win, went over to the enemy camp. Nevertheless, he wished the matter to be decided by the arbitration of war and the battle was fought to the north of Cairo and beneath the city's walls on the 9th Dījmād/1st May, without any decisive result. Day by day, Barkūk saw the devotion of his men vanishing and, in the end, he left the Citadel in disguise and went into hiding.

He was discovered, and sent off to prison at Karak in the land of Moab, whilst Ħādīdīl was replaced on the throne. As his masters, the latter had the factious generals, who proceeded to indulge themselves in the trivial occupation of street fighting. Barkūk took advantage of this confused situation
and, escaping from imprisonment, gathered together an army composed in the main of Bedouin Arabs. After numerous vicissitudes, some of which read like an adventure story, he made his triumphal entry into Cairo in Safar 792/February 1390. Clearly Bağdırı could do nothing but withdraw, but apart from this he was not troubled. Sulṭān Bağrūk, moreover, had not disposed of his old opponent Mīnṭāsh and a campaign of two years was needed to get rid of him.

As can be seen, these two reigns of the Sulṭān Bağrūk were eventful but contributed nothing to the glory of Egypt: the last fifty years of the 8th/14th century were indeed lamentable.

Other events must be noted, though at the time the seriousness of their implication was not evident. Already in 788/1386, during Bağrūk's first reign, rumours had been current in Cairo that a certain "Mongol rebel named Timür" had marched on Tabrīz and this was soon confirmed officially by a dispatch from the Djalā'irid sultan of Isfahān, Ahmad b. Uways, who urged Bağrūk to be on his guard. The Mamluk government then sent one of their intelligence agents to conduct an inquiry on the spot in Rajab 780/July 1382, the latter brought back somewhat alarming news. Detachments of the Mongol army had entered Upper Mesopotamia and Asia Minor, at Edessa and Malatya, after having scattered the troops of the Turcoman ruler Kārā Muḥammad.

In the middle of the year 795/1393, Timūr again made his presence felt; an embassy from the Ottoman sultan Bāyāzīd urged the Egyptian government to take military precautions, whilst the Sultan of Bağdagdād, Aḥmad b. Uways, expelled from his domains by the Mongol hordes, took refuge in the Mamluk kingdom. Timūr had nevertheless approached Bağrūk amicably, though the latter, casting aside all prudence, had the Mongol ambassador put to death.

The Egyptian sultan had left for Syria at the head of an army; at that time only a few skirmishes occurred. Bağrūk made a certain number of appointments relating to the Syrian frontier, so that the fortresses of Malatya, Țarsūs, Edessa and Kāfāt al-Rūm received new commanders. Epigraphy, moreover, reveals that works were carried out at this time at the citadel of Ba'labak, the command post at the entrance to Cœle-Syria. Thus, thanks to these meagre indications, we may assume that in the course of his passage through Syria, Bağrūk saw to the defence of the territory; he was back in Cairo on the 13 Safar 792/8 December 1394.

The end of the reign is devoid of historical significance; the sultan died on the 15th Shawwāl 808/20 June 1399, as the result of an attack of epilepsy. Bağrūk was 63 years of age, and for over twenty years had governed Egypt firstly as Marshal of the Armies and then as sultan. The disturbances caused by the Syrian governors gave him much trouble. They can probably be explained by normal feelings of jealousy and instinct for intrigue, which at all times actuated the Mamluks. Certain synchronisms, however, are suggestive and one might well ask whether the great Syrian officers were not induced to rebel by skilful propaganda conducted by the emissaries of Timūr, who was to benefit from the disorders.

Under Barkyaruk, things developed differently and the Empire assumed the guise of a federation of autonomous princes. In Syria, the sons of Tughril, Dukak of Damascusa and Rudwan of Aleppo, acknowledged his sovereignty in principle, without, however, Barkyaruk ever being able to intervene in their affairs. In Khurasan, in the inaccessible mountain regions of the East, rebels persisted—a cousin of Malikshah, a descendant of Yabgu, Tughril Beg’s brother, etc., so that Barkyaruk deemed it prudent to constitute the whole of Khurasan an appanage for his brother Sandjar, assisted by a governor whom he appointed. He did the same thing for Adharbaydjân (with its frontier districts), another of the frontier marches, dangerously—as recalled by Isma’îl b. Yakût’s attempt—by reason of the numbers of Turkomans always ready to support any enterprise showing a likely prospect of booty. Here Barkyaruk installed his youngest brother, Muhammad, accompanied by an aâtabeg, whom he likewise appointed.

Barkyaruk’s difficulties, however, did not end there. Muhammad and Sandjar, co-uterine brothers (but by a different mother from Barkyaruk’s) were incited, especially by Nizâm al-Mulk’s son, Mu’ayyad al-Mulk, (who had been dismissed from the vizierate by Barkyaruk, in favour of a brother with whom he had quarrelled) to throw off all control by their elder brother and revert to the operations which were complicated by several amirs constantly changing sides, and in the course of which both protagonists were in turn forced to flee, an agreement was negotiated by the moderate elements of both sides. In accordance therewith, Muhammad was given the title of malik and received Adharbaydjân with Armenia, under the suzerainty of Barkyaruk, the sole sultan. Muhammad, dissatisfied, reopened hostilities, but was forced to flee into Armenia. Finally, however, in 492/1094, Barkyaruk, ill and weary of the war, agreed to an actual division of the sultanate. Though in addition to the Dîjdîr with Rayy, he retained Tabaristan, Fârs and Khuzistân, Baghdad and the Holy cities, in other words the towns of greatest consequence and the core of the central territories, he was obliged to acknowledge his brother in Isfahan, half of ‘Irâk, and all the western frontier territories from Adharbaydjân to Syria, and to accord him the direction of the Holy War. As for Sandjar, he was to pronounce the khutba for Muhammad and himself simultaneously, disregarding Barkyaruk. It is difficult to say what the outcome of this agreement might have been, if Barkyaruk’s death and the provisional reunification of the Empire which ensued under Muhammad had allowed time for it to come to fruition. In any event, even within the territories as attributed to each brother, the reality of their authority was far from being everywhere assured.

It had been impossible to keep watch over the attempts at regional independence, and the support of the amirs, vacillating between the pretenders, had had to be purchased. The result was that even in Upper Mesopotamia, Kerbûh and especially his successor Diekermezîsh were to be found almost independent at Mawṣil, whilst the Artuqids were taking the initial steps towards the unification of Dîjdîr Bakr to their own advantage. In Armenia, to the Turkomans principalities established in former Byzantine territory and that of the Rawwâdis of Adî, which continued to exist, there was added that of Sukmân al-Küfth, one of Ismai’îl’s former officers, who made himself the Shâh-i Arîmân at Akhblât, On the borders of ‘Irâk, the masters of the Batbha and the Mazyadid Arabs became powers to be reckoned with. Leaving aside Khurasan and the Caspian provinces, where autonomous principalities had always been accepted, and the old principalities, belonging to ancient Buyid and Kurdish families, had similarly been tolerated, the genesis can be observed in Iran and even Khuzistân of hereditary feudal families, issuing from great Saldûkî officers, the best known of them being that of the sons of Bursûk at Tustar. The successive viziers of Barkyaruk, the three sons of Nizâm al-Mulk, ‘Irâz al-Mulk (487/1094), Mu’ayyad al-Mulk, disgraced after a year, and Fakhr al-Mulk (493/1096), then ‘Abd al-Djâliî al-Djistânî, who fell in battle, and al-Maydbadî (495-498), were doubtless primarily occupied in finding money by all possible means (confiscation, pressure exerted on the Caliph, harassing the Christians, etc.) and in countering the intrigues of hostile clans; the difficulty confronting them lay in making themselves accepted by the amirs, as is illustrated by the assassination of the muskawî (Director of Finances) Majdî al-Mulk at Balâlsânî, on the pretext of Shî’ism.

It is true that, in comparison with Muhammad or the early Saldûks, Barkyaruk did not enjoy the reputation of being a militant defender of orthodoxy. The dissensions of his reign benefited the Nizârî Isma’îlîs of Hasan al-Sabbâh, who acquired impregnable fortresses in the mountains of northern Iran and around Isfahan, not to mention the former Ismai’îlî seigniory of Tabas in the desert, which went over to them. When the Nizâmiyya took Muhammad and Sandjar’s side, Barkyarûk’s lieutenant in Khurasan was even to be found enlisting considerable contingents from Tabas. However at the end of the reign, the influence acquired by the Isma’îlîs and the disaffection of Barkyaruk’s supporters, due to the toleration he had shown them, appeared dangerous to him and he encouraged massacres of Isma’îlîs at Baghdad and in Iran, without, however, anything being done to deal with the bases of their power.

Barkyaruk died in Rabî’ II 498/beginning of 1105, when 25 years of age. He was certainly not a great man and the clumsiness with which he alienated the Nizâmiyya, for example, was a grave error indeed. Yet it must be remembered that he was very young and it would be unjust not to recognise that the factors of disintegration which manifested themselves in his time were latent even in the regime of the Great Saldûks.

Bibliography: The sources will be examined in the article Saldûkî. The main ones are the History of the Saldûks of ‘Imad al-Dîn al-Isfahânî (ed. in the version of Bundarî by Houtsma, Recueil, ii, 1888), the relevant part of which is based on the Persian memoirs of the vizier Anušîrwan; the Kâmîl of Ibn al-Athîr, x, which combines copious information from ‘Irâk and Khurasan sources etc., with that provided by the above work; and the Sahlîh-nâmâ of Câhir al-Dîn Nishâpurî, ed. of an approximate text by Gelaleh Khâwar, Tehran 1953, with its derivative, the Râhîl al-Sâdâr of Râwandi, ed. Muî. Ikbâl, GMS 1921. To these may be added, for the revolt of Tutush, the Muslim and Christian sources of Syrian history, in particular Ibn al-Kalâmî, ed. Anedroz. See also the Mu’dilâm al-Tawdîkhî in Persian, anonymous, ed. Bahar 1938, short, but contemporary; and the Nizâmî chronicle of Mari etc. ed. Gismondi. Modern works: Defrémery, Recherches sur le règne du...
BARDA, formerly capital of the Indian State of the same name, now merged with Madhya Bharat, situated in 22° 15' N. and 73° 15' E. on the Vaghjimātr river. Population in 1951 was 212,407. It is known to the inhabitants as Wadhār, said to be a corruption of the Sanskrit word vādār which means in the heart of the banyan-trees, and the vicinity of the town still abounds in these trees. The word bar in Urdu also means a banyan-tree. An old name of the town is Viraksetra or Virāwati which means a land of warriors and was used by the 11th/17th century Mughal governor of Gudjarat, Shah Durrani in 1175/1761 in the third battle of Pālpat. On the death of Damadji, the town was recaptured by the authority of God, but the very next year (1145/1732) Piladji invested the town with the intention of turning it over to his insane eldest brother Sayadji Rao. The House of Gaekwar continued to rule the city independently until 1177/1766, when non-Muslims were the object of such a decree, and the town was recaptured by the authority of God, but the very next year (1145/1732), Piladji was murdered and Abhay Singh, the ruler of Nefusa, to attend the classes given by Shaykh Abu Bakr. When non-Muslims were the object of such a decree, they usually circumvented it by payment of a sum of money. But it may also be interpreted as a measure of defiance, for European privateers were then very active.

The city proper was enclosed by the walls of the old fort, which have now been demolished. The history of Baroda is closely linked with the history of Gudjarat. In 1140/1727 Piladji Gāekwār, the founder of the dynasty which ruled over Baroda till 1949, when the State was merged with the Indian Union, wrested Baroda from Sarbuland Khan, the Mughal governor of Gudjarat. In 1144/1731 Pesjhwa Badji Rao invested the town with the intention of turning it over to his insane eldest brother Sayadji Rao. The House of Gaekwar continued to rule the city independently until 1177/1766, when non-Muslims were the object of such a decree, they usually circumvented it by payment of a sum of money. But it may also be interpreted as a measure of defiance, for European privateers were then very active.

The history of Baroda is closely linked with the history of Gudjarat. In 1140/1727 Piladji Gāekwār, the founder of the dynasty which ruled over Baroda till 1949, when the State was merged with the Indian Union, wrested Baroda from Sarbuland Khan, the Mughal governor of Gudjarat. In 1144/1731 Pesjhwa Badji Rao invested the town with the intention of turning it over to his insane eldest brother Sayadji Rao. The House of Gaekwar continued to rule the city independently until 1177/1766, when non-Muslims were the object of such a decree, they usually circumvented it by payment of a sum of money. But it may also be interpreted as a measure of defiance, for European privateers were then very active.

The history of Baroda is closely linked with the history of Gudjarat. In 1140/1727 Piladji Gāekwār, the founder of the dynasty which ruled over Baroda till 1949, when the State was merged with the Indian Union, wrested Baroda from Sarbuland Khan, the Mughal governor of Gudjarat. In 1144/1731 Pesjhwa Badji Rao invested the town with the intention of turning it over to his insane eldest brother Sayadji Rao. The House of Gaekwar continued to rule the city independently until 1177/1766, when non-Muslims were the object of such a decree, they usually circumvented it by payment of a sum of money. But it may also be interpreted as a measure of defiance, for European privateers were then very active.
active in the Mediterranean. Hence the Draconian decree: European property was impounded both in Egypt and Syria and no European was permitted to return to his own country. There then followed the temporary prohibition of the circulation of European currencies, a measure which had uncertain effects.

The government of Egypt also took serious military precautions, building a number of small forts on the coast and fitting out a flotilla of corvettes. The sultan, however, continued without respite, his preparations for the realisation of his great idea, an expedition against the island of Cyprus. After several preliminary reconnaissances, a large-scale attempt was launched; the only engagement, which was particularly bloody, ended unfavourably for the Cypriots, whose king, Janus, was taken prisoner and brought back to Cairo. He was led through the town in fetters; he only recovered his freedom and his kingdom on payment of a yearly tribute. A part of the booty was devoted to the restoration of various monuments in Mecca (830/1427).

Nevertheless, this relatively easy victory revealed a dangerous state of indiscipline among the troops and on the occasion of a frontier conflict with the army of the White Sheep Turkomân prince, Karâ-Yûlûk, the Mamlûks, after taking the town of Edessa by storm, perpetrated the most revolting atrocities there. This disagreement between neighbours severely impaired the prosperity of Upper Mesopotamia, which was alternately devastated by one side or the other. After considerable hesitation, Barsbay mobilised a large army, which finally proceeded to invest Amid (Diýârbakr). They were, however, unable to take the Turkomân capital, to Barsbay's great annoyance. Faced with the growing discontent of the army, the Sultan was obliged to resign himself to negotiate. Karâ-Yûlûk accepted his proposals for peace and, in several vague formulas, recognised the sovereignty of the sultan of Egypt. The Mamlûk army made its way back to Cairo; their progress was the stampede of a discontented soldiery. The troops proceeded in the greatest disorder, giving the impression rather of the hasty retreat of a defeated army (837/1433). The Sultan had left half the total strength of his army behind in Mesopotamia.

There then ensued a strange diplomatic struggle with the Timûrid sultan Shâh-Rûkh. The Mongol ruler claimed the right to cover the Ka'b with a veil. This was, in fact, a privilege of the Egyptians consecrated by immemorial custom and Sultan Barsbay, supported by his council of chief judges, was unwilling to relinquish it. The dispute, fanned by lawyers' quibbles and crude derisive treatment of the ambassadors, gave rise to the exchange of pithy diplomatic documents. However, it entailed no immediate consequences during the reign of Sultan Barsbay.

No doubt the policy of the ruler of Egypt was based on considerations of prestige, but primarily he wished to prevent the Mongol sultan from gaining a foothold in Arabia through official agents, which might possibly endanger Egypt's commercial interests.

Indeed, Barsbay had recently requested those merchants coming from India to land their wares at Djeddâ, instead of putting in at the port of Aden, as previously. It was a good beginning, but in his insatiable greed, Barsbay determined to force the merchants to proceed obligatorily to Cairo for the purpose of paying taxes. This vexatious regulation was soon formally modified, but though the merchants were excused from proceeding to the Egyptian capital, they still had to pay exorbitant dues at Djeddâ. This port, however, henceforth became a commercial mart of the first importance. Half the dues collected there went to the Sharif of Mecca and half to Egypt. The tax-collectors belonged to the Egyptian administration.

Barsbay's end is a pitiful and tragic tale. An epidemic of plague broke out and, fearing lest he might catch the disease, he resolved to suppress the vexatious economic measures to which we have referred; he proceeded to distribute alms in plenty, though at the same time he also had his two physicians put to death. On the 13th Dhu 'lt-Hijjah 841/7th June 1438, he fell a victim to the plague.

To summarise our impressions of Sultan Barsbay, we must bear two aspects of his character in mind. He was constantly haunted by the morbid fear inspired in him by his rival, Dîanjîbâb Süli, whom he had imprisoned at his accession and who made good his escape. This in itself induced him to make haphazard gestures, which, however, were milder than those suggested to him by his need of money. There flourished a series of practices which led the Mamlûk regime to disaster: the sale of offices, confiscation of fortunes which were too noticeable, the unprecedented extension of state monopolies and the institution of the compulsory purchase of primary commodities, bought up in advance by the Government. The Arab historians aver that Barsbay was an intelligent administrator, an able and poised politician, but the facts speak against this assessment. All his actions are dominated by the spectre of Dîanjîbâb and, precisely because of his erratic changes of mood, we can scarcely consider him as a wise and sagacious statesman. His preparations for the Cyprus and Diýârbakr campaigns appear to have swallowed up large sums of money and the latter was a resoundingly failure.


**BARSHALÔNA.** Spanish Barcelona, the old Iberian town of Barcino (compare Ruscino, from which Roussillon is derived), which incidentally has no connexion with Hamîlcar Barca. Barcelona, once the home of the Laetians, gradually supplanted Tarraco-Tarragona, situated to the south-west of it, as the capital of north-eastern Roman Spain (Hispania-Tarraconensis). From the fragments of the works of al-Idrîsî and al-Bakrî compiled by Ibn 'Abd al-Munîm al-Hîmyarî, it is clear that Barcelona in their day was already a large town. It was encircled by a strong rampart and its port was rockbound, so that only captains familiar with the channels could steer their ships into it. It was in Barcelona, the capital of his country, that the ‘King of Ifrandja' resided. This monarch owned armed ships for travel and corsair raids. The Ifrandjî (Catalans) were of an aggressive temperament which spurred them on to great daring.

The territory of Barcelona produced a great deal of wheat and other cereals, as well as honey in large quantity. There were as many Jews living there as Christians. In 96-98/714-16 it fell to the Arabs under ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz b. Mîsâh b. Nuṣayr after a single attack. In Arabic the town is called Barshinuna, a name derived from the low Latin Barcinona (Orosius already has Barcîlona, the Geographer of Ravenna Barcelona, cf. Hübner in Pauly-Wissowa,
BARSHALUNA — BARUD

s.v.), but it is still more commonly called Barsha-
luna, from which the present Barcelona derives.

The form Barsha-luna is rarer. This is in the origin of the name al-Barsha-luna, the short title which later Arab writers often gave to the king of Aragon and Catalonia (cf. J.A., 1907, ii, 275 ff.).

In 858/801 Louis, the son of Charlemagne, as king of Aquitaine, conquered Barcelona, which from that time became the capital of the Spanish borderlands of the Frankish Empire, and from 888, of the independent counts or marquesses of Barcelona or Catalonia. In 922/956 Barcelona was temporarily occupied by the Arabs (Al-Bayyân al-Mughribi, ii, 95-6). In 375/985, it was taken by assault in the last time by the great Almanzor (Dozy, Histoire des Musulmans, ii, 238-9), but in 987, Count Borell I reconquered it. In the twelfth century (1137) it was reunited with the kingdom of Aragon. Worthy of note is the order given in 450/1058 by the Muslim king of Denia, All b. Mudâjal al-Amirî, by virtue of which the Mozarabic bishops of Baleares (S.V.) like those of Denia and Orihuela were placed under the jurisdiction of the Archbishopric of Barcelona (Simonet, Historia de los Moradores de España — Memoria de la Real Academia de la Historia, vol. xii, Madrid 1905, 651-4; Campaner, Bosquejo histórico de la dominación islamica en las islas Baleares, Palma 1888, 184).

Bibliography: Marâsid al-Îîtîlà, Leiden 1859, IV, 304; Madoz, Diccionario geogr. estad. hist. III, 582 ff.; Bofarull, Los Condes de Barcelona vindicados, Barcelona 1836; Makkarî (index), ii, 844; Simonet (see above), 929 (index); Lévi-Provençal, La Péninsule Ibérique, 53; idem, Hist. Esp. Mus., i & ii, passim.

(C. F. Seybold-{A. Huici Miranda})

BARSISHAW [see NURORD]

Bares\da, the name of a pseudo-historical figure, a recluse, who is to be connected, according to a later interpretation, with the Antonian tradition. In its folk-lore aspect, the tradition concerning Barsïa must have assumed several forms, because at a late period Ibn Batûtah came across, between Tripoli and Alexandria, a hasr Barsïa al-'Abid, a name which recalls the career of St. Antony and his long period of seclusion in an old castle (siṣā). The Aramaic etymology of the name Barsïa calls to mind the highest sacerdotal office, whether one considers the siṣā as denoting the pectoral of the high priest, or the topknots of the sacerdotal coiffure. In Muslim tradition, Barsïa is the hermit who, after a long career of asceticism, succumbs to the successive temptations of the Devil who finally induces him to deny God, and then abandons him to eternal despair. These remarks refer to the commentary on the Kur'An, li, 16, which deals with hypocrites who tempt the faithful ... "in the likeness of the Devil, when he says to Man, 'Disbelieve,' but when he disbelieves, says, 'I am quit of thee; I fear Allah, the Lord of the Worlds'." There are two rival interpretations of "Man", and al-Tabari (xxviii, 31 f.) sets them before us: is it a question of a particular man, or of mankind as a whole?

The first four traditions which al-Tabari produces in the case of "Man" denoting a particular person, relate to a recluse, either a monk (râkhî) (Tabari, xxviii, 332), or an ascetic (radjul min Bâni Isrâ'il, 'Abid), or a Christian priest (kâds). The story about this pious man is relatively constant; three brothers entrust to him their sister, who is ill, while they are absent on a journey. The monk, yielding to the suggestions of Satan, seduces her, gets her with child, and then, in order to get rid of her and thus of the evidence of his fall, kills her and buries her in a secret place (under a tree, in his house). The brothers, on their return, believe at first that she died a natural death, but Satan reveals to them in a dream the ascetic's crime. The ascetic, panic-stricken at the realisation that his crime has been discovered, is approached in his turn by Satan, who offers to save him if he will prostrate himself before him and deny God. When the wretched man has stooped to this ultimate degree of sin, Satan mocks him, in the terms of the verse in the Kur'an, li, 16. After al-Tabari, Tradition rediscovered the name of Barsïa and applied it to the hero of this legend. In EI, Duncan B. Macdonald (s.v. Barsïa) enumerated these sources. The first author who seems to have mentioned the name of Barsïa is Abu Layth al-Samarkandi (d. 985 or 993), in his Tâbîkh al-Ghâdîn, who was followed by al-Baghwî (d. 1122).

Goldziher-Landberg, Legende vom Mönch Barsïa, fills in the history of the later development of the legend, as narrated in al-Kazwînî (ed. Wustenfeld, i, 368), in the Mûṣâṭarî of Ibn Isbâyî, chap. 64, in al-Suyûtî, and thence, in the Forty Vezirs, the Istanbul edition of which, 1303 A.H., 120-126, contains a long account, of greater length than the one translated by Pétis de la Croix and Gibb. This account, either via Spain, or through the medium of a translation of the Forty Vezirs, must have become the source of the 'Gothic' romance of Monk Lewis, Ambrosio or the Monk, in which every detail was dealt with at length and adapted to the taste of the day. Bibliography: Duncan B. Macdonald, in EI, 1, and Handwörterbuch des Islam, s.v. Barsïa, and addenda in IA s.v. Barsïa; Chauvin, Bibliographie des Ouvrages arabes, viii, 128 ff.; A. Abel, Barsïa, le Moine qui défla le Diable, Bruxelles 1959, in Publications de l'Institut de Philologie et d'histoire orientales. (A. ABEL)

BARTANG [see BADAKSHAN].

BARUD.

1. — General

In Arabic, the word naft (Persian naft) is applied to the purest form (jâwa) of Mesopotamian bitumen (kîr—or kîr—bâbîlî). Its natural colour is white. It occasionally occurs in a black form, but this can be rendered white by sublimation. Naft is efficacious against catarrh and leucorrhoea; it has the property of attracting fire from a distance, without direct contact.

Mixed with other products (fats, oil, sulphur etc.) which make it more combustible and more adhesive, it constituted the basic ingredient of "Greek fire", a liquid incendiary compound which was hurled at people, the various siege weapons which were made of wood, and ships. The Muslims of the East, as is well known, made spectacular use of it against the Crusaders and the Mongols. This new product retained the name of naft. A specialist, nafît or sarrùk, discharged the "Greek fire" in the form of a jet, by means of a special copper tube: naffû, sarrûkha, makhûla; this instrument, the prototype of our flame-throwers, seems to have been a sort of huge syringe, similar to the "pumps" of the earlier firemen of Constantinople. "Greek fire" could also be discharged in "pots" (kârûra) hurled by various types of ballistic apparatus, or in cartridges fixed to arrows, in the "Chinese" fashion (iṣkûm bâryâna).

With the introduction of the use of salpetre, about 1350, the word naft assumed new meanings. During a remote period, the Chinese had known of the
igniting properties of nitre, but they only used it to propel rockets used in firework displays or in warfare. Knowledge of the properties of saltpetre (and of the procedure for refining it) by washing) probably passed from China to Persia; in Persian, in fact, in addition to the Iranian term "ghura" (archaic: "ghirag") "nitrous earth, nitre", there existed the synonym "namak-i čini "Chinese salt". In Arabic, in addition to "gawrafji", a loan-word from Iranian, and the vernacular forms "milh al-bārād" "sea salt" (cf. infra) and "milh al-dab'ābīt" "tanners' salt", one finds "talghi jini "Chinese snow", "talghi al-šīn "snow of China". One also meets the terms "zahrāt hājar asisā'īs, lit. "flower of the stone of Assos" (an ancient town of Troas or Mysia), a sort of marine saltpetre, a powdery salty efflorescence deposited by sea spray on friable rock resembling pumice-stone, something like aphyrnonit. Ibn al-Baytār gives bārād, the history of which will be traced below, as the Maghribi equivalent of the last three terms, which apply to pharmaceutical saltpetres.

Saltpetre was at first incorporated in the igniting powder of fireworks, which retained the name of naft. Shortly afterwards, the same name was used for gunpowder.

As far as our present knowledge goes, the first word used by the Arabic-speaking peoples to denote the new saltpetre-containing powder, a word of universal application, was dawāt "remedy, medicament, drug". It was in fact the term used by Hasan al-Rammān (died 694/1294) to denote the mixture used to fill the midīfā: 10 parts of bārād, 2 of charcoal and 1.5 of sulphur. This term is still used in Arabic (cf. Landberg, Glossaire datinois, i, 895). Semantically, it is parallel to the Persian dārū (see infra), although it is impossible to determine whether it is pure coincidence, or whether it is a case of a loan-word transmitted through translation, and in what sense the latter could have been effected.

Far more widespread, at least in the Mamlūk East, was the term naft, the name of the earlier "Greekg fire" transferred to the new compound. In Muslim Spain, the earliest recorded name (from 724/1324) is naft. In the Vocabulista (a Latin- Spanish Arabic vocabulary compiled in the region of Valencia, in the 13th century), one finds opposite Ignis and Ignem excutere, the word naft, but its meaning is not given with any precision; at all events, this term recurs at Beirut in the sense of "matches". At Tunis, neffāta is a fire-cracker. In many Arabic dialects, words derived from the root n-f-t (neffā, neffāta) have the meaning of "ampulla" (under the epidermis). This may perhaps be an echo of kawārīr al-naft.

The form of the word bārād, with d, is not classical. It seems to appear for the first time in the Diarimsī of Ibn al-Baytār (d. 646/1248). It is stated there that it is the name given in the Maghrib by the common people and physicians to the "snow of China" or "saltpetre", a substance with medicinal properties (cf. trans. Leclerc, i, 71). Al-Rammān uses the word in this sense in his formula for gunpowder. Again, for Ibn al-Kutubī (710/1310, cf. infra), bārād only meant saltpetre.

In his Tarīfi (1312 ed., 208), al-Umari (d. 748/1348) twice uses the word bārād. In one instance, he is talking about a substance incorporated in the "naphtha pots" (kawārīr al-naft), projectiles used in naval warfare. In the other, he is talking about makhdil al-bārād, where the word could be taken to refer to a propulsive saltpetre compound (see infra: ii)

It is thus difficult to state with any accuracy at what date and in what country "gunpowder" assumed the name of its principal ingredient.

In Muslim Spain, the change in meaning took place in the course of the second half of the 15th century. "Gunpowder" then became bārād, and "saltpetre" makāf al-bārād; naft (pl. ansafī) then denoted "cannon", and naftāt "gunner" (see Dozy, Suppl., s.vv.).

In this new sense of "gunpowder", the word bārād is widespread throughout the Arabic-speaking world; it is in general pronounced with an emphatic r. As subsidiary terms, Arabic recognises representatives of dawāt (cf. supra). Tunisia has kushī "cousin", and Kabylian kusku "derkin "black cousin", names (perhaps euphemistic) deriving from the resemblance of the two products, both rolled up (mofalāt) and granulated. In Libya, in addition to bārād, one finds bārīg, which can be connected either with the Arabic root b.r.k "to flash (lightning)" or with bārād, the Greek nītron.

The word is used in Turkish, mainly in the form bārāt, a pronunciation which recurs in various southern Arabic dialects: Uman, Hadramawt (and even bārīt, cf. Landberg, Glossaire datinois, i, 130). The Turkish term has been borrowed by Persian and by the Balkan languages: modern Greek, Albanian, Serbian, Bulgarian. From Persian, the word has passed into Kurdish and Hindustani; but in the latter, as in Afghānī, it has a rival in the Persian dārū, lit. "remedy" (= dawāt). Representatives of bīrūt recur in several African languages in the sense of "gunpowder": Amharic, Swahili, Hausa, etc. In addition to the current and popular term māzāpūr, borrowed from Turkish, modern Greek recognises, as a scholarly word, ρυγκη, which has been seen as the origin of bārād. But this etymology is not absolutely certain.

Al-Kafādī [q.v.], an Egyptian author who died in 1066/1659 after a long residence in Turkey, devoted to the word bārād, in his Shiqāq al-Qāhil (ed. Cairo, 1282, 55), a long notice in which he said: "this word is written with a dāl without a dot, and bārād is an erroneous form. In the Màl tā yasa al-Taṭbīq (the work of Baghdad physician Ibn al-Kutubī, written about 1330), one reads as follows: "this is, in the Maghrib, the name of the "flower of Assīyūs" (cf. supra, the quotation from Ibn al-Baytār). In their vernacular dialect, the people of Irāk apply this term to saltpetre (milh al-bārādī) which appears as an efflorescence on old walls, where it is collected. It is used in fireworks (dāmāl al-nār) which rise into the air and move about; thanks to it, the fireworks rise more rapidly and ignite more quickly". The Egyptian author resumes: "this is a post-classical word (muwallad), derived from burādā "iron filings", because of the similarity of the two products. At the present time, bārād is applied to a compound of this salt, charcoal and sulphur: it has assumed the name of one of its components". For the Irākīs of the beginning of the 8th/14th century, bārād still denoted only saltpetre, but was already used in pyrotechnics.

Equally interesting is the notice devoted to this word by Ibn Khāla al-Tibīrī (in his Persian dictionary Burhān-i Kātī (Tehran ed. 1330/1951): "it is the dārū-yi tufang "remedy of collyrium for the musket". In the Syriac language (murtamīnā) it is the name given to ghura "niter, saltpetre", which constitutes the principal element of burād. I do not know where the Persian lexicographer got his information from. But it is a fact that the Lexikon Syriacum of Brockelmann, (and. ed. 1928, 95),
records an instance of bărūd "nitrum", culled from an alchemical text.

From these two indications, the word bărūd could therefore have had an Aramaic origin, which would correlate well with its morphological pattern fāsīl.

In Armenian, the name of gunpowder is տարջ (for tarjaud, with a doted r) which, for phonetic reasons governing word-transference, could not be directly connected with bărūd. However, the Armenian word appears to have an etymology (popula) founded in Armenian itself: տարջ “to burn” and աու "air". Could the Aramaic word be of Armenian origin? (Information supplied by Professor Feydut, Paris).

De Goeye proposed for bărūd another etymology which seems to have been overlooked (cf. Quelques observations sur le feu grecqois, in Homenage a D. F. Codera, 1904, 96): it could stem from barud, in the first place a "soothing collyrium (hālā) used for inflammation of the eye", which in the end was applied to all powdery collyria (cf. Ibn al-Hashshāhī, Glossaire sur le Mansuri de Razes, ed. Colin and Renaud, 1941, 18). The Baghdādi physician Ibn Dīazla (d. 493/1100) in his Minhādī heralded the use of "flower of the stone of Assiyūs, or marine saltpetree, in collyrium to strengthen the sight and make it clearer and also to get rid of leucoma. As regards the change of quantity in the first vowel, other examples of the change a > ā are known in Maḥri Arabic nouns belonging to the same morphological pattern and also denoting medicaments: ḡāsāl (already in Ibn al-Baytārī, fāsākh "gum ammoniac", etc. One is encouraged not to pass over this hypothesis in silence by the fact that, in numerous Arabic-speaking countries, the term mubhīlah "collyrium tube" has been used for "musket". Let us not forget that the first Arabic word for gunpowder was dawd (medicament). In the field of Iranian linguistics, gunpowder is sometimes termed "medicament or collyrium of the musket". Finally, in an altogether different field, Malay too has obat bedil "medicament of the musket". In the case of "gunpowder", as in that of "fire-tube", it could have been a case, to begin with, of a euphemistic name. The Arabic dawd has further other senses of the same origin: "poison", "depository compound" (cf. Dozy, Suppl.). To sum up, the origin of bărūd is still obscure.

On feast days, the rural population of North Africa devotes itself to the ḥūn al-bărūd "gunpowder game", with guns charged with blanks, either on horseback (ḫūn al-khayl, the "lancing" of Europeans) in which the participants imitate the old act of al-farr wa-l-harr, or on foot ("the musket dance"). For an accurate picture (in dialectic Arabic), cf. G. Delphin, Recueil de textes..., 233, 255; V. Loubignac, Textes arabes des Zaer, 79; in French, L. Mercier, La chasse et les sports chez les Arabes, 254.

From bărūd has been formed the derivative bdrūdīyya "terrous sulphate", which is used as a black dye, is explained by the colour of the powder.

Encyclopaedia of Islam

ii. — THE MAGHRIB

The first firearms which appeared were siege engines. According to Ibn Khaldūn (8th/14th century), the Marinid sultan Yaḥyā, when besieging the town of Sijilmās in 677/1279, brought into action against this town mangonels (mangādūn) and ballistas (lbarādāt), as well as a naphtha engine (ḥindām al-naft) which discharged iron grape-shot (ḥāsā al-hadīd) expelled from a "chamber" (khaṣṣā) by the fire kindled in the bărūd (cf. Ibn Dīazla, Bulûk 1284, iv, 188, at the bottom). This precise information is unfortunately doubtful for such an early period. In fact, in his account of the same siege in his history of the kings of Tlemcen (ibid., 85), Ibn Khaldūn speaks only of siege engines (dīlā al-ḥṣār), without any reference to this marvellous invention. On the other hand, the source used by the author for his account of this siege appears to be the Rawd al-Kirīfūs and its parallel history al-Dhakhīrī al-Saniyyūsī, Fās, 225; ed. Bencheneb, 158; and these two texts mention only mangonels and ballistas.

It is not until the year 724/1324 that one comes across an indication of something which appears to have been a true firearm. At the siege of Huecscar (68 m. (110 km.) N-E of Granada), which was held by the Christians, the king of Granada Ismāʿīl used "the great engine which functions by means of nafft" (al-dīl al-ʿumr al-ḥalākhaba bi-l-ʿaft). The latter hurled a red-hot iron ball (kurāt ḥadīd mulmādūt) against the keep of the fortress. The ball, when discharged, threw out showers of sparks, and landed in the midst of the besieged, causing damage as great as that caused by a thunderbolt. Several poets celebrated this event (cf. Ibn al-Khaṭīb, al-taba, Cairo 1319, i, 231; idem, al-Lamḥa al-Badriyya, Cairo 1347, 72).

Nineteen years later, at the siege of Algeciras (743/1343), the Muslim defenders fired against the Christians, by means of truenos (lit. "thunderclaps") large thick arrows as well as heavy iron balls (cf. Cronica del rey Don Alfonso el oncono, ed. Ribadeneyra, Ch. 270, 344, and Ch. 279, 352). But what exactly is meant by "thunderclaps"? Actual firearms, or machines analogous to the "thunderers" or raʿḍūdū? It is only during the last years of the Naṣrīd period (1482-1492) that there begin to appear in the sources the terms bărūd "gunpowder" and nafft (pl. anfāfī) "cannon", siege cannon for the Castilians, fort artillery for the Granadans. At the siege of Moclin (1486), the Castilians employed cannon which hurled "rocks of fire" (māṣūr min nār); the latter soared into the sky and fell back as a mass of flame (ṣuḥṣūdī nār) on the town, killing and burning all on whom they fell. It should be noted that, during that period, the plural anfājī is in general accompanied by the word ʿudda, which is properly applied to classical engines of the catapult type. In fact, at the famous siege of the suburb of al-Bayyazin, at Granada (1486), anfāfī and mandājīnī were seen in action together (cf. Müller, Die letzten Zeiten von Granada, especially 18 and 20).

In his Vocabulista of the Arabic spoken at Granada (compiled in 1501), P. de Alcalá translated artilleria by ʿudda; but artilleria is nafftī, derived from naff "lombarda"; and trabuco "trebuchet" has as its corresponding term mandājīnī. He knew in addition a sort of culverin: uhrubīn, uhrubīn "robadoquin, passabolante". But he only mentions the arbalate, and does not speak of portable firearms.

The latter appeared, in the Maghrib, at the beginning of the 16th century. It was a Maḥribī who presented the first arquebus (bundubkīyya) to the Mamlūk sultan Kānsūh al-Ghawrī (906-22/1500-16), saying that this weapon, which had appeared in the territory of the Irfānī, was in use in all the lands of the Ottomans and of the Ghurāb (cf. Ibn Zumbul, Path, Paris MS. 1834, f. 20).

Leo Africanus, who left Morocco in 1516, gives us a picture of the army of the Banū Wathāṣ (q.v.) as furnished with cannon, and arquebuses carried
by horsemen. In regard to Tunis, at the same period, he mentions that the king had a band of footguards composed of Turks armed with blunderbusses (cf. Description de l’Afrique, trad. Épaulard, 230, 387). It was mainly under the Sa’dids (q.v.), however, that the use and manufacture of firearms was intensified. The sultans of this dynasty organised their army on the Turkish model; they formed corps of Turkish and Andalusian musketeers, and surrounded themselves with more or less renegade Europeans (’ulâd) who initiated them in new techniques, notably that of casting cannon.

In 1575, the army of the sultan Mawlay Muhammad possessed more than 150 cannon, among which was one with nine barrels (now in the Musée de l’Armée in Paris). In 1578, at the famous battle of Wâdî ’l-Makhâzin, the Moroccan army had 34 cannon; it also had 3000 Andalusian arquebusiers on foot and a thousand arquebusiers on horseback.

In 1591, the expeditionary force sent against the Sa’dids included 2,000 Andalusian arquebusiers and renegades on foot, and 500 renegade horsemen armed with blunderbusses; it carried off six mortars and numerous small cannon (cf. Hespéris, 1923, 467). These firearms facilitated the defeat of the Sudanese, who were armed only with assegais, bows and swords. At Timbuktu, the—extremely hybrid—descendants of the Moroccan musketeers still constitute a sort of class: the arma, from the Arabic rumâl.

In Morocco, during this period, “cannon” was naft (sic), while “musket” was midâf. It is only later, in the 17th century, that this latter word took on the meaning of “cannon”, while the new “flintlock” took the name mukhâla, which came perhaps from the East. The following fact is characteristic of the date of this change of meaning: in the part of his Naft al-Tib in which he reproduces a Granadan Arabic text of 1540, al-Makkârl from Tlemcen (d. 1641/1632), who wrote it true in the East, on several occasions substitutes the word madâfi for anâlî (cf. Naft, Bulâk ed., 1279, ii, 1265; Müller, Die letzten Zeiten von Granada).

In 1630, a Morisco who had fled to Tunisia wrote in Spanish an important manual of artillery, based on German techniques. It was translated into Arabic in a popular form in 1638 by another Morisco who had taken refuge at Tunis after having lived for a long time at Marrakesh, for the purpose of distribution to the Ottoman sultan Murâd and other Muslim rulers (cf. Brockellmann, II, 465; S II, 714. A slightly abridged version exists in the Bibliothèque générale at Rabat: D. 1342). It is stated in this work that midâf was denoted “cannon” at Tunis, but “musket” in Morocco; and that conversely, anâlî “cannon” in Morocco, denoted “fireworks” at Tunis, which the Moroccans called samâ’îyyâšt.

The bronze cannon cast by the Sa’dids in Morocco, in their workshops at Fez, Marrakesh and Taroudant (or on their orders, in Holland), are particularly graceful. Many of them still exist in the ports of Morocco, usually decorated with the ‘alâma (or fiqhâr) of the reigning sultan. Portable firearms were imported from Europe, usually as contraband.

The artillery of the ‘Alawid dynasty comprised mainly pieces seized from the enemy, on land or sea, and pieces brought as gifts by foreign ambassadors. Otherwise, cannon and mortars were bought abroad and then an engraved inscription in Arabic was superimposed. On the other hand, it was under this dynasty that the manufacture of muskets spread in Morocco, especially in the south, but also in the north, at Tetuan and Târâst.

However extraordinary it may appear, magíjânîk (accompanied by cannon and mortars) were used in Morocco up to 1729, not only in siege warfare but also in expeditions against enemy strongholds (cf. Archives morocaines, ix, 107, 162, 169, 180).

Throughout present-day North Africa, the general word for “cannon” is medâf; kâra (class. kura), coll. kür, is “cannon-ball, shell”; everywhere the artilleryman is called fiqhî. The “musket” is midâr; it throws a bomb, bunda, a Latin word received through Turkish. In Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia, the old locally made musket bears names derived from mukhâla, the two principal types are called: bâ-qaiber “fired by a flint”, and bâ-habba “fired by percussion-cap”. Secondary appellations are derived from the name of the armurier or from the place of manufacture, or even from the length of the cannon measured in spans (gîdr). The vocabulary of the Maghribi dialect preserves the memory of earlier portable weapons of European origin: kâbiis “pistoleter” (arcabas), midâk, (muskôt), sheshkhdn (escopela), karbilla (carabina), etc. In Morocco, the European breach-loaded military musket is called kâlâ (Spanish culata); the different types are named after the number of cartridges held by the magazine. In eastern Tunisia, in Libya, the local musket is called bindâ and the rifled carbine: sheshkhdn (from Persian, “with a sexangular barrel”, received through Turkish).

We have seen that, in the western Maghrib and up to the beginning of the 17th century, naft denoted “cannon” and midâf “portable firearm”. This semantic pair has been preserved to the present day (with the variant naft) in the Berber dialects of the same region; it is also found in the Arabic dialect of Mauritania. However, among the Twâreg Berbers, a musket is l-bârd. In Amharic, the meanings are reversed: naft “musket”, midâf “cannon”.

For the nomenclature of the Moroccan musket, cf. Joly, L’industrie à Tébouân, in Archives morocaines, xi, 361; Delhomme, Les armes dans le Sous occidental, in Archives Berbères, ii, 123.

The introduction of portable firearms, their employment for the gîdrâd, and the necessity for a period of training in the technique of shooting (rimâyâ), led to the creation of societies of musketeers (pl. rumâl) of a religious character (cf. Archives Morocaines, iv, 97; xvii, 73; xx, 242; L. Mercier, La chasse et les sports chez les Arabes, 134).

On the other hand, the use of such weapons for hunting forced the jurists from the beginning to study the question whether prey killed by this method was licî (kâlid) or not (the akhâm al-bunduq literature).

(iii. THE MAMLUKS)

In the present state of our knowledge, the earliest reliable information on the employment of firearms in the Mamlûk sultanate is from the mid-sixties of the fourteenth century, i.e., some forty years later than the corresponding information on the use of firearms in Europe. There exist in the sources earlier references to these weapons, but their authenticity needs further proof. If Ibn Fadal Allah al-’Umârl speaks of firearms in his al-Ta’rîf fi l-Musâfârât al-Sharîf, Cairo 1312 A.H., 208, ll. 17-22, which he compiled in the year 245/1341, this would mean that the Mamlûks started to use firearms several decades before the mid-sixties.

Some words may be said about the terms by which these weapons were designated. These were makhâlî (sing. mukhâla) al-naft and midâf...
(sing. midja') al-naff, or simply naft (pl. nufā'). Subsequently the first two terms were shortened into maddfī* and maddfīh. From the Mamlūk sources it cannot be learnt whether mukhulla and midja* designate different types of firearms or not. During the first years following the introduction of the weapon one comes across the terms sawdikh al-naft, dldt al-naft, hindām al-naft, which also mean firearms. But all these last-named terms soon died out. (For detailed proofs that the above mentioned terms mean firearms and not naptha or 'Gun Fire', which is also called in Arabic nafī, see D. Ayalon, Gunpowder and Firearms in the Mamlūk Kingdom, 9-44).

In Mamlūk historical sources the term būrūd as designating the whole mixture of gunpowder is extremely rare during the major part of the Circassian period (784/1382-922/1517); only during the last decades of Mamlūk rule do references to it become quite frequent. The term naft remains, however, dominant until the very end of the Mamlūk sultanate. It would appear that the final victory of būrūd over naft took place after the Ottoman conquest.

Though the use of artillery in the Mamlūk sultanate increased steadily since the closing years of the 8th/14th century, a long time had to elapse before they could entirely displace the veteran siege engine, the mangleon (mangjānika, pl. manglekkā). For many years the midja* and the mukhulla served only as auxiliaries to the mangjānik, fulfilling but minor tasks. The Mamlūk sources provide abundant information on the negligible damage they caused to targets against which they were aimed. At the end, however, artillery had the upper hand. The mention of mangjānika in action becomes rarer and rarer during the second half of the fifteenth century, though they manage to survive up to the very end of Mamlūk rule.

The Mamlūks used their artillery in siege warfare only (both as a defensive and offensive weapon), consistently refusing until the very end of their rule to use it in the battlefield.

The ever increasing participation of artillery in sieges in the Mamlūk sultanate on the one hand, and its total absence on the battle-field on the other, can by no means be ascribed to accident. The reason for its easy adoption in siege warfare is to be found in the fact that it did not, especially during its early history, bring about any sweeping changes in the traditional methods of siege. Cannon was preceded by the mangjānika which performed precisely the same function, and which for a long period was superior to firearms. In the open, however, conditions were entirely different. Here artillery constituted a complete innovation, no similar weapon having preceded it; here it was bound to effect changes in tactics and methods of warfare, thus causing the Mamlūk military hierarchy to adopt a course in sharp contrast to its very spirit.

Sulṭān al-Qawrī did make some concessions to the use of firearms which, though on the face of it considerable, were in reality not very significant. For in all these concessions one condition was implied: the existing structure of Mamlūk military society should not be subjected to any important change. Such an attitude amounted, in fact, to a death sentence on the scheme of reorganising the Mamlūk army and on preparing it for the final test; for without transforming Mamlūk society, along with all the conceptions for which it stood, there was no hope of making effective use of firearms. Nor was this all: al-Qawrī made up his mind, side by side with his decision to extend the employment of firearms, to revive traditional methods of warfare.

His plan had three main points, the first raising considerably the number of cannon cast; second, to renew jurūsiyya exercises and the traditional military training; and third, to raise a unit of arquebusiers. Of them, only the first and third concern us here.

The Casting of Cannon. A few years after his accession to the throne al-Qawrī started casting cannon at a rate and on a scale never known before in the history of the sultanate. Near his newly built hippodrome (māyaḍī) he established a foundry for cannon (masbak) which turned out great quantities of artillery at short intervals. Unfortunately our source (Ibn 1yās) does not as a rule indicate the number of guns involved on each occasion; in four cases, however, he does. In one there were 15 guns; in another 70; in a third 74; in a fourth 75.

This huge output of artillery was not intended at all to be used against the Ottomans in the open field. The bulk of it was directed to the ports of Egypt both in the Mediterranean and in the Red Sea in order to strengthen the coastal fortifications or to be used on board warships.

From the dispatch of so much artillery to the coast and to coastal fortifications it should be concluded that strategic centres inland were not supplied with considerable quantities of cannon. As to the interior of Egypt, there is no doubt that both in al-Qawrī's time and in the preceding generations a very great portion of the total output of cannon was allotted to the capital, including the citadel. This is first of all borne out by the fact that most of our information about the weapon comes from Cairo; it is further confirmed by the concentration of great quantities of Mamlūk artillery in the battle of al-Raydāniyya (January, 1517). As for Syria, our knowledge of the fortunes of artillery in that part of the Mamlūk realm is scanty, both in regard to the coast and to the interior. From Ibn Ṭūlūn's chronicle we learn that there were great quantities of firearms in Damascus. This leads us to suppose that more detailed histories of Syria than those we possess might reveal that artillery played there a far bigger part than may be concluded from the available sources.

The Creation of a Unit of Arquebusiers. Arquebuses (or hand-guns or portable firearms) are referred to in the Mamlūk sources by the term al-bunduk al-raṣāṣ ("the pellets of lead"). The later designation for the hand-gun, bundubīyya, stems undoubtedly from bunduk, while raṣāṣ, the bullet or cartridge, is derived from raṣāṣ. The fact that a considerable traffic of arms was conducted in the period under review by Venice (in Arabic: al-Bundukīyya) might also have contributed to the choice of the term bundubīyya. It would appear that the process of transformation from bunduk raṣāṣ to bundubīyya did not take long. Ibn 1yās himself mentions bundubīyya three times, while in the works of his contemporaries Ibn Zunbul and Ibn Ṭūlūn, who died only a few decades after him, bundubīyya, bundubīyyāl and bundālīk are already of most common occurrence. They also mention bunduk, but the combination bunduk raṣāṣ is already extinct in their works.

The aversion of the Mamlūk to the use of portable firearms was far more pronounced than their reluctance to employ of artillery in the open field. For artillery is the province of specialised
technicians, whose numbers form only a small part of the fighting force, requiring little change in the structure of the army. The arquebus, on the other hand, is a personal and mass weapon, and its introduction affects a large number of troops. Hence its large scale adoption was bound to involve far-reaching changes in the organisation and methods of warfare. To equip a soldier with an arquebus meant taking away his bow and, what was to the Mamluk more distasteful, depriving him of his horse, thereby reducing him to the humiliating status of a foot soldier, compelled either to March or to allow himself to be carried in an ox-cart.

Any attempt, therefore, to extend the use of the arquebus had to be based on non-Mamluk and thus socially inferior elements of the army. This is what the Mamluk sultans were forced to do from the very outset. As a result, a clash between the interests of the sultanate and those of the military hierarchy ensued. The growing danger from without did, to be sure, enable the sultan to widen somewhat the very narrow limits imposed on the use of the arquebus by Mamluk resistance to it and to incorporate into the arquebus regiment men from other units whose social position had been somewhat higher than that of the earlier arquebusiers. But his success did not go further than this, and hence the doom of the arquebus was inevitable.

The very date of the introduction of the arquebus by the Mamluk is significant. It is mentioned for the first time in the sources as late as 895/1490 (the rule of Sultan Kaytbay), i.e., only twenty-seven years before the destruction of the Mamluk sultanate and one hundred and twenty five years later than in Europe (the hand-gun began to be used in Europe in about 1569). Artillery, on the other hand, was introduced into the Mamluk sultanate only about forty years later than in Europe. The much greater time-lag in the adoption of the hand-gun in comparison with the adoption of artillery is by no means accidental.

The units operating firearms were mainly composed of black slaves ('abbd) and sons of Mamluk (awldn nās) (q.v.). Members of these two categories seem never to have served in the same unit. Sometimes the black slaves constituted the predominant element in the firearms personnel and sometimes the awldn nās.

Sultan al-Nasir Abu l-Sa'adat Muhammed (901/1495-904/1498), Kaytbay's son, who ascended the throne at the age of fourteen, made a very serious attempt to create a strong unit of arquebusiers composed of black slaves, on whom he wanted to bestow a higher social status. The Mamluk amirs intervened, however, forced him to disband the unit and made him promise never to raise it again.

About twelve years after the murder of al-Nasir Abu l-Sa'adat, in 916/1510, Sultan Kanish al-Ghawri, who enjoyed an incomparably higher prestige than the above-mentioned boy-king, and in whose time the need for the arquebus was far more pressing, made, with much greater caution, a second attempt to create a unit of arquebusiers. Though it fared better than his predecessor's unit, its existence was very precarious, its status very low and its achievements quite insignificant.

It was called al-faskar al-mulaffaf, i.e., "the motley army" or "the patched up army", because it was composed of heterogenous elements which, according to Mamluk criteria, were of low origin. It included in its ranks—besides awldn nās—Turkomans, Persians, and various kinds of artisans, such as shoe-makers, tailors and meat vendors. Only when Sultan al-Ghawri, in Djiumādā I 921/June 1512, launched his big expedition against the Portuguese, were Royal Mamluk joined to it. It is significant that in spite of its heterogenous character al-faskar al-khāmisīa is never said to have included black slaves.

Though the members of this unit occupied a very low rung in the socio-military ladder and received a much lower pay than the Royal Mamluk, a very heavy pressure was brought to bear on the sultan to abolish it, on the ground that it was favoured over other units and that its creation was the main cause for the emptiness of the treasury. The sultan gave way, at last, and dissolved it on Muharram 920/March 1514. This dissolution was, however, only a paper only. Al-faskar al-khāmisīa continued to exist because it was urgently needed on a very vital front.

The fact that the Ottomans adopted firearms in the proper way and on a gigantic scale, whereas the Mamluk and all the other important rulers of Islam neglected them, had a decisive influence on the destiny of Western Asia and Egypt. Within a matter of two and a half years (August 1514-January 1517) the Ottomans routed the Safawids, destroyed the Mamluk sultanate and added to their realm territories of the old Muslim world which they kept up to the very dismemberment of their empire in the twentieth century and which were far bigger than their combined conquest in Europe throughout their history. Without their overwhelming superiority in firearms such a swift and extensive expansion could never have taken place.


(D. Ayalon)

iv. The Ottoman Empire.

There is no evidence to show precisely when the Ottomans first began to use gunpowder and fire-arms. A passage in a Turkish register for Albania of the year 835/1431 permits, however, the inference that cannon had been introduced at least in the reign of Mehemmed I (1413-1421) and perhaps even somewhat earlier (Inalcik, in Belleten, xxi (1957), 509). Other sources mention the Ottoman use of guns for siege warfare in 1422, 1424 and 1430, and again in 1440, 1446, 1448 and 1450 (cf. the references listed in Wittek, 142 and in Inalcik, op. cit., 509). It is well known, moreover, that Mehemmed II (1451-1483) had a large number of cannon, when he besieged Constantinople in 1453 (Ducas, 247-249, 258, 273; Sprantrzes, 236 & princip.; Chalcoondylas, 385-386, 414-415; Critoibulos, bk. i, chaps. 20 and 29 (with additional references given in the notes); Wille, 101; Jähns, 791-792, 1141-1144). Field guns seem to have made their appearance amongst the Ottomans not long before the battle of Varna (1444), i.e., during the course of the Hungarian wars waged in the reign of Murad II (1421-1451). The first clear indication that the Ottomans employed the cannon of this type in a major field engagement relates to the second battle of Kosovo (1448) (Wittek, 142-143; Inalcik, op. cit., 509-510), but it was not until considerably later that advances in technique rendered possible the emergence of an effective Ottoman field artillery. The arquebus, too, was taken over in about 1440-1443 during the Hungarian wars under Murad II and its use much extended in the reign of Mehmed II. None the less, the change to a more general adoption of the new weapon, e.g., within the corps of Janissaries, was a slow and gradual one, destined to remain long incomplete (Wittek, 143; Inalcik, op. cit., 506, 510-512; Ayalon, 38 (note 89); Jorga, ii, 228. Cf. also Promontorio, 36 (serbottanico), Chalcoondylas, 356 (sarabotanas), Dolfin, 13 (sarabottanico), terms uncertain in meaning, but perhaps referring to the arquebus? See, in addition, Lokotsch, 172 (Ar. sarbatana) and Ayalon, 61: sahaba). After the reverses which the Ottomans endured in the Cilician war of 1458-1491 against the Mamluks of Egypt and Syria, Bâyazid II (1481-1512) increased the number of Janissaries and provided them, and other categories of his troops, with arms more efficient and of greater offensive power than the weapons previously available; the Sultan also spared no expense to create a more mobile and more com-

petently manned artillery force (Alberi, ser. 3, i, 21 (a report dated 1503); cf. also Inalcik, op. cit., 506). The arquebus, slow to load and cumbersome to handle, was ill-suited to the needs and capacities of horsemen. It found little favour therefore, in the 15th and 16th centuries, with the Ottoman timarlıs and the Sipahis of the Porte, i.e., the “feudal” and the “household” cavalry of the Sultan. The use of fire-arms in this field had, in general, to await the appearance of new and more manageable types of hand-gun, i.e., the earlier forms of the musket and the pistol. A corps of mounted “arquebusiers” was, however, to be found in Egypt soon after the Ottoman conquest of 1517 (Ayalon, 96-97 and 129 (note 247a); Fevzi Kortuğlu, in Belleten, iv (1940), 67 and 68: alü tuğra züümü). The troops concerned primarily with gunpowder and fire-arms, and with their practical application in time of war, can be listed thus: (a) the Djebedjiler, i.e., the Armourers, who had charge of the weapons and munitions of the Janissaries—bows, arrows, swords, etc., but also hand-guns (tufen), powder (bârül), quick-matches (fiit), lead for bullets (bârhân) and the like. Members of this corps served both at Istanbul and in the provincial fortresses of the empire (Uzunçarşı, Kapakulu Ocakları, ii, 1-31). Venetian reports written between 1571 and 1590 state that almost all the Janissaries had adopted the arquebus, the Ottoman model of this gun being made with a longer barrel than was normal amongst the Christians and loaded with large bullets, “come li archibugio barbaroschi” (Alberi, ser. 3, i, 431-442, ii, 99, ii, 220, 343; cf. also Bombaci, in RSO, xx (1914-1923), 296, 299 (hand-guns firing shot which weighed 40-50 dirhems) and Uzunçarşı, op. cit., i, 366 and ii, 8 (note 2: hand-guns that took shot 4 and 5 dirhems in weight, 13-14, 28-29). (b) the Topkular, i.e., the Artillerists, who were responsible for the actual production of guns and for their maintenance and operation in war. These specialised troops had as their chief centre the arsenal (Top-khâne) at Istanbul, but served also in the various fortresses of the empire and in provincial cannon foundries and munition depots (Uzunçarşı, op. cit., ii, 33-93). The Ottomans at first carried into the field supplies of metal, rather than complete, and ponderous and cast their cannon as need arose during the course of a given campaign (Ibn Kemâl, Tevârîh-i Âl-i Osman, 462-463; 462-463 (= 420-421, in the transcription); Dolfin, 101; Promontorio, 61, 85; Jorga, ii, 227; Wittek, 142; Inalcik, op. cit., 509). This procedure, still current during the reign of Mehemmed II, fell gradually into disuse as further advances in technique and in methods of transportation rendered it, in general, superfluous. Chemical analysis has shown an Ottoman gun cast in 868/1464 to be composed of excellent bronze, allowance being made for the imperfections of the smelting process in use at that time (Abel, in The Chemical News, 1868). A Spanish artillerist, Collado, in his treatise of 1592, describes Ottoman cannon as ill-proportioned, but of good metal (Manual de Artillería, 8 v: “la fundicion Turquesa por la mayor parte es fea, y desfectuosa, aunque es de buena liga”). An account of the methods employed in the Top-khâne at Istanbul for the casting of guns is given in the work of Ewliya Celebi (Seyyid-nâme, i, 436 ff. = Uzunçarşı, op. cit., ii, 41 ff.). (c) the Top Arâbogilârî, i.e., the corps responsible for the transport of guns and munitions (Uzunçarşı, op. cit., ii, 95-113). Wagons (araba), drawn by horses, oxen or mules, carried the cannon, both large and
small, but much use was also made of camels to bear the lighter types of gun, especially in difficult terrain (Promontorio, 33; Menavino, bk. v, chapt. xxxi: 176; Ibn Tūlūn and Ibn Zunbul, cited in Ayalon, 125 (note 206) and 127 (note 220); Alberi, ser. 3, ii, 432, 438, 435, 436). There is mention, here and there in the sources, of guns on wheels, i.e., passages which refer perhaps to the "araiba" itself or possibly to some form of wheeled gun-carrriage (Tauer, Campagne ... contre Belgrade, 48 (Persian text: 64); Viaggio et Impressa ... di Diu, 173 v; Giovio, ii, bk. XXX, 104 r). Moreover, the Ottomans maintained on the Danube a flotilla which had a major rôle in the transportation of the siege artillery, field guns and supplies needed for the great campaigns in Hungary (cf. Uzunçarşılı, Bahriye Teskilatı, 403-404 (also ibid., 404-405; the arsenal at Birecik di The Euphrates); and Alberi, ser. 3, iii, 153: mention of flat-bottomed boats (palandarie) which carried horses, cannon, stores, etc.). (d) the Khambaradililar, i.e., the bombardiers concerned with the production and use of grenades, bombs, portable mines, artificial fire, etc. (Uzunçarşılı, Kapüşhâlu Ocakları, ii, 175-177). (e) the Lazhimdililar, i.e., the sappers who, with the aid of the large labour forces set at their disposal, prepared the trenches, earthworks, gun-emplacements and subterranean mines indispensable in siege warfare (Uzunçarşılı, op. cit., ii, 129-133). 

The Ottomans, even before the death of Mehemmed II in 1481, had acquired the main types of weapon and technique involving the use of gunpowder, i.e., siege and field artillery, mortars, bombs, the arquebus, mines and artificial fire (Jorga, ii, 227-228). A large share in the transmission of these new arms fell to the peoples of Serbia and Bosnia. Artillerists and arquebusiers, recruited in these countries and still retaining their Christian faith, are known to have been in the service of Mehemmed II (Inalcık, Fatih Devri, i, 155, 154-156 and also in Belleten, xxi (1957), 511). Masters came, too, from still farther afield, e.g., Jörg of Nuremberg (Kissling, 336). Reliance on specialists of European origin—at first mainly German and Italian, but with French, English and Dutch elements becoming more numerous in later times—was to be henceforth a permanent and indeed essential characteristic of the various Ottoman corps concerned with gunpowder and firearms. 

Information of a technical nature about the types of cannon in use amongst the Ottomans can be found here and there in the Western sources of the 15th and 16th centuries. The guns are of course described in accordance with the system of classification then current in Europe (and indeed in the Ottoman empire too), i.e., in terms of the weight or size of the projectile thrown (Promontorio, 61 and 85; de Bourbon, 135 v, with mention of iron and bronze cannon, e.g., culverins, basiliaks, sakers and also mortars firing marble shot and copper or bronze "bouletz" filled with artificial fire; Ufano, 40 and 41). An Italian account of the campaign against Diu in 1538 lists some of the guns which the Ottomans had with them on that occasion (Viaggio et Impressa ... di Diu, 150 r, 152 r; cf. also Sousa Coutinho, 58 v, on the Ottoman basiliaks used in the siege. The princes of India held the Ottoman artillerists in high esteem and welcomed them into their armies: e.g., a Muşafat Rûmî fought under Bâbur, and a Rûmî Khan under the Şultan of Gudjarat). 

The tactical use which the Ottomans made of their cannon in time of war has not been studied in detail. Their normal formation, however, was the ḏiḥār, when a field battle had to be fought, i.e., the wagenburg with the gun-carts chained together and the cannon set between them—a device which seems to have been taken over from the Hungarians (Inalcık, in Belleten, xxii (1952), 510; cf. also von Frauenholz, 434 and Uzunçarşılı, Kapüşhâlu Ocakları, ii, 255-259). The method used by the Ottomans to breach the walls of a fortress is described in the work of the Spaniard Collado: medium guns, e.g., culverins, capable of deep penetration and firing along transverse and vertical lines, undermined and split the stone-work, large basiliaks which threw heavier and more destructive shot, violent in the force of their surface impact, being then discharged in salvo to bring down the enfeebled structure (Manual de Artilleria, 135, 20 r, 32 r; cf. also Pečević, ii, 193). 

The Ottomans had of course their own nomenclature for guns and related instruments of war (cf. Uzunçarşılı, Kapüşhâlu Ocakları, ii, 48-53) including adjectives of a purely poetical character (e.g., ether-dikan and mür-on: "dragon-mouthed" and "serpent-bodied"—cf. Najmî, i, 148 and names given to individual cannon (e.g., the "Kočyân", i.e., the gun captured from Khatzenauer, the Imperialist general whom the Ottomans defeated in 1537 near Esaek on the Danube—cf. Selânikî, 31) terms which have a precise technical sense can also be found here and there in the Turkish chronicles and documents. Among the types of cannon most often mentioned in these sources are (i) the bagâyalıkska or baddiaška, a large siege gun (perhaps the basiliak?): cf. Selânikî, 35, 37, 38, 41; Hadjidî Khalîfâ, Feddeke, i, 29 (guns of this kind firing shot which weighed sixteen okkas each), 31, 33; Collado, 135, 32 r; Uzunçarşılı, op. cit., ii, 49, 60, 81; (ii) the bałayemct (e.g., the "Faule Metze" (Kissling: cf. Pečević, i, 202; Ewliyâ Celebi, viii, 418, 492 (where it is described as a mensli topu, i.e., a long-range gun); Siliîdâr, ii, 46 and 47 (cannon shot using 10-40 okkas in weight are here defined as bałayemets). (iii) the bolonborna (cf. the Italian scudrino), i.e., the culverin: cf. Selânikî, 8; Ewliyâ Celebi, ii, 128; Hadjidî Khalîfâ, Feddeke, i, 29 (culverins which fired shot weighing eleven okkas each) and i, 33 (bolonborna); Siliîdâr, i, 300 and ii, 46 and 47 (cannon throwing shot of 3-9 okkas in weight are here classed as bolonborna); Uzunçarşılı, op. cit., ii, 49, 81; Viaggio et Impressa ... di Diu, 169 r; Collado, 135; Alberi, ser. 3, iii, 432. (iv) the škalados (cf. the Hungarian szakalás), apparently a kind of light cannon which threw small projectiles of stone or metal: cf. Selânikî, 35, 41, 145; Pečević, ii, 242; Suhâyî Unver, in Belleten, xvi (1952), 560; L. Fekete, Die Siydqat-Schrift, i, 61 and 694, and also in Magyar Nyelv, xxvi (1930), 264; Redhouse, s.v. škalados. References to guns that fired small shot can be found in Ducas, 211 (cf. also Jâhns, 811) and in Giovio, ii, bk. xxx, 104 r: (v) the škyba (cf. the Hungarian sajka), a name given to a certain type of boat, but also used for the mounted on such craft: cf. Hadjidî Khalîfâ, Feddeke, ii, 320; Ewliyâ Celebi, viii, 378 (a mention of cannon (škyba toplari) that fired stone shot weighing eighty okkas each), 382 (škyba nâm prânka toplari); Fevzi Kurtoğlu, in Belleten, iv (1940), 68; Uzunçarşılı, op. cit., ii, 49, 50, 81 (large, medium and small škyba cannon); L. Fekete, in Magyar.
Nyelv, xxvi (1930), 265. On the guns used in the boats which the Ottomans maintained on the Danube, see Giovio, ii, bk. xxvii, 152. (vi) the darbzan or darbuzan, a gun cast in various sizes (cf. L. Fekete, Die Siydqat-Schrift, i, 694, 695: small (300 dirhem shot), medium (2 okha shot) and also a darbusan-i šah-i burs (firing shot 36 okhas in weight): cf. Ibn Kemâl, Tavvir-i Âl-i Osman, 464, 509 (= 422, 438 in the transcription); Selânîkî, 8, 35 (daht darbzan toplari); Peçevî, i, 93 and ii, 140, 147, 156; Du Lîor, Voyages, 226-227 (chahs seminatandar = "basofon royaux"); Silihdar, i, 467, 484, 497; ii, 147, 47 and 57; Uzunçarşî, op. cit., ii, 49, 50, 76, 79, 81; Ayalôn, 89, 90, 119 (note 92), 127 (note 220).

The Ottomans, in their sea warfare, seem to have used in general the same types of guns as in their campaigns on land. Among the cannon employed in the Ottoman fleet can be numbered the holon-borna, the darbzan and the şahîya (Barozzi and Berchet, i, 274, ii, 20; Uzunçarşî, Babrîye Teskilâtî, 464, 465, 466, 469, 512-513. Further information about the naval armament of the Ottomans is available in Alberî, ser. 3, i, 68, 140, 292-293, ii, 100, 150, 342, iii, 223, 354-355; Barozzi and Berchet, ii, 165; Marsîgli, Pt. I, chapt. xxix, 171-172; de Warnery, 115) and also the pranghi or prangki (Tauer, in ArO., vii (1935), 195; Kemâlpâşâzade, Mahdîyânâmê, 54 (Turkish text); Bombaci, in RSO, xx 1941-1943, 292 and xxI (1944-1946), 190; Uzunçarşî, Kapûkulu Ôcaklarî, ii, 49, 83 and also Babrîye Teskilâtî, 462, 468, 469, 512-513.

The sources often mention instruments of war other than cannon, but based on the use of gunpowder, e.g., (i) the hánâyî (Selânîkî, 8 (cf. Hammer-Purgstall, iii, 426, note 1); Uzunçarşî, Kapûkulu Ôcaklarî, ii, 49) and the hâsîm (Ewliyâ Celebi, viii, 407, 419, 471, 472; Yûsuf Nâbi, 43; Silihdar, ii, 47), i.e., mortars which fired bombs and also shot of stone or metal (Promontorio, 131; de Bourbon, 131; Viaggio et Impresa ... di Dùo, 169; Mauvrand, 202; Scheithâr, 81; Marsîgli, Pt. II, chapt. ix, 30-31); (ii) the khûmbara or khumbara, i.e., bombs (Tauer, Campagne ... contre Belgrade, 53, 58 (Persian text: 79, 89); Selânîkî, 40-41; British Museum MS. Or. 1157, 74 (bombs made of glass, and of bronze: sîxîje khumbara, furu' khumbara): Ewliyâ Celebi, viii, 401, 414, 435, 483 (khârsan [kahzîm] hûmbâr); Barozzi and Berchet, ii, 160; Silihdar, ii, 47 (khûmbara hûnmînî); Scheithâtî, 75, Marsîgli, Pt. II, chapt. ix, 33; Bigge, 154; (iii) the el khûmbarast, i.e. hand-grenades (Ewliyâ Celebi, viii, 414, 432, 471 (grenades of glass, and of bronze: sírçı ve ludî el khumbarast)); Silihdar, i, 467, 484, 502; Scheithâtî, 77; Marsîgli, Pt. II, chapt. ix, 33); (iv) the šâghân i.e., explosive mines of various types and sizes (Hâdîgî Khâlîfah, Fedîçhe, ii, 255 and Na'tmâ, iv, 143 (a large mine containing 150 kanîrân of gunpowder); Ewliyâ Celebi, viii, 444 (a mine with three galleries and three powder-chambers), 425, 432, 495; Silihdar, ii, 55, 56 (a mine of the type known as pushûmsîr and holding 30 kanîrân of powder), 66; Scheithâtî, 72-73; Montecuccoli, iii, chapt. ixvii; Marsîgli, Pt. II, chapt. xi, 37). Numerous references to mines can be found in the Ottoman accounts of the Cretan War (1645-1669), e.g., in Hâdîgî Khâlîfah, Fedîçhe, ii, 239 ff., passim, in Silihdar, i, 409 ff., in Na'tmâ, iv, 116 ff., passim, and in Ewliyî Celebi, viii, 396 ff. (cf. also ibid., viii, 468 ff., enumerating the guns, munitions, etc. found in the fortress of Candia after its conquest from the Christians in 1669—an account rich in the military terminology used by the Ottomans at that time).
French and also the Swedes); Barozzi and Berchet, ii, 166, 173, 222, 231-232; Marsigli, Pt. II, chapt. ix, 23 (the Ottomans made cannon according to the designs of the Italian author Sardi, one of whose works had been translated into Turkish—probably L’Artiglieria di Pietro Sardi Romano, Venice 1621). The 16th and 17th centuries witnessed in Europe notable changes in the art of warfare (J. R. Hale, in The New Cambridge Modern History, ii, 481 ff.; O. Laskowski, in Teki Hicrastiq, iv (1950), 106 ff.; M. Roberts, The Military Revolution 1560-1660, also Gualtiero Adolphus and the Art of War, in Historical Studies, i, 69 ff., and Gustavs Adolphus, ii, 165 ff.). These changes imposed on the Ottomans a constant need to adopt or otherwise to meet in an effective manner the innovations made in the European practice of war—a process of adjustment which was at times slow and difficult. A Muslim from Bosnia, writing not long after the battle of Varna (1521), lamented that the Christians, through their use of new types of hand-gun and cannon, as yet neglected by the Ottomans, had won a definite advantage over the armies of the Sultan (L. Thallotzy, Staatschrift, 153-154; Garcin de Tassy, in JA, iv (1824), 284; Safvetbeg Basagid, Nizam ul Alem, 13; British Museum MS. Harleian 5490, 350 ff). None the less, as the appearance of new, or the more frequent use of hitherto unusual terms in the Turkish chronicles and documents will make clear, the Ottomans did in fact assimilate to a large degree the latest devices and techniques elaborated in Europe at this time (Bombaci, in RSO, xx (1941-1943), 303 (çagma toplar, i.e., guns firing a form of grape-shot: cf. also Hâddîjl Khalîfî, Fedhahe, i, 34 and ii, 245, 377, 319, 321; Silhê'dâr, i, 596, 598 (misiket); Pecevî, ii, 199 (cf. Na'îmî, i, 164: muskets which fired shot 15-20 dirhems in weight); Ewliya Çelebi, vii, 179 (muskât tigeri, with shot weighing 40-50 dirhems, and kol tufenkleri) and viii, 398, 415, 426, 467 (badâloço, nâm mîskêt); Inalcik, in Tarih Vehikalari, ii/II (1943), 377 (güle tabancalı tufên); Uzunçarşıli, Kapukaüolu Ocakları, ii, 8, note 2 (a tufenk); Pecevî, ii, 212-213 (cf. Na'îmî, i, 190: an account of how an agâddî top, i.e., a petrâri, was made). Further evidence can be found in the Western sources (cf. Alberi, ser. 3, ii, 452 (archibugieri a cavallo)), iii, 391 (a report dated 1594. in which it is said that the Ottomans had not yet adopted the pistol) and 404 (the increasing use of the arquebus in the Ottoman fleet); Barozzi and Berchet, i, 265 (the spahî di paga, during the Hungarian war of 1593-1606, had begun to arm themselves with the arquebus and the terzarollo, i.e., a short-barrelled arquebus) and ii, 16 and 158; Ryczaat, 349 (the Sipahi of the Porte made use of pistols and carbines, but had no great esteem for fire-arms); Marsigli, Pt. II, chapt. viii, 15 and 16: the Ottomans learned new methods from the Christians in the Cretan War (1645-1669); the Janissaries and most of the Ottoman horsemen carried pistols). It was in the time of the Köprüyü viziers that this gradual transformation attained its full effect. Men well qualified to judge like Scheiter, Montecuccoli and Marsigli, describe in much detail, and often with approval, the weapons employed by the Ottomans, noting the excellence, for example, of their mortars (Scheiter, 75), their muskets (Montecuccoli, iii, chapt. xiv), and their mines, in the construction of which the Armenian lashhêdjar had a pre-eminent rôle (Marsigli, Pt. II, chapt. xi, 37 ff.; cf. also Levinus Warnerus, 69, 101 and Ewliya Çelebi, i, 315 ff., Montecuccoli, iii, chaps. xxx and xxxi). Alberi, ser. 3, ii, 452 (archibugieri a cavallo), ed. Pavet de Courteille, Paris 1859; Selânikî, Ta'irîkh, Istanbul A.H. 1281; Pecevî, Ta'irîkh, Istanbul A.H. 1281-1283; Hâddîjl Khâlla, Fedhahe, Istanbul A.H. 1286-1287; Ewliya Çelebi, Seyyâhatname, i, Istanbul A.H. 1314, vii and viii, Istanbul 1928; Yusuf Nâbi, Ta'irîkh-i Wâliî-i Kemalî, Istanbul A.H. 1281; Na'îmî, Ta'irîkh Istanbul A.H. 1281-1283; Silhê'dâr, Ta'irîkh, Istanbul 1928; Ahmed Djewdet, Ta'irîkh, ii, Istanbul A.H. 1292; F. Tauer, Histoire de la Campagne du Sultan Suleyman I contre Belgrade en 1521, Prague 1924, and also Additions a mon ouvrage "Histoire de la Campagne... contre Belgrade en 1521", in ArO., VII, Prague 1935, 193-196; A. Bombaci, Le fonti turche della battaglia delle Gerbe (1600), in RSO, XIX, Rome 1940-1941, 297-304, xx, Rome 1941-1943, 297-304, xxi, Rome 1943-1944, 297-304.

V. THE ŞAFÂWIDS

A consideration of the use of firearms in Persia under the Şafavids falls under two heads: artillery (generic name, tâp), and hand-guns; the latter, used by both cavalry and infantry, comprised arquebuses, muskets and carbines, all of which were termed, without differentiation, tâp-i farang (AT, 290). According to the traditional account of European writers, artillery was introduced into Persia during the reign of Şâh 'Abbâs I by the English soldiers of fortune Sir Anthony Sherley and his brother Sir Robert Sherley, who arrived in Kazvin in December 1596. Among Sir Anthony's party of 25 persons (Sir E. Denison Ross (ed.), Sir Anthony Sherley and his Persian Adventures, London 1933, 13 and n. 3) was "at least one cannon-founder" (Browne, iv, 105). Sir Anthony's steward, Abel Pinçon, states that the Persians at that time had no artillery at all (Denison Ross, 163), but his interpreter, Angelo, asserts that Şâh 'Abbâs "has some cannon, having captured many pieces from the Tartars; moreover there is no lack of masters to manufacture new ones, these masters have turned against the Turk and have come to serve the King of Persia" (Denison Ross, 29). Purchas, writing in 1624, claims that such progress was made under the guidance of the Sherley brothers that "the prevailing Persian hath learned Sherelian arts of war, and he which before knew not the use of ordnance, has now 500 pieces of brass" (Denison Ross, 21).

There is abundant evidence, however, in both the European and the Persian sources, that the Persians were familiar with the use of artillery long before the time of 'Abbâs I. The Venetian ambassador d'Alessandri, who arrived in Persia in 1571, states that the Ottoman prince Bayazid, who sought refuge with Şâh Tahmâsî in 966/1559, brought with him thirty pieces of artillery (A Narrative of Italian Travels in Persia in the 15th and 16th centuries, London 1873, 228). Herbert (A Relation of Some Years Travails etc., London 1634, 298) states that the Persians "got the use of cannon from the vanquised Portugal", and Figueroa states that the Persian artillery was manipulated by Europeans "and particularly by the Portuguese" (Tadhkirat al-Mulûk, 33). We know that in 955/1548 the Portuguese furnished Tâhmâsî with 10,000 men and 20 cannon at the time of the Ottoman sultan Sulaymân's second invasion of Persia (A Chronicle of the Carmelites, i, 29). Direct evidence that artillery was used by the Persian army even earlier than this is found in the contemporary Persian chronicle Ahsan al-Tawârikh (ed. C. N. Seddon, Baroda 1931). In the Şafawid army which laid siege to Dâmgân in 935/1528-9 there was a certain Ustâd (i.e., "master" [of his craft]) Shaykhîn the gunner (tâpî) (AT, 212). In a pitched battle with the Ozbegs near Mashhad, later the same year, Tahmâsî stationed in front of his army the wagons containing the dârzan (probably a type of light cannon, cf. the Mamlûk term dârzanâ); see D. Ayalon, Gunpowder and Firearms in the Mamluk Kingdom, London 1956, 117, n. 220 and (tâp-i) farangî (AT, 214); the gunners and musketeers (tâpî-yân wa sulangî-yân) were, however, unable to use their guns because the Ozbegs did not approach from the front (AT, 217). In 943/1538-9 the besieging Şafawid forces destroyed the towers (bûrdî) of the fort of Birkhîn in Shîrvân by artillery fire (AT, 287). In 946/1539-40 we hear for the first time of a tâp-i bâdî (commander-in-chief of artillery), in an action against Amîra Kûbâhî, the rebel governor of Æstārî (AT, 293). From this time onwards artillery was frequently used by the Şafawids in siege warfare, for instance at Gulîstân and Darband (954/1547-8) (AT, 311-2). At the siege of Kiş near Shâkkî in 955/1547-2 the Şafawids used "Frankish cannon" (tâp-i farangî), and in addition a type of cannon called bâdîî (cf. P. Horn, Das Heer- und Kriegswesen des Grossmaghuls, Leiden 1894, 29), and mortars (kâzbûn), which are mentioned for the first time; the towers of the fort were destroyed after twenty days' bombardment (AT, 350).

It is clear, therefore, that the claim that the Sherleys introduced artillery into Persia is entirely without foundation. In fact, artillery was in regular use at least as early as 935/1528-9, that is, within a few years of the accession of Şâh Tahmâsî, and fifteen years after the Şafawid defeat at Çaldîrân [q.v.], a defeat for which the Ottoman artillery was largely responsible. It must be emphasised, however, that even before Çaldîrân, the Şafawids were familiar with the use of artillery, and that consequently the Şafawid lack of artillery at Çaldîrân can only be attributed to a deliberate policy not to develop the use of firearms in the Persian army. The Persians had an innate dislike of firearms, the use of which they considered unmanly and cowardly (Nasr Allah Falsâfi, Mad[Jalla-yi Dânîhâda-yi Adâbî-yât-i Tîrhân, i/2, 1953-4, 93), and in particular they disliked artillery, because it hampered the swift manoeuvres of their cavalry (Tadhkirat al-Mulûk, 33). It is remarkable that, although we have frequent instances of the use of artillery in siege
warfare, little attempt seems to have been made to emulate the Ottomans in the use of artillery in the field. At the battle of Maghaghd in 935/1528-9 (see above), the one occasion on which the sources specifically record the use of artillery in the field by Tahmāsp, its immobility rendered it ineffective, and we hear no more of field artillery until the time of Shāh ʿAbbās I. Even under the latter, however, the use of artillery was still mainly confined to siege warfare (Naṣr Ḵālīf Falsafi, Zinādīyā-yi Shāh ʿAbbās-i Amwāli, ii, Tehran 1338 solar/1959, 403).

It seems that in the use of artillery the Persian armies suffered greatly from a paucity of cannon, while on the other hand the Turkish armies in Asia were very well equipped in this arm, and they could effect much damage in their attack" (Don Juan of Persia, ed. trans. G. Le Strange, London 1926, 98). When a ʿAfšāwīd force of 10,000 men under Muhammad Beg Ustāḏjiḏ laid siege to Ḵūn Kāyfa in Diyar Bakr about the year 913/1507-8, they made use of "a mortar of bronze, of four spans, which they brought from Mirdin (Mārdin) ... This mortar was cast in that country at the time of Jacob Sultan (Yaʿḵūb Sulṭān Ak Ḵoyunlu, d. 896/1490), and by his orders ... and Custagialu (Muhammad Beg Ustāḏjiḏ) also had another larger one cast by a young Armenian, who cast it in the Turkish manner —all in one piece. The breech was half the length of the whole piece, and the mortar was five spans in bore at the muzzle" (A Narrative of Italian Travels in Persia, 153). About the same time (probably in 912/1506-7) ʿIsaʿīl sent a force of 10,000 men under Bayrām Beg (Kāramānli?) to lay siege to Wān. Bayrām Beg, "having two moderate-sized cannons in his camp, began to batter the castle; but they were able to do no harm, as the walls were too strong and the guns too little skilful". After besieging the castle for three months, 'the artillerymen succeeded in destroying the source of the defenders' water supply, and the castle was thus at their mercy (A Narrative of Italian Travels in Persia, 161-3). In 916/1510 Ismāʿīl is said to have captured four cannon from the ʿOzbek after his great victory at Marw (Ḍjamīl Ḵusānli, Ṭārikh-i Niṣāmī-yi Ἰrān, vol. i, Tehran 1315 solar/1926, 372; no authority is quoted for this statement). It seems, therefore, from the evidence available, that although the ʿAfšāwīd used cannon in siege warfare during the first decade of the reign of Ismāʿīl, the number of guns available was small, and the gunners were as yet inexperienced.

Sir Anthony Sherley has also been given the credit for the formation of a corps of musketeers by Shāh ʿAbbās I. In a letter dated 22 April 1619, the traveller Pietro della Valle says that the corps was created by Shāh ʿAbbās "a few years ago" on the advice of Sir Anthony Sherley (Tadhikrat al-Muluk, vi, London 1905, 409-10).

Apart from Sir Anthony's own testimony to the existence of a large and efficient body of musketeers in the Persian army before his arrival in Persia, there is conclusive evidence, again in both the European and the Persian sources, that Persian troops were equipped with hand-guns and skilled in their use long before the time of ʿAbbās I. One of Sir Anthony's companions, Manwaring, explicitly states that the Persians were already "very expert in their pieces or muskets; for although there are some which have written now of late that they had not the use of pieces until our coming into the country, this much, I must write to their praise, that I did never see better barrels of muskets than I did see there; and the King hath, hard by his court at Aspahan, above two hundred men at work, only making of pieces, bows and arrows, swords and targets" (Denison Ross, 222). Even earlier (c. 1571) is the valuable account of d'Alessandri: "they use for arms swords, lances, arquebuses, which all the soldiers can use; their arms also are superior and better tempered than those of any other nation. The barrels of the arquebuses are generally six spans long (A Chronicle of the Carmelites in Persia, London 1939, i, 53, gives "7 palms" = 1.75 m.; incidentally this version of the text contains an obvious mistranslation), and carry a ball a little less than three ounces in weight. They use them with such facility, that it does not hinder them drawing their bows nor handling the arquebus, keeping both in one hand and holding it at their saddle-bows till occasion requires them. The arquebus then is put away behind the back, so that one weapon does not impede the use of another" (A Narrative of Italian Travels in Persia, 227). Herbert (op. cit., 298) states that the Persians had used muskets "since the Portugals assisted King Tahmas with some Christian auxiliaries against the Turk (probably in 953/1548) so as now (i.e., in 1627) they are become very good shots". In the contemporary Persian chronicle Aḵsān al-Tawārīḵ, however, there is direct evidence that hand-guns (tufang) were in use in the Persian army even before the death of Ismāʿīl 1: in 937/1520-1 a detachment of the ʿAfšāwīd garrison at Harāt drove off the troops of Ubayd Khān Ozbek with arrows and hand-guns (tir u tufang) (AT, 174). This is the first reference to hand-guns in this chronicle, and from then on they are mentioned frequently. In 930/1523-4, the year of Shāh Ismāʿīl's death and Shāh Tahmāsp's accession, infantry armed with hand-guns (priyadāgan-i tufang-anddā) constituted part of the ʿAfšāwīd garrison at Harāt, and reference is made to two successful actions against the ʿOzbek in which hand-guns were employed (AT, 186). In 934/1527-8, when Harāt was besieged for four months by the ʿOzbek, the Ozbek amir al-
umard Yari Bej was killed by a shot fired from a hand-gun by one of the defenders (AT, 206). In 935/1528-9 Tähmäsp himself led an army to Khurāsān against the Ūzbegs, and laid siege to Dāmghān; his forces included a group of Rūmī tufangles (AT, 212). A few months later, the Ūzbegs laid siege to Mashhad; musketeers (tufangles) formed part of the Šafawid garrison (AT, 221). While the Ḩasan al-Tawārīḵ thus affords positive evidence of the use of muskets in the Persian army as early as 927/1520-1, there is a strong indication in A Narrative of Italian Travels in Persia that they were in fact in use even before the battle of Cādīrān. In the description of the siege of Hisn Kayfā by Šafawid forces about the year 913/1507-8, there is a reference to "guns" which, in the context, can only mean "hand-guns", and we are also told that the defenders possessed three or four muskets of the shape of "Azemi", i.e., of ʿAdāmi or Persian design; these muskets had a small barrel and, with the aid of a "contrivance locked on to the stock about the size of a good arquebuse", had a good range (op. cit., 153).

It is clear, therefore, that the claim that the Sherleys initiated the formation of a corps of musketeers, if it has any historical foundation at all, can only be true in the sense that Shāh ʿAbbas was the first to create a regular corps of musketeers, which formed part of a standing army paid from the Ḿusūl revenue, as opposed to the units in existence under Ismāʿīl I and Tähmāsp, which, like the rest of the Persian army at that time, were probably raised on a tribal basis and paid from the revenue of the dawīn-i māmālīk. There is no doubt, however, that the practical advice of the Sherleys was of great benefit to Shāh ʿAbbas, who held Sir Robert Sherley in such esteem that, after Sir Anthony's departure, he appointed him "Master General against the Turks" (G. N. Curzon, Persia and the Persian Question, London 1892, i, 574). In addition to the corps of musketeers (tufangles), 12,000 strong (Chardin, Voyages du Chevalier Chardin en Perse, ed. Langlès, Paris 1811, v, 305), who were intended to be infantry but were gradually provided with horses, Shāh ʿAbbas created two other corps to form part of the new standing army, namely, the artillery (tālpīydn), also 12,000 strong (Chardin, v, 312-3), and the "slaves" (būlar, Ḿulmān-i Ḿusūl i khāṣa-yi ṣarḥiṭa), a cavalry regiment recruited from Georgia and Circassia, armed inter alia with muskets, and numbering 10-15,000 (Taḥkhirat al-Mulākh, 33). The Šafawid army was at its strongest under Shāh ʿAbbas I; its numbers declined under his successor ʿAbd al-Qādir (d. 1052/1642) and were reduced still further by ʿAbābī II (d. 1079/1666), who took the extraordinary step of abolishing the corps of artillery; when the tālpī-bāght Husayn Kull Khān died in 1665, no successor was appointed (Chardin, v, 312-313), and artillery does not seem to have reappeared on the scene until the reign of Shāh Sultan Ḫusayn (1105-1135/1694-1722) (Taḥkhirat al-Mulākh, 53). At the battle of Gulaḥāb against the Afghāns (8 March 1722), the Persians had 24 cannon, under the command of the tālpī-bāght Ahmad Khān and under the supervision of a French master gunner named Philippe Colombe (L. Lockhart, The Fall of the Šafawī dynasty and the Afghan Occupation of Persia, London 1938, 135, who quotes Krusinski's scathing remarks on the incompetence of the tālpī-bāght; the artillery was over run by the Afghan advance, and both the tālpī-bāght and Philippe Colombe lost their lives (ibid., 142). It is not much to say that the Šafawīs never really made any effective use of artillery in the field.

Bibliography: in the text. (R. M. Savory)

vi. — India

Napthha (naft) was used by the Muslims in India by Muhammad b. Ḫāsim in 93/711 against Rāḍja Dāhir. Tīr-i dtish (fiery-arrows) were the simplest fire missile used by the Muslim Indian rulers in the early part of the 7th/13th century. The department of dtish-bāzā (fireworks) was placed under the Mīr dtišā. Firīghta's statement that Sultan Māmūd of Ghūzān employed tāp "cannon muskets" against Anand Pāl near Peshāwār in 999/1508 is an obvious anachronism. It may, however, refer to his use of a missile carrying napthha (ḥārūra-i naft)—a weapon mentioned by Firīghta in another place regarding Sultan Māmūd's campaign in India. Saltpetre, an important ingredient of gunpowder, is commonly found in India. The word Ḫūsh-i ṣuldān mentioned in the 13th century MSS., ʿAbī al-Mulākh (f. 118 b) and Tādīj-i Maʿādīhur (f. 3 a), needs a minute examination. The Farhang-i Ṣhārāl-nāma-i Ahmad Mūnīydrī (compiled in 875/1470) gives its meaning as: "a perforator, or an instrument for throwing stones or a gōlā (ball) projected by the expansive force of combustible substances". Stein-glass explains it as a cannon or cannon ball. According to the Bāhār-i ʿĀḏām, it is an instrument of war worked with gunpowder. From this it would seem that a machine which discharged balls by some explosive force was used in India by 628/1230. Sang-i Maḥāribī "Western stone", mentioned by both Baranf and Ṭāhsūr as being used under ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Ḫūsārī (695/1296-1316) cannot be taken as denoting "gun". This new implement was borrowed from Spain and North Africa—countries which were called in Arabic "the West". Generally the besiegers employed this machine to bombard a fort. How the stones were thrown is not clearly stated, but this much is certain, that the stone balls were discharged by the force generated by gunpowder.

It is very difficult to discover the real nature of fire-arms used in the 7th/13th or the beginning of the 8th/14th century in India, as the term dtish-bāzā (fireworks) is applied to pyrotechnic displays as well to artillery, thus rendering the meaning of the passages ambiguous. However tāp and tufang are mentioned as being in frequent use from the middle of the 8th/14th century. When Sultan Māmūd fought against Timūr at Delhi in 800/1398, the former's elephants carried howdahs in which were raʿd-īndāz "throwers of grenades" and ṭahkhi-andāz "throwers of rockets". Artillery was improved under the Lodīs (855-932/1451-1526). ʿĪbrāhīm Lodī employed tāp and darbān "mortars" against Bābur at the battle of Panipat in 932/1526.

In the latter half of the 8th/14th and beginning of the 9th/15th century, the use of cannon became very common in the Deccan. The chief reason was that the Deccan States were in contact by sea with Arabia, Iran and Turkey, from which they received artillery and engineers. Firīghta records that Sultan Māmūd Shāh Bahmanī installed a firearms factory in 767/1365; he was the first of the Muslim rulers of the Deccan to do so. Sultan Māmūd Bāyḵārāb with the help of his Turkish gunners sank with his guns a large Portuguese ship at Diu in 915/1509. Bāḥādūr Shāh of Gujrat excelled his contemporaries in artillery; his master gunner, Rūmī Khān, cast many cannon. One of the reasons for Bahādur's success against the Portuguese was his superior
artillery. All these facts show that cannon were used in India long before Babur employed them at Panipat in 932/1526.

The Mughals paid much attention to the art of artillery. Babur had a limited number of heavy guns at Panipat. He uses the words "degh, firangi and dekh栏目", but does not mention their number. He used his artillery "chained together according to the custom of Rām with twisted bull-hides". Babur's gun could be discharged eight to sixteen times a day only and after improvement could cover a range of 1600 strikes. Rockets became common in India after 947/1540. The barrels of Akbar's (953-1014/1556-1605) matchlocks were of two lengths, 66 ins. and 42 ins. They were made of rolled strips of steel, with the two edges welded together. The longer of the two weapons could only be used by a man on foot. The flintlock was little known to the Mughals. The artillery was much improved, and was more numerous, in Awrangzib's reign (1068-1118/1658-1707). Besides Indians, Turks, Arabs and Portuguese, the Dutch were also employed by Awrangzib. There was one Dutch artillery engineer who served Awrangzib for sixteen years and went home in 1077/1667. Heavy field guns were used both by the Mughals and the Deccanis. The haft gazi in Bidar was constructed in 977/1570. It measures 32 ft. in length. The malish-i maydān "king of the battlefield" was built in 957/1549 by Burhān Nizām Shāh. The metal is an alloy of 80,427 parts of copper to 19,573 parts of tin. It weighs 400 maunds and the bore is so wide that a man can sit and move about in it easily. The shaped iron shot is ten maunds (Akbar's scale). The ba'la-buxā, used by Dārā in 1068/1658 at Sāmgarh, was made of 80% tin and measured 5 ft. in length. During the contest for the throne of Deccanis and the Deccanis, the Khedivial Library, and proposed the creation of a small town in the province of Lower Egypt: al-Bahira, called Itay al-Barud. He lost his father, then an official in the Dongola, at the age of seven.

After completing his primary studies, he entered, in 1267/1851, the Cairo Military Training School, during the reign of the Viceroy ʿAbbās I (1848-1854), and left it in 1271/1855 with the rank of bābādār (quartermaster-sergeant), at the beginning of the reign of Saʿīd I (1854-1863). His taste for poetry developed from this time onwards; his reading and personal researches, his contacts with the men of letters and poets of the period, made him, despite his military duties in his capacity as an officer which took up most of his time, one of the leaders of the literary renaissance in Egypt. A return to the true sources of poetry, that is to say to the great poets of the diāshiyya and particularly of the ʿAbbāsīd period, seemed to him essential; but he wished also to belong to his own epoch, and for this reason he took advantage of every opportunity to broaden his knowledge in all fields of literature, to begin with, Turkish and Persian, and later, French and English. He lived for some time in Constantinople, with the title of Secretary for Egyptian Foreign Affairs. At the time of the visit of the Viceroy ʿIsāmīl to the Ottoman capital, he brought himself to the notice of the new viceroy who had just succeeded Saʿīd (1279/1863). al-Barud found himself constrained to participate in various diplomatic missions. At the time of the Russian war in 1294/1877, al-Barud proved himself a brilliant and courageous officer, and as a result was promoted amir ad-dāy (colonel) of the 8th regiment of the Guard and, shortly afterwards, amir ad-dāy (colonel) of the 4th regiment of the same Guard.

He took part in the war in Crete in 1282/1865, and his services won him the Turkish decoration Wisâm ʿUthmānī, 4th class. ʿIsāmīl, who since 1283/1866 had been Khedive, kept al-Barud at the head of his Guard, and later appointed him private secretary and sent him to Constantinople, during the Serbo-Bulgarian war, to perform various diplomatic missions. At the time of the Russian war in 1294/1877, al-Barud proved himself a brilliant and courageous officer, and as a result was promoted amir ad-dāy (brigadier-general). From 1296/1879 to 1884, al-Barud busied himself with the reorganisation of the Egyptian General Staff, under the Khedive ʿAbd al-Karim who had succeeded ʿIsāmīl in 1296/1879. Meanwhile, appointed Minister of War as well as Minister of Wafrās, he became, in 1298/1881, Minister of War as well as Minister of Wafrās, and decorated with the Nishām Madīdī, he became, in 1298/1881, Minister of War as well as Minister of Wafrās, and thus found himself constrained to participate in the nationalist movement then in its infancy, and to intervene in the serious conflict between the locally recruited Egyptian army and the Turko-Circassian officers. From then on, al-Barud found
himself involved, either as a spectator or as an active participant, in what is known as Thawra 'Arabî Pasha or al-Thawra al-'Arabiyya, "the Revolt of 'Arabî Pasha" (the name is also pronounced 'Urâbî). Summary of events: fall of the minister Sharîf Pasha; formation of al-Barudi's Cabinet; proclamation of the constitution of 1299/1882; bombardment of Alexandria by the British fleet; landing of the British army; defeat of 'Arabî Pasha at Tell-al-Kebr (near Cairo); occupation of Egypt by Britain; exile of the leaders or promoters of the "Revolt," among whom were al-Barudi, 'Arabî Pasha and Shaykh 'Abdub.

For seventeen years, from the end of 1882 until the beginning of 1900, al-Barudi was obliged to reside in the island of Ceylon. He profited by his enforced leisure to study English, to devote himself to teaching his compatriots and co-religionists, and above all to take up again his favourite studies in Arabic poetry and to give his inspiration free rein to compose the major poems of his diwân.

When he returned to Egypt after having been pardoned by the Decree of 18 Mu'harram 1318/15 May 1900, he had amassed numerous poems selected with discrimination from the collections and diwâns of the 'Abbâsid period, and which, arranged in categories, constituted the most representative anthology of muwallad or muhaddhîth ("modern") poets. These categories are as follows: 1. Adab (moral or ethical); 2. Madîth (panegyric); 3. Rîthâ (threnody); 4. Sahîl (descriptive); 5. Nasîb (erotic); 6. Hîdîth (satire); 7. Zuhd (renouncement of the world). The poets quoted, arranged in chronological order, are thirty in number, and the total verses quoted under each of the above headings are respectively: 1,697, 24,185, 3,400, 3,397, 4,616, 1,225 and 473, making a grand total of 39,593 verses. The number of verses of the madîth category is particularly remarkable. More important, it seems to me, is the importance attributed to certain poets. Ibn al-Rûmî and al-Buhturî lead the field with 3,732 and 3,397 verses. Two poets have between 2,500 and 3,000 verses: Sibî Ibn al-Ta'sîwîdî and al-Sharîf al-Radî; four between 2,000 and 2,500 verses: al-Arâjânî, Abu Tammâm, al-Mutanabbi and al-Sarî al-Raffa; two between 1,500 and 2,000 verses: Ibn Nabîtâ al-Miṣrî and Mîhîyâr al-Dâyâli; five between 1,000 and 1,500 verses: al-Munâdîrî, al-Ghażî, Ibn Hâyûsî, Abu 'l-Fa'âlî al-Ma'sûrî, Surra'dur; eight between 500 and 1,000 verses: al-Tughrî, Abu Nuwâs, 'Umar al-Yamâni, al-Tihâmî, Ibn Hânî al-Andalusî, Ibn Sinân al-Khâfajî, Ibn al-Mutâzî and Ibn al-Khayyât; and, finally, seven between 90 and 500 verses: Abu Fîrâs al-Hamâdânî, Mîlîm b. al-Walîd, Abu 'l-Atâyâ, Ibn 'Umaiyn, al-Ahâb b. al-Ahnâf, Bashshâr b. Burd and Ibn al-Zayyât.

The Mukhtârs of al-Barudi did not appear in any bookseller's before the death of the author, but were published in Cairo in four volumes, two in 1327/1909 and two in 1329/1911, through the efforts of the scholar Yâkût al-Mursî.

Al-Barudi's diwân, which similarly did not appear until after his death, was first published, thanks to the scholar and commentator Mahmûd al-Manṣûrî, in three volumes in two (poems with rhymes hamsa to lâm), n.d., 536 and 631 pages, and was published a second time in 1940 with a preface by M. H. Haykal and a commentary by 'All al-Đârîm and Muhammad Shâfi' Ma'rîf; it reveals the same eclecticism. Occasional pieces are numerous; accurate descriptions of places enable one to follow the poet-statesman through his various étages; some of the poems composed at Colombo (Ceylon) are particularly moving. It is not possible, within the limits of this article, to go into the detail which would be required by a more profound critical appreciation of the subject matter, not to mention the form, of his poems. Let it suffice to say that al-Barudi attained an undisputed mastery of poetic language in its purest classical form; vocabulary, figures of speech, stylistic devices, held no secrets for him. He did not seek to make innovations in the pattern of the basîda or in the poetic metres (there is a rare exception in the diwân, i, 63-4), and remained faithful to his models. His admiration for the passed led him to imitate several famous poems, with astounding success. For example, his imitation of the Burda of al-Bûsîrî, using the same metre (basîd) and the same rhyme (mi), under the title of Ka'fî al-Qunüma ji Muhd Sayyid al-Umma (Cairo 1327/1909, i, 458, 48 pages, 447 verses, whereas the Burda only contains 172). The themes used in his diwân, however, are very modern and, in this respect, al-Barudi is justly considered to be one of the most effective pioneers of the renaissance of contemporary Arabic poetry.

Bibliography: The reader is referred to the very full references given by J. A. Dagher, in his Maṣâ'dîr al-Dîrâsâ al-Arâbiyya, ii: al-Rûhânî (1899-1951), Beirut 1956, 159-162. To these should be added, with regard to the Thawra 'Arabiyya, the following two works which give all necessary documentation: M. Sabry, La genèse de l'esprit national égyptien (1863-1882), Paris 1924, and Osman Amin, Muhammad 'Abdub, Essai sur ses idées philosophiques et religieuses, Cairo 1944.— Cf. also the notice in Brockelmann S III, 7-18.
ment of nurturing separatist ideas and plotting the founding of an Ibadite imamate. Proceedings were instituted against him, but the sentences pronounced were not fully executed because of the disturbances which they provoked, especially in the Djbabal. Finally he was granted an amnesty, but upon the Ottoman authorities requesting him to present himself in Constantinople, he fled to Cairo.

A man of unusual culture (having studied at Tunis, al-Azhár and in the Mzáb), he founded a printing office, which had the outstanding merit of disseminating several old Ibadí works. He also founded a newspaper, which however only enjoyed an ephemeral life, its circulation in the Ottoman provinces, Tunisia, and Algeria, being prohibited.

After the promulgation in Turkey of the constitution following the Young Turks' revolution, Sulaymán al-Bárúni was elected deputy in the ʿimāma wa mulūk al-Ibadīyya, thereupon he learnt Turkish in two months of intense study.

When Italy's designs on Libya became evident, al-Bárúni endeavoured to obtain consignments of arms from his government. After the Italian landing at Tripoli (11th October 1911), he was one of the most active promoters of the Arab resistance, which made Turkey decide to stand firm, and which continued even after the signing of the Turco-Italian Peace Treaty at Ouchy (or Lausanne, 18th October 1912). In the western Djbabal sector, where al-Bárúni was conducting operations and was aiming at the formation of a Berber amirate, the issue was decided at the battle of al-ʿAṣbāʿa (el-ʿAṣbāʿa) on the 23rd March 1913. Upon his return to Constantinople, al-Bárúni was appointed senator, receiving the title of pasha.

When Turkey entered the war on the side of the Central Powers (1914), al-Bárúni was sent to Sollum (October 1914) with the brother of Enver Pasha, Nûrî Bey, to induce the leader of the Sanüsí, Ahmad al-Sharif, to attack the British from the West. His mission failed; the plot to force the British to leave Tripolitania, to which al-Baruni was conducting operations and was aiming at the formation of a Berber amirate, the issue was decided at the battle of al-ʿAṣbāʿa (el-ʿAṣbāʿa) on the 23rd March 1913. Upon his return to Constantinople, al-Bárúni was appointed senator, receiving the title of pasha.

Nevertheless he managed to escape (January 1915). He resumed his role as an opponent of Italy, when the latter entered the war. However it was not until the end of 1916, when Turkey had appointed him Governor-General and Commander of Tripoli and its dependencies, that he landed at Misurata from a submarine. The Italians were in a precarious situation, having entrenched themselves at Tripoli, Homs (al-Kūms) and Zuara, but the Arabs also were in a state of complete confusion. Their leaders had divergent aims and the tribes were fighting amongst themselves; al-Bárúni restored harmony. Nevertheless, he soon lost his pre-eminence; after proceeding to western Tripolitania, he was there defeated by the Italians (16th and 17th January 1917). At the end of the same month of January, the Turks replaced him by a military man, the Nûrî Pasha referred to above. In November 1917, that is to say after the signing of the Armistice between Turkey and the Allies, the nationalists, under the influence of the Wilsonian principles, established the Tripolitanian Republic (al-Djum-hāriyya al-Tarabulusiya) in Tripolitania, to which Italy later granted (1st June 1919) the Tripolitanian Statute. Two movements then manifested themselves, one aimed at an agreement with Italy which would have meant complete independence, and the other, represented especially by the Berbers, favourable to collaboration with Italy by the appli-
ment here is the effect of a law of nature established by God.

In eschatology, the word barzakh is used to describe the boundary of the world of human beings, which consists of the heavens, the earth and the nether regions, and its separation from the world of pure spirits and God. See the pictures representing this conception in the Mat'rifat-nama of Ibrāhīm Ḥākī (Būlāk 1251, 1255); cf. also Carra de Vaux, Fragments d'eschatologie musulmane; R. Eklund, Life between Death and Resurrection recording to Islam, Upsala 1941.

The Šefs, too, use the town in the sense of space between the material world and that of the pure spirits; hence several shades of meaning; cf. C. E. Wilson, The Masmāvi, book ii, vol. ii, note 20.

The same expression is also found in the philosophy known as "illuminating" (al-bikmah al-maşrihiyya). It there denotes the dark substances, i.e. bodies: the barzakh or the body is dark by nature and only becomes light on receiving the light of the spirit. The celestial spheres are "animated" or "living" barzakhs, immaterial bodies on the other hand are "dead" barzakhs (cf. Carra de Vaux, La Philosophie illuminatrice d'après Suhravardi Mecitou, in JA, Jan.-Feb. 1902).

The term barzakh is sometimes rendered by Purat, on the analogy of the Christian idea of Purgatory, but this is inaccurate. It is used in the sense of "limbo". See further al-Tahānawi, Dīct. of Technical Terms, s.v. (B. Carra de Vaux*)

Bārzān, a Kurdish village on the left (eastern) bank of the Great Zāb river, approximately 80 km. due north of Arbil, in what was formerly the territory of the Zēbāri tribe. Šarāf al-Dīn Bīltīš, Šarār-nāma, i, 107, in 1005/1596, numbered it among the possessions of the Bahdīnā princes under the name of Bāzrān. Since the middle of the 13th/19th century Bārzān has been the residence of a Naḵghbandī šaykh. The šaykhās and their followers, now known as the Bāzrāni tribe, maintained a turbulent independence of Ottoman authority until, early in 1333/1925, the Mawīl authorities captured and hanged Šaykh Ābd al-Salām II. His successor, Šaykh Ahmad, temporarily declared himself a Christian in 1350/1931. This occasioned warfare with the neighbouring Brādōst tribe, necessitating the intervention of the government of Īrāk. The šaykh fled to Turkey, where he was arrested.

In midsummer 1362/1943 Mullā Ṩūṣṭāfā, brother of Šaykh Ahmad, escaped from seclusion at Sulaymānīyeh to Bārzān, where he gathered support and rebelled against the government. He had some initial success against government forces, but was finally obliged to retire, early in 1364/1945, to Persia. He assisted at the inauguration of the Kurdish People’s Republic at Mahābād on 10 Muḥarram 1365/15 December 1943 and was made a Field-Marshal. On the collapse of the Republic Mullā Ṩūṣṭāfā escaped to Soviet territory, while Šaykh Ahmad surrendered to the Īrāk government.


Barzanh, a village and township (dis冲刺tîn) in the district (qāhristān) of Ardabīl, county (būlāq) of Garm, lying in the mountains overlooking the plain of Muḥānā to the north. The name may mean “high place”. The village lies ca. 47° 40’ E. long. (Greenw.) and 39° 20’ N. lat.

A confusion between Barzan and Barzanji (near Tiflis) appears in several of the mediaeval geographers (cf. Yāḵūt, i, 526; Ḥudūd al-ʿAlām, 403). This confusion, together with a remark of Muhaddisī, 378, that Barzand was a market for Armeians, helps to explain why several geographers (e.g., Yāḵūt) placed Barzand in Armenia.

We find no notice of the place before the time of Afšin (q.v.), who in 220/835 made Barzand one of his headquarters in the campaign against Bābak (q.v.). Several sources say that Afšin rebuilt Barzand after he had found it in ruins (Schwarz, 1904). Bābak may have destroyed the town, since it was a strategic point on the main road from Ardabīl north to the Muḥānā steppe. After the time of Afšin Barzand became a large town with a prosperous bazaar, noted for textiles. It may have suffered during the Mongol conquests, for Ḥand Allāḥ Mustawī, Ṭuṣka, trans. G. L. Strange, 91, says the town was in ruins in his time (mid 8th/14th cent.). Later the area was included in the pasture land of the Šah Sewan tribe (q.v.), and the people spoke Adhārī Turkish as they do today.

At the present the township has a population (1950) of ca. 3820, and the central village is called Kala’-y Barzan.

Bibliography: P. Schwarz, Iran im Mittelalter, ii (1924), 1904-98, where references to Islamic sources are given. Add to these Ḥudūd al-ʿAlām, 142, 403; Le Strange, 175-6; Razmārā, Farhang-i Dīnghrāfiyyā-yi Īrān, iv, Tehran 1952, 87. (R. N. Frye)

Barzu-nāma, Persian epic, attributed to Abu ‘l-ʿAlā’ ʿAṭāʾ b. Yaʿqūb, known as Nakūk (called ʿAṭāʾ b. Yaʿqūb, known as ʿAṭāʾ Rāzī in Blochet, Catal. Mss. persans Bibli. Nat. Paris, iii, 15, no. 1189). According to Rīḍā Kūlī Ḵᵛān Hīdāyat, “some people have wrongly considered these two names to represent two poets. This is not so; they are the same person” (Maḏḥaʿ al-Fasāḥā, i, 342). ʿAṭāʾ was a poet in both Arabic and Persian (see his account in Bahkhal, Dumyat al-Ḵaṣr) and an official in the reign of the Ghaznavid sultan Ibrāhīm (1059-1099) who, dissatisfied with him, ruined him, imprisoned him and held him prisoner for more than eight years at Lahore. ʿAṭāʾ died in 491/1098, according to Awfī (Lubāb, i, 72-75). At the end of a remarkable elegy (marrātiya) his contemporary Maḏḥūḏ-i Ṣaʿīd-i Ṣalmān gave his name clearly: “az wafāt-i ʿAṭāʾ ŏn-i Yaʿqūb, tāzā-tar gūd wakhkhat-i ʿAlām” (by the death of ʿAṭāʾ son of Yaʿqūb the shamelessness of this nether world received a new stimulus”). His principal work was the Lay of Barzū (Barzū-nāma), the longest and one of the most important epic poems based on the ancient Persian traditions in imitation of the Book of the Kings (Shāh-nāma) of Firdawṣi (from which the Barzū-nāma in several parts is directly derived). Barzū, son of Suhrāb and grandson of Rustam, was born among the Tūrānians to a woman called Shahrū. Persuaded by Afrāṣiyāb, leader of the Tūrānians, he went to fight the Persians; at the end of protracted hostilities, Rustam recognised him and reconciled him to the Persians. Finally he died, killed traitorously in the course of a war against the Slavs, represented as demons (ḍūm) ruled over by the diw Shikbāb. Noldeke, seeing in these adventures (as J. Mōhli did before him) a variant of those of the heroes Suhrāb and Dīhāngir, assumed that the work was one of pure invention. The episode of the Tūrānian singing-girl Sūsān, who captured the chief
Persian heroes by a trick, and decided to send them in chains to Afrasiyab, when the Persian hero Faramurz came suddenly to rescue them, is one of the most brilliant parts of the poem; it may be considered as a work of art on its own merits. Fragments of the *Barzu-nama* (two MSS. in the Bibl. Nat. Paris, Blochét, Catal. ms. persans, iii, 15 and 16) were published by Turner Macan (Shah-nama, iv, 2160-2296), Kosegarten (Mines de l’Orient, V, 309), Vullers (Chryst. Schahnam., 87-99). It also seems possible to attribute to *Ata* the epic poem *Bijiq-nama*, concerning the exploits of another Persian hero, the last line of which is: "*Ja in dastan dil bi-paraxdtam, sad-i rasmi Barzu hami takhhtam*, "when I had freed my heart of this poem. I quickly began the Lay of Barzu" (Rieu, Catal. Persian Ms. Brit. Mus., 132-133).


**BARZÚYA,** Arabic name, attested by Yākūt, of a fortress to which modern writers, following a reference to it by his contemporary, prefer to apply the name Bourzy. The local people call it Kal'at Marza. The ruins of this castle, standing on the eastern slope of the Aloua massif, still dominate the marshy depression of the Ghâb. It had a troubled history from Hellenic times, when the impregnable position of Lysias was known. At the time of the Syrian expedition of the Emperor Tzimisces in 365/975, it passed from Hamdanid hands into those of the Byzantines. Subsequently it was occupied by the Crusaders and, forming one of the best defences of the principality of Antioch (at which time it appears to have born the name Rochefort) was retaken by force by Salâl al-Dîn in 584/1188. From the Manûlûk period it rapidly lost its importance and the chroniclers merely make passing reference to it.

**Bibliography:** Yâkút, i, 765; Abu ‘l-Fidâ, Takwim, 261; Dimashqi, Mehran ed., 205; M. Hartmann, Das Libn al-Ladkhî, in ZDPV, xiv, 174 and 212; M. van Berchem, Inscriptions arabes de Syrie, 82; idem, Notes sur les croisades, in JA, 1902, i, 434; R. Dussaud, Topographie historique de la Syrie, Paris 1927, especially 151-53; G. Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, London 1890, 421; M. Canard, Histoire de la dynastie des Hamdânidès, Algiers 1951, 215, 843; G. Cahen, La Syrie du Nord, Paris 1940, index (under Borzech); J. Weulersse, Le pays des Alouates, Tours 1940, index (under Bourzy); G. Saadé, Le château de Bourzy, in Annales Archéologiques de Syrie, 1956, 139-62. (J. Sourdil-Thomine)

**AL-BASASIRI,** Abu ‘l-Hârîm Arsân al-Muqaffar, originally a Turkish slave, who became one of the chief military leaders at the end of the Buwayhid dynasty. He owes his *nîsba* al-Basasîrî (al-Fâsâri) to his first master who was from Basâ (Fasa) in Fars. A mawât of Bahâ al-Dawlâ, he subsequently rose to the highest rank, though we only hear of him from the reign of Djalîl al-Dawlâ (416-433/1025-1044), in the struggles which the latter was obliged to maintain against his nephew Abû Kâlidjâr and the *Ukaylid* of al-Mawârî. During the reign of al-Malik al-Rahîm Khusrâw Firûz (440-447/1048-1055), a period of continuous troubles due to the indiscriminate of the Turkish troops at Baghâdâd, the struggle between Sunnis and Shi’i in the capital, the ambitions of the *Ukaylid*s and Buwayhid pretenders, the depredations of the Arab and Kurdish tribes, and, finally, the intervention of the Saljûqid sultan Toghrûl Beg in the affairs of Mesopotamia, al-Basasîrî came to play a major rôle (Abân taken from the *Ukaylid* Karwâsh, 441/1050, Basra taken from the brother of Malik al-Râhim, 441/1054, operations against the Arab and Kurdish brigands at Bawâzûdî, 445/1054), assistance given to the Mazyadî Shî’i Dubays, who had been attacked at al-Dâjânîn, the future Hilla, by the Banû Khâfâdjâ, etc.). However in 446/1054, he was unable to stop the rebellion of the Turks in Baghâdâd, followed by scenes of pillage and famine and an incursion by the troops of the *Ukaylid* of al-Mawârî, Kuraysh, to Barâdân, whence they carried off the camels and horses from his stables. In November of the same year, Kuraysh took Abân, al-Basasîrî’s fief, and, breaking with the Buwayhid, pronounced the *khutba* in the name of Toghrûl Beg.

At Baghâdâd al-Basasîrî had a powerful adversary, the Caliph’s vizier the ra’is al-ru’âsî’ al-Mulimâ, who, foreseeing the end of the Buwayhids, had already formed a connexion with Toghrûl Beg, because in 446/1054-1055, in which year the Turkish leader’s quarrel with the Caliph and his entourage became effective, al-Basasîrî accused him of having summoned Toghrûl’s Ghuzz, who had been at Hulâwân since 444/1052-3. The vizier prevented al-Basasîrî from taking action against supporters of Kuraysh who had come to Baghâdâd, to which he reacted by impounding one of the vizier’s boats, withdrawing the monthly pensions paid to the Caliph and the vizier, and, in March 1055, retaking Abân by force. Upon his return to Baghâdâd, he refrained from calling to pay his respects to the Caliph.

Al-Basasîrî probably already had Shi’i leanings. In 447/1055, at the time of the Sunni demonstrations in Baghâdâd, extremists, doubtless at the vizier’s instigation, seized a ship carrying wine destined for al-Basasîrî, who was then at Wâsit with Malik al-Râhim, and broke the wine-jars. As the wine belonged to a Christian, al-Basasîrî thereupon obtained a fatwâ declaring the smashing of the jars to be illegal. Thenceforth the vizier sedulously denigrated al-Basasîrî in the eyes of the Turks of the army, and of the Caliph al-Kâ’im. He accused him of being in communication with the Fâtimids al-Mustanjîr, caused his house in Baghâdâd to be pillaged and burnt by the Turks, and ordered the Buwayhid to send him away. Meanwhile the troops of Toghrûl Beg, who had announced his intention of performing the pilgrimage and of proceeding to Syria and Egypt to dethrone the Fâtimid, arrived before Baghâdâd. Al-Malik al-Rahîm again set out towards Baghâdâd, whilst al-Basasîrî went to his brother-in-law, the Mazyadî Dubays; the Turks of al-Mawârî, the Mâlikîs and Kurds, the intervention of the Saldjukid sultan Toghrûl Beg in the affairs of Mesopotamia, al-Basasîrî came to play a major rôl...
On Togrul's orders, Dubays was obliged to break with al-Basasiri, who proceeded to Raḥba on the Euphrates. He wrote to the Fātimid Caliph Mustansir asking him to receive him in Cairo. The vizier al-Yārūf did not agree, but the Caliph responded to his request for Fātimid aid to conquer Baghdaḍ in his name and prevent the Saljūqids from marching on Syria and Egypt; he gave him the governorship of Raḥba and sent him 500,000 dinars, clothes of a like value, 500 horses, 10,000 bows, 1,000 swords, and lances and arrows.

According to the autobiography of the Fātimid missionary Muʿayyad fi ʿl-Dīn al-Sḥirāzī, who was apparently the instigator of the revolt and a real Fātimid plenipotentiary in the affair, al-Basāṣīrī was not the first to approach Mustansir; Muʿayyad had written to him prior to Togrul’s arrival in Baghdaḍ, though the letters did not reach him until after the Saljūqids had entered the city. It was Muʿayyad who brought the money and supplies sent by Cairo to al-Basasīrī at Raḥba as well as the Fātimid Caliph’s patent of investiture.

The year 448/1056-7 was marked by intense Fātimid propaganda, attested by the numerous letters addressed by Muʿayyad to the amirs of Irāk and the Dhāʾira to win them to the Fātimid cause. The excesses of the Ghuzz favoured his success. The khubta was pronounced in the name of Mustansīr at Wasīṭ and other places in Irāk, and Dubays, who had been constrained to do likewise for Togrul, returned to the alliance with al-Basasīrī. The latter, reinforced by the Arab nomads and the Baghdaḍ Turks who had been despoiled by Togrul, marched in Dubays’s company with a considerable body of troops on the region of Sīndjār, where he inflicted a bloody defeat on the Saljūqids troops commanded by the vizier, near the racecourse, al-Kutlumush and his ally Kuraysh of al-Mawsīl. Kutlumush fled to Adharbājyan; Kuraysh was wounded and captured (29 Shawwāl 448/9 January 1057) and thenceforth made common cause with al-Basasīrī, who proceeded to al-Mawsīl where the Fātimid Caliph was acknowledged.

Togrul’s reaction was not long delayed. He left Baghdaḍ on the 10 Dhu ‘l-Ḵa’da’ 448/19 January 1057, and, after receiving reinforcements from Persia, marched on al-Mawsīl, took the city and then proceeded towards Nisibīn. Dubays and Kuraysh rallied to him, whilst al-Basasīrī returned to Raḥba with the Baghdaḍ Turks and a group of ‘Ukayl. However, after the arrival of the sultan’s brother, Ibrāhīm Ināl, who heartily disliked the Arabs, Kuraysh rejoined al-Basasīrī, whilst Dubays regained Dīmān via Raḥba. After wreaking his vengeance on Sīndjār for the affair of 448 and leaving Ināl at al-Mawsīl, the sultan returned to Baghdaḍ, where he was solemnly received by the Caliph, who conferred on him the title of King of the West and the East (26 Dhu ‘l-Ḵa’da’ 449/4 January 1058).

The sultan’s brother, Ibrāhīm Ināl, however, who coveted the sultanate, got into communication with al-Basasīrī and sent a messenger to the missionary Muʿayyad, who had come back to Aleppo, with a view to obtaining Fātimid support in wresting the sultanate from his brother, promising that the khubta should be pronounced in the name of the Fātimids. He abandoned al-Mawsīl, to which al-Basasīrī and Kuraysh returned. After the taking of the citadel, which held out for four months, al-Basasīrī returned to Raḥba. However, Togrul reconquered al-Mawsīl and marched on Nisibīn, whilst, according to Muʿayyad’s autobiography, al-Basasīrī, undoubtedly alarmed, directed his steps towards Damascus. Then it was that Ināl rose in rebellion and set out for the Dībāl. Togrul left Nisibīn on the 15 Ramaḍān 450/5 November 1058 and set off in his pursuit.

Now that ‘Irāk was free of the Saljūqids for a time, there was nothing to oppose al-Basasīrī’s return and counter-offensive. News was soon received of his arrival at Hit and then at Anbār. The Caliph Kāʾim hesitated as to the attitude to adopt and, in spite of the proposal of the Mazyādīd Dubays, who offered him a refuge, stayed on in Baghdaḍ, counting on being able to resist. On 8 Dhu ‘l-Kaʿda’ 27 December 1058, al-Basasīrī entered western Baghdaḍ with 400 poorly equipped cavalrymen accompanied by Kuraysh at the head of a further two hundred. The following Friday, 1 January 1059, the Shīʿa adḥān was heard and the khubta was recited in the name of the Fātimids at the Mosque of Mansūr. Then, re-establishing the bridge of boats, al-Basasīrī crossed the river and, on the 8th of January, the name of the Caliph Mustansīr was proclaimed at the Rusafa Mosque. The Caliph had his palace fortified, but al-Basasīrī not only had the Shīʿa of the Karkh on his side, but also the large numbers of Sunnis impelled by hatred of the Ghuzz and the lure of pillage. After defeating a group of Hāshimites and palace eunuchs urged on by the vizier, near the racecourse, al-Basasīrī attacked the palace on the 1 Dhu ‘l-Hijja, 19 January 1059, entering the harīm by the Bāb al-Nūbī. The Caliph, seeing that the game was lost, placed himself and the vizier under the protection of Kuraysh, who got them away, whilst the palace was sacked. Al-Basasīrī appropriated the Caliphal insignia, mīndī (turban), ṛiḍḍ (cloak) and ḥubbā (lattice screen), which were sent to Cairo as trophies. He solemnly celebrated the Feast of the Victims on 29 January 1059 at the masjid with the Egyptian standards. He agreed to leave the Caliph with Kuraysh, who placed him in safe-keeping at al-Ḥadīthah of ‘Ānā with his cousin Muhārīr, but insisted that his enemy, the vizier Ibn al-Muslinna, should be handed over to him. After parading him with ignominy, he had him put to a terrible death on 16 February 1059. Al-Basasīrī then took possession of Wasīṭ and Baṣra, but was unable to gain Khūzistan to the Fātimid cause.

But already al-Basasīrī was virtually abandoned by Cairo. Initially great hopes had been raised there by his action; Mustansīr relied on his bringing him the Caliph al-Kāʾim as a captive and had the Little Palace of the West at Cairo made ready for him, and the was made ready for him, and the was greatly displeased when al-Kāʾim was handed over to Kuraysh. In addition, the vizier Yāzūrī, blamed for ruining Egyptian finances to support al-Basasīrī, had been deposed and then put to death. From June 1058, Ibn al-Maghribī, a former secretary who had fled from al-Basasīrī at Baghdaḍ, was vizier. When the latter wrote to him, he replied in such terms as to leave him no expectations of support. Togrul, however, had triumphed over his brother in Dūnāsīn 11 451/July 1059 and was preparing to return to Baghdaḍ. He offered to leave al-Basasīrī in Baghdaḍ, provided he would pronounce the khubta and coin money in his name and restore the Caliph al-Kāʾim to the throne. In such an event, he himself would not return to ‘Irāk. He asked Kuraysh to leave al-Basasīrī in the event of his refusing to agree to this proposal. For his part, al-Basasīrī attempted to negotiate with the Caliph to persuade him to break away from the Saldjūqids, but without success. Kuraysh drew his attention to
Fatimid ingratitude and let him hope for a pardon
by Toghrul, but he would not accept the offer and
Took-flight, al-Basasiri accepted battle and fell,
his family on 6 Dhu 'l-Ka' 14 December, pro-
cceeding in the direction of Kufa and leaving the
Shi'is of Kirkh exposed to the reprisals of the
Sultans.

Al-Basasiri was swiftly overtaken by Toghrul's
cavalry and caught in the company of Dubays.
Whilst the latter, whose Arabs refused to engage,
took to flight, al-Basasiri accepted battle and fell,
his horse pierced by an arrow. He was killed by the
secretary of the Saljuk vizier al-Kunduri on 8 Dhu
'l-Hijja/15 January 1060 at Saky al-Furat, near
Kufa. His head was brought to the sultan.

Thus ended the adventure of al-Basasiri. For a
year he had gained acknowledgement of Fatimid
sovereignty at Baghdad. The Khûba in the name of
the Fatimids is said to have been pronounced there
forty times. This episode of attempted expansion,
Fatimid on the one hand and Saljuk on the other,
and more generally the struggle between Sunnis and
Shi'is, definitely profited by the causes of Sunnism and
Abbâsid legitimacy, of which Toghrul Beg showed
himself the interested champion.
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BASHKURT [see PASHA].

BASHDJURT [see DAPTAĐAR].

BAŠDHJURT (BASHKURT) is the name of a Turkish
people living in Bashkurdistan in the S. Urals,
which is now a Soviet republic. Their place of
origin is doubtful; some evidence says that they
came from S. W. Turkish (see Togan, Türk Tarhi
Dosyleri, 1927, 125; Hamilton, Les Uygures, 1935, 5),
whilst others indicate that their present
habitat is their original home (the Pajur'tit, 
Tryuvoi, Tzongoi, Wurousoi, und Soubouyoi,
Potelma, iii, 5, 22, 24 and iv, 14, 9, 11 may be
identified with "Bâshqyr" and the tribal names
"Geyne", "Tabin", "Burud", and "Suvnî"). Ibn
Fdjlan, ed. Togan, 187, 327; Rashid al-Dîn, Paris,
says that the Bashkurs lived in a mountainous
and wooded country into which it was difficult to
penetrate, and that the centre of this region was
25 days journey from the Bulgars; and al-Bîrdîn
calls the Urals "the Bashkurt mountains". Ibn
Fdjlan, who made a personal survey of the country,
religion, and customs of the Bashkurs in 310/922
says that he came on their tents after crossing the
rivers Kinal and Sokh, i.e., on approaching the
borders of the Bulgars. He also states that they were
all qâṣâns (i.e., Shâmânis). Idrîsî, by combining
the stories of his contemporaries about this province
with those found in the Arabic translation of
Ptolemy, has given rather more complicated details
about their cities, iron and copper manufactures,
arms, exports of beaver and squirrel furs, etc., but
much of this probably refers to the Magyars. Con-
fusion arose because Muslim sources called the
Bashkurs "the inner Bashkurs" and the Magyars
"the outer Bashkurs", while the Bashkurs of the
Urals divided themselves into "inner" and "outer"
Bashkurs. To their neighbours the Kâzâks and
the Nogays they were after the 13th century known
as "Istek", which gave rise to the Ottoman term
"Heshek". The Yurmatî and Yenei tribes of the
Bashkurt were among the Turkish tribes that held
sway over the Magyars in the 12th century; and
theories that the Bashkurs were Magyars who did
not become Turkised till the time of the Mongols.
Yâfcut, who met some Bash-
kurs from Hungary who came to study at Aleppo,
relates traditions from them that their ancestors had
learnt Islam from the Volga Bulgars and states that
they were Hanafs, that they had 30 villages, spoke
the "Afrandj" language and served in the army of
the "Hungar" monarchs, though not taking part
in expeditions against Muslim countries. The 12th
century writer Abû Hâmid al-Andalusî, who lived for
some time among the Bashkurs in Hungary, states
that like the Bulgars they were Hanafs and says that
there were 78 Bashkurt towns in Hungary, extending
the name Bashkur to the non-Muslim Magyars.

The Bashkurt lands were close to the summer
camping-gounds of the Mongol Khâns of the Golden
Horde, and when they came under the Mongols they
were forced to serve in the Mongol army. They were,
however, allowed to have a separate Muslim judge.
Prominent in the service of the Ilkâns were the
Amir Bâshkur, who put down the rebellion of
Sülmânish in Asia Minor during the time of Ghâzân
Khan, and Sarkan Bâshkur, a lieutenant of Öl-
qaytu. Bashkurs were also found in the service of the
Egyptian Mamlûks, among them 'Alam al-Dîn
Sandjâr al-Bâshkurdi, who was Kalâwûn's deputy
in Syria.

In the first half of the 16th century the Tura
(Sîbâbân) Khâns hold the northern and eastern parts
of Bashkurdistan under their sway, while the Kazan
Khan Sâhib Gerey won influence over the "Kazan
Yoll" and the Nogay Princes gained S. Bashkurdistan.
Two of the Ulu Nogay princes, Isımaikhi Uru
Mirzâ and his nephew Isâhir Mirzâ, governed the
"Nogay Volyu", i.e., the S. Urals and Bashkurs on half
of the Kidûmûns till 1608. At one time Uru Mirzâ
made representations to Sultan Sulaymân I urging
him to annex the Volga basin. He also sent am-

FATIMID INGRATITUDE AND LET HIM HOPE FOR A PARDON
BY TÖGHRUL, BUT HE WOULD NOT ACCEPT THE OFFER AND TOOK FLIGHT,
Bashkurt ambassadors to Czar Ivan IV because the Russians occupying Kazan and Astrakhan had pressed on to the east of the Volga, had made Samara, Yaytikia and Ufa into Russian fortresses, and had imposed taxes on the neighbouring Bashkurts, and protested that the “Bashkurt-Isteks” paid taxes only to him, and that by taxing them the Russians were interfering in the internal affairs of the Nogay province (Pekarsky, Kogda ossosanoy goroda Ufa i Samara, 1872, 8). However, despite some conciliatory moves the Russians gradually extended their control. In 1670-80 Bashkurt families were under the Russians. By 1700 the number had risen to 7,000. Under the Russians the province was organised very much as it had been before. The community was divided into several classes: the mirzas (Russian Kniaiz) who came from the Mongol and Tatar aristocracy; the biys (Russ. stragina) and tarkhs who were tribal leaders; the asabes (Arabic ’asaba; Russ. voltimek) who held hereditary fiefs and served in the army; the yasakli who were peasants liable to military service, and the titfers who were peasants registered in place of fieholders; the bobils (old Turkish and Mongol bogol = captive) who were landless peasants; and the tasnaks who were nomads tied to a particular village. The mirzas, biys, and tarkhs used to meet to discuss general political questions at congresses (yayfa) held at Khan Tobie in the neighbourhood of Ufa. This is now the village of Hadji Yurmat. There were also departments called diwan (= divan) which dealt with the affairs of the province. The territory of the Yurmati tribe was the military centre of the province, and the asabes were stationed along four military roads leading from there: the Nogay road to the south, the Kazan road to the west, the Osa road to the north, and the Siberia road to the east. There was fierce resistance to Russian annexation and risings were frequent. The Küçümdis, the popularly chosen leaders of the Bashkurts, were generally at the head of these movements, which were sometimes combined with other movements in the Ukraine and N. Caucasus and with enterprises of the Crimeans, the Kalmuks and the Ottomans, with all of whom they had contacts. During the 17th and the first quarter of the 18th centuries the Bashkurs, joined in movements in W. Siberia, the lower Jaxartes, Astrakhan, Don and Daghistan regions and even in the Debreczen area of Hungary. It was in 1667, during the reign of Kudiim Kudic, that the Bashkurs, under the guidance of Kayip Khan with the support of the Kazak Khans, the movement was put down only with further risings occurring in 1755 and 1774. In 1778 was the Kalmuk Khan Ayuke who was responsible for the death of Kudic. The fighting was renewed in 1740 under a leader known as Karasakal. This was, in fact, Baybulat, last of the Kudimdis, who together with a nephew had been working with the support of the Crimean Khans among the Bashkurs since 1738 (Istor. Zapiski. vol. xxiv, 102). After two years fighting Karasakal was defeated by the Russians and fled to the Ortayiiz Kazak Khans and took refuge with the Bashkurs. After this nothing more is heard of the Küçümdis, but further risings occurred in 1755 and 1774. In 1798, in accordance with her policy of conciliating the Bashkurs, Catherine the Great divided the province into a traditional tribal cantons. She set up Bashkurt regiments, which were armed with bows and arrows and wore their national costume. These regiments were used in the Napolonic wars, and actually advanced as far as Paris. However in 1861 the cantons were abolished, as were the regiments in 1862, though some small units were not disbanded until 1882. In 1872 the Bashkurs, who had previously been dealt with by the Foreign Ministry, were given the same status as other Russian subjects, though they had their own administrative and land laws. The Bashkurs played no important part in the 1905 revolution. In 1917, in accordance with a resolution of “The General Assembly of the Muslims of Russia” held on May 1-10, which called for autonomy for Muslim Turkish regions, the Bashkurt
representatives set up a 3-man central committee (Zekl Welidi, S. M. Miras, Allah Berdi Jasafer) to deal with the administrative organisation of their provinces. They came to an agreement with the Kazak-Kirgiz and held the first Bashkurt Congress which urged that the Bashkurs should join with other peoples struggling for autonomy (the Kazaks and Uzbeks, etc.) (Bashkurt Aymalii, Ufa 1925, vol. 1, 3). In the autumn they began to form an army, and an administrative centre was set up in the Caravanserai at Orenburg under Bikbaurov Yunus. In 1918 this government was suppressed by the Russians and its members were imprisoned at Orenburg but later escaped. In June the Bashkurt rose again, formed 2 military divisions, and revived the government at Orenburg. In order to include Kazak-Kirgiz detachments the divisions were turned into a separate army corps under the command of General Ishbulatov. But the Allies, alarmed at the German drive in the Ukraine and Caucasus, wanted no national Kirgiz and Bashkurt army in the Urals and in the steppes and sought its disbandment. In accordance with their wishes General Koleak proclaimed that the army and government would not be recognised (21 Nov. 1918).

On 19 February 1919 the "Bashkurdistan" government concluded a peace treaty with the Soviets, which protected its army and its autonomy in internal affairs. Afterwards there were efforts to unite the Bashkurs with the Kazaks, but they were rejected by the Soviets, and interrelatian was the administrative centre for Bashkurdistan, and Aktube for Kazakstam. This was "Little Bashkurdistan", with an area of 84,874 sq. km and a population of 1,295,059, some 65-72% of whom were Turks. The premier was Yuumugul ogluo, afterwards Z. V. Togan (Validov). On 20 June 1920 the members of the government withdrew from office and went to Turkestan to take part in the movement of the Basmadis [q.v.] against the Soviets. A completely Soviet government was formed and the army was disbanded. In June 1922 the Soviets united Bashkurdistan with the province of Ufa, which was predominantly Russian, as "Great Bashkurdistan". According to the 1935 census its area was 151,840 sq. km and its population 2,972,400 only 51% of whom were Turks.

The Bashkurt dialect occupies an intermediate place between the Kazak and Kazan dialects. Under the Soviets it has been reduced to writing and books have been printed in it.


BASHIR-BOZUK, a term, meaning 'leaderless', unattatched, that was first applied late in the Ottoman period both to homndutsch vagabonds from the provinces seeking a livelihood in Istanbul and to such male Muslim subjects of the sultan as were not affiliated to any military corps. From this last usage it came to signify 'civilian' (cf. Redhouse, Turkish-English Lexicon, s.v.); and for this reason individual volunteers forming bodies attached to the Ottoman army at the time of the Crimean War were called bash-bosuk 'askeri ('civilian' or 'irregular' troops). These irregulars, largely recruited among Albanians, Kurds, and Circassians, furnished their own arms and mounts (some being cavalry) and had their own commanders. In the course of the war an attempt was made to subject them to normal military discipline; but this was not successful; and during the next Russo-Ottoman war (of 1877) the bash-bosuk 'askeri earned so much opprobrium for their savagery and love of loot that their employment was thereafter abandoned.

Bibliography: IA, art. by Uzunçarşı.

BASHIR B. SA'D, Medinese companion of the Khazâdi tribe, and an early convert to Islam. He attended the second 'Akaba meeting with the Prophet, and, after the Prophet's emigration to Medina, took part in all the ensuing battles and himself led two expeditions, one in Shab'ta in October-December 629 against the Banî Murra at Fadak, and the other later in the same year against a force of Ġhatâfân which 'Uyyayna b. Ḥiǧān was assembling between Wâdî al-Kūrâ and Fadak in order to attack Medina. The first expedition succeeded in dispersing the enemy forces and Bashîr himself fought bravely but was wounded and left for dead. During the night, he managed to reach the house of a Jew in Fadak where he sheltered for a few days before returning to Medina. The second expedition, carried out with 300 men, was unsuccessful; 'Uyyayna's force was dispersed and much booty captured. In the same year, when the Prophet visited Mecca for 'Umrat al-Kâdâ in accordance with the agreement of the previous year at al-Hudaybiyya, Bashîr commanded an armed contingent which escorted him but did not enter Mecca.

On the death of the Prophet, Bashîr supported the claim of Kurayj against the Medinese attempt, in the Sabîfâ meeting, to elect an Anṣârî successor, and was the first—or one of the first—to make the decisive move of paying homage to Abû Bakr. Later he joined the expedition to 'Irâq and was present when al-Hîra was captured by Khâlid b. al-Walîd. He died at 'Ayn al-Tamr in 12/633, though it is not certain whether he was killed in the fighting.
or died from a wound he had received shortly before. Bashir was one of the few who knew the art of writing. He was the father of al-Nu'mân b. Bashir (q.v.).
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BASIR CELEBI, a physician who flourished in the middle of the 9th/15th century. According to the little treatise Hikâyet-i Basîr Celebi (of which one MS. has been published in facsimile by I. H. Erteylan as Tarih-i Edeire: Hikâyet-i Basîr Celebi, Türk Edebiyat Ornekeri i, Istanbul 1949), he was summoned from Konya to Edirne by Mehmed II very soon after his accession; he expounded to the Sultan the advantages of the climate of Edirne and recommended to him the site for the building of the New Palace (begun in 855/1451, cf. IA, article EDIRNE [M. Tayyib Gökgülbîn], p. 171b).

The Ottoman history attributed to him (Tevârîk-i Alî Osman, Türk Edebiyat Ornekeri iv, Istanbul 1949) is nothing but another MS. of the Giesel Anonymous Chronicles (as demonstrated by Adnan Erz in Bull. XXI, 1949, 181-3; the MS. is very close to Giesel's Wilen), cf. Flugel No. 983). Neither this History nor the Tarih-i Edeire is the work of Basîr Celebi.


BASHIR SHIHAB II, Amir of Lebanon, 1788-1840. Born in 1808/1797 in the village of Ghâzir, Bashir lost his father Amir Kâsim in his early years and was soon compelled to try his fortune in the field of politics in Dayr al-Kamar, the capital of Lebanon. Robust, intelligent, and circumspect, he soon attracted attention as a possible candidate for the governorship of Lebanon. Shaykh Kâsim Jumblat, a wealthy and powerful feudal lord, was the first to appreciate Bashir's gifts and possibilities. His first approaches were successful, and Kâsim and Bashir became friends and allies. Their chance for common action came in 1788. Wearied by the heavy exactions of the Turkish Pashas of Sidon, Tripoli, and Damascu, Amir Yusuf Shihab, governor of Lebanon, called the Notables of the Land to a meeting in Dayr al-Kamar to discuss the general situation. To their surprise, Amir Yusuf confessed his inability to come to an understanding with Jizzâzâr Paşâ (q.v.) of Sidon and called for advice regarding his successor. Shaykh Kâsim and his supporters suggested young Bashir, and Amir Yusuf agreed. Bashir made the usual journey to ʿAkka, Jizzâzâr's fortress, and came back Governor of Lebanon.

A rapacious intriguer, Jizzâzâr Paşâ stimulated in 1209/1794 a number of Lebanese notables to revolt and induced one of the sons of Amir Yusuf to make a bid for the governorship of Lebanon. He then promised support to Bashir in return for a large sum of money. Having satisfied the greed of the Pasha, Bashir immediately set himself to the task of internal consolidation. In 1794, he permitted the Jumbilts and the Amads to murder several Nakad chiefs in his own reception hall. Then, with the help of the Jumbilts, he forced the Amad chiefs to leave Lebanon and seek refuge elsewhere (1799, 1808, 1819).

In 1822/1827, he burdened the Jumbilts with very heavy contributions; and, in 1824, he demanded them in open battle and put them to flight. In the meantime, Bashir strengthened his local levies and made of them the strongest military contingent in all Syria-Palestine. His fifteen thousand men were more than equal to all the soldiers of all the Pashas of Syria put together. In addition, Lebanese levies were daring and extremely skillful in the manipulation of arms.

In the meanwhile, Bashir's grants in aid to Christian Patriarchs and Archbishops and his acts of toleration were winning for him clerical support and French consular aid. In 1817, Pope Pius VII wrote in person to thank the Amir for his policy of religious toleration; and in 1835, Pope Gregory XVI addressed the Amir as a faithful son and praised his conversion. With his own co-religionists, the Druzes, Bashir behaved differently. Until his time the Druzes had had only one religious head, the Shaykh al-Akl. Bashir introduced a second head and set him up against his colleague.

Bashir's greatest ambition was to ward off local Turkish intrigue and protect the historic autonomy of Lebanon. Circumspect and foxy, he refused to commit himself either for or against Napoleon at the time of his advance into Palestine. And, as soon as the French forces withdrew into Egypt, Bashir went down in person to the Grand Vizier's camp in al-Arish, 1799, and procured an Imperial firman which tied the Lebanon directly with the Sublime Porte. When the Grand Vizier died, this firman became null and void, and Bashir had to use other means. Jizzâzâr's successor, Sulaymân Paşa (1804-1819), was more humane; and Bashir courted his favour to stem the cupidity and inordinate desires of Kandî Paşa of Damascus. In 1820, Yusuf Kandî Paşa claimed direct control of the fertile valley of the Bekaa. When no amount of persuasion could change his desire, Bashir marched on Damascus at the head of a force, 15,000 strong, and Kandi fled to Egypt. In 1820, Bashir had to march again on Damascus and for the same reason. A year later, Darwish succeeded in gaining the good will of the Sublime Porte and marched against Bashir's ally, ʿAbd Allâh Paşa, with substantial assistance from his colleague the Paşa of Aleppo. ʿAbd Allâh then locked himself up in the fortress of ʿAkka, and Bashir sought help in Egypt (1821-1822).

Muhammad ʿAli Paşa [q.v.] of Egypt was then laying the foundation of independence. He had already sensed the hostile intentions of the Sublime Porte and was preparing himself for a war of liberation. He realised fully well the military importance of Amir Bashir and the strategic significance of Mount Lebanon. The two conferred together and soon arrived at a complete understanding of the situation. Muhammad ʿAli intervened in favour of ʿAbd Allâh Paşa at Constantinople and Bashir came back to Lebanon completely victorious.

In 1827/1831, Muhammad ʿAli decided to strike. The Sultan had lost heavily in both the Greek War of Independence and in the Russian War and had, in 1826, dissolved the Janissaries. Emissaries of the Porte promised full respect of the privileges of Mount Lebanon, but Bashir's answer was, "You should not expect help from those whom you have always neglected". Lebanese levies fought Ughmâni Paşa in Tripoli, joined in the march on Damascus, protected the Egyptian commissariat and rear as far north as Aleppo. In return, Muhammad ʿAli Paşa
recognised the ancient privileges of Lebanon, and promised to eschew direct interference in its internal affairs (1833-40). But as the Sultan could never consider the new situation consistent with his dignity and honour, Muhammad 'All had to remain prepared for another trial. This meant more men for his army and more money for his growing expenses, and actually led to disarmament, compulsory military service and increased taxation. Unable to understand the Lebanese mentality, he ordered application of his new regulations in Lebanon and in the Druze Mountain of the Hawran, and had to stand the consequences. Troubles flared up in the Hawran in the autumn and winter of 1837-38; and several thousand Egyptians perished. In the summer of 1835-38, the Egyptians were routed again in the Anti-Lebanon.

The impending clash between the Egyptian forces and the Ottoman Army took place in the early summer of 1839 at Nezib on the Turkish border. As the Egyptians put the Turks to flight and threatened to march on Constantinople, and as Russia was bound to come to the help of Turkey by the terms of the Treaty of Hunkar Iskelesi (1833), and as France had consistently favoured Muhammad 'Ali Pasha, the Eastern Question was open again for discussion. British and Turkish emissaries visited Lebanon in disguise trying to win over Amir Bashir to their side. Bashir himself procrastinated, but the Lebanese rushed to arms in open revolt. By the summer of 1836-40, France was isolated and the rest of the Big Powers, including Russia, signed the Treaty of London. Allied naval units arrived in Lebanese waters and a Turkish force was landed off the Bay of Junieh. Lebanese, Turks, and blue-jackets defeated Ibrahim Pasha at Bahrsaf, and Bashir III was proclaimed Governor of Lebanon. Bashir II surrendered to the British in Sidon and was carried to Malta in exile. Several months later, he was allowed to establish himself in Asia Minor. He passed away in 1851, and was buried in the Armenian Catholic Church in Galata, Constantinople. In 1946, when Lebanon achieved the sort of independence Bashir had sought, the Government of the Republic brought his new regulations to Lebanon and deposited them in the family vault in Bayt al-Din.
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Bashma (see Bashem). Bashmaklik, a term applied under the Ottoman régime during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to fief revenues assigned to ladies of the sultan’s harem for the purchase of their personal requirements, particularly clothes and slippers (bashmak or pashmak meaning ‘slipper’ in Turkish). The word has not yet been found in any document earlier than the end of the sixteenth century, and ceased to be used from the beginning of the eighteenth. The ladies who qualified for the receipt of bashmaflik were the sultan’s mother (mālids), his sisters, his daughters, his kadıns, and his hāissiks; but information is lacking on the different values of those assigned to each of these ranks,—if indeed there was any fixed scale at all. We know, however, that they were assigned for life and that during the seventeenth century they were often improperly enlarged beyond the usual revenue limit of 20,000
abées a year by the addition to them of military fiefs that had fallen vacant. Though from early in the eighteenth century the term bashmaklık fell out of use, fief revenues were still assigned to these members of the imperial harem, being known thenceforward simply as bâds and consisting, since virtually all revenues were by that date collected by tax-farmers (mubādā‘a), of the advance payments made by contractors for certain such farms. Towards the end of that century the practice was adopted of granting mabādā‘a to the ladies concerned on mālikā, or life, tenures; but in the reform period such grants were finally abolished and annual cash allowances were paid to them in lieu.
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BASHMUHASABA (see MĀLIYYA).

BASHSHĀR B. BURD, Abū Mu‘āammad, a famous 1Irākī Arabic poet of the 2nd/8th century. His family was originally from Tūhkhāristān or eastern Iran. His grandfather had been captured and taken to 1Irāk at the time of the expedition of Muḥallab (q.v.); his father, who was finally freed by an ‘Ukaylī Arab lady of Basra, was a bricklayer of that town. Bashshār was born in Basra, the date being uncertain (see A ghdnī, iii, 135). His career was of such importance up to the middle of the 9th/15th century (cf. Pellat, 158 ff.) that Bashshār was much in favour under the caliph al-Mansūr, whom he probably accompanied on pilgrimage to Mecca (see A ghdnī, iii, 153, 159, 188, 212, 219 especially Diwdn, 1, 257, 275 (bāṣidā‘a of 29 verses) and ii, 24); later relations between the monarch and the poet were to become strained (see infra). To these official connexions we owe much precious material on the poet’s life. But doubtless they are not as important as Bashshār’s connexions with the grammarians of Basra, such as Abū ‘Amr b. al-‘Alā‘, Abū ‘Ubayda or al-Asmā‘i (q.v.) or with religious folk in that town such as Ḥasan al-‘Arba‘ (q.v.) (d. 110/228; A ghdnī, iii, 169 f.) or Malik b. Dinār (q.v.) (d. 135/753), v. his anecdotes against a Shī‘ī poet’s pungent invective against his rivals or enemies, though other grounds should not be forgotten to explain the rancour of these quarrels on the ideological plane.

Bashshār’s religious views remain unclear; they are said to have been finally dedicated to the Abbāsid caliph al-Manṣūr (Aghdhnī, iii, 213 bottom; cf. al-‘Askari, Diwdn al-Manṣūrī, i, 126); if this fact is correct it is characteristic. Bashshār lived in Baghdad from the time of its foundation in 145/762 (see al-Marzubān, Mawṣū‘ah, 247-8). His panegyrics were then dedicated either to prominent figures in Basra such as Sulaymān al-‘Abd (governor in 142/759-60) or his sons (governor about 170/792) (see A ghdnī, iii, 165-7, 207; Pellat, 166, 280) or to such figures as ‘Ukba b. Salm (governor in 147/764) (see A ghdnī, iii, 174-5; cf. Pellat, index) or his son, Nāfi‘ (governor in 151/768) (see A ghdnī, iii, 230; cf. Pellat, 281); several anecdotes give the impression that Bashshār was much in favour under the caliph al-Manṣūr, whom he probably accompanied on pilgrimage to Mecca (see A ghdnī, iii, 153, 159, 188, 212, 219 especially Diwdn, 1, 257, 275 (bāṣidā‘a of 29 verses) and ii, 24); later relations between the monarch and the poet were to become strained (see infra). To these official connexions we owe much precious material on the poet’s life. But doubtless they are not as important as Bashshār’s connexions with the grammarians of Basra such as Abū ‘Amr b. al-‘Alā‘, Abū ‘Ubayda or al-Asmā‘i (q.v.) or with religious folk in that town such as Ḥasan al-‘Arba‘ (q.v.) (d. 110/228; A ghdnī, iii, 169 f.) or Malik b. Dinār (q.v.) (d. 135/753). His anecdotes show how lively these relations sometimes were (see ibid., iii, 137, 205, 223 bottom; al-Dījāhīz, Bayān, i, 30). His caustic temperament, his character and above all his sensitivity on the subject of his infertility and lack of inheritance explain in large measure the poet’s pungent invective against his rivals or enemies, though other grounds should not be overlooked to explain the rancour of these quarrels on the ideological plane.

Shu‘ūbism is one of these causes (thus Aghdhnī, iii, 138 and especially 174-5, against the Bedouin poet ‘Ukba b. Ru‘bā; v. also ibid., 166 the fragment against a Bedouin, and 203-4 in which a nobleman reproaches the poet with having stirred up the mawṣū‘ah against their Arab patrons). Bashshār’s position on the subject of Mu‘ātaxalimis his fluctuating opinion of Wāsil b. ‘Alā‘ (q.v.) (d. 131/748-9 in Basra), whom he satirises, having previously flattered him (see al-Dījāhīz, Bayān, i, 16 ff.), and again in Aghdhnī, iii, 145 f.; v. also the violent diatribes against each other of Bashshār and the Mu‘ātaxalite poet Sa‘fwan al-Anṣāri of Basra, on which see Pellat, Mīrū‘ al-baṣrīn, 175-7 with a translation of Sa‘fwan’s verses).

Bashshār’s religious views remain unclear; they seem to have fluctuated, and Bashshār, as an opportunist, to have concealed his true mind. The reservations he makes on the subject of poets he appreciates such as al-Kunayt or al-Sayyid al-Himyarī who lived in Basra from 147/764 to 157/773-4 (cf. Aghdhnī, iii, 225, VII, 237, but the facts are uncertain) would tend to indicate that he was not a Shi‘ī (but see Pellat, 175, who thinks that Bashshār brought together the Shi‘ī views of the Kāmilīyya, on which see id., 201). The accusation of sandūba made against Bashshār and the anecdotes
which illustrate it rather than give it substance point to his holding heterogeneous views; among these views there are in fact to be found Manichaean beliefs strongly tinged with Zoroastrianism (see al-Dżahîz, Bayân, i, 16: citation of the celebrated verse the Earth is dark and the Fire is resplendent and the Fire has been worshipped from the time that it existed; cf. the reference to this affirmation of Bâshshâr’s in the refutation of the Mu’tazilite Şafwân, ibid., i, 97, line 7; cf. also Fihrîst, 338, line 10, which puts the poet among the Zindîls-Manichaees of the 2nd/8th cent.).

But along with these beliefs there would seem always to have been a profound scepticism (see Aghânî3, iii, 227, line 1 ff.; Diwan, ii, 246) mingled with a fatalistic outlook leading Bâshshâr to pessimism and hedonism (ibid., 232, and the citation from Ibn Kutayba, ٨٤٠٣, i, 40 bottom). Like his fellows, Bâshshâr had to fall back on the tahrîyya and profess an orthodoxy and a pious zeal which was totally opposed to his real convictions (thus, his verses against the heretic Ibn al-‘Awgâlî3, who was executed at Kûfê, Aghânî3, iii, 147, and above all the verse of the Diwan, ii, 36, line 3, showing a strict Islamic orthodoxy).

His prudence in this respect was not allowed to obscure the scandal of his manners, his epigrams and his heterodoxy. A plot engineered in Basra, effected his ruin in the eyes of the caliph al-Mahdi (see the anecdotal accounts in Aghânî3, iii, 243 ff.), impinging as it did on matters of wider import, viz. the persecution under that ruler of all those covered by the name of sindî [q.v.] (see ibid., 246 bottom and ff.; especially, Gabrielli, Appunti, 158). Bâshshâr was seized, beaten, and thrown into a swamp in the Bahîâ (al-Tabârî, Cairo ed., vi, 401; Aghânî3, iii, 247-8). This occurred in 167 or 168/784-5 when the poet was over seventy years of age (not ninety, as has been said through an orthographic confusion; cf. Aghânî3, iii, 247, 249, giving the two figures, of which only the second features in al-Khâfish al-Baghdâdi, Târîkh Baghîdî, vii, 118 and Ibn Khallîkân, i, 88).

Bâshshâr was famous in his day as an orator and letter-writer or prose-writer (al-Djahîz, Bayân, i, 49), but he owes his renown above all to his poetic gifts. His work in verse was as abundant as it was varied, but he contrived to enrich this tradition with the wealth of his own interior universe, the hard experience born of his physical disgrace and his contact with a confusing and turbulent world. The importance of Bâshshâr’s place in the transitional period of poetry in the 3rd/9th century cannot be overestimated. The influence of the man and the artist is attested by the enthusiasm or hatred he awoke in his contemporaries. All in all he was considered one of the glories of Basra. His poems, often set to music, delighted the young and the feminine public, while the connoisseurs’ opinion emerges from the “value judgments” attributed to such scholars as Abû ‘Ubayda, al-‘Asma‘î, Khâlal al-‘A|mâr and a host of others (see Aghânî3, iii, passim). We know on the other hand what esteem al-Dzialhî held him (see Bayân, index). Finally, Bâshshâr profoundly influenced the following generation of poets; statements to this effect in the biographies of Abu ٨٤٠٣-‘Ata’îya [q.v.], al-‘Abbâs b. al-‘Ahnâf [q.v.], Abu Nuwâd [q.v.], Salm al-Khâlîsî and many others are confirmed by the study of their works. At the present day eastern critics have readily been able to see in Bâshshâr one of the greatest names in Arab poetry.
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Bashshar b. Burd — Basiri

Bashshar b. Burd, also known as Bashshar bayna 'l-dīdād wa 'l-mudūn, was a poet from Persia who lived in Kufa during the second century A.H. According to traditions related by al-Kahshārī, he was repudiated and disowned by the Imam Dja'far b. Ahmad. Bashshar b. Burd, also known as Bashshar b. Burd, was nicknamed Al-Basir (per antiq., see Ibn Khakān) and praised them in his poems (see e.g., Ibn Shadijār, Ḥamāsā 117; Muḥarrar, Kāmil 6; Yaḥyā Ḥaribī vi, 122; Ibn Rashīkhī, ʿUmmā, i, 78). He was acquainted with Abu ʿl-Aynāʾ (q.v.), Saʿīd b. Huṣayn, Ibn Abī Tāhir b. Abī Ḥānīfa, and other men of letters; they addressed to each other witty verses and satirical lampoons. He was a gifted writer; some of his admirers ranked him even higher than Dārīr. He had a poor opinion of the poetry of Abū Nuwās and Muslim b. al-Walī (see Marzubānī, Muwāṣṣakhā 282 l.). Abu ʿl-Ḥasan Ibn al-Munajjadīm in the appendix to his father Khalīl b. Ḥāfīz Ibn Ḥāfīz Ibn al-Nakhar and Ibn Ḥāfīz Ibn al-Nuḥnām in his Akhbar al-Kutāb devoted both a chapter to his poems (Fihrist 144, i, 166, 23). His Diwān and the collection of his letters are lost. Amongst his verses which have come down to us, are some, that can be dated: e.g., a poem, composed in 247/861, when al-Mutawakkil went from Sāmarrā to his new residence al-Djāhirīyya (Yaḥyā, ii, 87; read al-ʿAbsīr instead of al-Basīr), a few lines of a long poem, urging al-Mustāʿn in 249/863 to appoint his son al-Ḥāfiẓ heir-apparent (Masāʾidī, Murūḏī vii, 346; read Abū ʿAlī al-ʿAbsīr) and congratulatory verses on the occasion of the accession of al-Muṭaʿz to the throne 4 Muḥarrar 252/25 January 866 (Masāʾidī, Murūḏī vii, 328). This shows incidentally that contrary to the statement of al-Marzubānī he did not die during the civil war 253/865. Ibn Ḥadār places his death in the reign of al-ʿAbsīr (256/979-980-92).
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Başiş, b. (c.1465-1535) Turkish and Persian poet. Although Latifi and others want to cast Başiş as the record that he came to Rûm from the realm of Persia, it is clearly stated in the taḥthira of Ṣuṭṭān that he was from Bağdād. Because of a diseased condition (barash) from which he suffered, he was known as Aladja (Biotchy) Başiş. He grew up in the scholarly and literary milieu of Harāt, and frequented the circles of Sultan Husayn Bāykarār (1438-1507), Dīmāl (1424-92), and Nawāt (1441-1501). As he is not mentioned in the last-named’s Maǧdīlī al-Nafāʾīs, he could not have yet won fame in that environment, but he is mentioned among the poets of Selīm I in the supplement written by Ḥakīm Muhammad Shāh-i Kazwī to his Persian translation of the Mağdīlī al-Nafāʾīs. Başiş left Harāt for Rûm some time before 1492, bringing the books and ghāzals of Dīmāl and Nawāt, and various commissions to execute for them. For a while he was in the service of the Aḵ Konyulu. When Ahmad Gōde, son of Uğurulu, came to the Aḵ Konyulu throne (1496), Başiş was sent as his ambassador to Sultan Bayazid II, reaching Istanbul in 1496 or 1497. On Ahmad Gōde’s death in battle in the neighbourhood of Iṣfahān in the latter year, Başiş decided not to return to Persia but to settle in Istanbul. He later attached himself to Muḥyīyālādā,
BAŞT WA MURAKKAB

The testimony of the taShaBcras is that it was Baskt who brought the diwan of Nawfi to Rumi. While he wrote Persian poetry, Baskt, being brought up in the circle of Husayn Bâyqarâ and Nawfi, had a detailed knowledge of Turkish language and literature. After his arrival in Rumi, he adapted himself to his new literary environment with such success, thanks to his powerful intellect, as to win the favourable mention of the authors of the taShaBcras. Being an elegant and witty versifier he was much in demand in the salons of the great. In the reign of Suleymân he was one of the associates of the defterdar Iskender Celbe, and was given an income from the awâbî of Aya Şofya and from the imperial treasury. His poems, both Persian and Turkish, show that he had a sound knowledge of the sciences which in that age were the necessary concomitants of poetry and on which poetry fed. The chief features of his poetry are wit, elegance, and particularly the devices of djinnâ and ihâm. Although it influenced the local literature, his work does not display the characteristics of 16th-century Anatolian classical literature, but is closer to that of 15th-century Persia. His neat lampoons and witicism offended no one. Some of these witicism are quoted in the taShaBcras and he himself incorporated them into a risâda. Apart from his Turkish divân, he wrote a Bengi- name. He died in Istanbul, in his 70th year.
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AL-BASIT, Span. Albacete, Spanish town, chief town of the province of the same name which comprises the north-western portion of the old kingdom of Murcia, situated s.-w. of la Mancha and New Castile, on the S.E. slopes of the Meseta of Central Iberia at an altitude of 700 m. The modern name derives from the Arabic al-Basît ("lugar ancho y extendido y llano y raso") and not from al-Basîtta ("the plain") as is still often stated. The place and the name are found for the first time in al-Dabbî of Cordova and Ibn al-Abâr of Valencia in the 7th/13th century, in connexion with the great battle of 20 Shâbân 540/February 1146, a date confirmed by a laconic passage in the Annales Toledoanos (ed. Huici Miranda 347, in Las Crónicas latinas de la Reconquista, I: 'Cahedola [Sayf al-Dawla al-Mushtânâr Ahmad b. Hûd] did battle with the Christians, and they killed him in the month of February 1146' (Spanish era = 116 Christian era). The battle, which was quite an ordinary engagement, was not between Alfonso VII of Castile and his tributary, the short-lived king of south-eastern Spain which was entirely subject to him, but between the latter and the Castilian Counts sent by Alfonso VII to subjugate the rebels of Baeza, Ubeda and Jaén, who withheld their tribute from Sayf al-Dawla. The rebels, seeing their lands pillaged by the Christians, again submitted to their amir in order that he might save them from the Counts, who refused to suspend operations and, when Sayf al-Dawla took up arms against them, routed him and took him prisoner. While he was being led to their camp, certain soldiers, called Pardos, put him to death, much to the regret of the Counts and Alfonso VII himself. With him was killed his ally the governor of Valencia ʿÂshîb Allâh b. Muhammad b. Sa'd; the latter is for this reason known by the Arabs as ʿÂshîb al-Basît, ‘Master (martyr) of Albacete’. The battle is also called the battle of al-Ludîjî (Ibn al-Abâr: bi l-mantîs al-ma’srî bi l-Ludîjî wa bi al-Ludîjî; al-šâbîn al-jîndî) in the vicinity of Chinchilla. Al-Ludîjî the place (and the river) may be identified either with Lezura to the west, or with Alatoz to the east of Albacete, on the northern slopes of the Sierra of Chinchilla (in the latter case it should read Latuṭdîjî). It is not possible to settle the problem; Faḥṣ al-Ludîjî is found as early as Ibn al-Kardabûs (cf. Dozy, Scriptorum arabum loci de Alm. Acceso ii, 19).


(C. F. Seybold-[A. Huici Miranda])

BAŞT [see ʿ Âšîb ʿ Al-Basî].

BAŞT WA MURAKKAB. Basît and murakkab (simple and composite) are translations of the Greek ἥπλος and σύνθετος. In Arabic grammar (but also in philosophy and medicine), the term mufrad is used for basît. In grammar, mufrad and murakkab correspond to simple nouns and their structural states, in medicine to constituents and their compounds. In logic, mathematics and music, again, the term mu‘allaq is more commonly used for murakkab, while it is in physics and medicine alone that the term munfassad is used sometimes as an equivalent of and sometimes as distinguished from murakkab, secundum prius et posterius.

Something can be simple either absolutely or relatively: an absolutely simple thing is that which cannot be further sub-divided into simpler parts either physically or conceptually; an atom is an example of the first, a highest genus of the second type (for the definition of the simple as indivisible see, e.g., Aristotle, Metaphysics, 988b 17). A relatively simple thing is a constituent in a further complex and in itself it may be divisible. Again, from the point of view of the ‘composition’ of form and matter (and the whole of the material world is so composite), either pure immaterial entities are simple or the primitive matter which is devoid of any property, although Aristotle and the Muslim philosophers restrict the term metaphysically to the former category.

In the actual material world (for the primitive matter does not exist), the four elements, fire, air, water and earth are regarded as the basic simple bodies by the composition of which every other material object comes into existence. According to Aristotle (the chief treatment of the subject is De Gen. et Corr, I, ch. 10), a form of composition in which the constituents retain their identity is σύνθεσις, e.g., when sugar is mixed with sand, while in a real composition, called μεταξιος, the parts lose their identity and share a common quality which in many cases, may be different from that of the individual constituents. The former kind of ‘composition’ is not mentioned by the Muslim philosophers. They say that in certain combinations, e.g., in the case of compound numbers, figures or tunes, a certain total quality emerges which does not belong to individual parts which also keep their identity, while in others the parts as such share the quality of the whole (e.g., in flesh) which is called mu‘allâbîkh al-adâdî (سُوَتُورِقُصُوكُ). Whereas in the animal organism, each part, e.g., flesh, bones etc. is separately constituted in this way, but not the total organism, in the case
of the heavenly bodies, each body is *mu'tashābīh al-adājāt*; the final qualitative pattern resulting from definite proportions of the constituents of a given mixture (i.e., hot, cold, moist and dry) is called *mīṣādīj* whereas the particular form which a compound takes on due to this *mīṣādīj* is called *sūra* (or *hay')a tarkibiyya. Thus the *mīṣādīj* (temperament) of a piece of living flesh is the final pattern of the mixture of the four primary qualities, while its *sūra tarkibiyya* is the form of “fleshiness” (cf. Aristotle, *De Part. An.* 642a 18 f.; *De An.* 406a 5 f.).

We said above that pure forms unmixed with matter are simple in the real sense. This is patently the case with intellect which not only knows pure universals but in whose act of knowing the duality of subject and object is removed. This kind of simplicity again admits of various degrees and works upwards from the human mind, through the separate intelligences, to God, in whose mind there is no multiplicity of objects. According to philosophers like Avicenna, who believe everything other than God to be composed of essence and existence, God alone is absolutely simple, not only in the operations of His mind but also in the necessary fact of His existence (see *māhiyya wa Ṽuẓū'ud*).

There is no special treatise on the subject and the various application of the term can be studied only within the contexts of the special doctrines of the philosophers, chiefly in their physical and metaphysical works. As a further Greek source of the Muslims' physical doctrine see Alexander of Aphrosias, *Scripta Minora* II, *perī khr̄seos* καὶ συνέργως. (F. Rahmān)

**BASMĀCĪS** (in Čebeke "brigand"), the name given by the Russians to a revolutionary movement of the Muslim peoples of Turkestan against Soviet authority which broke out in 1918 and lasted until 1930 or even later. See *Türekestan, Uzbek, Täği̇n, Khokand, Khiva, Türkmen, Enwer Pasha.* (A. Benningh)

**BASMĀLA** is the formula *bi'smāl l-lāh r-rahmān r-rahīm*, also called *tasmiya* (to pronounce the [divine] Name). Common translation: “In the name of God, the Clement, the Merciful”; R. Blachère's translation: “In the name of God, the Merciful Benefactor”, etc. The formula occurs twice in the text of the Kur'ān: in its complete form in Sūra xxvii, 30, where it opens Solomon's letter to the queen of Sheba: "It is from Solomon and reads: I am the Seal of the Prophets, and the tongue of Jesus (see *Doutté, Magie et Religion dans l'Afrique du Nord*, 211).

Problems.

1) In the *Kur'ān*. Zamakhshari informs us that the readers of the Kur'ān and the jurists of Medina, Baṣra and Syria did not count the *basmala* at the beginning of the Fātihā and the other Sūras as a verse. In their view its presence in these places served simply to separate the Sūras and as a benediction. This is also the opinion of Abū Ḥanīfa, and explains why those who follow his doctrine do not pronounce these words aloud during the ritual worship. On the other hand the readers and the jurists of Mecca and Kūfah did reckon the *basmala* as a verse and pronounced it aloud. This is the view of al-Shāfi’ī. It is founded upon the usage of the ancients, for they wrote the *basmala* on the leaves on which they recorded the Kur'ānic texts, whereas they omitted the word *amin*. This opinion is followed in the current official edition of Cairo.

2) In the acts of daily life. Acts which are classified as obligatory or praiseworthy should always be preceded by the *basmala* unless "the Law-giver has decided otherwise", as, for example, in the *salāt* which begins with *Allāhu akbar*; also, according to tradition, in the recitation of a *dhikr* (repeated mention of a divine Name). In all other cases the *basmala* must be written or pronounced. *Hadith*: "Every important matter which is not begun with the *basmala* will be cut off (or mutilated or amputated, according to the different versions)"; that is to say "will be defective and hardly blessed by God; apparently complete, it will be spiritually incomplete". Al-Bāḍūrī (†Hāshiyah, 3) comments: "The adjective "important" signifies: a thing having a legal value (ḥukm), that is to say having a certain relationship with the law. It is not, then, a question of a thing which is bad, nor of one which is forbidden or blameworthy". Particular applications. Solemn writings or acts ought to begin with the full formula. It is required in its abbreviated form before the commencement of the approved acts of daily life, especially before eating (cf. the *Risāla* of al-Ḥaṣwānī, 236). An act the quality of which may differ according to the circumstances will receive divine blessing if it is preceded by the *basmala* marital sex-relations for example (al-Bukhari, *waṣā'a*, 8). Finally the *basmala* is authorised where it is a question of an act which by accident becomes forbidden or blameworthy (al-Bāḍūrī, 464).

3) The meaning of "Rahmān" (s.n.). In general the Muslim commentators regard *rahmān* and *rahīm* as two epithets from the root *RH*M, whence the translations: element, or benefactor, or most merciful for *rahmān* and merciful for *rahīm*. However, contrary to the opinion of B. Carra de Vaux (*EI*, s.v. *Basmala*), it seems certain that *Rahmān* was in use prior to Islam in southern and central Arabia (Yaman and Yamāmā) as a personal name of God, meaning the single and merciful God. On the day following
the death of the prophet Musaylima still appears in the Yamama claiming to receive direct revelations from the Kur'an: 1) rahim alone appears in the list of the most Beautiful Names (adjectives), and it is to be found, in the mass of the text, sometimes as al-rahim and sometimes as rahim without the article; 2) the Meccans on the other hand is always preceded by the article; 3) the Meccans refused to recognise al-Rafymdn as a Name of God (cf. J. Jomier, Le nom deon al-Rahman dans le Coran, 366-367, with references to al-Tabari). It seems that this divine Name appears in the Kur'anic preaching in order to stress more fully the absolute Mercy of the Single God; furthermore “whatever is said in the Kur'an about al-Rahman is said elsewhere about Allah” (Jomier, 370).

That al-Rahman should have been the name of the single God in central and southern Arabia is in no way incompatible with the fact that, when adopted by Islam, it assumes a grammatical form of a word derived from the root RHM. The tripartite formula which “opens” each Kur'anic sura and each consecrated act of Muslim life evokes the mystery of the One God who is Lord of the Mercies. It is to this mystery that the basmala owes, in the eyes of the Muslim who pronounces it, its power of benediction.


AL-BASRA (in mediaeval Europe: Balsora; in Tavernier: Balsa; orthodox modern European: Basra, Basrah, Bascora), a town of Lower Mesopotamia, on the Shatt el-‘Arab, 279 m. (420 km.) to the south-east of Baghdad. In the course of history the site of the town has changed somewhat, and we may distinguish between Old Basra, marked today by the village of Zubayr, and New Basra, which was founded in the 11th/18th century in the proximity of the ancient al-‘Ubûlla [q.v.] and which is the starting point of the modern town of Basra, for the rapid growth of which the discovery of oil to the west of Zubayr is responsible.

I. Basra until the Mongol conquest (656/1258)

Although probably built on the site of ancient Diriditis (= Teredon) and more certainly on the site of the Persian settlement which bore the name of Vahishtabadh Ardashîr, the Muslim town can be considered as a new construction. After having camped, in 14/635, on the ruins of the old Persian post called by the Arabs al-Khurayba (“the little ruin”), the Companion of the Prophet ‘Uthba b. Ghazwân [q.v.] chose this location, in 17/638, to establish, on orders from ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭâb, the military camp which was the basis of the town of al-Basra (the name of which is probably derived from the nature of the soil: situated at approximately fifteen km. from the Shatît al-‘Arab, this camp was destined to afford a control over the route from the Persian gulf, from ‘Irâk and from Persia, and to constitute a starting base for the subsequent expeditions to the east of the Euphrates and the Tigris, while at the same time it contributed to the settlement of the Bedouin. At the outset the dwelling places were simple huts made out of rushes which were easily gathered from the neighbouring Baṭâlîh [see al-Bâbînîa]; they were subsequently strengthened with low walls, and then, after a conflagration, rebuilt with crude bricks. It was only under Ziyâd b. Abî Sufyân that the latter were replaced by baked bricks and that the town began to assume a truly town-like appearance, with a new Great Mosque and a residence for the governor; the rampart, bordered by a ditch, was not constructed until 155/771-2. At all times the supplying of al-Basra with drinking water posed a grave problem and, in spite of the digging of different canals and the utilisation of the bed of the ancient Pallacopas to provide the town with a river port, the inhabitants were forced to go as far as the Tigris to get their supplies.

This inconvenience, added to the rigours of the climate, would have been enough to prevent the military encampment becoming a great city, but political, economic and psychological factors were sufficiently strong to keep the Basrans in the town which owed its development to them, until the time when other factors intervened—in the first place the foundation of Bagdad, and then the degeneration of the central power and political anarchy which ushered in a decline as total as the growth had been rapid.

At the beginning of its existence, al-Basra provided contingents for the Arab armies of conquest, and the men of Basra took part in the battle of Nihâwand (21/642), and the conquests of Ištâkhr, Fârs, Khurâsan and Sîdjastân (29/650). At this stage the military camp was playing its natural rdle, but then the booty began to flow in and in 45/665, the military encampment became a great city, but that pace of events accelerated and the town became the stage for the first great armed conflict in which Muslims fought against their brother Muslims, the battle of the Camel (36/656 [see al-Dâmâl]). Before the fight the inhabitants had been divided in their loyalties, and the victory of ‘Ali b. Abî Tâlib served only to increase their disorder, but, on the whole, the population remained, and was to remain, more Sunni than Şî'î, in contrast to ʿAlîd Kûfâ. In the following year (37/657) men from Basra took part in the battle of Šîfîn [q.v.] in the ranks of ‘Ali, but it was, at the same time, also from Basra that a considerable number of the first Khârijîs were recruited. In 41/662 Muʾâwiya reasserted the authority of the Umayyads over the town, and then sent there, in 45/665, Ziyâd, who, to a certain degree, be considered as the artisan of the town’s prosperity. Basra was divided into five tribal departments (khums, pl. al-khums): Ahl al-‘Aliya (the inhabitants of the high district of ‘Ujlîâ), Tâmm, Bakr b. Wâālî, ʿAbd al-Kâys and Azd. These Arab elements constituted the military aristocracy of al-Basra and absorbed, in the rank of mamâlîk or slaves, the indigenous population (undoubtedly relatively few in number) and a host of immigrant peoples (Iranians, Indians, people from Ñind, Malay, Zanjî, etc.), who espoused
the quarrels of their masters, among whom the old tribal ʿabdiyya was slow to lose its force. The local situation was agitated under the rule of the governor ʿUbayd Allāh b. Ziyād, and on his death (64/683) serious disturbances broke out; after a period of anarchy the Zubayrīs seized control of al-BAṣra which remained under their authority until 72/693. During the following years the primary concern of the Umayyads was to be the suppression of a number of uprisings, the most important of which was that of Ibn al-ʿAṣṭur ʿalī [q.v.] in 81/799.

The period of calm which then prevailed until the death of al-Hadījīdī (95/714) was only to be further disrupted by the revolt of the Muhallabīs in 101-2/719-20 and certain seditions of a minor character. The town then passed, without too much difficulty, under the control of the ʿAbbāsids, but the proximity of the new capital was not slow in robbing al-BAṣra of its character of a semi-independent metropolis which it had possessed since its foundation; it became henceforth a simple provincial town, periodically threatened by revolts of a character more social than political; first the revolt of the Zun[ ḍ] [q.v.], who spread a reign of terror in the region from 205 to 220/820-35, then the Zandī [q.v.], who seized power in 237/851, and finally the Karmaṭians who plundered it in 311/923; shortly after this it fell into the hands of the Barīdīs [q.v.] from whom the Buwayhīids [q.v.] recaptured it in 336/947; then it passed under the sway of the Majzādīs [q.v.] and experienced a resurgence of prosperity, although the new rampart constructed in 517/1123, at a distance of 2 km. within the old one, which had been destroyed towards the end of the 5th/11th century, is sufficient proof of the decline of the town. The neighbouring nomads (in particular the Muṭafīq) took advantage of the political anarchy to subject the town to their depredations; from 537/1142-3, affirms a copyist of Ibn Ḥawkāl, a number of buildings were destroyed; and in our time there is nothing left of the ancient metropolis save a building known by the name of Māḏjīd ʿAllī and the tombs of Talḥa, al-Zubayr, Ibn Sīrīn and al-Ḥasan al-BAṣrī.

The town reached its zenith in the 2nd/8th century and the beginning of the 3rd/9th century. At this period it was fully developed and its population had increased to considerable proportions. Although the figures given are wildly divergent (varying from 200,000 to 600,000), al-BAṣra was, for the Middle Ages, a very great city and, what is more, a “complete metropolis”: it was at the same time a commercial centre, with its Mirbad which was halting place for caravans and its river port, al-Kallālī, which accommodated ships of fairly large tonnage; a financial centre, thanks to the Jewish and Christian elements and the bourgeois of non-Arab stock; an industrial centre with its arsenals; even an agricultural centre with its numerous varieties of dates; and finally the home of an intense religious and intellectual activity. “BAṣra, in fact, is the veritable crucible in which Islamic culture assumed its form, crystallised in the classical mould, between the first and 4th century of the Ḥijrā (from 16/637 to 311/923)” (L. Massignon). It is, in fact, worth remembering that it was here that Arabic grammar was born and made illustrious by Sibawayh and al-Khaṭṭīb, Ahmad in particular, and that Muṭāṣilism was developed with Wāṣil b. ʿAṭṭāʾ, ʿAmr b. Ḫubayl, Abū ʿl-Hudhaylī, al-Naẓẓām and so many others; here also it was that scholars such as Abū ʿAmr b. al-ʿAlī, Abū ʿUbayda, al-ʿAmrī and Abu ʿl-Ḥasan al-Madāʾīnī collected verses and historical traditions which nurtured the works of later writers. In the religious sphere the sciences shone with an intense brilliance, while al-Ḥasan al-BAṣrī and his disciples founded mysticism. In the field of poetry al-BAṣra can claim the great Umayyad poets and the modernists Bāshār b. Burd and Abū Nuwās; finally it was in this town that Arabic prose was born, with Ibn al-Muṣaffāʾ, Sahl b. Ḥārun and al-Ḥādjīzī. After the 3rd/9th century the intellectual degeneration is not so clearly marked as the political and economic decline, and, thanks to Ibn Sawwār, the town was endowed with a library whose fame was to endure; the Ikhwān al-Ṣafāʾ and al-Ḥarīrī made their contribution to the maintenance of the ancient city’s prestige, but Arab culture in general was already decadent, and Baghdād, as well as other provincial capitals, tended to supplant al-BAṣra completely.

**Bibliography:** The history of al-BAṣra was written by at least four authors—ʿUmar b. Ṣhabba, Madāʾīnī, Sādūq and Ibn al-ʿArabī—but their works have not been discovered and it is necessary to refer to the great historical, biographical and geographical texts of Balādhurī, Ṭabarī, Ibn Saʿād, Ibn al-ʿArīr, Ibn al-Fakhrī, al-ʿIsaḥākī, Muṣṭaddaṣī, ʿIdrisī, Yakūt etc. These works have, moreover, been used by L. Caetani, Annali, ii, 202-90, 276-84 (see also the same author’s Chronographia, passim) and Le Strange, 44-6, as well as by Ch. Pellat, Le milieu basrien et la formation de Gāhîs, Paris 1953, where there is to be found a history of the town from its foundation up to the middle of the 3rd/9th century and a bibliography, to which might be added particularly J. Saint-Martin, Recherches sur l’histoire et la géographie de la Mésopotamie et de la Charchème, Paris 1838, 47 ff., Rawlinson, The five great Monarchies, iii, 290 and Nāṣir-i Khusraw, Sofar-nāmah. The ancient topography of the town is the subject of a detailed monograph by Sālīh al-Ṣallī, Khatā al-BAṣra, in Sumer, 1952, 72-83, 281-303 (see also the subsequent numbers of Sumer), and of a stimulating paper by L. Massignon, Explication du plan de BAṣra in the Western Arch. of R. Tschudi . . ., Wiesbaden 1954, 154-74, with two sketch maps showing firstly the site of both ʿAṣrs and secondly the location of the akhmdās. The social and economic institutions of the 1st/7th century have been studied in a most profound way by Sālīh al-Ṣallī, al-Tanṣisīmāt al-idāmīyya wa-l-akhmdāsfi l-BAṣra, Baghdād 1953 (with a full bibliography). (Ch. Pellat)

**II. Modern BAṣra**

BAṣra, already much reduced in size and vitality in the 5th/7th/11th-13th centuries, was further and faster debilitated by the destruction, near-anarchy and neglect which followed Hullegi’s visit to ʿIrāk in 656/1258, and the installation there of an Il-Kahn government, for which BAṣra was the remotest of provinces, with periods of disturbance, insur- gence or secession. In the mid-8th/14th century Ibn Baṭṭūṭa found the city largely in ruins, and, while some principal buildings (including the great mosque) still stood, already tending towards transfer from its original site to another (its modern location), a dozen miles distant, on or near the site of Ubulla: a move dictated by reasons partly of security, partly by the deterioration of the canals. The great date-belt of the ʿShāṭ al-ʿArab remained the wealth and pride of the BAṣrans;
but its cultural and economic life declined throughout the Djalā'ir and Turkoman periods of 'Irāk history—740/1340 to 914/1508—and when at last in the latter date it fell with all 'Irāk to the Persian power of Shāh Ismā'il for a brief generation—914/1508 to 941/1544—it was, in its now established new position two miles upstream a main canal (the modern 'Ashār Creek), a provincial town of little interest apart from its sea-port status, its gardens, and its predilection for local independence from distant suzerains. The Ottoman conquest of 'Irāk in 941/1544, which further strengthened the Sunni elements in the population already prevalent, had little other effect on its status or fortunes; the Turkish paša of Baghdād was satisfied with a minimum of respect and tribute from the marsh-surrounded and tribe-threatened city of the far south; and when in 953/1546 the independent airs of Basra became too offensive, two expeditions from central 'Irāk succeeded in restoring some semblance of the Sultan's authority as against powerful local (tribal or urban) candidates for power. A longer and more successful attempt at quasi-independence, under merely nominal Imperial suzerainty, was made by a local notable of now unascertainable origins, Afrāsīyāb [q.v.], and his son and grandson 'Ali Pasha (1034/1624) and Husayn Pasha (c. 1060/1650). This interesting dynasty opened the gates of Basra and its waterways to the representatives and merchant-fleets of the Europeans—Portuguese, British, Dutch—then active in the commerce of the Persian Gulf; it survived, with vicissitudes and interruptions, for some 45 years against the armed and diplomatic efforts of the Pasha of Baghdād, the threats of the Safawī Shāh, and the intrigues of local rivals and turncoat tribesmen. And its restoration to the Empire was still incomplete until after a further full generation of local uprising and Persian penetration, tribal dominance (of the Huwayza tribes and the Muntafik), and declamation by plague.

Throughout the two centuries (12th-13th/18th-19th) following these events, Basra remained the metropolis of southern 'Irāk, the country's sole port however primitive and ill-equipped—the base for a decayed and microscopic trade, and the centre of the date trade, and the gateway to the tribes and princes of Arabia, Khūzistān, and the Persian Gulf. The city, whose administration evolved only after 1247/1831 slowly towards modernity, was ever at the mercy of tribal marauders and even invaders, notably by the great Muntafik tribe-group, and by plague and inundation.

During the campaigns of Nādir Shāh in 'Irāk in the mid-century Basra was threatened and for a time besieged, and his withdrawal was followed by the usual attempts at secession. Sound and vigorous government was witnessed under rare Mutasamims of higher quality, including Sulaymān Abū Layla from 1266 (1749) and Sulaymān the Great from 1282/1765. The establishment of European (British, French, Italian) permanent trading-posts, consulates and missions slowly gained ground, but disorder scarcely diminished and tribal threats increased with the rise, after 1256/1740, of the powerful Sa'dūn leadership in the Muntafik. The siege and occupation of the city and district in 1256-1258 by the Persian forces of Shādīq Khān, brother of Karim Khān Zand [q.v.] was a curiously detached episode of Basra's history; it was succeeded by the return of all the familiar conditions. Threats to Basra by the fleet of the Imām of Mašrak in 1213/1795 came to nothing, though rivals for tribal or governmental power in southern 'Irāk sought him as an ally, for example in 1241/1825. The great plague of Baghdad in 1247/1831 did not fail to infect the Port also, and increased its weakness and disorders.

The period 1248-1332/1832-1914 was one of slow development, improving security and increasing commercial links with Europe and America. Basra became a wādiyet in 1267/1850 and, among its eminent families and personalities, a centre of nascent Arab nationalism. During the British occupation of 'Irāk (from 1333/1914) and subsequent Mandate (1339-1351/1920-32), the transformation of Basra into its most modern form was rapid. The port was constructed on spacious modern lines and fully equipped, a deep channel at the mouth of the Shatt al-'Arab dredged, and the town itself and its suburbs improved by a variety of new roads, buildings and public services. It became the southern terminus of 'Irāk Railways, and an air centre of increasing importance. Under the 'Irāk Government it became the headquarters of a liwād which included the dependent bādās of Abu l-Khašāb and Kurna. The city, with its suburbs of Maqādīl and 'Asgār, contained in 1955 some 200,000 souls. With improved security and communications Basra took its place as by far the leading port and entrepôt of the Persian Gulf, and 'Irāk's indispensable outlet. During the three decades preceding 1377/1957 further important improvements were carried out to its town-planning, streets (including an imposing Corniche road), public and commercial buildings, and public services and facilities. The vast date gardens (within which, however, life remained poor and primitive) and the magnificent waterway of the Shatt al-'Arab offer a remarkable setting to the modernised city of Basra and its spreading suburbs with their characteristic mixture of the primitive, the medieval, and the fully modern. The date export trade has been further organised and centralised under a Board located at Basra. Exploration for petroleum by a Company of the 'Irāq Petroleum Co. group was rewarded by the discovery of an important oil-field near Zubayr in 1356/1938, followed by others (notably al-Rumāvīa) in the area. Export of oil, by pipelines to Fābīn began in 1371/1951. The industry developed rapidly and on a major scale, and became Basra's greatest source of employment, technical education and wealth. A small oil refinery was completed at Muftiyya in 1372/1953. Meanwhile the city and district continued to benefit greatly, as from 1353/1934 but increasingly after 1372/1952, from the enrichment of the central government of 'Irāk through its exploited oil-resources. Important developments in flood-protection, land reclamation and perennial irrigation were planned in the vicinity of the city.

**Bibliography:** The manuscript and printed sources for modern Basra history to 1318/1900 are given in S. H. Longrigg, *Four Centuries of Modern 'Iraq*, London 1953. 427-40; for the period 1318/1900 to 1370/1950 see idem, *'Iraq 1900 to 1950*, London 1953, 401-12.

(S. H. LONGRIGG)

**AL-BĀSRA,** a town in Morocco, not extant to-day, which owes its name to Basra in 'Irāk. Situated between two hills of reddish earth (whence its epithet al-'Hamārā), on a plateau commanding to the east the road to Wazzān, to the west the valley of the Wad Mda, and to the north-east that of the Wad Lekkus,
about 12½ m. (20 km.) south of al-Kaṣr al-Kabīr, it occupied, according to Tissot, the site of the Roman town of Tremulse. Founded about the same period as Arzila (Aṣīla [q.v.]), and probably therefore by Idrīs II, at the beginning of the 3rd/9th century, it was doubtless intended to be the summer residence of the Idrīsids of Fās. When Muḥammad b. Idrīs II partitioned his kingdom, al-Baṣra fell to the share of his brother al-Ḵāsim together with Tangier and its dependencies. In the following century, it became the capital of a small state comprising the Rif and Ghānūsīrland, the administration of which was entrusted to the Idrīsīd prince Ḫānūn b. Ḥammūn; it was soon afterwards captured (5 Muharram 363/6 October 973) by the army of the Umayyad caliph of Cordova, al-Ḥakam II; Yahyā b. Ḥammūn set himself up there as an independent ruler before being driven out by Buḍūgūn b. Ẓirī, who razed the fortifications of the town. These are almost the only definite statements we have on the history of al-Baṣra.

Despite the statement of al-Mukaddasī (ed. trans. Pellat, 27) that it was in ruins, the town seems to have preserved a certain prosperity in the 4th/10th and 5th/11th centuries, as is asserted by Ibn Hawkāl and al-Bakrī, who speak of its walls pierced by ten gateways, its baths, its mosque, and the gardens, pastures and fields of corn and cotton which surrounded it; nevertheless, it rapidly declined and eventually fell into complete ruin; at the time of Leo Africanus, it was inhabited by no more than 2,000 households, and its walls stood in the midst of deserted gardens; to-day, only the stone wall remains.


**BAST (Pers.),** "sanctuary, asylum", a term applied to certain places which were regarded as affording an inviolable sanctuary to any malefactor, however grave his crime; once within the protection of the *bast*, the malefactor could negotiate with his pursuers, and settle the ransom which would set him free. When Telegraphic communications were introduced into Persia in the second half of the 19th century, the telegraph offices were at first invested with the status of *bast*. About 1889 Naṣīr al-Dīn Shāh attempted without success to abolish the institution of *bast*. (For details of the violation of the *bast* of Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīzm by Naṣīr al-Dīn Shāh in 1891, see the article *Bast* al-Dīn Al-Arōmān.)

In the present century, the institution of *bast* (also termed *tarāṣṣat*), assumed great importance during the events which led to the granting of the Persian Constitution by Muẓaffar al-Dīn Shāh in 1906. In December 1905 a group of merchants, *müllās* and students, in order to compel the Shāh to take note of their grievances, took refuge first in the Masjid-i Dāmī in Tehran, and then, after having been forcibly expelled from this sanctuary, in the shrine of Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīzm, 6 miles SSE of Tehran. A month later, on the receipt of certain promises and assurances from the Shāh, the *bastis* left their sanctuary. The "Second Bast" occurred in July 1906, when some 12,000 people, led by the *ʿulamā*, merchants, and members of the trade guilds, took refuge in the garden of the British Legation in Tehran, and ultimately (August 1906) succeeded in obtaining from the Shāh the promise of the grant of a Constitution. During the disturbances which attended the election of the members of the National Consultative Assembly, which sat for the first time on 7 October 1906, the constitutionalists again took refuge in the British Legation in Tehran; in the provinces, British Consulates, notably those at Tabriz and Kirmānshāh, and telegraph offices were used by the constitutionalists as places of refuge. In June 1907 a group of *müllās* and others hostile to the Constitution took *bast* at Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīzm in an unsuccessful attempt to rally opposition to the constitutionalist movement.


**BAST (A.),** a technical term of the Sūfīs, explained as applying to a spiritual state (hāl) corresponding with the station (maḥām) of hope (raḍājā): it is contrasted with ḥabībat [q.v.]. The Kur'ānic authority generally quoted for these terms is: "And God contracts (yaḥād) and expands (yaḥaṣṣat)" (ii, 245). As *bast* is a hāl, it bears no relation to personal mental or spiritual processes, but is a sense of joy and exaltation vouchsafed to the mystic by God. For this reason many Sūfīs accounted it to be inferior to ḥabībat, on the ground that, until God is finally attained and the human individuality is lost in Him, any feeling other than that of desolation is inappropriate. The following saying of al-Dīnawī illustrates this point: "The fear of God contracts me, and the hope for Him expands me . . . When He contracts me through fear, He causes me to pass away from self, but when He expands me through hope, He restores me to myself." (Kuṣayrī, Risāla, 43). These lines of Ibn al-Fārādī (al-Taqīyya al-kubrā,
ii, 646-7) summarise the Sufi theory excellently: "in the mercy of expansion the whole of me is a wish whereby the hopes of all the world are expanded, and in the terror of contraction the whole of me is an awe and over whatsoever I let mine eye range, it reveres me" (tr. Nicholson, in Studies in Islamic Mysticism, 256). Hudjwiri writes (tr. Nicholson, 374); "Kabūd denotes the contraction of the heart in the state of being veiled, and basf denotes the expansion of the heart in the state of revelation". The mood of basf appears to be similar to that in which Pascal cries: "The world hath not known Thee, but I have known Thee. Joy! Joy! Joy! Tears of joy!"

(A. J. Arbbery)

**BASTA**, Spanish Baza, Basti in ancient geography, now chief town of a partido of the province of Granada. It is situated to the north-east of Granada, 123 kilometres distant from it by road. Al-Idriṣī describes it as being of medium size, pleasantly situated, flourishing and well populated. It was a fortified town and had several bazaars. It was a commercial town where local artisans pursued a diversity of trades. Mulberry trees were prolific in the town and, in consequence, there was a large silk industry. Baza was also rich in olive groves and all kinds of fruit trees. It was here that the workshops (faras) for the weaving of prayer carpets (musall—called basf) were located. These carpets were made from brocade which had no equal. The galena (hubl or sulphide of antimony) used in eye washes was taken from deposits in the mountain known as Djabal al-Kuhl which was situated near the town. During the Umayyad Caliphate, Baza had an important Mozarab community with a bishopric subordinate to Toledo. The Basyūm in its last stage, at present in course of publication, gives the names of a number of the town's Almohad governors. In 635/1237, Baza came under the rule of Muḥammad b. ʿUṣuf b. ʿAmīd, founder of the Naṣīrī kingdom (see Naṣīrī).

**Bibliography:** Idriṣī, text 202, translation, 247; ʿAbd al-Rahman Sheref, the last official historiographer and first issue of the society's journal, written by, translated by R. Basset, 1001 contes, ii, 18; For al-Basūs the Jewess see (translated by R. Basset, Proverbs Arabum I, 687, Damiri s.v. Kalb (translated by R. Basset, 1001 contes, ii, 18) tells the story but omits the wife's name. For the moti of "the three wishes" see J. Bolte, Anmerkungen Zu den Kinder- und Hausmärchen der Brüder Grimm II (1915) 223.

(J. W. Fock)

**BAŞVEKALET ARŞIVI**, formerly also Başbakanlık Arşivi, the Archives of the Prime Minister's office, the name now given to the central state archives of Turkey and of the Ottoman Empire. The formation of the Ottoman archives begins with the rise of the Ottoman state, but the present collection, though containing a number of individual documents and registers from earlier times, dates substantially from after the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople in 1453. The archives became really full from about the middle of the 16th century, and continue to the end of the Empire. The organisation of the Ottoman records in the form of a modern archive collection dates from an initiative of the reforming Grand Vezir Muşafā Rashîd Paşa, who in 1316/1901 had erected a building for the archives in the grounds of the Grand Vezirate, and transferred to it a large number of record collections, previously kept in bales and boxes in various repositories and offices in different parts of the city. The building, designed by the famous architect Fossati, was provided with a staff and a director. This record office, in Ottoman times known as the Khatme-i Ewrb, originally consisted of two main groups of documents; the records of the Imperial Council (Dişên-i Hamdân) and of the Grand Vezir's office (Bâb-i Âlt or Paşa Kaptâ). To this core other collections were from time to time added, notably the finance departments and the registers of the cadastral survey office.

From the start, the Khatme-i Ewrb was attached to the establishment of the Grand Vezir. Under the Republic it was, after a brief period of uncertainty, attached to the office of the Prime Minister. The old name was replaced by the modern one by a law of 1937.

A new phase in the organisation and study of the archives had begun in 1911, after the formation of the Ottoman Historical Society (Ta'rikh-l-i ʿUlamâni Endûrûm). The opening address of two main groups of documents; the records of the Imperial Council (Dişên-i Hamdân) and of the Grand Vezir's office (Bâb-i Âlt or Paşa Kaptâ). To this core other collections were from time to time added, notably the finance departments and the registers of the cadastral survey office.

From the start, the Khatme-i Ewrb was attached to the establishment of the Grand Vezir. Under the Republic it was, after a brief period of uncertainty, attached to the office of the Prime Minister. The old name was replaced by the modern one by a law of 1937.

A new phase in the organisation and study of the archives had begun in 1911, after the formation of the Ottoman Historical Society (Ta'rikh-l-i ʿUlamâni Endûrûm). The opening address of the second issue of the society's journal, written by ʿAbd al-Rahmān Sherif, the last official historiographer and first collector of the ayyām al-ʿArab. In the Fāḥhīr, 76, in Tiberiš's Commentary on the ʿHamdsā 420 (on the authority of Abū Riḍād 339/950) and elsewhere four verses are put in the mouth of al-Basūs, addressed to Saʿd and indirectly compelling al-Djassas to take revenge on Kulayb; they are a fine specimen of tabrīd "incitement", and are cited in the Rasāʾīl ʿIkhwān al-Ṣafā, Cairo 1347, i, 133, as an example of the tremendous effect which poetry can have on man's actions.

The proverb ʿagāʾamu min al-Basūs was by some scholars thought to refer not the pathetic figure of the heroic age, but to her namesake, a Jewess, who by her stupidity forfeited the three wishes which God had granted to her husband.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the references given in the text: Ibn ʿAbd Rabbih, ʿYāḥi, Cairo 1316, iii, 66 f.; Maydānī, Maqāmī al-Anbālī (ed. Freytag) i, 683-7; ʿAbd al-Rahmān i, 150; Ibn al-ʿAttār i, 385 f.; Khizānāt al-Adab i, 300 ff.; W. Caskel, ʿAsām al-ʿArab (= Islamica vol. iii suppl.) 76 and 97 (German translation of Nah. 905, 10-906, 3)—For al-Basūs the Jewess see LA and TA s.v. b s s; Freytag, Proverbia Arabum I, 687. Damiri s.v. Kalb (translated by R. Basset, 1001 contes, ii, 18) tells the story but omits the wife's name. For the motif of "the three wishes" see J. Bolte, Anmerkungen Zu den Kinder- und Hausmärchen der Brüder Grimm II (1915) 223.

(J. W. Fock)
president of the society, contained a statement of the society’s aims, the first of which was the classification, study, and publication of archive documents (TOEM, 1931, 919 and 65; cf. P. Wittek, Les Archives de Turquie, in Byzantion, xiii, 1938, 601-9).

In the years that followed, Turkish scholars working in the archives began to sort and classify the records, and also published many individual documents. This work was interrupted by the Revolution and war of Independence, followed by the transfer of the capital and a general mood of revaluation from the Ottoman past. In 1932, however, a new start was made, and since then work has continued in housing, organising, and cataloguing the records. In 1936-7 Professor L. Fekete was invited to advise on the methods to be followed in these tasks (see L. Fekete, Über Archivalien und Archivwesen in der Türkei, AO, Budapest, iii, 1953, 179-206).

The contents of the Başvekalet Arşivi may be divided broadly, according to the form in which they are preserved, into two groups—serak, papers, and defters, bound registers. The former, ranging from Imperial decrees drawn up in due form to odd notes and minutes by minor clerks, are estimated to number many millions, of which only a very small proportion has been catalogued. A first classification of papers was made in 1918-1921 by a committee under the direction of Ali Enuri, which sorted 180,316 documents in simple chronological order, by reigns from ʿAbd al-Malik I to ʿAbd al-Majid. The great majority are of the 18th and the first half of the 19th centuries. In 1921 a second committee, under İbnülemîn Mahmud Kemal, sorted 46,467 documents, from the 19th to the 20th centuries, into 23 subject groups, the largest of which are those of financial (12,201) and military (8,227 documents) affairs. Within each group the documents are in rough chronological order. A third team, under Muʿallim Cevdet (1936-7), worked from 1932 to 1937 along much the same lines as İbnülemîn, and sorted 184,256 documents into 16 subject categories. Here the largest groups are military (54,984), waḥf (33,351) and internal affairs (17,468 documents). These three classifications are normally cited as the taṣnis of the three persons who directed them.

Since 1937 this kind of pre-scientific classification has been abandoned, and a new start made on more modern lines. Papers are being completely separated from registers, and classified according to the offices and departments to which they belonged, as far as possible preserving the original order and sequence. In addition to the main classification, the archives staff has undertaken the preparation of a number of special series, such as ‘imperial writings’ (Khaṭṭ-i Humdâyin), decrees (iridda), treaties, waḥf documents, etc. A special catalogue is being prepared of the papers and records of ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd II, which were transferred to the Başvekalet Arşivi from the Yıldız Palace.

The defters, bound registers, are estimated to number about 60,000 in all Turkish collections, the great majority being in the Başvekalet Arşivi. They are of two basic types: statistical, containing figures and other factual information required and collected for various administrative purposes; and diplomatic, containing register copies of the texts of outgoing orders, letters, and other communications.

The defters may be considered in three main groups: a) the Imperial Council and Grand Vezirate. The latter, which in the 17th century grew into a separate bureaucratic organisation, eventually took over most of the functions of the former, and the archives of the two together thus record the workings of the chief centre of Ottoman imperial government. Of the many series of registers included in this section by far the most important is the Mühimme Deftersi (register of important, i.e., public affairs). This consists of 263 volumes, covering the years 962-1323/1553-1905. It is a day by day record of outgoing correspondence of all kinds, in simple chronological sequence. On the Mühimme see G. Elezović, Is Carigradskih Turskoj Arhivi Muhimme Defterleri, Belgrade 1951, and U. Heyd, Documents on Ottoman Administration of Palestine 1552-1615, A Study in the Mühimme Defterleri, Oxford, in the course of time a number of separate series were started, dealing with matters formerly included in the Mühimme. From 1059 to 1155/1649-1742-3 complaints from the provinces and the decrees answering them are dealt with in separate ‘Complaints Registers’ (gihaiyel defterleri). These are still in purely chronological order, but from 1155 to 1306/1742-3-1889-9 are replaced by the ‘Decrees Registers’ (ahham defterleri), geographically subdivided into 17 separate provincial series. The Complaints and Decrees registers together number about 530 volumes. Other off-shoots of the Mühimme include a series on military affairs (68 volumes, 1196-1326/1781-1908); a series of specially secret Mühimme (10 volumes, 1203-1294/1788-1877), and a series on Egyptian affairs, the last volume of which is secret (15 volumes, 1190-1333/1770-1914). Among the numerous other series contained in this section, are the Royal Letters (Nâme-i humdâyin, 17 vols., 1111-1336/1699-1917), the Tühtimâhı Council registers (30 vols., 1271-1333/1854-1914), as well as other series dealing with foreign consuls and merchants, privileges (imbuďâ), legal rulings (mufadâlât), treaties, sentences of confinement to fortresses (hürdâ), appointments, churches, minority communities, etc. etc. b) The Cadaster (tapu), comprising the great land and population survey of the Empire. It was formerly a separate department of the government [see Dasta-r-i Ḵwârqani], and was housed in the Defterkhâne, near the Sultan Ahmed mosque. The greater part of the registers was transferred to the Başvekalet Arşivi, which now reports the possession of about 1155 volumes. The remainder, about 250, are still in the General Survey Directorate (Tapu ve Kadastro umum Mühimme) in Ankara. The earliest, a register of timars in a sandjak in Albania, dated 835/1431, was edited by Halil İnalci (Süret-i Defter-i Sancak-i Arnavut, Ankara 1954). These registers, which were renewed at frequent intervals, cover almost all the provinces of the Empire in Europe and Asia, including parts of Transcaucasia and Western Persia. Arabia, Egypt, and North Africa are excluded. c) Finance (Mâhiyye). The surviving records of the Ottoman financial administration are now in the Başvekalet Arşivi, and comprise many series of registers, as well as vast quantities of papers. They include the accounts and records of the Chief Comptroller’s Department (Bashmahâsebe) from the 16th to the 19th centuries; of the various special commissioners’ departments (mûeṣbih) —e.g., cereals, meat, artillery depot, mints, kitchens, powder-magazines; of provinces, departments, paymasters, tax-farms, mines, customs, escheats, etc. A good example is the djizya series (418 vols., 958-1255/1551-1840). Part of the series is sub-divided by provinces, and some registers contain copies of djizya documents and receipts, with lists of djizya payers, sent in from provincial capitals.
Apart from the main collection in the Başvekalet Arşivi, there are numerous other smaller collections in Turkey. The most important are the palace archives preserved in the Topkapı Sarayi [q.v.], the records of the General Directorate of Wakf in Ankara, and the collections of legal documents known as sigilli, şerî'îye (see sigill).


(B. Lewis)

**BAŞVEKIL** (Başwakil), the Turkish for Prime Minister. The term was first introduced in 1524/1525, when, as part of a general adoption of European nomenclature, this title was assumed by the Chief Minister in place of Grand Vezir or Şâdi-i Âşâm (q.v.). The change of style was of short duration, lasting only for 14½ months, after which the old title was restored. A second attempt to introduce the European title was made during the first constitutional period. Introduced in Şafar 925/February 1878, it was dropped after 114 days, restored in Şa'bân 1296/July 1879, and then dropped again, after about 3½ years, in Muharram 1300/November 1882. Thereafter the title Grand Vezir remained in official use until the end of the Sultanate, when it was finally replaced by Başvekil (or, for a while, Baş-bakan), in the Republic.

**Bibliography:** Abd al-Rahmân Shereif, *Ta'rikh Muğâbâbalârî*, Istanbul 1340/1929, 264 ff.

(B. Lewis)

**AL-BÂTA'ÎHî** or **AL-BÂTHâRAHî** (Baţhârî), a small déclassé tribe (ghây y asîl, da'îf) of (approx.) only a hundred males, on the south Arabian coast between Ra's Naws and Ra's Sawfîkî, facing the Kurîa Murîa Islands. They live mainly by fishing and goat herding but have also some camels, frankincense trees, and trading boats. Besides Arabic, they speak Baţhârî (Baţhâ-riyê), in which *a'un* is preserved more than in the related southern Semitic oral tongues: Mahri of al-Mahra, Ḩarsûsî of al-Ḥarsâsa, Ṣâhâri of al-Ṣâhâra and their overlords al-Ḳârâ and, Sukûṭrî (basically Mahri but greatly mixed) of the people of Sukûṭrî. In religion al-Bätâhîra are Shî'î Muslims, and in political faction they are Ghafiris. Their overlords are the chief men of al-Djanaba and al-Mahra. With proppingy outweighing regard for purity of blood, the social status of al-Batâhîra does not preclude marriage with any of the neighboring tribes.

The neighbours nearest to them in their rough coastal district—small beside the area into which they claim to have once owned—are al-Karî (or, for a while, al-Shâhab), the eastern groups of al-Mahra in the interior, and al-Djanaba to the northeast. Hence, with regard to geographical names in their territory, great variety if not confusion exists between forms in non-Arabic languages and those in dialectal Arabic—especially that spoken by al-Djanaba. Because political and economic developments are accelerating the aggrandizement of Arabic, such toponyms may eventually be the principal if not the only surviving mementos of historic non-Arabic tongues, both here and elsewhere in southern Arabia.


For general reference: Youakim Moubarac, *Éléments de Bibliographie Sud-Sémitique*, in *REI* 1955 (pub. 1957); *Index Islamicus* (1906-1955), Cambridge 1958. (Esp. important are newer studies by Dr. Wolf Leslau, University of California at Los Angeles, and Dr. Ewald Wagner, Mainz).

(C. D. Matthews)

**AL-BÂTA'ÎHî** (see al-bâthîhā)

**AL-BÂTHâRAHî** (Baţhârî), called al-Mâ'Mûnî, Fâtîmîd waâri. Born of obscure parentage, his father having been an Egyptian agent (*gâsâsî*) in 'Irâk, al-Batâhî rose to power through the patronage of the celebrated Fâtîmîd waâri al-Afdâl, in whose assassination he was implicated (515/1121), and whom he succeeded as first minister of al-Amir (ruled 495/1099-1108) and as vizier (515/1121). In that year al-Batâhî managed to have the suspicion of the Caliph, and fell from power. Among the crimes reckoned against him was the construction of the observatory, and it was alleged that his naming it after himself 'al-Mâ'mûnî' was proof that he aspired to the Caliphate. When al-Batâhî was himself arrested, the Caliph refused to go on with the work, and none dared mention it to him. He gave orders for its demolition, and the materials were removed to the government stores. The workmen and experts fled. The latter included, as well as Abu Di'âfar Yusuf b. Ḥâdîy, the sâ'dî Abu 'I-Tâsh of Ta'râbulus the geometer, Abu 'I-Nâdîy b. Sînd of Alexandria the instrument maker (*ad-dâ'î*), and the geomcter Abu Muhammad ʿAbd al-Karîm of Sicily. Al-Batâhî himself was crucified by the Caliph's orders. His large house in Cairo was still used as a residence more than thirty years later, but Ibn Khallikân, who gives this
information (tr. De Slane, ii, 426), adds that in his
time it had become a Hanafi...

The fortified capital of the province of the same name,
then called Cordova, Batalyaws became the brilliant residence
of the Aftasids, who, from 1022 to 1094, reunited
in a single important kingdom the largest part of
the north of the former Lusitania. After the disastrous
defeat of the Christians at al-Zallaka (Sacralias) in
1086, north-east of Badajoz, the principality of the
Reyes de Taifas, became gradually subject to the
Almoravid Empire of North-West Africa, and, after
sending of prophets or the resurrection.

The soul is not naturally immortal and its existence
depends on God's will though some late passages
(ii, 149/154, iii, 163/168) imply the continuous
existence of the soul and that those who died for
refuge for a time at Saragossa. Ibn al-Sid, who, at
Saragossa, had had a notable disciple in Ibn Bagh-
kuwâl (q.v.), is the author of some twenty works,
including his commentary on the Adab al-Kâlib of
Ibn Khatuba (under the title of al-Ibtidâb fi Sharh
Adab al-Kulib, ed. 'Abd Allâh al-Bustânî, Beirut
1901); Kihâd al-Ibadah (ed. trans. Asin, 1940),
which had some influence on the philosophy of
religion among the Jews (see the Hebrew trans.
published by D. Kaufmann, Die Spuren al-Bataljusis
in der jüdischen Religionsphilosophie, Budapest 1880);
a Fahrasa; a commentary on the Muwatta' of Mâlik;
a commentary on the Saḥ al-Zand of al-Ma'arrî,
which is lost, but the criticisms made by Ibn al-'Arabi
about this work provoked a counterblast by Ibn
al-iband, entitled al-Indisâr min-man 'adala 'an al-
Istibsâr (ed. Hâmîd 'Abd al-Majîd [Magued], Cairo
1955); al-Indisâr fi 'l-Tanbih *ala 'l-Asdbb allati
awdjabat al-Ibtîdî, Cairo 1319 (cf. Goldziher,

Bibliography: Ibn Baghkuwâl, no. 639;
Darûf, no. 892; Ibn al-Kiffî; Ibn al-Iimd, Shadharat;
Ibn Khallikân, i, 332 (trans. De Slane, ii, 61);
Shakundi, (trans. García Gómez, Elégio
del Islam español, Madrid 1934, 54 and n. 50);
Pons Boiguès, Ensayo, no. 151; González Palencia,
Historia de la literatura arábigo-española, 1945,
229; Sarkis, 569-70; Brockelmann, i, 122, 427,
S I, 185, 758.

BATH [see HÂMMÂM].

BATH (Ar.), literally "to send, set in motion";
as a technical term in theology it means either the
sending of prophets or the resurrection.

1. The Mu'tazila (q.v.) said that God could not
have done otherwise than send prophets to teach
men religion as He must do the best He can for
men; orthodoxy denied this but held that the
sending of prophets was dictated by divine wisdom.
One of the reasons for condemning Brahmins and
the Sumaniyya was that they denied the existence
of prophets.

2. Philosophy taught that resurrection (ba'ith, mâyâr, mâyâr) was of the soul only so orthodoxy condemned
it as a heresy, insisting on the resurrection of the
body. From the first Muhammad preached the
reality of the after life though he assumed that the
judgement came with the end of this world suddenly
(vi, 31), heralded by the sound of a trumpet (ixix, 13;
in xxxix, 68 are two blasts, each introducing a distinct
stage in the action) the graves open and all bury
to appear before the judge (xxxix, 75, lxxiii 23/24)
and the just will be given their records in their
right-hands (xvii, 73/71). For the signs which precede
the end of the world, see DABA, DAMDIR, 856.

The soul is not naturally immortal and its existence
depends on God's will though some late passages
(ii, 145/154, iii, 163/168) imply the continuous
existence of the soul and that those who died for
God’s sake are already in bliss. Later reports are little more than elaborations of these ideas, and do not form a consistent whole. The soul of a good man leaves the body easily, but that of a bad man has to be dragged out painfully (see 'ADHAB AL-KARR). The body decays in the grave except for the lowest bone of the spine to which the essential parts of the body will be restored. Most will remain in the grave till the judgement but a few are not so bound; some are in barasah [g.v.]. When Isaâfiq [q.v.] blows his trumpet, the world will return to chaos, the sun will be darkened and men will rise from the grave as they were created, barefoot, naked, uncircumcised, and will gather at the place of judgement, a level plain with no place in which or behind which a man may hide, perhaps it is in this world, perhaps specially created. Another version makes the first blast kill everyone except Iblis [q.v.] and the four archangels; a second blast brings all back to life. The heat of the sun is such that all sweat, a flood which with some will reach as high as the ears. They wait there 300 years or 50,000 without food or drink but worse than the physical pain will be the terror of the judge; each one will be so anxious for himself that he will pay no heed to others. They will turn to Adam to ask his intercession but all prophets in turn will refuse and refer them to Muhammad who accepts the task and to him God listens. Other forms of judgement are the bridge, thinner than a hair and sharper than a sword, over the fire; believers pass over safely but unbelievers fall off; the scales in which man’s life is weighed and the books in which his deeds, good and bad, are recorded. Sinners will be accompanied by the tools of their sin, a musician will have the instrument which distracted his mind from religion; a man’s good deeds will become an animal on which he will ride to judgement. Some believed that all living creatures would rise at the last day. It is obvious that much of this is older than Muhammad; the ancient Egyptians knew of the weighing of souls and the books of record and the Persians knew of the bridge. Later ideas are mixed. Some men turn to dust in the grave and their souls wander in the world of sovereignty (malahâdi) under the sky of this world; some sleep and know nothing till the trumpet wakes them and they die the second death; some stay two or three months in the grave and then their souls fly on birds to paradise; some ascend to the trumpet and stay in it for there are as many hiding places in it as there are souls. Muhammâd stayed on earth for thirty years till the murder of Husayn [q.v.] when he ascended to heaven in disgust.

**Bibliography:** Muhammad b. Abû Shâri‘, Kūbh al-Mu‘samâra, 1871; Gâzâli, Iyâd al-‘ulâm, vol. 4, ch. 8, part. 2; idem, al-Durr al-Fâdhira (La Perle Précieuse, 1878); Thââlibi, ‘Arâris al-Madârîs; Wolff, Muhammadanische Eschatologie, 1872. (A. S. TRITTON)

**BA’TH** [see NABI?]

**AL-BATHIYA,** district in Syria, with Adhârî [q.v.] as capital. It is bounded by the Djaib al-Drûz to the east, the Lajhî plain and the Djaydur to the north, the Djawan to the west, and the hills of Al-Dîumal to the south, where the boundary is a little imprecise. Also called al-Nûr, “the hollow”, it corresponds to the ancient Batanaea mentioned together with Trachonitis, Auranitis and Gaulanites as part of the old kingdom of Bashan and referred to in the Old Testament. The region is fertile, as its name demonstrates; cf. Delitzsch, Assyrie, Handbuch, 1897, 115. In particular, the whole country between Muhammara in the south, a point beyond Kurna and extant burial mounds are proof of this. Since then its reputation for being the “granary of Syria” has been maintained. According to the Arab geographers, the area was throughout the Middle Ages densely populated; it lay on the main route of communication connecting Damascus with al-Urduin, a highway which owned as much to the Manluk barid as to the Syrian pilgrim caravans.

Conquered by the Arabs in 1365/3, al-Bathaniyya, like Hawrân, became barâhd land, and was subsequently joined to the al-dûnd of Damascus although more usually connected with the Hawrân region. During the period of the Crusades it suffered from Frankish incursions. Later under Ottoman rule it was affected by two important factors: the invasion of the nomadic ‘Anâza, followed by the Rwâla, which introduced a reign of disorder and insecurity lasting until the end of the 19th century, and the settlement on its soil of the Hawranese hill folk expelled from their homes by the Druzes. These latter had from the 17th century begun to infiltrate into the Hawrân, where in 1861 they were joined by certain elements from the Lebanon.

Al-Bathaniyya should be distinguished from the small plain situated to the north-east of the Djaib al-Drûz, called in antiquity Sacnea and in the Arab period arîd al-Bathaniyya. This term has been translated to mean the “marsh of Bathaniyya” but one of the local names Batheyne, leads one to suppose that the area had been considered rather as a “small Bathaniyya”.


**AL-BATHÂ’HA,** (“the marshland”), the name applied to a meadowlike depression which is exposed to more or less regular inundation and is therefore swampy. It is particularly applied by the Arab authors of the ‘Abbâsid period to the very extensive swampy area on the lower course of the Euphrates and Tigris between Kûfâ and Wasîf in the north and Baṣra in the south, also frequently called al-Batâ’ih (plural of al-Bathâ’ha) and occasionally, after the adjoining towns, the Baṭhat (Baṭîh) al-Kûfâ, al-Wâṣîf or al-‘Asrâ.

The existence of considerable swamps in southern Babylonia goes back to high antiquity. The alluvial plain is soft and almost flat, the river beds are shallow and exposed to rapid silting, the banks are soft and low, therefore the flood waters overflow the banks, causing extensive marches; these would normally disappear but for the annual floods, and the rivers change their courses which, in turn, leads to new marshes. Even in the cuneiform inscriptions the agamm (swamps) and apparti (reedlands) are often mentioned; cf. Delitzsch, Assyrie, Handbuch, 1897, 115. In particular, the whole country between Muhammara in the south, a point beyond Kurna and...
in the north, and beyond the river Kārūn to the east, must have been covered by an enormous swampy lake; cf. Delitzsch, 627; Dougherty, The Sasanian Dynasty, 1913.

The Greek and Roman writers are likewise acquainted with it (as Ἀλβαττα or chaldæicus lacus). Nearcush’s account is particularly instructive, for he crossed this area of water and gave its breadth as 600 stadia (80 miles). The Tabula Peutingeriana also defines the Babylonian swamps; on it, in addition to Paludes, is mentioned the name Diodaki, probably to be amended to Diodakhi = Baštāḥ. On the notices in cuneiform inscriptions and classical authors, cf. Andreas in Pauly-Wissowa, i, 736, 815, 1878 ff., 2812; Weissbach, ibid, iii, 2044 vi, 1201 ff.; Streck, v. 1147 (s.v. Diodakhi); Ainsworth; Researches ii, 180 ff.

Since ancient times the great marshy lake has been gradually filled up by the deposits of sediment brought down by the rivers, and the modern delta has arisen. Some places, however, remain under water. These places extend around the present Hor (Khawr) al-Ḥuwayza, Hor al-Ḥammār, Hor al-Ṣhamiyya, and probably further north.

The origin of the swamp may be a syncline which occurred in geological times: parts of it were filled by the huge amount of silt, while others remained low and were filled by water; they formed what mediaeval Muslims called al-Baštāḥ. The syncline may have eroded in historic times (cf. G. M. Lees and N. L. Falcon, in Bibliography History of the Mesopotamian plains in Geographical Journal. On the retreat of the sea, cf. De Morgan, i, 4-48; Seton Lloyd, 19.

The Sasanids as a rule devoted a great deal of attention to the irrigation system and drainage in Babylonia. This should have led to the decrease of swamps. Under later kings of this dynasty, however, large areas of flourishing country were swallowed up by floods, and the region of swamps grew to such an extent that the Arabs wrongly date the beginning of the Baštāḥ from this period. They claim that during the reign of Kubāḏ Fīrūz (457-484 A.D.) a large breach occurred near Kaskar, and inundated large areas of cultivated lands. It was not until the reign of Khusraw I Anūṣḥarwān (517-578) that the dykes were partially repaired, and some of the lands brought under cultivation. But in the year 6 or 7627, in the reign of Khusraw II Parwīz, the waters of the Euphrates and the Tigris rose again, in a flood such as had never been seen. Both rivers burst their dykes, causing huge breaches. The water reached the places of the swamps, inundating the farms of several ḫussādī there. During the succeeding years of anarchy, and when the Muslim armies began to overrun ḫrāk, breaches occurred in all embankments, and the ḫikhāns were powerless to repair the dykes so that the swamps increased in all directions (Baladhūrī, 292-4; Kudāmā, 240; Yāḵūt, 668-9; Masʿūdī, al-Mubarak; he thus reclaimed large areas of lands, which yielded a large income, but resulted in a decrease in the volume of water available for irrigation.

When the ʿAbbāsids came to power (132/750), new bursts occurred in the dykes which, in turn, increased the swamps. In the Euphrates region, similarly, thickets formed, parts of which were reclaimed. In the north-west, the Baštāḥ extended nearly to Kūfah and Nīffār, while farther to the east it began at a considerable distance from Wāsīṭ. This part is called by many mediaeval Muslim sources Baštāḥ al-Ḵūfa. Their crude maps (cf. Miller, Maps of Arabia) do not show them connected with the southern Baštāḥ, not do they mention any dwelling-places or cultivation there. Nevertheless 4th/10th century sources assert that the Euphrates discharged into the Baštāḥ between Wāsīṭ and Baṣra (Masʿūdī, Murāḍī, i, 215; Suhrāb, 118). The suggestion that the present lower Euphrates region was covered with Baštāḥ up to the 6th/12th century, when sources mention that the lower Euphrates joined the Tigris in Maṭṭārā (Yāḵūt, ii, 553). This must have been due to hydrographic changes, in the depression of Shīnāfiyya, which must have then been deeper, and the reduction of the amount of water and silt, owing to the numerous canals which took water from the Euphrates to irrigate north and central Babylonia (cf. Le Strange, 75 ff.).

The Tigris, from about the end of the Sasanid period to the first half of the 10th/16th century, flowed in the western bed (the modern Shāṭ al-Dudgājla) past Wāsīṭ and several towns until, in the 4th/10th century, it joined the Baštāḥ in Қaṭr (Murāḍī, i, 218; Suhrāb, 118-9, 135; Ibn Khurramādābehībī, 59; Ibn Rusta, 185). According to Mustawfi, Қaṭr is 30 parasangs (about 107 m. = 172 kms.) south of Wāsīṭ (Nuzha, 166), according to Kudāmā (193), 22 parasangs.

The southern limits of the Baštāḥ border on บาhra (Baladhūrī, 362; Ansūb al-ʿAṣrāfī, v. 257). Suhrāb (135) describes the Baštāḥ as consisting of four Hors: Bahāšā, Bakāṃṣa, Baṣaryāḥa and the Muḥammatayya. Each Hor had plenty of water, with no reeds, but each one was linked with the other by a narrow passage of reeds.
Muhammadiyya was the largest, and the reed passage extended from it to the Hála, Kawán, and then to the "one-eyed" Tigris (al-Diglá, al-Tafir'). Yákút mentions the Hors of Shálám, (iii, 311), Djará, (ii 56), Gháráf (iii, 581) and Rabbák, (ii, 134).

In the flat soft alluvial plain of south Babylonia hydrography could not be static, especially since the canal and irrigation system was subject to change according to the political and economic situation. Though these changes have not been yet studied in detail, nevertheless one may see an indication in the 6th/12th century, when Yákút mentions that the Tigris was divided below Wáṣíj into five arms which, together with the Euphrates, joined in Máṭirá which was a day's journey from Başrá (ii, 553). The area of the lands covered by the Batibá undoubtedly changed according to the amount of control exercised over the flood water and the amount of water used for irrigation in the north.

Although water covered most of the lands of the Batiba, nevertheless there were areas of dry land, farms, cities and villages as well as rivers and canals (Mükaddás, 119; Samğání, Amáb, s.v. Batibá; Ibn al-Áthir, Libáb, i, 129). Ibn Rútsa (95) says that "the higher places became mounds which are known in Baṭá‘íh and are called Sartughan, Tustaghan and as its rivers the canals of Abba, Khurz, al-Zút (i, 970). Mükaddás, (134) calls the Batiba a district (mákáya) with Suláyṣ as its chief town, and the further towns of Djamí’da, Harrár, Haddádiyya and Zubádiyya. Most of these towns were north-west of Wáṣíj. Yákút mentions as towns of the Batiba Hála (of Dubyás) (i, 594, ii, 323) Kháthýmiyya (iv, 884), Harrár (iv, 970). Mansúra (iv, 664) and other places, and as its rivers the canals of Abbá, Khurz, al-Zút (ii, 950, iv, 840) and Yammá (iv, 1026).

Of the western marshes of the Euphrates about the middle of the 19th century European travellers and archaeologists give fairly accurate descriptions. The main course of the Euphrates passed through Babylon, Hála and Dwiáníyya. Several branches and cuts diverged from this branch, many of them re-uniting near al-Káraym, which was at the head of the delta. During the season of the floods, water spread for about 30 miles in length, 7-14 miles west of the main channel and to a much greater distance on the east side. This repress forms the Lámúm marshes. Thirty years later, the bulk of the Euphrates' waters went through the western Hindiyá canal which was dug in the 17th century by the the Indian Ásaf al-Dawlá. This emerged into the plains further south and created the shallow Bahr al-Ádáf and Shínáfiyya marshes, which remained even after the erection of the Hindiyá barrage in 1911 to increase the water of the Hála branch. These swamps are situated in a large depression, wider in the mouth, about 40 m. (65 kms.) long and 15 m. (25 kms.) wide; the depth of the flood water varies from a few centimetres in the north to 2-3 metres in the middle. Several sub-Hors branch off from it; in the east are the Hors of al-Ádíja, al-Wurídít, Ibn Nádím, al-Khabás, Abú Ghárǎbál, al-Rammá, al-Áháwá and Abú Hídjá; to the west of the Shámáfiyya branch are Gháudút, Rughála, Gilbá, Abú Hüllána, Ziyáda and Hwiba; near the Kufán branch are the Hors of Tubug, Gházálát and Sháb. The areas of these Hors shrink after flood, and the land becomes excellent for rice cultivation.

The Tigris below Baghdad flows through a flat plain, and the banks are not high enough to retain the huge volume of flood water. This leads to a number of breaches and levees on both sides of the river which produce numerous marches. The largest of them between Búghárd and Kut is Hor Shawdíja, which is a natural depression formed by the several above-mentioned Hors. The total flowing into the Tigris by several channels which begin a short distance beyond Usáy."
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Hammar are bare, uninhabited land, exposed to annual floods from the lake.

On account of its inaccessibility, the Batitha was a hiding place for all sorts of robbers and rebels, and an asylum for the discontented.

The Zuww [q.v.], who were transplanted with their vast herds of buffaloes in the marshes by al-Hasidî, made themselves, together with some other maawilî, in the early 'Abbâsîd period, a nuisance to 'Irâk by robbing and plundering, and disturbing communications and trade with the south. Their effect was felt to a greater extent at the time of Ma'mûn. It was only after strenuous efforts that the Caliph al-Mutâsîm succeeded in subduing them, and in removing them to the northern Syrian borders (Baladhuri, 171-375; Tabari, iii, 1144-5, 1167-70; Mas'ûdî, al-Tanbîh, 355). They have given their name to the Nahr al-Zutt (Yakut, iv, 840).

Far more dangerous, however, proved the great rising of the Zandj [q.v.] who, under the leadership of 'Ali b. Muhammâm [q.v.], stirred up near Basra a formidable rebellion (255-270/869-883) and dominated the Batîtha for several years (Tabari, iii, 1742 ff.; Nöldeke, Sketches from Eastern History, 146-175; F. al-Sâmîr, Thawrat al-Zandj, Baghdadh 1952).

In the following centuries the Banû Shâhîn (see 'Irâk b. Shânî) and after them the family of al-Mu'azzaffar [q.v.] founded a more or less independent kingdom in the swamp lands which they shared at a later period with the Mazyâdîs [q.v.] who ruled from 403 A.H. until 448 A.H. in Hilla. After the decline of the Mazyâdîs, the Banû 'l-Muntafik began to play their part, although the Caliph al-Mu'azzaffar succeeded in destroying their leaders, the Banû Ma'âdî, in 671/1220.

When the Mongols conquered 'Irâk (656/1253), the Batîtha fell in their hands, but the Arab tribes remained a source of disturbance. From then on it was called al-Diázarîr ("the islands") or al-Diawaizîr. It was conquered by Tamerlane (795/1338), and then by Úways the Diázarîrîd (826/1423); in the year 844 A.H. it was conquered by the Maghâshâ on [q.v.] who remained until the Ottoman sultan Sulayman occupied it in 953 A.H. A.A. Ottoman rule of the region; however, was not firm, and they could not destroy the several tribal principalities, e.g., the Ál U'layyân, who ruled over the Hammâm until they were destroyed in 975 A.H.; the Banû Lâm dominated the lower Tigris, until they were challenged by Álb b. Muhammad and gave the Ottomans a chance to control them. The al-Muntafik family ruled over the lower Euphrates up to the year 1281, when Midhat Pasha was able to establish a mutasarrîfiyya under the control of the governor of Baghdad (Longrigg, Four Centuries of Modern Iraq, Oxford; "A. 'Azzâwî, al-'Irâb bain Thalalâm, 8 Vols, Baghdad 1937-57; Field, The Anthropology of Iraq, in Field Museum of Natural History, Vol. 30, part i, no. 2, 1949).

Large numbers of the originally Aramaic (and Christian) population of Babylonia (the Nabats of Arab writers) remained in Batîtha for a long time, so that many sources call them the swamps of the Nabât (L.A., iii, 237; cf. also Mas'ûdî, al-Tanbîh, 161; Miskawiyah, ii, 409 Muckaddasi, 128). Probably another ancient remnant is the Mandaeans or Shûba, the mediaeval Mughatâsîla, cf. Ibn al-Nadîn, 340; Mas'ûdî, al-Tanbîh, 161); these Shûba still survive in a few places in the marshes such as Sûk al-Shûyôkî, Kal'at Sallû, and in Hor al-Hawîzâ (Hawîzâ) where the town of Hawîzâ is their chief centre (cf. Drower, in Bibliography).

Nevertheless some Arabs settled there. Ibn Rusta says that Yashkur, Bâhîla and Banû 'l-Anbar lived near the Batîtha before its formation. Baladhuri refers to the Bâhîli clients who joined the Zuww in their disturbances at the time of Ma'mûn. Tabari, iii, 1858, 1898, 1903 refers to some of the Bâhîlis who joined the activities of the Zandj in the 53/9th century. He refers also to Al'îlî in the Batîtha (iii, 1759). The Mazyâdîs domination must have brought Banû Asad [q.v. until they were destroyed by Al-Nâsîr. Ibn Khaldûn mentions Râbî'â who dominate this area (vi, 12), by whom he probably means the Muntafik [q.v.]. Ibn Batîtîa mentions Khâsâija and the Ma'âdî (ii, 2, 4).

The greater part of the modern inhabitants is composed of semi-nomads and farmers of Arab stock, organised on tribal lines. They are Shî'î Muslims except for a few Sunnis, the most prominent of whom are the Sa'dûn family.

The most important of these Arab tribes, which are themselves divided into a large number of subdivisions, are:

(1) The Banû Lâm who in the 16th century were able to establish their authority over the Tigris lands from Hawizâ as far as the environs of Baghdad in the north, and to the outer spurs of the Pusht-i-Kûh in the east. Kût al-Amâra was the residence of their Shaikh in the early decades of the 19th century, but their lands and authority diminished in the 19th century and became confined to the lands east of Tigris and north of Ìmârâ. They are a sheep owning tribe, and are still semi-nomadic.

(2) The Alûb (= Abû) Muhammâm. They also live east of the Tigris, beside the banks of the Çafla and its main tributaries where they settled ten generations ago, and have since expanded over the canals and marshes on either side of the Tigris in the 19th century, but their lands and authority diminished in the 19th century and became confined to the lands east of Tigris and north of Ìmâra. They are a sheep owning tribe, and are still semi-nomadic.

(3) The Alûbî, to the west of the Tigris. Their subdivision al-Mayyâh extends along the Gharrafi up to Shâtra, with Hâyî as their chief centre.

(4) Subayd, west of the Tigris. Their lands lie between Baghdad on the north and Kut al-Hâyî in the south-east. In the south they adjoin the land of the Khâzîlî.

(5) The Khâzîlî, south-west of the Subayd. They dwell from the district between Kefîl and the ruins of Nîffar, and along the Euphrates from Shammîyya to the south of Diwânîyya where they border on the country of the Muntafîk.

(6) The Muntafik, a loose confederation of tribes presided over by the al-Sâ' dîn who came in the 5th century from the Hidzî and were able to establish their authority over the tribes of the Lower Euphrates, and to expand at times even as far as Basra. They retained their semi-autonomous authority up to 1861, when Midhat Pasha was able to abolish their rule and establish a mutasarrîfiyya in Nâşiriyya.

The Muntafîk fall into three main divisions:

1) Al-Adiwaq, who dwelt from Dârráddî to the vicinity of Sûk al-Shûyôkî, and on the lower parts of the Gharrafi; 2) Banû Mâlîk, who live on the borders of Al-Handmâr; 3) Banû Sa'dî, who live near Karmâ bani Sa'dî.

(7) Al-Diázarîr. The Diázarîr ("islands") also called Diawîzir are the swamp lands as opposed to Shammîyya, the dry and desert land. The term has given its name to a confederation of tribes which are repeatedly mentioned in the Mongol and Ottoman
sources up to the 20th century. Their country was part of the Mushāqṭah state (Arzāwī, Taʾrīḫ, iii, 117, 174, 272) then of Al-Uyyān (Arzāwī, iv, 107), was conquered by the Ottomans (Arzāwī, iv, 50 quoting Mīr-i-Kābind, 137; Ebuliyâ Celebi iv, 414), at times dominated by the Persians and by the Mūntakhab, until it was finally brought under Ottoman control at the time of Midhat Pasha, who made attempts to reclaim some of its lands (Al-Zaaw, 568).

The tribes of Al-Dżazaʾr formed a federation composed of (1) Banū Asad [q.v.]; who settled between Kufa and Wasit (ii); Loftus (120-2) has described their primitive life and conditions. They are probably the Maʿādī who are mentioned by Ibn Baṭṭūta as dwelling between Kūfā and Wāṣīṭ (i); Loftus (120-2) has described their primitive life and conditions. They dwell in the marshes, are organised tribally in a small way, and have no cohesion on a large scale. They are fishermen, reed-gatherers, and breeders of buffaloes.

The settlements of the inhabitants of the swamps are usually on terraces and islands, which are not entirely submerged by the annual inundation, and sometimes form villages. They consist of long huts built of reeds and reed matting (sarifa) (Thesiger, xvi, 198, Note 1).

The most important product of the marshes is rice. Other products are barley, yellow maize, cotton, sugar, millet, lentils, melons, watermelons, and to some degree lady’s finger (bāmya, gumbo, okra) and onions.

One source of revenue is the reed, which is used for all household purposes and from ancient times has been much used for writing implements (see OLZ, ix, 190). The reed pens of mediaeval Wāṣīṭ and, in the 19th century, of Dīzīfīl were considered the best in the east (cf. Cl. Huart, Les Calligraphes et les miniaturistes de l’Orient Musulm., (1908), 13). Even at present 50-70 thousand tons of reeds are cut annually in the vicinity of Čābāyīr (Tams, 60).

In addition there is great abundance of fishes, which afford a continual food supply to the natives or are exported to other districts. Ibn Rusta (94) refers to the importance of the Bāṭīha products of fish and fish in mediaeval times. At present it produces about 2000 tons of fish annually, employing about 500 fishermen.

Buffaloes are an important source of wealth to the marshmen south of Īmāra and of the ʿĀmmār. The butter from their milk is exported to the surrounding cities and to Baghad. Sheep are also reared to a moderate extent, while cows are found in various places, especially in Kūfā.

As to the remaining fauna of the Bāṭihīa, water fowl of all sorts are numerous, such as gulls, wild duck, geese, swans etc.; there are flocks of cranes, pelicans, flamingoes, storks, bustards and bitterns. There are also some carnivorous animals. The lion, which was known in this country in ancient and mediaeval times, was last mentioned in the 19th century (Loftus, op. cit., 242 ff.). In addition, a number of leopards, jackals, wolves, lynxes and wild-cats have their lairs here. Wild-boar (Sus scrofa), wallow in large herds in the marshes.

The countless swarms of mosquitoes and midges form a terrible plague, and were a source of endemic diseases, e.g., malaria, which must have been an important factor in the decline of the district (cf. ʿĀbbās Sulaim Āl-Ṣabīḥīyyah, Vol. ii).


Al-Batin, though a historic route from al-Hasa to al-Hījāz, contains few known archaeological remains; the most prominent are the 42 steeled wells, which may be Yākūt’s Hafar Abī Mūsā, near the village of Hafar al-Batīn. The only settlement in al-Batīn, al-Hafar consists of 200 houses and the fort of the Amirate which reports to the Governorate of the Eastern Province at al-Dammām.

At an undefined point at the junction of al-Batīn and its tributary, al-'Awdja, the boundaries of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Ibrā, and the Saudi Arabia-Ibrā Neutral Zone converge, according to the al-'Uqayr agreements of 1922.


Al-Batīnīya, a lowland district in eastern Arabia lying between the coast of the Gulf of Oman and the mountains of al-Ḥadżār. It is bounded on the north by the headland of Khattat Milābā, and on the south by the village of Ḥayl al-ʿUmāy, southeast of the town of al-Sīb and west of the city of Muscat. The district varies in width from 10 to 20 miles. Near the coast the soil is sandy and dotted with many shallow wells. Farther inland the soil is clay, and then the ground becomes stony as the foothills of the mountains are approached. Numerous wādīs cut across the district and run down to the coast, where their beds broaden out. The name al-Batīnīa means the low-lying region, in contrast to al-Ẓāhirā [q.v.], the higher region on the western side of al-Ḥadżār, which is reached from al-Batīnīa by two important passes, Wāḍī al-Dījāy and Wāḍī al-Ḥawāṣīn.

Al-Batīnīa is primarily a region of fishing and date culture, though the interior supports a number of semi-nomadic folk with their herds. Along the sea coast stretches an almost continuous date-palm belt, which in places extends inland to a depth of about seven miles. Wheat, cotton, barley, sugar-cane, lucerne, mangoes, bananas, figs, limes, melons, and olives are also grown, being irrigated from the copious wells. Domestic animals are sheep, goats, donkeys, and especially the Bātīnīya riding camel, which among the three famous breeds of Oman is the one most noted for its comfortable gait. Fishing is often carried on in the Ṣhīdha, a non-sinkable craft of palm branches (diqv) similar to the Ṣarākibiyah of Kuwait. Larger vessels sail to the Persian Gulf, southern Arabia, Zanjībār, and Pākistān for trade.

Al-Batīnīa was first proselytised for Islām in 8/629 by Abū Zayd al-Ansārī and ‘Amm b. al-ʿĀṣ [q.v.], who were welcomed in Ṣuḥār [q.v.] by the house who were welcomed in Suhar in 928/1522. Although the Portuguese took the town, they did not continually, occupy the al-Batīnīa coast until 1025/1616. Until the expulsion of the Portuguese in 1053/1643 by the dynasty of al-Yaʿārība [see VAṢR], Ṣuḥār rivaled Muscat and Hormuz as a trading port. Persian attempts to regain possession of al-Batīnīa during the reign of Nādir Shāh [q.v.] were beaten off largely by the efforts of Ahmad b. Saʿīd of Al Bū Saʿīd (see BŪ SAʿĪD). His nine-month defence of Ṣuḥār in 1156/1743 brought him prestige which secured for himself the Imamate of Oman and for his descendants the Sultanate of Muscat.

The Sultan of Muscat has reigned at al-Sīb, Bārka, al-Maṣnaṣa, Suwayk, al-Khāibūrā, and Ṣuḥār. The customs and zakāt revenue from these places seldom exceeds the administrative expenses. The number of Bedouins roaming the interior is far less. Among the sedentary population, the chief tribes are Al Saʿīd and al-Ḥawāṣīn. Many of the Bedouins in the district come from the same two tribes and Banī Khāṣūr. Lesser tribes are al-Biduwāt, Ṣūḥār, Ṣuwayk, Al Djarad, Al Djarad, and al-Shubāl. The great majority of the people of al-Batīn are Ḥanāfī in politics and Ḥabīlī in religion, although the Balūchis and negroes tend to be Sunnī.


(R. L. Headley)

Bātīnīya, a name given (a) to the Ismāʿīlīs in medieval times, referring to their stress on the bātīn, the “inward” meaning behind the literal wording of sacred texts; and (b), less specifically, to anyone accused of rejecting the literal meaning of such texts in favour of the bātīn.

(a) Among the Ismāʿīlīs [q.v.] and some related Shīʿī groups there developed a distinctive type of taʾwīl [q.v.], scriptural interpretation, which may be called bātīm. It was symbolical or allegorical in its method, sectarian in its aims, hierarchically imparted, and secret. All branches of the Ismāʿīliyya as well as its Druze offshoots have retained the bātīm taʾwīl in one form or another. The like system of the Nuṣayrīs seems to be a survival from bātīm circles associated with the later Twelver imāms [see Shīʿī].

Certain aspects of this type of taʾwīl can be matched in Jewish and Christian prototypes (for instance, in the symbolical exegesis of Origen) and other aspects can be matched among the Gnostics. Its immediate origins, however, are Muslim. Like the symbolical taʾwīl ascribed to the imāms among the later Twelver Shīʿī (with which it has in common its symbolical and sectarian character and something of its secrecy), its beginnings can be traced to the Shīʿī Shihād of the 2nd/8th century in Ibrā. Thus
al-Mughira b. Saʿīd (d. 119/737) is said to have interpreted the mountains' refusal to undertake the task of building the Ka'bah as symbolising the imām alone being charged with its interpretation, taʾwil. Among the followers of Abu ʿl-Khaṭṭāb (d. 138/755-6) such allegoristic taʾwil seems to have been especially popular; some of them supposed that in each generation there is a speaker, nāʾīr, to declare publicly religious truth, and a silent man, ʿāmil, to interpret it to the elect. Presumably it was from the Khaṭṭābiyya that such elements of the bāṭiniyya, entered the Ismāʿīlī movement, where the taʾwil was elaborated till it became the hallmark of that movement.

The bāṭini system can be described in terms of four essential notions: bāṭin, taʾwil, ḥāṣa waʾīmm, and ʿāmil; all which were presupposed whatever particular doctrine was taught. It was held that every sacred text had its hidden inner meaning, the bāṭin, which was contrasted to the ẓāhir, "apparent" or literal meaning. Not only in passages which were in any case metaphorical, but in historical passages, moral exhortations, legal and ritual prescriptions, each person, act, or object mentioned was to be taken symbolically. The things symbolised often were explained one by one as objects of approval, obedience, hatred, and the like, according to the passage; but sometimes whole anecdotes were read as extended allegories. Number and letter symbolism was freely used. The same procedure applied to non-Muslim sacred books as well; and indeed to the whole of nature. For the bāṭin represented an esoteric world of hidden spiritual reality, parallel to the reality of the ẓāhir, the ordinary visible world, which cloaked and concealed it. The true function of scripture was to point to that hidden world even while keeping it disguised in symbols.

Taʾwil, the edifying of the bāṭin from the ẓāhir text, was therefore as fundamental as tanzil, the revelation of the literal sacred text itself, and was equally dependent upon divine intervention. For every prophet who was given an especial revelation to be proclaimed publicly to mankind, there must be a nāʾīr, an executor (in the case of Muḥammad, this was ʿAll) who was given the corresponding taʾwil, which he propounded privately to the worthy few, that is, the members of the sect which accepted his authority. Mankind, then, were divided into ḥāṣa, the elite who know the bāṭin, and ṣāmm, the ignorant generality. The ḥāṣa were those who had been ceremonially initiated into the sect, that is, into knowledge of and obedience to the imām, representative of ʿAll and sole authorised source of taʾwil in any given generation. Among the Ismāʿīlīs, a series of hierarchical ranks (ḥudūd) of teachers mediated between the imām and the simple initiate. To the latter the bāṭin was imparted only in gradual stages (the number of which varied) and in purely authoritarian fashion.

The bāṭin was "inward" not only in being unevident but also in being secret. Knowledge of it must not be imparted to the ʿāmil, the ordinary followers of the ẓāhir revelation, lest it be misunderstood in an unauthorised way and abused. The Shīʿite principle of lāḥiyya [q.v.], precautionary dissimulation of one's faith, was accordingly reinterpreted to imply the obligation not to reveal the bāṭin to any unauthorised persons even apart from any danger of persecution. For some, therefore, the practice of the ẓāhir ritual of the sharīʿa even in its frankly Shīʿite form came to be regarded as lāḥiyya, in that it kept the bāṭin concealed.

Despite an authoritarian hierarchism, the taʾwil (as we know it in its Ismāʿīlī form) never achieved any strict uniformity. For any given ritual action different authors gave widely differing bāṭin interpretations; even the same author sometimes gave multiple explanations in the same book. Thus the inner meaning of the obligation of ẓāhir was held to be that the ḥāṣa or fifth of one's income must be given to the imām; or that one should give all one's surplus to the poor; or that the only true wealth is knowledge. What the taʾwil did accomplish was to replace what seemed a "native" Kurānic world view with a more "sophisticated" intellectual system; one which seemed to go beneath the superficial differences among the quarrelling religious communities with their incompatible dogmatic claims, to reach a profounder common truth. A unity of spirit was given to the taʾwil among the Ismāʿīlīs by its being used for three large and interrelated purposes. It presented a cosmology derived from neo-Platonist sources; it interpreted eschatology in terms of cyclicist religious history (and sometimes of reincarnationism); finally, it justified the religious hierarchy of the sect, whose grades corresponded more or less to the several dignities of the neo-Platonist cosmos.

The desire for sophisticated freedom from common accepted dogmas made for a persistent tendency toward radical exaltation of the bāṭin. In official Fāṭimid Ismāʿīlism the ẓāhir and bāṭin were both held to have their own spheres of relevance, at least in matters of ritual and law, in which they were binding on the initiate. But there was a frequent recurrence among the bāṭiniyya of a total rejection of the ẓāhir meaning even of the sharīʿa, or at least of its ritual prescriptions, as superfluous for whoever knows the imām and hence the bāṭin; this happened, for instance, among the Nizārī Ismāʿīlīs after 559/1164. Those who rejected the ẓāhir altogether often tended also, consistently, to exalt the ẓāhir (ʿAll) to a higher rank than that of the Prophet (Muḥammad), since the taʾwil was worthier than the tanzil; this was the attitude of the Naṣāʾyris.

The bāṭiniyya movement seems to have left traces among such later groups as the Ḥurūfīs, the Rawshāns, and the Bābis, who also used symbolical exegesis, though in somewhat different contexts. Its terminology and conceptions, freed of their sectarianism, have likewise influenced the symbolism of Sūfī thought. Perhaps above all, however, the radical positions it took had the effect of rendering Muslim Orthodoxy all the more suspicious of any kind of symbolical taʾwil. Thus Ghazzālī used the Ismāʿīlī bāṭiniyya, in his al-Kūšān al-Mustaḵṣīm, as point of departure for his analysis of the legitimate limits of taʾwil in general.

(b) Sunni writers have subsequently used the term bāṭiniyya polemically to condemn any writers who, in their judgment, go beyond the recognition of a bāṭin meaning in scripture, to the rejection of the evident meaning of scripture in favour exclusively of such a bāṭin. Thus Ibn Taymiyya applies the term not only to the bāṭini Shīʿa but to some Sūfīs and to such jābliyya as Ibn Ruğdā. Sūfīs commonly hold that there are rich bāṭin meanings in the Kurān open to the properly contemplative spirit; but they
are generally careful to avoid a position which could be labelled bītin in this sense. Ibn al-ʿArabi, for instance, whose interpretation of scripture often seems particularly free, defends himself against the charge of being a bītin on the grounds that he accepts the ʿṣīr alongside the bātin. 


AL-BĀṬIYA [see NUGŪM].

BATJAN, a small island in Indonesia [q.v.], near the equator, at Long. 127° E., one of the earlier sultanates and centres of Muslim propaganda. It lost its importance as a spice-island about 1650 when the trees were destroyed as a result of a treaty between the sultan and the Dutch East India Company. (C. C. BERG)

BĀṬLAMIYOS, the almost exclusively used transliteration of the Greco-Latin Ptolemaeus; al-Masūdī, Tanbih, Ṭabakīt al-umam, i, 264, the former opinion deriving it from ḫulaylā (Suter, EI, s.v. Almages), has generally been abandoned. The Arabic form is al-Miḏiššt (so explicitly stated by Ḥāḍīḍī Khālfīa, v, 385); Barhebraeus also gives the correct Greek title Sūnīkkēs (ed. Salhani, 123). An elaborate survey of the contents of books i-iv in al-Yaṣāḥūbi, i, 151-154, cf. Klamroth, in ZDMG, 42, 17-18. Īṣākī al-Miḏiššt by Thābit b. Kura, cf. Brockelmann, i, 284, 1, 7a. The first translator is not Sahil al-Tabarī (and this man is not identical with Sahil b. Bishr, as proposed by Steinschneider, Arab. Lit. der Juden, 24), as stated by Sarton, IHS, i, 562. The whole problem has been discussed anew by Nallino, Lc., who also gives a new interpretation of the account in Fihrist (Raccolta, v, 263), and arrives at the conclusion that the first translator is unknown. The MS. Esc. 915 has been used by O. J. Tallgren, Un point d'astronomie gréco-arabe-romane, Neuropsychologische Mitteilungen, xxix, 1928, 39-44; cf. also the same, Survivance arabo-romane du Catalogue d'étoiles de Ptolémée, Stud. Or. Soc. Or. Fenn., ii, 1928, 202-283. A hitherto unknown commentary by Abu ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḵāṭīn (Brockelmann, i, 387) has been discovered by G. Vajda (Paris, BN, ar. 4821, 9, cf. RSO, xxv, 8), another one by ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥayyān is only known by name, cf. Kraus, ʿAbd ʿAbd al-Ḥayyān, i, 1943, no. 2834. Ch. H. Haskins and D. P. Lockwood have stated that the first Latin translation has been made directly from the Greek, 12 years before Gerard of Cremona's version from the Arabic in 1175 (The Sicilian Translators of the 12th Century and the first Latin version of Ptolemy's Almagest, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, xx, 1910, 75-102; cf. also J. L. Heiberg, in Hermes, xlv, 1910, 57-66, xlvi, 207-216). See also Carmody, r, and Millas, ch. xxxv.

b. The πρόγραμμα κανωνες (Tabulae manuales), cf. Steinschneider, in ZDMG, i, 217 and 341. Al-Yaṣāḥūbi, i, 159 = Klamroth, 25 calls the work which he analysed, ʿĪṣākī al-Ḵāṭīn fi ʿĪṣākī al-Nuqūm wa-Ḥisīkhā wa-Kismat ʿAgīṣkhā wa-Taqīkhā, but, as Honigmann, 118 f. shows, this is not Ptolemy's book. This last has already in Greek times been confounded with the commentary written by Theo Alexanderinus. This was known to some Arabic scholars, as shown by Honigmann, 120. Theo's commentaries upon Ptolemy influenced al-Kindī, as proved by F. Rosen-thal in his analysis of MS. Ayta Sefa 4830 (Studia . . . G. Levi della Vida, 1956, ii, 456 f.). Special attention must be paid to one of the Tables, the κανωνες βασειστης, ed. by C. Wachsmuth in his Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte, 1895, 304-306, reprinted with transliteration in Arabic numbers and Christian years for every king in F. K. Ginzel, Handbuch der mathematischen u. technischen Chronologie, i, 1906, 139. The text is quoted by al-Yaṣāḥūbi, i, 161, for the Greek and Roman kings. In this table Alexander the Great comes after Darius
III, then Philippus (Arrhidaeus) “that one with Alexander the Builder”, then “the other” Alexander the Great (Brockelmann, iii, 1205 ad i, 392; it exists in Alexandria, Kuruf, 12).

According to Thorndike, The Latin Translations of (Loeb Class. Libr., together with Manetho), new Latin

Arba’a, c (Barh. 123: K. al-Arb’ Malidldt) fi Afrkdm al-Nudjum, Arba’a, c (K. fi Dhdt al-§afd*ib wa-hiya al-

Astrolabe called Baflamiyus fi tasjih al-kura, transl. by Thabit. Al-


e. Another pseudoepigraphic book, K. al-Malhama, is known from numerous quotations in Yâkût’s Geographical Dictionary, cf. the collection of place-names mentioned in it, and further literature in Honigmann, Sieben Klimata, 125-34. The meaning of malhama is not quite clear, and the quotations do not furnish sufficient evidence as to the real character of the book.

f. Recently, a short text has been edited which refers to Ptolemy, namely, Djabîr ma dâ?î fi l-nây’arâs ua-ahkâmûs mim-mâ jasarakh Baflâmîyûs al-bahâm wa-wadjadâhâ ‘an ‘ilm Dânîyûl (1), ed. from Ist. Murad Molla 338 by ‘Abd al-Salam Hârûn, Madâdir al-Malhidâtî, 5 (ii/l), 1373/1954, 45-48 (information from Mr. M. Schwarz of the Hebrew University Library). It discusses the significance of the week-day on which falls New Year.

g. A book on the images which rise in the 360 degrees of the celestial sphere named Liber imaginum Ptolaei and the like, exists in Latin in many MSS. cf. Steinschneider, Eur. Ubs., no. 1770, Carmody, 20, Thormäcke, Journ. Warb. Court., 118. An Arabic text entitled Risala fi Ǧwlar al-Darâmî ascribed to Ptolemy is one of the sources of the Sahînî al-Akhâm by a certain Hadrat al-Nuṣayrî, MSS Berlin Pet. I, 676 and Br. Mus. Add. 23,400 (the number in the Catalogue, 848, is distorted by Steinschneider, Arab. Ubs., Philos., 90 and General Index into 1348, Math., 217 into 843, and 353 into 874); but the identity of the Arabic and Latin texts has not yet been examined. For the meaning of the title cf. Boll, Sphaera, 426 ff.

h. The Liber ad Heristhonem or Aristonom de judicis (Steinschneider, Ar. Ubs., 218, no. 11) has been analysed by Millas, 175, cf. also for similar texts ascribed to Ptolemy, Carmody, 17 and 20.

i. Messealach (Mâ gâ?î Allâh) et Ptolomeus de electionibus, printed Venice, 1509, cf. Steinschneider, Eur. Ubs., no. 164d, and Arab. Lit. d. Juden, 22, no. 26, has been tentatively identified by Carmody, 43 i with a Kitâb al-Ḫhîyiyyârât, MS. Esc. 919. Another MS. with the same title is quoted in Brockelmann, iii, 1205 ad i, 392; it exists in Alexandria, kursî, 12. According to Thormäcke, The Latin Translations of
astrological works by Messahala, in Osiris, xii, 1956, 69, the work is erroneously attributed to Ma' ḍahb Allah, and its author is Sahil b. Bighr. The Venice print is not mentioned by him, and consequently he does not make clear whether Ptolemy's book is supposed to be a different work or whether the print points to common authorship. The matter is still open for investigation.

4. Geography.

J. H. Kramer's account on the Arabic translations of the Περί οὐσίας τῶν θεών of Proclus, Suppl., 1. [Egypt, Coptic] is by no means out of date, cf. also his contribution Geography and Commerce in The Legacy of Islam, 1931, 79-107. We refer the reader to the works quoted in those articles and to Steinschneider, Ar. Übes., para. 119, and Ruska's review of H. v. Mzik's publications, in Geographische Zeitschrift, 1924, 77-81. For the translation made for Mehməd Fathı, the conqueror of Istanbul, preserved in MS. AS 2356, cf. Honigmann, 114; Flessner, in Islamica, iv, 1931, 547; Büttner, in ibid., xix, 1931, 52 f., where another MS, AS 2610, is described too.

5. Harmonics.


6. Optics.


7. Alia.


(M. FLESSNER)

BATRIN [see BITRIN].

BATRIN (or BATHRUN), Graeco-Roman Bostrys and the Boutron of the Crusaders; a small town on the Lebanese coast, situated 56 kms. north of Bayrūt; it witnessed the passage of all the armies of conquest, covering as it does the Bayrūt–Ṭarābulūs road to the south of the precipitous promontory of Rās Shākka (Theoprosopoton). According to a tradition cited by Josephus (Antiq. viii, 3, 52), it was apparently founded by Ithobaal, king of Tyre. In reality it is of much older origin and is mentioned in the Tell al-Amarna letters (15th century B.C.) as a dependency of Bybios (Djubayl). At one time it was a nest of pirates, who were dealt with by Antiocchus III Megas. To judge from the remains of a vast amphitheatre, the city, already famed for its vineyards, must have been of some consequence in Roman times. Like all the coastal towns, it was destroyed by the earthquake and tidal wave of 16 July 551.

In the period of the Crusades, Boutron was the seat of a bishopric depending on the county of Tripoli. It was a port where the Pisans enjoyed a number of privileges. For a long while the Provençal family of d'Agout were its lords. In 1271, following a quarrel among the Franks, the manor was razed by the Templars. Sulṭān Kalawān took Batrūn in 1289 without difficulty. Under the Mamluks of Egypt, the town was attached to the niyyāba of Ṭarābulūs. In the 19th century the town enjoyed a certain prosperity due to sponge fishing which, however, today occupies only a few boats. The town now has a population of about 3,000, the majority of whom are Maronites.

Bibliography: Yākūt, i, 494 (Beirut ed. i, 338); Idrisi, Syrie (Gildemeister) 17 (Jaubert) i, 356; Du Cagno, Les Familles d'Outre-Mer, 257-259; Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, 351-352; W. Heyd, Histoire du Commerce au Levant, i, 321; Lammens, La Syrie, ii, 38; Dussaud, Topographie historique de la Syrie, 71; Grousset, Histoire des Croisades, iii, 688, 745; ʿĀdīl Ismaʿīl, Histoire du Liban du XVIe siècle à nos jours, i, 33, 114 (ElISSEFFER).

AL-BATTĀL, ʿABD ALLAH, famous ghāṭ of the Umayyad period who took part in several expeditions against the Byzantines. His surname means “brave”, “hero”, but has also a pejorative sense (cf. for example Ibn Ḥawkal, 85; and the dictionaries). Concerning this person there is a comparatively meagre historical tradition, a pseudo-historical tradition and, moreover, an Arab romance Sinārat Delhemma wa ʿl-Battāl, and related to it, a Turkish romance, Sayyid Battāl.

According to the early chroniclers (Al-Yaṣīyūb, Al-Tabari), al-Battāl does not appear before the year 109/727-28, during the reign of Hishām b. ʿAbd al-Malik (103-125/724-43). Likewise the Byzantine historian Theophanes and the author of the Syriac chronicle, known as Pseudo-Dionysius of Tell Mahre, only mention the year of his death, in 740. However a tradition already old, as it appears in the Persian recasting of al-Ṭabari done by Bahā'ī who wrote in 352/963, associates al-Battāl with Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik in his famous expedition against Constantinople in 98/717. We are dealing with a largely legendary account and we cannot know whether it contains reliable historical elements. Historically, al-Battāl at the head of the vanguard
of Mu'āwiyah b. Hishām conquered Gangra in Paphlagonia in 109/728. In 113/731-32 he took part in the expedition in which another celebrated Umayyad general, 'Abd al-Wahhāb b. Bukht. In 114/732-33, or 115, in the course of an invasion by Mu'āwiyah b. Hishām of Phrygia in the region of Akroinon, he routed and captured a Byzantine leader called Constantine. There is no further mention of him before his death in 122/740. During that year several parts of Anatolia were attacked by the troops of Sulaymān b. Hīghām. Al-Ṭāalles’s detachment, commanded by the governor of Malatia, Malik b. Shāhīb (or Shu‘ayb), was surprised and routed by the Emperor Leo III and his son Constantine near Akroinon. The two leaders perished, their survivors fleeing south towards Synnada where they managed to rejoin Sulaymān. The date of al-Ṭāalles’s death is nevertheless placed in 121, 123 or even in 113.

If the early chronicles do not appear to have attached much importance to his person, his military exploits were celebrated early by popular tradition in various accounts and anecdotes. In the period of al-Maṣʿūdī, the first half of the 4th-10th century, he was known as one of the illustrious Muslims whose portrait the Byzantines had hung in their churches (Muraḍī, viii, 74), beside that of the famous amīr of Melitene, 'Amr b. ‘Ubayd Allah al-‘Aḍaṭa, defeated and killed in 249/863. It is not impossible that the legend of both developed shortly after that date, as an after-effect of the first Byzantine success. In Balʿam’s account of Maslama’s expedition, al-Ṭāalles is appointed to hold one gate of Constantinople open while Maslama entered the city alone on horseback, and to enter in force should anything befall Maslama. Al-Ṭāalles is even associated with Maslama in the account of the siege of the Byzantine capital in the Kitāb al-'Uyun (5th/10th or 6th/12th centuries), where one finds as well under the year 565/1170 the romantic account of a single-handed combat by al-Ṭāalles. The popular account of Maslama’s expedition by the great Andalusian mystic Ibn al-'Arabi (d. 638/1240), related to that of Balʿam, attributes also an important rôle to al-Ṭāalles, commander of the contingents of Djazira and Syria, chief of Maslama’s guard and charged with the same mission before Constantinople as in Balʿam’s version.

In a long biographical notice going back to Ibn ‘Aṣākir (d. 571/1176), a Syrian tradition reproduced more or less completely by various historians including Ibn al-Aṭhir, Sibt Ibn al-Djāwizī, Ibn Shākir al-Kutubī, Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmayrī and Ibn Katṣīr, one finds after a brief allusion to the rôle of al-Ṭāalles in Maslama’s expedition, romantic anecdotes of which certain reappear in the romance of al-Ṭāalles. These are 1) al-Ṭāalles the bogey: he appears one night in a Greek village where he hears a mother threaten her crying child with giving him al-Ṭāalles if he does not stop crying; 2) His entrance into a Greek convent: al-Ṭāalles, weakened by violent abdominal pains, is led by his horse to a convent where he is given asylum. He escapes the investigations of a Byzantine patriot thanks to the abbess, follows him when he leaves, kills him, and returns to the convent where he takes captive all of the nuns and marries the abbess; 3) His entrance into Amorium by a ruse: separated from his companions he arrives at Amorium where he gains access to the patrician by pretending to be a messenger from the Emperor, and forces him to indicate the whereabouts of the Muslim army, which he rejoins; 4) His death on the battlefield where the Emperor Leo attends his last moments, looks after him and permits his burial by the Muslim prisoners.

The authors who report these anecdotes distinguish them from the "lies" of the Strata Dilemmata of 'l-Ṭāalles (see below) of whose existence we know already during his period from the Jewish convert Samawʿal b. Yahyā al-Maghrībī, who wrote in 565/1169-70.

The early authors say nothing of the origin of al-Ṭāalles. According to later historians he came from Antioch (or from Damascus), lived in Antioch, and was a mausole of the Umayyad house, as was his companion ‘Abd al-Wahhāb b. Bukht, who also plays a major rôle in the Strata Dilemmata. His kunya is sometimes Abu Muhammad, sometimes Abu Yahyā, sometimes Abu 'l-Ḫusayn. His father’s name is Husayn or ‘Amr. On the origin of al-Ṭāalles, such as it is given, whether in the Strata Dilemmata or in the Turkish tradition of Sayyid Baṭṭāl, see the articles on these two romances.


AL-BATTĀL (SAYYID BAṬṬĀL GHULĀM), a champion of the Arabs in the wars against Byzantium in the Umayyad period, is transformed, in the Turkish romance devoted to his adventures, into a hero of the 'Abbāsid period. Al-Ṭāalles thus became the contemporary of the amīr of Melitene, 'Amr b. ‘Ubayd Allah al-‘Aḍaṭa (d. 249/863) and was incorporated into the epic cycle of Melitene. After the conquest of Melitene by the amīr Dānishmend in 495/1102, the Turks adopted the epic of Melitene, incorporating it in their own epic cycles and tracing their national heroes back to the legendary al-Ṭāalles. It is a Turkicised Baṭṭāl ennoblé by an 'Alīd connexion and answering to the name of Ḍja'far that we find in the Turkish version. The Turkish historians who used this epic romance as a historical source often took the legendary elements for historical facts and were even led to accept the chronology of the story. Thus Ewliya Celebi made
Battāl a contemporary of Hārūn al-Rāshīd, whose reign he transferred to 248/859—the year in which he made his siege of Constantinople. The same anachronism exists in the Turkish version of al-Ṭabarī; it was made by an anonymous translator who introduced into his work accounts taken from the Turkish epic tradition.

Al-Battāl appears in two great epic romances: the Arabic romance of Ḍālī al-himma (Delhemma) [see IHU 'l-HIMMA] and the Turkish romance of Sayyid Battāl. These two works, although related, were not subject to reciprocal influences; they probably both go back to an Arabic tradition—concerning al-Battāl of which we possess no written trace, but whose existence is confirmed by two pieces of historical evidence of the 6th/12th century (cf. M. Canard, in JA, ccviii, 116; id., in Byzantion, xii, 186).

The Turkish romance. After their conquest of Anatolia, the Turks adopted as their own the local epic traditions celebrating the Arabo-Byzantine Wars. These accounts transformed the addition of Turkish elements and Turkicised Persian elements, gave rise to a new Anatolian epic having as its subject the conquest of Asia Minor. The romance of Battāl is the prototype of this literature; however, from the first, elements of Turkish folklore crept in, containing events which took place in a fantastic world peopled with anthropomorphic demons and supernatural beings, themes taken from Persian fairy stories or epic tales, popularisations of the Shāh-nāma, motifs from historical romances of heterodox ideology, such as the Romance of Abū Muslim, a work found all over the Turkish world. The Turkish romance of Battāl appears as a mosaic where the elements of different times and sources amalgamated. Among these elements, the book which recounts the inscription and the capture of the heretic Bābak stands out from the rest of the work because of its historical basis, which is evident through the trappings of the legend. In this account, which takes place in the Caliphate of al-Mu'tasim (833-842), Batṭāl has been substituted for the real hero of the campaign, Aṣfān, whose name was proscribed after his disgrace and death in 225/839. This book is probably one of the Bābak-nāmas whose existence we know from Ibh ad-1bn al-Nadlm, and which is incorporated in the romance of Battāl.

Similarly in the Delhemma the Turkish romance contains reminiscences of the time of the First Crusade. It was probably composed during the 6th/12th century, or right at the beginning of the 7th/13th century, because the Romance of Malik Dānishmend, which celebrates the exploits of the first Turkish conqueror of Melitene and which was first written down in 643/1245, was conceived as a continuation of the romance of Battāl; some narrators of the Saltik period added a chapter in which they told how the tomb of the hero was discovered by the Saldjiiks of Anatolia. There exists a version of the romance of Battāl in verse, attributed to Bākāt, in the reign of Muṣṭafā III (1757-1774). Independently of the epic cycle, the name of Battāl still lives on in numerous Anatolian legends and in particular in the hagiographical stories of the Calaure and Bektashī sects [see NUSAYRIS, BEKTASHIYYA] who have adopted him as one of their heroes.


(I. Melikoff)

Al-Battānī (his full name is Abu 'Abd Allah Muḥammad b. Diābir b. Sinān al-Battānī al-Harrānī al-Ṣāḥīb), the Albatagni or Albatanius of our mediaeval authors, one of the greatest of Arab astronomers, was born before 244 (858) very probably at Harrān or in its neighbourhood; the origin of the nisba al-Battānī is quite uncertain. His family formerly possessed the Sabian religion, whence the name al-Ṣāḥib although his author was a Muslim. He spent almost his whole life at al-Raḵša on the left bank of the Euphrates, where several families from Harrān had taken up their abode; from 204 (822) he devoted himself to astronomical observations which he regularly pursued for the rest of his life. Having had occasion to go on business to Bagdad he died on his return journey at Kašr al-Dişp, a little to the east of the Tigris and not far from Samarrā in 317 (929).

He wrote: 1. Kitāb muʿrifat mutašīrīn al-burūdī fi maʿ bayna arbaʾ al-falak, "the book of the science of the ascensions of the signs of the zodiac in the spaces between the quadrants of the celestial sphere"; i.e., of the ascensions of the points of the ecliptic which are not, at the given moment, one of the four "awtād" or pivots [see the article NUGUM]; it deals with the mathematical solution of the astrological problem of the "direction" of the significator. 2. Risāla fi taḥkik awtād al-istiṣfālī, "a letter on the exact determination of the quantities of the astrological applications", i.e., the rigorous trigonometrical solution of the astrological problem of the proiectio radiorum [see the article NUGUM] when the stars in question have latitude (i.e., lie outside the ecliptic). 3. Shār al-muḥallāt al-arbaʾ il-ḫaṭamīyyas, "commentary on Ptolemy's Tetrabition", 4. al-Zīdī, "Astronomical treatise and tables", its principal work and the only one that has survived to us; it contains the results of his observations and had a considerable influence, not only on Arab astronomy but also on the development of astronomy and spherical trigonometry in Europe in the middle ages and beginning of the Renaissance. It was translated into Latin by Robertus Retinensis or Ketenensis (died at Pamplona in Spain after 1143 A.D.; the version is lost) and by Plato Tibasinus in the first half of the xiith century (an edition of the text without the mathematical tables was published at Nuremberg in 1537 and at Bologna in 1645). Alphonsus X of Castile (1252-1282) had it translated directly from the Arabic into Spanish (incomplete MS. in Paris). Three insignificant astronomical pamphlets, of which a Latin version exists in several manuscripts, which give their author's name as Bethem, Boetem, Bereni, Bareni, have been wrongly attributed to al-Battānī.

Al-Battānī determined with great accuracy the obliquity of the ecliptic, the length of the tropical year and of the seasons and the true and mean orbit of the sun, he definitely exploded the Ptolemaic dogma of the immobility of the solar apogee by demonstrating that it is subject to the precession of the equinoxes and that in consequence the equation of time is subject to a slow secular variation; he proved, contrary to Ptolemy, the
variation of the apparent angular diameter of the sun and the possibility of annular eclipses; he rectified several orbits of the moon and the planets; he pronounced a new and very ingenious theory to determine the conditions of visibility of the new moon; he emended the Ptolemaic value of the procession of the equinoxes. His excellent observations of lunar and solar eclipses were used by Dunthorne in 1749 to determine the secular acceleration of motion of the moon. Finally he gave very neat solutions by means of orthogonal projection for some problems in spherical trigonometry; solutions which were known to and in part imitated by the celebrated Regiomontanus (1436-1476).


**BATU** (in Arabic script _Batu_), a Mongol prince, the conqueror of Russia and founder of the Golden Horde (1227-1253), born in the early years of the 13th century, the second son of Djuchi [see 200 CI]. During Cingiz-Khan's lifetime Djuchi, as his eldest son, had received as his yurt or appanage the territory stretching from the regions of Kayalik and Khwârzam to Saksin and Bulghar on the Volga “and as far in that direction as the hoof of Tartar horse had penetrated”. The eastern part of this vast area, i.e., Western Siberia, the present-day Kazakhstan and the lower basin of the Srî-Daryâ, passed upon Djuchi's death in 624/1227 to his eldest son Orda, whilst to Batu fell the western part, i.e., Khwârzam and the Dashti-Kipchâk or Kipchâk Steppe to the north and north-east of the Black Sea. Of the first ten years of Batu's reign we know only that he was present at the _burultay_ or assembly of the Mongol princes held in 626/1229 in Mongolia, at which Ögedey was elected Great Khan, probably also at the _burultay_ of 632/1235 at which it was decided to renew the war against the Russians and neighbouring peoples; he was never again in Eastern Asia. In the army which set out in the spring of 633/1236 there were also sons of Caghatay, Ögedey and Toluy, but Batu was in supreme command. The Mongol forces are said to have reached the territory of the Volga Bulgars by the autumn of the same year, but the destruction of the town of Bulghar does not seem to have taken place until the autumn of 635/1237, during which year the Mongols were engaged in operations against the Kipchak Turks in what is now Southern Russia. In Rabî I-I 635/11 December 1237 they crossed the frozen Volga and attacked the Russian principalities, capturing city after city, until by _Râcib-Shâhâbân_ 635/March 1238 the road lay open to Novgorod. The Mongols had approached within 65 miles of the town when they suddenly withdrew to the south, evidently fearing that the spring thaw would render the roads impassable. After a long period of rest in the lower Don basin and minor campaigns in the Caucasus in 636-7/1239, the war against Russia was resumed in 637/1240 in a campaign which ended with the fall of Kiev on the 6th of December of the same year. From the Ukraine simultaneous attacks were launched upon Poland and Hungary. Through Poland the Mongols penetrated into Silesia defeating Duke Henry the Pious at Liegnitz on the 25 Râmâdân 638/9 April 1241 and then passed through Moravia to join the main army, which, led by Batu in person, had crossed the Carpathians into Hungary and inflicted a decisive defeat on the Hungarians at Mohi (27 Râmâdân 638/11 April 1241). The combined Mongol forces passed the summer and autumn on the Hungarian plain; and on Christmas Day Batu in person crossed the frozen Danube to take the town of Esztergom. The last major operation was an expedition through Croatia and Dalmatia to the shores of the Adriatic in pursuit of Béla IV of Hungary. The armies were apparently poised for a general assault on Western Europe when news arrived of the death of the Great Khan Ögedey (5 Dhumâdâr II 639/11 December 1241), and Batu decided to withdraw his forces. Retiring by way of the Balkans he finally reached his encampments on the Lower Volga late in 1242.

It was now that Batu laid the foundations of the Golden Horde. Of the lands invaded in the years 635-9/1237-1241 only Russia had remained subject to the Mongols. As early as 639-40/1000-1002 Grand Duke Yaroslav I of Vladimir came to Batu's ordur to pledge his loyalty and was confirmed by the Khan in his rank as "senior of all the princes of the Russian people"; in 1000/1243 Prince Daniel of Galicia had to be confirmed in the same way and do homage to Batu.

During this period Batu's attention was largely diverted to events in the East. Ögedey's eldest son Gûyûk, a personal enemy of Batu, had been raised to the throne in succession to his father at the _burultay_ of 644/1246. Batu had been represented at the ceremony by five of his brothers, excusing his own absence, according to Rashid al-Dîn, on the ground of physical infirmity. Early in 644/1247 the new Khan left Kara-Korum in a westerly direction. He gave it out, according to Rashîd al-Dîn, that he was proceeding, for reasons of health, to his yurt on the Emil in what is now eastern Kazakhstan, but Toluy's widow suspected that his real intention was to attack Batu, to whom she accordingly sent a warning. Gûyûk died suddenly en route in a place called Kum-Sengir on the Upper Urungu, according to the _Yûan shih_ in the third month (27th March-24th April) of 1248. Dîjumâyîn and Rashîd al-Dîn disagree as to Batu's whereabouts at the time of Gûyûk's death. According to Dîjumâyîn he was advancing eastwards to meet the Kân, at the latter's invitation, when he received the news of his death in a place called Ala-Kamâk, a week's journey from Kayalik, probably in the Alatusu mountains to the south of the Ili. On the pretext that his horses were lean Batu summoned the princes to meet him in this place. On the other hand, according to Rashîd al-Dîn, this meeting took place in Batu's own territory, and the sons of Ögedey, Caghatay and Gûyûk are represented as refusing to make the long journey to the Kipchak Steppe.

The result of the meeting, wherever held, was that Mûngke, the eldest son of Toluy, was, on Batu's
proposal, acclaimed as Great Khan in succession to Güyük; and it was decided that his enthronement should take place at a kuriltay in Mongolia in the following year. The ceremony did not in fact take place till the 9 Rabī‘ I 649/7 July 1251, Batu being represented by his brother Berke [q.v.]. A plot against the Great Khan was uncovered while the celebrations were still in progress; it was headed by certain princes of the Houses of Çağhatay and Ögedey, most of whom were punished by banishment to remote parts of the Empire. Yüsü, the son and first successor of Çağhatay, and Būrī, one of his grandsons, were hanged on a tree near Batu, by whose orders the latter, who had been involved in Batu’s quarrel with Güyük, was put to death.

The whole Empire was now in effect divided between Möngke and Batu. William of Rubruck quotes Möngke as saying in 651/1254: “As the sun sends its rays everywhere, likewise my sway and that of Baatu reach everywhere . . .”. The boundary between the respective territories lay, according to Rubruck, in the steppes between the Talas and the Cu, and more respect was shown to Batu’s people in Möngke’s kingdom than vice versa. It is certain that Batu, both as the senior Cingizid and as the man to whom Möngke owed his throne, enjoyed very considerable prestige. Even in such lands as Māwarra? al-Nahr, which lay outside his ancestral territories, he exercised certain sovereign rights. Thus, according to Diuwaynā, he confirmed the son of Temür Malik, the defender of Khudjand, in the possession of his father’s estate.

Rubruck tells us that Batu had twenty-six wives and Rashīd al-Dīn that he had four sons. In the latter years of his life he seems to have delegated some of his authority to his eldest son Sartak, a Nestorian Christian: it was Sartak who from 646-7/1249 onwards received the homage of the Russian princes. There is considerable divergence in the sources as to the date of Batu’s death: it seems most likely that he died in 653/1255. From Rubruck’s narrative it appears that towards the end of his reign he lived on the eastern bank of the Volga, ascending the river in the summer as far north as Lat. 52° and spending the winter near the mouth, where the town of Saray was founded by him at this period on the Akhūtha, a channel of the delta, 65 miles north of Astrakhān.

Batu, whom the Russians knew only as a cruel conqueror, was given by his Mongol contemporaries the epithet of sain, i.e., “good” or perhaps “wise”. He is praised as a just and sagacious ruler even by Djuzdīn, a writer by no means prejudiced in the politics of the Golden Horde for the following decades, and there were frequent struggles with the Ilkhans—in the Caucasus and on Lake Aral. During this process, the Caucasus came under
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**BATUIDS, descendants of Batu [q.v.], a grandson of Čingiz Khan [q.v.], the ruling house of the Golden Horde from 1236/40 until 1502.**

After a short-lived advance by Mongol troops in 1223-24 into what is today the Ukraine (Russian defeat on the Kalka in that year), Batu, the second son of Čingiz Khan’s eldest son Djiči (who died early in 1227), succeeded in subjugating large parts of Russia in the years 1236-1241. Only the north west (with Novgorod as its centre), was spared, and apart from occasional payments of tribute—it remained independent. Similarly, the Caucasus (together with Georgia; see Gurgştān) was under Ba tu’d suzerainty until about 1260 and Danube-Bulgaria until about 1310. Advances into Galicia, Moravia, Silesia and Hungary in 1241 had no lasting result.

Batu gave the Western Mongolian Empire, thus created, a centre in the towns of Old, and later New, Saray [q.v.] on the lower Volga, which quickly developed into important centres of commerce and had a very mixed population (including a Russian diocese in Saray from 1261). The most extensive Mongol settlements were to be found in this area and in the Crimea, becoming absorbed into the indigenes Turks as well as into part of the Finnish and Eastern Slav peoples. In this way, the new tribe of (Volga) Tatars [q.v.] arose, speaking Turkish—also spoken by the population further to the north on the Volga, and particularly by a section of the Volga Bulgars [q.v.]. The structure of the population remained nomadic until about the middle of the 15th century. It has been described most vividly by John of Plano Carpini (1243-46) and Ibn Baštūtā [q.v.], 1333. The new state was called the “Golden Horde” by the Russians, and thus also in Europe—the corresponding Turkish *Altın Ordu* is a modern translation. (The name may possibly have been given because the ruler’s tents were paved with golden tiles, or else because of a borrowing of ancient Central-Asian colour symbolism—compare *šara*). In eastern literature, the country is usually referred to as the KipāCK Steppe, Orda, Batu’s elder brother, founded a subordinate state in Western Siberia, which is sometimes referred to as the “Blue” or the “White Horde”. It was under the sovereignty of the Golden Horde, but hardly anything is known of its history.

Batu was very much taken up with the affairs of the whole Mongol Empire, but refrained from accepting the title of Great Khan. He died in 1255-56. His brother and successor Berke (1255-67) was the first Mongol prince to become a Muslim (Sunni), and thereby he began the incorporation of the Tatars into Islam. By this action he distinguished them particularly (in contrast to their tribal brothers in Iran, China and Central Asia) from their subjects, the Orthodox Russians. A complete amalgamation of these two peoples has in consequence (hitherto) proved impossible. Berke made a treaty with the Mamūk rulers in Egypt, which was primarily directed against the Mongol Ilkhāns [q.v.] in Iran, who were Shamanists or Buddhists and who had already roused Berke’s bitter hostility by their fight against the Caliphate in 1238. This treaty greatly influenced the politics of the Golden Horde for the following decades, and there were frequent struggles with the Ilkhāns—especially in the Caucasus and on Lake Aral. During this process, the Caucasus came under
the influence of the Ilkhans. This political treaty was followed by a lively commerce with Egypt (many of the Mamluk slaves came from the Golden Horde). This commerce depended on the continued good will of the East Roman Emperor (a Paleologus from 1261) and therefore required agreements with him. There were also connections with the Saldjûks of Rûm [q.v.]. As a result of all this, it was possible for Islamic—especially Turkish (Saldjûk and Mamluk)—cultural influences to reach the Golden Horde. As a result of excavations, we are fairly well informed about the art and implements of the Volga-region (see particularly F. A. Balodis: Alt- und Neu-Sarai, die Hauptstädte der Goldenen Horde, in Latvijas Universitātes raksti, xiii, Riga 1926, 3-82). In Russia the Tatars confined themselves largely to raising tribute through Baskaks, and to recognising certain lesser princes, whose mutual quarrels were their best protection. The Russian Orthodox Church, to which the Tatars had granted certain privileges, was able to maintain its unity before these minor princes, and thus became the embodiment of Russian thought in general.

The death of Berke did not altogether put an end to Islamic influence, although to begin with all his successors were again Shamanists. The strength of the state was impaired through civil wars against the rising Prince Nokhai, a successful general in Poland (1259, 1286) and the Caucasus (1261, 1263), until Nokhai's death in battle in 1299 (cf. Nogai). In the beginning of the 8th/14th century, the political position changed, as the dealings between the Ilkhans (who were by then Muslims) and Egypt grew smoother. In the year 1332 a formal peace-treaty was signed. This reduced the commercial connections between the Golden Horde and Egypt. The collapse of the Ilkhânî Empire in 1335 brought the Golden Horde, under Özbeg Khan (1337-1357), once more into a position of great importance. A Muslim himself, he definitively strengthened the position of Islam on the Volga, and henceforth all the Khans adhered to that religion. The greater part of the Volga-Tatars was now also more and more drawn into Sunni-Islamic culture of a particular type found in Asia Minor, which was particularly active in the Crimea. The new tribe of Özbegs [q.v.] named after Özbeg, also came under its influence.

Western attempts at Christianisation at that time (in particular under Pope John XXII) proved to be of no avail, and religious wars (such as were fought in Persia) did not affect the Golden Horde. Certain centres resulting from these attempts, however, survived for some time; among these were the Genoese colonies (which began in 1265) (cf. Kaffa) in the Crimea [q.v.]. These were also commercially active, as middlemen in the supply of cloth from Flanders, ceramics, and jewellery to the Horde. Fur, fish and grain were the main articles exported in return.

The attempts made by both Djânîbeg Khan (1341-57), Özbeg's son, and Berdibeg Khan (1357-59), his grandson, to conquer Akharbâyjian in 1356-59 miscarried. It is possible that their aim was to bypass the Dardanelles, which had been in the hands of the Ottoman Turks since 1354, and to gain access to the Mediterranean through Syria. As this could not be achieved, the Golden Horde henceforth became an Eastern European continental power, thus more and more at the mercy of the rising Great Powers of Poland-Lithuania and Russia (Muscovy).

This development was accelerated by the internal disintegration caused by the conflict between innumerable pretenders (from 1359), thanks to which a Russian army was able to gain a victory over the Tatar armies (under Mamay) for the first time, on the Field of Snipe (Kulikovo Pole) on the Don in 1380. Thus the Grand-Duchy of Muscovy—which the Golden Horde had finally charged with the collecting of tribute in 1328, and in which the title of Grand Duke had become hereditary—established itself as a new power and as a 'Collector of all Russian Lands'.

Towards the end of the 8th/14th century, Tokhtamish [q.v.] of the "White Horde" attempted to unite the whole empire once more, but he was opposed by Timur, who defeated him in 1391, and in
1395 forced him to flee, and destroyed Saray. General Edigii (Russian: Yedigey) emerged as the true ruler of the Golden Horde. He had succeeded in holding his own and in checking the Lithuanian expansion through his victory on the Vorskla in 1399. He succeeded in guarding the independence of the state until his death in 1419. After this, the final disintegration started in earnest, and it was speeded by the formation of independent Khânâtes in Kazan (q.v.), Astrakhan (q.v.) and in the Crimea in 1438 (see GiRAy). The remainder, now generally referred to as the “Golden Horde”, could only hold its own in the region east of Kiev by treaties with Muscovy and (from 1460) with Poland-Lithuania, and in 1480 it was able once more to threaten Moscow. In 1502, the “Great Horde” was finally beaten; deserted by its allies, outlawed by the Ottoman sultan (who had been Protector of the Crimea—its main enemy—since 1475), it was vanquished by Crimea and Muscovy. The Khânâtes of Kazan, Astrakhan and Siberia also met their doom in the 16th century. The only remaining one was the Crimea, which survived until 1783. The Golden Horde is the only state which has ever actually subjugated Russia (and from the east at that). The “Tatar yoke”, which lasted for 2½ centuries, forms an important period in the history of Russia as well as in that of Poland-Lithuania, and resulted in the settlement of Turkish tribes on the Volga and in western Siberia. Even today, scattered Tatar remnants can still be found there, and the decisive element in their survival was their Islamic faith.

The cultural influence of the Tatars on the Russians can be traced for centuries in certain aspects of the administration, the army, ceremonial, and in the relationship between ruler and subject as well as in vocabulary, and in certain respects it makes itself felt even today. Furthermore, the fight of the Czars against the “Infidel” decisively shaped the political and popular consciousness of the Russians and of the eastern Slavs in general (concerning this cf. also TATARS”).

Bibliography: B. Spuler, Die Goldene Horde, Leipzig 1943; idem, Mongolisches Leben und Glauben 1933 (Handbuch der Orientalistik v12); B. D. Grekov and A. Yu. Yakubovskiy, Zolotaya Ordra i yevey padenie (The Golden Horde and its Fall), Moscow and Leningrad 1950; A. Nasonov, Mongol y Rus (The Mongols in Russia), Moscow and Leningrad 1940; J. von Hammer-Purgstall, Geschichte der Goldenen Horde, Pest 1840 (superseded); P. Pelliot, Notes sur l’histoire de la Horde d’Or, Paris 1940 (excursus concerning some 20 personal and place names; not a historical appreciation); W. von Tiesenhausen, Materialy ot nosnositel'stvo k istorii Zolotoy Ord'i (Materials for the History of the Golden Horde), 2 vols., St. Petersburg 1884, 2nd. vol. 1941. C. M. Frähn, Über die Münzen der Chane vom Ulus Dschutschi’s, St. Petersburg and Leipzig 1852. These works also list the original sources and give further bibliography.

BATUMI (Batum), port in Soviet Transcaucasia on the Black Sea, capital of the autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic of Adjaraistan, built on the site of an old Roman port, Bathys, constructed in the reign of Hadrian and later deserted for the Byzantine fortress of Petra, founded under Justinian on the site of the present Trabibis-Tziri to the north of Batumi. A former possession of the Laz kingdom, the region of Batumi (the Adjarian district) was occupied briefly by the Arabs who did not hold it; in the 9th century it formed part of the principality of Taoklardjeti, and at the end of the 10th century of the United Kingdom of Georgia which succeeded it. From 1010 it was governed by the eristav of the king of Georgia. In the 8th/14th century, after the disintegration of the United Kingdom of Georgia, Batumi passed to the princes (miasar) of Guria.

In the 9th/15th century, in the reign of the miasar Kakhâber Gurieli, the Ottoman Turks occupied the town and district of Batumi, but did not hold them. They returned in force a century later after the decisive defeat which they inflicted on the Georgian and Immeretian armies at Sokhoista. Batumi was recaptured, first by the miasar Rostomi Gurieli in 1564, who lost it soon afterwards, and again in 1609 by Mania Gurieli. From 1627 Batumi was part of the Ottoman Empire.

With the Turkish conquest the Islamisation of the Adjarian region, hitherto Christian, began. It was completed by the end of the 18th century.

Under the Turks, Batumi, a large fortified town (2,000 inhabitants in 1807 and more than 5,000 in 1877) was already an active port, the principle centre of the Transcaucasian slave-trade.

Ceded to Russia by the treaty of San Stefano and occupied by the Russians on 28 August 1878, the town was declared a free port until 1886. The Adjarian region at first constituted a self-governing administrative unit; on 12 June 1883 it was annexed to the government of Kutais. Finally on 1 June 1903, with the Obrug of Artvin, it was established as the region (oblast') of Batumi placed under the direct control of the General Government of Georgia.

The expansion of Batumi began in 1883 with the construction of the Batumi-Tiflis-Baku railway completed in 1900 by the finishing of the Baku-Batumi pipe-line. Henceforth Batumi became the chief Russian oil port in the Black Sea. The town expanded to an extraordinary extent and the population increased very rapidly: 8,671 inhabitants in 1882, 12,000 in 1889, 45,382 in 1926.

The population of the town is cosmopolitan; the Muslims (Adjars, Laz and Turks) are only a minority in comparison with the Russians, Greeks, Armenians, Jews, and Georgians, but the region remains purely Muslim. In 1911 the oblast' totalled 170,377 people, of whom 70,918 were Adjars and 58,912 other Muslims (Laz, Turks, Kurds, etc.).

In April 1918, Batumi was occupied by the Turks; they were succeeded in the following spring by the British, who evacuated it in June 1919. After the fall of the Georgian Republic, the treaty of 16th March 1921, between the R.S.F.S.R. and Turkey, gave the regions of Kars and Ardagan back to Turkey, but left Batumi to the Russians. The Soviet régime was proclaimed on 18 March 1921 and, on 16th June in the same year, the region was established as the Soviet Socialist Republic of Adjaraistan, with its capital at Batumi, dependent on the R.S.S. of Georgia.

The Adjars constitute the largest community, and in 1926 they were still considered as a separate nationality from the Georgians and were registered in a separate census. They numbered at that time 71,350 people, all Muslims (Hanaf Sunnis), speaking the Gurian dialect, which has a vocabulary strongly influenced by Turkish and Arabic. Their material culture (the çada worn by the women, for example) was close to that of the Turks and bilingualism (the Gurian dialect and Turkish) was still a wide-spread phenomenon.
At the time of the census of 1939, the Adjars, considered from then on as a simple, ethnical group of the Georgian nation, were registered as Georgians. Batumi is at the present time a large port, the outlet for the Baku pipe-line (refineries) and quite an important industrial centre with factories producing preserved foods and machine tools. As the beginning of 1956 its population reached 27,000, of whom only a minority were Muslims.

The autonomous Adjars (area 3,017 sq. km.) comprised 238,000 inhabitants in 1956, of whom the majority were Muslims; Adjars and Laz in the valley of Coruh (about 2,000), Kurds (3,000 nomads in 1926 in the high valley of Adjars-Tskali) and a colony of Abkhaz (5,000 in 1926) near Batumi.


**al-Bâ'ûni**

This nizâh relates either to the village of Bâ'ûn (or Bâ'ûna) in Hâwar or to the village of the same name near Mosul. It is usually associated with a particular family descended from one Nawz b. Khâlifâ b. Farâdî al-Nâsîr al-Bâ'ûnî al-Shâfi'î, who started life as a weaver in the former village and left it about 750/1349 to settle in Nazareth (Sakhâwî, al-Dawâr al-Lâmî, etc., Cairo 1355/1364, ii, 235). The following table represents Nâsîr's descendants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nâsîr</th>
<th>Ismâ'îl</th>
<th>Ahmad</th>
<th>Ibrâhîm</th>
<th>Muhammad</th>
<th>Yusuf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Little is known about him except that he became a Sûfi, and deputy kāfî at Nazareth, engaged in commerce and attained prominence (loc. cit. 308).

(2) Born in Nazareth c. 757/1350; he became kâfî of the Umayyad mosque and kâfî of Damascus, kâfî of the Aṣâr mosque in Jerusalem and (for two months) kâfî of Egypt. He wrote on tafsîr, composed a poem on dogma called al-`ā'īda, and was an impressive preacher, though he had little fikhr. For his tahlîlms of a poem by Ibn Zurayk (c. 420/1029) cf. Brockelmann I 82, S 1, 133. As kâfî he showed administrative competence and integrity, refusing sultan Barkûk a loan out of awlûd funds, an action which caused his momentary humiliation and imprison. He died in Damascus in 816/1411 (Ibn al-`Imâd, Shâhadâtî, vi, 118; Dawûd, ii, 231; Ibn Taghribîrî, vi, 267, 306, 314, 439).

(3) Born in Nazareth c. 777/1375, he studied in Damascus and Cairo. He deplored for his father as kâfi of Damascus when he became kâfî at the Umayyad mosque. He also became kâfî at the Aṣâr mosque and nâzîr al-karâma yaw in Jerusalem at which after post he showed considerable ability. His literary virtuosity is displayed in a treatise in which he employed only words without diacritical points and in a tafsîr of Ibn Mâlik's Al-Mukhtasar. His reputation was great, earning him the title of shaykh al-adab fi l-diyâr al-`âlîmiyya, and one of his innumerable pupils was the biographer Saîd Al-Bâ'ûnî. He died in Damascus in 871/1465 (Shâhadâtî, vii, 310; Dawûd, ii, 114; `Ulmâ al-`Uns al-Dali`î, etc., Cairo 1283/1866, ii, 382).

(4) Born in Damascus in 760/1363, he became kâfî at the Umayyad mosque and was appointed nâzîr [perhaps of the awlûd] of al-asrî wa l-`asâd. His works (for which cf. Brockelmann II 31, S II 38) include a verse summary of Islamic history down to the reign of Barsbay (Mu`âadh, 1908). His later years he spent in prayer and contemplation. He died in Damascus in 871/1465 (Shâhadâtî, vii, 310; Dawûd, ii, 114; `Ulmâ al-`Uns al-Dali`î, etc., Cairo 1283/1866, ii, 382).

(5) Born in Jerusalem in 805/1402, he studied in Damascus, Hebron, Ramla and Cairo and became kâfî in Safed, Tripoli, Aleppo and Damascus. In Damascus he reorganised the administration of the mîristân of Nûr al-Dîn, expanded its awlûd and added new sections to the building which were called after him (Dawûd, x, 298). His literary output (which included the versification of Nawawi's Minâdâd) was small although he had great facility in both verse and prose. He led a life of asceticism and piety and died in Damascus in 880/1475 (Shâhadâtî, vii, 320; Dawûd, ii, 87; `Ulmâ al-`Uns al-Dali`î, etc., Cairo 1283/1866, ii, 382).

(6) Born in Damascus, she grew up as a precocious child, learning the Kur'an by rote at the age of eight. In her the literary talents and Sûf tendencies of her family reached full fruition. She likewise inherited an independence of mind and outlook which is seen in her companionship with her men contemporaries on equal terms. In Cairo she was granted certificates authorising her to lecture and give fatwâs. A great friend of hers was Abu l-Thânâ` Mahmûd b. Aţâ, the last sâhib dawwâr al-mînhâd under the Mamûlûks (whom she praised in a ra`îyya quoted by Ghâzî in al-Kawâkib al-`âsîra etc. ed. Dja`bbur, Beirut 1945, i, 204). She carried on a correspondence in verse with the Egyptian scholar `Abd al-Rahîm al-`Abbhâsî (For selections of which cf. op. cit., i, 288) and met Sultan Ghârî in Aleppo in 922/1516.

Perhaps her most famous work is her bâdî`yya in praise of the Prophet entitled al-Fath al-Mubîn fi Mâdâs al-Amin (Brockelmann, II 340 no. 1), to which she wrote a commentary, thus following the practice first set by Sâfi al-Dîn al-`Hillî [q.v.] though she was probably more immediately under Ibn Hîdîdîa's influence. `Abd al-Ghânî al-Nâbulusî [q.v.] read and admired (though not uncritically) an autograph copy of her al-Fath al-Mubîn and was no doubt inspired by it to write his own bâdî`yya, Nasâmât al-Ashâr etc. in his commentary on which (Nawâbî al-Ashâr, etc., Cairo 1390/1871) he makes a continuous comparison with the corresponding lines in al-Fath al-Mubîn. Both al-Fath al-Mubîn and `Âjûsha's commentary on it are published in the margin of Ibn Hîdîdîa's Khatiṣnât al-`Adab, Cairo 1304/1915, 316-317. Her original works also include Kitâb al-Mâlîmî al-Shârîf wa l-`Âdâr al-Munîfî, and al-Fath al-Bâmîfî, both on Sûf themes (Kawâkib, i, 288). Her Ma`âsh al-Nâbi (Brockelmann S II 381, no. 14) is partly prose and partly verse and was published in Cairo in 1303/1883.
and 1310/1892 (Sarkis, Muqdiam 1928, 519).

She also versified Suyutl’s al-Muṣjid wa-l-Khaṣṣa‘ by al-Nabawiyya and 1892 (Sarkis, Mu’dfam 1928, 519)*

She also versified Suyutl’s al-Muṣṭadi‘ wa-l-Khaṣṣa‘ by al-Nabawiyya and 1892 (Sarkis, Mu’dfam 1928, 519)*. In another urdija she abridged Saghawt’s al-Kawal al-BAWAND, (Persian Bawand), an Iranian dynasty which ruled in Tabaristan for over 700 years (45-750/665-1349). The centre of the dynasty was the mountainous area, although they frequently ruled the lowlands south of the Caspian Sea. The name is traced back to an ancestor Baw who was either 1) named Isphahbad by Tabaristan in Khursaw Parviz (Rabino, 411), or 2) a prominent Magian of Rayy (Marquart, 128, where an etymology of the name is also given). The several rulers of the Bawand dynasty were called isphahbad or malik al-azamshah; they were usually independent, though sometimes tributary to caliphs or sultans.

The dynasty can be divided into three branches: 1) the Kayuya, which ruled 45-497/665-1006, when the isphahbad Shahiray revived against Kabus b. Washmghr, was captured and later put to death; 2) the Isphahbadiyia, which ruled 466-606/1073-1210, when Muḥammad Khurramshah invaded Tabaristan; 3) the Khâkhariyya (635-750/1237-

The second branch took its name from Kayus b. Kabud the Sâsânid, possibly the grandfather of Baw. The early history of the family is uncertain. The ninth ruler Karim b. Bawand, the only one to continue to rule in localities in the mountains. One of them, Muḥammad b. Wânderin, had a mausoleum erected in 1012, known as the Mîl-i Râdkân (cf. E. Diez, Chronisanische Baudenkmale, Berlin 1918).

The second branch had their capital in Sârî, ruling over Gilân, Rayy and Kumis as well as Tabaristan, and were vassals of the Sâlûdûs, then of the Khârazmshahs. Towards the end of their rule the Isna‘îlis spread in Tabaristan and obtained power at the expense of the Bawand dynasty. Finally the Khârazmshah assumed the rule when Shams al-Mulûk Rûstam Bawand was assassinated. After the Mongol invasion there was anarchy in Tabaristan, and finally a member of the Bawand family, Ḥosâm al-Dawla Ḍârah b. Khâkh was chosen ruler by the people. He moved his capital from Sârî to Amlû for safety’s sake. Under his rule (12 or 15 years) the Mongols invaded Tabaristan. His son, Ṣâm al-Mulûk, was put to death in 1263/1264 by Abâkâ Khân after ruling 18 years. This dynasty ruled as vassals of the Mongols but they suffered nonetheless from Mongol invasions and depredations.

In 750/1349 Fakhr al-Dawla Ḥasan, last of the Bawand family, was assassinated by members of the prominent family of Kayû.


BAWARD [see ABIWARD].

BAWÂTDJÎ, of Bawâtîdi al-Malîk, in ‘Abbâsîd times a town in the province of Mosul on the right bank of the Lesser Zâb, not far from its mouth. The name is the Syriac Bêt Wâzîk, “the house of Baw and Wazik, or a Nestorian of Shenna and Beth Wâzîk, or a Nestorian of Shenna (i.e., the village of Bârimmû) and Bêt Wâzik, or a Nestorian of Shennû (i.e., Sinn) and Bêt Wâzik. The ruins of the town have not yet been discovered.

Bibliography: Ibn Khurradâbih, 94; Ibn Hawkal (ed. De Goeje), 169, note g; Bâktî, 183; Vâkût, s.v.; G. Hoffmann, Syrische Akten Persischer Märtyrer, 189; cf. his note on Ibn Hawkal (ed. De Goeje, Ibn Khurradâbih, translation, 68; E. Herzel, Untersuchungen zur historischen Topographie etc. in Memnon, i, 1907, 1 and 2; F. Sarre and E. Herzel, Archaeologische Reise im Euphrat und Tigris-Gebiet (1910-11), chap. iii; Le Strange, 91 and 98. (E. Herzel)

BAY (Bey), name applied to the ruler of Tunisia until 26 July 1957, when the Bey Lamine (al-Amlûn), 19th ruler of the Husaynid dynasty, was deposed and a Republic proclaimed in Tunisia.

To discover the origin of this title, we must go back to the end of the 16th century. It was at that time that the Bey ‘Ulama‘ created the Office of Bey (in Turkish: bej), without consulting the Porte, whose vassal he was. He entrusted the holder of the office with command of the tribes, the maintenance of public order and the collection of taxes. Equipped with these extensive powers, the Bey soon became the most important man in the country. This was the title which the Agha of the soldiery, Husayn b. ‘Ali, founder of the Husaynid dynasty, subsequently assumed upon receiving the investiture at Tunis on 10 July 1705.

It was only later that the order of succession to the throne was regulated by a Charter included in the
Tunisian Constitution of 26 April 1861, article I of which decreed: "Succession to the throne is hereditary among the princes of the Hafsids family, by order of age, according to the rules in use in the Moslem Kingdom". This was in fact the codification of a traditional rule which, with two exceptions, was adhered to in regard to accession to the throne of Tunisia from the founding of the dynasty.

The enthronement of the sovereign was accompanied by a dual ceremony, the first private, in which the great men of the Kingdom and intimates participated, the second public, open to the broad mass of subjects. This recalled the old dual ceremony of doing homage (al-bay'a al-cnasra and al-bay'a al-baytama). As a result of the establishment of the Protectorate, the representative of France in Tunisia became associated with the ceremony of the enthronement of the Bey, bestowing on the new Bey the "solemn investiture" in the name of the protecting Power.

Articles 3 and 4 of the Decree of 26 April 1861 stated: "The Bey is the head of the State. At the same time, he is the head of the ruling family. He has full authority over the princes and princesses of his family, none of whom may dispose either of their persons or of their property without his prior consent. He exercises a paternal authority over them and is obliged to give them the benefits of such. Members of the family owe him filial obedience."

The titles borne by the Bey contained a number of expressions expressly designating his sovereign function. In official documents his appellation was: Sayyidun wa-mawdun ... Bagha Bay, yrib al-mamlaka al-sunnisiyya (= Our Lord and Master ... Pasha Bey, possessor of the Kingdom of Tunis). This old style, in part dating back to the Hafsids and partly to the middle of the 18th century, was augmented by a new element, namely Mushir (Marshal), bestowed by the Porte about the year 1839, which however was only borne by three Beys. Unlike the Hafsid styles, however, no titles (al-bayb) of a personal character occur.

Among the special insignia of sovereignty, mention must be made, in addition to the dynastic throne, of the ceremonial costume worn by the Bey on solemn occasions. These material attributes were enhanced by the kissing of hands encumbent on Tunisian subjects, and other marks of royalty. The Bey had a civil list, a guard of honour (the Bey's Guard), a standard, bestowed decorations (Nishan al-dam, 'Akh al-amân, Nishan al-sichhâr) and honorary military ranks. Finally, each Thursday there took place the Ceremony of the Seal, at which the Bey applied his seal to governmental decisions in the form of a decree, thus giving them executive force.

The heir apparent bore the title of Bey of the Camp (bay al-amhâl). This title originated in the duty incumbent on the heir apparent to proceed twice a year at the head of a military expedition to the south and north of the country both to assert the authority of the central government and to overawe tribes who might refuse to pay their taxes. The Bey of the Camp was head of the army by virtue of this institution, but it disappeared with the advent of the Protectorate. (Ch. Samarân)

BAY (= Arabic, to sell); two roots are used in Arabic to designate the contract of sale: b-y- and sh-r-y; in the first verbal form both usually mean "to sell", but also "to buy"; in the eighth form exclusively "to buy"; the function of expressing both sides of a mutual relationship is shared by these two roots with a number of other old legal terms. Bay optionally means the clasping of hands on concluding an agreement, sh-r-y perhaps the busy activity of the market. In the terminology of Islamic law, the normal term for selling is bâ'a, for the contract of sale, the infinitive bay, and for buying, ibdâ'a, or ishtarâ. The frequent use of sharâ for a profitable and of ishtarâ for an unprofitable transaction (in the metaphorical sense) in the Kurân is parallel to that of kasâba "to be credited" and thassâba "to be debited" (cf. Schacht, in Studia Islamica, i, 30 f.). Commercial law in pre-Islamic Mecca had undoubtedly reached a certain level of development; the trade on which alone the existence of the town depended, occupied such a predominant place there that the Kurân not only referred to it often but used a number of technical terms of commerce to express religious ideas. (On the other hand, the importance of the Meccan trade in absolute terms ought not to be overestimated; cf. G.-H. Bousquet, in Hesp., 1954, 233 f., 238 ff.). To this body of ancient Arab commercial law can be traced the ribâ contracts which the Kurân was to prohibit, certain dealings involving credit and speculation, and possibly the khîyûr al-majlis, a special right of option, which seems to go back to a local Meccan custom (cf. Schacht, Origins, 159 ff.); to all appearance the legal construction of the contract as being constituted by offer (idjâb) and acceptance (tabâl), as well as part of the terminology of Islamic law and, perhaps, some of its legal maxims, belong to this pre-Islamic stratum; the term idjâb itself seems to reflect another, unilateral, construction of the contract (cf. Schacht, in OLZ, 1927, 664 ff.). The Kurân directly envisages commercial law in the general exhortations to give full weight and measure and to carry out agreements, in the specific demand that forward deals should be put in writing (Sûra ii, 282 f.; in the system of Islamic law this injunction has been deprived of its binding character), and above all in the two prohibitions of interest (ribâ) and of games of chance (maysir), which include aleatory transactions (Sûra ii, 219, 275 f.; v. 90 f.); in contrast with the attitude of the contemporaries, bay, i.e. legitimate trade, is sharply opposed to ribâ. The implications of these prohibitions have been worked out to their last details in Islamic law. Tradition contains a certain number of teachings regarding commerce in general and the duties of the good and the punishment of the wicked merchant (see tigâra); it also elaborates the teachings of the Kurân. As legal principles which now appear for the first time may be mentioned; the recognition of the right of withdrawal (khîyûr), unconditional during the negotiation, and under certain conditions either agreed or fixed by law after the agreement has been made; the legal maxim al-kharâfj bi'l-damân ("profit goes where the responsibility lies"); the rule that the produce in existence at the moment of sale belongs to the vendor, unless the contrary is stipulated; the prohibition of a sale the object of which cannot be exactly defined (in the case of a sale of ripe fruits on a tree etc., the main group of traditions is satisfied with an estimate); the prohibition of a re-sale of foodstuffs or of merchandise in general before possession has been taken (a consequence of the prohibition of ribâ), or in general of the sale of things which are not already the property of the vendor; the exclusion of certain things from commerce, ritually impure or forbidden as well as things which, like surplus water, are common property; finally,
the special treatment, diverging from the general rule, of the case in which the vendor of a milking animal, in order to suggest a greater yield, does not milk it before the sale. The question whether nascent Islamic commercial law was influenced by the law and economic life of the peoples incorporated in the Muslim empire, has been much discussed in the past but can now be definitely answered in the affirmative (cf. Schacht, in XII Conseguo "Volatile", Rome 1957, 197 ff., and the literature mentioned there).

The contract of sale forms the core of the Islamic law of obligations. Its categories have been developed in most detail with regard to the contract of sale, and other commutative or synallagmatic contracts, such as idāra and kird (locatio conductio operarum and loc. rei), and even marriage, although regarded as legal institutions in their own right and not reduced to contracts of sale, are construed on the model of bay and sometimes even defined as kinds of bay. In its narrower meaning, bay is defined as an exchange of goods or properties and it therefore includes, beside sale proper, barter (mubāyāda) and exchange (sarf). The following is a short account of the main provisions of Islamic law, according to Ḥanafi doctrine, concerning bay.

The object of the sale must belong to the goods or properties (māl) which Islamic law recognizes as such; these include servitutes on real estate but exclude: 1. things which are completely excluded from legal traffic, e.g. animals not ritually slaughtered (musta'), blood; 2. things in which there is no ownership, e.g. pious endowments (wāhib) (q.v.), or which are public property, or constituent parts etc., in which there is no separate private ownership; 3. those slaves in whom there is only a restricted ownership, particularly the umm al-salād (q.v.); 4. things on the disposal of which there are restrictions, e.g. things which are ritually impure, such as wine and the pig, and other things without market value (māl ḥayr mubāsawīm) which are not rigorously defined; 5. things which are not in actual possession, such as things lost or usurped and run-away slaves: here the power to dispose of the property is refused, to exclude the risk. A sale concluded with regard to an object of this kind is not valid (ghair sahih); such a sale, according to the Ḥanafis, however, is not necessarily void (ḥātīl, as it is in the cases 1, 2, 3), but in certain circumstances only voidable (ḥāsid [q.v.]); in the other schools this term is used as a synonym of ḥātīl; even if the two parties have taken possession, a ḥāsid sale confers only a "bad ownership" (milh khabīl) and is liable to cancellation (waqīd) until the object is re-sold. A stipulation in favour of or against one of the parties is invalid and makes the contract ḥāsid. Conditional or deferred agreements are not admitted in this contract. Legally qualified persons who are of age (bīlīg) and of sound mind (tiḥrib), also the minor with the permission of his guardian and the slave with the permission of his master; the master can authorize his slave either to conclude an individual sale, or generally to engage in trade (this slave is called ma'zāhīm). Representation (wakāla) is possible; in this case the agent is regarded as a main contracting party with corresponding rights and obligations, but the rights of ownership accrue to the principal directly. In common with the other contracts, the sale is concluded by offer (tājī'ah) and acceptance (kabāl), which must correspond to each other exactly and must take place in the same meeting (madālīs); the term ṣaḥā ("clasping of hands") for the conclusion of the bargain dates from the pre-Islamic period, but Islamic law completely disregards the symbolic action which it expresses. Ownership (milh) is transferred through the conclusion of the sale, but completed only through the transfer of possession (tasālim "handing over", ḥādīd "taking possession") which, however, is dispensed with in the case of real estate; on the other hand, the existence of an option or right of withdrawal (qayiyīn, [q.v.]) prevents the transfer of ownership even though possession has been taken. In the case of eviction (istīkhāb), the vendor is responsible for a defect in ownership with the amount of the price paid; this is the so-called responsibility for darah or tabī'ā. On the prohibition of ribā, see the art. The prohibition of risk (gharar) implies that the obligations of the parties must be determined (mualām), in particular the object of the sale, the price and the term or terms. The first requirement is particularly strict in the case of goods covered by the prohibition of ribā, so that here no indefinite quantity (ḏīwāl) is permitted even if a price per unit is mentioned. A third prohibition which has far-reaching consequences, too, is that of selling or exchanging a debt (dayn) for another debt. In the field of sale proper, one distinguishes the thing sold from the price (gharām) or the value (kimā). As the price consists of fungible things (normally gold or silver), whereas the thing sold is, generally speaking, a non-fungible object, the rules applicable to both are not quite identical; the vendor, for instance, is permitted to dispose of the (fungible) price even before he has taken possession. Actually a special kind of purchase, although in the opinion of the Muslim lawyers a contract in its own right, is the salaf (q.v.) or salām, the ordering of goods to be delivered later for a price paid immediately; the term ra's māl ("capital") which is used for the price here, shows the economic meaning of the transaction: the financing of the business of a small trader or artisan by his clients. Because of its closeness to the subject of the prohibition of ribā, salām is carefully treated, and is subject to numerous special rules. Its counterpart, delayed payment for goods delivered immediately, is also possible, but this kind of transaction plays a minor role in Islamic law. The name "sale on credit" (bay al-šina) is given a potiori to an evasion of the prohibition of ribā which is based on this transaction. Barter of merchandise (mubāyāda) is hardly distinguished from sale in general; but money-changing and, in general, dealing in precious metals receive detailed treatment on account of the prohibition of ribā; these transactions are regarded as sales of "price" for "price" (cf. šārīf).

The actual practice of commerce in the Muslim middle ages was controlled not by these theoretical rules of Islamic law but by a customary commercial law which had been called into being by the normal needs of commercial life in the great cities of Islam, and was then elaborated by the legal advisers of the merchants, who were competent specialists in Islamic law. This customary law did not put itself into direct opposition to the sacred law of Islam, on the contrary, it maintained its main features, such as the prohibition of ribā, which it never dared openly to challenge but only managed to evade, just as it evaded, too, most of its rigid, restrictive rules, and it is characterized by a greater flexibility, accompanied by effective safeguards of fair dealing, which were made necessary by the lack of any official sanction. A unique source for the knowledge of this customary commercial law in ʿIrāk about
400/1000 is the younger edition of the Kitab al-Hiyal wal-Makhdidi spuriously attributed to al-Khassaf (ed. Schacht, Hanover 1923; cf. also the same, in I. XII Convene 1935, 218 ff.; R.Afr., 1952, 322 ff.). Similar, independent developments have occurred later in the Maghrib (cf. O. Pele, Le contrat de safqa au Maroc, Rabat 1932; J. Berque, Essai sur la méthode juridique maghrébienne, Rabat 1944, and numerous papers). This customary commercial law of Islam has, in its turn, influenced the law merchant of Europe in the early middle ages (cf. O. Pesle, “Volos”, 215).


(J. Schacht)

Bay’a, an Arabic term denoting, in a very broad sense, the act by which a certain number of persons, acting individually or collectively, recognise the authority of another person. Thus the bay’a of a Caliph is the act by which one person is proclaimed as head of the Muslim State. A synonymous expression is that of muháyá’a (cf. the verb bay’a: to make the bay’a).

I. Etymology. According to a view which has become traditional the term bay’a is derived from the verb ba’ā (to sell), the bay’a embodying, like sale, an exchange of undertakings. This explanation seems the most artificial. In most of the views of the author the bay’a owes its name to the physical gesture itself which, in ancient Arab custom, symbolised the conclusion of an agreement between two persons and which consisted of a hand-clasp (cf. the manusmissio of the ancient law of certain Western countries). Again, in a non-technical sense, “to make a bay’a in regard to some matter” (lubâyâ’a ‘ala ‘l-amr) means “to reach agreement on this matter” (cf. sa’āda, lit.: manusmissio, = agreement, contract). The physical gesture was termed bay’a because, precisely, it consisted of a movement of the hand and arms (ba’ā). And since the election of a chief (and the undertaking to submit to his authority) was demonstrated by a hand-clasp, it was naturally described by the very term which denoted this gesture.

The bay’a has two principal aims which differ both in their scope and nature. The first is essentially that of adherence to a doctrine and recognition of the pre-established authority of the person who teaches it. It is in this sense that the bay’a was practised in the relations between Muhammad and his newly acquired supporters (cf. Kurî, xlix, 10, 18; lx, 13). In the same sense, but with a more restricted purpose, the bay’a was served simply to recognise the pre-established authority of a person and to promise him obedience. Such was the case with the bay’a effected in favour of a new Caliph whose title to succeed had been established by the testamentary designation (‘âhid) of his predecessor. In its second sense the position of the bay’a is that of a person to a post of command and, in particular, the election of a Caliph, when a promise of obedience is implied. It was thus that the first Caliph, Abû Bakr, was designated by the bay’a of the so-called assembly of the Sahîha (13 Rabi‘ I 11/8 June 632); and the same invariably applied on all subsequent occasions that the seat of the Caliphate fell vacant and no successor designated by other means existed. Sunni doctrine, indeed, specifies the bay’a as one of the two procedures for designating the Caliph.

In Shî doctrine the bay’a has never been able to play this rôle, for the Shîs recognise only one method of designating the Imam—namely appointment by testament (nâs, wasiya) of one in the legitimate line of descent. However the Zaydi branch of the Shîs hold that the Imamate is acquired by election from within the ‘Ahîd family. Here, then, the bay’a was practised in the sense of an act of election.

II. Legal nature. The legal doctrine analyses the bay’a as a contractual agreement: on the one side there is the will of the electors, expressed in the designation of the candidate, which constitutes the offer, and on the other side the will of the elected person which constitutes the acceptance. This analysis may be admitted provided that it is not carried so far as to confuse the act of bay’a with the legal category of ordinary contracts. For the bay’a is a voluntary act sui generis which involves the general public. And again it must be stressed that the doctrinal analysis, even when so regarded, is only fully valid in regard to the bay’a of election and not in regard to the bay’a of simple homage. For in the latter case adherence becomes obligatory and no room is left for any freedom of decision.

What, particularly as regards the bay’a election, is the number of electors (ahl al-ikhtiyar) required for the validity of the procedure? On this point opinions are numerous and widely varied and range from one extreme to the other—from a view which requires that the bay’a should emanate from all “the upright men of the whole kingdom” to the opinion which is satisfied with the vote of a single individual. In fact, however, the body of electors was made up of the high dignitaries and notables of the State.

The bay’a is an act performed solely by agreement. Neither the physical gesture of manusmissio nor the confirmation of the bay’a by an oath is required as a condition of validity or even simple proof. No sacramental form is imposed for the manifestation of will; it suffices that this should be clearly and definitely expressed.

The form of the bay’a remains the same in both its roles—that of election and that of simple offer of homage.

The formalities of a single process of bay’a may be split up into two or even several sessions. Thus, as far as the Caliphs are concerned, the first step is generally what is termed the bay’at al-khâṣṣa (private bay’a) in which a very limited number of persons, the chief dignitaries of State and Court, participate. This is then followed by the bay’at al-dmna (public bay’a). Further, formal sessions for the offer of bay’a are held in the centres of the different provinces.

An innovation, which was introduced into the procedure from the Umayyad period, is the renewal
of the bay'a (tadżdid al-bay'a) whereby the Caliph or Sultan has recourse, during his reign, to a new bay'a in favour of himself or his heir apparent; and this may be repeated twice or more. The ruler resorts to this to establish the loyalty of his subjects.

III. Effects of the bay'a

A question peculiar to the bay'a—election is that of knowing whether it has the effect of investing the ruler with authority or whether it is simply confirmatory. It is in favour of himself or his heir apparent; and whether it is simply confirmatory. It is in favour

This effect, however, is limited by the law. For the bay'a is made on condition that its recipient remains faithful to the divine prescriptions, which means that if the ruler does not abide by these prescriptions those who have performed the bay'a in his favour are thereby released from their obligations.


Bayân, an Arabic word meaning lucidity, distinctness; the means by which clearness is achieved, explanation; hence, clarity of speech or distinctness, and the faculty by which clarity is attained. In technical language bayân develops from a (near-) synonym of baláţha, eloquence, to the designation of a particular aspect of it which, within the 'ilm al-baláţha is deal with by the 'ilm al-bayân. Common usage, however, continues to employ bayân in a wider variety of meanings (cf. also colourless phrases like bâb bayân or dar bayân-i, where nothing more than fi or dar is intended). Occasionally, tabîyân takes the place of bayân without suggesting a different shade of meaning; e.g., Ḵhattâbî (d. 996 or 998), K. Bayân I, 'Òdzîz al-Kurân, MS. Leiden 1654 (Cod. Warner 165), i, 114 (also: Ibn Ḵutaybâ, 'Uyun al-Ābkâr, Cairo 1343/954, ii, 173; Zahr, Cairo 1327/1909, i, 126): "Bayân means "that the word (ism; later one would have used kalâm, discourse) covers your idea completely and renders your intention (fully), lifting it from ambiguity, shirk, so you do not need the assistance of reflection (it is understood)". In this sense (bayân) must be free from constraint, tabâlîf, remote from artificiality, san'a, without obscurity,
ta'awul", and comprehensible without interpretation, ta'wil". (Translated from *Uyun and Zahr Baydn's text is somewhat longer; *Umūda, i, 225, offers a different but different phrasing.

What to my knowledge may be the first attempt to integrate bayān in a system of rhetorical analysis is preserved as the statement made by Ibn al-Kirri (d. 847) on letter, word and discourse or speech, where speech is divided in ten abwāb, seven of them "preliminaries", faqūltāt, and three, "comprehensive (qualities)". In this listing bayān al-kalām figures as the fourth of the faqūltāt among requirements such as "the encouragement to speak up", "refraining from clearing one's throat and hemming", being able to begin and end at will (quoted Kanūn al-Balāgha, 433).

‘Ibādīṣ or K. al-Hayawānī, Cairo 1325/1907, i, 17, notes that both men and animals possess the faculty of dalāla, the indication of a meaning; but only man possesses that of istiqlāl, the power of inferential thinking, along with it. The term bayān, however, in Diāhī’s view, covers both kinds of dalāla. Human dalāla (or bayān) has five forms: word, writing, counting on fingers or knuckles, *ukanad (not as Sandūbī vocalises)在我看来, and * insightful, or *chābra, and *haba, posture or attitude (not *haba as “abid, line 11); on *haba cf. Nallino, in KSO, 1919-21, 637-46, who lists, 640-47, later grammarians using this term; Diāhī repeats this doctrine of the five forms of expression in Hayawānī, i, 23, and Bayānī, i, 76. Ibn al-Muḍabbīr (d. 924), Risālāt al-‘Adhrawī, ed. Z. Mubārak, Cairo 1350/1931, 40, restates Diāhī’s fivefold division of bayān and adds the correct observation that the concept of *haba goes back to Aristotle (whose seventh category is ḥabā); Ḥusayn (d. 1061), Kudāma b. Dja, “sign, would seem to go back to Diāhī, too; the origin of the modifications is as yet unexplained. No later references to Diāhī’s theory are known to me.

Ishāk b. ‘Ibrāhīm b. Wahb, who after 335/946-7 wrote the K. al-Burhān fi Wudufih al-Baydn (“The Exposition of the various ways of explaining things”)—until recently wrongly attributed to Kudāma b. Diāfar and published under the title of Nakāb an-Nawhr by Ṣāḥib al-Husayn and ‘A. H. al-‘Abbādī (Cairo 1933)—undertook his work to correct the insufficiencies of Diāhī’s presentation of the subject. Ishāk b. ‘Ibrāhīm distinguishes four ways of expression: a. “things may become intelligible by their essences, *bawāt (i.e., by the very fact of their being as they are), even though the words which (commonly) express them are not used; b. they may become intelligible by coming into the heart when thought and intellect are applied [i.e., presumably Diāhī’s *istiqlāl]; c. they may become understandable through articulating sounds with the tongue; and, finally, d. by writing, which reaches those who are far away or do not (yet) exist.” (Trans. S. A. Bonebakker, *The Kitāb Nāqī al-Sīr of Qudāma b. Ga’far al-Kāthib al-Baghdādī, Leiden 1956, 16; words between brackets are the writer’s). It can easily be seen that Ishāk’s concept of bayān is very different, and both wider and narrower, than that which Diāhī envisaged to formulate. Regarding the manner in which Ishāk applies his concept to material it must suffice here to note that in his discussion. Of c. he lists, 44-54, sixteen *aksiq al-‘sūrā, categories of verbal expression, that include, without further classification, *ṣūrā *stymologica, comparison, suggestion ( RAMA), metaphor, parable, enigma and inversion.

A completely different strain of thought is represented in Rumānī’s division of balāgha in ten parts, *aksiq: concision, *idās, comparison, metaphor, and so forth, of which *husn al-bayān, successful exposition, is the tenth. In line with this concept, Ibn Ragīlī (d. 1064 or 1070), *Umūda, i, 225-28, has a chapter on bayān (with two pertinent quotations from Rumānī) paralleling as it were, on the other hand, classificatory level his chapters on balāgha, *idās, *nasr (composition), *mahās (transferred meaning), *isti’āra (metaphor), *al-mukhṭara wa ‘l-bādi (invention and the ‘original’), etc. It deserves notice that nowhere in the tenth and eleventh centuries is there an anticipation of that treatment of the bayān, especially in its relation to the bādi, that was later to become the dominant doctrine. Neither ‘Abbādī (d. 987), who in his K. al-Muṣūna bayna Abī Tammād wa ‘l-Būkturi, Constantiopolis 1287, 6, divides bādi in *isti’āra, *tādīs (paronomasy) and *tābā (anthroposis), nor Abū Ḥiṣāl al-‘Askārī (d. 1005), who in *Ṣīna‘ al-‘ayn, (e.g.) 205 and 290, treats *isti’āra and *kindāya (metonymy) on the same level as all other tropes, nor again Bākīllānī (d. 1013), Kudāma (d. 1073) and Abū Tāhir, who still subsume *dīrās and *kindāya under bādi, Kanūn, 425-459 (cf. in particular the list of forty-two rhetorical figures on 436), made any contribution to the development of the basic organisation of rhetoric, the *im al-balāgha, or as Abīl-Khādh al-Diurjānī (d. 1078), Dalal’ al-’idāt, Cairo 1313/1913, 4, still prefers to call it, the *im al-bayān, to him the greatest of all sciences. Diurjānī, to whom we owe *intās the aesthetically most sensitive analysis of the metaphor, notes, Dalal’, 349-50, that the development of the *im al-fasādha wa ‘l-bayān differs in two points from that of the other sciences: the early authorities of this *im expressed themselves in hints and metaphors rather than plainly and directly; and besides, in no other area were the opinions of the ancients transmitted with as little criticism. But Diurjānī’s interest is not in the theory of bayān and his innovations are made on another plane of literary analysis. This fact is reflected in Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī’s (d. 1209) *Nikāyat al-’idās fi Dirāyat al-’idās, Cairo 1331, which according to the author’s statement, 3-5, is an attempt to organize Diurjānī’s Dalal’ and Asrār al-Balāgha (ed. H. Ritter, Istanbul 1934); German translation, Wiesbaden 1959), and which fails to offer any explicit discussion of bayān.

When Ibn al-Āṭīr (d. 1234) writes al-Mathāl al-Ṣā’ir fī Adab al-Kāthib wa ‘l-Shā‘ir thinking on bayān has taken a new turn. To what extent it was Ibn al-Āṭīr himself who was responsible for this change we have no means of deciding. Ibn al-Āṭīr places, p. 2, the *im al-bayān in the same relation to the composition of both poetry and prose as the science of the usul al-fikr to the individual judicial statutes or decisions, akhām. (On p. 114, he refers to the representatives of this field of learning as ulamā al-bayān). He divides his book in a preface, mukhaddima, dealing with the foundations, usul *im al-bayān, and two sections treating the handling of wording, al-sinā‘ *l-lajīfya, and of content, al-sinā‘ *l-ma‘nasīyya, respectively. The subject of the *im al-bayān is *fāzā and barakah whose content he investigates in regard to both wording and meaning. He shares with the grammarians,
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Bayān, his concern for the manner in which words indicate meanings; but he goes beyond the grammarians' interest by a concern for the aesthetic qualities of the various ways of verbal rendering of ideas (p. 3). In the terms of his criticism, Ibn al-Hadid (d. 1257), al-Falak al-Dā'ir 'alā 'l-Mathal al-Sā'ir, Bombay 1308, 41-42 (al-Mathal, 28-29). Ibn al-Athīr's 'ilm al-bayān is basically a "rational" science, his concern for the manner in which words indicate meanings; but he goes beyond the grammarians' interest by a concern for the aesthetic judgments empirically from Arabic literature, bi l-līm wa l-mádhīm min ash'ār al-‘Arab (for ḍhawq cf. also Ibn Khaldūn, Muḥaddīsī, ed. Quatremerre, Paris 1858, iii, 312-317; 349-50 trans. F. Rosenthal, New York 1958, iii, 358-62; 396-98). The heartpiece of the 'ilm al-bayān is to Ibn al-Athīr the doctrine of ḥabība and madjādī, the proper and the transferred use of words (p. 23). It is in the nature of his system that he does not differentiate between comparison, metaphor and metonymy on the one hand and the other tropes on the other—a differentiation which was to be one of the principal features of the system that was about to become dominant in Arabic rhetoric when Ibn al-Athīr wrote.

This doctrine originated with Ibn al-Athīr's contemporary, the Khorezmian al-Sakkākī (d. 1229) who, according to his own statement, K. Muṣṭāfā al-Ṭumn, Cairo n.d. (ca. 1588), 2-3, set out to treat the 'ilm al-bayān as "the arts of eloquence", which requires "prosody" as "rhythmic" as subsidiary branches of study. The 'ilm al-bayān deals fundamentally with three subjects, usu: (1) comparison, taqāḥa; (2) madjādī and ḥabība; (3) inkāṣya, metonymy. The remaining tropes are relegated to the end of the book, 224-229, under the heading al-badī'.

It is presumably due to Sakkākī's commentator, al-Kawzānī (d. 1338), and to the mujassar of the latter, al-Taftazānī (d. 1389), that Sakkākī's structuring of rhetoric received the more consistent form which has continued to make authority to this day. Kawzānī no longer wishes to deal with al-badā'. To him, al-badā' is the term for the science of rhetoric as a whole which he divides in the three branches of 'ilm al-mašā'ī, 'ilm al-bayān and 'ilm al-badī' (as the doctrine of the embellishment of speech) [cf. balāgha]. 'ilm al-bayān is now no more and no less than the science that deals with the various possibilities of expressing the same idea in various degrees of directness or clarity. Since the word used may indicate either the concept in its totality or merely a part of it, or again point to it through evoking an element external to it in which the hearer perceives a necessary connection with the concept actually intended, a certain number of modes of expression are open to the speaker. In their descriptive function and power, comparison, metaphor and metonymy correspond to those three basic possibilities of word-concept relations. For this reason they are treated apart from the other tropes that are dealt with under the general category of badī', embellishments. (This presentation of Kawzānī's views is based in part on his Taḥīṣṣ al-Mašā'ī, Cairo 1342/1923, iii, 256-290; also in A. F. Mehren, Die Rhetorik der Araber, Copenhagen and Vienna 1853, 6-7 of Arabic text, Trans. 53-54 of German text; and in part abstracted from the tenor of the Taḥīṣṣ as a whole; a rather full summary of Kawzānī's doctrine of bayān, ibid., 20-42.)

While al-Nuwāyri (d. 1332), Niḥāya, vii, 35, already follows the tripartite structure of 'ilm al-mašā'ī, bayān and badī' without, however, distributing the tropes accordingly, Ibn Ḥāṣim al-Djāziyya, Fawā'id, a work whose purpose is the analysis of the uniqueness and inimitability, ṣā'īda, of the Kurān, still uses 'ilm al-bayān for rhetoric as a whole and divides his presentation of it in sections (1) on ḥabība, balāgha, ḥabīka and madjādī, metaphor, comparison, tamāthlī (expression by way of a simile, analogy), concession, and reversion of word order; and (II) on 'ilm al-bayān proper which he subdivides in (a) eighty-four Sinnfiguren (including metonymy as no. 17) and (b) twenty-four further tropes; he notes, 219, that this second fuss of (II) is also called al-badī'. Like Ibn Ḥāṣim, Ibn Khalīd (d. 1406) sees the value of the ṣā'īda in its leading to the understanding of the ṣā'īda, and like him he uses 'ilm al-bayān, the name of the subsection first to be explored by Arab critics, as the designation of the "science of expression" as a whole. But the strictness of his systematisation sets him apart from Ibn Ḥāṣim. Bayān, the manifestation of ideas, is achieved either by verbal expression, ẓabān, or by writing, kūṣa (Muḥaddīsī, iii, 242-43; trans. de Slane, Paris 1862-68, iii, 264-65; trans. Rosenthal, iii, 281-82). The 'ilm al-bayān consist of the three sciences of balāgha, in Ibn Khalīd's description a combination of grammar and 'ilm al-mašā'ī, bayān and badī'. Ibn Khalīd adds that it is the Easterners who give special attention to bayān whereas the Westerners show particular interest in the badī' (Muḥaddīsī, iii, 289-94; trans. Slane, iii, 324 ff.; Rosenthal, iii, 332-39). Ibn Khalīd recognises the importance of Sakkākī and Kawzānī, with whose works he is clearly familiar and whose authority had already grown beyond challenge.

Bibliography: in the article.

Bayān b. Samān al-Ṭamīmī, 'Abū al-Muḥammad Bī, leader in Kūfah. (Otten, Imperatrix, 1910, p. 507; Bāni in Nawbakhtī, al-Nabāhī). He was a dealer in straw. According to Nawbakhtī, he was a disciple of Hamza b. 'Amārā, disciple of Ibn Karīb, men known for ḡululaww speculation on the imāmat of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanāfiyya. He accepted the imāmat of Muhammad's son Abū Ḥāshim (d. ca. 99/717) [qf.] and was hostile to Muḥammad al-Ṭābi'ī. Bayān taught a literalist anthropomorphic interpretation of the Kurān; e.g., God is a man of light, all whose parts will finally perish except his face (Kurān xxviii, 88). When on al-Ṭābi'ī's death al-MugHIRA b. Sa'dī [qf.] left al-Ṭābi'ī's circle, he and Bayān evidently joined forces. After what may have been a forced premature rising, they were seized with a handful of followers and burned by Khalīd al-Kasīrī, Ḥāfiz al-Ṭābi'ī's governor, in 119/737. (There are several circumstantial but contradictory accounts of their death.) Iṣfahānī in al-Aghnī in very improbable has the rising be in the name of Dī'a'ar al-Ṣāmī' (Vol. 15, 121; but cf. Vol. 19, 58). Wākīdī has it be in the name of Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh, who rebelled against al-Mansūr twenty-six years later; possibly (cf. Tabārī and Ibn Ḥāzm) it was connected with the 'Abbhādī, who inherited Abū Ḥāshim's party in Kūfah in the name of all the family of the Prophet.

Bayān's followers apparently formed a party, the Bayānīyya (or Banānīyya, or the Samānīyya, said
to have ascribed to the imám's prophecy through an indwelling particle of divine light; to have expected the return of various religious figures after death; and to have discussed the "greatest name" of God. Some are said to have regarded Bayân as an imám, citing Kur'ân iii, 138. Like other Shí'ís they supported Muhammad b. 'Abd Allâh at least at first.

**BAYAZİD (DOĞU-BAYAZIT),** a small town belonging to the Turkish Republic and situated a little to the south of Mount Ararat (Ağrı-Dâğ), close to the frontier with Iran. It has been suggested that the town was named after the Ottoman Sultan Bayazid I (791-805/1389-1403), who, according to this view, fortified the site as a post of observation against Timûr Beg. A more recent interpretation is that the name derives in fact from a prince of the Dânjlâyir dynasty, i.e., from Bayazid, the brother of Sultan Ahmed (784-813/1382-1410). The Ottomans captured the town in 920/1514, but did not obtain definitive control over the region until after the Persian campaigns of Sultan Sulayman in 940-942/1533-1536, 955-956/1548-1549 and 990-992/1583-1585. Bayazid and its adjacent territories formed, under Ottoman rule, a sanjak which was dependent at times on the eyâlet of Van, but more often on the eyâlet of Erzurum. The Russians, in the course of their wars with the Ottoman Turks, occupied the town in 1828, 1854, 1877 and again in 1914. Bayazid, now included in the Turkish province of Ağrı, (Ağrı) had in 1935 a population estimated at 28,000 inhabitants, the comparable figure for the entire sanjak amounting to just over 20,000 people, most of whom are of Turkish or Kurdish descent. Sheep and cattle rearing, the production of wool, hides and leather and the weaving of carpets constitute the main economic activities of the area.

**BAYAZIS** [see PAYAS].

**BAYAT,** an Oghuz (Türkmen) tribe. The Bayat are understood to have taken part in the conquests of the Seldûqs in Anatolia. The nickname al-Bayâtî given to Sunûr, representative in Basra in 512-3/119 of the Seljukid amir Ak Sunkur al-Bulhârî, is quite probably connected with this tribe. There were numerous places called Bayat or Bayad in central and western Turkey in the 9th/15th and 10th/16th centuries of which few survive today. Most of these place-names, no doubt, belonged to the Bayat who participated in the conquest of Anatolia. There were Bayat among the Turkmen in northern Syria in the 8th/14th century. An important part of these, called Şâm Bayadî, used to go in the summer like other Turkmen tribes to the provinces of Diyarbakr, Kutahya and Tripoli. From the same century they are also seen in Iran, particularly around Kazzâz and Karahrud, to the south of Hamadhân. They numbered about 10,000 tents, and were perhaps more recently called Ak Bayat, probably to distinguish them from the rest of the Bayats in the country. The Ak Bayat reared some very fine horses known after them as Bayatî Nîchâdî, Şâm 'Abbâs used to send these horses as gifts to the ruler of India. The Bayatî mode (mahâbî) found in classical Turkish and Persian music has its origin in the songs of this tribe. It seems likely that these Bayats went to Iran from Syria with the Ak-Koyunlu conquest. Some of the Bayat clans in Iran live in Khurâsân and these are called, to distinguish them from the rest, Kârâ Bayats. One of the clans of the famous Kâdîrî tribe was of the Şâm Bayat. In fact, as shown by names of its clans, the Kâdîrî tribe has its origin in Turkey. Some Bayat are also found in Şirâk, particularly around Kûrkhû. The castle called Bayat south of Baghdad quite probably takes its name from them. This tribe produced a number of famous men; Korkut Ata (Dede Korkut), and Fuzûlî (Fudûlî) were of this tribe. Hasan b. Mahmûd Bayatî, author of Dîvân-i Dîvân âyâs, a work dedicated to the Ottoman Prince Dîvân, is, as indicated by his nisba, of the Bayat tribe.

**BAYÊN, B. SAMÑN AL-TAMIMI — BAYAZID I**

**Bibliography:** Faruk Sumér, Bayatlar, in *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi*, Istanbul 1952, iv/1, 37-57; (Faruk Sumér).

**BAYAZID (DOĞU-BAYAZIT),** a small town belonging to the Turkish Republic and situated a little to the south of Mount Ararat (Ağrı-Dâğ), close to the frontier with Iran. It has been suggested that the town was named after the Ottoman Sultan Bayazid I (791-805/1389-1403), who, according to this view, fortified the site as a post of observation against Timûr Beg. A more recent interpretation is that the name derives in fact from a prince of the Dânjlâyir dynasty, i.e., from Bayazid, the brother of Sultan Ahmed (784-813/1382-1410). The Ottomans captured the town in 920/1514, but did not obtain definitive control over the region until after the Persian campaigns of Sultan Sulayman in 940-942/1533-1536, 955-956/1548-1549 and 990-992/1583-1585. Bayazid and its adjacent territories formed, under Ottoman rule, a sanjak which was dependent at times on the eyâlet of Van, but more often on the eyâlet of Erzurum. The Russians, in the course of their wars with the Ottoman Turks, occupied the town in 1828, 1854, 1877 and again in 1914. Bayazid, now included in the Turkish province of Ağrı, (Ağrı) had in 1935 a population estimated at 28,000 inhabitants, the comparable figure for the entire sanjak amounting to just over 20,000 people, most of whom are of Turkish or Kurdish descent. Sheep and cattle rearing, the production of wool, hides and leather and the weaving of carpets constitute the main economic activities of the area.


(V. J. Parry)
mous Tawdrīkh, 27) which they did, and his only surviving brother (the others, called Savdjl and Ibrahim, were already dead) was immediately put to death to prevent a civil war. Lazar, the Serbian prince, was also executed on the field.

Bayezid spent the winter of 792/1389-1390 in taking Philadelphia (Alaşehir) and annexing the Turkish principalities in Western Anatolia, namely Aydın, Saruhanlı, Menteghe, Hamid and Germiyân. Süleyman, the Dündar Bey and Evrenuz (Ewrenos) [q.v.] were with him during this expedition. In Dümâdâ II 792/May 1390 he was in Karahisar (Afyon), preparing to march against Karaman-oghlu. He recaptured Beyşehir and laid siege to Konya. At this time Süleyman, back in Kastamonu, formed an alliance with Kâşif Burhan al-Din against Bayezid to help Karaman-oghlu. Apparently this threat made Bayezid give up the siege of Konya and sign a treaty with Karaman-oghlu in which he abandoned the whole region west of the Çarşamba river. The following year (793/1391) Bayezid attacked Süleyman, but Burhan al-Din defied him in support of his ally. In the spring of 793/1392 Bayezid made great preparations against Süleyman. A Venetian report of 12 Dümâdâ I, 794/6 April 1392 stated that as a vassal of Bayezid, Manuel Palaeologus was about to take part in the naval expedition against Sinop (Silberschmidt, 77). This expedition ended with the annexation of Süleyman’s territory (except Sinope) and his death. Then, in spite of Burhan al-Din’s protests and threats, Bayezid occupied Osmanlılar. But Burhan al-Din finally attacked Bayezid near Corumlu (Corum) and forced him to retreat. Burhan al-Din’s raiders reached as far as Ankara and Sivrihisar. Besieged by Burhan al-Din’s forces the Amir of Amasya handed over the castle to the Ottomans (794/1392). The next year Bayezid came and entered the city. Local dynasties such as Tağl al-Din-oghullarlı (in Çarşamba valley), Taşhan-oghullarlı (Merzifon region) and the lord of Baçra recognised Bayezid as their suzerain. Burhan al-Din harassed the Ottoman army on his way back (Başım u Râzım, 418-20).

Bayezid then found things more pressing in the west. After the victory at Kosoovo he had increased his control on Byzantium. His support first secured the throne to John VII (27 Rabî‘ II 792/14 April 1390) and then to John V and his son and co-emperor Manuel (16 Shawwâl 793/17 September 1391) who had showed his faithfulness to the sultan by accompanying him in his expeditions in Anatolia (Fr. Dilger, Johannes VII, 27-8). When Anatolian affairs kept Bayezid busy in the east, his Uğû beyliş [q.v.] by their raids held enemies under restraint on the western borders: Pasha-yigit submitted Vuk; Evrenuz (Ewrenos) [q.v.] conquered Kitro (Çitro) and Vodena and advanced into Hungary, but Burhan al-Din raiding in Wallachia, and Shâhinn was active in Albania. But Mircea cel Batran managed to take Silistre back and attacked with success, against the akâmîji in Karın-ovalı (Karnobat) when Bayezid was in Anatolia. Venetian activities in Morea, Albania and in Byzantium on the one hand, and Hungarian attempts in extending influence in Wallachia and the Danubian Bulgaria on the other made Bayezid decide to concentrate his efforts in the Balkans. He first occupied Trnovo (7 Râzâm 795/17 July 1393) which had been under Ottoman control since 790/1388 and Czar Shishman had to move to Nicopolis as an Ottoman vassal. In the winter of 796/1393-94 Bayezid summoned all of the Balkan princes and the Palaeologus to Serres and there attempted to strengthen their ties of vassaldom. In particular he wanted Theodore Palaeologus to hand over his main cities in the Morea against Venice. In despair, the Palaeologus, Theodore and Manuel turned against Bayezid and sought help in the West, especially in Venice. It seems that Bayezid then reconquered Thessalonica (Neshri, 88, gives the date as 19 Dümâdâ II 796/21 April 1394; the city was taken once in 796/1394 and lost probably in 797/1394). Bayezid also reconquered Thessaly, the conquered Salone, Neopatrai; Evrenuz entered Morea, but Theodore had given Argos to the Venetians (27 May 1394) (J. Loenertz in REB, i, 171-85). Another Ottoman division put southern Albania under direct Ottoman rule and Shâhinn exerted pressure on the Venetian possessions on the Albanian coasts [see Arnavutluç]. Bayezid also started the blockade of Constantinepol (796/Spring 1394) which lasted for seven years. In 797/1395 he invaded Hungary, and on his way attacked the castles of Slankamen, Titel, Beckserek, Temeghvar, Carashova, Caransebeş, Mehedia (see Actes du X. Congrès Int. d’Et. Byz., 220). Defeating Mircea on the Argesh river in Wallachia (26 Râdja 797/15 May 1395) he then put Vlad on the Wallachian throne. Bayezid then passed over the Danube to Nicopolis and seized and executed Shishman (13 Sha’bân 797/3 June 1395).

These bold conquests caused Hungary and Venice to conclude at last an alliance (796/1394) and to form a crusade in Europe against the Ottomans. When in 799/1396 Bayezid was making a major effort to take Constantinople the Crusaders under Sigismund came to lay siege to Nicopolis. Hurrying there, Bayezid inflicted a crushing defeat upon them (21 Dhu ‘l-Hijdja 798/25 September 1396) and took Vidin from Stratsimir, the last independent Bulgarian prince. Now the fate of the Balkans and Constantinople were in Bayezid’s hands. In the imperial capital Manuel had to agree to Bayezid’s settling there a Turkish colony with a şâbîl. Evrenuz took Argos and Athens (799/1397). Then the sultan went back to Constantinople because of the hostile movements of Karaman-oghlu during the crisis of Nicopolis. He defeated and executed Karaman-oghlu at Açıka and incorporated his territory with Konya (800/Autumn 1397). The following year he incorporated also the region of Dianik and the territory of Burhan al-Din [q.v.] and disregarding his alliance with Egypt against Timur (Tamerlane) [q.v.] conquered Albistan, Mala-tya, Belusini, Kahta and Divrigi: Fritiof Berg.

Marshal Boucicaut’s attack on the Turkish coasts and the small force he brought to Constantinople were not enough to relieve the city (800/Summer 1399),
so Manuel II went to Europe to ask more help (10 Rabic II 802/10 December 1399). In the Autumn of 1399 Timur once more appeared in eastern Anatolia, and hopes were high in the West as they were during his first invasion of eastern Asia Minor in 796/1394. From 802/1399 on Timur claimed suzerainty over all the rulers in Anatolia as the representative of the Djezgizkhândis whereas Bayazid claimed to be the heir of the Saldjûks there. Timur hesitated before attacking the sultan of the ghâzis. Timur gave refuge to the Anatolian rulers expelled by Bayazid by Karâ Yûsuf and Ahmad Djâlrâ. This exasperated Timur. He took and sacked Sivas (802/August 1400), to which Bayazid retaliated by capturing the Amir of Erzindjân, a protégé of Timur named Mutâshârten (803/1401). Finally Timur and Bayazid came to grips at Cubuk-ovaüs near Ankara (27 Dhu 'l-Hijjah 804/28 July 1402). Defeated and taken prisoner by Timur, Bayazid died in captivity at Akseheir (13 Sha'ban 805/8 March 1403) Bayazid's hastily founded empire collapsed. The Anatolian princes, who all regained their respective territories (804/1402), as well as the Ottoman princes, who divided the rest of the country among themselves, recognised Timur as their suzerain. It was not until Mehemmed II that the Ottomans again assumed the offensive in East.

Bayazid was responsible for the foundation of the first centralised Ottoman empire based upon the Kûl system and the traditional administrative methods perfected under Muslim-Turkish states in the Middle East. Popular tradition criticised him as an innovator in finances, administration and manners.


(Bàiit Iwhalîcî)

BAYAZID II, Ottoman Sultan (886/918/1481-1512), was born most probably in Shawwâl or Dhu 'l-Ka'da 851/December 1447 or January 1448 (some sources give the date of his birth, however, as 856 or 857/1452 or 1453). During the lifetime of his father, Mehemmed II, he was governor of the province of Amâsya and served in the war against Uzun Hasan, the leader of the Ak Koyûnlû Turco- mans, being present at the battle of Otluk Bell in 878/1473. On the death of Mehemmed II in 886/1481 a conflict for the throne broke out between Bayazid and his younger brother Djem, then governor of Karamân, with his residence at Konya. The support of the Janissaries and of a powerful faction amongst the great officials at the Porte ensured the accession of Bayazid to the throne. Djem, defeated in battle near Yeni-Shehir in Rabî' II 886/June 1481, with
Poland, however, made peace with Moldavia in April 1499, this agreement being soon followed by a renewal of the former truce between the Ottomans and the Poles.

The reverses experienced in the war against the Mamlûks, Bâyazîd sought to provide his troops with arms more efficient and of greater offensive power than the weapons hitherto available, and also to create a more mobile and more competently manned artillery force. At the same time efforts were made to increase the size and strength of the Ottoman fleet, numerous vessels of war being built in the ports of the Aegean and the Adriatic. A new war was indeed imminent, which would test the worth of these armaments and of the much augmented naval forces of the Sultân. Friction along the borders of the Venetian enclaves on the coasts of the Morea, Albania and Dalmatia, where the Ottoman ghâlis faced the Greek, Cretan and Albanian mercenaries in the service of the Signoria, and also the repeated occurrence of "incidents" at sea, induced Bâyazîd to make war on Venice in 904/1499. A decision influenced by the fact that, since the death of Djiem in 1495, some of the high dignitaries at the Porte had been urging the Sultân to pursue a more aggressive policy towards the Christians. Lepanto, lacking all hope of relief from the sea, because the Venetian fleet had been driven to take refuge under the guns of Zante, fell to the Ottomans in Muharram 905/August 1499. Meanwhile, the frontier warriors of Persia carried out a great incursion into the Friuli and then, reinforced after the capture of Lepanto, ravaged the Venetian lands as far as Vicenza. Modon, Coron and Navarino in the Morea yielded to the Ottomans in 906/1500, and also Durazzo on the Adriatic coast in 907/1501. Venice, finding the conflict too expensive, sought peace in 908/1502 and in the final agreement concluded in 909/1503 renounced all claim to Lepanto, Modon, Coron, Navarino and Durazzo. Bâyazîd could feel well satisfied with the outcome of this war, which had brought solid territorial gains in the Morea and on the Adriatic shore and, more notable still, had underlined the fact that the Ottomans were becoming a formidable power at sea.

The years 909-918/1503-1512 witnessed the growth of a major crisis in the East. Ismâ'il, the head of the religious order known as the Şâfawîyya, had begun in 904-905 a career of conquest which soon made him the master of Persia. The Şâfawîyya had long conducted, on behalf of the Şâfi'i faith, a vigorous propaganda amongst the Turcoman tribes of Asia Minor—a propaganda so successful that the armies of the new régime in Persia consisted to a large degree of warriors drawn from these tribes. As orthodox or Sunni Muslims, the Ottomans had reason to view with alarm the progress of Şâfi'i ideas in the territories under their control, but there was also a grave political danger that the Şafawîyya, if allowed to extend its influence still further, might bring about the transfer of large areas in Asia Minor from Ottoman to Persian allegiance. An additional threat arose from the fact that Şâfi'i beliefs flourished in those regions along the Taurus frontier which were in dispute between the Ottomans and the Mamlûks. Ottoman intervention here against the adherents of the Şafawîyya might well drive the Mamlûks, despite their profession of the Sunni faith, into an alliance with the new Şâfi'i state in Persia.

Bâyazîd, aware of the danger, ordered in 907-908/1502 the deportation of numerous Şâfi'i elements from Asia Minor to his recent conquests in the Morea. He also garrisoned his eastern frontier in force, when in 913-915/1508 Şâh Ismâ'il, then at war with 'Âlâ al-Dawla, the prince of Alhûstân, occupied Dîyûr-Bakr and large areas of Kurdistan. How critical the situation had become was made clear on the outbreak, in 917/1511, of a great Şâfi'i revolt in Tekke, a region of Asia Minor long noted as a centre of heterodox religious ideas. The rebels, after plundering Kutâhşa, advanced on Brusa, but then, retiring in the face of superior forces, suffered a total defeat between Kayseri and Sivâs in the summer of 917/1511—a conflict in which both the Ottoman Grand Vizier 'Ali Pasha and the rebel chieftain, Şâh Kûlî, were slain.

Meanwhile, the Ottoman empire had come to the verge of civil war. The practice that a new Sultân, on his accession to the throne, should order the death of all his brothers and their male children imposed on the sons of an ageing Sultân a dire pressure to prepare for armed conflict on, or even before, the death of their father. There had been war between Bâyazîd and Djiem in 886-887/1481-1482; now, the issue was to rest between Ahmed, who was governor of Amûsya, and Selîm, who had charge of the remote province of Trebizond (Kölküd, the eldest of the three surviving sons of Bâyazîd, enjoyed little favour at the Porte and had but a minor rôle in the events which now occurred). Selîm, in 916/1511, sailed from Trebizond to Kaffa in the Crimea and, having won the support of the Tatar Khân, moved with his forces across the Danube, demanding of his father the government of a province in the Balkans. Bâyazîd, reluctant to make war on his own son and worried about the revolt of Şâh Kûlî in Asia Minor, yielded to the wishes of Selîm and, in a formal agreement, conferred on him the great frontier province of Semendria. The news that the Grand Vizier 'Ali Pasha, who favoured the cause of Ahmed, had been sent with a strong contingent of Janissaries to crush the Şâfi'i rebellion aroused in Selim the fear that, if Şâh Kûlî should be defeated, 'Ali Pasha might make a bold effort to raise Ahmed to the throne. Selim now marched on Adrianople, where his father was in residence. Bâyazîd withdrew in the direction of Istanbul, but then stood firm at Uğrash-deresi near Çorû. The Janissaries, although well disposed towards Selim, refused to remain loyal to the old Sultân. Here, on 8 Dümâd 1 917/5 August 1511, their skill and discipline routed the Tatar horsemen of Selim, the prince himself fleeing from the battlefield to seek refuge in the Crimea.

Ahmed, after the defeat of Şâh Kûlî, advanced towards Istanbul, hoping to cross the Straits and ensure his own accession to the throne. Disturbances amongst the Janissaries at the capital in Dümâd 1 917/August 1511 overawed the adherents of Ahmed at the Porte. Ahmed, realising that the Janissaries had thus declared their support for Selim and their intention not to accept himself as Sultân, now used armed force to bring much of western Asia Minor under his control—a course of action which amounted to open rebellion against his father. The result was that Bâyazîd consented to recall Selim from Kaffa and to restore to him the province of Semendria. There was, however, a growing fear at the Porte that Ahmed would make an alliance with the Şâfi'i régime in Persia. This fear, together with the demand of the Janissaries that Selim should lead them in the now inevitable campaign against Ahmed, hastened the issue of events. Bâyazîd was compelled to abdicate in favour of Selim in Safer 918/April 1512. The old Sultân had chosen to retire to the town of
his birth, Demotika, but while travelling to this destination, died on 10 Rabūṭ I 918/26 May 1512.


When he was nearing sixteen, his father took him along on one of his trade journeys. Later, Bāyazīd made several more. On these he must have met Pir-i Kdmil (as in Tadhkira, f. 82b) the Mufyid (Isma, Tadhkira, f. 92). He claimed descent through Sh. Sirādī al-Dīn (his fifth ancestor) from (Abū) Ayyūb al-Ansārī, the famous Companion of the Prophet, (his 21st ancestor). His mother Aymana (varr. Biban, Biban, Mā-Shāhir al-4Uman, ii, 245), the second cousin of his father, was a daughter of al-Ḥādīḍi Abā Bakr of Jallandhar, in which city Bāyazīd was born c. 931/1525, i.e., a year before Bābūr had founded his Empire in India. His father left for Kānīgurām (Wazirāstān), his home-town, before the child had completed his forty days. Alarmed by the establishment of the Mogul supremacy, the people of Bāyazīd fled (c. 956/1549) to Bābār and thence went with him to Kānīgurām. 4Abū Allāh, who had another wife (and several children by her), now developed an aversion for Aymana and divorced her. Bāyazīd, then about seven, found his subsequent home life extremely unhappy and gradually he developed a life-long estrangement from his parents and step-brother. His early schooling was interrupted as he was called upon to attend to home affairs and trade, but he turned to his studies whenever possible, though always confining himself to what related to the questions of divine worship. He applied himself diligently to acquiring a detailed knowledge of, and a punctilious performance of, devotional exercises and other religious duties. But he felt himself baulked in every direction, for his father would not let him perform the ḥaḍīḍ or go elsewhere for further studies, or allow him to become a disciple of a Pir. When he was nearing sixteen, his father took him along on one of his trade journeys. Later, Bāyazīd made several more. On these he must have met (as in Tadhkira, f. 82b) the Multāb (Ismā’llī) Sulaymān, whose influence can be seen, among other things, in the excessive emphasis on the doctrine of the Pir-i Kdmil (as in the “perfect spiritual director”), the frequent use of τάλατα, etc., in certain Ḥūrif doctrines
The Tadhkira refers also to Bayazid’s association with Yogis, from whom he learnt the doctrines of transmigration of souls and of divine inspiration (ma’rifa). This is not expressly mentioned in the Hāl-nāma, but if, as some Ṣ añārīs of Jalandhar believe, he is identical with ‘Vaḍīd’ who compiled Shlokas (see Onkār Nāth, Vaḍīd ādi de shlokā, Lāhore n.d.) he shows considerable knowledge of popular Hindū lore, and some verses of the editor of the Hāl, 502 f., may indeed have been inspired by the shlokas directly or through the Khaṣȳr al-Bayzīd.

The time had now come to preach to others. He was going with a caravan to India, but he returned home from Kandahār, had an underground cell constructed, in which he made his wife and a few others observe Ṣillās, to begin with. Later, he received orders to preach openly. On the basis of dreams of his own and others, people began to call him “Mīrā Mīrā”. He met a great deal of local opposition, especially the Shinwāris and Mohmandzīs and was so impressed with their sincerity and devotion to his cause, that he and his sons and a daughter married among them. A dā’ī then converted the Kāsīs of the Kandahār region, especially the Shinwāris and Mohmandzīs and some Bārech and Sāṣīs of Kandahār.

After some years’ work among them, the dā’ī appeared among the Sindhis and Balōḍīs and made Sayyidpur (near Ḍhādarat-Sind) the centre of his activities. The Pīr and his agents (who were allowed to work only in his name and never in their own) had a remarkable initial success everywhere, in spite of the violent opposition aroused by the rival pīrs, ‘ulāmā’, etc., except in Turān, where such rivals do not seem to have existed. At this stage, Bayazīd sent his missionaries (from Kālla Dher in Ḥaḍhsīnagār, Mākhsān, f. 154 b) to the rulers, nobles and ‘ulāmā’ of the neighbouring countries inviting them to the acceptance of his claims. One of them was sent to the Emperor Akbar, another to Mīrā Sulaymān of Badagahshān. Some more were sent to India, Bālḵ and Būḵhārā. Sayyid ‘Alī Tirmūzī, the mūslih of the Aḥjūnī also got one (Tadhkira, f. 92 b).

His teaching: The central doctrine of Bāyazīd could be briefly stated thus (see Ṣirāl, 1): Gnosis of God (“the Truth”) is an imperative duty (fard-i ‘ayn). This gnosis without which obedience (fā’a), divine worship (‘ibāda), charities and good works, are not acceptable to God, cannot be obtained except through a Perfection of Spiritual Director (pir-i kāmil). He is one who is a man of law (shari’a), the Way (ṭariqa), of the Truth (ḥakība), of the gnosis of God (ma’rifa), of Nearness (burba), of Union (waṣla), of Oneness with God (waṣda), of Tranquillity (ṣukina = sakina of Ṣirāl, 110). He is a Reveler of the truths of divine secrets, an Embodiment of taqallud bi-ahhīd Allāh, i.e., his spirit acquires divine qualities (cf. ibid., 23). Seeking and obeying him is incumbent on all. Obedying him is obeying the Apostle of God, and therefore obeying God. Such a Perfect Director is Bayazīd himself, who was told both this in dreams and when awake, and those who sincerely obey him would be led by him through the above stages to taḥkīd (cf. Ṣirāl, 24 f.).

Special stress was laid on the neophytes’ repentance (taubah), retiring to cells, observing illsaṣ once a year, invoking the divine name in silence, meditation, and similar ascetic practices. When they had reached the last stage in their “ascent”, presumably they looked upon themselves as free from the obligations imposed by the shari’a (cf. Tadhkira, 88 a).

What Dabistan, 251 (Nasar 2), gives as his doctrines are probably his war regulations relating to the period in which he was at war with the Mughals and other Afghan tribes hostile to him.

His missionary work outside his home town. He began with a village a day’s journey from Kāṅgīrūm, met violent opposition and fled back to his home town, where too there were strong reactions against him, amounting almost to his ejection from the community. But he adopted a conciliatory attitude and that saved the situation for a time. A dā’ī of his having prepared the ground among the Dāws (or Dāwris) of the Tochī Valley in northern Wazīristān, he went there, and even performed some miracles. A clever agent of his then prepared the ground for him farther afield and in due course he appeared among the Bangāṣh, then worked his way up and won over the Orakzīs, Tirāṁs and Afīrīs. Passing on to the Ṣarābān land of Peshāwar, he converted numerous tribesmen of the Ḳalīl, Mohmand, Da’sīs, Gagāṁs, Yūsufās, Tūsīs and Sāṣīs. Complaints against him having reached Kābul he was hauled up by the young governor of the Province, Akbar’s brother Mīrā Muhammad Ḥakīm (b. 961/1554 d. 990/1583) and Bāyazīd had to face an inquisition conducted by Kāḏkhān, the Ṣadīq of Kābul. Bāyazīd gave clever answers and was allowed to return to Peshāwar. He now resumed his work among the Mohmandzīs and was so impressed with their sincerity and devotion to his cause, that he and his sons and a daughter married among them. A dā’ī then converted the Kāsīs of the Kandahār region, especially the Shinwāris and Mohmandzīs and some Bārech and Sāṣīs of Kandahār.
which brought down upon their heads the wrath of the authorities in Kabul, and the villagers carried into captivity. On the death of Bāyazīd, Mūsā Khan, the Governor of Peshawar, was ordered to arrest him, but he escaped to a hill in the Yūsufzī region and, being besieged there, successfully fought his way to Khaybar and Tirah. This first battle-ground was named by him Aqāzpur. The war lasted during the remaining 2½ years of his life, till his death in 980/1572-73. The details of it are supplied not by the tājīl-nīma, but by Mūllā Darwīza, according to whom Bāyazīd was finally defeated at Torragha by Muḥṣīn Kūhā Ghāzī, who had led an expedition against him from Djalālahbād. The Pir fled on foot to the hills, suffered pangs of exhaustion and thirst and ultimately died at Kālā Pānī but was buried in Hāshīnāger (Tadhkira, f. 91b). Some Gujārs were found desecrating the tomb at night, so Bāyazīd’s son and successor Sh. ‘Umar removed the coffin in which he was buried and kept it in front of him when on the march, until in the confusion of a battle (98/1569), it fell into the Indus. It is said that he has been recovered later and buried in Bhattapār. (Hāl, 483 f., 493-525). This place appears to have been three days’ journey from Kaniguram (Hāl, 156).

His literary and other cultural activities. Bāyazīd wrote an autobiographical-cum-propaganda work, and many tracts, to explain the tenets of the sect he had founded. Out of these treatises only 9, 113, 117, 125). His Arabic, from a literary point of view, is weak and ungrammatical, even allowing for the fact that the MSS. of his works which have reached us are late copies. His chief opponent and contemporary Mūllā Darwīza (Tadhkira, f. 80b) finds in the Khayr al-Bayān Arabic words strung together “without a sense of proper syntactical relationship” (biḥā tāriḵ-i tarkīb). These works were read and explained by him to the members of his family (Hāl, 689) and his other disciples, and the Khayr al-Bayān and Maḥṣūl al-Muʿminīn especially, acquired a semi-sacred character for them. He claimed that the former work had been revealed to him. Hotly pursued, on one occasion, at night, by the Yūsufzīs, his son ‘Umar halted his troops and waited till the work, which had been forgotten at some place on the way, had been retrieved (Hāl, 498). The Maḥṣūl al-Muʿminīn is said to have saved the life of another son of Bāyazīd (Djalāl al-Dīn), for, when he was carrying it, it shielded him by receiving the sword-cuts and dagger-thrusts from his enemies. A darwīsh heard a voice from the unknown asking him to retire to his home and devote himself to the study of these two books (Hāl, 390), and so on. Judging from what remains of his Afghan prose, it seems that he attempted to write in rhymed prose (ṣadf) following Arabic and Persian models, even to the detriment of the idiom of Pushto. Because of the nature of the subjects dealt with (religion, mysticism, morality), he had to use freely the familiar Arabic and Persian terminology along with the words of the Yūsufzī and Kandahār dialects of Pushto (see Urdu Encyclopedia of Islam, art. Bāyazīd Anṣārī). The following of his works are traceable:

1) Khayr al-Bayān, in 40 chapters (Hāl, 431). Some passages of it, according to the Tadhkira, were in Arabic and Persian, some in Afghan and Hindi (but cf. Dabestān 251) though “all the sections were inharmonious and incongruous” (nā mawṣūm wa nā muwāṣṣīk). The Ḥāfiz even asserts that part of the work was contributed by Mūllā Arzān Khweshd of Kasūr, a Ḥāfiz of the Pir. On his death-bed, when asked by his disciples for his last injunctions, Bāyazīd directed their attention to the Khayr al-Bayān, in which, he said, he had recorded unthinkingly whatever was revealed to him (Hāl, 483). The work is said to have attempted an affirmation of pantheistic belief (wakad-i ngalīd) (Maʾādhīr al-ʿUmarāʾ, ii, 243). No copy of it is known to exist except the one (transcribed in 1061/1651, ff. 167) which was sent to Sir Denison Ross by someone and is now said to be in-traceable. Prof. Morgenstierne (Oslo) published some extracts from it, with their English translation, in the Indian Antiquary. 2) Maḥṣūl al Muʿminīn (Arabic). Only two copies are known, one with me (with interlinear Persian translation), transcribed in 1224/1809, and the other in the Aṣfīyya transcribed a year later (see Cat. i 390/86, Brockelmann, 5, II 38). This handbook of the Rawshānīyya doctrine was composed by Bāyazīd at the request of his eldest son ‘Umar (who is occasionally addressed in it as “O! my dear son!”) for the benefit of the faithful who were to read, remember, and act according to it. It has 21 sections. The first thirteen forming more than half of the work, deal with such topics as Admonition, Reason, Faith, Fear, Hope, Spirit, Satan, Heart, Soul, This World and the Next, Trust in God, and Repentance; the last eight deal with the eight stages (see above) from sharīʿa to sakāna. 3) Šīrāt al-Taʾwīl (Arabic-Persian). This partly autobiographical treatise begins with a description of the stages of his spiritual development up to the time when he discovered the Pir-i Khūz in himself, and ends in a risāla addressed specially to kings and amirs. It contains an admirable detailed account of the course of his spiritual development, and describes the various disciplinary stages for the ascent of the soul of man, possible only under the guidance of the Perfect Pir. He urges them to seek repentance at the hand of such a Pir (Šīrāt, 71 f., 184 ff.). Bāyazīd tells those who had gone through spiritual exercises under his supervision or that of his disciples that they had won divine favour according to their capacity, for capacity and sincerity were indispensable for the ‘ascent’. It is stated in the colophon of the work that it was composed in 978/1570 and that “whoso studies it and acts according to it will learn Šīr al-Taʾwīl”. A copy of the work was sent by the author through a special messenger to the Emperor Akbar, who was pleased to receive it (Hāl, 468). A copy, ed. M. A. Shākūr, Pāshāwār 1952. The text is based on an original slightly defective at the beginning. 4) Fākhr (7), the MS. has 3 or 4) al-Tāḥīb (Hāl, 468 f.), a treatise sent by Bāyazīd to Mirzā Sulaymān of Badakhshān at the time he sent his works to the various princes. No copy is known to exist.

5) Hāl-nūma (Persian), an autobiography of Bāyazīd re-edited and amplified by ‘Ali Muḥammad “Mukhīs” b. Aḥā Bakr Ḵandāḫārī, a “home-born”
(khatamāt) of the sons of Bāyazid and a ḥālitāt of the sect.

There is one undated copy (ff. 526) in Aligarh (Subhan Allah Oriental Library No. 920-37). From it the Pandjab University copy was made recently (745, ll. 20), and the references given in this art. relate to this copy. No other copy of the work is known to exist, but Count Noer (A. S. Beveridge’s tr., ii, 148) refers to some “existing fragments” of it.

Abā Bakr, father of ʿAlī Muḥammad, had served Djalāl al-Dīn as a boy, and later, commended troops under Abād Dād, and still later came to India with the members of the family of Bāyazid when they moved to India. ʿAlī Muḥammad served Bāyazid’s grandson Rašīd Ḫān in the Deccan, and settled down in Rašīḍabād, a village in Shāmsabād Māʿū (Ḥāl, 714, Maʿāṭir al-ʿUmārāʾ, ii, 250), near Āgra (Gazet. of Jullundur District, 99).

The text of the Hāl-nāma of Bāyazid, the editor tells us in his preface, had become corrupt in course and continuation relating to the military exploits of his sons and grandsons had to be added. At the request of some friends he supplied this, drawing upon written and oral sources. The narrative, which is brought down to the accession of Awrangzīb (1659–60, Hāl, 729) is of a considerable literary merit, though it has lengthy digressions in prose and verse (often of his own composition) dealing with the doctrines of the sect and minor incidents relating to the faithful. The earlier part, giving a full and detailed account of the life of Bāyazid, has much fewer dates, and some of them, as compared with those in the latter part, are open to doubt, but the narrative of the life of Bāyazid lacks details of his war with the Mughals (fought in the last 2½ years of his life) and ends abruptly. But he gives a very full and up-to-date account of the descendants of the Pīr, both male and female, and their genealogies.

The Hāl-nāma (453 f.) claims that Bāyazid made definite contributions towards the cultural rise of the Afghān people. He was the first, according to this work, to compose ḥādasas, ḡazals, ṭubstäyyāl, ḥīfās, maḥānasāts etc. in Puṣhto, though before him people wrote only a few verses or two. This, however, is an exaggerated statement, as ḥādasas etc., of a much earlier date are known to exist. But it may be true that following his example, Bāyazid’s sons and disciples composed several Puṣhto diwāns, full of lofty truths and fine ideas. Other Afghāns, outside the sect, also followed these models, and an impetus was given to the more frequent use of Puṣhto as a literary medium.

The Pīr also made contributions towards the improvement of the music of the land. Ḥādīqī Muḥammad, a ʿalām of Mir Faḍl Allāh Walī (the Ḥurūfī? d. 796/1393), added some strings to the rebeck (rubāb) and as a result of his instructions the Afghān musicians produced new tunes, generally dance-tunes, but the players could not play them with proper rhythm, so Bāyazid improved their rhythm and under his guidance the musicians were able to compose surūd-i sulkāt (“the mystic’s song”), a sort of devotional music and other pleasing tunes, and the following six modes:

n. d. s. a. r. i. (dhanisāri?); pandj purda; tāhār purda; si purda (five, four and three melodies); martial notes (for the battlefield); and maḥām-i ḡāḳādād (“the mode of bearing witness or martyrdom”). Even as a boy Bāyazid had shown great sensitiveness to music and would dance in ecstatic delight when songs were sung (Ḥāl, 23 f.). Several of his sons and grandsons proved to be expert musicians and one of them, Abād Dād, employed musicians who took turns and played music day and night for his entertainment (Ḥāl, 581 ff.; see also 672, 680 etc.).

The Pīr is also credited with the popularisation of the Afghān script.

Decimated by internal and external wars, violently opposed by the ‘ulama’, and later mostly scattered in various parts of India, the followers of the sect almost disappeared. The tenets of the sect are said to be professed to-day only “by the immediate descendants of the founder in Tīrāb and Kohāt and some of the Bangāsh and Orakzai Pathans” (Gazetter of the Peshawar District 1897–98, 60; cf. J. Leyden, Asiatic Researches, xi, 363).

Bibliography: Apart from the standard Mughal historical works, particularly the Maʿāḍhir al-ʿUmārāʾ, ii, 242 (Bibl. Ind.), the following are important:

ʿAlī Muḥammad b. Abā Bakr Kandahārī, Hāl-nāma-i Pīr-i Ḥādīqī (Pandjab University Library MS.; Bāyazid Anšārī, Maḥānd al-Muʿāmmīn, my MS.; idem, Širāt al-Taufīkī, ed. Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Shākir, Peshāwar 1952; Aḥkund Darwīzā, Maḥānd al-ʿĪslām, my MS., f. 8b., 9b., also the Cat. of Persian MSS. in the Library of the India Office, nos. 2632–8; idem, Taḏkira al-Abrār wa-l-Āḥārīr (Persian), Pandjab University MS., f. 82 ff., s. a. A. H. 1021 (see also Rieu’s Cat., i, 28, Or. 222; J. Leyden, On the Roshenīan Sect and its Founder, Bāyazid Anšārī (Asiatic Researches, xi, 363 ff.); Graf Noer, Kaiser Akbar, ii, 180 f. (English tr. by A. S. Beveridge, Calcutta 1890, ii, 138); G. Morgenstierne, Notes on an old Puṣhto Manuscript containing the Khais-ul-Baydīn of Bāyazid Anšārī, in New Indian Antiquary, (Bombay), Vol. ii, No. 8 (Nov. 1939), 566 ff.; Maʿāḍirī (an Urdu Magazine publ. at Aṣḵandgarh), col. ix, no. 6 (1927), 450; Sayyid ʿAbd al-Dībbār Shāḥī Sīhānawī, ʿĪrātan i-ʿUlā-i-l-ʿAbdār (Urdū), 45 ff. (author’s autographe). See also the art. Rawshshānīyā (Mohammed Shāfar) BAYAZĪD AL-BĪSTĀMĪ [see Abu Yaṣīd al-Bīstāmī].

BAYBAR S. AL-MALIK AL-ZĀHIR RUKN AL-DĪN AL-SALIH, fourth Mamlūk sultan of the Bahri dynasty. He is said to have been born in 620/1223 and to have been one of a group of Ḥūrūfī Turk slaves purchased by the Ayyūbīd sultan Malik Saleh. His first master had been Aydakin Bundufcdar, whence his surname Bundūkdārī, which also explains in Marco Polo’s work (ed. Hambis, II), “Bondodaira, sultan of Babylonia”. He appears first in history in 636/1239, in prison with his master Malik Sāliḥ at Karak. Several months later he was fighting in Syria on behalf of the sultan of Egypt, serving there a rough apprenticeship in the military life, not to mention the intrigues of the last Ayyūbīd princes which offered a gloomy example for his contemplation. His first military accomplishment consisted in taking command of the Egyptian army on the battlefield at Mansūrah, which ended in the decisive victory of Fāraskūr and the capture of Louis IX king of France. It was then that upon his instigation that Tūrān-Shāh was assassinated in 648/1250, the plot unfolding in the guise of resistance to the enemy. This murder, whose odious character is scarcely disputable, settled nothing. Weakness was general. Baybars undoubtedly bore the responsibility for it, and in it the reign of the Mamlūk sultans had its beginning. The origins were bloody and when
Sultan Küçü realized power the Mongol hordes had begun their invasion of Syrian territory. A bloody encounter took place at Ayn Djilút [q.v.] in Palestine. Sultan Kutuz distinguished himself there with enormous valour, as well as the Mongol general who was killed. The Egyptian success was decisive, owing to the tenacity of a sultan against all odds that had managed to field an army. Baybars had fought in the vanguard.

We know little of the sequence of events which led to yet another tragic end; Küçü was assassinated in his tent; this deed being accomplished by a group of officers of which Baybars was one. Clashing ambitions have been mentioned; at any rate it was Baybars who gained the throne (658/1260).

There had already been two murders; but the glory of the sovereign will conceal from history the perfidy of the officer. We will examine his rule chronologically, for the evolution of events allows an evaluation of his activity, which can be confirmed by the written sources. His period cannot but recall that of Salahadin: the achievement of a unity of command, and the victorious war against the Franks. These are two elements of the comparison which accruing to the advantage of Baybars. He wiped out feudalism rather than created it: he lacked any family to provide for. Moreover, Salahadin's offensive, of which the title to glory is the capture of Jerusalem, was a blight of thunders without consequence. In this respect too the advantage lies with Baybars, whose forced marches, rapid and unexpected, were not without method: every inch of conquered land was put immediately in a state of defence.

Internally the organisation of the state manifests an exceptional harmony and equilibrium. Beyond his actions, which one can establish by deeds and dates, Baybars gives the impression of a man who dominates events with an imperturbable optimism.

From the year 659/1261 the new sultan consolidated the key points of his future offensives. Every citadel which had been destroyed by the Mongols, from Hims to Hawran, were put in order and provided with victuals and ammunition.

In his eyes these military precautions were insufficient. He insisted upon being informed rapidly, upon being able to group his officers of which Baybars was one. Clashing ambitions have been mentioned; at any rate it was Baybars who gained the throne (658/1260).

On the first of Rabî‘ II 663/21 January 1265, this enormous army, commanded by the sultan, left Cairo, for the first stage of the great offensive against the Franks, which would not terminate until 670/1271. Their strongholds were taken one after another. In 663/1265 it was the capture of the port of Caesarea which split the Frankish possessions in the south and isolated Jaffa; further north Aqîkh and Hayyâ were occupied. The towns were destroyed: in the event of a reverse they could not serve as supports for the enemy. Then the army turned south and took the port of Arsuf. In 664/1266 simultaneous attacks were made all along the front, but the principal effort was directed toward the town of Safad, to the northwest of Lake Tiberias: the place was taken after a heavy siege. In 666/1268 Baybars turned towards the enclave of Jaffa which did not hold out for a day. One may read the account of that exploit, still engraved on the gate of the great mosque at Ramla in Palestine: "He lay siege to Jaffa at dawn and took it, with God's permission, at the third hour of the same day". A few weeks later a new line of defense was forced: the river Litani and the castle of Beaufort, opposite Tyre, became Muslim. Suddenly the Egyptian troops appeared at the northern point of the Latin kingdom, and Antioch capitulated. This conquest had a considerable repercussion, perhaps greater than the capture of Jerusalem by Salahadin. Since the beginning of the Crusades, Antioch had not once left the possession of the Franks. The neighbouring fortresses could resist no longer and Baybars took advantage in concluding peace with the king of Little Armenia, who was obliged to surrender a part of his domain to the sultan of Egypt. A final offensive, starting from Hims, cut the distant defences of Tripoli. The strongholds of Safidhâ, the Cast of Crac and of Akkâr were taken in two months, in the course of 668/1271.

Meanwhile the sultan, habitually dividing his time between Cairo and Damascus, had made the pilgrimage in 667/1269. Negotiations led in 668/1270 the lord of the Ismâ‘îlî forces to pay tribute to the sultan, who, preoccupied with the expedition of Saint Louis to Tunis, thought for a moment of going to the aid of the Maghribi. Reconsidered, the expedition was set off again for the conquest of the Ismâ‘îlî fortresses, then returned to Cairo. The year 670/1272 was dedicated to a general inspection of Syria. The historians agree in their accounts of how the sultan would arrive unexpectedly, changing direction on route to preclude any foreknowledge of his itinerary. In 671/1272-73, he left Damascus for Bireglik, overwhelming a Mongol detachment near there. Other divisions of the army were operating in Nubia, in the region of Barka and in Armenia. The Franks had at last got a respite. After a year of calm, Baybars was again in Armenia, during 674/1275, where he took Sis and Ayas. The year 674 is marked by an expedition to Nubia, led by the sultan's lieutenants. In 675/1276 Baybars was in Asia Minor where he took Caesarea (Kayseri) in Cappadocia, after having defeated the Saïdjudjík and their Mongol allies. Then he returned to die at Damascus in the early part of 676/1277, at the end of a substantially full life.

The Crusaders never recovered. One can evaluate the territorial losses of the Frankish kingdom at the death of Baybars: the principality of Antioch virtually existed no longer; in the south the frontier had been pushed back from Jaffa to Acre. Everything considered, the Crusaders possessed
only a narrow strip of the coast, while the Mamluks held all of the crests.

The seventeen years of Baybars' reign show a balance of thirty-eight campaigns in Syria. Of the nine battles with the Mongols, only the last was due to the initiative of the sultan, the others being considered counter-attacks. There were five significant engagements with Little Armenia. The Ismâ'îll sectaries, the Assassins, suffered three attacks. On the Franks, the most abused, the Egyptian troops inflicted twenty-one defeats.

The military activity of the sultan was not the result only of the orders which he gave; he took personal command in fifteen battles, not fearing when it was necessary, to expose his own life. A few figures give an idea of Baybars' travels: he does not appear to have spent more than half the period of his reign in his capital at Cairo; he left it twenty-six times, and certainly covered more than forty thousand kilometres.

One sees in the rule of Baybars a splendid example of energy, bringing to light an unexpected political recovery. Under the impetus of this exceptional leader, Egypt, who had just undergone an internal revolution and had been the target of powerful enemies—Crusaders, Mongols, Ismâ'îll—was suddenly to impose its rule upon the Orient. The confusion following the fall of the Abbâsid caliphate in Baghdad, the bâtri of alliance between Crusaders and Mongols, the potential conspiracies of the disposed Ayyûbid princes, and the personal ambitions of the high-ranking Mamlûk officers, are all elements of the tragic combination which makes Baybars' success so extraordinary.

It was a stroke of genius on his part to welcome a refugee of the Abbâsid family, after the disastrous invasion of the Mongols in 656/1258, and to recognise him in Cairo as supreme pontiff. It was not merely a spiritual gesture, for the ruler had seen in it immediate and tangible consequences: suzerainty over the Holy Cities of the Hijâz. Finally, the Egyptian state might from that time on style itself the "Islamic Kingdom".

The exploits of this extraordinary warrior made him a legend in his own lifetime; the epic of Baybars is well below his actual biography. His life is indeed a story of adventure: the death of the hero, drinking a cup of poison prepared by another, is but part of the perfect romance.

Bibliography: The two chief primary sources for the life of Baybars are the biographies of Ibn ʻAbd al-Zâhir and of Ibn Ǧâhid, neither of which is fully extant. A British Museum manuscript of a version of Ibn ʻAbd al-Zâhir, covering the period up to the beginning of 666/1265, was published, with an English translation, by Mrs. S. F. Sadeque, Baybars I of Egypt, Dacca 1956. A more complete ms. of the same version, preserved in the Fâṭîmî library, is being edited by Mr. A. A. Khowaitir (see further B. Lewis, in Spectrum, xxvii, 1952, 488; C. C. Cahen in Arabica, v, 1958, 211-2; P. M. Holt in BSOAS, xxii, 1959, 143-5). A unique and incomplete manuscript of Ibn Ǧâhid's biography of Baybars, covering the years 670-76/1272-78, was found in Edirne by Ş. Yalıktay, who published an abridged Turkish translation of it (Baybars Tarîhî, Istanbul 1941) without the Arabic original. Further information will be found in the general historical sources (Maḳrîzî, Dhaḥabî, Ibn Taghribîrdî etc.). See also E. Quatremère, Souvenirs Mamlouks, ii; M. F. K. Hitti, Baybars, in Jâ'; M. D. S., al-Zâhir Baybars, Cairo 1938, and the general histories of medieval Egypt by G. Wiet (Histoire de la Nation égyptienne, iv, Paris, n.d., 367-82, 403-38) and S. Lane-Poole (A History of Egypt in the Middle Ages, London 1914, index). For inscriptions see RCEA, xi, nos. 4235, 4344; xii, nos. 4476 to 4478, 4485, 4501, 4528, 4552, 4553, 4556, 4557, 4592, 4595, 4598, 4599, 4600, 4608, 4611, 4612, 4623 to 4626, 4618, 4660, 4750, to 4662, 4673, 4686, 4690, 4692, 4714, 4723, 4724, 4726 to 4728, 4730, 4732 to 4735, 4737 to 4740, 4746, 4750 again, 4751, 4752. Further bibliography will be found in G. Wiet, Les Biographies du Manhal Sâfî, no. 708. (G. Wiet)
against the Christians (Byzantines and Crusaders) and the Persians (= Mongols). Towards the end, the novel grows more and more into a fantastic tale of adventure, sorcery and roguery. Traditional tales and motifs, also to be found in other Arabic contexts such as the *Thousand and One Nights* (as well as some which are known in the Iranian tradition), have been used. Baybars’s cunning but basically faithful servant ‘Ukhmân—half-groom-cum-pickpocket, half saint—and (in the later parts of the novel) an Ismâ’îll master of disguise by name of Shîba also play large parts. Shîba is constantly on the move, reconnoitring, freeing Muslim prisoners, and harming or at least scaring his enemies with his craftiness and pranks. His opponent on the Christian side is the dangerous Gwân (= Juan; the original name given is Girgîs), a deadly enemy of Islam. Besides the Mamlûks, there are also Syrian Ismâ’îlls (i.e., Assassins, even though they are never called such) who take part in the battles. The printed editions give an outline, at the end, of the history of Egypt from Mamlûk times to the present day. This is a subsequent addition, which has nothing to do with the actual novel.

Historical events are presented as seen from a bourgeois point of view. The novel has a special predilection for impoverished merchants or craftsmen. Pictures of life in the streets of Cairo are particularly attractive. Amongst the degenerate Mamlûk soldiery, Baybars appears as the just ruler who protects his subjects and fights corruption. Crude jokes, puns, and situations of a certain primitively comic nature, appealed to the uncultured taste of the listeners (the *sîra* was probably always meant to be recited, not read). A definite Islamic conception of the world underlies the whole. Christian and other opponents of Islam are—unless they are later converted—painted in the blackest colours. There is an underlying offensive religious fanaticism. As all non-Muslims are necessarily villains, they have no claim to decent treatment, still less to pity, and none whatever to respect. Things are occasionally very harsh among Muslims, however, evenly distributed. So far there has been no close study of these (cf. Wangelin, 307). The language is somewhat colloquial, particularly in the manuscript texts.

The literary form of the *sîra* corresponds to that of similar Arabic popular tales. The prose tale is interrupted and enlivened by sections of rhymed prose and interspersed with poems. These (in part quotations, in part verses made up for the *sîra*, in classical metres as well as strophic form), are not, however, evenly distributed. So far there has been no close study of these (cf. Wangelin, 307). The language is somewhat colloquial, particularly in the manuscript texts.

The first literary mention of the *sîra* is Sidi Abd Allah al-Maghrâwî. He is the Muslims’ helper in all plights, who protects his subjects and fights corruption. His opponent on the move, reconnoitring, freeing Muslim prisoners, and harming or at least scaring his enemies with his craftiness and pranks. His name “al-Mansuri”). In the retinue of Kala’un, he was appointed sultan of Egypt and Syria, appointed Baybars governor of the province of al-Karak in 664/1266 in campaigns in Syria and Cilicia, in 666/1268 in the siege of Antioch and in 673/1275 in December 1293 al-Malik al Nasir Muhammad was elected sultan, he appointed Baybars general (mukaddam alf) and gave him the high post of da‘îddr (chief of the chancery). From that time
Baybars' career was linked to the fate of this prince, who was twice deposed and reinstalled. Baybars lost his post after al-Malik al-Mansur Ladlín had become sultan instead of al-Malik al-Násir Muhammád, but he was reinstated on al-Malik al-Násir's return to the throne, in 698/1299. In the following years he fulfilled both military and administrative tasks, until he was deposed from his post of ḍawādār in 704/1304-05. Meanwhile al-Malik al-Násir Muhammád had lost all influence on the government and had become a mere puppet in the hands of two powerful generals and at last he abdicated formally. Baybars al-Manṣūr was an ardent partisan of this prince and made strenuous efforts to have him reinstated. When this came about in 709/1310 Baybars was entrusted with various administrative tasks and on 17 Dhu‘d al-‘Ijāh 711/13 October 1311 he was appointed vicerey of Egypt (ndib al-salātān), second to the sultan only. But he held the post less than a year. In Rabī‘ II 712/August 1312 he was deposed and sent to the state prison in Alexandria, where he remained for five years. He died on 25 Ramadān 725/4 September 1325, about eighty years old.

Baybars was a pious Muslim, fond of theological studies, and besides his military and political activities he found time to write historical works, with which he did the help of a Christian secretary. His chief work was a general history of the Islam until the year 724/1324 called Zubdat al-Fihira fī Tarīkh al-Hidjra. This voluminous work, which is divided into centuries, is based in its former parts on the Kāmil of Ibn al-Ashīr, whereas its last part is an important source for the history of the Bāṭrī Mamlikūs, since the author tells the story of campaigns and political events in which he participated himself. The strong personal note of the Zubdat al-Fihira is even more conspicuous in the account which Baybars al-Manṣūr gives of the political history of Egypt at the end of the 13th and at the beginning of the 14th centuries, where he does not conceal his strong bias for al-Malik al-Násir Muhammád. His work was much used by other historians, among whom al-‘Aynl should be mentioned especially. It was abridged and continued by a later author, whose work is preserved in MS. Bodleiana I, 704. Baybars al-Manṣūr himself wrote a shorter history of the Bāṭrī Mamlikūs, which he called al-Tawḥīf al-Mulāli‘iyā fī I‘lālama al-Turkīyyā. This work, partly written in rhymed prose, relates the history of the Mamlikūs up to 711/1311-12. Al-Sakhwī also mentions a History of the Caliphs written by Baybars. It was called al-La‘dāfī fī akhkhār al-khaldīnī.

Bibliography: Brockelmann II, 44, S II, 43; Rosenthal, History of Muslim historiography, 75, 127, 335, 418. (E. Ashton)

BAYBÜRD (BAyyBURD), known to the Byzantines in the time of Justinian as Baibearp, is situated on the Çoruh river, about 300 km. to the north-west of Erzurum. The Seljūq Turks overran this region in the years 440-447/1054-1055. After the battle of Manzikert in 463/1071 BAYBÜRD came under Turkish rule, now of the Saltukids at Erzurum and now of the Dānishmands at Sivas, although the Byzantines, who still held Trebizond, did in fact recapture the town for a time in the reign of Alexios I Komnenos. During the 13th and 14th centuries BAYBÜRD, under the political domination of the Seljūq sultans of Rūm and later of the Mongol Il-Khāns of Persia, prospered from the active commerce which, in the hands of Christian (i.e., Venetian and Genoese) as well as Muslim merchants, flowed along the route leading from Trebizond to Erzurum and thence eastward to Tabriz. The Seljūq sultans and, after them, the Ak Koyunlu Turcomans had control of the town from about the mid-14th to the close of the 15th centuries. BAYBÜRD fell to the Ottomans in 930/1514 during the course of their Čaldırān campaign against the new Şafāwī state in Persia. Ottoman rule over BAYBÜRD and its adjacent territories was consolidated in 940-942/1533-1536, when Sultan Sulaymān organised on a firm basis the eyālet of Erzurum. The Russians occupied the town in 1829, much of the old fortress of BAYBÜRD being ruined in the course of the fighting. Russian forces also defeated the Ottomans in the battle of BAYBÜRD (July 1916) during an offensive directed against Erzindān. BAYBÜRD was in Ottoman times a ḍādār of the sandjak of Erzurum in the eyālet of that name, but is now included in the present Turkish province of Gümüşhāne. Its population was estimated in 1935 at 70,339 inhabitants, the figure for the entire ḍādār being given as 64,813 people. The region is noted for its production of cereals, wool, hides, etc.


( V. J. Parky)

AL-BAYDĀ‘ (Al-Beizā‘), “the white town (castle),” a common Arabic place-name, designating localities scattered all over the Islamic territory. Hamdānī (Siha) quotes four places with this name; Yākūt has sixteen different al-Baydā‘. Most important of these is the Persian town al-Baydā‘, situated in the province Fars, N. of Shiraz and W. of Iṣkahr. Its original name was Naṣā‘. Being the chief town of the Kāmfrūz district, it was as large as Iṣkahr in the 14th century, surrounded by fertile pasture lands. Several scholars carry the name of this place (see al-BAYDĀ‘). Also al-Hallādī [q.v.] was born here. For the S. Arabian town al-Baydā‘, the main place of Upper Bayhān, see art. BAYHĀN.

Bibliography: Iṣkahrī, 126, 197; Ibn Hawkal, 157; Ibn Khurraḍadbih, 46 f.; Mukaddasi, 24, 432; Yākūt, i, 791 f. (Mas‘ūdī, 77); G. Strane, 280; H. von Wissmann and Höfler, Beiträge zur histor. Geogr. des vorislamischen Sūd-arabien, 14, 23, 58, 62, 66. (O. Löfgren)

BAYDAK [see SHATRANDJ].
AL-BAYDAWI, 'Abd Allāh b. 'Umar b. Muḥammad b. 'Ali b. Khayr Nāṣir al-Dīn. He belonged to the Ẓāhirī school, and attained the position of kādi at Ẓafrah. He had a reputation for wide learning, and wrote on a number of subjects including Qur'ānic exegesis, law, jurisprudence, scholastic theology, and grammar. His works are generally not original, but based on works by other authors. He is noted for the brevity of his treatment of his various subjects, but his work suffers on this account from a lack of completeness, and he has been blamed for inaccuracy. His most famous work is his commentary on the Kur'ān, Anwār al-tasālil wa-asrār al-ta'wil, which is largely a condensed and amended edition of al-Zamakhshārī's Kāshf al-Din. That work, which displays great learning, suffers from Muṭʿalīlīlī views which al-Baydawi has tried to amend, sometimes by refuting them and sometimes by omitting them. But on occasion he has retained them, possibly without fully realising their significance. In his introduction he does not claim to be producing an original work. He says that he had long wished to produce a book which would include the best of what he had learned from leading Companions, learned Followers, and upright men of early days who were of lesser rank. He also purposed to include allusions which were the result of his own and his predecessors' researches. It would contain some readings of the 'eight famous imāms' (for al-Baydawi adds Yaḥyā of al-Baṣra to the more normal number of seven readers of the Kur'ān), and would also include readings peculiar to one or other of the recognised readers. The result is a work which has been very popular, and has accordingly been published in many editions. Numerous commentaries have been written on the whole work, or on parts of it. Of these Brockelmann lists 83, after which he published two works which drew attention to places where al-Baydawi has failed to remove al-Zamakhshārī's heresies. Of the many editions of the work mention may be made of that by H. O. Fleischer (Leipzig 1846-8), 2 vols., Indices by W. Fell (Leipzig 1878); and that of Cairo, 1350 A.H., 4 parts in 2 vols., with the commentary of al-Khathīb al-Baghdādī. It would contain some readings of the eight famous imāms for inaccuracy. His most famous work is his commentary on the Kur'ān, Anwār al-tasālil wa-asrār al-ta'wil, which is largely a condensed and amended edition of al-Zamakhsharī's Kāshf al-Dīn. That work, which displays great learning, suffers from Muṭʿalīlīlī views which al-Baydawi has tried to amend, sometimes by refuting them and sometimes by omitting them. But on occasion he has retained them, possibly without fully realising their significance. In his introduction he does not claim to be producing an original work. He says that he had long wished to produce a book which would include the best of what he had learned from leading Companions, learned Followers, and upright men of early days who were of lesser rank. He also purposed to include allusions which were the result of his own and his predecessors' researches. It would contain some readings of the eight famous imāms (for al-Baydawi adds Yaḥyā of al-Baṣra to the more normal number of seven readers of the Kur'ān), and would also include readings peculiar to one or other of the recognised readers. The result is a work which has been very popular, and has accordingly been published in many editions. Numerous commentaries have been written on the whole work, or on parts of it. Of these Brockelmann lists 83, after which he published two works which drew attention to places where al-Baydawi has failed to remove al-Zamakhsharī's heresies. Of the many editions of the work mention may be made of that by H. O. Fleischer (Leipzig 1846-8), 2 vols., Indices by W. Fell (Leipzig 1878); and that of Cairo, 1350 A.H., 4 parts in 2 vols., with the commentary of al-Khathīb al-Baghdādī. It would contain some readings of the eight famous imāms (for al-Baydawi adds Yaḥyā of al-Baṣra to the more normal number of seven readers of the Kur'ān), and would also include readings peculiar to one or other of the recognised readers. The result is a work which has been very popular, and has accordingly been published in many editions. Numerous commentaries have been written on the whole work, or on parts of it. Of these Brockelmann lists 83, after which he published two works which drew attention to places where al-Baydawi has failed to remove al-Zamakhsharī's heresies. Of the many editions of the work mention may be made of that by H. O. Fleischer (Leipzig 1846-8), 2 vols., Indices by W. Fell (Leipzig 1878); and that of Cairo, 1350 A.H., 4 parts in 2 vols., with the commentary of al-Khathīb al-Baghdādī. It would contain some readings of the eight famous imāms (for al-Baydawi adds Yaḥyā of al-Baṣra to the more normal number of seven readers of the Kur'ān), and would also include readings peculiar to one or other of the recognised readers. The result is a work which has been very popular, and has accordingly been published in many editions. Numerous commentaries have been written on the whole work, or on parts of it. Of these Brockelmann lists 83, after which he published two works which drew attention to places where al-Baydawi has failed to remove al-Zamakhsharī's heresies. Of the many editions of the work mention may be made of that by H. O. Fleischer (Leipzig 1846-8), 2 vols., Indices by W. Fell (Leipzig 1878); and that of Cairo, 1350 A.H., 4 parts in 2 vols., with the commentary of al-Khathīb al-Baghdādī. 


AL-BAYDHAK, Abū Bakr b. 'Ali al-Ṣināḥī, author of Memoirs on the beginnings of Almohad history. His name was known only through extracts quoted by Ibn al-Ṭūrīyīn in his K. al-Dīmān, by the anonymous author of al-Fula al-Mawṣīyya, and from various passages in which Ibn al-Ṭātānīn, author of Nasn al-Dīmān, reproduces him. The discovery of the bundle of papers (no. 1919) in the library of the Escorial by L. Édi-Provencal, and their publication in the Documents indits d'histoire almohade, brought al-Baydhak to light, although in a trap-door, from the obscurity in which he lay. We find in his work "the actual Memoirs of the experiences of one who frequently took an active part in the events he sets down and who immediately appears as one of the early Almohads. At the first glance it can be seen that this is no chronicle of the usual type or form. The new information provided on each page and its character of authenticity nearly always enables us, in a remarkable manner, to complete our knowledge of the Almohads in North Africa, which has hitherto been exiguous. The thirty six pages of the manuscript have no lacunae in the text. Unfortunately, however, the beginning is missing and also no title is given. The information we possess on al-Baydhak is limited to what he himself tells us in his work, but this is too vague to serve as the basis for a biography. We find him in the following of the Mahdi, after the latter reached Tunis, and in that of 'Abd al-Mu'mīn, close to their persons and acting as a servant. And it was as such that he recorded in his work merely what he actually saw and heard". An enthusiastic convert, he adds to the facts he relates all such incidents of a supernatural order as serve to confirm the divine mission of Ibn Tūmār and the predestined choice of 'Abd al-Mu'mīn. We do not know whether he came with his master from the East. However, the appellation baydhiḥak, which passed from Persian into Arabic, is still in use among the Berbers of the South for the pawn in the game of chess. The one thing certain is that al-Baydhak's mother tongue was Berber and that he did not know Arabic very well. This is born out by the colloquialisms abounding in his Memoirs, and the Berber phrases appearing in his narrative. Remaining in the background as a faithful and devoted servant without political ambitions, and having served the Mahdi, 'Abd al-Mu'mīn and even Yūsuf I, down to whose time the information he provides extends fragmentarily, he disappears from the Almohad scene as suddenly as he appeared, silently and without fame."
satisfaction for his uncle's death. An uneasy truce was concluded between the cousins; and when hostilities were later resumed it ended without bloodshed in Ghazan’s favour thanks to the address and diplomacy of his general Nawruz and in particular to Ghazan’s having, at Nawruz’s suggestion, adopted Islam and so won the support of the Muslims. Baydawi was defeated by his adherents and met his end in Naḵchīwān (the present-day Nakhichevan in the Azerbaijani S.S.R.) whilst attempting to escape. During his brief reign he is said to have shown special favour to the Christians and so given offence to the Muslims, although according to Bar Hebraeus he was himself a convert to Islam.


(B. WARTHOLD—J. A. BOYLE)

BAYHAKṢ, formerly the name of a district to the west of Nishāpūr in Khurāsān. In Tāhirid times it contained 390 villages with a revenue assessment of some 236,000 dirhams. The chief towns were Sabzawār and Khurasawīrd. It capitulated to a Muslim army under Abū ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmīr in 365/976-7. In 548/1153 it was devastated by Yānālūq. According to Hamd Allah Mustawfi its people were ʿIḥnā ʿAshārī Shīʿīs. Among its famous men were Niẓām al-Mulk, the vizier of Alp Arslān and Malik-shāh, Abū ʿl-ʿAfdī Muhammad b. Husayn Bayhakṣ, the author of the Taʿrīkh-i Bayhakṣ, and Abū ʿAlī Razzāk, the founder of the Sarbadar dynasty. Formerly marble quarries were worked there.

Bibliography: Ibn Funduq, Taʿrīkh-i Bayhakṣ; Mukaddasi, 318, 326; Hamd Allah Mustawfi, Nuṣaḥ, 149-50; Muhammad Hasan Khān, Mirzā al-Buldānī, 1, 327; Dawlatshāhī, 277; Barbier de Meynard, Dictionnaire de la Perse, 130.

(A. K. S. LAMBOTON)

AL-BAYHAKṢ, Abū BARK AL-HĀMID b. AL-HUSAYN B. ṬAʿLĪ. B. MUṢĀ b. KHUṢRAWDĪRĪ, traditionist and Shāfīī faḳh. He studied Tradition with Abū ʿl-Hasan Muhammad b. ʿAlwān, al-Hākim Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muhammad b. Abū ʿAlī, and others. He travelled in many countries in pursuit of this subject and is credited with having had a hundred Shaykhīs. In theology he was an Ashʿarī. He was of a frugal, pious, and scholarly nature. Towards the end of his life he went to Nishābūr where he taught traditions and transmitted his books. Al-Bayhakṣ was a voluminous writer, his writing being said to have reached 1000 fascicules. Although he was a traditionist of some note, he is reputed to have been unequaled with the works of al-Tirmidhī, al-Nasāʾī, and Ibn Mājd; and it is suggested that he had not seen the Musnad of Ahmad b. Ḥanbal. He used al-Hākim’s Mustadrak freely. Al-Bayhakṣ said that his compass in Tradition was not great, but that he was an adept at dealing with it, being versed in the sub-divisions and the men who appear in iṣnād. Among his writings his K. al-suʿān al-kubrā (publ. Ḥaydarābād, 10 vols., 1344-55) is perhaps his most notable work. It has been held in high esteem; for example, al-Ṣubkī declared that there was nothing like it in adjustment, arrangement and excellence. In this work notes are frequently added about the value or otherwise of traditions and traditionists, and attention is often drawn to the fact that particular traditions are included in one or other of the recognised collections.

The Ḥaydarābād edn. has in each vol. a valuable index of men of the first three generations and traditions traced to them, with indications of the nature of the transmission. Another work which was valued is his Nūsūṣ al-Shāfīī. He has been said to have been the first to collect al-Shāfīī’s legal precepts, but al-Ṣubkī denies this, saying he was the last, for this collection included more than earlier efforts, and therefore there was no need to repeat the work. Al-Daghawaynī, ʿAmīn al-Harāmaysī, highly praised his writings in support of Shāfīī’s doctrine. Al-Bayhakṣ was born in 384/994, died in 458/1066 in Nishābūr, and was buried in Khurasawīrd.

Bibliography: M. BAYHAKṢ, Qādir, al-Tālḥ, al-hujjāt, iii, 309 ff.; Subkī, Tahābāt al-Shāfī’īyya al-kubrā, iii, 331 ff.; Ibn Khallikān, No. 27; al-Samānī, f. 102a; Yāḥyā, Mirzā al-dīnān, iii, 81; Ibn al-ʿImād, Shaḥḥārdī al-dhahab, iii, 304; Brockelmann, i, 446 f.; ii, 618 f.; Sarkis, Dict. encyc. de bibl. arabe, 620 f. (J. ROBSON)

BAYHAKṢ, Abu ʿl-ʿAfdī Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn KĀṬĪB (in Persian: Dābīr), famous Persian historian of the 5th/11th century, born in 385/995 at the village of Hārīshbād in the district of Bayhakṣ (today the district of Sabzawār in Khurāsān). At an early age he went to study at Nishābūr, then an important centre of learning. He soon entered the chancellery of the Ghaznawid rulers at Ghaznī, with the function of secretary, in this city he spent most of his life. He was at first the assistant of the celebrated writer Abū Nasr Ṭuḥrī, director of this chancellery, and was charged with drafting and making copies of the most important officials papers dispatched by Māmūd the Ghaznawī (389-421/999-1030) and his son and successor Māmūd (421-33/1030-41); during the latter’s reign his first master died, in 431/1039, and was replaced by Abū Saḥl Zāzānī, with whom he was not always on good terms. During the reign of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (440-45/1049-51), he was appointed director of the chancellery, but was dismissed after a short time. At the king’s order, a Turkish slave named Nūyān confiscated all his property, and he was imprisoned on the pretext that he had not settled his wife’s dowry. He remained in judicial imprisonment until the usurper Ṭuḥrīl Birār occupied the throne in 443/1051 and imprisoned him in a fortress with other courtiers held in custody. After his release, he did not seek employment at court after the year 451/1059, and he died in the month of Ṣafar 470/2 August-21 September 1077. Bayhakṣ is the author of a voluminous history of the Ghaznawī dynasty, written in an archaic and sometimes complicated style. He states that he commenced his history with the year 409/1018-19, but a large part of the work has long been lost, and the only traces of it are found in the borrowings of other Persian historians—the last of whom lived in the 9th/15th century. This work, which comprised 30 volumes, has been variously entitled by different authors: Dāmī al-Tawārīkh; Dāmīt Taʿrīkh-i Sabuktān; Taʾrīkh-i Āli Maḥmūd, Taʾrīkh-i Nāṣiri, and Taʾrīkh-i Āli Sabuktān. It is almost certain, however, that the different volumes referring to each ruler would have borne different titles. Thus the whole collection of 30 volumes would have had a general title of Dāmī al-Tawārīkh or Taʾrīkh-i Āli-i Sabuktān; the first part, relating to Sabuktān, would have been entitled Taʾrīkh-i Nāṣiri, the second part, relating to Maḥmūd, that of Taʾrīkh-i Yāmīn or Maḥmūd-i Maḥmūdī, the third part, of which the most important portions have come down to us,
would have had the title of *Ta'rikh-i Mas'udi*, while the title of the final part or parts must remain a subject for conjecture. The part which has come down to us comprises volumes 5 to 10; volumes 11 to 30 are lost. As regards the six volumes which we possess (5 to 10), which are usually known as *Ta'rikh-i Bayhaki*, and which ought rather to be called *Ta'rikh-i Mas'udi*, the title which I have given them in my edition, there are certain noticeable lacunae in the sequence of events, which indicates that a portion of these volumes has also been lost. Volumes 11 to 30 must have covered the end of the reign of Mas'ud and the reigns of his successors up to the beginning of the reign of Ibrāhīm in 451/1059, that is to say, the reigns of Mawdūd, Mas'ud II, Abu 'l-Ḥasan 'Allā, Ābd al-Raḥšīd and Farrukhzād, which extend over 19 years in all from 432/1040 to 451/1059. The known MSS. of the part which has come down to us close with the events of the year 451/1040, and the last year of the reign of Mas'ud is missing. It can easily be seen that this part was written later, doubtless from notes made at the time, because the author five times gives us the date 451/1059 for the composition of certain passages. On one of the occasions on which he mentions this date, he states that he has been in the service of the Ghaznawids for twenty years, which proves that he entered their service in 431/1040 at the age of 46. Consequently 451/1059 was the year in which he began to write up his notes, which covered a period of 42 years from 409/1018 to 451/1059. He states that events prior to 409/1018 had been related by his predecessor the historian Maḥmūd Warrāš, whose work is lost. The end of chapter ten of the *Ta'rikh-i Mas'udi* which has survived includes a portion of a chronicle on Khwārizm written in Persian by the great savant Abu 'l-Ḥayān al-Bīrūnī (lit. [362/440/972-1048]) under the title of *al-Musadda fi Aḥbār Khwārizm*, which is incomplete and of which no other version exists. Bayhaki seems to have written other works, one of which bore the title of *Makāmāt-i Abū Nasr-i Muḥkām* a collection of reminiscences which had been related to him by his first master in the Ghaznavid chancery. Some fragments of this work have been quoted by modern authors. Another work, quoted by the author of the History of Bayhak, bore a title which can be read either as *Ruhat al-Kutūb* or *Zināt al-Kutūb* and seems to have been a manual of literary style as is indicated by its title. The fragments of the *Ta'rikh-i Nāṣīrī* which have come down to us were incorporated in the *Dhāriَāt al-Khūṣūṣ wa Lāmināt al-Rawāyāt* of Muhammad ʿAwwī (two recent incomplete Tehran editions), the *Tabākāt-i Nāṣīrī* of Minhādī al-Dīn b. Ṣiraḍī al-Dīn al-Durjānī (editions: Calcutta and Kabul-Lahore), and the *Madāmaj al-Ansāb* of Muḥammad b. ʿAllā Shabānkārī (MSS.). The surviving portion of the *Ta'rikh-i Yaminī* is incorporated in this last-named work, and the surviving portion of the final part of the *Ta'rikh-i Mas'udi*, which we possess, is quoted by ʿAwwī. The passages from the *Makāmāt-i Abū Nasr-i Muḥkām* are quoted by ʿAwwī and by Sayf al-Dīn ʿAkkī in his work on the lives of the *ustārūs* entitled *Āṭhār al-Wuzarāʾ* (MSS.). The famous historian Ḥāfīz Abrū has also reproduced certain passages from the lost portions in his own monumental history. The author of the History of Bayhak states that the *Diāmāt-i al-Taṣawirīkh* comprised more than 30 volumes; of these he had seen only a few in the library of the Khwārazmī, certain others in "Māhī-i 'Irāk" library and still others in the possession of various people. This proves that a large part of Bayhakī's chronicle had disappeared within a short time after its composition, since already in the 6th/12th century this author did not have access to all the volumes. Only ʿAwwī (6th/12th century) Minhādī al-Dīn (7th/13th century) Ṣhabānkārī (8th/14th century), and Ḥāfīz Abrū (9th/15th century) had at their disposal certain—perhaps fragmentary—portions of the work. The *Makāmāt-i Abū Nasr-i Muḥkām* was consulted by ʿAkkī in the 9th/15th century, but no one has mentioned his work on the epistolary art except the author of the History of Bayhak. The MSS. of the *Ta'rikh-i Mas'udi* so far known nearly all come from India and indicate a common source.


(Said Naficy)

**Al-Bayhaki, Zāhir al-Dīn Abū 'l-Ḥasan 'Ali b. Zayd b. Fundūk,** Persian author, born at Sabzavār, the administrative centre (kasaba) of the district of Bayhak (W. of Naysābūr in Khurāsān) in 493/1100. The date 499/1106 in Yakūt (Iṣrāḥād, v. 208), though cited from Bayhakī's autobiography (see below), has been shown to be wrong by M. Kāzwīnī. Of his numerous works (more than 70 titles on an encyclopaedic range of subjects listed in Yakūt) the best known are a history in Persian of his native district, *Ta'rikh-i Bayhak* (to be distinguished from the *Ta'rikh-i Bayhak* of Abu 'l-Fadl al-Bayhakī [see preceding article]), and an Arabic supplement (lāsimma) to the biographical *Ṣawāna al-biḥma* of Abū Sulaymān al-Sulaymānī. The *Ta'rikh-i Bayhak* was translated into Persian probably about 730/1330. It has been edited together with the Persian version by M. ʿṢaffī (Lahore 1935), and under the title *Ta'rikh Ḫūmādāt al-Islām* by M. Kurd ʿAllī (Damascus 1946). The *Ta'rikh-i Bayhak* though scarcely very original (it is based, the author tells us, on an earlier history of Bayhak, as well as on a 12-volume *History of Naysābūr* by al-Ḥākim Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh), is full of interest. The contents have been analysed by Rice (Supplement to the Catalogue of Persian MSS. in the British Museum, 60 ff.), and there is an edition by A. Bahmanyār (Tehran 1317/1936), with an important introduction by M. Kāzwīnī. The family of Bayhakī, which had been distinguished for several generations previous to his time, called themselves Ḫākimīn from an ancestor, al-Ḥākim Fundūk (*Ta'rikh-i Bayhak*, 102), and traced their descent back to a Companion of Muḥammad, Dhu ’l-Šahādatayn Ḫurayzām b. Ṭāḥītī. Bayhakī also claimed relationship with Ṭabarī, the historian (*Ta'rikh-i B. yahak*, 19). It appears from his autobiography, given in his last historical work *Maḏṣūrāt al-Taḏāsīr* wa-Ṣawāna al-Ghanīrī (or Maḏṣūrāt al-Taḏāsīr ft 'l-Tawārīkh) and taken over by Yākūt, that he had his higher education at Naysābūr and
Marw, and that his career was mostly in Khurāsān. For a short time (526/1132) he was frddi of Bayhaḵ, probably owing to the influence of his father-in-law, Muḥammad b. Masʿūd, a former governor of Rāyy, then mukhrif al-mamlakah, but he found his duties irksome and soon resigned. A short time later we find him studying algebra and astrology in Rāyy (Iṣrāḏād, v, 210). The autobiography comes down to 549/1154-55, when Bayhaḵ was in Nāṣābūr. Nothing is there said of a visit which he paid with his father to Ṣultan-i Ḫayyām in 507/1113-14 (Ṭadżīm-i Ṣīwān, ed. A. Bahmanyar, Tehran 1317/1938; and Ṣāb Ṣāb, where Djuwaynī says incorrectly that it was a sequel to the Ṣīwāni, i.e., approximately A.D. 1020-1165 or nearly 150 years, and was intended as a sequel to the Taʿrīḵ-i Yamīnī of ʿUthīb (Ṭaʿrīḵ-i Bayhaḵ, 20). Yāḵūt quotes the work elsewhere, e.g., Iṣrāḏād, v, 124. It is quoted also by Ibn al-ʿAḏīr (xi, 247-49, cf. 253) for the career of Sultan Shāh of Khwārizm, and by Duwaysī (Ṭaʿrīḵ-i ʿUthīb, ed. A. Boyle, 190 ff. = Boyle, 293 ff. with the passage in Ibn al-ʿAḏīr mentioned above). The Mašdrīb al-Taḏdrīb is referred to by Bayhaḵ himself (Ṭadžīmān, 168) for an account of the contemporary poet Rāshīd al-Dīn Wāṭāwī, and is also cited by Ibn Abī Usaybīʿa (Taβāḳāt al-ʿAṯībīa, i, 72) for the date of Djalānūn (Galen), and by some other authors, the latest of whom appears to have been Hamd Allāh Mustawfī (8th/14th century). Bayhaḵ himself died in 565/1170 according to Yāḵūt.

Some portions of Bayhaḵ’s poetical anthology Wisḵāh al-Dumyaḵ, a continuation of the Dūmāyat al-Kasr of Bāḵ_passwd and including specimens of his own poetry in Arabic, are known. See Brockelmann, and H. Ritter, ‘Philologika XIII,’ no. 173 (Orients, Vol. 3, 1950, 77). There was also a supplement entitled Durrat al-Wisḵāh (Iṣrāḏād, v, 212).

A work on judicial astrology by Bayhaḵī in Persian, Pādavān al-Aḵbām, is preserved in Cambridge University Library (E. G. Browne, Handlist of Muḥammadan Manuscripts, 235), and a companion of this work at one time existed (ibid., 254).


(D. M. Dunlop)


BAYḤĀN (Bāḥān), wādī and territory in South Arabia, situated between Wāḍī Ḥarīb (q.v.) in the west, and Wāḍī Māḥliḵ (with the high plateau of the Ṣiṣīyān) in the east (cf. art. ʿAḏīrḵāl). This long valley, stretching from the Kawr ʿAwdhilla (cf. art. ʿAḏīrḵāl) ca. 100 km. (65 miles) northward, until its dry “delta” disappears in the desert Ramlat Sabatayn, was once the centre of the ancient state of Ḵatābān (q.v.). Thanks to the American expedition in 1950 the main part of Bayḥān now is by far the best known of all South Arabian districts.

In Ṣabaeān inscriptions BYḤN only means a tribe (Ḍḥū Bayḥān) or a temple. This fact does not seem to favour the etymology of Landberg (Arabic, v, 4) “common pasture land” (opp. kīma). From Ṣabaeān texts we know of another Bayḥān, a place situated in the Dūḡ (Ryckmans, i, 324; Grohmann, i, 174; v. Wissmann a. Höhner 15, 77). According to the ʿṢif of Ḥamānī, Bayḥān was irrigated from Ṣabān and Ḥaḡ, but got its drinking water from Wāḍī Ṣuḏār. The inhabitants belonged for the most part to Banū Murād, whose leader of Āl Ṣakhrān enjoyed a high reputation in the tribe of Madḥīḏ. Yāḵūt has Bayḥān in his list of South Arabian districts (mīḏāf).

There are three Bayḥān districts to be distinguished:

(1) Bayḥān al-Dawla (Bayḥān al-ʿAḏīr) is the narrow, barren and sparsely populated upper part of the valley, from its beginning unto Nāṭī on the frontier of Bayḥān al-Ḵaṣāb. Like the territory of the Banyār (q.v.) it formerly formed part of the Raṣṣās sultanate, but now belongs to the state of Ṣaman. The climate is unhealthy, owing to the stagnant waters of the Ṣāḥyi. The capital al-Bayḥān (q.v.) is in the S.

(2) Bayḥān al-Ḵaṣāb, the fertile central part of the valley. (See the following art.)

(3) Bayḥān al-Asfāl, the remaining, northern part of the wādī, is a sparsely populated plain, gradually turning into the wide sand desert. Its four districts (Ḥinw, al-Ṣḥatt, Ḥaḵba, ʿĀṣayyān) were dominated by descendants of the Prophet—the two first-mentioned by sayyids, the last two by Ṣabbaʿ. Hence the denomination Bilād al-Ṣai’dān-il-Ṣādān (Abū Ṣaʿdān) for the whole country. The capital is Ṣuḵb, with a landing-ground for aircraft. Numerous Bedouins also live here, mostly belonging to Bal Ḥarīṯ; this tribe also controls the important salt-mines of Ayāḏīn far out in the desert.

In antiquity this whole area was more intensely cultivated, thanks to the aqueducts, and for centuries the kingdom of Ḵatābān had its centre here, along the incense road, between Ṣabwā (q.v.) and Mārib (q.v.). Special interest is attached to the tell Ḥadjiya Ṭuḥlān a little S-W of ʿĀṣayyān. As already Rhodokanakis had inferred from the inscriptions, this is the place of ancient Timna(Tumma) (q.v.), the capital of Ṣabān (Phylai: Thomna). Thanks to the finds made here in 1950, esp. of Roman Arretine ware, its final destruction by fire can be fixed to ca. 10 A.D. The excavation of two palaces (YFSH and HDTH) has yielded a lot of inscriptions, a bronze statue of princess BRT and two fine bronze lions of Hellenistic type, with infant riders. At Ḥadjiya ʿAḵl the cemetery of Timna was found and partly investigated. Antique ruins also were found further to the south, at Ḥuṣn al-Ḥadjiya and Ḥaḡār bin ʿUmayyid. Here, at the junction of Wāḍī Bayḥān and Wāḍī Māḥliḵ, a huge cross-section of the stratified mound was made, which allowed to establish a pottery sequence back to ca. 1000 B.C., when
Bayhan — Baykara


Bayhan al-Kasab forms the central part of the Wadi Bayhan (see the preceding art.). Lying between Bayhan al-Dawla (S) and Bayhan al-Asfal (N). It includes also W. Khirr which starts in the south, to the west of W. Bayhan, until it meets the latter near the town of al-Kasab. Bayhan al-Kasab, together with Bayhan al-Asfal, now forms the Independent Territory of Bayhan in the Western Aden Protectorate. The Territory's boundaries in the S-W and N-W are a part of the 'status quo line' of 1934 between Yaman and the Protectorate. The other boundaries are, in the E the Upper 'Awallaki mountains, in the N-E the Kurab tribes and the fringes of the Empty Quarter (al-Rub' al-Khali). Bayhan al-Kasab (6,000 inhabitants) is rich in subterranean waters often found at the depth of a few yards; there are well over two hundred wells in operation and the irrigation system is adequate. Rainfall is not regular and sometimes there may be no rainfall for a number of years. The region is rich with palm and 'sib' tree groves and other kinds of vegetation. The main products and crops are dates, mahûb, figs, grapes, wheat, barley, millet, dukkan, sesame, indigo and cotton. There is good pasture land for sheep and goats and the region is famous for a breed of camels. The inhabitants form the tribe of al-Musababayn, who, have, as is evident from the dual form of the name, two main branches: Al Ahmad and Al 'Arrif. They are settled in a great number of villages. The main town is al-Kasab, also called Hisn 'Abd Allah, which is the main trading centre of the area and an important seat of administration. There is a landing ground and a wireless station at al-Kasab.

The Ashraf and Sayyids form no tribal group. They had always had the support of the Bal Hārith of Bayhan al-Asfal and of one section of al-Musababayn, the Al Ahmad, when Shafir Ahmad b. Mulshin signed a treaty with the British in 1903. The subsequent development in the internal situation of the area and the security requirements in face of the claims of Yemen and to the allegiance of the population led to the consolidation of the authority of the 'Treaty Chief', with the help of the Protectorate British authorities, over the whole territory and the tribes of W. Bayhan. In 1944 the Regent of the then minor Sharif of Bayhan entered into an agreement with the British by which he undertook to accept advice on the administration of his country and the expenditure of his revenues. The Sharif's capital is al-Nukûb, where there is a landing ground. Recently the Mus'ababayn have been treated as semi-independent and were given a minor agreement for the protection of a landing ground. There is one 'ashcha court and one Common Law ('urf) court and two elementary schools for boys, in Bayhan.

Baykara, a prince of the Oghuz (Türkmen) tribes, the Ak-Koyunlu founders of the dynasty called by the same name, are a clan of this tribe, and some historians call the Ak-Koyunlu dynasty 'Bayindir Khân Oghlanlar' or 'Al-i Bayindirîyye', and the Ak-Koyunlu state 'Dewlet-i Bayindirîyye'. It is possible that the Bayindir took part in the Saljuq conquest of Anatolia. There were many places in central and western Turkey called after them in the 9th/15th and 10th/16th centuries. No doubt most of these belonged to the Bayindir who took part in the conquest of Anatolia. We find Bayindir among the Turkmen in Syria in the 8th/14th century. The Ak-Koyunlu clan of this tribe was engaged in political activity in the Diyarbakr region in the same century. The most important Bayindir clan in the 10th/16th century was in the Tarsus region, and was engaged in agriculture. There were other Bayindir clans in the Tripoli and Aleppo regions of Syria, and in the Yemen, south of Sivas. The Bayindir of Aleppo were called by the Ottoman government to take part in the expedition against Austria in 1690. A Bayindir clan lived in the Astarabad region among the Göklen Turkmen. Members of the Ak-Koyunlu dynasty believed themselves to be descended from Bayindir, ancestor of the Bayindir tribe, and used its mark on their coins, monuments and edicts. Bayindir was also used in the past as a personal name in Turkey and Iran.

Bibliography: Faruk Sümer, Bayindir, Peştek ve Yüreğirler, in Dil ve Tarik-Cografya Fuhulesi Dergisi, X/2-4, 317-22. (Faruk Sümer)

Baykara, a prince of the house of Timur, grandson of its founder. He was 12 years old at the death of his grandfather (Sha'bân 807/February 1405) so he must have been born about 795/1392-3. His father 'Umar Shâh had predeceased Timur. Baykara is celebrated by Dawlat-Shâh (ed. Browne, 374) for his beauty as a second Joseph and for his courage as a second Rustam; he was prince of Balkh for a long period. In the year 817/1414 he was granted Luristan, Hamadân, Nîhâwand and Burûdjîr by Shâh Rukh; in the following year he rebelled against his brother Iskandar and seized Shîrûz but was afterwards overcome by Shâh Rukh. Pardon ed and allowed to go to Prince Kaydû at Kandahar and Garmûr, he stirred up a rebellion there too, and was seized by Kaydû in 819 (1416-7). Shâh Rukh pardoned him again and sent him to India; nothing further is known of him. This account, which is based on Hâfir-i Abrû, does not agree with
what Dawlat-Shah tells us; according to the latter (loc. cit.) he went of his own accord from Makran to Shahr Roogh, was sent by him to Samarkand and there put to death at the instigation of Ulugh-Beg; according to other accounts he was put to death at the court of Shahr Roogh himself (in Harat). The year 819 is given by other authorities also as the year of Baykara’s death. According to Bâbur (ed. Beveridge, f. 163 b.) the name Baykara was also borne by a grandson of this prince, the elder brother of Sultan Husayn; this second Baykara was for many years Governor of Balkh.


**BAYLAKÂN,** an ancient town in Arrân (Albania) S. of the Caucasus, said to have been founded by the Sândîn Kûshâtî. Baylanak was the scene of incidents in the second Arab-Khazar war, and in 112/730 the Muslim general Sabûd b. Qamar al-Harîshî won an important victory there over the Khaṣârs.


**AL-BAYLAMÂN** [see *MADJLIS*].

**BAYLAN (BELEN),** a village situated in the Amâna mountains (Elma-Daghî) on the main line of communication from Iskenderun (Alexandretta) eastwards into northern Syria. The site seems to have had no great importance during the earlier centuries of Muslim rule, the chief town in this local area being then Baghrâs (Bâkhrâzî). The neighbouring pass of Baylan, i.e., the ancient Sûrîâ Pîlûol or ’Ama’inâ Pîlûol, was included in the *sawârîm* of northern Syria. It has received various names during the long period of Muslim domination, e.g., *abûal-malîd* (Balâdhurî), *ma’dîk Bâghrâs, bâb-i Iskandarîn* (cf. IA, s.v. Belen), and Baghrâs beli (Hâjiqî Khaţîîa). According to a *sâ’nâmê* for the vilayet of Haleb (Aleppo) dated 1320/1902-1903, the Ottoman sultan Sulaymân Kânûnî built a mosque, a *bâhîn* and baths at Baylan in 960/1552-1553. The same source also notes that the population of Baylan was increased in 1183/1770-1770 through the efforts of *’Abd al-Rahmân Paşha*, then in charge of the *sandjaq* of Adana. At the pass of Baylan in July 1832 the Ottomans suffered defeat in battle against the Egyptian forces under the command of İbrahim Paşâ—an event which has been given as an explanation of the fact that the pass is sometimes called locally Top-Yolu or Top-Boghârî (cf. EI’, s.v. Belan and IA, s.v. Belen). A number of derivations have been advanced in order to elucidate the name Baylan-Belen, e.g., that it comes from the Greek *Pîlûol,* from the Turkish bel or beyî (a depression in a mountain ridge), or from beyî, bil (a road high between two hills) used in the Arabic dual form (cf. EI’, s.v. Belan and IA, s.v. Belen). Ewliyâ Celebi notes that beyî meant in the language of the Turcomans a steep ascent. Baylân, which was, under Ottoman rule, the centre of a *bâdî* in the *eydlet* of Haleb, is now a *nâšîye* dependent on the *kaza* of Iskenderun in the vilayet of Hatay. Its population amounted in 1940 to 1,153 inhabitants, the figure for the entire *nâšîye* being 5,373 people. Cereals, fruit, silk and wines are among the more notable products of the region.


(V. J. PARRY)

**BAYNÛN,** ancient South Arabian castle and town, one of the famous Yamanite strongholds (ma’âdîfî) enumerated by Hamdânî (Şînî, 203), who gives its description in the *i ket*, book VII (ed. Müller, 41, 86 f.; Kirmîli, 66 f.; Faris, 54 f.). In legend Baynûn is said to have been built for Solomon by the qimn, just as Ghanûn (GHANDN) and Sahîn (SLHN), the castles of Şan’a and Mârib (see these articles). Baynûn is located by Hamdânî in the territory of ‘Ans (b. Madhîgî), facing the *barra* of Kawmân (six hours’ journey NNW of mount Isblî). Its ruins are at the modern village, where Qasim found ten inscriptions. Baynûn was famous for its two tunnels, cut through the rock. The Himyaritic king As’ad Tubbâ’ (= Ablkarîb As’ad, ca. 385-420 A.D.) resided here and in Şafî (q.v.) alternatively. Baynûn was destroyed, along with Ghanûn and Sahîn, by the Abyssinians under the command of Artîq, ca. 525 A.D. Bainoyun on the map of Toleomy (8° 30'14° 15') must be sought in Ḥadramawt (Wâlî Dawân) [q.v.], but this may be an error for Kaynûn.


**BAYRAK** [see *ALAM*].

**BAYRAKDAR,** a Turco-Persian term, meaning ‘standard-bearer’, applied under the Ottoman régime to various officers of both the ‘feudal’ and the ‘standing’ army and to certain hereditary chieftains of Albania. In the feudal army the alay-beyi of a each province had a baykât, an adjutant, and in the standing army one of the officers of each bûluk of the cavalry and each orta of the Janissaries.
was its standard-bearer, called usually bayrakdar, but also, synonymously, 'alamdar (‘alam being the Arabic equivalent of the Turkish bayrak, ‘flag’). The sultan’s own standard-bearer was a high official of the palace service, one of the “Albas of the Stirrup”, but he was usually called, not bayrakdar, but Mir ‘Alem (for Amir al-‘alem). Under most of the earlier Turkish Muslim régimes the ruler likewise confided the care of his personal standard to an officer of high rank, who was known either by this title, or by another similar import such as Sandjabdar.

Bibliography: IA, art Bayram (Kapprkl) Bib. & Bowen, Islamic Society and the West, i, part r, index.

BAYRAKDAR MUSTAFĂ PASJA [see MUSTAFĂ PASJA BAYRARDAR].

BAYRAM [see ‘Ar].

BAYRAM ‘ALLI, place on the Trans-Caspian Railway, 407 m. (57 km.) to the east of Marw, with a Persian population, now in the Marw (Mary) district of the Turkmen SSR, situated close by the oasis of Old Marw which was created by the Murghab [q.v.] and existed until the 18th century. Its ruins cover an area of some 50 sq. km. In the 19th century the region became part of the emperor’s personal domain, which existed until 1917. Today there is an agricultural research station and an agricultural technical school in Bayram ‘Alli. There are vineyards and orchards, and both silk worms and karakul sheep are bred.

Bibliography: Brockhaus-Yefron, Enciklopedicheskzy Slovar’ 4 (II A) (1891), 722; Bolshaya Sovetskaya Enciklopediia IV (1950), 54.

(B. Spuler)

BAYRAM ‘ALI KHAN, prince of Marw 1197-1200/1753-1766, a member of the ruling branch of the house of Kâğıdr which ruled there from the time of ‘Abbas I [q.v.]. In his own day, he was renowned as a valiant warrior. During a war against Murad-Bi (Shâh Ma’sûm) of Bukhârâ, he was ambushed and killed. His second son, Muhammad Karîm, succeeded him in Marw; his eldest son, Muhammad Husayn, dedicated his life to learning in Mashhad, and was regarded as the “Plato of his day” (Afżîlîn-i Wâdîl). Bibliography: Mir ‘Abd al-Karîm Bukhârî, istorie de l’Empire Ottoman (text) ed. Schefer, i (trans.) 157 f.; V. Žukovskiy, Razvalini Starago Merv (The Ruins of Old Marw), St. Petersburg 1894, 83 f.

(W. Barthold-B. Spuler)

MUHAMMAD BAYRAM KHAN, KHANA-KHANAN (Amir al-Umarî), affectionately and respectfully addressed by the emperor Akbar [q.v.] as Khan Bâbâ or Bâbâ-am ([My] Good Old Man!) during the latter’s minority, was a Turkoman of the Baharlu tribe, a branch of the Karî Koyunlu, which played a leading rôle in Diyar Bakr after the death of Malik Shâh Saljûq [q.v.]. ‘All Shukr Bég, one of the ancestors of Bayram Khan, whose sons served Abû Sa’îd Mirzâ, and after his defeat by Uzun Hasan in 837/1433-4, Ma’mûd Mirzâ, his son (Bâbûr-nâma, transl. A. S. Beveridge, i, 46), held large estates in Hamadhân, Dinawar and Kurdistan. The family to which Bayram Khan belonged had always been in the service of kings and princes; his grand-father Yâr ‘All Bég Balîlî, who had settled in Badakhshân, was a servant of Bâbûr (Bâbûr-nâma transl. A. S. Beveridge, i, 91, 189). His father, Sayî ‘All Bég, was, according to Firuzoga (Bombay ed. 250), governor of Ghazna and on the death of Bâbûr had entered the service of Humâyûn.

Bayram Khan was born in Badakhshân (according to some at Ghazna, which is most probable) but lost his father at a very early age. He then migrated to Bâlîh where he received his education, which later events prove to have been sound and thorough. A widely-read man, well-groomed in Court manners, he joined, at the age of 16, the service of Humâyûn, who had been appointed governor of Badakhshân by his father in 936/1529. At that time Humâyûn happened to be in Kâbul. He accompanied him to India and participated in the disastrous battles of Câwâs (946/1539) and Kannawad (947/1540) which resulted in the complete rout of Humâyûn’s troops. Finding the enemy in hot pursuit he took refuge with the sâmilinâr of Sambhâl which Humâyûn held as a sâmilinâr chief who asked him either to join his ranks or leave Sambhâl. Bayram Khan refused to cross over and fled towards Gujârât. A clever ruse played by his companion, Mir Abu ‘l-Kâsin, who at that time was the commandant of Gwâlor, saved him from disgrace and sure capture. Abu ‘l-Kâsin, however, lost his life in the bargain. Bayram succeeded in reaching the Court of Sultân Ma’mûd of Gujârât, who not only offered him protection but also took him into his service. He, however, bided his time and, on the pretext of going on a pilgrimage to Mecca, was allowed to proceed to Sûrat. Availing himself of this opportunity he turned towards Râjgîptûnâ and crossing the desert of Sind, joined his master, Humâyûn, at the township of Dîjân (950/1543), now in ruins, when the fugitive emperor was making desperate efforts to regain his lost throne. Bayram was with him when he went to Kandâhâr (950/1543) to seek help from his brother Mirzâ ‘Askarlî, and witnessed the rude and churlish behaviour of Tardi Bég when this nobleman was asked to lend his horse to the deposed emperor for the use of his wife, Hamûda Bânû Bêgam, mother of the infant Akbar, at the time of their flight from the inhospitable city.

At the Court of Shah Tahmâsp of Iran, whose help was sought in men, money and material Humâyûn was forced to seek to regain his lost crown, Bayram demonstrated unflinching loyalty towards his ill-starred master by politely refusing to accept the service of the Shâh, who was impressed by his gallantry and family connexions. During his Indian campaigns Bayram won many battles for Humâyûn, as commander-in-chief of the Imperial army (961/1554), crowning his series of successes with the crushing defeat inflicted on Şikandar Sûr at Mâchhûwâra, near Sirhind, in 963/1555. Contrary to what had been the practice so far, Bayram Khan ordered that the women and children of the vanquished Afghans should neither be molested nor enslaved, as both the acts were un-Islamic. This victory decided the future of Humâyûn who was now reassured of the throne of Hindustân and owed his restoration, to a large extent to the loyalty and devotion of Bayram Khan, who was appointed in 962/1555, apparently as a token of appreciation of his meritorious services, as the official guardian (alâdit) to young Akbar, then 13 years of age, and given the official title of Khan Bâbâ. Thereafter Bayram accompanied his ward to the Pandjâb, of which Khan Akbar had been appointed the governor. When the news of Humâyûn’s accidental death (1556) reached Pandjâb, Bayram was at Kalânawar (Dist. Gurdaspur, India) engaged in mopping-up operations against the remnants of Şikandar Sûr’s defeated army. He again saw the hard situation, and without loss of time proclaimed Akbar as the emperor, arranging his coronation on
an improvised brick-throne, still extant at Kalanaw.

Soon after wards Himu, originally a Sūr troop, attacked Delhi, and Tārdī Bēg, the Mughal governor, fled from the city without offering the feebile resistance. Bayram, who was now all-powerful, ordered the execution of Tārdī Bēg, apparently as a lesson to others but most probably to avenge the insult which that officer had had the audacity to offer to Humāyūn in the hour of his distress when he was fleeing from Kandahār. Fīrūghtā justifies this murder, although on purely political grounds. In 964/1556, when Himu clashed with the Imperial forces at the battle-field of Pānpat, Bayram scored a clear victory and, with the tacit approval of the monarch, killed the wounded general. Bayram has been adversely criticised for this callousness towards a fallen foe, but it should not be forgotten that in despotic monarchies, decapitation was the order of the day, especially in the case of rebels, rivals to the throne or State enemies; an example is the execution by Awrangzib of Dārā Shukhūb, whose head was publicly exhibited in Āgra. Further, it was idle to expect any mercy from Bayram towards a low-caste upset who nurtured the ambition of wearing the crown, and who had had the audacity to oppose the Emperor in person. With the defeat of Himu and the break-up of the Afghan army, the crown of Hindūstān fell into the lap of Akbar like a ripe apple. Bayram was now at the height of his power and practically ruled the empire in the name of his ward. Akbar, however, had begun to show signs of resentment towards the Protector, who interfered in his boyish pleasures and desired him to maintain a princely demeanour. His marriage in 965/1557 to Salīma Sultan Bēgum, a cousin of Akbar and the daughter of Humāyūn’s sister, Gulrukh formally introduced Bayram into the royal family, thus adding to his prestige and personal glory. This marriage was celebrated with great pomp and show at Dijullund (Dījamāndh), on (g.v.), his way back from Māṅkot (now Rāmkot, in Dījamāndh), where earlier in the same year Bayram, in a joint command with Akbar, had compelled Sīkandar Sūr to surrender after a long siege. Prior to this marriage to Salīma, which was purely of a political character, he had been married to the daughter of Dījamā Khan, a Mēwāt chieftain, who gave birth to Mirza ‘Abd al-Rahim Khan, Khan-i Khānān (g.v.), only four years before his death. The Mēwāt territory, which was Tārdī Bēg’s assign- ment, had already been conferred by Bayram on one of his confidential servants, Mullā Pīr Muḥammad Shīrwānī.

Bayram committed a tactical mistake in appointing Shāykh Gādāl Kāmbōh of Delhi, a bigoted Shīfī, as saḥūr al-ṣudūr in 966/1558-9. This caused great resentment among the people and the Tārānī nobles, who were almost all of them Sunnīs, and al-Badā‘ūnī (Eng. trans. ii, 22-4) makes it the peg on which to hang his ‘most bitter gibes and venomous puns’. This, coupled with his other indiscreet acts, such as the elevation to State offices of members of the Shīfī sect, the execution of Tārdī Bēg of the Sunnī persuasion, the non-allocation of the privy purse to the Emperor, whose needs were fast multiplying with his increasing years, the meagre allowances for the royal household, and his own arrogant behaviour and over-estimation of his services, brought about a change in Akbar’s attitude towards the Protector and he began to look for an opportunity to throw off the trammels of tutelage. Māhmūn Anāqa, Akbar’s wet-nurse, who, at the head of a small but powerful Palace clique, had been secretly striving to compass Bayram’s ruin, played no mean a rôle in estranging the ward from the guardian. Bayram realising that the scales were weighted against him, decided to clinch the issue by force of arms, and, on the pretext of leaving for Mecca, came to Dijullund with the intention of taking it, after lodging his family in the fort of Bhattinda. He was defeated in a pitched battle by the Emperor’s forces and was made to return the insignia of office. Deprived both of his office and the title of Khan-i Khānān, now conferred on Munīr Khan, Bayram saw no way out but humbly to submit, and was pardoned by Akbar. Dejected, disappointed, and fallen from grace, Bayram, in fulfilment of his earlier intention, set off for Mecca, but was treacherously murdered by a vengeful Afghan enemy, Muḥārrak Khan Lūhānī, whose father had been killed in the battle of Māchīwārā (969/ 1565) Bayram was killed while encamped at Patan (Anhibāwā), on 14 Dijumādā I 968/31 January 1561. His camp was plundered and his family, including the 4-year old Mirzā ‘Abd al-Raḥīm Khan, reached Ahmadābād almost penniless. The commandant of Patan, Mūsā Khan Pūlādī, who had hospitably received Bayram Khan, did not even give the dead hero, formerly so wealthy, a decent burial. Some poor and God-fearing people buried the former Khan-i Khānān, whose dead body, in accordance with his wishes, was transferred in 971/1563-4 to Mashhad from Delhi, where it had been brought from Patan for a temporary and modest burial. Now he lies buried in a high-domed tomb in the vicinity of the mausoleum of Imām Mūsā al-Riḍā.

An accomplished scholar, a good poet in Turki and Persian, a connoisseur of art, a liberal but orthodox Shīfī, Bayram Khan was a truly great man who patronised the ‘ulamā? and men of letters, no less than poets, artists, musicians, singers and craftsmen. He has received a generous tribute from even a carping critic like al-Badā‘ūnī for his qualities of head and heart. His divān was published at Calcutta in 1910.

Akbar, who like his father owed his throne to Bayram Khan, tried to atone for his ingratitude by bringing up Mirzā ‘Abd al-Raḥīm Khan, his orphaned son (who later on became Khan-i Khānān and is better known to history than his father) and by marrying Salīma Sultan Bēgum, his widow. If the execution of Tārdī Bēg is a stain on the good name of Bayram Khan, his undignified dismissal by Akbar is no less a blot on the escutcheon of the ‘Great Mogul’.

MUHAMMAD BAYRAM KHAN — BAYROT 1137

having been found there. It is as a port on the Phoenician coast that the agglomeration appears under the name called Tarsus in the Greek "Amarna (14th century B.C.), at that time a modest settlement long since eclipsed by Byblos (Djubayl). During an obscure period of twelve centuries Beruta underwent the passage of armies coming up from Egypt or descending from Mesopotamia, among whom was Ramses II in the 13th century and Asarhaddon, king of Assyria, in the 7th century. Towards 200 A.D., Antiochus III the Great gained a victory over Ptolemy V and annexed Bayrut to the Seleucid kingdom and Syria. The town, for a time called Laodicea of Canaan, was destroyed about 140 B.C. by the Syrian usurper Tryphon. Despite this disaster the port saw a great rise owing to the commercial relations with Delos, the Italians and the Romans; Bayrut then found its vocation as a link between Orient and Occident.

Taken by Marcus Agrippa in the name of the Emperor Augustus, the town was rebuilt, embellished by remarkable edifices and peopled by veteran Roman legionaries. In 14 B.C. it was raised to the rank of a Roman colony (Colonia Julia Augusta Felix Bertus). Very rapidly Beritus became a great administrative centre (Herod the Great and his successors were resident there), an important station of commerce and exchange, and a well attended university city. Its school of law, from the 3rd century A.D., enjoyed particular acclaim and by its brilliance rivalled Athens, Alexandria and Caesarea. The increase in population made it necessary to construct for its water supply an important aqueduct (Kandir Zubayda) in the valley of the Magoras (Nahr Bayrut).

By the end of the 4th century Bertus was one of the most important cities in Phoenicia and the seat of a bishopric. A violent earthquake, accompanied by a tidal wave, destroyed Bayrut in July 551. Justinian had the ruins restored, but the city had lost its splendour, and it was a town without defences that the troops of Abū 'Ubayda took when they entered in 14/635 the most important of the Roman cities of the Orient.

Under Muslim domination a new era began for Bayrut. The Umayyad caliph Mu'awiya had colonists brought from Persia to repopulate the city and its surrounding area, sericulture prospered again, and commercial relations resumed at first with the interior (Damascus) and later with Egypt. In the first centuries of Islam Bayrut was considered a ribā', and the holy imām of Syria, Al-Awzan, installed himself there in 157/774. In 364/975 John Tzinises conquered the city, but shortly after the Fatimids retook it from the Byzantines. The Arab geographers of the 4th and 5th/10th and 11th centuries all mention that the city was fortified, and subject to the diwan of Damascus.

The Crusades brought fresh troubles. In 492/1099 the Crusaders coming from the north along the coast did no more than provision themselves at Bayrut; they returned there after the capture of Jerusalem. In 503/1110 Baldwin I and Bertrand of St. Gilles blockaded the city by land and sea. An Egyptian fleet managed to get supplies to the besieged, but a reinforcement of Pisan and Genoese ships enabled them to launch an assault and take the city on 21 Shawwal 503/13 May 1110. In 1112 nomination of the first Latin bishop took place, Baldwin of Boulogne, who relieved the patriarch of Jerusalem, since in the Greek ecclesiastical organisation of the 11th century Bayrut had been subject to Antioch. The Hospital-
bers built the church of St. John the Baptist, which
became the mosque of Al-‘Umari. In Rabic II 578/
August 1132, Salah al-Din sought to separate the
County of Tripoli from the Kingdom of Jerusalem
by retaking Bayrut, but it was not until the second
attempt in Djamdād II 582/August 1137 that the
city capitulated. In Dhu ‘l-Ka‘d 593/September
1197, Amalric of Lusignan took the city, whose
Ayyūbīd garrison had fled. The Ibelins restored the
defences of Bayrut and renewed its brilliance
throughout the Latin Orient. In 1231 Riccardo
Filippigari occupied the city, but not the castle,
in behalf of the Emperor Frederick II.

Shortly after the accession of the Mamlūks at Cairo,
the lords of Bayrut were reduced to treat with them
in order to preserve their independence with respect
to the other Franks. In 667/1269 Baybars gave a
guarantee of peace. In 684/1285 Sulṭān Kālūn
granted a truce which allowed a resumption of
commercial activity, and finally, on 23 Rajab 690/
23 July 1291, the Amir Sandjar Abū Shudjāh’s,
coming from Damascus, occupied Bayrut in the
name of Al-Malik Al-Ashraf Khālid.

Under the Mamlūks Bayrut was an important
wilāya in the province (dānd) of Damascus, and its
governor an amir tašalīḥiyya. During the entire
Middle Ages, possession of Bayrut was a powerful
trump card, for one could procure there two rare
“strategic materials”, wood, from the pine forest
south of the city, and iron, from the mines nearby.

In the 8th/14th century, commerce was troubled,
the port having become the scene of rivalries between
Genoese and Catalans, and the Mamlūk princes
reinforced its defences, Tanghiz (744/1343) and
Barkūk (784-791/1382-1389) each having a tower
constructed. In the 9th/15th century, Bayrut con-
tinued to be the meeting-place of western merchants
who came there seeking silks, while fruit and snow
were exported to the court at Cairo.

At the beginning of the 10th/16th century, the
Frankish merchants were subjected to the extortions
of the semi-autonomous governors nominated by the
Porte. Under Faḥhr al-Dīn (1595/1634) the city saw
a brilliant period, and relations were renewed with
Venice. In exports silks surpassed citrus fruits, while
rice and linen cloth was imported from Egypt.

In the middle of the 18th century, Bayrut was the
most heavily populated coastal city after Tarābulūs,
the nucleus of the population being the Maronites
protected by the Druze amir. Suffering the counter-
attacks of the Russo-Turkish war, Bayrut was
bombarded several times and finally occupied by the
Russians in October 1773, until February 1774.

From 1831 on, despite the competent administration
of Baḥrī the Great (1788-1850), the campaigns of Ibrāhīm Pāsha, which terminated in the bombarda-
ment of Bayrut by a combined Austrian, English and
Turkish fleet in 1840, ruined commerce. A new era
began in 1860. The massacre of the Christians in Syria
led to a major exodus towards Bayrut, and the tiny
city of 20,000 acquired a deep Christian imprint.

Having begun about a century ago, the rise of
Bayrut continues. The city has developed very
rapidly and for several decades has surpassed the
brilliance of its Roman period. After having been,
during the French Mandate (1920-43), the residence
of the High Commissioner of France for the States
of the Levant, Bayrut became the capital of an
independent state and the seat of Parliament and the
Administration of the country. The extremely
heterogeneous population, predominantly Arab, is
more than 200,000 (1958), which is doubled during
the week with the daily influx of villagers, workers
and merchants from the surrounding areas.

Three universities (American, French and Leba-
nese), numerous academic establishments of every
nationality, and a National Library make of Bayrut
one of the most important intellectual centres of the
Arab Middle East. The city is also a centre of commerce
and exchange. A port continually expanded since
1893 and linked by railway to Syria and Jordan
permit important transactions (2,500,000 tons in
1950), despite the competition of Haifa and, more
recently, Lattakia, the port of Syria. The volume of
transactions has led to the creation of a Stock
Exchange, and the foundation of branches by all
the large international banks. An aerodrome of
international class (Khalād) permits contacts with
the entire world. A centre of transit and distribution,
Beirut is by vocation a link between Orient
and Occident.
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BAYSAN, a little Palestinian township in the
valley of the Jordan, situated 30 kms. (18 miles)
south of Lake Tiberias and 98 ms. above sea-level
on a terrace raised 170 ms. above the low-lying
ground through which, some distance away, the
Jordan winds its way. Avoiding thus the extreme
tropical heat which reigns elsewhere in the Ghawr
[see], it has all the same a hot and humid climate
which Arab geographers did not fail to criticise,
and the same time depleting of its water (they nevertheless point out the merits
of ‘Ayn al-Fulūs, a well which a wide-spread tradition
regards as being among the four springs of Paradise).
Irrigation formerly made possible the cultivation of rice
which was the country’s wealth at the time of
al-Makdisi, whilst of the palm-groves, mentioned in
traditions, the geographer Yāḥūt, in the 7th/13th
century, observed only two single palm trees. But
Baysan, thanks above all to its remarkable com-
mmercial and strategic position on the main stream of
the traffic joining Damascus and the interior of
Syria to Galilee and thence to Egypt and the
Mediterranean coast, has succeeded in preserving
its urban nucleus up to the present day, despite
innumerable historical vicissitudes.

The settlement of this site, proved for the period
before the 3rd millennium by the excavations of Tall
al-Husn which have succeeded in reaching the
calcilitic level, goes back indeed to very far-off
times. We know of the Egyptians’ interest in the
ancient Bethšan or Bethshe‘an, whose name they
transcribed as Bayrût and which they annexed for
three centuries after the victory of Thutmoses III in
the plains of Megiddo, leaving numerous traces of
their occupation. Then this important village, equally
coveted by Philistines, Israelites and Madianites,
which at one time formed part of the kingdom of
Solomon but remained always hostile to Judaism, became in the Hellenistic and Roman periods one of the most important cities of the Decapolis under the name of Scythopolis. Hellenism flourished there and the success which Christianity attained later was confirmed by the construction of various churches and monasteries. Its bishop was Metropolitan of Palestina Secunda and the celebrated hagiographer, Cyril of Scythopolis, was born there.

Exposed to the first Arab attacks, for as early as 13/634 the troops of Khalid b. al-Walid attacked and annihilated a Byzantine army not far away, the town, which now resumed its original native name softened into Baysan, was definitely occupied in 15/636 at the time of Shurabbil b. Hasana’s conquest of the Jordan region and was certainly visited by Abū ’Ubayda b. al-Diarrāh whose tomb according to some authors is situated there. As administrative centre of one of the districts of the diwan of al-Urdum, it seems to have prospered peacefully among his gardens until it was attacked by the Franks of the First Crusade who annexed it to the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem after it had been taken by Tancred in 492/1099. They created the barony of Bessan but transferred the episcopal see to Nazareth. Its history continued to be a troubled one. Muslim attacks ended in its reconquest by Salāh al-Din in 583/1187 and later there was a new raid by the Franks of the Fifth Crusade who plundered it in 614/1217. The invasion of the Mongols who were defeated not far away at Ayn Djalfūt (q.v.) in 658/1260 was a heavy blow to it but later on in the time of the Mamluks it was to become the capital of a wilāya in the second southern frontier district of the province of Damascus. At this time the caravanserai of Salār was built in its immediate neighbourhood on the route of the present-day railway. This was used by the mounted mail couriers whose itinerary was modified in this way by the initiative of the chief of the chancellery, Ibn Faḍl Allāh, in 741/1340.
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BAYSÓNGHOR, GHIYĀTH AL-DIN, son of Shāh Ruḥī and grandson of Timūr, was appointed by his father in 820/1417 to the office of chief judge at his court; in 823/1420 on the death of Kara- Yūsuf, he took possession of Tabriz and was appointed governor of Astarābād in Safar 835/October 1431, but he never ascended the throne; the astrologers having predicted to him that he would not live more than forty years, he gave himself up to dissipating life and died at Harāt on Saturday, 7 Dījūmād 837/19 December 1433, at the age of thirty-six. He was buried in the Kaṣr-al-ʿAbbās in the Mausoleum of Princess Gawhar-Šāhīd. An artist and patron of the arts, he was a designer and an illuminator; in the library which he had founded, forty copyists, pupils of Mīr-ʿAllī, inventor of the nastaʿlīq script, were occupied copying manuscripts. His example had a considerable influence in the development of the art of painting in Persia in the period of the Timūrids. In 829/1425-6 he caused a critical edition of the Shāh-nāma of Firdawṣī to be undertaken and a preface to be written to this work, the longer of the two which we possess.

Bibliography: Cl. Huart, Calligraphes et miniaturistes, 97, 208, 324, 336; J. Mohl in Firdawṣī, Livre des Rois (Shāh-nāma), Vol. i, xv, note 1; Mīrkhānī, Rawdat al-Safa, vi, 212, 213; Kāhīnāmīrī, Ḥabīb al-Siyar, iii, Part 3, 116, 123, 130.

CL. HUART

BAYSÓNGHOR, the name of another prince, of the Ak-Koyunlu dynasty in Persia, son and successor of Shāh Ruḥī; he only reigned for a short period from 806-7/1402-3 and was overthrown by his cousin Rustām. (W. BARTHOLOD)

BAYT, the common Semitic root of the word for “dwelling”, whether the “tent” of the nomads, or the “house” (stone, wood or brick) of sedentary peoples. It may sometimes designate a “sanctuary”: thus in Arabic with the article al-Bayt is applied par excellence to the holy place at Mecca, also called al-Bayt al-harām (sacred dwelling) or al-Bayt al-sabīb (ancient). Geographical names composed with the root are equally frequent, and the first element is often found reduced in Syro-Palestinian toponomy to the prefix B-, derived from the Aramaic (Syriac) Bē, also known from Canaanitic, to judge by several examples of it in Biblical Hebrew (Bē’er, etc.).

In Arabic, the definitions, always detailed, of the lexicologists limit the term to a dwelling of medium dimension, perhaps suitable for one family. The sense of “family” is found precisely in all of the Semitic languages. As, by contrast, BAYT does not figure among the technical designations of tribal subdivisions, one might see there an argument in favour of a classical distinction between the family, however large, and these other various groupings, if unfortunately the same metonymical association were not to some extent encountered in all languages, too generally to be probative. (J. LECQ)
BAYT [see 'Arab']

BAYT DABRIN, or sometimes DABRIL: a large Palestinian village of the Shephelah, situated at an altitude of 287 m., southwest of Jerusalem, on the northern borders of the limestone mountains of Judea and the coastal plain, in a region rich in quarries and ancient remains which attracted the interest of Arab authors. Called Begabri by Josephus who regarded it as a village of Idumaea, and Betogabri by Ptolemy and the Tabula Peutingeriana, it was a successor to the town of Maresha/Marisa, often regarded as the capital of the region before being driven back under the pressure of Edom, and who bore a name synonymous with 'troglydotes'. This name was translated into Greek through a play of words in Hebrew as 'town of the free men' or Eleutheropolis when Septimus Severus gave the jus italicum to this locality in 200 A.D. In the middle ages it resumed its original name which appears in the Talmudic writings under the form of Beth Gabrin, and was twisted by the Crusaders into Beth Gebrin, Bethigebelin or Gibelin; it seems that a play of words on the Arabic دابرین گلخان then allowed to identify the place with the legendary 'City of the Giants', according to a tradition which is referred to by al-Harawi and which describes the story of Mūsā related in Kurān, v, 24/21-25/22 as having taken place there.

Minting its own money and commanding a vast region, the city of Eleutheropolis enjoyed great prosperity in ancient times as is proved by the Romano-Byzantine mosaics which have been discovered there. Its importance diminished in Arab times although after its conquest by 'Abd al-As during the Caliphate of Abū Bakr, it continued to be the capital of a district within the military دیوان of Palestine and a trading-post on the road between Jerusalem and Ghazzah. However, bitter local fighting seems to have occurred in this region which was mainly populated, according to al-Ya’qūbī, by the دیویشام [q.v.], and "according to the account of a monk, Stephen of Māl Eultheropolis was completely destroyed in 790 in the course of a war between Arab tribes" (Fr. Buhl), a statement which should certainly be accepted with some reservations. Indeed a little later al-Makdisi describes Bayt Dabrin as a commercial centre for the district of Dārūn [q.v.], and the military value of its situation caused the Crusaders, who had first destroyed it, to build a citadel there towards 1134 which was put into the charge of the Knights Hospitallers, to safeguard the frontier of the kingdom of Jerusalem on the Egyptian side and to stop Muslim raids which came principally from the direction of 'Askalān [q.v.]. After having suffered some damage when Sa'laḥ al-Dīn retook it in 583/1187, it still remained a fortified town in the Mamluk period, depending directly from the محلة of the Ghazza district in the coastal frontier area of the province of Damascus.


J. Sourdel-Thomine

BAYT AL-FAKIH, (i.e., "the Abode of the Jurist"), a town of c. 10,000 population located at 14°30' N., 43°16' E. in Tihāmat al-Yaman. The town is also called Bayt al-Fakih al-Saghīr, to distinguish it from Zaydiyya or Bayt al-Fakih al-Kabīr to the north near Bājdil, and Bayt al-Fakih Ibn Udjayl after the name of the jurist around whose tomb the town has grown. The town in 1944 was the capital of the ٍرود of Bayt al-Fakih, comprising four الن‌یس in the لیس of al-Ḥudaydah. The four الن‌یس are: Nāhiyyat Līğān, Nāhiyyat al-Hussaynīyya, Nāhiyyat Bani Saʿīd, and Nāhiyyat Bayt al-Fakih, each of which is governed by an ٍن‌یل, with the courtesy title of بیت if he is not a sayyid. The لیس of al-Ḥudaydah falls under a royal prince.

Bayt al-Fakih may be connected with pre-Islamic history through the migration of the tribe of al-Azd from Mārib after the breaking of the dam. Tradition alludes to the temporary settlement of the tribe near a watering-place called Ghassān, perhaps between Wādī Rima and Wādī Zābīd. A portion of al-Azd later moved to the Syrian borders and established the state of Ghassān. In the 8th/9th century, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa mentions the name of the village near the tomb of Ibn Udjayl as Ghassānīna, but this name is unknown today. The classical Arab geographers mention neither Ghassānīna nor Bayt al-Fakih.

It seems likely that the present village of Bayt al-Fakih arose shortly after the death of the ḥabīb, Abu T-ʿAbbās Ahmad b. Mūsā b. ʿAlī b. ʿUmar b. Udjayl, in 690/1291 due largely to pilgrimages made to his grave and the miraculous powers attributed to the invocation of his name. In the 11th/12th century the town increased its prosperity as a coffee-centre for the port of Mocha and an East India Company factor, Revington, suggested the establishment of a factory there in 1659. During the 19th/20th century, the Yamanī Imams took monthly pilgrimages from Bayt al-Fakih to the north near Bājdil, and Bayt al-Fakih resumed its provincial, scholarly life, amid the anarchical political conditions in Southern Arabia.

The unsettled state of this area had been due largely to the fractious independence of the tribe of al-Zārānī centered on Bayt al-Fakih. With a fighting strength estimated at 10,000 men, the tribe has steadfastly refused to accept government control for long and was strong enough in 1914 to levy road tolls on Ottoman infantry. As recently as 1947 the tribe cut down to the last man a punitive force sent by the Imam.

BAYT AL-FAKIH — BAYT AL-MAL 1141


BAYT AL-ḤIKMA, “House of Wisdom”, a scientific institution founded in Baghdād by the caliph al-Ma’mūn, undoubtedly in imitation of the ancient academy of Dūriyāsābūr. Its principal activity was the translation of philosophical and scientific works from the Greek originals which, according to tradition, a delegation sent by the caliph had brought from the country of Rūm. Its directors were Sahl b. Hārūn [q.v.] and Salm, assisted by Ṣaḥīl b. Hārūn. It included an important staff of translators, of whom the most famous were the Banū ‘l-Munāḍātim, as well as copyists and binders. It appears in fact that the library so constituted, and often called Ḥizānat al-ḥikma, had already existed in the time of al-Raṣīd and the Barrakūdās who had begun to have Greek works translated. Al-Ma’mūn may have only given a new impetus to this movement, which was to exert a considerable influence on the development of Islamic thought and culture (see *Arabiyā, B. III, 1*).

To the same institution were attached astronomical observatories (marṣad), one installed at Baghdād, the other at Damascus, where Muslim scholars devised in particular new tables (ṣīḥ [q.v.]), correcting the ancient ones furnished by Ptolemy.

The Bayt al-ḥikma properly so called, does not appear to have survived the orthodox reaction of al-Mutawakkil, although there is subsequent mention in ʿIrāq, during the ʿirdk/ghiyth century, of several scientific libraries, owing their existence to private initiative and the fact that the caliph al-Muʿtadīd had sought to favour the work of various scholars whom he had installed in his palace. Only the Fāṭimids were later to found similar official academies, of which the most important was the dār al-ḥikma [q.v.] established by al-Ḥākim in 395/1005. *Bibliography: Fīhirīs, 5, 10, 21, 120, 145, 235, 274; Yākūt, Ḥiṣād, iv, 258-259, v, 66-68; Khīṭṭ, ed. Lippert, 29-30, 97-98; A. F. Rifāʿī, *Aṣr al-Ma’mūn*, Cairo 1928, i, 375-76; O. Pinto, *Le biblioteche degli Arabi nell’eta degli Abbassidi*, Florence 1928, 12-14; K. Ṭawwād, *Ikhānīn kutub al-ṣirāṣ il-ṣīma*, in *sumer*, ii, 2, 1946, 214-218.* (D. Sourdel)

BAYT LAHM, large Palestinian village and celebrated centre of pilgrimage situated in the limestone mountains of Judaea 800 m. above sea-level and approximately 10 kms. south of Jerusalem, corresponds to the ancient Bethlehem of biblical fame. Honoured and visited by Christians from the 4th century on, it became equally venerated by Muslims as the birthplace of ʿĪsā b. Maryam [q.v.]. The Arab geographers who never failed to refer to this fact and who often expressed admiration for the Byzantine basilica which (founded by Constantine in 325 and restored under Justinian in 525) had been built there, commented equally on the miraculous palm of Kurān, xix, 25, the tomb of David and Solomon which Christian tradition had already located in the Grotto of the Nativity, and the mīhrāb of ʿĪmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, traditionally the spot where the second Caliph had prayed at the time of his journey through Palestine after his conquest. This remarkable reputation from the religious point of view did not however help the village of Bayt Lahm, too close as it was to Jerusalem, to develop in impetus, and the attention paid to it by the Franks of the First Crusade, who built a fortress there after they had annexed it in 1099, and in 1110 got permission to set up a bishopric there, did no more than give it a brief spurt of life. Occupied by Salāh al-Dīn when he reconquered Palestine in 583/1187, then included in the temporary retrocession of the Treaty of Jaffa concluded between al-Malik al-Kāmil and Frederick II, the place continued then and later to vegetate. However the intensification of the relations between its Christian population and the West permitted it finally to achieve its present position, that of a small town with a feeble Muslim minority (the Muslims never recovered from the repression of which they were the victims in 1834 after they had revolted against Ibrāhīm Paša), where religious institutions and modern houses predominate, ranged in a semicircle on the side of the hill round the platform surmounted by the famous basilica. This sanctuary of the Nativity whose archaeological interest has already been emphasised, has been the object of successive restorations which have left the primitive arrangement of its central part with its four-fold rows of columns untouched, but have transformed especially the decoration which gives valuable information about the evolution of the art of the mosaic in the high middle ages.


BAYT AL-MAKDIS [see AL-KUDS].

BAYT AL-MĀL, in its concrete meaning “the House of wealth”, but particularly, in an abstract sense, the “fiscus” or “treasury” of the Muslim State.

I. The Legal Doctrine. ‘Bilāl and his companions asked ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb to distribute the booty acquired in Iraq and Syria. “Divide the lands among those who conquered them”, they said, “just as the spoils of the army are divided”. But ‘Umar refused their request... saying: “Allāh has given a share in these lands to those who shall come after you”’. (Kitāb al-Khadrij, 24, Le Livre de l’Impôt Foncier, 32). In this alleged decision of ‘Umar lies the germ of the notion of public as distinct from private ownership and the idea of properties and monies designed to serve the interests of the community as a whole. Coupled with the institution of the dawān [q.v.] in 20 A.H. it marks the starting point of the conception of the bayt al-ʿmal as the State Treasury or fiscus. Previously the term had simply designated the treasury where money and goods were temporarily lodged pending delivery to their individual owners. See *Fīhirīs*, *Institutions du Droit Public Musulman*, i, 216.)
Organisation. All the various officials derive their powers by delegation from the Imam who is the head of the bayt al-māl. In Sunni law a firm distinction is drawn between the public authority with which the Imam is invested in this respect and the personal control of his privy purse. (See Tyan, op. cit., i, 391 f. and ii, 195. Also Mez, Renaissance, 113-116 (Eng. tr., 120-122), for the position in practice.) This distinction does not apply to the same extent in the law of the Twelver Shi'a, where the ownership of certain properties which in Sunni law belong to the community as a whole is vested in the person of the divinely inspired Imam. (See Querry, Droit Musulman, i, 178, 337. Baillie, Imameca Code, 362).

The actual collection and distribution of State revenues is the responsibility of the Sāhib bayt al-māl who controls the several officials in charge of the various categories of revenue listed below. Freedom, Islam, moral integrity (sadāqa) and competence are essential qualifications for such appointments, and in addition the quality of āfāfh bāyda (q.v.) is required for those offices which involve discretionary assessment or expenditure. Minor agents of collection or delivery may be slaves, or dhimmīs when dealing only with their co-religionists. The records and accounts of Treasury business are dealt with by a special administrative department under the control of the Kāṭib al-dīwān, for which office sadāqa and professional competence are the only two essential qualifications.

Within this skeleton framework the nature and scope of individual offices is a matter for the discretion of the Imam. "Neither for general nor for particular appointments does the Sharī'a define the terms" (Ībn Farhān, Taḥṣīl al-Hukūm, ii, 141, 158).

Sources of Revenue. Not all State revenues are "assets of the Treasury" (hubūḍ bāyta bāyta al-māl) as such. These latter may be defined as those monies or properties which belong to the Muslim community as a whole, the purpose to which they are devoted being dependent upon the discretion of the Imam or his delegate.

Thus the only portion of the ghanīma (q.v.) which qualifies as one of the assets of the Treasury is that fraction of the fifth (al-khums) — which term may here be taken to include the levy on mined products and treasure trove — which is the share of Allāh and the Prophet and which is to be spent in the interests of the community as a whole. The remainder of the fifth is earmarked for specified classes — the relatives of the Prophet, orphans, poor and travellers — and as such is removed from the discretion of the Imam. Similarly the proceeds of sadāqa or zakāt (q.v.) are destined for particular classes of the community and though, like ghanīma, these monies may be controlled by Treasury officials or lodged in the vaults of the Treasury pending the determination of the entitled recipients, ownership, from the moment of payment, vests in the entitled recipients and not in the bayt al-māl. Even the Hāfiz jurists, who allow the Imam to apportion out the sadāqa at his discretion to one or more of the specified beneficiaries to the exclusion of the rest, draw a clear-cut distinction between māl al-sadāqa and māl al-Muslimīn. (See Kāṭib al-Khārāṣī, 80, 149, 187).

The primary source of the Treasury's income is, then, the revenues collectively termed fāy, i.e., the takāz of khārāṣī and derived property. The position of the tax 'ushr (q.v.) is somewhat confused. Some jurists appear to regard it as fāy and others as sadāqa, while in one view it is treated as sadāqa if paid by Muslims and as fāy if paid by non-Muslims. Among the subsidiary sources of income are:

(i) Property with no known owner — e.g., runaway slaves when apprehended, or property found in the possession of arrested brigands. The proceeds from the sale of such property if movable, or its exploitation if immovable, belong to the bayt al-māl.

(ii) The property of apostates. While the great majority of jurists maintain that all the available property of apostates belongs to the bayt al-māl, the Hāfiz jurists divide it between denying the claim of the Treasury altogether and restricting it to such property as was acquired after apostacy.

(iii) Estates of deceased persons. [See Mīhrāj]. The Treasury is especially favoured in this respect in Mālikī law, where it will always succeed, as residuary heir, in the absence of any entitled 'asāba and such Kurānic heirs as would exhaust the estate by the sum of their allotted shares. With no heir of either category the Treasury is assured of at least two thirds of the estate, since bequests may not exceed in value one third of the nett estate. In the law of the other schools, however, the presence of any Kurānic heir or blood-relative will exclude the Treasury, and in Hāfiz law, failing such heirs, testamentary disposition may embrace the whole of the estate. Here then the Treasury only succeeds by a species of escheat.

Expenditure. Claims upon public monies (all, according to Māwardī (al-Ākhām al-Sulānīyya, 367 f.), into two main categories.

(i) Claims in regard to which the liability of the Treasury is absolute. Such claims are either for services rendered to the State — e.g., the stipends of the armed forces, the salaries of State officials, the price of equipment purchased — or for expenditure which is a specific obligation upon the State — e.g., the duty to maintain its prisoners. The satisfaction of such claims is the first obligation upon the Treasury and payment may only be deferred when (as is the case with an ordinary debtor) the Treasury is insolvent. At the discretion of the Sāhib bayt al-māl loans may be raised to satisfy these claims.

(ii) Claims in regard to which the Treasury's liability is dependent upon the existence of the necessary funds and the satisfaction of all claims in the previous category. Here the expenditure involved is for purposes of the public welfare and interest — e.g., the construction of roads, water supplies, the repair of damage to kharāṣī lands.

When all outstanding obligations have been met the Hāfiz jurists advise that any surplus should be preserved to insure against possible future need, while the Shāfī's maintain that any surplus should be expended immediately in the public interest. Beyond these general principles the law does not go, content to leave the detailed determination of the public interest to the discretion of the Imam, with the one proviso that public funds are not to be devoted to purposes prohibited by the law — e.g., gambling, music etc.

Procedure. The administrative work of the dīwān (analysed by Māwardī, op. cit., 370-375) raises three main legal issues.

(i) Legal proof. While it is a fundamental principle of Sharī'a law to deny any validity to written evidence, in Treasury practice official documents and records are per se a sufficient basis for action. Shāfī law endorses this practice by drawing a clear-cut distinction between "private rights" (al-ruṣūṭ al-khādīja) and "public rights" (al-ruṣūṭ al-Īmmā}).
but the Ḥanafis declare that Treasury documents can only serve as a basis for action when their authenticity is established by oral testimony. Secularly proof of payment of taxes is established in Treasury practice by the written receipt of the collector. Legal doctrine, however, requires the oral acknowledgement of his signature by the collector; and further, in Ḥanafi law, such an acknowledged written receipt must be substantiated by oral acknowledgement of actual receipt. Finally written authorisation for payment from the Treasury is in practice accepted as a sufficient basis for Treasury accounts, while the jurists ideally require in addition oral acknowledgement of actual receipt by the designated receiver.

(ii) Procedure in disputes. The paramount question of the allotment to the contending parties of the respective roles of plaintiff and defendant is governed by normal Ḡarī'a principles. The plaintiff, upon whom falls the burden of legal proof (failing which effect is given to the defendant's oath of denial), is the party whose claim runs counter to the initial legal presumption attaching to the case. Thus in disputes arising from the inspection of officials' accounts by the dīwān's officers (the presentation of accounts to the dīwān being obligatory upon officials concerned with the collection or distribution of jay') the accountant of the dīwān fills the role of plaintiff if the dispute concerns the income of the Treasury and that of defendant if the dispute concerns expenditure.

(iii) Jurisdiction. Disputes between private citizens and Treasury officials are justiciable by the Ṣāḥib al-dīwān, unless he is expressly denied this function in his terms of appointment. Such judicial competence belongs naturally to an office of which the principal duty is that of assuring the application of the rules and regulations of fiscal law. In the case of disputes between officials of the treasury and the officers of the dīwān, when the Ṣāḥib al-dīwān is, in effect, a party to the dispute, the principle that no one can be judge in his own case applies and jurisdiction belongs to the ordinary courts.

Fundamentally concerned with the strict regulation of man's relationship with his Creator, the Ḡarī'a dealt with the relation of authority to administration, and the State only in general terms, restricting itself to demanding the observance of a few relevant principles. This attitude is particularly evident in the field of criminal law, where, outside the ḥadd offences (in which the notion of man's obligations towards Allāh predominates) the determination of offence and punishment is left to the discretion of the sovereign. So it is with fiscal law. Only those limited aspects of public finance which are deemed to constitute man's obligation towards Allāh (e.g., ṣahīl tax) are regulated in detail; thus the law concerning the ḏayt al-māl is essentially within the province of the administrative regulations (ḥānūn) of the political authority and not of the Ḡarī'a.


II. History. The institution can be traced back to Muḥammad in so far as there already existed in his time the embryonic notion of a Treasury of the Community, supplied by diverse forms of contributions; but its real origin is to be found in the contact between the new needs of the Community which had become the conqueror of an Empire and the pre-existing fiscal institutions of the conquered States. Tradition is certainly correct in attributing to the Caliph ʿUmar several essential preliminary steps, although the details are undoubtedly surrounded with much confusion. For ʿUmar the immediate problem was the organisation of the system of stipends (see ʿṣālī), the fiscal régime itself and the collection of taxes remaining almost exclusively in the hands of the native population. Afterwards the progressive development of a bureaucratic and centralised Muslim State had a particular effect on the elaboration of the scheme of taxation, the methods of financial administration and the organs of this administration. It is obviously impossible here to encompass the whole history of the institution, particularly after the time of the fragmentation of the Muslim world into individual States whose differences became more and more accentuated; moreover no history of this kind has as yet been written. We shall, therefore, confine ourselves to making certain observations of general validity and indicating certain desirable lines of enquiry.

The simple taxes of the early Muslim community could, in their broad concrete lines if not in their theoretical basis, be assimilated to the more complicated taxes of the States to which Islam fell heir and whose fiscal structure the Arabs, like the majority of conquering nations, respected—to such a degree, indeed, that throughout the length of Islamic history the former Byzantine territories (differing among themselves) and the former Sākānad territories (not to mention the West) remained quite distinct areas from the fiscal point of view. To this was added, at the outset, a further distinction, afterwards resolved, between the towns conquered by force of arms, which were directly subject to Muslim taxes and tax-collectors, the towns of ʿaḥd, which paid a fixed tribute and raised it independently in their own fashion, and, between these two extremes, the towns of ʿalīh, where the taxes were Muslim taxes but were raised by the native administration. For two thirds of a century the fiscal records continued to be written in the native languages, until ʿAbd al-Malik, (685-705) ordered the translation of the fundamental documents into Arabic (the example of the Egyptian papriy proves that it was by a slower process that Arabic came to be exclusively used in the work of the subordinate administration).

Both practice and theory fairly soon distinguished the following taxes and sources of revenue:

The basic tax was the land tax, bāḥrādī, originally levied upon all the lands of the non-Muslim natives. When a large part of the indigenous population became Muslims by conversion, it became necessary, in spite of certain misgivings, in order not to ruin the fiscus, to decide that the land was not affected by the change of faith on the part of its possessor and must always be subject to the bāḥrādī. From the point of view of the Islamic theory, the bḥa-
... constituted a permanent rent from the land for the benefit of the Muslim community, the supreme owner. This is the doctrine of pay of tax, which does lapse upon conversion to Islam. The distinction between khurādi and diyya, though sharp in theory, is not always so in terminology and in practice, particularly because the Byzantine Empire, it seems, had practiced a combined land-capitation tax.

The tax, or rather voluntary alms, peculiar to the Muslim was the zakāl or sadāqa, levied upon both landed and moveable property. As regards landed property it was applied on the Arab land to Arab properties (especially in Arabia) and on the other hand to the tābī', conceded from the State domains to Arab notables and, later, to the military leaders of every race. In its relation both to landed and moveable property the zakāl was closely allied to the tithe, ushr, which was known to the Near Eastern pre-Islamic societies, and often was so called.

So these taxes were very far from the right to one fifth of the booty, the produce of mines, treasure trove from the land or from the sea and the mawārīt ḥāshiyya, succession to the inheritance of persons dying without legal heirs.

In addition, the State lands, sawādi', when they were not conceded as tābī', whatever the method of their exploitation, brought in revenues similar to those of private properties. Further the State appropriated the proceeds from judicial fines.

It was only the taxes listed above which were held to be legal by the theory. But in practice many others were discovered or invented. Some were supplementary increases upon the normal taxes for the defrayal of attendant expenses or any other reason (ṣarā', tawābi'), in contrast to the basic tax, asl, and others fell upon the most varied forms of economic activity (ṣarā'īb, rusūm). These last were generally condemned by the jurists, who were often connected with commercial circles, under the name of muḥās, and certain pious rulers attempted to abolish them, though naturally this was without any lasting effect. The police often demanded the payment of a particular hādīya. Finally the State was always punishing high officials who had enriched themselves by confiscations (mustādara) etc.

The peculiarities of the assessment and the collection of each tax will be studied under their respective titles and so nothing more need be said on the subject here.

In general terms the recovery of taxes can be effected either by direct administration (through the agent or dāmin) or by farming out, dāmin. The system of tax-farming, which was as well known to antiquity as the direct levy, gained ground with the growing decadence of the 'Abbāsid Caliphate, but it was perhaps never practised to such an extent as has often been believed by those who have failed to distinguish properly the notions of dāmin, ḥādīya and ḍiyya, which, although there may be occasional confusions of terminology, are utterly different things. Ḥādīya can only be paid by the owner, there exists a group of tax-payers collectively responsible for the tax. By agreement between the group and the agent of the fiscus it may be decided, as was the case in the later Roman Empire, that the tax will be paid by one or several individual persons of standing, and it will be annually to the State a contracted sum, less than the calculated revenue from the tax, and afterwards undertakes its recovery on his own account, which will, of course, reimburse him with profit. If the State is reduced to this method it is assured of a precise and immediate return from the pockets of rich individuals, but it loses a portion of the money paid by the tax-payer and, for the duration of the contract, the control of operations. As for the ḍiyya, he may well be dāmin, but he has at the same time the unique position of a sort of official money-changer cum surety; for he verifies and standarises by exchange the different types of currency, good and bad, paid by the tax-payers in return for a small percentage collected as a supplementary tax from the latter.

Furthermore, outside the territories subject to the normal taxation, levied directly or by farming out, there were other areas in regard to which the State had renounced some part of its fundamental rights. In some areas—ṣāḥir—the State temporarily refrained from sending agents of collection, abandoning the revenue to an army commander so that he might cover therefrom the expenses of his army's maintenance. In other areas—theṣāhiyyā (to be carefully distinguished from the ḍiyya)—the State was content with a contracted tribute, without concerning itself with the theoretical scheme of taxation: equivalent to the primitive 'ahd, this was applied in particular to the vassal rulers of regions which were not completely subdued. The ḍiyya, in its original form of a concession of land from the State domains which was subject to the payment of the tithe, had not any particular fiscal character; but later there were assigned under this name to army officers as the equivalent of their salary the fiscal rights of the State in khurādi districts, initially subject to the payment, by the beneficiaries, of the tithe for the area concerned, then later with no attached condition other than that of professional military service (see C. Cahen, L'évolution de l'ṭidt', in Annales ESC, 1953). These different methods of alienation of the revenues of the fisc naturally diminished the returns, but they equally alleviated the expenditures in a manner which often involved hardly any break with the previous position, since in any case the proceeds of the taxes from a province were never sent to the fiscus until the provincial expenditure had first been satisfied on the spot. The danger to the State was only serious in proportion to the extent, which varied in the different regions and at different periods, to which these alienations resulted in a relaxing of the fiscal control itself and consequently also of the appreciation of the resources of the territory concerned.

This appreciation was obtained with fairly reasonable accuracy not only through the lump evaluations of the budget but also from the daily sessions, following the ancient custom, devoted to the detailed assessment of lands and their fiscal value, as well as of persons subject to the ḍiyya...
and, in all probability, the *sakād*, not to speak of the other taxes. The best example preserved concerns the Fayyūm in the 7th/13th century (*Arabica*, 1956), but we know that what we call *sakād* or *sawād*, of the province of Kumān in Iran, etc., and in a general way of the methods of the administration, allows no one to doubt that there are almost everywhere parallels in ‘Abbāsid times. The value of each fiscal unity was the object of an assessment, *qibra*, which continued to serve as an authority so long as there had been no revision, although naturally, the administration itself had to admit annual variations. Diverse works, such as the *Mafīṭih al-‘usām* and the Egyptian papyri, allow us to follow from another angle the precision of the daily accounts of the refunds of taxes and of the reliefs granted to taxpayers. Arrears (*bākāyā*) were meticulously noted and claimed in following years, although it was in practice often necessary, when arrears had accumulated, to settle them by compromise. Recovery of taxes necessitated a distinction between the two calendar years, for only the personal taxes or the payments *ex contractu* could be based on the legal lunar year, while the taxes on land and its produce were of necessity based on the solar year, Persian or Egyptian.

These methods, which were the pride of the *hujūd* and the *hussāb*, allowed the ‘Abbāsid Caliphate, until the beginning of the 4th/10th century, and certain regional rulers after that date, to establish veritable budgets, at any rate of receipts (the arbitrary activity of the rulers in the matter of expenditure not allowing equally comprehensive appreciations in that sphere). In particular four ‘Abbāsid budgets have been preserved, undoubtedly based upon good archive sources, the relative agreement of which guarantees the accuracy, if not of all the details, at least of the main and broad essentials. They do not provide a complete statement of the total receipts of the Caliphate, for the *qijāya*, the *sakād* on moveable property and, *a fortiori*, the *mukhās* only figure there exceptionally (their more variable character and the fact that they did not issue from the same services being obvious). Such as they are they show a total of income exceeding 400 million dirhams for the second half of the 2nd/8th century, falling short of 300 million by the beginning of the following century, and at the beginning of the 4th/10th century down to 14½ million dinars, which is approximately equivalent to 210 million dirhams. This shrinking of the receipts was due to the territorial losses of the Caliphate and not, except at moments of crisis, to diminishing fiscal values within each province. The increasing financial difficulties of the Caliphate were, therefore, not occasioned by any economic catastrophe, for which supposition there is absolutely no foundation, but by the relatively increasing burden of necessary expenditure, particularly military, which it was impossible to reduce in proportion to the decline in the provincial tax returns. Without attempting here to cover all the details of the military organisation of the Caliphate, we may try to show something of the financial burden which it constituted: a foot-soldier’s usual pay being of the order of 1000 dirhams per annum, and that of a horseman double this amount, it can be estimated that the cost of the stipends alone for an army fifty thousand strong would be in the region of seventy five million dirhams. To this, of course, it is necessary to add the exceptional salaries of the commanders, the gratuities and the cost of equipping and maintaining the armies and the fortifications etc., and one writer maintains that in the middle of the 3rd/9th century the army was costing at one time some 200 million dirhams, which means to say that at that moment there would be a surplus only of approximately one half of that sum (not counting the taxes which did not figure in the budget) for all “civilian” expenditure. This latter expenditure is more difficult to assess, although we know the salaries of the principal officers of Government and Court under the ‘Abbāsids and the Fāṭimid, not to speak of later periods (see especially Hilal al-Ṣahh, *Wuzārā*, and al-Maqrīzī, *Khilāl*, ii, 401).

It is difficult to give a precise description of the various organs of the central fiscal administration which often, and in a varying manner, overlap and are confused with each other under ill-defined titles. The fiscal administration was the primary duty of the *diwān* in particular and in general, consequently, of the vizirate when this latter developed. But it was impossible for a single organ to deal at the same time with both the operations and the fundamental rules of *qabla* (assessment and collection and the daily accounts of income and expenditure. In spite of the difficulty of the texts it is apparently to this division of duties that the institution of the *diwān al-imtām* corresponds, for this office, which was later known in the East as the *istiqf* (the director being the *mustawfi*) appears to be the service of accounting. From the time of al-Mahdī it controlled the accountancy services attached to each *diwān* as well as those of the provincial administrations. Expenditure was the province of a special *diwān*, the *diwān al-maḥbūs*, while expenditures relating to the army were the province of the *diwān al-dākhil*. With the inauguration of the system of the fiscal *shabī‘* this latter *diwān* in fact came to possess duplicates of the survey registers for receipts. The *Bayt al-Māl* properly so called was the service to which the income was delivered and from which the expenditure was drawn, the Treasury. An army of scribes, *hutāb*, and accountants, *hussāb*, worked in these offices, some under the control of others, applying the accountancy techniques which the didactic fiscal treatises of the Būyid period have revealed to us. For the representation of numbers they employed what is known as the *diwān* script, which consisted of letters and particular signs devised from abbreviations of the names of numbers, and which was to remain in use almost up to the present day in certain countries, to the exclusion of the “Arabic” numerals. Still further subdivisions existed in the services, in particular, as regards the receipt of the land taxes, between the service for the *khāraḍ* and that for the *diyād*, that is to say landed properties subject solely to the tithe. On the other hand a regional division was gradually established, by virtue of which we can distinguish a *Diwān* of Sāwād (province of Bābdhād), one of the east and one of the west (Arab territories). Special services ministered confiscated properties; these were sometimes returned, sometimes distributed. Again, dues paid in kind, presents and gifts received, the valuable products of the *fīrāz* etc., were stored in the *khāṣād* or *mukhās* and, and the general term of *mukhās* appears to have almost replaced, in the administration of the later Caliphate, the term of *Bayt al-Māl*, the change reflecting, undoubtedly, the proportionate increase of presentations in kind and the diminution of fiscal receipts in hard cash.

The Muslim State, however, always recognised the distinction between the private Treasury of the
Caliph or the Prince, Bayt mâl al-khdssâ, and the public Treasury, Bayt mâl al-muslimin or simply Bayt al-mâl. But the distinction was by no means a rigid one, for the private Treasury was supplied not only with the revenues from the sovereign's personal estate but also with different public revenues such as fines, confiscations and even capitulation fees and land taxes from certain provinces of Irâk and southern Iran, out of consideration for both the needs of the Court and also all the pious works which the Caliph and his successors had to undertake. In practice, whatever the pecuniary position of the Caliphs, the privy purse had often to play the rôle of a simple reserve for the public Treasury, furnishing it with advances which might or might not be reimbursed (W. Fischel, Le Bayt Mâl al-khdssâ, in Actes du 19e Congrès des Orientalistes, 1938, 538-41).

Each of the provinces had, on a small scale, an organisation parallel to that of the central government. They did not despatch to the latter the sum total of their fiscal revenue but only the residue after local expenses had been satisfied. Furthermore the provinces did not send on this residue as and when local expenses had been satisfied. Furthermore the organisation parallel to that of the central government was in proportion to the fiscal autonomy of the provinces, even if it did not alleviate the tax burden itself, did improve the situation in general, since the interest of the fiscal rulers lay in being self-supporting and in at least expending on the spot revenues which had formerly gone to enrich the favourites of the Caliph. A few echoes of the conflicts between the democratic and aristocratic notions of taxation have come down to us (for example in Ibn al-Kalanisî, 343 and 352-3).

The growing, albeit variable, spread of the régime of the fiscal sâmil* from the beginning of the 4th/10th century considerably diminished the importance of the fiscal administrations, as it also did that of the direct resources of the State. It is out of the question here to trace the financial history of the different Muslim principalities which were the heirs of the Caliphate. It must suffice to say that until modern times the countries which have not been affected by the Mongol invasion have retained for the taxpayers almost the same régime of taxation as that of the State was in the 12th/18th century. The rights of the State have only ever been partially alienated and that in consequence certain methods of assessment and budgetary estimates have always there been possible. The countries incorporated, during the 7th/13th century, into the Mongol Empire, not to speak of the subsequent series of changes of rule, experimented with forms of fiscal administration which combined with the old Muslim traditions new elements taken from the conquerers. Such elements were also introduced into Asia minor, where, in addition, there still persisted Byzantine traditions which had become interwoven with the local Saldjûkîd Muslim institutions; and these three elements apparently influenced, though in a way which has not yet been discovered, the original formation of the future Ottoman institutions. The figures quoted in such and such a source have often been adduced to demonstrate the decadence of the fiscal revenues and consequently of the economy; but these figures can only be interpreted on the basis of a consideration, in the first place of the proportion of taxes accruing directly to the State and that alienated to individuals, and in the second place of the value of currency and market prices; and it would be wise for the moment to refrain from any positive assertion.

_Bibliography:_ We can naturally do no more here than note certain sources of particular importance. For the origins references may be found in Caetani, _Annali_, iv, 368-417, to which may be added Abû 'Ubâyda b. Sallâm, K. al-Amwâl (see 'ârijâ); the majority are drawn from the works on _iḥrâd_ composed in the 1st 'Abbasid century by Abû Yûsûf and Yûsûf b. Adîm, and that of an annotated English translation by A. Ben Shemesh, Leiden 1958 has just appeared), and, later, from the K. al-Fuṣûsh of Balâghhuri. The K. al-Khâridji (not wholly preserved) of Kudâma (ed. A. Makki, a typewritten thesis, Sorbonne, Paris) and the scattered information in the Ma'dâsh al-Ulim of Khwârizmi date from the 6th/12th century, and the _Abhâm al-Sulâmî_ of Mâwardî from the 5th/11th century. The
budgets studied by A. V. Kremer in his *Kulturgeschichte des Orients*, i, ch. VII and Das Einnahmenbudget ... vom Jahre 306 (Denkschr. d. k. Akad. d. W. Wien, Ph. Hist. Kl. 38, 1888 (the oldest one, now also accessible in Dijhaviyâr, K. al-Wusârî, ed. Mizik, 179-182, or Cairo 1938, 281-88)) are drawn from various chronicles. To the Bûydî period belong the didactic treatises on fiscal mathematics of al-Bûzâqânî (a study is being prepared by Saleh el-Alli, Baghdad) and of the anonymous author of the K. al-Ḥâlî (analysed and commented upon by myself in ABER, x, 1952). Much information can naturally be obtained from the Egyptian papyri, edited by A. Grohmann, see his commentaries in the articles in the *Archiv Oriental*., v-vi, 1933-1934, and by C. Leyerer in ZDMG, 1953. Among the historical chronicles and works the most valuable are evidently the *Taḏbardîb ‘Umam* of Ibn Miskawaih with their supplement by Rûdhrawarl, the K. al-Wusârî of Hîlal al-Ṣâhîr and the *Tawâkht Kumn* of Hasân b. M. Kûmî, much used in A. K. S. Lambton, *Landlord and Peasant in Persia*, Oxford 1953, especially chap. II. Certain official correspondence, such as that of the Bûydî vizir Ibn ‘Abbâd, ed. ‘Abbâd al-Wâhâb, ‘Azzâm and Shûkhî Da‘îl, 1947, may be consulted with advantage. For subsequent periods it will suffice to note certain recent publications: for the Ayyubids, in addition to the classical *Kawdnîn al-Dawdîn* of Ibn Mammati (ed. Atiya, 1943), the short works of ‘Ughmân b. Ibr. al-Nâbulusi (*Description of Fayyum*, see my analysis in *Arabica* 1956, and *Lam* al-Kawdnîn, edition prepared by myself); for the Mongols, the *Kesrâyî fâlakhiyya* of ‘Abbâd Allâh b. Kiyâm al-Mâzâdarânî ed. W. Hinz and studied by him in *Der Islam*, xxix, 1949; for the Yemen, R. B. Serjeant and myself will publish a valuable work of the 9th/10th century, the *Mula‘khhas al-fisân* (cf. *Arabica*, iv, 1957, 23 f.). For Egypt in general and the Mamlûks in particular the importance of Makrîzî, Khiyâtî, and of Kalkašhândî, ‘Ushb need not be emphasised.

There does not exist any financial history of the Muslim world; there are, however, certain useful partial studies. See particularly D. C. Dennett, *Conversion and the Poll-Tax in early Islam*, 1954; for the whole of the “classical” period, Fr. Lokkegaard, *Islamic taxation in the classic period*, 1953 (a great documentary and technical achievement, but not uniformly reliable) which refers to the works, important in their time but now superseded, of C. Becker, etc., and Chapter 8 (cf. 5) of *Mez in Renaissance*. Useful observations will be found in the Sorbonne thesis of D. Sourdol on *Le visirat abbâsîde*, when this is published. Among other more specialised studies, apart from those which are cited in the text of the article, see W. Fischel, *Origin of Banking in Medieval Islam*, in *JRAI*, 1933, and H. Gottschalk, *Die Mâlardîvîyya*. An exposition of the classical doctrine may be found, for example, in S. A. Siddiqi, *Public Finance in Islam*, Karachi 1948. (CL. CAREN)

In the Ottomân state the distinction was carefully maintained between the private treasury of the Sultan (*Khazine-i Endûrîn* or ‘îl Khazine) and the public treasury or treasuries of the state (*Khazine-i Emirîyye, Khazine-i Develî, Khazine-i Âmire*, etc. On the Ottoman treasury, and finances see further *Dâftarâs, Khazine, Mâliyya*). The term most commonly used to the state treasury was *Mîrî* (from *emirî*), which was also used in the more general sense of government property (cf. *beyâlîk*). In Ottoman administrative documents it is normally called *bayt al-mâl*, though the expression does occur, usually in the forms *bayt al-mâl-i Mûsîmîn or bayt al-mâl-i ʾîmâma* (as for example in some legal rulings of Abu ʿİ Suʿûd quoted by Ömer Lutfi Barkan in *Tanzimat*, Istanbul 1940, 333, 335, 343; and in a few *kânûnînâmes* published in Barkan, *Kanunlar*, 297, 300, 326. In all these the context is the rights of the *bayt al-mâl* over certain categories of land, called *ard-i mîrî or ard-i memleket*). In common Ottoman usage the term *bayt al-mâl* was normally restricted to a certain group of revenues belonging by law to the public treasury. These consisted of various categories of forfeited, escheated, and unclaimed property, and are enumerated and discussed in a number of documents. The most important were property belonging to missing and absent persons (*mîlî-i gâdîb* and *mîlî-i maḥbûb*); escheated property (mukaddasât, mabârad); runaway slaves and stray cattle (*‘abd-i ãbîb, kakhun, yasû*). The collection and care of these properties was the function of an official called the *Emin bayt al-mâl* or *bayt al-mâlîgî*. Most legal sources agree that unclaimed properties are to be held for a period of time, variously determined, as a trust, to give the heirs the opportunity to assert and establish their claim. Only after their failure to do so does the money or estate become the property of the treasury. There are frequent complaints that this rule was disregarded, and that property was seized too quickly and without proper verification (e.g., Lutfi Paşa, *Aşfâmîn*, ed. and tr. R. Tschudi, Berlin 1970, text 12, tr. 12; cf. Sarî Meşmûd Paşa, *Naşîbî al-Wusârâ* ed. and tr. W. L. Wright, Princeton 1935, 71).

The Ottoman *kânûnînâmes* contain elaborate instructions and safeguards concerning the claiming of these properties and the assigning of the proceeds. Properties claimed for the *bayt al-mâl* could be and frequently were assigned to *‘amîls*, to *sandjak-beys*, and even to *şâbîhs*. As early as 883/1479, a *ferman* of Mehmed II lays down a distinction between reversions worth less than 10,000 aspers, and those worth 10,000 and over. The former were to be paid to the *‘amîl*, or tax-farmer of the area; the latter were reserved to the Imperial treasury (*beyâlîk*) (Halil Inalcık, *Faith Sultan Mehmed’in Fermanlari*, Bell. no. 44, 1947, 699-700). A similar distinction is made in a late 15th century *kânûnînâme* (Anhegger-Inalcık 70-1), and is common in *kânûnînâmes* and registers from the 16th century onwards.

The normal rule was that these properties, or the fees payable if they were successfully reclaimed by their owners, belonged to the treasury. In fact the share of the treasury was limited to items worth 10,000 aspers or more, and to property left by the servants of the Sultan, a category including the *şâbîhs* and other persons in the Sultan’s employ. In the earlier period it also included the Janissaries. The remainder was part of the *khâs* of the *sandjak-beys*. There were some exceptions to this division. In the so-called ‘free’ *imalars* (*serbest imârs*), the *bayt al-mâl* revenues were assigned to the *imalar*-holder, and not, as in ordinary *imalars*, reserved to the Sultan’s or the governor’s *khâs*; in some *sâyi* lands too, notably those in favour of the *barameyn*, they were included in the *sâyi* revenues. From the 16th century the Janissaries had a special officer of their own, the *Ojâk bayt al-mâlîgî*, a kind of regimental
treasurer one of whose duties was to collect and assess the *mukhallafat* of heirless Janissaries, "şâqimi ohlâns", etc. These or their equivalent were placed in the regental chest (Isma'il Hakkû Uzunçarşılı, Ṭurşûs, Osmani Devletî teşkilâtîndan Kapulu Ocaklari I, Ankara, 1943, 311-320). Another interesting example of corporate privilege occurs in Jerusalem, where the *Zâviya* of Maqârib *muğâwirs* were collectively given the right of retaining the *mukhallafat* of any one of their number who died without heirs. This right was granted by Salâdîn, and confirmed by the Mâmrîdî and Ottoman Sultans (Basvekalet Arşivi, tapu register no. 427 of 352/1556; cf. A. S. Tritton, Materials on Muslim Education in the Middle Ages, London, 1957, 123). A similar privilege appears to have been given to the monks on Mount Athos (P. Lemerle and P. Wittêk, Recherches sur l'histoire et le statut des monastères orientaux sous la domination turque, Archives du droit oriental, iii, 1948, 443, 544, 453, 465).

### Bibliography:


The *Muslim* West. As long as the Maqârib and al-Andalus were under the direct administration of the Umayyâd or the *Abbâsid* Caliphate they posed no particular problems of financial organisation; the local *bayt al-mâl* was only a branch of the *bayt al-mâl* of Damascus or of Bagdad.

It was only when some part of the Muslim west slipped from the control of the eastern Caliphate that separate administrations were organised there.

Except for the chapters of Ibn Khaldûn devoted to administration (Masâddîmîn, Cairo ed., 269), one cannot point to any detailed concerning the administration of the public finances or even any systematic treatment of the situation at any given period or place. There is no alternative but to try to give some idea of what happened from the slight and scattered indications in the chronicles and diverse documents available.

1. Al-Andalus. The work of E. Lévi-Provençal has shown that in Muslim Spain the term *bayt al-mâl* was nearly always taken in a limited sense. In effect this expression, which is often found in the form *bayt mîl al-musulîmîn*, designates the treasury composed by the revenues of pious foundations (*awâkîf*) and clearly distinct from the public treasury properly speaking, which is commonly called *kânsûnîat al-mâl* and much more rarely *bayt al-mâl*. This treasure from pious foundations was quite naturally placed under the authority of the *kâdî* who looked after its administration, and was kept in a religious building, at Cordova in the *mâkhûra* of the Great Mosque (Ibn Əlînârî, Bayânî, iii, 98). The sums which constituted it originated for the most part from the revenues of pious foundations often assigned to strictly determined expenditure, but also from irregular deposits that could not be touched, in particular the goods of the "absentees" (mâhkûh), that is Muslims who, for one reason or another, had abandoned their possessions without designating a legal mandate for their administration.

The *kâdî* was assisted in the provinces by the inspectors of the pious foundations (nâṣîr al-*awâkîf*) and was only qualified to authorise expenditure. These funds could only be employed for the ends indicated by the donors, or if the objects were only expressed in vague terms, for works of public utility and religion like help for paupers, the upkeep of mosques and the payment of their staff, the building of institutions of learning and the payment of teachers, etc. The *kâdî* could authorise advances from the public Treasury for pious works like the organisation of a military campaign against the infidels or the restoration of a defence work on the frontier of the dâr al-îslâm.

This system still functioned at the beginning of the 6th/12th century during the Almoravid occupation, as is shown in Ibn ʿAbdûn’s discourse on the *bîšîa*, edited and translated by E. Lévi-Provençal (see bibliography).

II. Maqârib. Nothing leads us to believe that the term *bayt al-mâl* was used in the Maqârib in such a restricted sense. It seems to have been used in its wider meaning of the public Treasury and it designates at the same time the administration of public finances.

So far the financial organisation of the different states of the Muslim West has not been the object of a systematic study. It must be added that the information supplied by the Arabic chronicles is slight and very scrappy. We must be content with very general observations on the matter.

The Ṭâhlabîs of al-Ḵawwârîn do not appear to have been innovators in this respect and seem to have been content with the system they found when they came to power in 184/800. If the ʿAlînîms did not change much in the administration and nomenclature of the taxes, they obtained, according to the indications of Ibn Ḥawkâl (ed. De Goeje, 69) a remarkable return from the taxes, the annual total of which reached 7 to 8 million dinars. The Zîrîds could only maintain the system so well organised by their predecessors.

We know practically nothing about the financial organisation of the Almoravids except that their first ruler, Yûsûf b. Ṭâhâfûn felt obliged to content himself with "legal" taxes—an attitude which his successors did not keep up, and that they maintained in Spain the organisation that they found in force there.

The only precise indication that we have is the subject of the Almohads is the establishment by ʿAbd al-Mumanent in 555/1160 of a sort of cadaster intended to cover the whole Maqârib and to help in the assessment of a land tax (ṣûrûdîyâ) (Râvûd al-Kirûfîs, ed. Tornberg, 126; 174).

R. Brunswig’s study on the ʿHâṣîds contains all the details possible—and they are comparatively few—on the financial organisation of the eastern Maqârib from the 7th/13th to 9th/15th centuries. The official who directed it bore the name of Ŝâkîh al-asâbîkâl, a term also used by Ibn Khaldûn (*loc. cit.*), then of munâfîfîh. It was characterised by the fact that, in a number of instances, it renounced *Kûrânîc* "legality" but it was successful, for the Ḥâṣîd treasury was nearly always well filled.

Nothing precise is known about the Banû ʿAbd al-Wâd. It is possible that the thesis being prepared by M. Mounîn may clarify the subject.

The rare and scattered indications on the financial organisation of the Maqûïds can be found in the
**Masālik of Ibn Fadl Allāh-al ‘Umari (tr. M. Guade-froy-Demombynes, BGA, ii, Paris 1927) and in the Musnad of Ibn Marsūk (ed. and tr. E. Levi-Provençal, in Hesp., 1925). They all concern the reign of Abu ‘l-‘Uṣaybā’ī (the middle of the 14th century).**

A text of al-‘Irāfīr (Nuzhat al-‘Irāfīr, ed., Houdas, 38-40; tr. 70-75) provides interesting information on fiscal matters at the beginning of the Sa‘dīd period and on the establishment of a new land tax called nā‘īdā. Finally, the work of E. Michaux-Bellaire gives quite a clear picture of the financial system under the ‘Alawīd dynasty at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries.

It may be hoped that the Turkish archives preserved in Tunis and Algiers contain the materials for a study of Turkish fiscal policy in the Maghrib, at least from the 18th century.


(R. Le Tourneau)

**AL-BAYT AL-MUQADDAS** [see al-Kuds]

**BAYT RĀS,** a village in Transjordania, was described by the Arab geographers, and situated about 3.5 km. N. of Irbid in the district of ‘Ajlūn [q.v.], on an eminence (389 m.) surrounded by ruins which mark the desert site of the ancient Capitolias. This town of the Decapolis, the name of which corresponds to the Arabic name which outlived it and doubtless relates to its dominant position in a less hilly region, was noted by the early itineraries along with Aṣhūr (Der‘a), Abila (Tall Abil) and Gadara (Umm ar-Rayb), which were neighbouring places. Formerly a Nabatean possession, it had maintained its importance as a Byzantine bishopric of Palestine Secunda. Occupied by Shu-rabīb b. Hasana at the beginning of the period of Arab conquest and incorporated in the jund of Urdunn, it enjoyed during the Umayyad period a position which is attested by various notices in the poets and chroniclers. These sing the praises of its wine, “already praised by the pre-Islamic poets Nābiğha Dhubyānī and Ḥassān b. ‘Abîl Ġhūfī (H. Lammens) and still known by Yākūt in the 6th/13th century, and mention it as the seat of the caliph Yazīd II, who lived there with his favourite Ḥabba (the tradition which makes it the birthplace of the caliph Yazīd I seems however more doubtful, and may be based on a confusion with the village of Bayt Rānūs in the Ghuta of Damascus, as has already been pointed out by H. Lammens, Études sur le règne du califique omayyade Mo‘awia le, Beirut 1908, 379 and n.). The fame of Bayt Rās, at a period when the Marwānīd rulers preferred to reside in the region of al-Balqā‘ [q.v.], which is rich in archaeological remains that can be attributed to them, was followed by a rapid decline, and the site was almost completely abandoned. It is a cause for regret, however, that the ruins which still exist, and which have been briefly described by travellers, have never formed the subject of a serious study which might enable one to distinguish the traces of an Umayyad establishment in the midst of the earlier buildings.

**BAYT AL-MĀL — BAYTAR**

**BAYṬAR** is the most frequently used form of the word which denotes the veterinary surgeon. It is an arabised form of ἰπποτρόχος, and, as a matter of fact, the more exact form ḵavār is to be found in ancient poetry, as well as baytar. The preservation of the original Greek form in Oriental languages is also proved by the 12th century Mīnārāt Numūrī, 9, where ḥayṭār is expressly written. However, the Greek hippiatric terminology does not seem to have been known in Islam, if the quotation of Heraclides in al-Bīrūnī, al-Andalus, 1350 does not mean Heracleides of Tarentum (ca. 75 B.C.), who wrote, amongst others, a hippiatric book, cf. M. J. Haschmi, Die Quellen des Steinbuches des Bīrūīnī, Thesis, Bonn 1935, 44. A pseudo-Hippocratic work on the subject bearing the title De Curationibus infirmitatum equorum, was translated by a Jew named Moses of Palermo for Charles I of Anjou (1266-1285), and printed in Bologna 1865, in P. Delprato, Trattati di <i>mascalia</i> attribuiti ad Ipocrate tradotti dall'arabo in latino.

The oldest Arabic work on <i>baytara</i> is ascribed to Ḥunayn b. Ṣa‘īdī by Ibn Abī ‘Uṣaybā‘ī, i, 200, 26; it is also the only work on the subject quoted by Taḥkūrīzāde, Miṣṭah al-sa‘ādā, i, 270, who calls it “sufficient” (ḥaflat). A work called Ḥabīr b. Ṣa‘īdī (Husayn) is the first author on hippiatrics whose works are preserved, namely, Abū Yūsuf Ya‘kūb b. Ḥabīr Ḥiṣām, stablemaster to al-’Uṯmān and al-Mu’taḍīd (second half of 3rd/9th century), cf. Brockelmann, S I, 432 ff., where further bibliography is quoted. A great many manuscripts of books by several authors were listed by H. Ritter in an annex to his review on ‘All b. ’Abd al-Rahmān b. Ḥudhayl al-Andalusī, La parure des cavaliers, ed. L. Mercier, 1922 (Der Islam, xviii, 1929, 119-126). The words baytar and baytara are still in use in modern Spanish (albestar and albestaria). An French article on the veterinary medicine of the Bedouins was translated into Arabic by Père Anastase, al-Machriq, i, 1898, 684, 942.


(M. Plessner)
**BAYYĀNA, Span. Baena**, a small town in the province of Córdoba, 59 kilometres from the capital. During the Muslim period it belonged to the district of Cabra; with al-Zahrāʾ, Ecija, Lucena and Cordova, it formed the ṭālim of al-Kambaniya (la Campana). Situated on a hill in the Campana of Cordova and watered by the Marbella, a tributary of the Guadajoz, it was surrounded by gardens, vineyards and olive groves, as at present, and enjoyed great prosperity during the Umayyad period. The town possessed a solid fortress, situated on the slope facing the river, a cathedral mosque built by the order of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān II, markets and baths. Ibn Ḥafsūn [q.v.] succeeded in conquering Bayyana during the period of the ʿamīr ʿAbd Allāh but, with the fall of the caliphate and the ensuing disorder of the fīna, it lost much of its rural tranquillity. Its present location dates back to the Muslim period, as no Roman traces have been found there nor in various parts of its environs, as far as the neighbouring ridge of Antigua. Alfonso the Warlike on his famous expedition into Andalusia, passed by Baena without taking it, shortly before the battle of Arnisol (Ṣafar 520/March 1126). When the town fell into the hands of Ferdinand III in 1240, it had a double enclosure, an internal wall which enclosed the alcazaba and the mudaina, and an external wall which encompassed the outskirts occupied by the civilian population. The mudejares who remained at Baena were transferred to Castile in 1571, but a royal charter authorised their establishment at Cordova until their final expulsion. The most important celebrity of the town was Kāsim b. Aḥṣāq b. Muḥammad b. Yūṣuf b. Nāṣr b. ʿAbd Allāh, a traditionalist and philologist who was born at Baena in 247/862 and died at Cordova in 340/951.

**BAYYĀSA, Span. Baeza**, a town in the province of Jaen, 48 kilometres from the capital. Its present population is about 17,000 and it is situated on a hill whose slopes descend to the valleys of the Guadajoz and the Guadajal. Of Iberian foundation, it was called Bistra, according to Ptolemy. Pliny calls its inhabitants Vindicenses, and the Goths made it the seat of the diocese biatensiōnis. Upon its fall to the Muslims it took the name Bayyāsa. Its corn and barley were praised, according to al-Idrisī, who did not however mention its olive groves which today cover half its area.

During the Umayyad caliphate Ibn Ḥafsūn [q.v.] conquered it, but it was retaken by ʿAbd al-Raḥmān III in 217/910. In 412/1021 the town belonged, with Jaen and Calatrava, to the sief of Zaid b. ʿAmīr. It was occupied by the Almoravids, whose last champion in al-Andalus, Ibn Ghanīya, surrendered it in 541/1146 to the emperor Alfonso VII; the latter kept it until he evacuated it in 552/1157 at the same time as Ubeda, shortly before his death and after the loss of Almería. For nearly a century it belonged to the Almohads, and in 609/1212 Al-Nāṣir on his way to Las Navas de Tolosa, moved his camp from Jaen to Baeza. After the rout, the inhabitants of Baeza fled to Ubeda, and on 18 Ṣafar 609/20 July 1212, the victors entered the deserted city and burned it. When the Christians had retired, it was rebuilt and repopulated. In the following year, Alfonso VIII beset it with difficulty during the winter of 1213-14, and was forced to retire without success.

A nephew of ʿAbd al-Muʿmin, Abū ʿAbd Allāh, who held the governorships of Bougie, the Balearics and Valencia, must have lived for a long time at Baeza, for his ten sons had the surname al-Bayyāṣ, and the eldest, ʿAbd Allāh revolted at Baeza against the caliphs al-ʿĀlid and al-Maʿmūn. He allied himself with Ferdinand III and received a Castilian garrison in the alcazaba of Baeza. When he was killed by the Cordovans in 623/1226, the inhabitants of Baeza again abandoned their city, and it was finally occupied by Ferdinand III on 19 Ḍuʿl-Hijja 2440 November 1247. During the 14th and 15th centuries, Baeza, as a stronghold of great strategic importance, owing to its situation on the frontier between Castile and the kingdom of Granada, played a major rôle in the struggles of the Reconquest between the Nasrids and the Marinids.

**BAYYINA** (plural bayyinā), etymologically the feminine adjective “clear, evident”, was already in use as a substantive with the meaning of “manifest proof” in numerous passages of the Kurʾān—in xxviii, 1 for example, whence it is that the Sūra itself is entitled al-Bayyina. In legal terminology the word denotes the proof per excellensiam—that established by oral testimony—, although from the classical era the term came to be applied not only to the fact of giving testimony at law but also to the witnesses themselves. There are other words to express other aspects or degrees of the notion of proof, notably ḫadīth (plural ḫadījāt) “argument, proof (in general or at law)”, “a document constituting proof”, dāll “conclusive indication” and ṣurban “demonstration”.

In the legal field the Kurʾān is concerned with proof in diverse matters, both civil and penal. It is at once noteworthy that it is fundamentally concerned with oral testimony (gāha [q.v.]) that the Kurʾān prescribes recourse. It recommends that certain legal acts should be established by witnesses—divorce by repudiation (lxv, 2), testamentary dispositions (v, 106-108), accounts of guardianship (iv, 7) and the contracting of debts (ii, 282). And while, in this last case, the Kurʾān strongly supports written evidence, this is closely tied up with the eye-witnesses who ought to corroborate, as soon as it is completed, the recognition of the debt dictated to the scribe by the debtor. Such are the modes of proof which the Kurʾān, albeit in a summary fashion, regulates. It notes, in addition, the need for a double number of witnesses (four in place of the ordinary number of two) to establish legal proof of fornication (iv, 19, xxiv, 4, 13); and, to provide for the case where the husband cannot produce this difficult standard of proof of his wife’s adultery, institutes the exceptional procedure of the mutual “oath of imprecation” (lādān) between the spouses (xxiv, 6-9). This procedure, although it does not, properly speaking, establish proof, has, nevertheless, important legal effects. On the other hand the sacred book has nothing to say about the primitive institutions of physical ordeal and oaths of compurgation.

Classical Islamic law consecrated the superiority of proof by testimony, requiring, for its validity,
the fulfilment of some fairly stringent theoretical conditions (see 'ADL and SHAHADA). And it was only in so far as written evidence could be construed as a *sahih* (i.e., the weight of Roman law) that it became generally and more widely accepted, though not without keen discussion, reservations and precautions, even in the case of notarial acts (see E. Tyan, *Le notariat et le régime de la preuve par écrit dans la pratique du droit musulman*, Annales École française de droit de Beyrouth, 1945, no. 2).

In the Kur'anic verses relating to testamentary dispositions (v. 169-170) the witnesses, in case of suspicion, or new substitute witnesses, were invited to take an oath by Allah; but traditional theory regards as abrogated the precept contained in this passage, which is the only one in the Kur'ān where third-party witnesses are required to support their own evidence by an oath. Occasional and exceptional instances can be adduced, under Islam, of kādīs subjecting suspect witnesses to the oath. The celebrated maxim declares: "The burden of proof (by testimony) lies upon the one who makes the allegation and the oath belongs to him who denies (al-bayyina 'alā l-mudda'ī wa-l-yamin 'alā l-mandār)" with the variant "to him against whom the allegation is made (alā l-muddāsī 'alayh)." It ought to be noted that in the process of the action "the one who makes the allegation is not necessarily the original plaintiff (and hence the burden of proof may fluctuate), and further that, in the view of the scholars, evidence can only normally be given to positive facts.

In principle the *bayyina* itself has a self-sufficient authority: where the legal conditions of validity are satisfied it is, as a general rule, binding upon the judge. Several early attempts to support testimony with an oath taken by the plaintiff wholly failed, apart from cases where the defendant defaults or suffers from some incapacity, to influence the classical law (Schacht, *Origins*, 187-188; see Ibn Kūnuma, *Mudāfā*, i, 77). Notwithstanding the assistance of the Fātimids, kādīs Na'mūn, Ibtidsar, Damascus 1557, 163). The Hanafi school held strictly to the letter of the maxim mentioned above, and indeed certainly contributed to the spread of its influence, if not to its very formulation; for, contrary to the doctrine of the other madhābi, Hanafi law does not allow the plaintiff to take the oath in order to complete an imperfect *bayyina* (a single witness) in disputes concerning property, nor does it allow the oath declined by the defendant to be returned to the plaintiff. In the mutual taking of the oath (tahdul) which the Hanafis, along with the other schools, upheld in certain cases where *bayyina* is lacking, each of the two parties stands in relation to other in the position of defendant. For other developments of the judicial oath see the article *yamin*. We will only observe here that the pre-Islamic oath of compurgation survives, in Islamic law, as a method of proof in a limited field of penal procedure (see *kāsamah*).

It is possible, especially in regard to property claims, that contradictory *bayyināt* may confront each other. The *fiqh* texts concern themselves with this *sa'dād al-bayyināt* and endeavour to destroy the conflict by officially declaring one of the proofs superior on the basis of criteria which differ considerably among the different schools and may result in diametrically opposite solutions. Should the proofs concerned nevertheless still prove equal, the solutions, even within the schools themselves, vary between their reciprocal postulates. Indeed the contrary is explicitly stated by the Zāhirī Ibn Ḥamza, *Muhallā*, i, 426. The doctrine requires less in the way of personal capacity for an acknowledgement than for testimony, by reason of the basic presumption of truthfulness on the part of the person making the acknowledgement. But the authors usually—and quite sensibly—distinguish in this regard between the acknowledgement whose only effect is to bind the one who makes it ('alā nafṣi) and the acknowledgement which affects the rights of third parties (*fi ḥabb ḍhuyūrīh), and their decisive force and their legal consequences differ considerably.

In addition it would be relevant, on the subject of *bayyina*, to enquire into the position, in relation to it, of the expert evidence which may be required by the judge. Further, if one were to attempt a general theory of proof in Islamic law, it would be fitting to take account of the discussions relating to the judge's personal knowledge of the facts of a case, to underline the considerable importance and the abundance of legal presumptions, and to note the role and the importance of certain auxiliary indications or initial steps in proof recognised by the law. In this field of proof at law two Islamic tendencies may be observed: the desire to establish, in a humane fashion, what is most probable by regulated means rather than to pursue the strict truth, the certain knowledge of which belongs only to God,—and a tendency towards rationalisation, which, though it does not prevail always and everywhere, is nevertheless latent in, for example, the position allotted to the oath in the field of personal capacity for an acknowledge-
Shubrawi, Rector of the Azhar, whose determination on this occasion contrasts favourably with his behaviour on others (Djabarti, i, 195). Bayyumi’s works include handbooks on the Demirdashiyya and Bayyumiyya and a commentary on Dhill’s Insâni al-Kâmîl. He seems to have been most at home in hâdîth, on which he lectured when Shubrawi invited him to the Taybarsiyya College at the Azhar. The mosque in which he is buried was built by Mustafa Pasha, a wâli of Egypt (probably between 1757-1760), when according to Djabarti he became grand vezir (probably sometime between 1763/1765). Bayyumi did not leave any ascetics, but his dhîkhr was still popular during the mawlid in Lane’s days.

**Bibliography:** To Brockelmann, II 462, S I 784, S II 146, 475 add: Risâdat al-Tanbihal Muâlîk li man lâhu al-Wâdîd al-Kâmîl (MS in writer’s possession); Sarkis 622; Djabarti, i, 339; Lane, Modern Egyptians, 249, 401.

**BAYZARA,** (Arabic), denotes “the art of the flying-hunt”, and is not restricted to the designation of “falconry”. (Its Persian origin from bâz: goshawk; see below) is more closely related to the notion of “orстing art”). Derived from bâyzâr, “orstinger”, an Arabised form of the Persian bâzyâr/badâdar, it was preferred to its dual form bâzarra; the words bâzya and bîyâwa were scarcely used in the Muslim Occident. The use of rapacious predators (bâsîr, pl. kawasîr) as “beasts of prey” (dâjîrîh, pl. dâjwarîh) was undoubtedly known to the Arabs before Islam, and Imru’ul-Kays sketches in his asyâym al-sayd, some descriptions of flying-sport. However, hawking only assumed importance with them after the great Muslim conquests which brought them into contact with the Persians and the Byzantines. It quickly won the favour of the new leaders who discovered in it the possibility of diversion and of satisfying peacefully their passion for riding. Caliphs and high Muslim dignitaries were zealous in elevating it, with venery, to the rank of an institution under the direction of a “master of chases” (amir al-sayd), and later (amir al-mulâk). The Umayyad caliph Yazid b. Mu’awiyah (680-83) was one of the first to show an unbridled enthusiasm for the flying-hunt. Historians, biographers and chroniclers in the Arabic language provide information, each according to his own period and country, on the current practice of hawking, and relate for the occasion lively anecdotes of the exploits of certain princes in this field. (see al-Tabari, Ibn al-Akhîr, al-Suyûtî, al-Makrizî-Quatre-mère, in J. Sauvaget, Introduction, à l’Hist. de l’Orient Musulman.) Much more valuable is the information concerning bayzara found in certain encyclopedic works, edited for the purpose of adab or philological learning, such as the K. al-Bayawînî of Al-Dihiq (Cairo 1947), the Al-Mubâjjasa of Ibn Sida (Alexandria 1904, vol. viii, and indices by M. Tahli, Tunis 1956), the K. Sûkh al-Áthdâ of Al-Kalkashandi (Cairo 1933, vol. ii), the K. Murûdî al-Dhâhabî of al-Mas’ûdî.

The Maghrib and Muslim Spain, as well as the Orient, had their enthusiasm for the hawking-sport. In Aghlabid Ifrikiya, the governor Muhammad II (864-75), called not without reason the “Cransman” (Abu ’l-’Gharânî), exhausted the state exchequer with his wild expenses on the “flying-play” (lakh) (see Ibn ’Idhârî, Bayân, trans. Fagman, Algiers 1900, 147-48). Later, the Hafsids, too, were smitten by hawking. Like a Sâsânî prince, Al-Mustansîr (1249-77) found his pleasure, with the hawk on his fist, in a vast “preserve” (masyad) near Birzarta (see Ibn Khalînî, K. al-Ihbar, trans. De Siane et Casanova, ii, 339). In the 15th century his descendant, Uthman ‘Ali (1433-88) spent several days a week in this entertainment (see R. Brunschvig, Deux récits de voyage inédits . . ., Paris 1936, 212). At the Umayyad court in Cordova, the Grand Falconer (Sâkhîb al-bayyâyîsra) enjoyed a high office, close to the ruler (see Ibn ’Idhârî, op.cit., in E. Lévi-Provençal, X° s., Paris 1932, 55). The fashion of hawking, widespread in the countries of Islam during the Middle Ages, was the livelihood of a great number of people, and its practice was not limited to the privileged classes, as it was in Christendom. The rural population and the nomads continued to devote themselves to it and preserved the tradition, down to the beginning of the 20th century. From this fact it is easy to evaluate the rôle played by the sporting-bird in Muslim economic life, especially during the medieval period, by the commerce it provoked and the people required for its maintenance (see A. Talas, La vie économique aux II° et III° siècles de l’Hégire, in Arabic in Madjalalt al-Madîmât-ir’âhî, 1952, ii, 271-301; al-Dîhiqî(7), K. al-tabâsuqur, bi ’l-I’djâra, ed. H. H. Abdul-Wahab, Cairo 1935 34-35, trans. Ch. Pellat, in Arabica, i, 2, 1935, 150-61).

Most often, in fact, the master of the hawk-keepers train was not a falconer in the strict sense of the term, and he only put on the glove (dastabâm; Maghrib: bûfâz) during the hunt. The care of the “hawk’s room” (bayt al-tuyur) was entrusted to hawkers’ assistants (ghulâm, pl. ghulâmân) who had besides the task of keeping the aviary well provided with pigeons and other game-birds, for the nourishment and training of the hawks. The latter, a technical term of the bayzara, necessitated, according to the kind of sporting-bird, the competence of the orstinger (bâzyâr pl. bayâsira). On the preference of bâzyâr to bayzâr see Ibn Sa’dî al-‘Akânî, Irghâd al-Mâhâsîd, 92; the terms bayyâzâ, bayyâzâ, biyâs, bîzây, bayânî in the general sense of hawk, are Spanish-Maghribî, and frequently give way to fâyyûr, or of the falconer (sâkhîr); both were often assisted by the kalldbâz, the master of the hawking pack who sets his greyhounds (sulâkîh, pl. sulâkîyya) to the gazelle or the hare, and the Goshawk, occasionally the Saker Falcon or even the eagle, flying “waiting on” (hâzîm), distances the pack and bends to the quarry.

The traditional classification in the Orient of predators worthy of training (dardâwa and dardâ’), based on the black or yellow colour of the iris denoting remarkable visual powers, corresponds exactly to the modern ornithological system. In fact the “dark-eyed birds” are found only in the genus Falco, “falcomidae”, who alone have a black iris. These are “long-winged sweeping birds, lured-birds, used to “highflying” (the flight of the heron: bâhshîn, of the crane: türkî or ghirnîk, of crows: ghirbân, from time to time the eagle: wâbl, the kite: kâdî, and the wild waterfowl: ayr al-ma’â). The Arabist is often puzzled by the abundance of terms designating sporting-birds, a such abundance not being due to the multiplicity of types, but to the great variety of adjectives qualifying the innumerable shades of plumage worn by the bird according to its sex, its age and habitat. The Arabs saw several different types when it was only a question of individual birds of the same family, whether immature, young or adult, male or female. One can discover, however, among that accumulation of names
the generic term, with the aid on the one hand of scientific inventories of the avifauna of each country, and on the other, of the descriptions provided by the great Muslim naturalists, such as al-Khwārizmi (1203-1283) in his K. ʿAǧāʾib al-Makhlūkāt, al-Damīrī (1341-1405) in his K. Ḥayāt al-Ḥayawān, and especially by the authors of cynegetic works (see below).

Thus the saḥkār, falconer, was occupied in training only: a) the Ger-Falcon, Falco rusticolus, (sunbūr, ḥunbūr, ḥunbār) which, unknown in the Arab countries, had to be imported at great expense from Siberia, and which often figured among the ceremonial gifts upon an exchange of ambassadors; b) the Saker Falcon, Falco cherrug, (sārḥ, sāḥr al-ghazāl, ṣḥār); c) the Peregrine Falcon, Falco peregrinus, under its three original sub-species: peregrinator, babylonicus and cailidus (either šāhīn or bahārī for the "Passage-Peregrine"); d) the Black-winged Kite, Elanus caeruleus (curraḥ, sāḥr ab-yāṭ, and Perā, ḫāṭ); e) the Merlin, Falco columbarius acaulo (yuʾyuʾ, ḡalām); f) the Hobby, Falco subbuteo (ḥawīnād); g) the Kestrel, Falco tinnunculus (ṭāsāḥ); h) the Lesser Kestrel, Falco naumanī (wawasīḥ); i) the Red-footed Falcon, Falco vespertinus (luṣayk) (see A. Maʿālikū, Muḍjam al-ḥayawān, Cairo 1932, to be consulted with great care in view of the numerous errors in a scientific apparatus so often outdated).

In the Muslim West highflight hawking knew only four falconidae: the Saker (nuḥūl or lublūl, derived from the name of the Andalusian town Nuéba, which points to a loanword); the Barbary Lanner Falcon, or the "Alphabet" of the Christian falconsers, Falco biarmicus (burnī); the Barbary Falcon, Falco peregrinus peregrinoides (turkhī); and Eleanor's Falcon, Falco eleonorae (bajirī); (see Leo Africanus. Il Viaggio, Venice 1837, 166; L. Mercier, La chasse et les sports des Arabes, Paris 1927, ch. V, La fauconnerie, 81-106, and bibli.; E. Daumas, Les chevaux du Sahara, Paris 1853, with the Réflexions de l'Emir Abdelkader, 359-372). These four falcons are described in the Ḥayāt as "noble" (ḥarr). As for the "yellow-eyed birds," raised only by the ḥāzār, ostragers, they are the class most used in the hawking sport. They are all "short-winged soaring birds" or "fist-hawks" trained for "low-flying". This category is composed largely of the genus Accipiter or accipitrinae and includes in some parts of Persia and Turkey the smaller aquilinae.

The birds which has enjoyed the greatest favour since remote antiquity and in every country of the Orient is undoubtedly the Goshawk, Accipiter gentilis, and its subspecies Accip. albidus (either bāzd, or ḍhāḥbāz) which, because they do not belong to the avifauna of the Arabic countries, were imported by merchants from Greece, Turkestan, Persia and India; the Maghribi scarcely knew of them. It was believed that the Goshawk was born to the flying art. Its Goshawk was born to the flying art. Its Hen (sāḥ) is still used at Cape Bon in Tunisia for flying at the passage-quail in spring (see D. M. Mathis, La chasse au faucon en Tunisie, in Bull. Société Sc. Natur. de Tunisie, ii, 3-4, Tunis 1949, 107-18 and illustrations; idem, in A. Boyer et M. Planiol, Traité de Fauconnerie et Autourserie, Paris 1948, 22-48; L. Lavudden, La chasse et la faune cynégetique en Tunisie, Tunis 1920, 20-21; al-Lalāʾī, in Arabic, Tunis, May 1955, 24-27 and illustrations).

As for eagles, they never have had in fact the rank of sporting-birds (ṭād al-fayr); however, Persians and Turks trained with success the Crested Hawk Eagle, Spizaetus cirrhatus (tughrāl), Bonelli's Eagle, Hieraetus fasciatus, and the Booted Eagle, Hieraetus pennatus (both called zumāmād). The Harriers (mazadā) and Buzzards (ṣāḥbād) were neglected owing to their untamable ferocity; the kite and the vulture (nāṣr) as well, because of their taste for carrion. The Persians carried the art of training as far as the Eagle Owl (bīḥa) which served to attract the other predators. All of the "yellow-eyed birds" were earmarked for the lowflying at the quail (zumānā, sabād), the partridge (ḥaḍḍ), the Chukar partridge (ḥaḍḍ) and the See-See (laṭyākūd), the sandgrouse (ḥāṭā), the Bustard (būḥārā), the Little Bustard (raʾād), the Francolin (durādād), the Ruddy Sheldrake (ṣāḥkūd) and other game-birds of the steppe and desert.

The techniques proper to ṣāḥbāzd were early in Islam the objects of numerous treatises which, for the most part, have not survived; Ibn al-Nadīm mentions ten of them in his Fīrāzī. On the other hand a large number of the manuscripts in the public and private libraries in Europe and the Orient have yet to be studied (cf. Brockelmann, chapters on "Naturwissenschaft" and "Jaqād"). Nevertheless these techniques are comparatively well known to us thanks to several works already edited. The oldest of these texts, treating falconry, might be the treatise of the Latin-Roman versions not yet identified but attributed to the two authors Moamin and Ghattrī (see the excellent critical edition of these texts by H. Tjerneld, Stockholm-Paris 1945). Recently, the Syrian Kurd ʿAlī had the happy idea of publishing (Damascus 1953) a treatise Al-Ṣāḥbāzd devoted to the falconry of the Fāṭimid caliph Al-ʿAzīz bī-l-lāh (975-996); the anonymous author offers us the profit of his own long experience and that of the specialists in hawking (luʿād) in a style stripped of extraneous erudition: poetical citations are arranged in a special chapter. This work is by far the most valuable of those we possess in Arabic on the training methods. At almost the same time Asād ʿĪlās (Baghdād 1954) the oldest known Arabic text, K. al-Masāqīd wa l-Matlārīd, the work of the famous poet Al-Kushāḏīm (d. 961 or 971) (cf. Brockelmann, I, 85, and S I, 137; ʿĪlās, Madjallā . . . op. cit., with an analysis of the work). This complete treatise on venery and falconry was one of the sources most exploited by later authors of cynegetic works; there emanates from it unfortunately too great a preoccupation with adab which relieves it of any practical significance. Very different and far more lively and useful are the "hawking-sport memories" of Usāma Ibn Munkīd (d. 1288) in his K. al-Ṣāḥbāzd (ed. P. Hitti, Princeton 1930, ch. iii,
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192-229) composed during the period of the Crusades (see Derenbourg, *Vie d'Ousma...*), and texts, Paris 1885 and 1893. The work of the Mamluk Muhammad al-Mangil, *K. Uus al-Malā* bi-Wāhā al-Fādā, written in 1371 (cf. Brockelmann, II, 135 and S II, 167) and published (Paris 1880) with a mediocre French translation by Florian Pharaon, has lost much of its value since the treaty of Al-Medija. These compositions deserve publication, though they have already been exploited by L. Mercier (op. cit.) who has in addition used the manuscripts of Al-Fākhi (d. 1541) and Al-Asfārī (1444) (MSS. Paris, B.N. nos. 2831 and 2834). Ţalās (*Maqal...*) has restored to its original version the beautiful *ardjūsara* on the flying-sport by Ibn Nūbātā (1287-1366) entitled *Fārād al-Sulāık ji Māsāyid al-Mulāh.*

From all these texts it results that snaring and training methods were nearly the same for all species of sporting-birds. The young hawk was caught "eyes" or "yellow beak" (*khiṣrī, khīṣrī*) or "branchiers"-*rockers*, i.e., the nest-forsakers (*nūhād*) from her eyrie; when "red-falcon" (*farkh*) or "haggar" (*wākkāh* "native" or "passage-hawk") (*kalādāli* or *rādāji*), she was limed or snared by means of nets, of nooses and chiefly of "flying-decoys" (*bīrah*) (cf. the system of the hut in Ibn Munkiḫ, *op. cit.,* 200-01; M. Planiol, *op. cit.,* 154-56). When captured, she was "reclaimed", i.e., made tame (*laʾbīr, lahīdī*); her eyelids were "sealed" (*khayt*) and she was "abated" (*kāṣirī, ṭankī*) by fasting and then, progressively unsealed, she was induced to step, of her own accord, on the fist by offering her some "beakfuls" (*ṣabbī*). When become tame and stepping on to the fist at call, she was tied to the "creance" (*Missing*) and it was now the beginning of her training to stoop at such and such game. When estimated "ensued" (*mustuṣī* li-i-ṭirās), the pupil was lifted with "jesses" (* Missing*) and "belts" (*ṣārīfī*, *kāhīfūlī*) and then she was accustomed to wear on her head the "hood" (*būrāh, ḫumma, ḫumra*), Maghribi: *kanbīl* and to be "mailed in the sock" (*kabābī*), gaining some "manning" (*uns*) by long hours spent among the crowds of the streets and markets. Once familiarised with people, horses, dogs and domestic animals, she was taken to the hunting places where she was flown "for good" (*ṣāda ṭalīm*) at waterfowl and sparrows. She returned at the sound of a drum (ṭanbāl) attached to the saddle of the falconer (see L. Mercier, *op. cit.,* 98), and she was allowed to "take her pleasure" (*ṣābīb*) on one of her takes. In the Maghrib training was never carried to such a degree of refinement: always taken in adulthood, the bird was released in the autumn and underwent only a rudimentary training (cf. L. Mercier, *op. cit.,* 96-104). Being set down to rest, the hawk was placed on the "block" (*karnasa, ṭalhrī*) and then she was kept apart, from any noise, and her "mutes" (*ḥārk, ṭamūdī*) were carefully controlled. By this means her good health was restored. The treatises on *bayzara* devote long chapters to the diagnosis of diseases particular to sporting-birds and their cure, revealing most often a barbaric empiricism combined with hygienic superstitions.

From the time of the Prophet the question has been posed, with regard to Kur'ānic law, of the legality of eating a game-bird caught by means of a trained (hawk) predatory; it was a question of whether the bird ought to be slaughtered in accordance with the rites. Averroes, in his *Bidīyat al-Mugājāh...*, (cf. Averroes, *Le livre de la chasse*, ext. of the *Bidīya*, text and trans.; annotated by F. Viré, in *Revue Tunisienne de Droit*, nos 3-4, Tunis 1954, 228-59), gives a clear account of the different positions adopted by each of the four schools of law. This same question constitutes the introductory part of all of the works dealing with falconry and venery.

The *bayzara* on the other hand did not fail to inspire poets and, from the time of the Umayyad period, it became with the coursing hunt one of the principal themes of popular poetry in *rādājār.* In fact the *ardjūsara,* more supple and lively than the rigid classical *kaṣida,* soon became, with al-Schāmmākī (d. 22/643), al-ʾAbīdī (d. 69/708), his son Ruβbā (d. 145/1662) and several others, the typical form of the cynegetic poem (*tarādisyya*). The latter, very much in fashion under the ʿAbbāsids, was adopted by the great masters of verse such as Abū Nuwās, Ibn al-Muʿṭazz, Kushādjm and Al-Nāṣīḥī, and afforded them, through research into rare terms (*ghitrīfl, ghitrīf*), the occasion of displaying their learning (*Ch. Pellat, *Langue et Littérature Arabes, Paris* 1952, 108-09) (on the *tarādisyya* see idem, *Le mot du basrîen*, 160 ff. and notes. *Tarādisyya* are found in the *šaâ"ins* of the poets; those of Abû Nuwâs are for the most part cited by Al-Djâhīz, *Bayazâdîn*). It is regrettable to note that this pedantic erudition led the use, by those who took pleasure in it, of a language which has very little in common with that employed by the lovers of the flying sport. In Muslim Spain the poets, especially from the 11th century, developed, by releasing before her training-birds (*kasira*) selected from the species for which she was being trained to hunt. These exercises were patiently repeated, each time at a greater distance. When trained to hunt. These exercises were patiently repeated, each time at a greater distance. When trained to hunt. These exercises were patiently repeated, each time at a greater distance. When trained to hunt. These exercises were patiently repeated, each time at a greater distance. When trained to hunt. These exercises were patiently repeated, each time at a greater distance. When trained to hunt. These exercises were patiently repeated, each time at a greater distance. When trained to hunt. These exercises were patiently repeated, each time at a greater distance. When trained to hunt. These exercises were patiently repeated, each time at a greater distance. When trained to hunt. These exercises were patiently repeated, each time at a greater distance.
and embroidery, owe to the "hawk motif" a great deal of their inestimable accomplishments. Indeed, it is from this motif, in its innumerable interpretations that Muslim art of East and West has borrowed many of its characteristics (cf. A. U. Pope, A Survey of Persian Art, Oxford 1939; G. Migeon, Art Musulman, Paris 1956; G. Maçarès, L'Art de l'Islam, Paris 1946). We add in conclusion that this same motif was vastly exploited by Mamluk heraldry (cont. a l'étude du blason en Orient, Londres 1902).


Bâz [see BAYZARA].

BÁZ BAHÁDUR, The last ruler of independent Mâlwa before the Mughal conquest in the time of Akbar, Bâz Bahâdur was the son of Shûdja' Khân, a relative of Shir Shâh Sûr, whom the latter appointed governor of Mâlwa after its conquest by Shir Shâh's forces in 949/1542. On the death of Shûdja' Khân in 962/1554, Bâz Bahâdur murdered his brother Dawlat Khân, governor of Ujjain (Udijâin) and had himself proclaimed as sultan in 963/1555. He then brought most of Mâlwa under his rule by forcing his youngest brother Mustâfâ Khân to give up Râsin and Bhilsa. In 968/1560-1, a Mughal army under Adham Khân advanced to conquer Mâlwa. Bâz Bahâdur was forced to relinquish his capital Mandû and was forced to retire to his refuge there. Five years later he made several guerilla attacks upon the Mughal forces, he grew tired of the trouble and in 978/1570 submitted to Akbar eventually to receive a mansâb of 200. He died not long after and is probably buried at Ağra.

Bâz Bahâdur is celebrated in popular legend for his love for his mistress Rûmânat for whom he is said to have composed love-songs and verses. He is also an eponymous figure in the development of a new passionate style of central Indian painting, in which the twin cultures of Mâlwa, Hindu and Muslim, were blended.


BAZA [see BASTA].

BÁZÁHR, Bezoar, a remedy against all kinds of poisons, highly esteemed and paid for throughout the Middle Ages up to the 18th century, and in the Orient even up to this very day. The genuine (Oriental) Bezoar-stone is obtained from the bezoar-goat (Capra aegagrus Gm.) and, according to the investigations of Friedrich Wöhler, the famous chemist (1800-1882), and others, it is a gall-stone.

The stone seems to have been unknown to ancient Arabs, for neither in the lexica nor in A. Siddiqi, Studien über die persischen Fremdwörter im klassischen Arabisch, 1919, is the word mentioned. The generally accepted etymology is Persian (pl)zd-zahr "against poison" (P. Horn, in Geiger-Kuhn, Grundr. d. ir. Phil., i/2, 159). The Arabic books of stones and drugs present various spellings and etymologies that do not always correspond with each other, nor are the etymologies themselves throughout correct (see later).

For the first time in Islamic literature the Bazahr seems to appear in some of the Hermetic writings (none of them printed), and in the (partly edited) pseudo-Aristotelian writings inspired by the Oriental translations of the Alexander Romance. In the Lapidary ascribed to Aristotle (J. Ruska, Das Steinbuch des Aristoteles, 1932, 104 f.), Bazahr is erroneously stated to be Greek, while the explanation is the usual al-natf il-'samî. The poisons coagulate the blood; this effect is prevented by the stone which frees the body of the poison by strongly sweating. Aristotle also registers the different colours of the Bazahr and the places where it is found, namely, China, India, the "East" and Khurasân. Also as amulet and sealing-stone the Bazahr is useful, as well as against the sting of poisonous insects (see below).

Some MSS. of the pseudo-Aristotelian Sûr al-Asdr (Secretum secretorum) offer a chapter on precious stones, namely, Oxon. Laud 210 and Paris 2418. The text of the former was translated in Opera hactenus inedita Rogeri Bacoñi (1): V. Secretorum secretorum, ed. R. Steele, 1920, 233; the latter has only been noted by Abdurrahmân Badawî, Fontes Graecae Osce, doctores series xi, London 1922, 156.

Some MSS. of the pseudo-Aristotelian Sûr al-Asdr (Secretum secretorum) offer a chapter on precious stones, namely, Oxon. Laud 210 and Paris 2418. The text of the former was translated in Opera hactenus inedita Rogeri Bacoñi (1): V. Secretorum secretorum, ed. R. Steele, 1920, 233; the latter has only been noted by Abdurrahmân Badawî, Fontes Graecae Osce, doctores series xi, London 1922, 156.
points to the Hebrew text (ed. and transl. by M. Gaster, JRAS, 1907-8, para 130). The name of the stone rendered al-naf† al-dur§r in Grčmish al-r구r (Hebrew ґשְרֵי הָרַעַר) (?). Its action is described similarly to that in the above-mentioned stone-book. The Ḥik̲h̲wān al-Sāf̲r̲i, ii, 81 Bombay = 104 Cairo explain the action of the stone in an elaborate theoretical way. It is worth noting that they use the name also as an appellative in the plural, along with summāt̲i and taryāq̲i. In the K. al-Summ̲m wa-Daft̲f ̲mad̲r̲s̲a by Ḍābib b. Ḥayyān, Bāz̲i̲r̲sh is, according to A. Siggel, Das Buch etc., 1958, 213 mostly used in the sense of "antidote" in general; only on 186 Siggel translates "Bezoar." The stone is only called one of the major remedies. Ḍābib is one of the sources quotes by al-Br̲i̲r̲sh in his elaborate article, al-D̲i̲zm̲āh̲r̲ fi Ma^rafi/al-D̲i̲wāw̲āh̲r, 1355, 200-202; cf. M. J. Haensch, Die Quellen des Stein-buches des Berūnī, Thesis, Bonn 1935, 19, who does not realise that the numerous quotations from Dā′ibī's K. al-Nukhab mean his K. al-Bahir, extant in MS. Istanbul Diārūll̲āh 1721. Al-Br̲i̲r̲sh's account, deriving from various sources, although opening with the statement that the stone is a mineral, offers also descriptions which make its being an organic material possible. He also teaches methods of examining its genuineness, and concludes with anecdotes.

The next author according to chronology is al-Ḥāfīk̲i, for the time being accessible only in Barhebraeus' abridgment, ed. M. Meyerhof and G. P. Sobhy, 98, para 185 (English translation 356-58 with elaborate commentary, where later sources are quoted in extenso). Al-Ḥafrīk̲i's rendering of the name is mād̲s̲i̲w̲m̲ al-samm. For al-Tīf̲s̲ī̲, see also the long chapter on Bāzar in Clément-Mullet, J.A., vi, 1868, 143-50. Later sources not quoted by Meyerhof-Sobhy: the Arabic text of Ibn al-Baytār, 1291, i, 81 f.; the German version of al-Kawāzin (J. Ruska, Das Steinbuch aus der Kosmographie des al-Kawāzin, Kirchhain, 1896). Al-Tīf̲s̲ī̲ and also al-Anṭāk̲i, Taq̲h̲irat ʿu̲l̲i̲ ʿl-alb̲āb̲, i, 60 call the stone ṭāk̲h̲-ẓ̲ahr "cleaning from poison," cf. F. Anastase-Marie de St.-Elie's commentary on Ibn al-Akhārī, Nukhab al-D̲i̲zm̲āh̲r̲, 1939, 75 ff.; para 13. A story of a lad struck unresponsive by a drink of incense sealed with a seal of Bāz̲i̲r̲sh is preserved in Ahmad b. Yūsuf ibn al-D̲i̲āyā's commentary on Ps.-Ptolemy's K. al-Th̲a̲m̲ara (Centloquium), aphorism 9, and was reproduced in Gḥyāṣ al-bāk̲h̲ (Picatrix), ed. Ritter, 1933, 55 (in the forthcoming German translation 56).

On the later history of the Bāz̲i̲r̲sh, also in Europe, and its high esteem in contemporary Persia see C. Elgood, Medical History of Persia, 1951, 369-71 who also describes modern methods of examining its genuineness.

Bāz̲a̲r̲ [see ១ុ១ខ].

Bāz̲a̲r̲g̲ān [see ឃុំ].

Bāz̲i̲g̲h̲ b. Mūṣ̲a, called al-Ḥāṭ̲ik̲, Shī'ite heretic. A disciple of Abu ʿl-Khaṭ̲ṭ̲āb [q.v.], he was, like his master, denounced by the Imām Dī̲j̲̲̲ra̲r̲ al-Sād̲ik̲ as a heretic and was even, according to Nāwbaḵšī, disowned by Abu ʿl-Khaṭ̲ṭ̲āb himself. Kash̲a̲l̲ reports a tradition that when Dī̲j̲̲̲r̲̲̲̲r̲ al-Sād̲ik̲ was told that Bāz̲i̲g̲h̲ had been killed, he expressed satisfaction. This would place Bāz̲i̲g̲h̲'s death before that of Dī̲j̲̲̲r̲ al-Sād̲ik̲ in 148/765. Like many of the early extremist Shī'ites, Bāz̲i̲g̲h̲ was an artisan—a weaver of Kōfa, and some amusement was expressed at the religious pretensions of one of such lowly status. His followers were known as Bāz̲i̲gh̲iy̲a.
BAZINKIR — BEDJA

state in the Sudan, Oxford 1958; 52, 56, 94, 196). After the defeat of Sulayman b. al-Zubayr (1879), a group of his bdzinkir, commanded by Rābiḥ Fadl Allāh (Rābiḥ al-Zubayr), escaped westwards, and Rābiḥ made himself ruler of a territory in the Chad region, where he was defeated by the French and killed in 1900 (Richard Hill, op. cit., 312-13: Max v. Oppenheim, Rabeh und das Tchadseengebiet, Berlin 1902). Of the bdzinkir who remained in the Egyptian Sudan many were probably incorporated in the djihādiyya, the Mahdist professional soldiery, or in the Sudanese battalions of the new Egyptian army. 'Arabī Dafā' Allāh, the Mahdist governor of al-Radjīdīf (upper White Nile) raised new bdzinkir, sending 600 as tribute to the Khalīfa ʿAbd Allāh in Shawaṭāl 1312/March 1896 (Sudan Government Archives, Khartoum; Mahdīa 1/32, 18/1, 75/1; 1/32, 18; 76; 1/34, 1, 10).

Bibliography: Principal references in text.

(P. M. Holt)

BAZİRGAN, Bezirgan, Turkish forms of the Persian Bāzārγān, a merchant. In Ottoman Turkish usage the term Bāzirγan was applied to Christian and more especially Jewish merchants. Some of these held official appointments in the Ottoman palace or armed forces; such were the Bastırγan-bahāği, the chief purveyor of textiles to the Imperial household (D’Ohsson, Tableau général, vii, Paris 1824, 22; Gibb-Bowen, 1/1, 359), and the Öğüz Bāzirγanlū, the stewards, usually Greek or Jewish, who handled the pay and supplies of the corps of Janissaries. This office tended to become hereditary in certain families (D’Ohsson, 318; I. H. Uzunçarşılı, Kapukulu Ocakları, i, Ankara 1943, 407 ff.).

(B. Lewis)

BAZİKYYUN (Pazāki), a tribe settled, according to M. A. Zaki (Taʿrīkh, 370-71) either in Persia or in Turkey (having relations with the tribe of Suwayd). The tribe was divided in two parts: Khālid Bekbū and Shaker Bekbū, of which the former was more important. Its places of habitation were Khnis, Malāzgird and to some extent Māsh. The latter was subject to the amir of Bizāl. The founder of the Khālid Bekbū was Husayn ʿAll Bek. His descendant, Khālid b. Shāhsuwar Bek b. Husayn ʿAll Bek, a fellow warrior of ʿAlī Bek. One of his battles in which he won fame but lost an arm, whence his sobriquet. One armed Khālid (like Ahmad Khan of Baradust [q.v.]: Khālid Dhuʾl-yad al-Wāhidā). As a reward for his valour, the Shāh gave him Khnis, Malāzgird and the nādīya of Ukhān (Udākān) at Māsh. Later he declared his independence of the Shāh and allied himself with Sultān Selim Yāwūz. This submission was, on the other hand, of short duration; he was finally arrested and executed, though his family continued for a long time to exercise power. During the time of his son amir Kūlidj Bek, a part of the tribe emigrated to the Donboll (q.v.), though remaining subject to the Ottoman sultan. The existence of a tribe of this name is, on the other hand, mentioned by M. A. Zaki (Khuldsat Ta’rīkh) in the region of Tہīr (15), in the south of Persia (465) and in the neighbourhood of Ervān (466). A Pāseguī tribe is mentioned by Lerch (i, 96) at Tarow.


(B. Nikitine)

BĀZĂZĪSTĀN [see Қўшариyya].

BEČ (Begov), the Ottoman name for the town of Vienna. The Turks (as also the Serbs and Croats) took this word from the Hungarian word meaning of “suburb, outer city” (Hungarian: külsős; hence it is explained as kultar by Ewlyía Celebi, vii, 251), where the word probably goes back to the Kuman-Pečenek (perhaps also Avar.) beć (Gombóc-Melich, Magyar Etymológiai Szótár, Budapest 1914 s.v.). There is only scanty and superficial information on the town in Ottoman geographical literature and diplomatic reports (cf. Hammer-Purgstall’s translation from Ebū Bekir b. Behrām in the Archiv f. Geographie, Historie, Staats und Kriegskunst, 1828, 28 ff.; also; hammer-Purgstall, viii, 215; Fr. Kraeßlitz, Bericht über den Zung des Grossbotschafters Ibrahim Pascha nach Wien im Jahre 1719, in SBA Wien, 1907), although in the 16th and 17th centuries, Vienna was the immediate goal of two large campaigns under sultan Suleyman the Magnificent and under the Grand Vizier Kara Mustafā Pasca (cf. Sturminger, Bibliographie und Iconographie der beiden Türkenbelagerungen Wiens 1529 und 1683; Vienna 1955; comments on this in WZKM 52; and R. Kreuel, Kara Mustafa vor Wien, Graz 1955); Ewlyía Celebi is an interesting exception. He claims to have visited Vienna (cf. WZKM, 31, 188 ff.) in 1665 in the entourage of the Ambassador Kara Mehmed Pascha. His extensive description of the town (Siyāhat-nāme, vii, 247-292; translation: R. Kreuel, Im Reiche des Goldenen Apfels, Graz 1957) contains numerous absurdities, as well as many correct observations. In the first half of the 19th century (lanzimāt), the name Beć was replaced by Vyiana (from Vienna) in Ottoman writing, and today this is the usual form.

BEDEL-J ʿASKERI [see BADAL].

BEDEL-J NAKDI [see BADAL].

BEDEL [see BADIL].

BEDJA (usual Ar. form, Budja), nomadic tribes, living between the Nile and Red Sea, from the Kina-Kusayr route to the angle formed by the ʿAtbarā and the hills of the Eritrean-Sudanese frontier. The principal modern tribes are the ʿAbbāda (q.v.), Bīghārīn (q.v.), Ummarār, Hadanduwa and Bānil (q.v.): The ʿAbbāda now speak Arabic; the others (except the Tigre-speaking sections of B. ʿAmīr) speak tu-Bedawiyeh, a Hamitic language. The Beđja subsist mainly on their herds of camels, cattle, sheep and goats. Since grazing is sparse, they move usually very small groups. Beđja origins are obscure but Hamitic-speaking groups have inhabited the region from ancient times. The usual identification with the pre-Islamic Blennymes was rejected by Becker (see Beđja in EI).

Relations with Muslim Egypt. ʿAbd Allāh b. Saʿd encountered some Beđja on his return from Nubia (31/651-2) but regarded them as politically insignificant. The first Beđja-Arab treaty, made with ʿUbayy Allāh b. ʿAbīḥāb in the reign of Highān, regulated Beđja trade with Egypt and safeguarded the Muslims from their depredations. The Arabs penetrated Beđja territory in search of emeralds (mined in the desert of Kīft) and gold, found in the Wādī al-ʿAllāḥ (q.v.). The dominant northern Beđja tribe was the Hadārīr, traditionally descended from pre-Islamic immigrants from Ḥadhramawt. They were dismuted but there are occasional indications of a supreme chief, living in a village named Hadjar. Some of the Ambassadors Ṣanāʿīfī, acted as herdmens. Muslim immigration resulted in a superficial islamisation of the Ḥadhārīr and Arab-Beđja intermarriage. Beđja raids on
Upper Egypt led to a Muslim expedition, which defeated the chief, Kanun, and imposed a treaty (216/831). The caliph was acknowledged as sultan, mosques in Bedja territory were to be respected, Muslim merchants and pilgrims were to pass in safety, and collectors of zakat from converts were to be allowed entry. Other provisions sought to prevent an alliance of the Bedja with Christian Nubia. Further raids and the withholding of tribute from the gold-mines ensued. A cavalry expedition, sent by sea, defeated the Bedja camel-men, whose chief went to Samarra in 241/855-6 to make his personal submission to al-Mutawakkil. Soon however the Bedja began to raid al-Fustat itself. After a particularly severe attack, a force mustered by 'Abd al-Rahmān al-'Umarl intercepted a raiding-party and killed its chief. Supported by the Rabīya and Diushayna, al-'Umarl established control over the mining districts (c. 253/868-9) and, after his death, Rabīya, who intermarried with the Ḥādrīb, came to dominate the area. Al-Mas'ūdī describes the chief of Rabīya in 332/943-4 as the owner of the mines; he commanded 3,000 Arabs and 30,000 Bedja camel-men. The ratio is probably more significant than the numbers. The rise of 'Ayyūsbah in the mid-9th century increased the importance of the Ḥādrīb, whose territory was crossed by the route from the Nile valley to the port. A chief, called Ibn Baṣṭāṭa al-Ḥadraḥī, shared in the customs of 'Ayyūsbah. Information about the southern Bedja is sparse. Al-Yaṣirī lists six Bedja “kingdoms”.

Uswān depicts the further Bedja as a fragmented, pagan society, in which each group had its own khdin to give guidance on grazing and raids.

Decline of the Ḥādrīb and formation of the tribes. By the 8th/14th century the gold-mines had been abandoned and 'Ayyūsbah was in decline. These economic factors may explain the disappearance of the Ḥādrīb, who appear to have migrated southwards, perhaps becoming the Balaw ruling-caste which dominated the Bedja of the Suakin-Massawa hinterland. The spread of Arab tribes up the Nile and the establishment of the Muslim Fundji sultanate (c. 910/1504) resulted ultimately in the general, if imperfect, this was a time of pacification and development.
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BEG or BEY, a Turkish title, "lord", used in a number of different ways. The various dialect forms (bâg, bâk, bek, bey, biy, biy, bag, etc.) all derive from the old Turkish bag as seen from the Orkhon inscriptions (8th Century) and the Chinese transcriptions concerning the Turks of Mongolia of the same period. The word has no Altaic origin (Mongol beg meaning a later loanword from Turkish; the series Turkish bârka, bâk/bâk/bāk "strong, sound", etc., owes nothing to the old Turkish bâg and should be dissociated from it; the same is true of the series: Turkish bâgâ, bâg "wise-man, sorcerer", Mongol bâg, hê "Shaman"). Like many other titles, bâg is a loan-word possibly deriving from the Iranian bag, viz. the title of the Sâsânid kings ("divine", from an older form baga "God", cf. Bag-dâd).

In the Orkhon inscriptions the compound term bâg-lâr refers to the "nobility", "the order of beys", as opposed to the bodun "people, masses". The word bâg also appears in these texts to denote the second rank in the hierarchy of high dignitaries. Finally, there is the evidence of a Bars Bâg who becomes Khan and brother-in-law of the Turkish Grand Khan. These different usages show that the title bâg (as later with beg or bey) does not imply a specific position or duty but is essentially honorific. Hence among many Turkish peoples it is joined to the name of the "eldest brother", aghâ (bâg aghâ, or agha bâg = old Ottoman aghabey "lord elder brother"). Some Turkish societies have reserved the title for personages of high rank; others have given it an extended general meaning of "chief", "master", "husband" or "Mr.". It can only assume a precise connotation in a given social and administrative context, often as the second part of a compound (on begi "chief of ten", corporal", Golden Horde; Ott. sandjak beyleri; etc.); or as a title when used with a proper name which it usually follows: Bars Bâg, Mehmèd Bey. The feminine title of Begum [q.v.] is simply a possessive form of the 1st pers. sing. of beg (= bâg-im "my lord", thence "my lady"); cf. khan-um, a similar possessive formation which has assumed a feminine connotation.

(L. Bazin)

ii. In Islamic times we find the word applied under the Karâkhanids to at least one high official; and it was the title first borne by Tughrul and his brother Câghrâl, the founders of the Seljûk empire. Under the Seljûks and other subsequent Turkish régimes, as Turkish terms began to be used officially side by side with the traditional Arabic and Persian, beg came to be employed as the equivalent of the Arabic amir, as in the titles beglerbegi or beylerbeyi, equivalent to amir al-umârât; and sandjak beyleri, equivalent to amir al-lîsad. Under these régimes, again, whereas the great monarch would be entitled khârîm, khan, or sultan, lesser sovereigns, such as those of the Anatolian states successor to the Seljûks, the Kara-koyunlu, and the Akkoyunlu, were entitled beg, as indeed was the great Timûr himself.

Under the Ilkhânids beg was sometimes used for women, and under the Moguls of India the feminine form, begam, was common. Under the Safawids, since the ruler went by the title shâh, beg lost ground for lesser personages to khan and even sultan. Under the Ottomans, on the other hand, it remained in wide use for tribal leaders, high civil and military functionaries, and the sons of the great, particularly pashas.

Bibliography: EI, art. Beg by Barthold; IA, art. Beg by Köprüçü; Redhouse, Turkish-English Lexicon, s.v. (H. Bowen)

BEGDILI, a tribe of the Boz-ol branch of the Oghuz (Turkmen) peoples. Anqštâgan, ancestor of the Khârâmâyînama dynasty, is sometimes believed to be of this tribe, but this is probably not so. A large Begdili community was found among the Turkmen tribes in Syria in the 9th/10th century. At that time they were led by Tashkun (Tashkun) Oghullari. They were regarded as one of the most important Turkmen tribes in Syria in the 9th/10th century. Another important branch of this tribe lived in the 14 villages of the Gîlân district of the Îlî province in the same century; their leaders were in possession of fiêfs (dirîk). The Begdili of Syria were the largest of the Turkish tribes in the Aleppo region in the 10th/11th century; they had 40 clans during the first half of the same century. The Syrian Begdili also had important clans in the Yeni Îl and among the Boz Ulus in the Diyarbakr region. Another branch of these Begdili went to Iran together with the khan of the Shâmilî tribe. The great garrisons between Diyarbakr and Aleppo were, in the 11th/17th century, in their possession. They were, however, punished by Khosrow Pasha during his Baghdad expedition (1039/1630), for refusing to pay taxes and for allowing their cattle to destroy the crops of the local people. They are estimated to have had 12,000 tents during the second half of the same century. Like many other tribes, the Begdili were called to take part in the Austrian campaign in 1101/1690. A few years later the government made an attempt to settle the Begdili and other Turkmen tribes among them near, in the Rakka region. Consequently some Begdili settled in Rakka and the rest in the Aleppo and Ayntâb region. As already mentioned a branch of the Syrian Begdili went to Iran together with the Shâmilî. Many important Şafawi commanders and governors were of this tribe. A branch of Begdili is seen among the Göklen Îli in the Astârâbîd region.

Bibliography: Faruk Sumer, Bosoku Oğuz Boylarına Dair, in Dil ve Tarih ve Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi, xli, Ankara 1953.

(Faruk Sûmer)

BEGLERBEGI, beylerbeyi, Turkish title meaning 'beg of the begs', 'commander of the commanders'. Like other titles it suffers progressive debasement, having originally designated 'commander-in-chief of the army' it came to mean 'provincial governor' and finally was no more than an honorary rank. In the first sense it was used by the Seljûks of Rûm as an alternative title for the malik al-umârât and by the Ilkhânsids as the title of the chief of the four umârât al-ulûs. In the empire of the Golden Horde the title was used for all the umârât al-ulûs. In Mamlûk Egypt it was perhaps used for the alâsîb al-as-sâbîr. (For references to the sources see M. F. Köprüçüzâde, Bizans Müesselerinin Osmanlı Müesselerine Te'siri, Istanbul 1931, 190-5; Italian translation, Alcune osservazioni... Pubblicazioni dell'Instituto per l'Oriente di Roma, 1944, and I. H. Uzunçarşî, Osmanlı Dedalet Tarihîlinden Medehal. Ist. 1944, index; also D. Ayalon in BSOAS XVII, 1954, 253-266.)

Among the Ottomans too the title seems to have meant originally 'commander-in-chief' (in which sense it is used by Sa'd al-Din, i, 69). It is said to have been first bestowed on Lala Shahin by Murad I when, after the capture of Edirne, he himself returned to Brusa (Giese's Anon. 22, = Urdâd 22). Lala Shahin was succeeded by Timurtash, still apparently the sole beýlerbêgi, who was left to guard Anadolu
when Bâyezid I marched against Mirce (Nezâr [Taeschner] i 86). When Mûsâ, during the 'time of troubles', had seized the European territories he appointed a vezir, a hâkkâsh pashazâde [Giese § 69]. By the end of the reign of Mehmed I at the latest there existed two beglerbegis, with territorial designations, one of Rumeli' and one of Anadolu' [cf. 'ÅPz. § 81, 'beglerbegi of Anadolu' and § 83, 'beglerbegi of Rumeli'; such references for earlier periods in later historians may be anachronisms). This was clearly the case under Murad II, by which time the beglerbegis of Rumeli and Anadolu were the governors-general of the two provinces, their main responsibility being the supervision, through the sandjak-begis [q.v.], of the feudal sipâlâhs, whom in time of war they led into battle. As Ottoman territory expanded, new provinces were created, so that by the end of the 16th/17th century the beglerbegis numbered nearly forty. The beglerbegi of Rumeli (who from 942/1536 onwards was admitted to the divân, i.e. Feridûnî i 595) always took precedence, the others, if of the same rank (see below), taking precedence according to the dates of the conquest of their provinces. It was not unknown for the Grand Vizier to hold also the office of beglerbegi of Rumeli.

It is clear from a Rûmân-name of Mehemmed II that already in his reign beglerbegis had come to be also an honorary rank (as it had perhaps been under the Saljûqs of Rûm, cf. Kprüûtûzade, op. cit., 192), holders of which took precedence immediately after westirs. By the end of the 11th/12th century Rumelî beglerbegisi too had become an honorary rank, besides denoting the actual governor-general. Conversely, from the 16th/17th century onwards, the office of beglerbegi of important provinces was often bestowed on holders of the rank of vezir, who had authority over beglerbegis of neighbouring provinces. The vezir was entitled to three tughâs, the beglerbegi to two. Both westirs and beglerbegis bore the title pasha, whence the sandjak in which the beglerbegi resided was known as pasha sandjak. The beglerbegis were regarded as 'viceroys', sañânat usbîlî; he had a miniature court and presided at his own divân. At first succession of timârs and ziâmets, his appointments being automatically ratified, but after 95/1350 he could grant his own berât only the smaller (tekbiresi) timârs.

In the 12th/13th century the terminology became further confused, for (1) the name wâli [q.v.] was increasingly given to the governor-general, and beglerbegi in this sense fell into desuetude (except for the office of beglerbegis of Rumeli and Anadolu, to judge from D'OYsson, Tableau général, vii, 278); (2) the Persian mir-i mîrân, mîrîmîrân [q.v.], which had earlier been used indiscriminately (together with Ar. amir al-umara [q.v.]) as a synonym for beglerbegi, was increasingly used to denote the honorary rank of beglerbegi, and bestowed as such even on governors of sandijaks. With the thorough re-organisation of provincial administration by the law of 1251/1864 the term wâli became the official designation of the provincial governor (cf. A. Heidborn, Droit public et administratif de l'Empire Ottoman, Vienna-Leipzig, 1908, 157 ff.). Thenceforth only the terms Rumelî beglerbegisi, mîrîmîrân and mir-i umara survived, and they only as honorary titles.

In the Şafawid state the beglerbegis formed the second of four classes of provincial governors (Tadžkirit al-Mulûk, tr. and comm. V. Minorsky, GMS New Series xvi, London 1943, 25, 43, 163).

Bibliography: Hammer-Purgstall, Staats...
time among the various rulers of Upper Mesopotamia, supporting first the Ayyubids against the Zengids, and later the weakened Zengids, to whom he married two daughters, against the sons of al-'Adil. Finally he set himself to opposing the ambitions of Badr al-Din Lu'tu', the lieutenant and successor of the Zengids, who was an ally of the Ayyubid al-Ashraf. At the end of his life, having no son and fearing the intervention of his different neighbours, Gökburhani bequeathed his principality to the Caliph, who brought it under effective occupation (630/1233).

Apart from diplomatic and military matters Gökburhani was concerned with various enterprises of social value, especially at Irbil, though their influence extended beyond the town itself. He instituted madrasas, khanaqahs, hospitals and almshouses, and public services in aid of pilgrims, as well as contributing to the ransom of prisoners of the Franks, etc. He seems to have been the first prince to celebrate formally the Mawlid festival, perhaps as a reaction to the Shi'i nativity festivals or Christmas as kept by the Irbil Christians. He was a devout and a well-read man, much visited by scholars and writers from foreign lands. In governing he was assisted, particularly on such occasions, by his vizier, who was known by reason of his former activities as Mustawfi of Irbil, and compiled the history of the town. Ibn Khalilikân and his family were among their most famous protégés. Around the town of Irbil, which had always remained Christian and somewhat aside from the current of Muslim history, there grew up a new lower town, and the whole became transformed into a Muslim centre of some standing. This advance, which was attended by a rather severe fiscal policy, was set at naught by the Mongol sack of 634/1237.


BEGTIMUR [see ŞAH L-ARMAN].

BEGUM (Indo-Persian Begam, Turkish Bâqum), feminine of Beg (q.v.). During the Mughal period of Indian history its use, as an honorific, was confined to the royal princesses only. Djâhânârâ Begam [q.v.] the unmarried daughter of Şâhdjâhân [q.v.], bore the official title of Pâşâh Begam during the reign of her father. She retained it even after the dethronement and subsequent incarceration of Şâhdjâhân. During Akbar's rule the Begams (queens and princesses) received from 1028 to 1610 rupees per annum as privy purse. After the death of Djâhânârâ, his widow Nûr Djâhân, received 200,000 rupees per annum allowed her by Şâhdjâhân. Mumtâz Mahall, the consort of Şâhdjâhân, drew 1,000,000 rupees annually from the Imperial Exchequer while Pâşâh Begam enjoyed an allowance of 600,000 rupees per annum, half in cash and half in lands. Awrangzib gave the latter 1,200,000 rupees per annum. Before the establishment of Pakistan (1947), Indian Muslim ladies of high and noble birth were designated as "begams". Now all married women in Pakistan, with the exception of those belonging to the poorer classes, are called "begams", the equivalent of khanım or Madame. In this sense the word is practically unknown to the Arabic and Persian speaking countries. Husbands, in public and private, not infrequently, address their wives as begam, scrupulously avoiding pronouncing their given names. Domestics and menials, as a rule, address their mistresses, in India and Pakistan, as begams. Conventionally, every newborn girl bears this word as a suffix to her name, but the practice is now fast disappearing.

Bibliography: Hobson-Jobson, s.v.; Āsaf al-Lughât, s.v.; Sayyid Ahmad, Farhang-i Āsâh-'wâ, s.v.; 'Abd al-Ḥamîd Lâhorî, Bâšâh-nâma (Bib. Ind.), i 96 and index; Âl-i Âkbûrî (Eng. transl.), i 615. (A. S. BAZMEE ANSARI)

BEHESNÎ [see BEHSA].

BEHISTÜN [see BESITÜN].

BEHESNA [see BANASA].

BEHRAM [see BAHRAHM].

BEIRUT [see BAYRUT].

BEJA [see BAJA].

BEKRI MUŞTAFA ÂĞHÎ, the name of a drunkard, who lived in the reign of Sultan Murâd IV (1623-1640) and is said to have led him into habits of drunkenness; the name bekri therefore in Turkish still commonly means a drunkard. In the popular literature and in the Karâgöz plays the drunkard Bekri Muṣṭafa Âğhî is a well-known figure, characterised by his sharp and ready wit and his Bohemian way of life. Ewliya even gives the title of a Tabîlûd: Bekri Muṣṭafa and the Blind Arab Beggar (Seyhhat-nâma, i, 654).

Bibliography: Jacob, Traditionen über Bekri Mustafa Âga, in Kelelo Szemle, v (1904), 271; T. Menzel, Bekri Mustafa bei Mehmed Teyfik, ibid., vii (1906), 83; H. Ritter, Karâgööz, Wiesbaden 1953, index. (F. GIESE*)

BEKTÂSHI, a Dervish order in Turkey. The patron of the order is Hâdîdî Bektaş Wallı, whose biography as given in the order's traditional writings, (the first version of which goes back about the beginning of the 9th/15th century) is legendary, its purpose being manifestly to bring together the saint with famous religious personalities and to account for the later political importance of the Bektâshiyâya by insisting on the activity of its alleged founder. It is quite out of the question that Bektaş was ever in relation with 'Oghmân or Orkha'n or that he consecrated the Janissary corps (established for the first time under Murâd I), as is maintained by the Bektaşhi tradition and by some historical sources written under its influence.

We can however consider as certain the appearance in the 7th/13th century, among the dervishes of Anatolia, of Hâdîdî Bektaş from Khurâsân. He was probably a disciple of Bâbâ İshâq [see BAYRAM], whose revolt had taken place in 638/1240. The aristocratic entourage of the rival Mawlawîyyâa order later laid emphasis on this. According to the researches of M. Fuad Koprulu, the order originated from the circle of his disciples. However, in the Mubâdid of Hâdîdî Bektaş, originally written in Arabic and translated into Turkish verse by Khâtiboglu and afterwards rendered also into Turkish prose, the secret rites and doctrines characteristic

Bibliography: Jacob, Traditionen über Bekri Mustafa Âga, in Kelelo Szemle, v (1904), 271; T. Menzel, Bekri Mustafa bei Mehmed Teyfik, ibid., vii (1906), 83; H. Ritter, Karâgööz, Wiesbaden 1953, index. (F. GIESE*)
of the Bektashiyya are not particularly emphasised. At all events, the order, whose immediate predecessors of the Bektashiyya are not particularly emphasised. At all events, the order, whose immediate predecessors appear to have been the Abdallah-i Rüm, already existed in the 8th/14th century; it was at the beginning of the 10th/16th century that the grand master Bâllin Sultan, the "second Pir", gave it its definite form.

Turkish dervish institutions had received their characteristic features in western Turkestan from Abûmad Yasawî (d. 562/1160); they had acquired an ever increasing expansion in Anatolia, but at the same time they had adopted heretical tendencies. The Bektashiyya was able to conserve a good deal of pre-Islamic and heretical elements. In those regions where the order absorbed Muslim as well as Christian sects it came to include a large part of the population, as for instance in southern Anatolia and particularly in Albania, where there arose a kind of mixed religion, composed of Islamic and Christian elements. Also other communities with closely related dogmas and rites, and especially the groups comprised under the denomination of Kütlbâsh, stood in certain relations to it.

The attitude of the Bektâshis towards Islam is marked both by the general features of popular mysticism, and by their far-reaching disregard for Muslim ritual and worship, even including the salah. In their secret doctrines they are Shî'îs, acknowledging the twelve imams and, in particular, holding Dâ'ûr al-Sâ'dik in high esteem. The centre of their worship is 'Ali; they unite 'Ali with Allah and Muhammad into a trinity. From 1 till 10 Muharram they celebrate the nights of mourning (müsleml ehgereler); also the other 'Alid martyrs and especially the ma'sûm-i pîk (those who perished in infancy) are highly venerated by them. In the 9th/15th century the cabbalistic number speculations of the Hurâfs spread among them, while the Dîwûdân of Faîl Allah Hurûfî in its Persian reduction, and the Turkish exposition of the doctrines of the sect written by Ferîşte-oghlu under the title 'Aşkî namâs, have canonical authority with them. Furthermore they believe in the migration of souls.

The Christian elements may already partly have belonged to the Anatolian predecessors of the Bektâshîs; other parts were perhaps taken over from Christian groups in the region. The occasions of the reception of new members there is a distribution of wine, bread and cheese, which is probably a survival of the Holy Communion as practised by the Arctoyrites. Moreover the Bektâshîs make a confession of sins before their spiritual chiefs, who grant them absolution. Women take part in their rites without veiling their faces. A narrower group vow themselves to celibacy, the celibates wearing earrings as a distinctive mark. It is not yet made clear whether celibacy existed already in early times among the Bektâshîs; probably it was introduced for the first time by Bâllin Sultan.

The Bektâshîs not seldom settled in famous places of pilgrimage, explaining the sanctity of the shrines or the holy places which are also the twelve-fluted tasîlm taşhi, which is in Tirana; according to certain documents, there were still 30,000 Bektashis in Turkey in 1952 (cf. C.O.C., 1952, 206).

The celibates have their own grand master or dede. The head of one single monastery (tekke) is called baba; the fully initiated member derwâsh, the member who has only taken the first vow musâhib, the not yet governed adherent eşâsh. The discipline is chiefly governed by the relation of the muğrûd to his disciples and novices.

The Bektâshîs wear a white cap, consisting of four or twelve folds. The number four symbolises the "four gates": şahrî, tarîba, ma'dîra, hakîka, and the four corresponding classes of people: şubûd, şâhid, derwâsh, musâhib; the number twelve points to the number of the imams. Particularly characteristic are also the twelve-fluted tasîlîî taşhi, which is worn round the neck, and the teber (double-axe). Illustrations are to be found in the work of J. K. Birge (see bibliography).

The big tekkes comprise the following parts maydam evi, the monastery proper with the oratory, ask evi, the bakehouse and the women's quarters, ahk evi, the kitchens, mihamd evi, the guest quarters.

Among the many earlier settlements of the order the following should be mentioned. In Rumelia: Dimetoka and Kalkandelen; in Anatolia: 'Olmândîjîk north-west of Amasya and Elmalı in Lycia; near Cairo first at Kâşr al-'Ayn and soon afterwards also on the Muşåam slope (already as early as the 9th/15th century); there are others in Bağhdad and at Karbalâ?.

The Bektâshî form of the dervish religion deeply influenced the pious attitude of the Turkish people. Next to the mystical writings proper of the order there flourished also a rich and fervent lyric poetry of Bektâshî poets.

The order's political importance was due to its connexion with the Janissaries; the latter had been from the beginning, in the same way as all other early political institutions of the Ottomans, under the influence of religious corporations. In the second half of the 9th/15th century at the latest the Bektâshîs acquired exclusive authority amongst them. The receptivity of the Janissaries to Bektâshî beliefs may perhaps be explained by their Christian origin. Their connexion with this strictly organised order gave the Janissary corps the character of a closed corporation. The Bektâshîs also took part in several dervish rebellions against the Ottoman power, e.g., the revolt of Kalender-oghlu (933/1526-1527). The destruction of the Janissaries in 1241/1826 by Mahmûd II affected also the order to which they were linked; many monasteries were destroyed at the time. Towards the middle of the 19th century began the renewal of the order and the rebuilding of the monasteries; the Bektâshîs experienced a revival which found expression in its literary activity at the end of the 19th century and even after 1908.

In the autumn of 1925 the Bektâshîs, like all dervish orders in Turkey, were dissolved; it was, however, precisely the Bektâshîs who had opened the way for many measures inaugurated by the Turkish republic (relation to Islamic orthodoxy; position of women). To-day the Bektâshîs continue their existence in the Balkan peninsula, particularly in Albania where their chief monastery is in Tirana; according to certain documents, there were still 30,000 Bektashis in Turkey in 1952 (cf. C.O.C., 1952, 206).

Bibliography: Pioneer works in critical research are the studies of G. Jacob and Köprü-lâzade Mehmed Fuad and his school. These writings and the remaining bibliography are mentioned in: J. K. Birge, The Behtash Order
of Derwishes, London and Hartford (Conn.) 1937. See Fr. Taeschner in OLZ xxxii (1939), 751-756. Further H. H. Schaeder in OLZ 31 (1948), 105-107; H. Jansky in OLZ 29 (1926), 553-559; F. Babinger, Das Bektashikloster Demir Baba, in MSOS As. xxxiv (1931); Else Krohn, Vorislamische in einigen vorderasiatischen Sekten und Derwischorden, in Einh. Studien i, 295-345; idem, Kleine Beiträge zur Kenntnis islamischer Sekten und Orden auf der Balkanhalbinsel, in Mitteilungsh. der Ges. für Völkerkunde 1971; I. A. Bektash (by M. F. Köprüli); Abdulbaki Gölpinarlı, Vildyet-i nümü. Istanbul 1958; E. R. Ramsaur, The Bektashi Dervishes and the Young Turks, in Moslem World, 1942, 7-14; OM, 1931, 1932, 1936; further references in J. D. Pearson, Index Islamicus, nos. 2581-2600. (R. Tschudi)

**Bélén [see Belén].**

**Béleyn.** The name of a tribe-group of herdsmen and cultivators in the southern part of the Keren province of Eritrea. Known to themselves as Bogos, and numbering some 30,000 souls, they are organised in two main tribes, the Bayt Tarké and Bayt Tawké, strictly similar in culture and habit, though claiming distinct (mainly mythical) origins. A characteristic master-and-serf relationship has long been traditional in their tribal and folk-lore, indicate that their presence in Eritrea is due to the immigration of little-diluted Agau elements from northern Ethiopia in the 10th and 11th (16th and 17th) centuries into territory previously occupied by folk of lower culture and energy.

**Bibliography:** W. Münzinger, Studi sull' Africa Orientale, Rome 1887; C. Conti Rossini, Principi di diritto consuetudinario dell'Eritrea, Rome 1916; A. Pollera, Le popolazioni indigene dell'Eritrea, Bologna 1935; S. H. Longrigg, Short History of Eritrea, Oxford 1945; British Military Administration of Eritrea (per S. F. Nadel), Races and tribes of Eritrea, Asmara 1943. (S. H. Longrigg)

**Belgrade** (in modern Serbian: Beograd = White City), capital of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia and of the People's Republic of Serbia, at the confluence of the Sava and the Danube. It comprises Belgrad, the old town on the right bank of the Sava and the Danube, Novi Beograd (= New Belgrade), a new settlement still under construction, on the left bank of the Sava, and Zemun, the old town on the Danube. A number of smaller places on both banks of the Sava and the Danube also belong to Belgrade. It has more than 500,000 inhabitants.

Since Belgrade became the capital of Yugoslavia in 1918, it has begun to spread to the far side of the Sava and the Danube. In former times it covered only the area along the right bank of the Sava and the right bank of the Danube below the confluence. It was here that the Celtic Scordici founded a settlement and named it Singidunum, a name which the town retained in the days of Roman rule (Singidunum). During the Bulgar rule in the 9th century, the town received its Slavonic name, which it retained, despite frequent changes of rulers (including Byzantine and, later, Hungarian ones). It was, however, frequently translated (Alba Bulgarica, Nándor Alba, Nándor Fejérvár, Alba Graeca, Griechisch Weissenburg). In their day, the Turks referred to it as Belgrad (Belgrade).

In order to distinguish it from other towns in Albania, Hungary, and Transylvania which also bore the name of Belgrade, the Turkish occupation called it Belgrad Ungürüs (in the 9th/10th century), Ashaghl Belgrad, Tuna Belgrad, Belgrad-i Semendire, or similar names. In some Turkish documents, and in contemporary geographical and historical works, Belgrade is sometimes designated by names applied in the Islamic world to border towns and strategically important fortresses. Thus the name dâr al-dhiyâdî is found frequently, and this has led some of the earlier Serbian historians to state that this was the Turkish name for Belgrade. Prof. F. Bajraktareviç has proved that such a statement is unfounded.

Up to the First World War, Belgrade was an important fortress on the road from Central Europe to the Near East. Thanks to its strategic importance, Belgrade has had a stormy past. After it had changed rulers frequently in the Middle Ages (Byzantines, Bulgars, Hungarians, and Serbs), Belgrade was ceded to the Hungarians after the death of the Serbian despot Stevan Lazarevíc (1427). For nearly a century, it was the most important base for the defence of the southern borders of Hungary against Turkish raids.

If we disregard some uncertain reports concerning a siege of Belgrade by Bâyezîd I, the Turks twice attacked Belgrade prior to 863/1459: in 843/1440, when the town resisted a six months' siege, and under Mehemmed II the Conqueror, who in 860/1456, arrived with a great army, a fleet, and strong artillery. Encircled on the landward side, with the Turkish fleet blocking the Danube, and heavily bombarded, Belgrade none the less held out. Assistance reached the town, and under the leadership of János Hunyady, who took over the defence after the break-through, the garrison of Belgrade resisted successfully, despite the fact that the Turks had penetrated into the lower fortress. After a premature assault, the Turks gave up the siege on July 23rd. This was the second occasion on which Belgrade won fame as "The outer wall of Christendom." In 845/1441-2, the Turks built a fortress opposite Belgrade, on the mountain Avala (Havala). This fortress played an important part in the Turkish raids on Belgrade after Serbia finally fell under Turkish rule (863/1459). The defensive power of Belgrade decreased during the first decades of the 10th/11th century in the clashes with the Turks. Broken by financial and political crises, Hungary was not able to give regular pay to the garrison; still less could it improve its defences.

During Sultan Sulayman's first campaign (927/1521), the Turkish army entered Belgrade on 29 August 1521, after a long siege. The Hungarian troops were sent home, the Serbian population was settled in Constantinople, and some of the Serbian crews of the warships in the Danube became sailors in Turkish service. At that time, the seat of the sandja of Smederevo (Semendire) was moved to Belgrade, and Bali-bey (died 933/1527) the son of Vahyá Pasha, was made governor. In order to make Belgrade secure, Bali Bey destroyed all settlements in the neighbouring areas of Syria, and he used the building materials of these destroyed Syrian towns for Belgrade's new fortifications.
which now became the most important fortifications against Hungary. After the battle near Mohács (932/1526) the towns in eastern and central Syria came under the rule of the sandjak-beg in Belgrade. After Bali Bey's death, his brother Mehmed-Bey (who died in 955/1548 as Paşa of Buda) continued the policy of conquest. Until 944/1538, the conquered regions of Syria, Slavonia, and southern Hungary remained under the rule of the sandjak-beg in Belgrade. After that, the sandjak of Pozega was founded in Slavonia. After the conquest of Buda (948/1541), and the foundation of the eyalet of Buda, the sandjak of Smederevo, with its seat in Belgrade, fell to this eyalet. The representative (kâsim-mahâkim) of the Paşa of Buda resided in Belgrade, as this town had lost none of its great military importance as a marshalling-place for Turkish troops before their wars against the west, even after the conquest of Buda. Together with the Turkish armies, sultans and Grand Viziers passed through Belgrade and paused there for varying periods. There are many events in Turkish history connected with Belgrade. Diplomatic missions, too, which came down the Danube from the west on their way to the Turkish Sultan, stayed in Belgrade for a short time, for this is where the overland route began.

Immediately after the conquest of Belgrade, the Turks began to consider the fortifications there. As during the Hungarian rule, these consisted of the lower and the upper fortress, which were now, however, well equipped with artillery. Each of these two fortresses had its own commander (düdâr). The Turks equipped Belgrade with a garrison and a fleet. The fleet on the Danube was particularly necessary because of the wars with Hungary, and in the first half of the 16th century, Serbian-Martolos were stationed there (in 943/1536-7 there were 385 Martolos in 40 oda with 39 odabâşî, under the command of the vojvoda Vuk). In the second half of the 16th century, there was also a considerable garrison in Belgrade (in 1560 there were 223 müstâfaşî, 9 zikrêli, 41 topâşi with 5 bolişebâşî, 4 kumbârâşî, 101 azâb, 96 Martolos with one Ağâ and 8 odabâşî; the Martolos, with the exception of the Ağâ and one boliş of the topâşi, were Serbs).

Whilst Belgrade, on one the one hand, developed quickly as a fortress after coming under Turkish rule, the same could not be said for its economic and commercial recovery. In 943/1536-7, there were in Belgrade 4 Muslim mahâalles with 79 households around four mosques. Nearly half of the non-military Muslim population was registered as craftsmen. There were 68 Christian households in the 12 mahâalles of the town. These inhabitants did not have to pay taxes, but their duty was to maintain the fortress. At that time there were 72 households of settled âfâlak (here used for semi-nomadic herdsmen, and not to be taken in the ethnical sense) in Belgrade, and not to be taken in the ethnical sense) in Belgrade, who guarded the imperial powder magazines, and there were 20 households of gypsies, whose duty it was to repair the ships in the harbour. In the thirties of the 16th century, a colony of Dubrovnik merchants from Smederevo settled in Belgrade.

After the middle of the 16th century, Belgrade took on the character of an oriental town. The Muslim population was recruited in three ways: from the arrival of the whole administrative machinery and the military garrison, from the settling of merchants and craftsmen from other parts of Turkey and from the islamisation of the local population. After Buda (948/1541) and Temesvar (950/1552) came under Turkish rule, Belgrade became very important as an entrepôt. By 967/1560, there were already 16 Muslim mahâalles with more than 350 households, and more than 60 Christian households in Belgrade. Craftsmanship developed considerably, and new, more delicate crafts appeared. Details from the Defter of 980/1572-3 bear witness to the rapid rise of Belgrade. At that date, there were over 200 Christian households, and over 500 Muslim (in 21 mahâalles), 133 gypsy, and 20 Jewish.

The end of the 16th/17th century, and the first half of the 17th century in particular, were times of great prosperity for Belgrade. According to a statement made by a Papal visitor to the archbishop of Bar, Peter Masarechi, Belgrade had 8,000 households with some 60,000 inhabitants (in 1632). According to Ewliya Čelebi, there were 38 Muslim mahâalles, and 11 others (Serbs, Greeks, Gypsies, Armenians and Jews), and 98,000 permanent residents in the year 1070/1660. The town had a large garrison and was the seat of the commander (hâfudân) of the Danube fleet. There were large storehouses for food for military purposes, workshops for the repair of cannons and nearby a powder factory. According to Ewliya Čelebi, Belgrade had 277 mihrâbî (Kâthî Čelebi mentions only up to 100 mosques there). The mosques of Sultan Sulaymân in the fortress (according to the title of Vezir. Northern Serbia began to be neglected and sank to a mere border garrison for janissaries. It became the seat of a Paşa with the title of Veizir. Northern Serbia began to be referred to as the Belgrade paşâlik, although it was still called the Smederevo sandjak or (Semendire sandjak) in official documents. From 1789 to 1794, Belgrade was once again under Austrian rule. By
the end of the 18th century, it had about 25,000 inhabitants.

After the Peace of Svishtov (1791), the janissaries were driven from Belgrade, though Sultan Selim III had to agree to their return not long afterwards. The rule of terror which they introduced gave rise to the first Serbian revolt in 1804; the rebels surrounded Belgrade immediately, but only succeeded in taking it towards the end of 1806. Belgrade remained the capital until the collapse of the rebel Serbian state in 1813. After the outbreak of the second Serbian revolt (1815) and the Turkish compromise to which it led, established dual rule in Serbia, Turkish authorities and garrison remained in Belgrade. As the vassal state of Serbia grew stronger, Belgrade, too, began to change more and more into a Serbian town. After a bloody clash there between Serbs and Turks, the Turkish garrison bombarded the town (1862). This was followed by lengthy diplomatic negotiations. In 1867, fortified towns were handed over to Serbia, and Belgrade then became the capital of Serbia.

Only a few buildings of the earlier periods were preserved in Belgrade, and similarly there are but few monuments of the Turkish rule left. A few of them are in the older fortress (now a park). In the town itself there are only two, a mosque and a tiwbe. More obvious traces of Turkish rule can be found in the names of parts of the town and of places in the neighbourhood, such as Kalemegdan (halis meydani), Karaburma, Tašmajdan (taš ma’demi), Dorcol (dorf yol), Rospicuprija (rospi köprüsü), Topcider (topçu dere’si), Avala (havale) etc.

Muslims living in Belgrade at the present time are not the descendants of the earlier Muslim population of Turkish times. The last Muslim families of old Belgrade emigrated in 1867 (many of these settled in northern Bosnia) The Muslim population found in Belgrade to day came after 1918, the rule of terror which they introduced gave rise to the first Serbian revolt in 1804; the rebels surround Belgrade, though Sultan Selim III had to agree to their return not long afterwards. Belgrade — Benares was captured by Muḥammad b. Sam. in 590/1193, and many of the idols decorating the small Bursa mosque. He also served as a minor government official in various departments in that town, except for a short appointment in a Tokat court. He died in 1142/1729 in Bursa where he is buried. According to Şafâî’s Tedhikire, Beligh composed a dinâdî which has so far not come down to us. His known poetical works consist of a number of poems quoted in various contemporary medjmu’as and tedhikires and two medjmu’as, i.e., Serguzesht-ndme, which relates his journey to Tokat and his adventures there, with vivid descriptions of his colleagues in court and the provincial town, and a Şehrensiz which is a description of the beauties of Bursa. Beligh’s most important work is his well known book of biographies, Güldeste-i riyaḍ-i ’r-fāl we wafyâ-i dânehwerîn-i nüshêdana. The Güldeste consists of five parts and deals with the biographies of Ottoman sultans, princes, wârîs and notables of Bursa such as poets, scholars, musicians, physicians, story-tellers, etc. (printed in Bursa 1302/1885). Beligh also wrote a supplement to Kâf-zade Fâhîd’s Tedhikire, Zübâdet al-ashâr, and called it Nuhbâat al-Âkhir lî pâyâl Zübâdet al-Âshâr. It covers the period between 1020 to 1726 (autograph MS, Unive 1182). Two works, both in verse, have not come down to us: Gülî-i Şadberk, a commentary of 100 hadîths, and Seba’i Seyyâr, a collection of seven tawhîds.

Bibliography: Şafâî, Tedhikire, s.v.; Faṭîn, Tedhikire, 28; Gibb, Ottoman Poetry, iv, 117; Sadeddin Nüzhet Ergun, Türk Şairleri, Istanbul 1936, ii, 809-817; IA, s.v. (by F. A. Tansal). (Fahir Iez)

Benigh, Mehmed Emin of Yenisehir, Turkish poet. Little is known of his life. He belonged to the ‘ulama? and served as hâdî in various Balkan towns. He does not seem to have been appreciated by his contemporaries as most biographers do not mention his name. He died in 1174/1760 in Eski Zaghra after a hard life, according to his writings. His small dinâdî was printed in Istanbul in 1258/1842. His hadîths are of mediocre quality. Some of his ghâsals show a certain power of description, but his most original work is his four poems in tardi’dhîn form: Keifgerémne, Hammadnâme, Berhernéme, Khayyândnâme, written in a fluent and unadorned style, which contain vivid descriptions of craftsmen and their trades.

Bibliography: Râmi, Tedhikire, s.v.; Faṭîn, Tedhikire, 28; Gibb, Ottoman Poetry, iv, 117-133; IA, s.v. (by F. A. Tansal); Sadeddin Nüzhet Ergun, Türk Şairleri, Istanbul 1936, ii, 817-820. (Fahir Iez)

Benares (or Banâras), also known as Kâshî, derives its name from two tiny monsoon streams, Varûna and Assî, that flow through the northern and southern parts of the town. Situated on the left bank of the Ganges, this ancient city, said to have been founded by Kâshîyâ, son of Subhôtîrâ, about 1200 B.C., is a centre of the Hindu faith and is also revered by the Buddhists. Pop. (1951) 341,811.

Benares was captured by Muḥizz al-Dîn Muḥammad b. Sâm in 590/1193, and many of the idols decorating its numerous temples were destroyed and the town reduced to ruins. In 757/1356 Firûz Şâh Tughluk, while on his return journey from Bengal, gave battle to the ruler of Benares and forced him into submission. In 797/1394 the town and the pargana were bestowed by Muḥammad b. Tughluk.
BENARES — BENDER

on his minister Ḥṣāḏa Ḥaḥān. It was captured by Bābur in 936/1529. During the reign of Akbar, Rādža Ḍjay Singh Sawāʾī built many a temple and an observatory here, the latter is now in ruins. Shāhdjahan appointed his eldest son, Dār̤ Shukoh, as the governor of the town when he came into close contact with Brahmans and imbibed Hindu learning. Awrangzīb, enraged at Muslim students also being taught by Brahmans, ordered the closure of its madrasas. He also built a mosque on the site of an ancient Hindu temple which he destroyed on the plea that it was being used as a seat of conspiracy. The name of the city was also changed to Muhammadābād but it never gained popularity, although it appears on his coins struck here. Muhammad Shāh "Rangālī" (1132/1720-1162/1748) bestowed the pargana of Benares on Manṣārām, a Rādāpūt zamindār, whose son Balwant Singh sided with the British during the Battle of Buxar, (1764) when he became independent of the Nawāb of Awadh. It was ceded to the British in 1765. In 1950 the estate was merged into the Indian Union forming part of the Banaras Division (Uttar Pradesh).

Kabhī, the Indian sūfī-poet, came of a weaver family of this place. All Ḥazīn, the Persian poet, lies buried here. It is also the birth-place of Agha A1I Hazīn, the Persian poet, whose son Balwant Mānsārām, a Radjput zamindār, gained popularity, although it appears on his coins.

Shahdadhajan appointed his eldest son, Dara Shukoh, whose son Balwant Mānsārām, a Radjput zamindār, was under an emin [q.v.]. Ewliya Celebi reported that its "varosh" lying on the west and the morning at Benares, like the evening at Lucknow, has become proverbial in Urdu literature.
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( A. S. BAZMEE ANSARI)

BENAVENT, (in al-Ibrīsī b.m.b.m.t.), Benevento, never captured by the Muslims, even for a short period as were Bari and Taranto. However, in the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries the Muslims became involved in the history of the town and the principality of Benevento, having frequently been both enemies and allies of its princes in their domestic struggles, as well as often plundering and threatening its territory. The period on which we are best informed, thanks to the Latin sources, is the middle portion of the 3rd/9th century (the Arab sources are silent in this regard or give only very vague information). We know that in 228/843 a Saracen amīr Apoalaffar or Apoiaffar (Abū Ḥanīfār), who had come from Taranto, became the ally of prince Siconulph against his rival Radelchis, but eventually quarrelled with Siconulph and was killed defending Benevento. In 237/851 we find a certain Massar (Abū Maʾṣḥar), with a troop of Saracens, allied to this same Radelchis. Massar was later treacherously seized by Radelchis and executed together with his family. Some years after this Benevento was again threatened by Sawdān, the enir of Bari. It was only during the 4th/10th century that the Muslim danger receded, to disappear in the 5th/11th century with the Norman conquest of Sicily. According to the testimony of al-Ibrīsī the town of Benevento is very old (azalīyya), and its population large.

**Bibliography:**
M. Amari, Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia, Catania 1933, i, 502-504, 509-511; Ibrīsī, ed. Amari and Schiaparelli (L'Italia nel libro del Re Ruggero, Rome 1883), 82.

(F. GABRIELI)

BENAVERT, a Muslim leader who inspired Arab resistance to the Normans in eastern Sicily from 464/1072 until 479/1086. His name figures as Benaventi or Benavent in the account of the historian of the Normans, Malaterra. This person, of whom the Muslim sources make no mention, defeated the son of Count Roger in 467/1075 near Catania, captured this town in 474/1081, and in 478/1085 led expeditions from it into Calabria. In the following year he was besieged by Roger in Syracuse, and made a supreme effort to free this stronghold, which seems to have been the centre of his power. He was killed in the ensuing naval battle in the port, on 8 Šafār 479/25 May 1086. The real Arab name of this champion of Islam in Sicily was Ibn Abīḍ̣āb. His memory has been handed down only by his enemies, who admired his courage. Almost certainly he was a forbear of the Muhammad b. Abīḍ̣āb who a century and a half later led the last great revolt of the Sicilian Muslims against Frederick II, by whom he was put to death.

**Bibliography:**
M. Amari, Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia, iii, 151-169.

(F. GABRIELI)

BENDER, a town in Bessarabia; the name appears on a coin of Mengli Gerey dated 905/1499-1500. It is found in the Tatar documents as Bender Kerman (V. Zernov, Materiali, 16). Bender, from Persian Bandar, was called earhly your bandar, which may have a Kuman origin. That the town was first established by the Genoese is a legend (Chronique d’Ureche, ed. Giurescu). Its rise as a trading town with important customs revenue was due to its being on the “Tatar-route” on which an active trade was carried on between Lvov and the Crimea and Ak Kirmān [q.v.] in the 14th century. The place seems to pass from under the rule of the Tatars to that of the Moldavian princes around 1400. The Tatars tried to reconquer it (Ulugh Muhammad in 1428 and Iminek Mirzā in 1476), and, finally Mengli Gerey in cooperation with the Ottomans took it with Kavşan and Tambasar in 1484. When in 945/1538 Süleyman II invaded Moldavia and formed the new sândjak of Ak Kirmān with the incorporation of the south Bessarabia he ordered the erection of a strong castle on the new border at Bender. A good description of the castle was given by Ewliya Celebi (v, 116-120) in 1067/1656-57. It became the seat of a sândjak-begi toward 1570 and later it was attached to the newly formed eydlet of Özü. The kâşi of Bender had 40 nābīye [q.v.] under his jurisdiction and the customs house, always active, was under an ēmin [q.v.]. Ewliya Celebi reported that its “warōgh” lying on the west and

(F. GABRIELI)
the south of the castle consisted of 7 Muslim and 7 non-Muslim districts with 1700 houses and about 200 shops. Bender was, Ethylja adds, "the key of the empire" in the north, a stronghold especially against the Cossacks of Dnieper.

Bender was also famous as the refuge of Charles XII of Sweden between 3 August 1709 and 17 February 1713 and of Potocki in 1768. The Russians captured it first on 27 September 1770, in 1789 and on 8 November 1806 keeping it only with the treaty of Bucharest, 28 May 1812.


BENDER [see bandar].
BENG [see bang].
BENGAL [see bangala].

BENGALI.

(i) Muslim Bengali Language.

Bengali belongs to the Indo-European family of languages. It may have begun to evolve as a separate language with a distinct identity, out of Gaur languages. It may have begun to evolve as a separate language about three hundred years before Muslim rule in Bengal and flourished as a regional literature a century and a half after the Muslim conquest. But it did not exist either as a language or as a literature before Bengal came in contact with Islam and the

Persian contributed as many as 2,500 words to Bengali vocabulary in general, and nearly another 2,000 words to the vocabulary of the Muslims inhabiting the south-eastern part of East Pakistan in particular. In addition, Persian suffixes like i, dâin, dâini, dâr, khâwur, bâdî, giri, are used to form Bengali adjectives, abstract nouns etc., e.g., desh + i = deshi (country-made), phul + dâini = phuldâini (flower-vase), dokhân + dâr = dokhândar (shopkeeper), guli + khâwur = gulhâkhor (drunkard) mamlâ + bîd = memlâyâbîdî (litigant), bâb + giri = bâbégiri (interested in fashion), etc. Persian words like nar and mūdā denote gender in Bengali, e.g., pîrâ (pigeon), narpârâ (male pigeon), mūdâ pîrâ (female pigeon). Similarly mardâ and mūdâ before a Bengali word of common gender denote the male and the female of the species respectively, e.g., mardâ kûkur (dog), mūdâ kûkur (bitch).

Arab merchants developed commercial relations with the people of the south-eastern coastal regions of Bengal long before the political conquest of the country by the Muslims. The Muslim conquest in later times strengthened the religious and cultural ties of the people of this area with the Islamic way of life, and resulted in an increase in the numbers of the Muslim population. It left its mark on the pronunciation of words in this part of Bengal. For example, in the districts of Noakhali, Cittagong and Sylien the use of the Arabic voiceless velar fricative kh ≤ in place of the Bengali plosive k and k̆ of the same category, e.g., khâbâr ≤ kâbâr (cloth), khâs ≤ khâs (I eat), etc., and the Arabic voiced alveolar fricative z ≤ in place of the Bengali voiced plosive-like affricate dj of the standard Bengali dialect, e.g., sāi ≤ djāi (I go), sānd ≤ djâns (to know) etc.

Since the handing over of power in 1947 there has been in East Pakistan a growing tendency to absorb words of Perso-Arabic origin in large numbers through Urdu, as a result of cultural and political contact with West Pakistan.

Bibliography: Halhed, Bengali Grammar 1783, intro. (M. ABDUL HAi)

(ii) Muslim Bengali literature.

Formative Period (900-1200 A.D.). Bengali sprang up as a distinct branch of the Indo-Aryan language about three hundred years before Muslim rule in Bengal and flourished as a regional literature a century and a half after the Muslim conquest. But it did not exist either as a language or as a literature before Bengali came in contact with Islam and the
Muslims. Archaeological excavations at Paharpur (Rajshahi) and at Mainamati (Tripura), which led to the discovery of a few Abbasid coins of the period from the 8th to the 13th centuries, and the history of Muslim saints like Bayazid Bistami (d. 874) at Madanpur Mymensingh, Baba Ahmad (1119) at Vikrampura, Dacca, prove that there was constant maritime and missionary communication between the Muslim world and Bengal while the Bengali language was being formed.

Turki Period (1200-1350 A.D.). The Turks conquered Bengal in 1202 and took 150 years to establish their administration all over the country. This was the period of creation of an Islamic atmosphere through administrative, religious and social machinery. Sanskrit, the fountainhead of Hindu culture, fell into desuetude; Persian, the official and cultural language of the Muslims, came into prominence; and Bengali, the language of the masses, developed rapidly. Shek Sabhadaya, a Sanskrit hagiography on Shaykh Djalal al-Din Tabrizi (d. 1225), and Niranjaner Ruskami, a Bengali ballad by Ramai Pandit, contain sufficient materials indicative of the growing Islamic atmosphere in Bengal.

Period of Independence (1351-1575 A.D.). Bengal became independent under Sultan Ilyas Shah (1342-1357) and preserved her independence for 225 years. The Sultans of Pandua and Gaud identified themselves with the people and extended their patronage liberally to Bengali literature irrespective of caste and creed. The Bhagavata, Ramayana and Mahabharaata were translated into Bengali under their direct patronage; the great poets Vidyapati and Candidas flourished; and Muslims, participating with their Hindu neighbours, opened up new avenues of literary themes primarily derived from Perso-Arabic culture.

The first attempt at popularising Bengali among Muslim scholars was perhaps made by the saint-poet Nuru Kuthi-i 'Alam (d. 1416) of Pandua, who introduced the 'Rikhia Style' in Bengali, in which half the hemistich was composed in pure Persian and the other half in unmixed Bengali. The saint was a classmate of Chyakh al-Din A'ram Shihab (1398-1410) and a life-long friend of the Sultan, under whose patronage Vidyapati of Mithilakhand and Muhammad Saqir of Bengal, the author of the first Bengali romance Yusuf-Zulaykha, flourished. Other writers of romances, like Bahram Khan with his Layli-Madamin, Sahir Khan with his Rumi-Kaydarfiri, Donaghazi with his Sayyid al-Mulk and Muhammad Kabir with his Madhumadhati (1651), followed Saqir in quick succession.

Historical tales too were introduced in Bengali by a few poets. Zayn al-Din wrote Rasul Vijay on the exploits of the Prophet, under the patronage of Yusuf Shihab (1478-1481), who also helped Malaghur Basu to compose Shikshiksha Vijay. Sahir Khan also wrote a Rasul Vijay, while Shyakh Fayd Allah (1545-1575) composed Gasidi Vijay and Goraksha Vijay.

The earliest Muslim poet introducing Islamic precepts in Bengali literature, was 'Ali. His book of admonition, Nasikal-nama, was written on the tenets of Islam. He was also a composer of songs, in one of which he mentions the name of Firuz Shihab (1532-1533). Positive literary evidence on the fusion of Hindu and Muslim culture is found in Shyakh Fayd Allah's Saptapiri (1575). He described in it the beliefs and practices of a new cult aiming at a common platform of worship for Hindus and Muslims alike. Cauda Kaidi and Shyakh Kabir, two composers of songs on the common ideals of Sufis and Vaishnavs, flourished during the time of Husayn Shihab (1493-1519) and his son Nusrat Shihab (1519-1531).

Mughal Period (1576-1757 A.D.). Bengal came under the Mughals in 1576, to whom the country was a 'hell full of the bounty of heavens'. They introduced their own culture with more stress on Persian and neglected the provincial literature. Notwithstanding this, Hindu literature developed on the themes of Candl, Manas, Dharma, Anand and Gangad; Vaishnav literature reached its climax and Muslim Bengali literature, deeply influenced by Indo-Persian literature, flourished as never before.

Among Muslim literary figures, two major poets deserve special mention, namely, Sayyid Sultan (1550-1648) and Aliwal (1607-1680). The former was the saint-poet of Cittagong; Nabi Vamgga, his magnum opus, rivalled the Bengali Ramayana and Mahabharat in all respects; the latter, who was a scholar-poet of the Arakanese Court, adopted the theme of Padmavati (1651), from Hindi. Both of them exerted a wide and abiding influence on successive generations of poets, who not only improved upon the old themes, but also discovered new ones.

In the field of religion, the Nasihat-nama of Shyakh Farid (1550-1615) and Kitab al-Muwallid of Muttalib (1575-1600) are outstanding. Nasr Allah Khan (1560-1625), a prolific writer on religious subjects, wrote the Shari'at-nama, Masar Sawali and Hidayat al-Islam. The Bayyinaat of Nawazish Khan (1638), Hasar Mas'udil of 'Abd al-Karim (1698), Nasihat-nama and Shikhd al-Din-nama of 'Abd al-Hakim (1620-1690), Sarsalr Niti of Kamar 'Ali (1675) also deserve notice.

In the realm of Muslim tales, the Nabi Vamgga, Rasul Vijay and Shabi Mirdad of Sayyid Sultan; Djang-nama of Nasr Allah Khan (1560-1625), Amir Hamza (1684) of Gulam Nabbi and Amriyat Vangi (1758) of Hayat Mahmud narrate many legends about the Prophet and his uncle Hamza. Sayyid Sultan's Iblis-nama, Muhammad Khan's Kiydmainama, Shyakh Parin's Nari-nama and Muhammad Shah's Naur Kandil were built up with the Muslim concepts of Satan, Doomsday and Cosmogony respectively.

Romances introduced earlier were developed by 'Abd al-Hakim in his Yusuf Zulaykha and Lai'mati Sayf al-Mulk, Nawazish Khan in his Gul-i Bahawali (1638), Ghurib Allah in his Yusuf Zulaykha and Muhammad Akbar in his Zeb al-Mulk (1673). When pure romances became monotonous, Sherbaz in his Fakhr-nama and Shyakh Sadiq in his Gadda Mulkaha (1712) introduced moral instruction in romances.

A good elegiac literature developed centring round the tragedy of Karbala. Muhammad Khan in his Maktal Husayn (1645), 'Abd al-Hakim in his Karbala, Hayat Mahmud in his Djang-nama (1723), and Muhammad Ya'kub in his Maktal Husayn (1654) contributed largely to the wide popularity of this theme.

British Period (1757-1947). The Hindus took advantage of Western education at least half a century before the Muslims, and revolutionised Bengali literature by the introduction of a new prose and a new poetry embodying Western ideas, thoughts and forms. Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar (1820-1891), Bankim Chandra Chatterji (1835-1894) and Madhu-
sudan Datta (1824-1873) played a great rôle in this literary regeneration.

The Muslims entered the field half a century later. Mr. Muhammad Husayn (1848-1931), Pandit Riyâd al-Din Mashhadi (1850-1919) Shaykh 'Abd al-Rahîm (1859-1911), Kaykobâd (1858-1951), Muzammil Hâkî (1860-1933) and Dr. Abu 'l-Husayn (1860-1916) took to this new Bengal to lay the foundation of modern Muslim Bengal literature and a host of others came in their wake. Among them Ismâ'il Husayn Shîrâzî (1870-1931) was the most illustrious.

Meanwhile, Rabindranâth Tagore (1860-1941), the Rebel Poet of modern Bengal, ushered in a new school of realistic poetry full of life, light and vigour. He shared the sorrows and sufferings of his countrymen in particular and of oppressed humanity in general. He was the only singing bard to herald a new era of common men and women in search of independence of their motherland, a struggle which culminated later in the creation of Pakistan. In his wake, the poet Dâjîsm al-Dîn (b. 1902) came forward to sing the songs of rural Bengal, particularly of its east portion, now known as East Pakistan.


**BENGHÂZI,** the principal town of Cyrenaica, formerly the district of Barka [q.v.], situated on the western plain on a strip of shore partly cut off from dry land by lagoons. Its position is not advantageous, as seaward by lagoons. Its position is not advantageous, as there is no land, the hinterland is a strip of land about 63,000, all Muslims except for a very few Egyptians, Jews and Greeks, some of whom were tax-paying residents.

Benghazi suffered much from the bombing of late 1942, and from the departure of the Italian population, who evacuated it and the whole of Cyrenaica on the arrival of the British 8th Army. It became the capital and seat of the sovereign of the Federal Union of Libya (1951), and the principal town of Cyrenaica, but lost its industries and much of its importance as a port. The value of its airfield is primarily strategic. Its population in 1954 was about 63,000, all Muslims except for a very small number of Jews and Europeans.

**BENGHÂZI**, the principal town of Cyrenaica.

**BENGHÂZI,** the principal town of Cyrenaica, formerly the district of Barka [q.v.], situated on the western plain on a strip of shore partly cut off from dry land by lagoons. Its position is not advantageous, as its harbour is exposed to winds from the north and east, while the neighbouring regions are arid and the fertile districts on the al-Mârîdî and Djâbl Alghdâr plateaux are some way off. The town is built on the site of the former Euhesperides, a colony founded by the Greeks in the fifth century B.C. During the reign of the Egyptian Ptolemy III Euergetes the settlement became known by the name of his wife Berenike, and retained this name, as Bernik, in the Middle Ages. It was always a town of secondary importance, and declined in the Middle Ages, possibly vanishing completely.

The modern town dates from the immigration at the end of the 19th century of Tripolitians from Zliten and Mesrata who had commercial connexions with Teke, 859/1455) it was only 5 akka. In later times it was usually 9 for djâbl benndk and 12 for chînîlî benndk and when the chîf resmi system was extended to eastern Anatolia in 1540 the rate there was 18 for chînîlî and 12 or 13 for djâbl benndk.

**BENJAMIN** [see BINYÂMÎN].

**BENN nâk,** also called benndk in the 9th/15th century, an Ottoman "çâfi (çâfi)" tax paid by married peasants (muzawwâdî re'dîyâ) possessing a piece of land less than half a çâfi [q.v.] or no land, the former being called chînîlî benndk or simply benndk and the latter djâbl benndk or djâbl. The word benndk might possibly be derived from the Arabic verb benâka.

Actually the benndk resmi made part of the çâfi resmi [q.v.] system and can be considered originally as consisting of two or three of the seven services (sullûk, khidmat) included in the çâfi resmi. The rate of benndk was 6 or 9 akka in Mehemmed II's basânamâme [q.v.], but in some areas (Teke, 859/1455) it was only 5 akka. In later times it was usually 9 for djâbl benndk and 12 for chînîlî benndk and when the çâfi resmi system was extended to eastern Anatolia in 1540 the rate there was 18 for chînîlî and 12 or 13 for djâbl benndk.

In principle benndk resmi was paid by the Muslim peasants directly to the timâr-holders for whom they were recorded as ra'îyyât in the defter [q.v.]. In the defters the term benndk shows the peasants themselves paying benndk resmi. If a bachelor was married he was immediately subject to this tax. If later divorced he paid only the bachelor tax (mudjfer-red resmi). If married, the nomad re'dîyâ without stock animals paid also benndk. Thus this tax was considered essentially as a poll-tax and called also ra'îyyât resmi.

BERÄR, formerly a province of British India consisting of the four districts of Amraoti, Akola, Buldana, and Yeotmal; area: 17,809 sq.m.; population: 3,604,866 of whom 335,169 were Muslims (1941 Census). Under British rule it was administrated as part of the Central Provinces. It has recently been incorporated in the Bombay State.

The territories of the Vakataka, contemporaries of the Guptas, roughly corresponded to modern Berär. It was first invaded by Muslims in 1294 but was not permanently occupied until 1318. It formed the northernmost province (taraq) of the Bahmani kingdom of the Dakhan but towards the end of the 9th/10th century became an independent sultanate under the ‘Imad Shâhs until annexed by the Nizâm Shâhs of Ahmadnagar in 1574. It was conquered by Akbar towards the end of his reign and remained a salât of the Mughal empire until 1724 when Asaf Djiâh Nizâm al-Mulk became independent in Haydârabâb. Until the defeat of the Marâthас by Arthur Wellesley at Assaye in 1803 it was frequently overrun by Marâthâ forces [see NAGPUR]. In 1804 the Berär territories ceded by the Bhonsla Raja of Nagpur were handed over to the Nizâm. During the governor-generalship of Lord Hastings, Berär was for a time controlled by the banking firm of Palmer and Company (vide Preliminary Report on the Russell Correspondence relating to Hyderabad, C. Collin Davies, The Indian Archives, vol. viii, no. i, 1954 ff.). In 1853 Berär was assigned to the East India Company and its revenues were partly employed in the payment of the Nizâm’s debts and partly in maintaining the Haydârabâb Contingent. By a fresh agreement in 1902 Lord Curzon reaffirmed the rights of the Nizâm over Berär but the province was leased in perpetuity to the Government of India at an annual rental of 25 lakhs of rupees. During the viceroyalty of Lord Reading a demand by the Nizâm for the restoration of Berär met with no success. Later under Lords Willingdon and Linlithgow a number of gestures were made to the Nizâm, but Berär continued to be administered as part of the Central Provinces until 1956.


BERÄT, A word of Arabic origin (for the Arabic meaning see BERÁRA which in Ottoman Turkish denotes a type of order issued by the Sultan. Several words of Turkish or other origin were used with the same meaning: the Turkish biti, yarîlîg, buyuruldu, the Arabic berät, emr, ículos, tevêkî, menshur, misbâh; in the Persian fermân, nîşâdan. Some of these words were used during the entire Ottoman epoch, others were used only during certain periods; some of them had only a general meaning, others had also a more special, limited meaning. In the same document several words could be used to designate the ‘sultan’s order’; they could denote an order in the wider sense and also in a narrower, more limited sense. Biti meaning a sultan’s order was not much used after 1500. Emr (amr), in use for 400 years, did not only mean a general order issued in the name of the sultan, but also a special order which decreed the issue of a berät; hence the expression in the preambles of the berät: âdi emrî ‘he who has the order concerning the issue of the berät in hand’. Nîşâdan (fethâm) always occurs in the sense of general order; but also meant a special type of order, the documents of which used to be separately dealt with by the administration and which, at present, are registered in the Turkish archives as a separate archival unity (akhâm defterleri). The nîşâdan meant all orders, without any restriction of subject, that were provided with the tuzhrah (nîşâdan), but (since the 10th/11th century) especially those which were drawn up by the highest financial department of the empire, the defterkhânâ, and were concerned with financial matters. Synonymous with the term nîşâdan was tevêkî (lawî) which could be used, without further limitation, to designate any document which was provided with the tevêkî. (Their identical meaning is proved by the derivatives of both words, the tevêkî-i nişâdan, which are synonymous). An order of more limited scope was provided with the more rarely used menshur, the misbâh and the sîvade (in use only since the 19th century). The berät had a more limited meaning, that of a “deed of grant”, “a writ for the appointment to hold an office”; the documents belonging to this group were also handled separately by the administration; the memory of this is preserved in the designation of some public records: rumdar berät defteri “the defter of the berâtis issued in matters concerning the Orthodox Greek Church”, katolik berät defteri etc. (Midhat Şertoğlu, Mukteva bâkimdan Bayzeeddî Arşivi, 29, 32).

As all grants in the Ottoman empire derived from the sultan, the berât was always issued in the sultan’s name and its constant attribute was: şerîf or humdâyûn (“imperial berât”).

In the Ottoman empire all appointments were made by “grants”, those which were paid by a temporary tenure of estates as well as those paid in ready money; thus all appointments to the civil service, whether that of a high-ranking pasha or that of a low-ranking employee of a mosque, were effected by a berât. The bishops of Syria also received their licences from the sultan in the form of a berât. E17, 678, s.v. Bard’a). Even the vassals of the empire, e.g., the princes of Transylvania, received their recognition in their principality in the form of a berât, with the difference that in the diploma issued to them the expression in question was complemented the following way: bu berât-i humdâyûn un ‘ahdâm-i sîvade menshûr verdüm” I have issued the imperial berât and the treaty full of faith”. Thus under the name of berât an exceedingly great number of orders were issued and these could be grouped according to their contents: şerîf berât, simdâr berât, mülkâname berât, illsâd berât, and, if issued for the benefit of a corporation, ojabâk berât etc.

The word berât became especially part of many of the expressions used in connexion with the administration of the simdâr-estates, e.g., berât-i illsâd-i simdâr teşhir berâtı “the instruction (or warrant) called téşhir given for issuing a high berât”, berât-i şerîfîm verdîm fermânîm olmâgân “since my imperial order has been given for issuing a high berât”, teşhirî oilmâgân “to exchange the written order called teşhirere for a berât”, teşhirî oilmâgân “as the sultan’s order has been issued for the renewal of the berât” (such procedure was usually ordered
after the sultan’s accession to the throne), eli berât “having a berât in hand” (corresponding to this expression is the above quoted eli emirât, eli-i berât “who has a berât”, and in official documents there is often reference to issued berâtis. The word berât, however, often does not occur in the deeds of grant and it has to be inferred from the contents of the document whether it is at the same time a berât or not.

According to the dimension of the grant, the berât has simpler or more elaborate variants, but the word berât “having a berât in hand” (corresponding to berâts) is always written in the same style and the tughra, however, often does not occur in the deeds of grant, and in Persian, it has not the same meaning as in Turkish (see also barât). The number who availed themselves of this offer was, however, very limited. Both terms and guilds fell into desuetude after the Tanzimat.


BERBER (Barbar): (1) Tribal territory. The name originally signified the territory of the Mirâfâb (Mayrâfâb), an Arabic-speaking tribe claiming kinship with the Dâlîyin. It extended on both banks of the Nile from the Fifth Cataract (lat. 18° 23' N.) to the river Aţâbara. The Mirâfâb included both riverain cultivators and semi-nomads. The ruler (makk) was a vassal of the Fundži sultan of Sinnâr. On the death of a makk, the sultan nominated his successor from the ruling family of Timsâb. He also levied, at intervals of four or five years, a tribute of gold, horses and camels. Burckhardt (1814) describes the southernmost portion of Mirâfâb territory as forming a small separate kingdom, known as Râ‘al-Wâlî, under a member of the Timsâb family. Berber was an important trading-centre. A route from Upper Egypt across the Nubian Desert here reached the Nile, and caravans going to...
Egypt from Sinnar and Shandl passed through Berber. The trade of Dongola found an outlet through Berber but by the early 19th century the Dongola-Berber route across the Bayuda Desert was dangerous and little used. Trade with Suakin and al-Taka (the region around modern Kasala) was slight owing to the predatory Bedja and Bisharim tribes. The transit dues levied on Egyptian caravans provided most of the makk’s revenues; the Mirafabi paid him no taxes on land or produce, although they provided the tribute levied by Sinnar. Caravans coming from the south paid no dues, although they made presents to the makk. The trading-connections of Berber resulted in the settlement of Danakil, ‘Ababda and other strangers. The ‘Ababda served as guides and protectors of caravans crossing the Nubian Desert. The last makk, Naṣr al-Dīn, is reported to have sought the assistance of Muhammad ‘Ali Pasha to regain his throne; certainly he welcomed the arrival of the Turco-Egyptian army on 5 March 1821.

(2) Province. During the Turco-Egyptian period the Mirafabi territory formed part of the province of Berber, which extended from Ḥadjar al-‘Asal (lat. 16° 24’ N.) northwards to Abū Ḥamad on the right bank and Kurdi on the left bank, and included the adjacent deserts and their nomads. The extension of Muhammad ‘Ali’s rule over the Begia, resulting in the opening of a permanent trade-route with Suakin, increased the prosperity of the provincial capital. The last khedivial governor was the ‘Abbādī notable, Husayn Pasha Khalīfa, who was endeavouring to repress Mahdist activities when Gordon arrived as governor-general in February 1884. Gordon’s attempts to establish friendly relations with the Mahdī and his indiscreet disclosure of the intended evacuation of the Sudan weakened resistance. In April 1884 the Mahdī commissioned Muhammad al-Khayr ‘Abd Allāh Khudjali to lead the djihād in Berber, and in May the provincial capital was taken, leaving Gordon isolated in Khartoum.

Mahdist Berber was administered by a military governor and had a provincial garrison and treasury. The decline of commerce irritated the inhabitants but a precarious trade continued with Upper Egypt and Suakin, the customs dues from which formed a source of provincial revenue. The last Mahdist governor, Muhammad al-Zakī ‘Uṯmān, after appealing in vain for help against the Anglo-Egyptian advance, evacuated the provincial capital which was occupied by Anglo-Egyptian forces in September 1897. After the reconquest, Berber was reconstituted within narrower boundaries than the pre-Mahdist province and was subsequently combined with Dongola and Halfa to form the present Northern Province.

(3) Town. Berber as the name of a town was apparently unknown before the Turco-Egyptian period. Bruce (1772) speaks of “Gooz” (i.e., Kūz al-Funqūl) as the capital of Berber. This place was much decayed at the time of Burckhardt’s visit (1814), when the capital was a more northerly village called by him “Ankheyre”. This may be an error for al-Mikhayrif, (“El Mekheyr” in Cailliaud), a name used for the provincial capital under the Turco-Egyptians. Al-Mikhayrif was abandoned after the Mahdist conquest and the modern town of Berber lies further north, on the site of the Mahdist camp. Since the Reconquest Berber has declined in importance. The provincial head-quarters was transferred in 1905 to al-Dāmir, while the modern railway-town of ‘Aṭbarā has superseded it as a centre of communications.


Berber, the port and former capital of the British Somaliland Protectorate, lying in 10°26’ North lat. and 45°02’ Long. The Periplus, Ptolemy, and Cosmas give the name βαβαπραξης ἑγγόρως or βαβαπραξία to the coast of the Land of Frankincense. The town itself may be Μαλκά ὑμηρόν. The older Arab geographers write of the land of Berberā, the Gulf of ‘Aden being Bahr Berber or al-Khalidj al-Berberī. The inhabitants are known as βαβαπραξοι, Berbera, or Berabīr. They are Somali [q.v.] and the people whom Yākūṭ (iv, 602) describes as barbarous negroes, amongst whom Islam had penetrated, living between the Zanj and the Ḥabash. Ibn Sa’d (died 1256) who seems to be first to mention the town of Berber, describes them as Muslims, and Ibn Battūta records that they are Shafi’ī which they are today. The name Soomalī first occurs in an Ethiopian hymn in the reign of the Negus Yeshāq (1414-29) and frequently in the Futuḥ al-Habashi (1540-50).

Berberā’s original site is Bandar ‘Abbās now a burial ground to the East of the present town. Amongst its tombs are those of three sayyids said to have been concerned with the foundation of Bandar ‘Abbās as other Arabian proselytisers founded Zayla’ and Makdish. Traditionally the town was contemporary with ‘Amūd and Aw Barre further to the West. It formed part of the Muslim state of Adal (sometimes based on Zayla’, [q.v.]) which, founded in the 9th/10th centuries, reached its zenith in the 14th century and rapidly declined after Imam Aḥmad Ibrāhīm al-Shāhz (1506-43)’s 16th century conquest of Abyssinia. While the Abyssinian armies were recovering their losses with Portuguese aid, Berberā was sacked in 1518 by Saldanha. In the 17th century, with Zayla’, it became a dependency of the sharīfs of Muḥāj. The first British-Soomalī treaty was signed in 1827, two years after the Mary Ann had been plundered off Berberā. With ‘Ali Sharmarke (Soomalī Habar Yānis), governor of Zayla’, Britain signed a treaty in 1845 to secure harbouring rights for vessels of the East India Company. He was British Agent at Berberā when Burton was attacked in 1855. Travellers in the 19th century describe Berberā as a poverty-stricken collection of huts with a population, in the hot months, of as little as 8,000. From October to March, however, during the north-east Monsoon, the port was open to vessels from Arabia, the Persian Gulf, and India, bringing imports of dates, cloth, rice, and metals etc., and exporting slaves, livestock, ghee and skins, and the town sometimes contained as many as 40,000 persons.

Berberā was occupied in 1875 by the Egyptians who withdrew nine years later during the Mahdist rebellion in the Sudan when Britain acquired Zayla’ and Berberā. Treaties were signed with the Gada-bursi (1884) and the Habar Awal (1884 and 1886) clans. In 1901 Sayyīḥ Muḥammad ‘Abdullā hai Ḥassān [q.v.], the ‘Mad Mullah’, of the Shāliḥiyah family began his djihād against the colonial powers. The administration of the interior was abandoned in 1908, and gradually resumed about 1912.
In Burton's time Berbera was dominated by the Habar Awal tribe who were still in 1912 receiving a subsidy of 10,000 Rs. annually. With a population today rarely less than 30,000, most of whom are Habar Awal, the town is the headquarters of Berbera District. It is the centre for the Protectorate of the Kadjiriyah (French: afarakeh) with a markam for Sayyid Abd Al-Kadir al-Dilani, and of the Somali Youth League nationalist party. A local Government Council was started in 1953, and the harbour is being developed.


BERBERI, name given to the eastern Hazāra inhabiting the mountainous region of central Afghanistan between Kābul and Harāt; in Iran, the region of Mašhad, Bālūcistān (near Quetta), and in the S.S.R. of Turkmenistān, the oasis of Kuşkha (district of Makī) [see haṣāra].

BERBERS, the name by which are commonly designated the populations, who, from the Egyptian frontier (Swā [q.v.]) to the shores of the Atlantic Ocean and the great bend of the Niger, speak—or used to speak before their arabisation—dialects (or rather local forms) of a single language, Berber. This term is probably an abusive or contemptuous epithet, used in Greek (Barbaroi) and in Latin (Barbāri) as well as in Arabic (Barbar, singular Barbar, pl. Barāber, Barābira), and does not constitute a national name, as some people (cf. P. H. Antichan, _La Tunisie_, 1884, 3) maintain (cf. the toponymics Berber in Nubia and Berbera in Somaliland; see G. S. Colin, _Appellations données par les Arabes aux peuples hétérogènes_, in GLECS, vii, 93-6). The term amāṣiḫ (and var.), pl. amāṣiḫ (and var.) may be considered as designating the Berbers in general, though they themselves, lacking as they do all sense of community, usually employ their tribal names when referring to themselves or have otherwise more or less willingly accepted foreign designations (Kabyles, Chauoua, etc.). The term amāṣiḫ has the meaning of "free man" (see however T. Sarnelli, _Sull'origine del nome imazigton/, in Memoriai André Basset, Paris 1957, 131-138) and is still employed over a fairly extensive area. The feminine tamāṣiḫt (tamāṣiḫt) (and var.) is used there to designate the Berber language.

The only general work on the Berbers is the small but excellent popular account by G. H. Bousquet, _Les Berbères_, Paris 1937.

I. — History

a) Origins

The language is at present the only criterion which will serve to distinguish the Berbers, who, from the anthropological point of view, reveal morphological characteristics which are too varied, indeed too irreconcilably opposed, to permit us to speak of a homogeneous Berber race, whilst, from the political point of view, they have always been too divided to constitute a truly distinct nation. In spite of the relative abundance of prehistoric remains discovered in the immense territory conveniently called "Barbary", in spite of the epigraphic documents and the works of Greek, Latin and Arab authors, a whole portion of the history of this obviously composite people is still unknown to us. It would be useless to deny that the origin of the Berber language—the unity of which, moreover, is a relative matter (see section V below)—remains a mystery for us and that to locate, therefore, the cradle of the men who speak it remains an impossible task. However, on this absorbing subject, bibliography is by no means lacking, and, many hypotheses, sometimes presented as certainties, have been put forward concerning the origins of the Berbers. Classical authors consider them about variously as autochthonous, oriental or Aegean. The Arabs usually consider them as orientals, Canaanites or Himyariotes, and this latter hypothesis has recently been supported by cogent arguments (Helfritz). The Canaanite origin has been revived by some modern authors (Antichan, Daumas, Slouschz), whilst for others the Berbers are autochthonous (Carette), with an admixture of Asian blood, especially Phoenician (Fournel, Mercier); some people, usually amateurs, even go so far as to reconstruct the ancient population of Barbary in all its elements (Rinn, _Les origines berbères_, Algiers 1889; Col. de Lartigue, _Monographie de l'Aurès, Constantine 1904_) and to establish bold relationships with the Celts, Basques and Caucasian peoples (Comm. Cauvet, _Les Origines caucasiques des Touareg_, in Bull. Soc. Géogr. Alger 1925; idem, _La Formation celtique de la nation tarquie_, ibid., 1926), or even with the indigenous populations on the other side of the Atlantic (idem, _Les Berbères en Amérique_, Algiers 1930). Anthropology is at a loss and the problem is not simplified by the existence of fair Berbers. The best qualified scholars are reserved in their opinion and generally consider that various elements coming from the south, the East and perhaps the north were added to a basic population rather similar to that which occupied the northern shores of the Mediterranean, but that this occurred at too remote a period for us to be able to date the various migrations. In any event, all these are no more than hypotheses; only linguistic data may perhaps enable us to solve the mystery of Berber origins, which, in the middle of the 20th century, remains complete.

b) Before Islam

All that can be said for certain is that the Berbers had been established in Northern Africa from a remote period. The classical historians and geographers refer to them under different names, which have not persisted as they were certainly not used by the peoples concerned: Nasamonians and Psylli occupying Cyrenaica and Tripolitania; Garamantians leading a nomadic existence in the Sahara; Machlyans, Maxyans populating the Tunisian Sahel; Numidians living in the eastern Maghrib; Getulians defending the desert borders and the high plateaux; and lastly Moors, spread over the central Maghrib and the furthest Maghrib. The establishment of foreign colonies, Phoenician, Carthaginian, and Greek, only had a limited influence on all these populations, except perhaps in the immediate vicinity of Carthage. They were divided into numerous rival tribes, which were, however, capable of uniting briefly against the foreigners, though never to the point of forming powerful and lasting states. At the time of the Punic wars, however, whilst anarchy persisted in the East, the beginnings of political organisation (creation of the kingdoms of the Massylae, the Masaesylae and of Mauritania) can be observed in the centre and the west. The genius of Masinissa, bolstered by the support of Rome, permitted this prince to unite the whole of Numidia under his rule and to create, in a few years, a kingdom comprising all the Berber populations from the Moulouya to the Syrtes. But this kingdom had but an ephemeral existence; it disappeared in 46 B.C. and Eastern Numidia became a Roman province. A few years later the kingdom of Numidia was reconstituted and became a simple Roman protectorate. Still shorter was the life of the kingdom of Mauritania, created by Augustus in 17 A.D. in favour of Juba II, and transformed into a Roman province as from the year 42.

Rome's domination in Africa lasted until the 5th century of the Christian era. In this period of time, the Berbers, whilst assimilated in the Province of Africa and in Numidia, were hardly changed in the mountainous areas, on the high plateaux, on the confines of the Sahara and in Mauritania. For the most part the Romans were content to impose on them the obligation of paying tribute and providing auxiliary troops, leaving the administration of the tribes to the local chieftains (principes, praefecti, reguli). The Berber spirit of independence was by no means extinguished; it showed itself at times in risings, led by more or less romanised natives, such as Tadfarinas (17-25 A.D.), and at times in attacks by the desert peoples or by the barely civilised tribes of the interior. Such were the attacks led by the Nasamonians and the Garamantians during the reigns of Augustus and Domitian; the insurrections of the Moors during the reigns of Hadrian, Antoninus and Commodus; of the Getulians during the period of military anarchy; the rising of the Quinquegentians (Kabyles of the Djurdjura) at the end of the 3rd century. As Roman authority progressively declined, there was an increasingly energetic reaction on the part of the Berbers, who affirmed their particularism by the adoption of heterodox doctrines, as for example Donatism, so that the religious quarrels which desolated Africa in the 4th century are, from many points of view, racial wars. The rising of the "Circumcelliones" appears to have been a kind of Berber Jacquerie. Revolts, such as those of Firmus (372-73) and Gildon (398) provide further testimony of the effervescence of the native populations. But, as previously, the Berbers were unable to ally themselves against the common enemy and to take their place. Their hostility to the Romans merely made the Vandal conquest easier. Like the Romans, these Germanic invaders were obliged to take the Berbers into account. Though Gaiseric succeeded in restraining them by enrolling them in his armies, his successors had to maintain a constant struggle against them. Mauritania, Kabylia, the Aurès and Tripolitania retained their independence. The Byzantines who, after defeating the Vandals, remained the masters of North Africa for a century (533-642), were no more fortunate. Indigenous chieftains such as Antalas in Byzacene and Yabdas in the Aurès, offered such resistance to Solomon, the governor sent by Justinian, that he had great difficulty in surmounting it. After the death of this general, killed in an expedition organised against the Levatians (Luwata [q.v.]) of Tripolitania, the situation in Byzantine Africa became very critical. John Trogilita was only able to stop the invasion of the Luwata with the assistance of the Berbers of the Aurès. But Byzantine authority was not recognised by all the indigenous populations. Outside Byzacene, the former Province of Africa (Tunisia) and the northern part of the province of Constantine, the coastal towns and some strongholds in the interior, the Berbers were everywhere independent. At that time they formed three groups: 1—in the East, the Luwata (Hawwâra, Awrlgha, Nafzâwa, Awraba) extending over Tripolitania, Cyrenaica, the Djarid, the Aurès; 2—in the West, the Šanhâja scattered throughout the central Maghrib and the furthest Maghrib (Kutâma in Little Kabylia, Zâwâ in Great Kabylia, Zankûta on the Algerian littoral between Kabylia and Chelif, Iferen from Chelîf to Moulouya, Ghûmûra in the Rif, Mašmûda on the Atlantic coast of Morocco, Gezûla (Djazula [q.v.]) in the High Atlas, Leûma in Southern Morocco, Šanhâja “with the ithâm” leading a nomadic existence in the western Sahara); 3—the Zanûta spaced out along the borders of the plateaux, from Tripolitania to the Djabâl Šamûr, and extending progressively towards the central Maghrib and the furthest Maghrib.

(G. Yver*)

Bibliography: The basic work is that of S. Gsell, Histoire ancienne de l’Afrique du Nord, Paris 1913-28; see also the historical works quoted in the bibliography of the articles Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, as well as the bibliography of the preceding section, and Dureau de la Malle, L’Algérie, Paris 1852; Diehl, L’Afrique byzantine, Paris 1896; S. Gsell, Textes relatifs à l’Afrique du Nord: Hérodote, Alger-Paris 1916; P. Monceaux, Histoire...
The arrival of the Berbers scarcely changed the previous situation. Their first expeditions were, in reality, no more than raiding expeditions and left no traces other than the havoc wrought by the Muslim bands. It is true that the founding of al-Kayrawan (50/670) provided the Arabs with a permanent base of operations, but the expeditions of `Uqba b. Nafi` across the Maghrib were more like raids than an actual conquest. The towns still occupied by the Byzantines remained inaccessible to the Muslim leader, as did the mountain massifs, where he would have been unable to overcome the inhabitants. In fact so little were they under control that one of their leaders, Kusayla (q.v.), having surprised and killed `Uqba at Tabukhah, expelled the Arabs from Idrilkiya and formed a Berber kingdom comprising the Aurès, the Southern part of the present-day Department of Constantine and most of Tunisia (68-71/687-90). However Kusayla was unable to hold his position for long and, in spite of the resistance of the Berbers of the Aurès, symbolised by the legendary personage of the “Kāhinā” (q.v.), the Muslims finally emerged victorious at the end of the 1st/7th century. The conversion of the Berbers to Islam, initiated by `Uqba without great success, took place at the beginning of the following century. This was accomplished less by conviction than by interest, for the Arab generals had the idea that the natives would enrol in their armies in hopes of booty and thus be won over to their religion. The Berbers formed the nucleus of the armies which, under the command of Arab or even Berber leaders like Tāriq (q.v.), in a few years completed the subjugation of the Maghrib and, in less than half a century, brought about the conquest of Spain.

Harmonious relations, however, did not long prevail between Arabs and Berbers. The latter complained of having been poorly rewarded for their services and, in spite of the fact that they were Muslims, of being treated more like inferiors than equals. And so, having first broken away from orthodox Islam and embraced Khāridjī doctrines (see below, section III), they rose against the Arabs. The movement began in the West (122/740), at the instigation of a man of the Mātghāra, Maysara (q.v.), and subsequently, in spite of his death at the hands of his own followers, prevailed throughout the whole Maghrib and even spread into Spain. The Arabs suffered disastrous defeats, like that of Killūjām b. `Iyād (q.v.) in 123/741; they were expelled from al-Kayrawān, which was sacked by the Warfaddijīmā, followers of the Sufīre doctrines (139/756); then the Nawwāra (Ibadīs), led by Abu `l-Khattāb (q.v.), defeated the Warfaddijīmā and formed an Ibadī state extending over Tripolitania, Tunisia and the eastern part of Algeria. For a while the authority of the `Abbādī Caliph was abolished in Africa. But the Berbers, continuously divided amongst themselves, were incapable of profiting from their success.

The destruction of Abu `l-Khattāb’s army by troops from Syria restored Idrilkiya to the Arabs (144/761). Forty years of sanguinary struggles and innumerable engagements (300 according to Ibn Khaldūn) enabled them to re-establish their control over the eastern Maghrib. The rest of the country eluded them. A number of states, governed by chieftains of Arab origin, but inhabited by Berbers, for the most part heretics, not recognising the authority of the `Abbāsīs Caliph, came into being in various places. Such were the kingdom of Tāhurt (144-296/761-908) founded by the Imām Ibn Rustam with the survivors of the Ibadites from the East who had taken refuge in the central Maghrib [see RUSTAMIDS]; that of Sādarāta [q.v.] where the Banū Midrār reigned (155-366/771-977); that of Tlemcen [q.v.] in the Rif; the state of the Barghawātī [q.v.] on the Atlantic coast; finally, at the beginning of the 3rd/9th century, the kingdom of Fās, founded by Idrīs I, a descendant of `All b. Abī Tālib, with the help of Berber tribes (Miknāsa, Sadrāta, Zwāgha). Only the semi-independent dynasty of the Aghlabīs (184-296/800-909) recognised the sovereignty of the `Abbāsīs; they found among the Berbers soldiers for the conquest of Sicily, but had to suppress many revolts by the indigenous populations of Tripoliāntia, southern Tunisia, the Zāb and the Hodna.

Berber opposition to the Arabs remained, in fact, as inveterate as ever; it was even sufficiently strong to ensure the triumph of Shī`ī doctrines in the Maghrib, in spite of the fact that they were radically opposed to the Khāridjī doctrines embraced by the Berbers in the preceding century. The Kutāma provided the dā`ī Abī `Abbāl Allāh al-Shī`ī (q.v.) with the soldiers who fought the Aghlabīs and founded the Fātimid power for the benefit of the mahdī `Ubayd Allāh (297/910). The Fātimids, it is true, did not succeed in imposing their rule on the whole of the Berbers. Though they succeeded in suppressing the Imāmate of Tāhurt, they were unable to prevent the Idrīsids from maintaining themselves in the furthest Maghrib; they did obtain the submission of the Mafrāwā and the Zanāta who, out of hatred for the Fātimids, had placed themselves under the patronage of the Umayyads of Spain; finally, they had to combat the revolt of the Khāridjīs led by Abū Yazīd (q.v.) “the man with the donkey” (332-36/943-47), a revolt which endangered their power and which they only succeeded in suppressing with the help of the Ṣanḥādja of the central Maghrib. In addition, at an early date, the Fātimids turned their attention towards the East and, once the Caliph al-Mu`izzī had established himself in Egypt (362/973), they lost interest in the Maghrib. North Africa was once again disputed between the various Berber tribes, none of which was sufficiently strong to dominate the others. In the East, the Ṣanḥādja, taking the place of the Kutāma, upheld the authority of the Zirīds [q.v.], governors of Idrilkiya and Tripoliāntia (362-563/973-1167); in the West, following the disappearance of the Idrīsids, power passed into the hands of the Zanāta, at first nothing more than local governors on behalf of the Umayyads of Spain, but later independent princes at Fas until the advent of the Almoravids (455/1063). At the beginning of the 5th/11th century, the Zirīd state disintegrated; in the centre of the Maghrib there was founded the
Hammadid kingdom [q.v.], the rulers of which recognised the authority of the Caliph of Baghdad and took as their capital firstly the Kaifa and then Bougie (Bdijâya, 405/457-1014-1152). The anarchy resulting from the internecine Berber struggles was further complicated, in the middle of the century, by the invasion of the Hilâlî tribes, which had as an immediate result the devastation of Irikiya and part of the Maghrib, and which entailed, as a long-term consequence, a profound modification of the ethnography of North Africa.

However, just as the disorder seemed to reach its climax, two Berber dynasties, that of the Almoravids [see AL-MURABITUN] and that of the Almohads [see AL-MUWAHHIDUN], both proclaiming reforming religious doctrines, succeeded in establishing their temporary supremacy in North Africa. The triumph of the Almoravids was that of the Lantûna, who until then had led a nomadic existence between southern Morocco and the banks of the Senegal and the Niger. Converted to Islam in the 3rd/9th century, they had for a long time been only nominal Murabites. They had been instructed in orthodox doctrine and practices by 'Abd Allâh b. Yânûn (d. 451/1060) and resolved to carry the faith to the Blacks of the Sudân and to the ignorant populations of southern Morocco. Their conquests speedily passed beyond these limits. Abû Bakr b. Umar founded Marrâkush (462/1070) and Yûsuf b. Tashfîn (Tâshfünin) within a few years subdued the whole of Morocco and the central Maghrib as far as the borders of the Hammadid kingdom, halted the progress of the Christians of the Iberian Peninsula by the victory of Zallâka [q.v.] (479/1086), dethroned the Andalusian amirs, and became the sole master of the whole of Muslim Spain. The decline of the Almoravids was as rapid as their success. Exhausted by their own victories and by contact with a higher civilisation, the Berbers of the Sahara rapidly disappeared. To replace them, the Almoravid Caliphs were obliged to have recourse to the use of Christian mercenaries, whilst they themselves, unmindful of Islamic orthodoxy, scandalised strict Muslims by their conduct. Won over to the unitarian doctrine (muwâhidûn) by the preaching of Ibn Tûmart [q.v.], the Masmûda of the Atlas rose against them. Under the command of a man of genius, a Berber of the Kûmîya, 'Abd al-Mu'min [q.v.], they overcame the Almoravids without great difficulty (541/1147). The Empire founded by the Almohads was still more extensive than that of their predecessors. Though it is true that 'Abd al-Mu'min did not succeed in subduing the whole of Spain, on the other hand he destroyed the Hammadid kingdom of Bougie and the Zirid kingdom of Irikiya, expelled the Christians from the ports which they had occupied, and made himself master of all the country between Syrte and the Atlantic. Thus a great Berber Empire extended over the whole of North Africa; however it was not long before it began to crumble. The Almohad Caliphs were not more successful than the Almoravids in remaining faithful to orthodoxy; one of them, al-Ma'mûn [q.v.], even went so far as publicly to curse the memory of Ibn Tûmart, and dealt rigorously with the faithful. The rivalries of the various Berber splinter groups was an additional factor which contributed to the disintegration of the empire created by 'Abd al-Mu'min. The quarrels of the Masmûda and the Kûmîya led to constant bloodshed at the Moroccan court; the tribes of the central Maghrib supported the enterprises of the Banû Ghâniya [q.v.], or attempted to make themselves independent. A century after the death of 'Abd al-Mu'min, the last of his line, Abû Dabbûs, reduced to the role of bandit-chief, met his end in obscurity (668/1269).

The Maghrib was already divided among the powers, the Marinids [q.v.] installed at Fas, the 'Abc Al-Wâdid [q.v.] at Tlemcen (Tilmûsân), the Hafsids [q.v.] at Tunis. Not one of these new dynasties was capable of imposing its supremacy on the others, or even of making its own subjects respect it. In Morocco, the tribes of the mountain regions were in a state of constant revolt against the Marinids; in the central Maghrib, the Banû Wâmana of the Ouarsenis, the Zwâwa of the Wadids, the Kabyles of the province of Constantine, and the populations of the Zâb and Djarid, remained outside the authority of the sovereigns of Constantine, Bougie and Tunis; the same was true of the oasis of the Jebel Nafusâ and the Aurès. The inability of the Berbers to organise themselves in a large State is conclusively demonstrated. It therefore becomes impossible to follow their history except by making a historical assessment of the various tribes. They had been instructed in orthodox doctrine and practices by 'Abd Allâh b. Yânûn (d. 451/1060) and resolved to carry the faith to the Blacks of the Sudân and to the ignorant populations of southern Morocco. Their conquests speedily passed beyond these limits. Abû Bakr b. Umar founded Marrâkush (462/1070) and Yûsuf b. Tashfîn (Tâshfünin) within a few years subdued the whole of Morocco and the central Maghrib as far as the borders of the Hammadid kingdom, halted the progress of the Christians of the Iberian Peninsula by the victory of Zallâka [q.v.] (479/1086), dethroned the Andalusian amirs, and became the sole master of the whole of Muslim Spain. The decline of the Almoravids was as rapid as their success. Exhausted by their own victories and by contact with a higher civilisation, the Berbers of the Sahara rapidly disappeared. To replace them, the Almoravid Caliphs were obliged to have recourse to the use of Christian mercenaries, whilst they themselves, unmindful of Islamic orthodoxy, scandalised strict Muslims by their conduct. Won over to the unitarian doctrine (muwâhidûn) by the preaching of Ibn Tûmart [q.v.], the Masmûda of the Atlas rose against them. Under the command of a man of genius, a Berber of the Kûmîya, 'Abd al-Mu'min [q.v.], they overcame the Almoravids without great difficulty (541/1147). The Empire founded by the Almohads was still more extensive than that of their predecessors. Though it is true that 'Abd al-Mu'min did not succeed in subduing the whole of Spain, on the other hand he destroyed the Hammadid kingdom of Bougie and the Zirid kingdom of Irikiya, expelled the Christians from the ports which they had occupied, and made himself master of all the country between Syrte and the Atlantic. Thus a great Berber Empire extended over the whole of North Africa; however it was not long before it began to crumble. The Almohad Caliphs were not more successful than the Almoravids in remaining faithful to orthodoxy; one of them, al-Ma'mûn [q.v.], even went so far as publicly to curse the memory of Ibn Tûmart, and dealt rigorously with the faithful. The rivalries of the various Berber splinter groups was an additional factor which contributed to the disintegration of the empire created by 'Abd al-Mu'min. The quarrels of the Masmûda and the Kûmîya led to constant bloodshed at the Moroccan court; the tribes of the central Maghrib supported the enterprises of the Banû Ghâniya [q.v.], or attempted to make themselves independent. A century after the death of 'Abd al-Mu'min, the last of his line, Abû Dabbûs, reduced to the role of bandit-chief, met his end in obscurity (668/1269).
Distribution at present

At the present day, the Berbers, although without doubt constituting the basis of the population of North Africa, no longer form a homogeneous mass and one can at most take into account those of them who have retained the use of the Berber language; they would appear to amount to over 5,000,000 individuals. Many of them are in fact bilingual—even trilingual—but still more numerous are those who have lost—often deliberately—all memory of their origins as well as their customs and language, frequently providing themselves expressly with an Arab genealogy; in contrast, a few elements here and there lay claim to a Berber origin, though they have ceased to speak the language of their ancestors. Generally speaking, Berber has in fact always receded before the advance of Arabic, and recent events or those of the present day have tended to accentuate the narrowing of the area in which the old language is used; the disappearance of various Berber speaking pockets, especially in eastern Barbary, is a contemporary phenomenon, and it seems likely that the political situation in North Africa will continue in the immediate future to favour the extension of the domain of Arabic.

However, several considerable groups have persisted in the mountain massifs and in the desert, that is to say in those regions only superficially penetrated by the Arabs. They are linked together by pockets more or less close to one another, which remain as evidence of the old ethnic and linguistic pattern. In general terms, it may be said that the density of Berber groups increases from east to west. They are scattered over a vast area which extends from the Egyptian frontier (with Siwa and the oasis of Gharyan) to the Atlantic Ocean, from the cliff of Hombori, south of the Niger, to the Mediterranean.

Libya.—Various groups subsist in the mountains of the country of Barqa, in the Djabal Ghurýán, Iren, Nafta; they are also to be found in the oases of Awdjila, Sokna, Timisá and, on the coast, at Zwara; some of the elements of the population of Awdjila and of Urfella, in the neighbourhood of Tripoli, say they are Berbers although they speak Arabic (about 23% of the population in all).

Tunisia.—Six villages in the island of Djerba: Adjim, Guellala, Sedoukhe, Elmá, Mahboub and Sedghjane, to which must be added seven on the mainland: Tmangourt, Sened, Zraoua, Taoujdjout, Tamerzet, Chnini and Douiret, which are still partly Berber-speaking; these Berbers, many of whom spend a long time in the towns of the North, especially in Tunis, where they occupy positions of trust, are much attached to their dialect, which moreover serves them as a secret language (1% Berber-speaking in all).

Algeria.—Kabylia in the north and the Aurás in the south-east have been the two poles of Berber resistance; these regions are now only separated by a fairly narrow Arabic-speaking zone, up to Sétif. In the Algerian and Oranian Telí country, the groups only reach some importance in the mountain region of Blida and the Chéf (Ouarsenis, Djendel, Bent Menacer, Chenoua); finally, several groups appear along the Algero-Moroccan frontier (Bent Snous, near Tiemcen) (about 30% Berber speaking in all).

Morocco.—The geographical configuration of Morocco has been especially favourable to the survival of the Berber populations; though a number of tribes have relinquished the use of Berber, it nevertheless remains the language of the great groups of the Zanata, Masmúda and Sanház in the Rif, the Middle, High and Anti-Atlas, as well as in the Sous. R. Montagne, Vie Sociale, 17, has estimated that the Arabs constitute from 10 to 15% of the population in Morocco, Arabised Berbers from 40 to 45%, the remaining 40 to 45% being Berbers who cannot disclaim their origin.

Sahara.—In the Algerian and Moroccan Sahara, the oases of Oued Righ, Ouargla, Nouaga, the seven towns of the Mzaá, the “ksoures” of the Gourara, the Touat, the Tidikelt, of Figuig, of the Tafillalt, of the Dades; then in a very extensive zone in the shape of a triangle, between Ghadames in the North, Tombouctou in the south-west and Zinder in the south-east, including Ghat, Dj Janet and the Ahaggar, we have the various groups of Touareg (q.v.).

Berber is also spoken in Mauritania (Zenaga) by about 25,000 inhabitants (especially the Trárâ); the Wada pocket uses Azer, a Soninke dialect mixed with Berber.

Diaspora.—Outside those zones roughly indicated above, attention must be drawn to the influx of the Berbers into the large towns of Morocco (Casablanca) and Algeria (Algiers), where, “detrubalised” and lacking the control of their natural social group (see below section IV), they tend to form an impoverished proletariat, ready for anything. Outside Barbary, there are to be found in the Lebanon descendants of the Kutâma who arrived with the Fātimids and, in Damascus, Algerian Berbers who emigrated at the beginning of the conquest, or who rejoined the amīr ʿAbd al-Kûdár [q.v.] or his descendants. Some elements remained in various European countries after the second world war, and a few are even reported in America, but as yet all Metropolitan France has the largest number of Berbers; the majority of them are Kabyles, who have temporarily—or in some cases permanently—abandoned the barren soil of their homeland, seeking to find more fruitful means of livelihood abroad; these displaced persons also form a proletariat which finds it difficult to adapt itself to the conditions of life in the Metropolis.

In ancient times, the religion of the Berbers appears to have been divided into a multitude of local cults, corresponding to the tribal divisions. The objects of this cult, concerning which we only possess scanty and incomplete information, were doubtless natural objects: grottos, rocks, springs, rivers and mountains, to which must be added the celestial bodies, at least the sun, moon and some of the stars. The veneration accorded them still persists in some of the legends, beliefs, rites and religious ceremonies. In spite of their conversion to Islam and their deep feeling of belonging to the Islamic community, the Berbers have in fact retained a host of pagan practices, some of which have more or less been adapted to Islam, whilst others remain in direct opposition to Islamic precepts; these survivals are particularly apparent in agricultural rites and festivals (practices for obtaining rain, harvest rites, lighting bonfires, *anfisa* [*q.v.*]), the concept of baraka [*q.v.*], the cult of saints etc.

It cannot be denied that from Punic times, various foreign divinities were not only borrowed, but were in fact assimilated to the national divinities (see H. Basset, *Influences puniques chez les Berbères*, in *RAfr.*, 1921). Judaism also obtained numerous proselytes, and even if it did not play the rôle which some claim for it, it was disseminated over the whole of North Africa; in fact, with the exception of the descendents of Jews expelled from Spain in the 9th/10th century, the majority of indigenous Jews are descended from proselytes pre-dating the appearance of Islam (see Slouschz, *Hebraeo-Ptichimici et Judico-Berbères*, Paris 1909; M. A. Simon, *Le Judaïsme berbère dans l'Afrique ancienne*, in *Rev. Hist. et Philos. Fac. thêol. protestante de Strasbourg*, 1946; L. Voinot, *Pèlerinages judéo-musulmans du Maroc*, Paris 1948; P. Flamand, *Population isldiste du Sud marocain*, in *Hesp.*, 1950, 365 ff.; idem, *Un Mellah en pays berbère: Demnate*, Paris 1952; idem, *Les Communautés isldistes du Sud marocain*, thesis, Sorbonne 1957).

Judaism paved the way for Christianity which prospered in spite of the bitter struggle which it had to conduct against paganism and the internal quarrels which soon beset it; it will be sufficient to note that it afforded the Berbers an opportunity of grouping together against Roman rule and that they enthusiastically embraced heresies (Arianism, Donatism, etc.) opposed to the doctrine of the Church of Rome (see P. S. Mesnage, *Etude sur l'influence du Christianisme sur les Berbères*, Paris 1902; idem, *Le Christianisme en Afrique*, Algiers 1915; E. Albertini, *L'Afrique romaine*, 15 ff.; Dom Ledercq, *L'Afrique chrétienne*, Paris 1900; Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, Paris 1900-23).

The same thing happened at the time of the Muslim conquest: it was only the name of their adversaries which had changed. We do not know in detail the history of the conversion of the Berbers to Islam, but tradition has it that they succeeded twelve times and Islam only finally triumphed in the 6th/7th century; it was at this date that the last indigenous Christians disappeared, whilst Jewish communities survived down to our own day. At the beginning of the conquest, the converted Berbers professed the orthodox doctrines, the only one known to them; but their spirit of independence soon showed itself by their adoption of Khâridjî doctrines which put forward the most egalitarian ideas (see *Ibadyya*, *Khâwarîd* and the works of T. Lewicki, especially *Etudes isldîtes nord-africaines*, Warsaw 1955, and *Là répartition géographique des groupements isldîes dans l'Afrique du Nord au moyen âge*, in *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*, 1957; see also Chikh Bekri, *Le Kharijisme berbère*, in *AEEO*, Alger 1957, 55-108). The clearest indication that religious doctrine little concerned them fundamentally is given by the fact that one party espoused the cause of the *Shî'îs*, not only that of the Idrîsîs of Fâs, but even of those who had come under the influence of the Persian outlook and saw in the *imâm* an incarnation of the Divinity. Thus it came about that alongside the Khâridjîs (Sufrîs and Ibađîs) there were the Fâmînîs, and that the Kutâmîs provided the main support for the *mâkî* ʿUbayd Allâh. This tendency to turn to extremes was again in evidence when a puritan reaction brought about the triumph of Sunnî doctrines with the Lamtûnî (Almoravids) of the Sahara, recently converted in the 5th/10th century; it was further emphasised with the Maṣûmîn of the Atlas who founded the Almohad Empire and destroyed the remaining dissidents, Christians or Shî'îs, with the exception of a few Khâridjî communities who were protected by mountains, the desert or the sea; it again made its appearance with the formation of the small Marabout states which arose in Morocco from the 5th/11th century onwards (see R. Montagne, *Nie sociale*, 22 ff.).

Among reactions against official Islam, two further attempts must be cited which aimed at creating a new religion in Morocco: in the Rif, in the 4th/10th century, the attempt of Há-Mîn al-Muftari [*q.v.*] and, on the Atlantic coast, that of *Ṣâlih b. Ṭârîf* [*q.v.*].

After having provided a Father of the Church, Saint Augustine, born at Thagaste (Souk-Ahras), the Berbers under Islam only produced theologians who were adept in disputation, but no great intellects. Wherever Sunnî Islam triumphed, it was Maṣûmî which was adopted, and it continues to prevail in Barbary, though some Khâridjî communities (Ibâđî) survive in the Djabal Nafusa, at Djerba, in southern Tunisia and in the Mzab.
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IV. — Customs, Social and Political Organisation

Observers have all been struck by the character and usages of the Berbers, which differ in many respects from those of the Arabs, particularly as regards women, who, in general, enjoy a greater degree of freedom (see for example the 'courts of love' among the Touareg (ahal), H. Lhote, Touaregs du Hoggar, 288 ff.) and to a certain extent, greater respect (on women, see M. Gaudry, La femme chaouia de l'Aurès, Paris 1929; A. M. Goichon, La vie féminine au Maab, Paris 1927-31; L. Bousquet-Lelivre, La femme kabyle, Paris 1939; on matriarchy: G. Marcy, Les vestiges de la parenté maternelle en droit coutumier berbère, in RAfr., 1941(3-4). As a rapid synthesis is made impossible by the great diversity which appears from one group to another, we shall limit ourselves to giving references to the large number of monographs and works of ethnography which have been devoted to North Africa.

The Berbers (except in the Maab) are basically a rural population, leading a nomadic or sedentary existence. The nomads live in tents, of which the different types have been frequently described (see H. Lhote, Touaregs du Hoggar, 221 ff.; E. Laoust, L' HABitation chez les transhumants du Maroc central, in Hesp., 1930 ff.;) the sedentary population live in houses (see E. Laoust, op. cit.; A. Adam, La Maison et le village dans quelques tribus de l'Ait-Atlas, in Hesp., 1950, 289 ff.) or even in majestic kasbas (kasaba) which in some respects recall the style of South Arabia (see H. Terrasse, Kasbas berbères de l'Atlas et des oasis. Les Grandes architectures du Sud marocain, Paris 1938; A. Paris, Documents d'architecture berbère, Paris 1945; K. C. Creswell, A Bibliog. of Muslim Arch. in North Africa, Paris 1954, passim).

One of the peculiarities of Muslim Barbary is the retention of customary law, which continues to be applied, either officially or unofficially (see 'dād), both in Algeria and Morocco (for Tunisia, see G. H. Bousquet, Note sur la survivance du droit coutumier berbère en Tunisie, in Hesp., 1952(1-2, 246-9). This custom ('dād, 'urf, târif, tāfādi) is essentially oral, but of recent years some have felt the need to record in writing in Arabic and even in French, though rarely in Berber (see below section VI) some ḫānūns, simple lists of offences, with the scale of appropriate fines (imprisonment is unknown). Justice, based on custom, is dispensed, in civil and criminal matters, either by a kind of (indigenous) arbitrator, or by judicial djāmādūs which set themselves up as clandestine tribunals (for example in the Aurès subject to French law) or which in contrast have had a legal existence (as in Morocco since the famous dahir (pahir) of May 16th 1930, called the 'Berber dahir', which gave rise to numerous protests because it established customary tribunals). Needless to say, this law is not uniform and varies quite considerably from group to group; as a result of its lay origin and oral transmission it is subject to modification (see Hacoun-Campredon, Étude sur l'évolution des coutumes kabyles, Algiers 1921).

The social organisation of the Berbers also differs in many respects from that of the Arabs; it is based on the ties of blood, real or fictitious. The smallest social unit is the "hearth", a number of hearths opposed, but not incompatible, systems, which seems a further proof of the diversity of the ethnic elements combined under the name Berber: on the one hand, an aristocratic type, having a warrior nobility, a religious caste, a class of tributaries and finally the serfs; this is the régime prevailing among the Touareg, who are governed by an amdokal [q.v.], each tribe being placed under the authority of an amghar [q.v.]; on the other hand, in the rest of Barbary, we find a democratic type, with an elected assembly (djāmādā, infas, ašt arḥān) in which all power resides (legislative, judicial and executive); each assembly of a lower group delegates members to higher assemblies, but generally speaking, it is the djāmādā of the division which has most political weight. This democratic system usually results in a de facto oligarchy and does not impede the development of personal power, at least in those regions where the internal leagues (leff [q.v.]) group independent divisions together (and not just villages or parts of villages, as in Kabylia, the joffs [q.v.]; R. Montagne (Vie sociale, 91 ft.) has pertinently analysed the stages in the development of this power of the temporal leaders, who have been called the "Lords of the Atlas".
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V. — LANGUAGE

One cannot but envy the assurance with which René Basset, fifty years ago, painted a picture of the Berber language in this *Encyclopædia*. By an inevitable process, research has produced questions in greater number than answers; some illusions have vanished. However, the balance-sheet of this half century is not negative: a mass of materials has been collected, their classification and analysis has been undertaken and sometimes fairly extensively developed; an attempt at a synthesis has even been made by André Basset, but he is cautious and is at pains to avoid taking hypothesis for established fact.

A. The historical problem

1. — History of the language: Berber is almost exclusively a spoken language, and its history, even in the recent period, is almost unknown owing to the lack of written documents. It is only in the 19th century that the texts collected orally from Berbers by Europeans start to become numerous. Indigenous documents are rare and of limited scope. Southern Morocco has produced manuscripts in Arabic script (cf. section VI) of which we only possess partial and out-of-date editions; moreover, the language of these works of religious edification, in spite of its undeniable interest, seems somewhat artificial. The Berber words and expressions cited by Arab authors have not received a systematic treatment. The best known and also the oldest are the phrases of the 12th century published by E. Lévi-Provençal in his *Documents inédits d'histoire almohade*, Paris 1928 (cf. G. Marcy, in *Hesp.*, 1932, 61-77) and which appear to confirm the relative stability of the language. The Arabic texts have also preserved a number of Berber ethnic names, anthroponymics and toponyms which still remain to be studied.

The remains of Guanche, which was spoken in the Canary Islands up to the 17th century, are generally considered a Berber language. However, after a very detailed investigation, J.-D. Wölflé openly relates a part of the Guanche forms to Berber.

Further back than the Almohad period, the linguist finds no Berber documents properly so-called. The early centuries after the Arab conquest are even more "obscure" for him than for the historian. Antiquity confronts us with a number of very difficult problems. It has bequeathed us a documentation as mysterious as it is abundant on African dialects:

a) Over a thousand Libyan inscriptions have been published (cf. section VI). The alphabet used is known with fair accuracy, at least for the bilinguals, but the proposed interpretations show serious divergencies and are not convincing: Libyan has not been deciphered.

b) In the east and particularly in Tripolitania, a series of inscriptions in Latin characters has been discovered, whose meaning is unknown. One or two words are Latin, others can be explained by Punic, but the remainder has not been identified.

c) A host of African words, mostly proper names, are to be found scattered throughout the Punic, Greek and especially Latin inscriptions, as well as in the classical authors. Some of these words have been identified as Punic; the majority have only given rise to nebulous explanations.

Thus, little has been made of these old materials. Why is this the case? Very few research workers venture into this field and if they do so, it is generally in the course of other investigations or in the service of a different discipline. Moreover, the unity of the documents, scattered both in space and time, is problematical. The inscriptions of Tripolitania are of an early period. The Libyan ones come from Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco and cover several centuries: the only one which is dated goes back to 139 B.C.; some appear to be contemporary with the Roman Empire; the majority cannot be dated at all. The onomastic material is even more dispersed: provided by texts ranging from Herodotus to the latest antiquity, it concerns the whole territory comprised between Egypt and the Atlantic. Such diverse evidence inevitably represents several stages of linguistic development, or even several languages. Its interpretation assumes that preliminary work has been done in listing and subjecting them to a critical examination; however, a general onomastic index is still awaited. In spite of the extraordinary diversity of this ancient material, the modern Berber dialects are frequently thought of as providing a miraculous key capable of unlocking all doors. Extensive use is made of the glossaries, but only in order to adduce isolated comparisons or erect a superstructure of conjectures, whereas a system of well established correspondences alone could afford proof. A direct connexion is postulated between Libyan and Berber, considered as two stages of the same language. This assumption is based on history, which discovers Berber populations in Africa from ancient times and concludes that the Berber language was already spoken there: but was it the only language? Is it really Berber that is concealed in the Libyan inscriptions? The parallels which are certain are rare; the similarity of the Libyan and Touareg scripts (cf. section VI) does not demonstrate that the languages are related: the difficulties encountered call for criticism. A. Basset has drawn
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systems rest. Here, only slightly modified, is the table proposed by A. Basset:

Consonants  labials  b  f  m
dentals  t  d  n  l  r
sibilants  s  z
palatal sibilants  š  ž
velars  k  g
uvular  γ
Semi-vowels  γ  w
Vowels  i  u  [ə]

The tendency for short occlusives to become sprirant in numerous dialects (Rif, Middle Atlas of Morocco, Kabylia, etc.) has already been mentioned. This may lead locally to the introduction of new phonemes and to modification of the phonological system. Almost everywhere this system has been complicated and distorted by large-scale borrowing from Arabic, to which the presence particularly of the pharyngals h and e and the laryngal k in the majority of dialects appears to be due.

A remarkable fact is the presence in Berber of emphatic consonants. Apart from d and t there are attested: [ð], [l], [l] and even [h], [l], but they cannot be accorded phonological status a priori. Emphasis does not always belong exclusively to the phoneme concerned. On [l], cf. below.

y and w are sometimes pronounced as consonants [y], [w], and sometimes as vowels [i], [u], according to their position; quality varies with syllable pattern, which is not everywhere the same. Furthermore, besides these occurrences of phonetic [i] and [u], morphology suggests the need to recognise separate vowels i and u: which is not devoid of difficulties.

Each of the three vowels a, i, u comprises a range of gradations conditioned by the articulation of the neighbouring consonants and devoid of phonological value. As regards [ə], it is in principle a purely phonetic element, the occurrence of which is subject to the laws, as yet not very well known, which govern the syllabication and structure of words. Very unstable in central and southern Morocco, it perhaps presents a greater consistency in Kabylia; in spite of certain indications by Foucauld which does not always belong exclusively to the phoneme concerned. On [l], cf. below.

An important rôle is played by the quantitative value of consonants. Every consonant or semi-vowel may be “short" or “long," thus creating a type of opposition widely exploited by the vocabulary and to a still greater extent by the morphology: Chleuh ḫi "tongue"; ḥi "he has soiled"; ḥa-ti "he has given it (masc.)"; ḥa-hi "he has given it (fem.)."

The long consonant seems to be less characterised by its duration than by the tenseness of its articulation; lengthening sometimes results in transition from sprirant to occlusive and from voiced to voiceless: thus it comes about that the most frequent realisation of γγ is [ŋg], and that of ḥd [k]; we may be represented by [ggy] on one occasion even [kk] or [h], and γγ by [gg].

Not all vowels always have the same duration; their length, however, is not pertinent, except perhaps in Touareg.

Accentuation of a word, where the accent is one of intensity, is not recognised as fulfilling a distinctive function.

a. — Forms and their functions.

a. — The Berber word. Words are made up of a theme and inflexions. The theme is produced by the combination of a root with a schema. The root is bound to a minimum concept beyond any kind of grammatical categorisation. It is always consonantal, containing one or four, most frequently two or three consonants, being characterised by their number and order. The term schema, borrowed from the Arabists (J. Cantineau), indicates the structure of the theme; the schema gives the word part of its grammatical identity: thus, to a degree which varies with cases, it may indicate the nominal or verbal nature of the word, the number of the noun, the form of the verb, etc. The schema itself is defined by the presence or absence of formative consonants, by short or long quantity of formative consonants or radicals, by the presence or absence, the place and quality of the vowels. The inflexions complete the grammatical description of the word; as prefixes and/or suffixes, they appear fundamentally to be consonants; in certain cases, it is convenient to recognise a zero inflexion. Examples: Touareg təbras "she ties" = theme -əbras- (root KRS, schema i 2 a i 3) + inflexion -t-; takarrissi "knot" = theme -akarris- (root K RS, schema a 1 2 i 3) + inflexion -t-t. The system on the whole closely resembles that of Arabic, though it is more difficult in Berber to isolate the roots and establish the precise value of the schemas.

Berber distinguishes two genders, masculine and feminine, and two numbers, singular and plural.

b. — The verb. The forms (simple and derived, Verbs appear either in a simple form or a derived form. The simple form is constructed in principle with or without an object and is at times translated by our active voice and at other times by our passive. Derivation is achieved mainly by means of prefixes. There are three primary derived forms, which sometimes combine among themselves. They have frequently been referred to as the causative, passive and reciprocal forms, according to their most apparent significance; these designations do not correspond closely enough to the facts and have nowadays been replaced by those of sibilant-form, dental-form and nasal-form according to the articulation of the prefix. Examples: Touareg xuyba- "to strike with the hand"; xuyba- "to strike"; təwba- "to be struck"; təwba- "to strike one another". In fact, not all verbs possess the complete series of simple and derived forms. A derivation by the suffix -t is well attested in Touareg and has left traces elsewhere.

The themes. For each of the forms, simple or derived, there are three themes or groups of themes: 1) an aorist theme: ex. Chleuh -ls- "to put on clothes"; -əsl'u- "to become red"; 2) an intensive aorist theme: -iss-, -əsl'uy-, which is sometimes accompanied by a negative intensive aorist theme; 3) a preterite theme: -ίsia-, -əgg'ay-, to which is connected a negative preterite theme: -ίsi-, -əgg'ay-. These themes may contrast with one another by alternation of vowels or of consonantal length, or by prefixing -ls- (in the intensive aorist only), or again by a combination of two or rarely three of these processes. In principle the two aorists form a group opposed to the preterite, as -iss'uy/-isĩuy- to -əgg'ay-. It frequently happens, however, that the themes of the aorist and the preterite coincide. When several verbs adopt precisely the same procedure to differentiate their themes, they are said to belong to the same type: this affords a means of formal classification which is justified by the existence of a relationship, often masked but
sure, between the verbal type thus defined and that of the derived forms, as well as between the verbal type and the schemas of the nouns of action and of the agent. The verbal type itself appears to be more or less bound to the structure of the root.

A careful examination of all the themes obliges us to distinguish a large number of types of verbs. In practice, account is taken above all of the antithesis of the aorist and preterite themes, which enables us to recognise the main groups, particularly the “zero vowel” type (A. Basset) in which the affirmative aorist and preterite are formally identical (Chleuh -mgir: -mgir “to harvest”), the type with a non-alternating “full vowel” (-mun: -mun “to accompany”), the pre-radical alternating vowel type (-ams: -ams “to walk”), the intra-radical (rar: rur “to give back”), the post-radical (-la: -la “put on clothes”), different types of complex alternations (-izwi: -izzg “ay “to become red”).

The table of verbal themes lacks symmetry, as there is no intensive preterite given. The latter exists in Touareg, and A. Picard, basing himself on certain Kabyle and Moroccan data, has recently raised the important question of the Pan-Berber character of the intensive preterite (Mémorial A. Basset, 107-20).

The inflexions. — A first though incomplete series of suffixed personal inflections is associated with the aorist and intensive aorist themes to produce the ordinary and intensive imperatives. The inflexion is zero in the 2nd person singular, which is the form of the non-intensive imperative used by grammarians to indicate a verb (“the verb mgir”, the verb mun”, etc.).

The impersonal inflexions y-n (on occasion zero-n in the plural) are added in well defined syntactical conditions (cf. below) to any one of the themes to form what is called the “participle”. Survivals of an older stage (in the negative preterite) or disturbances (in the aorist) are to be observed locally.

In addition to these preceding cases, a third series of inflexions, prefixed and/or suffixed, is found with all the themes, indicating person, number and, in the 3rd person sing. and plural, gender. However, a conjugation without prefixes is attested in Kabyle (with identical inflexion for all persons of the plural) and in Touareg for the so-called verbs “of quality”, verbs of becoming rather than verbs of state. It is probably the vestige of an ancient opposition between the inflexions of the aorist and those of the preterite.

The working of the verbal system. — It is more difficult to determine the meaning of the forms and themes than to classify them formally. Brief indications have been given above for the simple and derived forms. It remains for us to describe briefly how the choice is made between the different themes of a given form. One fact is certain: the time concept is foreign to the verbal system, and Berber, like the Semitic languages, gives priority to aspect. But it has several mechanisms which are peculiar to it; we must not be deceived by terminology, borrowed from other linguistic fields. There is a fundamental antithesis, indicated already for the morphology, between the respective functions of the aorists and the preterite. Thus it is that certain particles (aal, aal, ara, etc.) may be followed by either of the two aorist forms but not by the preterite: Kabyle ad-yaf (“he will find”); ad-yafi (“the will find (incessantly)”)(but ad + preterite yaf is impossible). When these particles are not present, the elements of the system are grouped somewhat differently: most frequently

the intensive aorist and the preterite alone remain in opposition: ad-yaf (“these populations) dwell” (process envisaged as a series or sometimes as a development); ad-yaf (“the members of such and such a family) dwell, have taken up their domicile” (process envisaged from beginning to end, as a whole). With the exception of certain optative formulas, the non-intensive aorist, therefore, only appears in certain syntactical conditions where it may assume the meaning of any other verbal theme whatsoever: in this sense one may, with A. Basset, consider it as the “unmarked” term of the aorist: preterite opposition; this use of the aorist is very frequent in the Moroccan dialects, but is less current elsewhere.

Whatever the theme, the verb assumes the form of the “participle” when it occurs in a relative clause in which the subject and the antecedent are identical: Kabyle wun yaf “he (who) dwells”.

The satellites of the verb. — The particles of the aorist have been mentioned above. There are other particles (ur, da, ilia, etc.) which may accompany the intensive aorist or the preterite; the list of them and the conditions in which they are used vary considerably according to the dialect, some dispensing with them altogether. The basic negative particle is ur (ul, ud, u); it always precedes the verbal form which, in different dialects (Kabylia, Aurès, etc.), may then be followed by a second element (ara, 3(a), etc.); ur is encountered with all the verbal themes, but negative constructions are not everywhere identical.

The verb is frequently accompanied by a particle “of approach” d and sometimes by a particle “of withdrawal” n(m), which indicate the direction of the action. Finally the personal pronouns, direct or indirect objects of the verb (cf. below), are closely welded to it. In the case of simultaneous use, these pronouns and the particles of approach and withdrawal follow one another in a fixed order: indirect object (I), direct object (D), particle (L). After a number of words (particles of the aorist, the intensive aorist, negation, etc.) or in a relative clause, the elements IDL precede the verb; elsewhere they follow it; hence those chains which fluctuate on both sides of the verb: Chleuh ad-as-tr-m-d-aemy “that I may bring them to him”: taw-y-as-tr-m-d “I have brought them to him”.

C. — The noun. All nouns cannot be reduced to a single morphological type. Some have been borrowed from Arabic (or from other languages) and have not been berberised; they have retained the Arabic article and are characterised by the initial consonant group IC- or CC (<IC- by assimilation): sikas “glass”, ssouq “market”; this group is considerable in all dialects except Touareg.

The majority of Berber or berberised nouns in principle have an initial a, i- or u- if they are masculine, la-, li- or tu- if they are feminine; this initial has been related to the demonstrative elements, which is unlikely; locally in a number of schemas it loses its vowel. The prefixed l- characterises the feminine; many nouns also have a suffix -e in the feminine singular: Chleuh ayul “ass”; tayyl “she-ass”; ifsmmi “house”. The vowel of the initial syllable participates in both oppositions of number and state (cf. below). The plural is indicated, furthermore, either by a vowel a preceding or following the last radical consonant, with or without further vowel alternances: ayulp: iyulp; aggul “fortified granary” ayul, or by a basic suffix -n: aryas “man”: irgas, or by a combination of both processes: irt “star”: irtun. The concept of state, in spite of the ambiguity of the terminology, is
characteristic of Berber: in certain syntactical conditions, when the noun is closely associated with the word preceding it, the initial vowel lapses, the noun passing from the "free" state to the state of "annexation": taserdunt, todda "the mule, she has gone": todda tsaroud on "the she-mule has gone". In numerous dialects (Morocco, Kabylia, Aures, etc.) the annexed state of the masculine noun also displays a prefixed w-, and hence the contrast: argaz : argaz > Chleuh argaz "man". Finally, contrary to the description given, some nouns retain their initial vowel in the annexed state, this "constancy" of the initial vowel may be explained (diachronically) by the disappearance of an old radical or be related (synchronically) to the structure of the schema. The opposition of state appears to be unknown to the Eastern dialects.

A third somewhat heteroclite group is formed by nouns beginning with a short consonant other than the feminine prefix t- or the Arabic article; some of them are perhaps historically connected with the previous category or with other strata of vocabulary. The series of "nouns of relationship" must be mentioned, remarkable both for their form and construction.

Adjectives generally show the same morphological characteristics as nouns.

d.—The personal pronouns. Several series of personal pronouns are distinguished according to form and use. The "isolated" pronouns enjoy more or less independent status in the text and may even constitute a complete utterance. The affixed pronouns of the verbs, of which they are the direct or indirect objects, have already been mentioned. Most prepositions take special personal pronouns, which also appear after the nouns of relationship: swar-i "the son of him, his son"; after a common noun, the pronoun is generally preceded by an element n(n)- which appears to be analogous to the preposition n- "of": Chleuh lqomtn nn-s "his house" (but Kabyle ahhám-is, same meaning); Berber has no possessive adjectives or pronouns. For every person, certain appropriate morphological elements are common to several or all of these pronominal series.

e.—The demonstrative elements. The demonstrative elements have a vowel base: a/w and t, which is found acting as a pronoun or acting as a determinative ("adjectival"). As a pronoun, this base appears particularly as the second member of the construction called "emphatic anticipation": Kabyle d-hyté a-d-yooman "it is thou who hast dyed it" (Basset-Picard), "it is thy having dyed it". As a determinative, it follows a noun or a demonstrative pronoun: Chleuh argas-a "this man", ay-a "this". This base frequently combines with other elements, especially with w- or t-, producing oppositions animate/inanimate and masculine/feminine: wafía : a "he/she : it", as well as with the particles of approach and withdrawal: Chleuh argas-ad "this man here" / argas-ann "that man there". The details of the system vary from dialect to dialect.

f.—The Berber sentence. The Berber sentence in the highest degree reflects all the characteristics of a spoken language. It constantly resorts to expressive procedures and in particular to "anticipation" (A. Basset), which may detach and place any element of the sentence at the beginning, ready to be reiterated as required by a personal pronoun. Of very frequent occurrence is "anticipation", of which an example has been given above (e). Subordination is relatively little developed and parataxis dominates, though it is not always possible to determine exactly the limits between the two types of construction.

Relative clauses have no formal indication other than — on occasion — the inflexions of the participle or the place of the satellites of the verb (cf. b); there is no relative pronoun; however, a tendency can be observed in many dialects to determine the antecedent by means of a demonstrative element, the use of which in such cases becomes more or less a matter of grammatical usage.

Nominal and verbal clauses are known to Berber. The former are frequently hinged on a particle d which may perhaps have some connection with the particle of approach: Kabyle nakk d-afellah "I am a peasant" (Basset-Picard). In verbal clauses the verb is normally placed at the beginning and is followed by its subject, except in the case of anticipation.

3.—The vocabulary. Vocabulary is perhaps the aspect of Berber which has roused the most lively curiosity, but produced the least exact studies. We have no statistical evaluation of the vocabulary. The dictionary of Foucauld for Ahaggar Touareg and that of Father Dallet for Kabyle, which may be taken as being very nearly exhaustive, contain respectively 1,400 and 3,500 verbs in the simple form. The vocabulary possesses a stock common to all dialects but, as A. Basset has stressed, the living form of each word should be separately studied. Another striking point, moreover, is the numerical importance of loan words, except in Touareg. We have seen that words furnished by Arabic have opened a breach in phonology and even in morphology. Berber, however, has shown proof of extraordinary powers of assimilation.

Vocabulary is, above all, concrete. Its richness and precision are remarkable wherever a vital activity is concerned (camel breeding among the Touaregs, irrigation in the Great Atlas, etc.). The language of intellectual and religious life is less well equipped and borrows extensively from Arabic. Some examples, however, reveal literary resources which wait only to be exploited.


VI. — LITERATURE AND ART.

As far back as one can go in the past, Barbary, “the land of conquest”, has never possessed any other language of civilisation than that of its foreign conquerors; thus, Berber writers have successively utilised, perhaps not Punic but at least Latin (Apuleius, Saint Augustine), Greek (?), Arabic (Ibn Khardun and many Moroccan writers) and now, above all, French. Yet there nevertheless exists a “Berber literature”, written and oral, which though not appearing in the inscriptions, does so in works of piety inspired by Arabic, in texts and stories set down at the request of European investigators, in the kdnuns (all of which taken together do not amount to much), and finally in folklore and poetry.

The Libyan inscriptions [cf. section V], in spite of the ardour with which their study has been approached, have not as yet delivered up the secret of their decipherment and Berber, as known to us, does not afford a satisfactory means of reading them. However, the Libyan alphabet, which the bilingual inscriptions have enabled us to establish, is relatively close to the only ancient system still in current use among the Berbers, the tifinagh (sing. tafinek < punica ?); this alphabet is used by the Touareg for engraving a few short inscriptions on rocks, bracelets or other objects, as well as for brief exchanges of love letters. This is an alphabetic script, writing only consonants in the body of words, but also vowels finally; no distinction is made between long and short sounds; individual words are not separated and one can write horizontally, vertically, from right to left or from left to right (or in boustrophedon), from top to bottom or from bottom to top. In practice, all texts are very short and the long ones appearing in A. Hanoteau, Essai de grammaire de la langue tamacheh, Paris 1860, were only written in tifinagh at the request of the investigator.

The following is a simplified table, according to Ch. de Foucauld, of the most usual forms of tifinagh (for further details and comparisons with the Libyan alphabet, see particularly A. Basset, Écritures libyque et touarègue, in Notices sur les caractères étrangers, by Ch. Fossey, Paris 1948).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin script</th>
<th>tifinagh</th>
<th>direction of reading</th>
<th>Arabic script</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>[b]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>[f]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>[t]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>[d]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>[n]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>[l]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>[r]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>[s]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>[z]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʔ</td>
<td>[ʔ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>[y]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>[k]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɡ</td>
<td>[ɡ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>[w]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɣ</td>
<td>[ɣ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɣh(ɣ)</td>
<td>[ɣh]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kl(h)</td>
<td>[kl]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>[k]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>[h]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʔ</td>
<td>[ʔ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Religious literature inspired by Arabic may be said to be represented by a few dozen works, very few of which have been published. These texts, transcribed in Arabic script with additional diacritical points, are intended for teaching the precepts of Islam and for the edification of the faithful; thus we possess an adaptation of the Mukhtasar of Khall, al-Haouj, edited and translated by Luciani (Algiers 1897), and
its complement, the Bahir al-Dumâ'ı, partially published by de Slane in his appendix to the Histoire des Berbères, iv, 552-62 (a complete ed.-trans. of this last text by B. H. Stricker is in the press). The "Kur'âns" of Hâ-Mîm and of Sâlih b. Taîrīf are, in a sense, related to these works, but they are, entirely lost, the same being true of the Berber text of three treatises composed in Tašâlīḥīt by Ibn Tûmârt. Of Khârijī literature, which was probably abundant, there remains the treatise of Ibn Ghânim entitled al-Mudawwana (cf. Motylinski, Le Manuscrit arabo-berbère de Zouagha, in Actes du XXIVe Congrès des Orient., Algiers 1909, ii, 64-78). A proportion of these religious works (particularly the Hâvâd and some others existing in manuscript form, cf. A. Roux, in Actes du XXIe Congrès des Orient., Paris 1949, 316-7) are in verse so as to be more easily memorised, but unfortunately they include a high proportion of Arabic words. To this type of literature belong religious poems, such as that of Sabî, which relates a young man's descent into Hell in search of his parents (R. Basset, Le poème de Çabi, Paris 1879, P. Galand-Perren, in Mémoires A. Basset, Paris 1957, 39-49), those of Sâlih Hâmmû (H. Stumme, Dich-kunst und Gedichte der Schlûk, Leipzig 1895; Johnston, Fadma Tagurramt, in Actes du XIVe Congrès des Orient., ii, 100-1; idem, The Songs of Sidi Hammou, London 1907; I. Justnard, Poètes en dual. du Sous marocain d'après un ms. arabo-berbère, in J. A., 1928), the legend of Joseph in verse (Loubignac, Dual. des Zaïân, Paris 1924-5, 359 sqq.), a story of the ascent of the Prophet and a version of the Burda of al-Bûsîrî (q.v.). To these may be added the translations of the Old and New Testaments made by Catholic and Protestant missionaries.

Secular works are rare; apart from Arabo-Berber glossoptaries and books of popular medicine which have practical interest, such writings as we possess were composed under the guidance of European scholars, as for example the The Narrative of Sidi Ibrahim on West Africa in Tašâlīḥīt (F. W. Newman, in J.R.A.S., 1848, 215-60; trans. R. Basset, Paris 1882, or the description of the Diabâl Nafûsa by al-Shâmînâkhî, in Nafûsî (ed. trans. Motylinski, Algiers 1885); to these may be added the collected works entitled Khâmil al-Šîkha (MS of the B.N. in Paris), which to a large extent appears to be borrowed from the Bahîyi yâd-nâma (q.v.) and the Hundred Nights (R. Basset, in Revue des traditions popul., 1891; extracts published by de Slane, de Rochemontez, R. Basset); to this category belong the ethnographical narratives and texts composed at the request of investigators who subsequently included them in their tribal studies or made independent collections of them, such as the Textes touareg en prose by Ch. de Foucauld, Algiers 1922. In this connexion it will not be without interest to note that the Fichier de documentation berbère, directed at Fort-National (Kabylia) by the Rev. Father Dallet, has been publishing since 1947 texts and even small plays composed in Berber, in addition to linguistic and ethnological documents.

As for the customary kânûmâ in use among certain Berber populations, very few of them have been published in the original language (as above section iv); the following may be mentioned: Ben Sedira, Cours de langue Kabyle, 293-355; Boulifa, Le Kanoun d'Adâni, in Recueil de mémoires ... XIVe Congrès Orient., Algiers 1905, 152-78.

Folk-lore is abundant, not to say rich. Marvellous and humorous tales, folk-tales, stories of animals, historical and religious legends are transmitted from generation to generation by the women, who are wont to tell them of an evening. It is this folklore that investigators have been able most easily to collect and few are their documents which do not contain some stories or riddles, without counting collections of folk-lore texts presented also as linguistic documents.

Finally, secular poetry, in spite of its appearance of primitive simplicity, is probably the most original literary production. The songs improvised collectively during the ritual dances (âbidâw), lullabies, funeral laments, and ritual chants contain a large share of real professional poets also exist among the Berbers, whose inspiration, generally speaking, is restricted to themes of love and war. In Morocco, the smdâz, a chant d'andyaz, the âidî berbère du groupe linguistique berbera, in Mém. H. Basset, Paris 1928, ii, 237-42) travell about the country and, like the troubadours, celebrate important events, sing the praises of likely patrons and discharge their arrows at those who disappoint them. Some poets, such as the Kabyle Mohand u Mohand and the Touareg poetess Dassin, have achieved a certain fame, local it is true and ephemeral, since their works remaining oral, are soon forgotten in countries where the rûwâd do not exist.

Berber art also is of no great account; the rock engravings and paintings are indeed far from lacking in quality, but one may well ask whether the artists who executed them are really the ancestors of the present day Berbers. In spite of the great architectural achievements to which we have referred (above, section iv), there is no real Berber art comparable to Arab and Hispano-Moorish art. The fact is that the Berber is a countryman, indeed a nomad, only seeking to possess articles of current use, which are easily transportable; his art, therefore, is limited to ornamenting articles of everyday life and does not transcend a craftsmanship seeking to provide the comforts of life rather than to delight the eye. Its products, sought at times by a clientele enamoured with exoticism and simplicity, and supported in North Africa by the efforts of the authorities to maintain and improve traditions and techniques, are restricted to carpets, hangings, mats, silks, embroideries, chinaware, earthenware, cabinet-work, work in gold, brass wares and damascene work; ornamentation is characterised by the almost exclusive use of the straight line (triangles, stripes, lozenges, checker-work). To this may be added very realistic statuettes in wood, which are at variance with the Islamic ban on the representation of the human form.

BERBERS — BERKE

BERGAMA, the ancient Pergamon in Asia on (on which cf. the data and references given in Pauly-Wissowa). Armenians who had fled before the Muslim raids into Asia Minor settled in Byzantine Pergamon during the course of the 7th century. The Byzantine emperor Philippikos (711-713) was of Armenian descent and came from Pergamon. Muslim forces under Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik sacked the town in 716, but it was rebuilt and refortified after the Arabs had abandoned their attempt to take Constantinople in 717-718. Pergamon was included, from the reign of Leo III (717-741), in the theme of Thracis and, from the reign of Leo V (886-912), in the theme of Samos. The town suffered during the Turkish raids into western Asia Minor after the battle of Manzikert (1071). It continued, however, to be a prosperous and well fortified centre under the Byzantine emperors of the house of Komnenos and their immediate successors. Pergamon, having been hitherto a suffragan bishopric dependent on Ephesos, was raised to the status of a metropolitan see in the reign of Isaac Angelos (1185-1189). After the fall of Constantinople to the Fourth Crusade in 1204, the town was included in the Greek state of Nicea. Later, when the Turks overran western Asia Minor in the early 14th century, the town in 1226 was passed to Berke.

Like Batu, Berke, during the early years of his reign, seems to have exercised certain sovereign power: he was appointed his father's successor by Mongke but the succession was unexpectedly transferred to his cousin and possible son-in-law, Ulagh-Chin, while Berke was still a child. The young prince Ulagh-Chin, his son or brother, seems to have already become a Muslim at the time of Mongke's accession to the throne. The evidence of contemporary Russian sources shows that Ulagh-Chin is the same person as the Alexander of the Peking annals, and that he was a member of the direct line of Khwājam, the descendants of the great Seljuk city of Abydān. Thus, it is clear that Batu died according to Djuwayni while his son Sartak was on his way to the Court of the Great Khan. Sartak continued his journey and was assassinated at Herat in the year 1132/1133.

For a recent account of the Islamic monuments of Bergama, see: G. Bayath, Bergama Tarihinde Türk-Hilmi eserleri, Istanbul 1956. (V. J. PARRY)

BERKE, a Mongol prince and ruler of the Golden Horde, grandson of Chand-Khan and third son of Djići. Little is known of his early career. He took no part in the wars in Russia and Eastern Europe in the years 1242-1244 but was more frequently in Mongolia than Batu, whom he represented at the enthronement of Güyük (644/1246) and that of Möngke (649/1251). His yurt of appanage was originally situated in the direction of Darbān but by 655/1255 had been moved to the east of the Volga in order to cut off Berke from contact with his fellow Muslims. His conversion to Islam is mentioned by Rubruck, who says that he did not allow pork to be eaten in his yurt. The date of his conversion is unknown. Djuwayni's statement that he was brought up from infancy as a Muslim seems hardly credible. On the other hand he seems to have already become a Muslim at the time of Möngke's accession to the throne.

Little is known of his early career. He took no part in the wars in Russia and Eastern Europe in the years 1242-1244 but was more frequently in Mongolia than Batu, whom he represented at the enthronement of Güyük (644/1246) and that of Möngke (649/1251). His yurt of appanage was originally situated in the direction of Darbān but by 655/1255 had been moved to the east of the Volga in order to cut off Berke from contact with his fellow Muslims. His conversion to Islam is mentioned by Rubruck, who says that he did not allow pork to be eaten in his yurt. The date of his conversion is unknown. Djuwayni's statement that he was brought up from infancy as a Muslim seems hardly credible. On the other hand he seems to have already become a Muslim at the time of Möngke's accession to the throne.

Little is known of his early career. He took no part in the wars in Russia and Eastern Europe in the years 1242-1244 but was more frequently in Mongolia than Batu, whom he represented at the enthronement of Güyük (644/1246) and that of Möngke (649/1251). His yurt of appanage was originally situated in the direction of Darbān but by 655/1255 had been moved to the east of the Volga in order to cut off Berke from contact with his fellow Muslims. His conversion to Islam is mentioned by Rubruck, who says that he did not allow pork to be eaten in his yurt. The date of his conversion is unknown. Djuwayni's statement that he was brought up from infancy as a Muslim seems hardly credible. On the other hand he seems to have already become a Muslim at the time of Möngke's accession to the throne.
rights in Ma wara3 al-Nahr. According to Dijurdzhan he visited Buakhirā and showed great honour to the leading men of the town; he is also said to have ordered the Christians of Samarkand to be punished and their churches destroyed because of their behaviour towards their Muslim fellow townsmen. When the news of Möngke's death arrived (1259), the khutba was read in Berke's name not only in Ma wara3 al-Nahr but also in Khurāsān.

During the next four years (1260-1264) two brothers of the dead Great Khan, Kubilai and Aq Qaś, were engaged in a struggle for the throne. As the coins struck in Buakhirā show, the unsuccessful claimant Aq Qaś Bōke was recognised by Berke as the rightful heir. Prince Alughu, a grandson of Cāghatay, appeared in Central Asia about the same time, first as a representative of Aq Qaś Bōke and afterwards in open revolt against him; he succeeded in bringing under his sway not only the whole of his grandfather's appanage but also Khwārizm, which had always belonged to the kingdom of Djiōči and his successors; the governors and officials appointed by Berke were driven out of the towns. The massacre mentioned by Wāṣṣāf (Bombay ed., 51) of a division of Berke's army, 5,000 strong, in Buakhirā must have been carried out, not, as Wāṣṣāf himself says, by Kubilay, nor, as d'Ossian supposes, by Hūlegi, but by Alughu. The war between Berke and Alughu was continued until the latter's death; in the last years of his life, after the final defeat of Aq Qaś Bōke, Alughu's troops occupied and destroyed the town of Otrar. Berke, whose forces were engaged in the South and West, could do nothing against his enemies in the East, but he did not abandon his claims; Prince Kaydu, a grandson of Ogedey, who had fought under Aq Qaś Bōke, continued the war against Alughu after Aq Qaś Bōke's defeat and was supported by Berke.

The campaigns in the West against the Lithuanians and King Daniel of Galicia were of no great importance and were conducted by the frontier commanders without the personal intervention of Berke. King Daniel fled to Poland and Hungary and his son and brother were forced to dismantle the fortifications of all their main cities.

The war between Berke and his cousin Hūlegi, the conqueror of Persia, was more important and less successful. The causes of the war are variously given. Berke is pictured by some authorities as the defender of Islam and is said to have bitterly reproached Hūlegi for his devastation of so many Muslim countries and particularly for the execution of the Caliph Mustaṣsim. However those authorities who say that Djiōči's heirs felt their rights endangered by the foundation of a new Mongol kingdom in Persia are probably nearer the truth. Some of the territories incorporated in the new kingdom, such as Arrān and Aqgharbaydīyān, had already been trodden by 'the hoof of Tartar horse' in the reign of Cūgir-Kān and were therefore, according to the conqueror's directions, part of the appanage of Djiōči. The evidence on the war itself is contradictory. Hūlegi seems at first to have been victorious, advancing across the Terek (late in 1262), and then to have been defeated by Berke's forces (Berke not being present in person), losing a great part of his army in the retreat; many were drowned in the Terek when the ice gave way under their horses' hoofs.

Even before the outbreak of these hostilities the Egyptian Sultan Baybars [q.v.] had decided to enter into communication with Berke and form an alliance against their common enemy Hūlegi. A message to this effect had been sent from Cairo to Berke as early as 1262; on the 16th November 1262 an embassy was dispatched for the same purpose, and in the following year Berke's ambassadors were received by Baybars. The detention of Mongol and Egyptian envoys in Constantinople led to hostilities between the Golden Horde and Byzantium. Berke dispatched an army under Prince Nokay into Thrace, where they joined forces with the Bulgarians; and the Saltgjük Sultan Yız al-Dīn Kılık, who had been driven out of Asia Minor and placed in custody in the fortress of Ainos on the Aegean was set free and brought to the Crimea.

In 1265, the year of Hūlegi's death, the Klīq̲aḳ̲ and Persian Mongols were again at war. The two armies, under Berke and Abaka, for a long time faced each other across the Kur; in search of a crossing Berke proceeded upstream to Tiflis, where he died (1266); and his forces then withdrew.

Berke left no family, so that the throne passed to Batu's grandson Möngke-Temür. During the last years of his reign he was no longer, as Batu had been, second to the Great Khān in the Mongol Empire, but the ruler of an independent state, although this evolution was not completed till the reign of his successor, who was the first of the Klīq̲aḳ̲ Khāns. A message to strike coin in his own name. It is difficult to estimate how much Berke did as a Muslim to further the practice of Islam among his subjects. The Egyptian accounts speak of schools in which the youth was instructed in the Kurān; not only the Khān himself but each of his wives and Emīrs also had an mīmīn and a ma'laḏākhīn attached to their establishments; yet we learn from the same sources that all sorts of heathen customs were observed at the court of the Khān with the same strictness as in Mongolia. Not only Berke himself but several of his brothers are said to have adopted Islam; and yet half a century was to elapse after his death before Islam became definitely predominant in his kingdom.

Berke was the founder of New Saray (so called to distinguish it from the Saray founded by Batu), which was situated on the eastern bank of the Upper Akhtuba near the present-day Leninsk, about 30 miles east of Stalingrad.

Bibliography: As in the article on Batu. (W. BARTHOLD-[J. A. BOYLE])

BESERMYANS (or Glazov Tatars), a small ethnic unit skin to the Udmurts (Votyaks) living in North Russia. Differing views are held on the subject of their origin, some considering them as Finns who have come under Turkish influence, others as descendants of the old Kama Bulghars, profoundly influenced by the Udmurt language and culture. The Soviet census of 1926 listed 10,035 Besermyans, 9,195 of whom were from the districts of Balezino and Yukamenkoe in the autonomous Udmurt SSR, and 834 from the neighbourhood of the village of Slobodskoe at the confluence of the rivers Vyatka and Čeptza in the Kirov region. The Besermyans are bilingual, speaking Russian (in the Udmurt ASSR) and Kazan Tatar (in the Kirov region) as well as Udmurt much influenced by Tatar. The were converted officially to Christianity in the 17th century, and until the October revolution were considered fully Orthodox, but in fact they remained Muslims at heart, retaining many customs which are traditionally Islamic. Notably, they would call in the Tatar molla after the Orthodox priest when a death occurred.
After the proclamation of freedom of worship in 1905 the greater part of the Besermyans returned openly to Islam.


BESERMYANS — BESKESEK-ABAZA

Almost all the Tapanta had accepted Islam by the end of the 18th century, but the Shkarawa (the Tarn, Kizilbek, Bag, Cegrei and Misilbai tribes) emigrated to Turkey; 30,000 are officially stated to have left, but this estimate seems too low. After the Caucasian wars only 9,927 Abaza remained in the region (E. Felitsin, Cislovie dannie o gorskom i prostran musulmanskom naseleni Kubansko oblasti, in Sbornik Svedenii o Kavkaze Tiflis 1885, i, 67-94).

The conversion to Islam of the Abaza (who had formerly been animists or Christians) began after their migration towards the northern Caucasus, when they came into contact with the Caucasian Tatars and the Nogai. They took over the 'iddat and chronological system of these peoples (a twelve-year animal cycle), together with Sunni Islam of the Hanafi school. This conversion was slow, almost all the tribes south of the Kuban being still animist or Christian at the end of the 17th century (Huseyn Hazhurdin, cited by V. D. Smirnov, Kriticheskie Voprosy vnutrennego Otmanskoj sverkhvolya, St. Petersburg 1887, 347).

Ewliya Celebi affirms that the Biberdara, one of the most important Maza tribes, are not Muslims. Almost all the Tapanta had accepted Islam by the end of the 18th century, but the Shkarawas were still Christians when they were visited by P. S. Pallas, Islam being restricted to the nobility (Bemerkungen auf eine Reise durch die Staatskommisarisse des Russischen Reichs in den Jahren 1793 und 1794, Leipzig 1799, 365).

1926) live in the Circassian Autonomous region, the high valleys of the Great and Little Zelenchu, the Kuban and the Kama. Here there are thirteen villages, and there are two other Abaza villages near Kislovodsk in the Stavropoli Krai, as well as a few groups of Abaza in the Circassian and Nogai villages in the Adlghe Autonomous Region.

The Abaza are descended from the multilingual tribes which at the beginning of our era dwelt on the shores of the Black Sea, north-west of present-day Abkhazia, and which fused together in the course of the centuries to form the Abkhaz national unit.

In the 14th and 15th centuries most of the Abaza left their original home in the coastal region (between Tuapse and Bzbf), crossed the Caucasus, and dislodging the Kabardians settled in the area they now inhabit. From that time onward they had to contend with the hostility of the Circassians, and their history is one of slow but continuous decline. At the end of the 16th century the Abaza tribes which had formerly dominated the region accepted the rule of the Kabardian and Beslemei princes. At this time too (in the reign of Sultan Murad III) the Turks extended their protectorate over eastern Caucasus but by the treaty of Belgrade relinquished Kabardia, which was recognised as an independent territory. The Turkish frontier then ran along the Kaban, and the Tapanta who were leading a nomadic existence on both banks of this river became independent, no longer owing any clearly defined allegiance. After the treaty of Küçük-Kaynardjia (1774) the Russians occupied Kabardia, and in 1802 the greater part of the territory of the Abaza was combined with that of the Nogai in a special presidio administered directly by the Russian authorities. During the Caucasian wars the Abaza were divided in their allegiance, the Tapanta allying themselves with the Russians while the Shkarawa supported the Muriid cause. After the Russian conquest, which took place between 1858 and 1864, the majority of the Shkarawa (the Tam, Kizilbek, Bag, Cegrei and Mislba tribes) emigrated to Turkey; 30,000 were officially stated to have left, but this estimate seems too low. After the Caucasian wars only 9,927 Abaza remained in the region (E. Felitsin, Cislove dannie o gorskom i prostran musulmanskom naseleni Kubanskij oblasti, in Sbornik Svedenii o Kavkaze Tiflis 1885, i, 87-94).

The conversion to Islam of the Abaza (who had formerly been animists or Christians) began after their migration towards the northern Caucasus, when they came into contact with the Caucasian Tatars and the Nogai. They took over the 'iddat and chronological system of these peoples (a twelve-year animal cycle), together with Sunni Islam of the Hanafi school. This conversion was slow, almost all the tribes south of the Kuban being still animist or Christian at the end of the 17th century (Huseyn Hazhurdin, cited by V. D. Smirnov, Kriticheskie Voprosy vnutrennego Otmanskoj sverkhvolya, St. Petersburg 1887, 347).

Ewliya Celebi affirms that the Biberdara, one of the most important Maza tribes, are not Muslims. Almost all the Tapanta had accepted Islam by the end of the 18th century, but the Shkarawas were still Christians when they were visited by P. S. Pallas, Islam being restricted to the nobility (Bemerkungen auf eine Reise durch die Staatskommisarisse des Russischen Reichs in den Jahren 1793 und 1794, Leipzig 1799, 365). At the
same period J. Reineggs ([Allgemeine historisch-topographische Beschreibung des Kaukasus, Gotha-St. Petersburg 1796, 273) states that the Tam, Ceresi, and Barakali tribes of the Shkawara group were "enemies of Islam". In 1807, J. Klaproth (Reise in den Kaukasus und nach Georgien, i, Halle-Berlin 1812, 459) found that the Tam were islamised but "ate pork", and this is confirmed by the anonymous author of the article Gorskie pliema livichkie za Kuban’yu in Kaukas no. 94, 1850, who describes the Tam as "very lukewarm Muslims", the Ceresi as "setting small store by Islamic ritual, apart from certain of the nobility", the Bag (a tribe of the same group) as "without precise beliefs" and the Barakali as partially converted to Islam. Thus it seems that the final conversion of the Shkawara dates only from the middle of the 19th century, effected by the missionary zeal of Muhammad Amln, the Nâd ibî of Shâmîl (q.v.) in Circassian territory.

Until the beginning of the 20th century Abaza society retained its very complex feudal structure, which was similar to that of the Circassians. At the bottom of the social scale were the slaves, unauat (anauat among the Circassians). Then came the serfs, 1lg (grîla among the Shkarawa), and the freed serfs, azat-îlg, who remained under the obligation to perform certain tasks but could none the less change their master and themselves own unauat and ìlg. Above these was the most numerous class, that of the free peasants, ahand (or 2’lhabashaw). Next were the nobles, divided into "small nobles", amîlstâ, who made up the princes retinues, and the "great nobles", amîlstâd (lwasd among the Shkarawa) who could retainers of their own. At the top of the scale were the "princes" who were heads of clans, âkha, and vassals of the Beskenei and Kabardian princes. They took Azat-Ug among the Circassian princely class (phsa) but in the lower class of telkotesh. The children of the âkha and women of a lower class made up a special class, tuma.

Until the October revolution and even during the first years of the Soviet regime the Abaza still retained certain patriarchal and feudal customs (clan divisions, vendettas, kâlym, wâlîkh, etc.).

Language and literature

The Abaza language belongs to the Abkhazo-Adyghe division of the Ibero-Caucasian languages. It is so close to Abkhaz that it is sometimes taken as simply a dialect of this tongue, but it shows numerous Kabardian features. There are two dialects: Aghkara in the south, with two sub-dialects, that of the Apsua Aul and that of Staro and Novo-Kuvinskoe, and in the north Tapanata, comprising likewise the two sub-dialects of Kubina-EIPburgan and Pelt-Krasno-Vostochnoe. Abaza was an unwritten language until the October revolution. In 1932 a modified Roman alphabet was devised for it and a page in the language added to Cerkes K’âráf, the Cerkess Adyghe daily. In 1939 the Roman alphabet was replaced by Cyrillic, and in this new script the first works by Abaza writers have appeared, from 1940 onwards (collections of poems by Tsekov and Tkhaitsakho, the short stories and novelettes of Zirov and Tabulov, etc.).

Bibliography: L. I. Lavrov, Abasin (Isto-rishno-Etnografitski Òcherk) in Kaukazski Etnografitski Sbornri, U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, Moscow 1953, 5-48, (the best historical and ethnographical study); see the same writer in Southka Etnografija, no. 1, 1946 (Obzor russkich lelopsei); Shora Bekmuzin Nogmov, Istoritsa Adlkhetskogo naroda sostavlennta po predannyam Kabardintsy, Tiflis 1861. On the Abaza during the Soviet period see the works on the Circassian Autonomous Region, especially the anonymous 20 let Cerkeskhio Awtonomoi obshtii, Stavropol’ 1948; the relevant articles in the Cerkess Periodica Krasnaia Cerkessia (nos. 237, 245, 249 for 1940).

On the Abaza language see K. Lomatidzél Tapanatiki Dialet Abkhaskogo yazhiska, Tbiliss, 1944; and particularly G. P. Serduchenko, "Aba, zinishe dialeti", Moscow 1939; Abazinskaja Literatura (vol. i of the Scientific Memoirs of the Pedagogical Institute of Rostov-on-Don 1939) and Abazinskaja Fonetika (vol. v of the same collection), Rostov-on-Don, 1949.

(A. Brenningen and H. Carrere d’Encausse)

BESLENEY (see Čerkes).

BESNI (Besnesi in the Middle Ages), from the Syriac Bet Besniä, a crossroads settlement at a height of more than 2,900 feet on the important junction of the Malaya-Aleppe and (Cilicia), Marâsh-Diyâr Bakr roads. Besni was the hinge between the series of strongholds north of the great bow of the Euphrates on the one hand, which protected the upper valleys of the right bank tributaries of this river from incursion from the plateau’s and high ranges of the eastern Taurus, and on the other those towards the south, which dominated the small basins north of ’Aynâb. Further it was in the immediate vicinity of a pass which led down towards the north-west to the gorge of the Al-Su, the site of the old strong-hold of Ḥadath the Red. Despite these advantages and the ancient etymology of its name, Besni is not mentioned in texts until after the destruction of Ḥadath, whose place it then took (4th/10th century). Formerly it had been overshadowed by Ɨyysûn, its southern neighbour, which was then more important and was itself linked predominantly with Mar'âsh. Besni probably owed its rise to an influx of Armenians after the Byzantine conquest. At the end of the 5th/11th century it was part of the principalities of Philarêt and Kogb-Vasli, and during the period of the Crusades was one of the most frequently mentioned places in the Franco-Armenian province of Edessa. It was fought for by the Zengid or Ayyubid princes of Aleppo and the Saljûkïds of Rûm, who in the 7th/13th century incorporated it into their border province of Mar’âsh. The Mongols ceded it to the Armenian kingdom of Cilicia, but it was almost at once annexed by the Mamlûk state, with whose fortunes it was linked until the end of the 8th/14th century. It then came within the sphere of operations of the Dhu ’l-ghadîr Turcomans, was pillaged by Timûr, passed again at the end of the 13th century into Mamlûk control, and in 922/1516 was occupied by the Ottomans together with Syria. From that time on it has had no more than local importance. The town, in which a fortress largely rebuilt by Kâîthây is still standing, had a population of 10,500 in 1955.

Bibliography: Besni is mentioned by all the chroniclers of the period of the Crusades, in particular by Matthew of Edessa, Michael the Syrian, and Kamâl al-Dîn b. al-‘Adîm. The last-mentioned gives a note on it in the geographical section of his Bughya (Aya Sofya 3036, i, 333), and likewise ’Izz al-Dîn b. Shaddâd in his Nâdib (= Ibn al-Shihna, ed. Cheiko, 171). Of the Mamlûk chroniclers see especially Ibn Kâbir, Ibn Ḥâdîd, Mahmûd Makrizî, al-Aynî, Ibn Taghrîbdî, Ibn Ɨyâs. In the modern period, particularly Alnsworth, Travels,
BESNI — BEYSHEHIR

BEYLIK, (Beği), a term formed by joining the adjective and relative suffix bık to bey (beg, beg) which was an old Turkish title [see BEG]. The word bey is said to correspond to the Arabic amir, and beylik to imara. The term beylik thus denotes both the title and post (or function) of a Bey, and the territory (domain) under the rule of a Bey. Later, by extension, it came to mean also "state, government",
BEYSHEHIR — BHARATPUR


BEZÊTA [see Dido].

BEZÎSTÂN [see KAYSARÎYVA].

BEZOAR [see BAZAHK].

BEZM-I ÂLEM [see WÂLIDE SULTAN].

BHAKCAR, a fortress situated on a limestone rock in the middle of the river Indus (27° 43’ N. and 68° 36’ E), which is identified with the Sogdi of the ancient Arab citadel of al-Mansûra). The name has been fortified and garrisoned at a very early date; as the local tradition goes, whence it was conquered by Babur, who had sent an ultimatum to the governor, Nusrat Khan, lying in 614/1227 by the troops of the governor, Nusrat Khan, who compiled the Ta’rikh-i Akbarî, trans. Gladwin ii, 112; J. N. Sarkar, History of Sind, Karachi 1950, 56-7; Jour. Bombay Br. RAS xxxiv, 144; J. N. Sarkar, History of Afghanistan, 1, 119-20; James Todd, The Antiquities and Annals of Rajasthan, London/New York 1914, 250; ‘Alî b. ‘Abd al-Hamîd Khân, The Towns of Pakistan, Karachi 1950, 56-7; Calnma (Sindhi ed.) Karachi, 1935, 287, 289, 420, 497; Oriental College Magazine, Lahore 1937, 74-6; Djuwaynî, ii, 146; Storey’s ii, 948-9. (A. S. BAZMEE ANSARî)

BHARATPUR, formerly a princely State in India, now forming a part of Rajasthan, lying between 26° 43’ and 27° 50’ N. and 76° 35’ and 77° 46’ E. with an area of 1,982 sq. miles. The chief city is Bharatpur, situated in 27° 15’ N. and 77° 30’ E., 34 miles from Agra, with a population of 37,321 in 1951. Paharsar, 14 miles from Bharatpur, was first conquered in the 5th/11th century by the troops of Mahmûd of Ghazna, under the Sayyid brothers, Džalî al-Dîn and ‘Alî al-Dîn, who claimed descent from Imam Džafar al-Sâdjîk, in about 3 hours, as the local tradition goes, whence the place derives its name pahar (3 hrs.) sar (conquered). At the close of the 6th/12th century it passed into the hands of Mu’tiz al-Dîn b. Sâm also known as Shihab al-Dîn Muhammad Ghuri, and remained under the rule of different dynasties till it was conquered by Bâbûr, who had sent an ulti-
matum, in verse, to the Mir of Bayana, 34 miles from Bharatpur, beginning bā Türk satizah maqṣūn ay Mīr-i Bayana. It remained thereafter under the Mughals. An attempt by Birāi, the founder of the State of Bharatpur, at independence towards the close of the reign of Awrangzib was thwarted by the Imperial army killing Birāi in action. During the reign of Farruĥšīyār (1123-31/1713-18) Cūrāmān Ḍīnjūv ravaged the area and closed the roads to Delhi and Agra. In 1132/1718 a strong expeditionary force under Sāwādī Dīnjūv Singh, the chief of Ḍīnjūvpur, was sent to punish him but the Sayyid king-makers who were opposed to Muhammad Shāh, king of Delhi, made peace with the Ḍīnjūv directly. In 1135/1722 Badan Singh, the successor of Cūrāmān, was proclaimed full Šāhī of Bharatpur on the condition of paying tribute to the Emperor. In 1160/1753 his son, Sūrāji Māl, gained so much strength as to attack the Imperial capital and indulge in pillage and plunder. Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿĀzīz al-Dīljāwī (q.v.) had, in several of his letters, lamented the atrocities committed by the Ḍīnjūv on the residents of Delhi.

The present city and the mud-fort of Bharatpur are said to have been founded about 1146/1733. The British, under Lord Lake, made an unsuccessful attack on this fort in 1220/1805; it was, however, captured by Lord Combermere in 1242/1826.


(A. S. Bāzmī Ansārī)

**Bharāwch.** A district in Gudjārāt [q.v.] in the present Bombay State, India, of about 1450 sq.m. and with a population of some 300,000; the Islamic population was about 20% of the total prior to partition in 1947. Although this has since moved to Sind in Pakistan. The principal town of Muslims was Bohārah [see 1109014859]. Bharāwch is also the name of the principal town of that district, Lat. 23°42′ N., Long. 73°5′ E. It is first known as a town within the Mawrya dominions, and later (c. 150 A.D.) to have been in the hands of Parthian Sāhas; from the Middle Indian form bhuṛavaccha of the Sanskrit bhūryukṣa- it was known to the Greeks as βάρυκα, a seaport from which the Red Sea commerce was carried on (Ptolemy, *Geog.* VII, i, 63; VIII, 21, 12) and as the head of an important trade-route into India (*Periplus*, §§ 47-48). Held by Rādūpūrī and Gūrdjās, probably as tributaries of the Cālukya, it suffered Arab invasions in 15/536, 99/717, and 154/770. It was held by Rāstākrātus in the 3rd/4th and 4th/10th centuries until reconquered by the Cālukya; from them it was taken in 698/1298 by ʿUglā Khān, brother of the Sultan ʿAlī al-Dīn Khālūdī, by whom Hindu and Jāytu temples were destroyed (Briggs, *Ferishta*, i, 327). It was under a succession of Muslim governors representing the Delhi sultāns until 798/1396, when Muhammad Zāfār Khān (governor from 793/1391) assumed his independence. From then it continued subject to the Ahmad Shāh kings [q.v.] until annexed by Akbār in 980/1572. In 1149/1736 ʿAbd Allāh Beg received from Niṣām al-Mulk (independent from 1135/1722, who previously as governor of Gudjārāt had made Bharāwch part of his private estate) the title of Nik ʿAlī Khān, and was the founder of the line of Nawāwds of Bharāwch. In 1186/1772 Bharāwch was captured by the British—whence its Anglo-Indian name of Broach.

**Buildings.**—The old fortifications were rebuilt by Bahādur Shāh 932-43/1526-37. In 1071/1660 they were partially razed by Awrangzīb, but rebuilt on his orders in 1097/1685 as a protection against the Mahrattas. They are now in a very dilapidated condition. The Dāmān Maqṣūd, c. 700/1302, is of great significance in the development of Islamic architecture in Gudjārāt: the earliest buildings at Pātaū were mere adaptations of existing Hindū and Śiṅya structures, whereas here a original and conventionally planned mosque is composed of former temple materials, the enclosure walls, of temple stones specially recut, being thus the earliest examples of independent Islamic masonry in Gudjārāt. The Dāmān is an open colonnade, three compartments of which are three temple sanctuaries, erected intact, except for the removal of the Hindū animal figures, with 48 elaborately carved pillars; the three mihrbāns are intact temple niches with pointed arches added under the lintels. The liwān roof, with three large and 10 small domes, houses elaborate coffered ceilings removed from temples; the designs of these, though Hindū, were conventional in character, and were perpetuated in later Gudjārāt Islamic buildings. It appears that the whole production was the work of local Hindū artisans working under the direction of Muslim overseers.

**Bibliography:** For the history see article *Gudjārāt*, *Bombay Gazetteer*, ii, 1877, 337-369. For a full description of the Dāmān Maqṣūd, J. Burgess, *On the Muhammadan architecture of Bharōch ... in Gudjārāt*, ASWI VI (= ASI, NIS XXIII), London 1896.

**Bāḥṭī** the Pandjāb form of the Rajput word Ḍhāti, the name of a widely distributed Rajput tribe associated with the area stretching from Jaisalmer to the western tract of the Pandjāb between Paṭhābād and Bhatnāir. Large numbers of those settled in the Pandjāb accepted Islam. According to one of their traditions the Ḍhāns of Jaisalmer were driven from Zabūlūstān and Bāḥṭī to the Pandjāb and Rādūpūtnā, the branch settling in Rādūpūtnā being named Bāḥṭī. The references in the *Catnāma* to the Bāḥṭī king of Ramal in the Thar desert confirm the legends preserved in Tod’s *Annals and antiquities of Rajasthān*, i, Madras 1873. They are also mentioned in Afīfī’s Taʿrīkh-i Pirās Shāhī (*Bih. Indica*, 30-39). The widespread nature of their settlements is recorded in the *Ālmā* where Abu ʿl-Fadl reserves the form Bāḥṭī for those settled in Sihrínd, MūJTān and Rādūpūṭ.
country was practically uninhabited. Known as Vikramgarh in the pre-Islamic period, it figures in early Indo-Muslim chronicles like the Tabakht-i Nāṣīrī and the Tādī al-Maʿmūdī of Ḥāfiz Sīrājī (Panjab Univ. Lib. MS.) as Tabarhinda (تبارحیند), a corrupt form of the correct name Bhattinda (بختیند), due apparently to the transposition of the dots of the letters bā and ta. Murtadā al-Zabīdī is nearer the truth when he says that al-Bīrānda (Tādī al-ʿArūs, ix, 212) is "a city in India". This place-name is generally found written as Bhattinda in all earlier Persian chronicles and hagiographical works (e.g., Bābur-nāma, Eng. translation by A. S. Beveridge, i, 383). In the Tābakht-i Nāṣīrī (ed. ʿAbd al-Ḥāyy Ḥabībī, Quetta 1949, i, 537) Bhattinda is wrongly called Sirhind because no hills exist in the vicinity of this town. The existence of a dense jungle, thirty miles from Bhattinda, in the direction of Sirhind, is, however, proved by a statement in the Mafiṣūdī-t i Timārī (Elliot and Dowson, iii, 427). This jungle served as the favourite leopard hunting-ground for Akbar (A. S. Beveridge, Eng. transl. Blochmann, i, 286). As to the predominance of Bhattinda in and around Bhattinda, there is more than ample evidence (Imp. Gazetteer of India, n. ed., viii, 91). Cunningham's etymology of the name Bhattinda (see Bībī) based on mere conjecture is erroneous and wide of the mark.

It was conquered by Māḥmūd of Ghazna in 395/1005 when the Rādāq of Bhattinda (Bhātīyā), Bīdījān Rāy, unable to resist the besiegers, fled from the fort, and committed suicide. There has been some controversy as to the identification of Bhātīyā (Bhātīyā) mentioned by al-ʿUṭbī (Ṭabākht-i Yamini, Lahore 1300/1882, 209 ff.). Mūhammad Nāẓīm positively asserts (The Life and Times of Sultan Māḥmūd of Ghazna, Cambridge 1931, 197-203) that it was Bhātīyā and not Bhattinda as we now know the place, called Hātīyā, still exists in the neighbourhood of Rawalpindī, which also answers the description, given by al-ʿUṭbī, to some extent. Unless, however, more conclusive evidence is forthcoming Mūhammad Nāẓīm's view must prevail. Al-ʿUṭbī (p. 209) gives vivid a description of the lofty city-wall and the fortifications of Bhātīyā as they existed in the time of Māḥmūd. The victory of Sultan Māḥmūd also incidentally marks the introduction of Islam in Bhattīnā and the Sāmānī-Ambālā-Hiṣār region of India.

It was conquered by Muʿīz al-Dīn Mūhammad b. Sām, also known as Shihāb al-Dīn Muḥammad Ghūrī, in 587/1191. After the withdrawal of Muḥammad Ghūrī to Ghazna, his commandant at Bhātīyā, Mālik Diyā al-Dīn Tūlākī, was attacked by Rāy Pithorā (Pethivirāḍā) who laid a siege to the fort and continued it for 13 months. Ultimately the Muslim command made peace with the enemy and surrendered the fort. It was captured by Nāṣīr al-Dīn Kabāčā after the death of Kūṭb al-Dīn Aybak in 607/1210. Thereafter, it remained in the possession of the Slave kings. In 657/1259 Malik Igraṭyār al-Dīn Aḥfūnī, the commandant of Bhātīyā, rose in revolt, killed Yākūt the Abyssinian and took Rādāḍiyā Suṭānā (g.v.) a prisoner, who was lodged in the fort where he married her. They were, however, killed by the Hindus while on their way to Delhi from Bhattinda. The fort was captured by Nāṣīr al-Dīn Māḥmūd in 657/1253 and Malik Shīr Khān was appointed its commandant.

Very little is heard of the town thereafter. It must have decayed and lost its importance, although its fort has, throughout, been famous both for strength and impregnability. Strangely enough it finds no mention in the Memoirs of Bābur. Akbar, as already stated, used to hunt leopards in the purgana of Bhattinda. His guardian Bayram Khān [g.v.], after his disgrace, lodged his family in this fort before proceeding to Dūlīndūr [g.v.]. He was defeated in a decisive action with the Imperial troops, he suffered an ignominious defeat. It then completely fades out of history and only reappears in 1168/1754 when it was conquered by Ālā Sing, the Patīlā chieftain, whose descendants held it till the merger of their territory with the Indian Union in 1956. The modern fort is 118 ft. high, with 36 bastions. It dominates the town, a thriving centre of trade and commerce, and is visible for several miles around. In the time of Sūltān Māḥmūd, it had a deep and wide moat, which great conqueror ordered to be filled up with stones and trees before storming the fort. The ditch still exists partly filled up with the refuse and debris of the town, which is dumped here. The fort is now mouldering rapidly and serious cracks have also appeared in the arches of the main gate. Its two massive minarets collapsed in 1958.

Bābā Ḥādīdī Rātān [see Ratan], said to have been born in the pre-Islamic era and to have later visited the Prophet, was a native of this place.

written in a pure form of eighteenth century Sindhi and are remarkable for the manner in which philo-

sophic and religious use is made of the folk tales of the Sind countryside. The poems deal with the
longings of unrequited love and the need for trust in the power, wisdom and compassion of Allah.

Their deep mystical character has endeared them to the simple rural folk of Sind. It is noteworthy that their appeal has been as much to the Hindus of Sind as to the Muslims. The reason is perhaps due to the fact that the bulk of the indigenous Sindhi population is Hindu in origin, as many of the personal names testify, and the poet himself was deeply interested in the mystical contemplation of faṭrā, sanyas and yogis, which in turn found an echo in the Sikh religion followed by most of the caste Hindus living in Sind till the partition of India in 1947 resulted in their precipitate flight therefrom. The poems of the Rīsalā which are lyrical in type are sung to well-known Indian music and many of them, such as the Sur Āsā and the Sur Bilawāl, proclaim a sublime form of devotion. The folk stories on the other hand make direct appeal to the childlike simplicity common to uneducated people. The love tales of Sasui and Punhun, of Suhinī and Mear, and of Lilān and Chanesar are sung at the cradles of Sindhi children today. A vast literature in Sindhi on the poet and his message has been evoked by the poet's achievement and the rasada of Shāh ‘Abd al-Latīf is the scene of regular pilgrimages of devotees who listen today to the recitation and singing of his verses. There have been learned studies of Shāh ‘Abd al-Latīf's life and work by three Sindhi scholars of distinction, namely the late Shams al-‘Ulmā Mīr Dālī Kalīch Beg, the late Professor H. M. Gurbuxani and the late Shams al-‘Ulmā M. Da‘uddota, whose works may be consulted by those interested. (H. T. SORLEY)

BHĪTĀ'ī — BHŌPĀL xi95

BHŌPĀL, formerly a princely State in India, lying between 22° 20' and 23° 54' N. and 76° 28' and 78° 51' E. with an area of 6,678 sq. miles, with a population of 838,474 in 1951. It was the second most important Muslim State, next to Haydarābād [q.v.].

Bhopāl was founded by a military adventurer, Dōst Muhammad Khān, a native of Tirāh (in the tribal area of present-day Pakistan) who belonged to the Mīrzā Kalīkh tribe of the Āridī Pathans. In 1220/1708 he went to Delhi, at the age of 34, in search of employment, and succeeded in obtaining from Bahādur Shāh I [q.v.], emperor of Delhi, the lease of Bārāsia pargana, partly in recognition of his military services and partly through his own efforts. A man of exceptional courage and outstanding military skill, he soon extended his sway over a large area and founded the town of Bhopāl with its citadel, which he named Fatghar. Taking advantage of the enfeoffment of the central Mughal authority, he broke loose and assumed the title of Nawwāb. He died in 1233/1710 and was succeeded by his minor son Muhammad Khān, who was soon afterwards ousted by Yār Muhammad Khān, a natural son of Dōst Muhammad Khān. The latter died in 1236/1724, but was formally installed Nawwāb and was succeeded by Fayyād Muhammad Khān, a pious man and almost a recluse, whose weakness as a ruler, combined with the political chicanery of his Hindu minister, resulted in half of the Bhopāl territory being lost to the Peshwā, Bādīī Rāo I. On his death in 1252/1737 he was succeeded by his brother, Hayāt Muhammad Khān who, strangely enough, adopted four Hindu boys as his īdās, two of whom, Fīlād Khān and Chōṭā Khān, later became ministers. Rivalry between Wazīr Muhammad Khān, a cousin of the ruler and Mūrid Muhammad Khān, his minister, was responsible for surrendering the fort of Fatghar to Amīr Khān Pindārī (the founder of the former Tōnk [q.v.] State who was then in the service of the Sindhī of Gwālīr. Wazīr Muhammad Khān had to leave Bhopāl but on Sindhī’s repairing to Gwālīr, where disturbances had broken out, he returned with a sizable force and expelled the Marathas, under Amīr Khān, from the fort and after sometime also drove out the Pindārs. In 1253/1738 Hayāt Muhammad Khān died and Wazīr Muhammad, who had proved his capability as a ruler, succeeded him to the principality, setting aside the claim of Gwāh Muhammad Khān, son of the deposed ruler. In 1259/1743 the combined forces of Nāgpūr and Gwālīr marched on Bhopāl, which resisted the invaders heroically for eight long months and the unsuccessful siege had to be lifted.

On the death of Wazīr Muhammad Khān in 1252/1716, his son and the son-in-law Gwāh Muhammad Khān, Nadhr Muhammad, succeeded him. He entered into a treaty with the British, the obligations of which he faithfully observed. This treaty guaranteed to him and his descendants the territories of Bhopāl, while the British were assured the services of native troops for exterminating the Pindārs, who were then over-running Central India and were no more than organised bandits. Nadhr Muhammad was married to Kudsiyya Bégām, a daughter of Gwāh Muhammad, who assumed the reins of power after the death of her husband in 1256/1830, as regent on behalf of her minor daughter, Sikandar Bégām, whose formal accession took place 25 years later in 1261/1845. From this lady begins the long and illustrious chain of the Bégāms of Bhopāl, which ended up with the voluntary abdi-
cation of Sultan Dīshān Bégām in 1345/1926, in favour of her son, Hamīd Allāh Khān (the last feudatory ruler of Bhopāl) and her subsequent death in 1348/1930.

Sikandar Bégām, owing to the delaying tactics of her mother, who wanted to retain power in her own hands, was married very late in 1251/1837 to Dīshān Muhammad Khān, a nephew of Nadhr Muhammad Khān. Kudsiyya Bégām, still reluctant to part with power, instigated a civil war in which Nadhr Muhammad was defeated by the combined troops of the Dowager-Bégām and his own wife. In 1253/1837 the authorities of the East India Company interfered and restored the administration of the State to Dīshān Muhammad Khān. Kudsiyya Bégām, baulked of her wishes, had to retire on pension. She lived long thereafter but was scrupu-

ously kept out of the picture by her successors, Sikandar Bégām and her daughter Shāhīdjahān Bégām, whose husband Siddīk Hasan Khān, for personal and public reasons, did not allow the old Bégām even to attend social functions held by the ruling family. She died in 1299/1881 and held a dāndīr of Rs. 498,682 since her retirement from political life until her death. The rule of Sikandar Bégām is remarkable for a number of military reforms which forged the irregular Bhopāl troops into a fine well-knit force. The State remained loyal to the suzerain British power during the upheaval of 1857 in spite of the refractory conduct of a few of the nobles. She also introduced agricultural, economic, administrative and legal reforms. Although the head of a Muslim State, she was bold enough to do away with the pardah and appear in public attired in military accoutrements. At the same time
she was of a religious bent of mind and performed the Hadjdj in 1280/1863-4. After a rule of 23 years, she died in 1285/1868 and was succeeded by her minor daughter Shakhir Begam, under the regency of Fawjdjar Muhammd Khan, an uncle of Sikandar Begam. In 1263/1847 he had to resign, chiefly because of the machinations of Kusdiyya Begam, and Sikandar Begam was appointed regent. In 1272/1855 Shakhir Begam married Bakhshii Balki Muhammd Khan, who did not belong to the ruling house. He, therefore, as subsequently all the husbands of the Begams of Bhopal, enjoyed only the status of a Nawwab-Consort and had nothing effective to do with the administration of the State, the entire power having been delegated to Sikandar Begam, a woman jealous of her status and dignity. She strongly objected to the recognition of her minor daughter as ruler and could only be appeased by Shakhir Begam's voluntarily giving up all claim to rule during the life-time of her mother; an act of filial attachment rather than of expediency or political sagacity.

In 1285/1868, her husband having died a year earlier, Shakhir Begam was formally installed as the ruler. Three years later she remarried, taking a mawlawi of Kannawdi, Sayyid Siddik Hasan [q.v.], once a petty official of the State, as her husband. Through the efforts of the Begam the honorary title of Nawwab and other insignia of office were conferred on Siddik Hasan Khan as the consort of the ruler. She had discarded the pardah after the death of her first husband but again retired on her marriage with the mawlawi, whose learning and ability always overawed her. Her second marriage met with a mixed reception, the entire ruling family strongly disapproving it. The heir-apparent Sultan Dja‘han Begam, was full of bitterness and her memoirs depict Siddik Hasan Khan as an unscrupulous upstart, a tyrant who robbed her and her mother of all happiness, threatening the latter with divorce, a great stigma for a lady of high birth, if she went against his wishes. She also holds him responsible for the estrangement between her and her mother and the grand old lady Kusdiyya Begam. His disgrace in 1303/1885, due to his objectionable writings, came as a shock to the Begam but she had to bow before the decision of the British Government. Siddik Hasan Khan died in 1308/1890, to the great relief of Sultan Dja‘han Begam and others, but the relations between the ruler and the heir-apparent showed no improvement. The real cause, it appears, of the estrangement between mother and daughter was the latter's husband, Ahmad ʿAli Khan Sultan Dlhan Khán, with whom the ruler, for unknown reasons, was never entirely happy, although it was she who had selected him as her son-in-law out of some twelve suitors.

In 1319/1901 Shakhir Begam died of cancer and, in accordance with the sanad issued in 1279/1862 by Lord Canning, Governor-General and Viceroy of India, was succeeded by Sultan Dja‘han Begam, her only child by her first husband. She had no issue from Siddik Hasan Khan. Sultan Dja‘han, during 25 years of rule, personally directed the administration of the State and carried out a number of reforms. She paid two visits to England, first in 1329/1911 to take part in the coronation ceremonies of King George V (1911-1936), and then in 1344/1925 to get the succession of her youngest and surviving son, al-Ḥādid Hamidallah Khan, recognised by the British Government. Her two other sons, Muhammad Nasr Allah Khán (b. 1293/1876) and Háṣīf Ubayd Allah Khán (b. 1294/1877) both died, in quick succession, in 1343/1924. It was suspected that they had been poisoned, but the political sagacity of Sultan Dja‘han averted a crisis. The late Ağha Khán also played an important part in securing the rulership of Bhopal for Hamid Allah Khan, who thus superseded the sons of his two dead brothers. Born in 1312/1894 Hamid Allah Khan was educated at ‘Alligarh and took an active part in politics insofar as the native princes were concerned. On two occasions (1931-2, 1944-7) he was elected Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes and in that capacity rendered yeoman service to the cause of his brother-princes. In 1366/1946 he played a memorable rôle in Indian politics, acting as an intermediary between the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League, led by Muhammad ʿAli Djinna [q.v.], when he was able to secure a carte blanche from the Congress in favour of the Muslim League. This was, however, later repudiated by M. K. Gandhi, the undisputed leader of the Congress.

On the lapse of British paramountcy in 1947, when India and Pakistan became two independent States, Bhopal was first treated as a centrally-administered area but in 1949 was merged with the Indian Union. It had an elected legislature and a ministry with a Chief Commissioner as the constitutional head of the administration. The ex-Nawwáh, now no more than an ordinary citizen, has since been pensioned off and is entitled to a privy purse of 1,00,000 rupees a year of which 100,000 rupees was allocated to the heir-apparent, Gauhar-i Táddi ʿAbidà Sultan who has since migrated to Pakistan and settled permanently there.


BHOPAL (GVR), Capital of the Indian province of Madhya Pradesh, situated in 23° 16' N. and 77° 25' E. on a sandstone ridge and on the edge of two
BHOPAL — BIBLIOGRAPHY

beautiful lakes, the Pukhtah-Pul Talao and the Bara Talao, famed throughout India for natural charm and picturesque surroundings, was founded by Dost Muhammad Khan, an Orakza'i Afridi in 1141/1728 when he built the Fat'ghah fort, named after his Indian wife, Fatih Bithi, and connected it by a wall to the old dilapidated fort, ascribed by tradition to the legendary Rudjia Bhodj, after whom a quarter of the city is still called Bhojpur. The population in 1951 was 120,333. The city is divided into two parts, the Sahar-i Khan, enclosed by a wall built by Dost Muhammad, and the modern quarters and suburbs, Dhamangrabad and Ahmadabad, added by the succeeding rulers to perpetuate the memory of Dha'angir Muhammad Khan, husband of Sikandar Begam, and of Ahmad 'Ali Khan, husband of Sultan Dha'han Begam, rulers of Bhopal. The city was made the capital of the State by Nawwb Fayyad Muhammad Khan (1268/1754-1272/1777) whose predecessors' seat of Government was Islamnagar (25°22' N. and 77°25'E.).

In 1227/1812-13, the town, outside the wall, was devastated by the combined forces of Nogpur and Gwallor, which had attacked Bhopal. Nadir Muhammad Khan (1233/1816-1234/1818), during his short rule began to restore the town, which process was continued for decades thereafter. Many civic amenities, like roads and street-lighting, were introduced by Sikandar Begam followed by Shahdjhan and Sultan Dha'han Begams; the former particularly added some grand buildings of which the Taj Mahall palace and the Tadj al-Masjid deserve mention.

The two lakes, on whose banks a string of palaces has been raised by almost all the rulers, are connected by an aqueduct and provide drinking water to the citizens. Above them rises the city, tier on tier of irregular houses, with spacious gardens here and there, dominated by the congregational mosque of Kudsiyya Begam, built of purple-red sandstone, with high minarets, from which the Friday prayer is led. In the same building is the tomb of the ambassador to the Mughals who died in 1614.


BIBAN [see KAMISA].

BIBAN, the gates; passes across a chain of the Tellian Atlas Mountains—parallel to the Djurdjura, south of the depression of the Wad! Sahel. The French have retained the Turkish name for these passes, Damir kapu, Iron Gates. The road and railway track from Algiers to Constantine both pass through the Great Gate, al-Bab al-Kahir, hollowed out by the Wadi Chebba. The Little Gate, al-Bab al-Saghir, 3.5 km. to the east, is crossed by the Wad! Buktun. It is the narrower of the two. These 'gates' were not included in the network of Roman roads and the Arab routes, were used from the sixteenth century onwards by Turkish troops travelling between Algiers and Constantine; but these troops were forced to pay the rough local inhabitants to let them pass through the area un molested. On October 28th, 1839, a French column of 8000 men, commanded by Marshal Vallee, Governor-general of Algeria, and accompanied by the Duke of Orleans, crossed the Pass of the 'Little Gate' without hindrance, for the mountain tribesmen of the locality had obtained the customary tribute through the good offices of Mokrani, bag-aqsa of Medjdjana, won over to the French cause.

This expedition, known as that of the Iron Gates, was acclaimed as a brilliant feat of arms, but it led to the final rupture between the French and 'Abd al-Kadir who regarded it as a violation of the Treaty of Tafna.

Geographers have extended the name Biban to the whole of the anticlinal chain of mountains which cuts across the Iron Gates and which stretches at a height of 1000 to over 1400 metres from Aumale to the Guergour (Lafayette), separating the depression of the Wad! Sahel and the tributary valleys of the lower Bou Sellam from the structurally complex mountains of the Ouenougha, the Mezza and the Meten and of the basin of the Bordj buou Arreridj. These mountains with their limestone, marle and schistose clay soil are not very fertile. The Biban chain is partly wooded with Aleppo pines. Populated by Arab tribes in the west, Kabyle Berbers in the centre, it forms, in the east, the southern boundary of the Kabyle Berber dialect area (see 'Abd al-Kadir, Algerian Atlas, Kabylia).

(G. Yver-[J. Des Pois])

BIBI, a word of East Turkish origin, with the meaning of 'little old mother', 'grandmother', 'woman of high rank', 'lady'. It is noted, with the sense of 'woman of consequence', 'lady', in the Ottoman-Turkish dictionary Lughat-i Deshdji, composed in 988(1580-1581). Bibi also means, in Anatolian Turkish, 'paternal aunt'. Taken into Persian at an early date, with the sense of 'woman of the house', 'lady', the word can be found in a verse of Anwarî (12th cent. A.D.) cited in the Farhang-i Nasiri. It was in used in Khurasan during the 13th century as a title for women of distinction, as in the case of the mother of the author who wrote the history of the Saldjids in Asia Minor, 'Ali b. Muhammad b. Husayn b. Muhammad b. 'Ali al-Djafari al-Rughadî, better known under the name Ibn Bibî [q.v.] al-Munadjidima (son of the distinguished lady, the woman astrologer). One of the two wives of Shaykh Safî (cf. Safî al-Dîn) was called Bibî Fattima. The mausoleum, situated near Tehran, of the daughter of the last Sâsâni, Yaqûtîrîd III, is known under the name Bibî Shahrâbân.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Shaykh Sulaymân Bułhârî, Lughat-i Djiddâtî ve Türkî-i 'Omrânî, Istanbul 1298, 88; Taniklariyle Tarama Süzlügi, iii, Ankara 1954, x and 90; Tarama Dergisi, Istanbul 1934, ii, 909; Burhân-i Kabit, s.v.; H. W. Duda, Die Seltschugengeschichte des Ibn Bibî, Copenhagen 1959, 2; Browne, i, 130 and iv, 42; al-Ya'qubî, ii, 293. (H. W. Duda)

BIBLE [see TARKAV, ZABUR, Imp.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY. In the present article the word is used in the sense of a systematically arranged list of books, compiled for the benefit of those who need to know what has been written on a particular subject.

The outstanding achievement in Islamic bibliography to appear before the adoption of printing in Islamic territories is the Fihrist. Its author, Ibn al-Nadim [q.v.], a bookseller (warrik) in Baghda, compiled the work in 377/987-8 in the form of a bibliographical history of literature, arranged in ten books, the first six being concerned with the "Islamic writings" (Kur'an, grammar, history and belles-lettres, poetry, scholastic philosophy, and law), the remaining four with philosophy and science, legends and fables, sects and creeds, and alchemy. In each book there is to be found an account of the rise and development of the study of the subject dealt with, a list of all available writings on it and bibliographical details of their authors, from the earliest times.
The other great monument of Islamic bibliography is the Kāfiyā al-Zunun 'an Asmā' al-Kubūb wa l-Funūn, a work for which the Ottoman polymath, Hāджīdīl Khādī, spent some 650 years after the Fihrist. After an introduction relating at great length the nature, value, divisions and history of the various sciences, the author lists the titles of all the works written in Arabic, Persian and Turkish which he had personally seen or of which he knew the title. For each work he gives details of author, date of compilation, particulars of its division into sections and chapters, and the various commentaries, glosses, refutations and criticisms that the work has attracted to itself; he gives incipits of all works seen by him in order to facilitate the identification of unknown works. Several supplements to the work were compiled by his successors, the latest by Bādgāth Iṣmā'īl Pāsha (d. 1920) containing some 18,000 titles.

Little needs to be said about the remaining bibliographical works which have survived. Ibn Khayr al-Īshībīl (A.H. 502-572, q.v.), who spent the greater part of his life as a peripatetic student in Andalusia, compiled a Fihrist (ed. Codera and Ribera, BAH IX, X, Saragossa 1894) in which he enumerates the titles of some 1400 books in Arabic of both Spanish and Oriental origin which he had read or heard, with chains of transmission going back to their original authors. Lists of works of individual writers exist, such as those for Rāzī (compiled by al-Bīrūnī, ed. P. Kraus, Paris 1936), Galen translations (by Ḥusayn b. Iṣhāk, ed. Bergsträßer, Leipzig 1925, and 1932) and Ṣuyūṭī’s autobibliography (Brockelmann II 145; S II 179). The Shī’īs were assiduous in the compilation of bibliographies of writings of their own adherents; the earliest, by Muhammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī (d. A.H. 460), has been edited by Sprenger, ʻAbd al-Ḥaḳḳ, and Ghulām Kādir for the Bibliotheca Indica. In the preface to this edition three similar works on bibliography are described. More recently, ʻIḍār al-Ḥusayn’s (A.H. 1240-1286) Kāfiyā al-Iṣbūb wa l-ʻAsrār ‘an Asmā’ al-Kubūb wa l-Funūn contains notices of 3414 Shī’ī books arranged alphabetically, and the al-Dhārī’s tiw Taṣāwif al-Shī’a of Aḥbār Buzurg al-Tahrīrī (1396, in progress) has already run to ten volumes.

The publications of Western scholars and students of Islam were recorded for the first time by Schnurrer, the second edition of whose Bibliotheca Arabica published in 1811 lists in an arrangement by subject the printed works on the subject from the earliest times until the year 1810 with a chronological index. Zenker’s Bibliotheca Orientalis (Leipzig 1840; 2nd ed., ib., 1846, 1861) which purported to give the titles of all Arabic, Persian and Turkish books from the inception of printing, is disappointing. Chauvin continued the work of Schnurrer in a much more expert fashion, providing incidentally an author index to the Bibliotheca Arabica. Of his Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes on relatifs aux Arabes publiés dans l’Europe chrétienne de 1810 à 1885 twelve volumes in all were published during the years 1892-1922; the materials for the remaining part of this work are still preserved in manuscript in the library of the University of Liège. It was his intention to bridge the gap between Schnurrer and the Orientalische Bibliographie which began publication in 1887 and provided a most adequate record of all publications in the Islamic field, as well as in all other branches of Oriental studies, until 1911. Had Chauvin’s work been published in its entirety there would now be in existence a substantially complete record of all Western publications on Islamic subjects from the beginnings down to 1911 readily to hand in the three bibliographies, Schnurrer, Chauvin, Orientalische Bibliographie. The ever-increasing volume of work done on Islamic studies and consequent publication since that date made it even more difficult to comprehend the total of publications over a period within the confines of a single work. For publication since 1911, therefore, the scholar must make recourse to a large number of bibliographies of all kinds which cannot here be listed in detail. (Pfannmüller in his Handbuch der Islamischen (Berlin and Leipzig 1923) provided a useful introduction and guide to the literature of the subject, but had no intention of compiling a complete Islam bibliography). The principal periodicals in the field have striven to cope with the problem: it is only necessary to mention the ‘Kritische Bibliographie’ published in Der Islam at intervals from 1913 to 1933 and ‘Abstracta Islamica’ which, since 1937, has been a regular feature of the Revue des études islamiques.

In Index Islamicus (Cambridge 1958), Pearson has attempted to list the periodical and Festschrift articles of the fifty years from 1906 to 1955.

The Ibn al-Nadīm—Hāджīdīl Khādī tradition of bibliographical literary histories has been carried on in our own times in the monumental works of Brockelmann and Storey on Arabic and Persian literature respectively. Each of these writers gives, in addition to bibliographical data, a list as complete as it is possible to make of surviving manuscripts, cumulating the printed catalogues of collections in all libraries, as well as notes on the principal editions, translations and works of history or criticism of the individual writers. Brockelmann handles his material on a chronological basis, Storey arranges his by subject; both are quite indispensable for all students of these literatures, as well as to all who have occasion to catalogue Arabic and Persian books and manuscripts. A similar work with more limited scope was compiled by Bahinger, Geschichenschreiber der Osmanen (Leipzig 1927). Christian and Jewish literature in Arabic form the subject of separate treatments by G. Graf, Gesch. d. christlichen arab. Litt., 5 vols., Vatican City 1944-53, and M. Steinschneider, Arab. Litt. der Juden, Frankfurt 1902.

In recent years Islamic countries themselves have been making great contributions to their bibliography. In 1918 Yūsuf ʿĪlyān Sarkis published his Muḍjam al-Maṭbūʿāt al-‘Arabiyya wa l-Mu‘arrabā containing the titles of all Arabic printed books from the beginnings of printing to the year 1919 inclusive, arranged in alphabetical sequence according to the most commonly used form of the author’s name, whichever this be ʾism, laḥab, ḥuṣya or nisba. The work is provided with an index of the titles of works. Egypt has issued a number of volumes of what is to all intents and purposes a national bibliography in Al-sīdījīl al-ṭabāḥīl. A Persian national bibliography by Dr. İrādji Afsār has appeared in the Farhang-i Irān-sāmīn since 1954 and the first volume of a catalogue of Persian printed books by Khanbābā Muḥārār was published in 1337 solar/1915. The ‘Oshnānī muʿāṣīlara of Bursāl Mehmēd Tābīr is a bio-bibliographical dictionary of Ottoman writers in the style of the tāḥkīmer and is of great value to all students of Turkish culture, even though it is
not marked by accuracy of bibliographical detail and, as Babinger puts it, finding a name in the index is often a matter of luck or demanding of great patience. Türk bibliyografyası has recorded all publications in Turkey since 1928 and the National Library has announced plans for the publication of a catalogue of Turkish printed books from the date of the adoption of printing in that country in the 13th century. Türkçe makaleler bibliyografyası, an index to articles in Turkish periodicals, has been issued regularly since 1952.


G. Gabrieli, *Manuale di bibliografia musulmana* (Rome 1916) is the only work of its kind and is invaluable for its lists of general bibliographical works. (Regrettably only the first part was ever published). For the works of Schnurrier and Zenker see the preface to Chauvin, *Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes*, esp. xx-xxx; for the unpublished portions of Chauvin’s Bibliographie see J. Gobeaux-Thoret, *Notes from the Liège Library on Victor Chauvin and on Ibn Butlūn in Unity and variety in Muslim civilisation* (ed. Grunebaum, 1955), 363-4; the index to Schnurrier occupies xli-cxvii; Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur* was originally published at Weimar and Berlin, 2 vols., 1898-1902; Supplementbände I-III, Leiden 1932-42; 2den Supplementbänden angepasste Aufl., 2 vols. Leiden 1943, 1946. Storey, *Persian literature, London* 1927-, in progress.

(J. D. Pearson)

**BID’A**, innovation, a belief or practice for which there is no precedent in the time of the Prophet. It is the opposite of sunna and is a synonym of mubdath or hadath. While some Muslims felt that every innovation must necessarily be wrong, some allowance obviously had to be made for changing circumstances. Thus a distinction came to be made between a bid‘a which was ‘good’ (kasara) or praiseworthy (mahmudā), and one which was ‘bad’ (sayyida) or blameworthy (mādhdima). Al-Shāfi‘i laid down the principle that any innovation which runs contrary to the Kur‘ān, the sunna, idīma, or aištah (a tradition traced only to a Companion or a Follower) is an erring innovation, whereas any good thing introduced which does not run counter to any of these sources is praiseworthy. On this basis innovations have been classified according to the five categories (akḵām) of Muslim law. Under duties incumbent on the community (fard ḵifāya) are included such bid‘as as the study of grammar, rhetoric, etc. on which an understanding of the Kur‘ān and the sunna is based, investigation of the reliability of men whose authority is quoted for traditions (al-dīfrared wa‘ītā’il [g.v.]), distinguishing sound and weak traditions, codifying law, and the refutation of heretical sects. Prohibited (muharrama) innovations include the doctrines of those who oppose the followers of the sunna and the accepted beliefs of the community. Among those which are recommended (mandāba) is the establishment of such institutions as hospices and schools. Innovations which are disapproved (mahrūka) include the decoration of mosques and the ornamentation of copies of the Kur‘ān. Among those which are permitted (mubda‘a), i.e. towards which the law is indifferent, is the free use of pleasant foods, drinks and clothing.

Bid‘a is to be distinguished from heresy. When it includes matters which have been introduced in disagreement with what has come down from the Prophet, it is said that this is not due to any purpose of rebelling against him, but has arisen through some kind of confusion. Innovators are called Ahl al-bid‘a and Ahl al-akwā‘. The implication is that the innovator (mubdī‘a) is one who introduces something on an arbitrary principle without having any basis in the recognised foundations of Islam. The objection to bid‘a has led some Muslims in more recent times to denounce the use of tobacco and coffee, and even of modern scientific inventions; but among the Wahhābis, the strictest body within modern Islam, scientific inventions are freely used. Indeed, the economy of the present state of Saudi Arabia is mainly dependent on oil whose production could not be accomplished without modern inventions.

Bid‘a may be treated on the level of kiyās [q.v.]. Just as what is kiyās in one generation may be included in what a later generation considers idīma, so may it be with bid‘a. The distinction between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ innovations was therefore a necessary principle. Only people of an ultra-conservative nature who live in an unreal world of their own and rail. A new edition which was ‘good’ and ‘bad’ innovations was therefore a necessary principle. Only people of an ultra-conservative nature who live in an unreal world of their own and differing circumstances. But a number of traditions condemning innovations are found in the collections of Ḥadīth as statements of the Prophet.


(J. Robson)

**BIDAR**, a district in south-central India (the ‘Deccan’, [q.v.]), and the headquarters town of that district, lat. 17° 55' N., long. 77° 32' E., population over 15,000, 82 miles north-west of Ḥaydārābād from which it is easily accessible by road and rail.

The identification of Bidar with the ancient Vidarba (Briggs’s *Ferishta*, ii, 411) is now discounted, cf. G. Yazdani, *Bidar: its history and monuments*, Oxford 1947. A, Bidar was included in the Cālukya kingdom of Kalyān, 4th-6th/10th-12th centuries, but in the hands of the Kākatiyās of Warangal when conquered by Ulugh Khān (later Muḥammad b. Tughlāk, [q.v.]) in 722/1322 (details of siege and men-
tion of fortifications, Divā' al-Dīn Barānī, Ta'rikh-i Fitrūr Shāhī, Bibl. Ind., 449), from whose governor it was taken after a fierce battle in 748/1347 by a Amir-i Sadak (Commander of a Sādī or subdivision of approximately 100 villages; Barānī, 495; Ribha, Cairo ed., ii, 75), Zafar Khān. The latter, on his acceptance as first king of the Bahmani dynasty [q.v.] as 'Allā' al-Dīn Ḥasan Bahman Shāh, divided his dominion into four provinces, of which Bidar was one. The town was important strategically (Bahmani dynasty, monuments, [q.v.]), and as a fortress held the seventh Bahmani king, Mahdī al-Dīn (799/1397) in internment; Muhammad II (780-99/1378-97) established orphanage schools in Bidar and elsewhere, cf. Briggs's Forskhta, ii, 349-50. An assault by the eighth king, Firūr Shāh, against his brother Ahmad in 825/1422 was repulsed at Bidar, leading to Ahmad's succession, shortly after which he transferred his capital to Bidar from Gulbarga (Sayyid 'Allā Tabatābā, Burhdn-i Mā'dīr, Haydarābād edn., 49-50), rebuilt the fortifications and renamed it Muhammadābād; the natural position of Bidar on a healthy plateau with abundant water, and its central position in the kingdom, offered advantages not possessed by Ahbānābād-Gulbarga. Bidar was attacked in 866/1462 by Sulṭān Mūzmīd Khādīfī of Māwī, who destroyed some of its buildings, but was repulsed with the aid of Sulṭān Māhmūd Shāh of Gujūrāt. Bidar's heyday under the Bahmanīs was during the able ministry of Māhmūd Gāwān [q.v.], c. 866-886/1462-68; but after his murder the Bahmani power declined, to the advantage of the minister Kāsim Barīd (founder of the Barīdī dynasty, [q.v.]) and his family. The Bahmanīs remained as puppet kings under the Barīdī ministers until at least 932/1527; 'Allūr Barīd was de facto ruler until 949/1544, and his son 'Alī Barīd adopted the royal title, presumably after the death of the last Bahmani king, Kālīm Allāh (for coins in whose name, dated 952 [== 1545 A.D.], see Proc. VII All-India Oriental Conf., 740). Bidar fell to Ibrahim 'Adī Shāh of Bīdāpur in 1028/1619, was annexed to the Mūlakh empire by Awrangzīb in 1066/1656, and passed to Nīzm al-Mulk Asaf Dijā in 1137/1724.

Monuments. Buildings particularly associated with the Bahmanī and Barīdī dynasties are described under those headings; those of the post-Barīdī period are unimportant and are not described. Page references in the following account are to Yazdani, op. cit.

The city and fort are both fully walled, and in their present area date from the time of Ahmad Shāh Wall Bahmanī, who incorporated the old Hindū fort in the west of the present area into his buildings of 823-5/1422-2; Persian and Turkish engineers and architects are known to have been employed. The ground on the north and east of the perimeter falls sharply away; on the other sides the walls are within a triple moat hewn out of the laterite outcrop by local Hindū masons (p. 29). Much of the defences was destroyed in Mūzmīd Khādīfī's invasion (vide above) and restored by Nīzm Shāh; but their characteristic was continued in the time of Mūzmūd Shāh Bahmanī, c. 875/1470, after the introduction of gunpowder. Minor improvements were made by Mahdī Shāh (inscriptions, EIM 1925-6, 178-8), and more extensive ones, including the mounting of large guns, by 'Alī Barīd Shāh, 949-87/1542-79. The description of the defences in the reign of Shāhjahān by Mūzmūdī Shāhī Kāmbū ('Amdal-i Shāhī, Bibl. Ind., iii, 249-50) indicates that little subsequent changes were made. In the perimeter of 4 km. there are 37 bastions, mostly massive, many with gun emplacements, and 7 gates as well as the three successive gates between town and fort. The first gateway serves as a barbican for the second, the Shārza Darwāza—so called from the figures of two tigers carved on the façade, a common feature of Dakhân forts (32). The third gate, Gunbad Darwāza, is massive, with battered walls, hemispherical dome and corner guldastas recalling the contemporary Delhi architecture, but with an outer arch of wide span stilted above the haunch, the shape of much Persian-inspired architecture in the Deccan and characteristic of the Bahmanī buildings in particular (34). The town walls are said to be the work of 'Allī Barīd (Mūzmūdī Sulṭān, 'Ā husband-i Bīdār, 17-18) in 962-3/1555-8, but doubtless superseded Bahmanī work. Again there are 37 bastions, adapted for long-range guns, and five gateways (83-90).

Within the fort is the Solah Kha mbā ('sixteen pillar', so called from a period of its decay when 16 pillars were screened off in the (Shah) Masdīj, the earliest Muslim building at Bidar and the original Djāmī' Masdīj, having been established before the transfer of the capital (inscription giving date 827 [== 1423-4 A.D.], EIM 1931-2, 26-7); the style is heavy and monotonous, particularly in the 91-metre façade, and the inner circular piers were over-massive; the central dome rests on a hexadecagonal collar pierced with treatered windows, to form a clerestory (54-6); the Takht Mā'hīl, the modern name for what was probably Ahmad Shāh Wall Bahmanī's palace described in the Burhdn-i Ma'sīr, 70-1, and referred to as Dar al-Imāra by Firšt, i, 627. The arches have the typical Bahmanī Hilt at the apex, and the fine encaustic tile-work, probably imported from Kāshān, includes the emblem of the tiger and rising sun (66-77); the Bahmanī Dīwān-i 'Ā'īnm, with fine tile-work in floral, geometric and calligraphic (Kūfī) designs, generally Persian with some chinoiserie (62-6); the Gagan (Skt. 'sky'), Tarkash and Rangīn Māhalls, all begun in Bahmanī times and rebuilt by the Barīdīs: typical Barīdī chain-and-pendant motif in Tarkash Māhall, 'Allī Barīd's rebuilding of Rangīn Māhall in inlay mother-of-pearl work and woodcarving in Hindū as well as Muslim patterns, with some cespning of wooden arches, the best of Barīdī work but on too small a scale to be fully effective (60-2, 57-9, 44-9 respectively); a group of underground rooms, Hazār Kottālī, with an emergency escape passage leading outside the walls (77-8); the Shāhī Hāmmām, late Bahmanī or early Barīdī, with a fine vaulted ceiling, 51-2; and minor buildings.

Within the town walls are the Čāwbrā, a massive tower at a cross-roads probably built by Ahmad Shāh as an observation post (90); the great Madrasa of Māhmūd Gāwān, built 877/1472, whose Persian prototype was the madrasa of Khārgīr in Khurāsān (cf. E. Dīez, Chorasamische Baudenkmäler, i, 72-6); its remaining mindār (the other, with the south-east corner, destroyed by a gunpowder explosion in 1107/1696, 40 m. high, in three stages. Much of the former tile-work has perished from the mindār and façades, but the proportions, the silhouette, and the interplay of light and shade due to the rows of deeply recessed mindrs, ...
late Bahmani design, and a trefoil parapet which, originating in the Bahmani period, is found in Baridi buildings also (100-2); the Dāmād Māsjid of the town, plain but elegant, with a high lantern-vaulted iwan under its double dome, late Bahmani work restored in the Baridi period (chain-and-pendant motif in spandrels of façade), 1054; the Bārī Khānkhā of Māhābūb Subhān, whose mosque parapet shows the overlapping arches of the Bahmani period, 111. Outside the town walls are (besides the tomb buildings of the Bahmanis and Baridi Šhāhs, (q.v.)) the fine Cāwī khāndi of Ḥadrat Khallī Allāh, similar in style to the tomb of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Bahmanī and one of the best Bahmani buildings (141-6); the tombs of the Abyssinian nobles in the Hābshī Kōt, 180; the Kāli (black) Māsjid, probably early Baridi, whose mihrāb, projecting out from the iwan, forms a high square chimney-like base for a dome supported on each side by an open arch, resembling an aerial Baridi tomb (196-7); and numerous other buildings.

Mention must be made of the local Bīdīrī ware, a class of damascened metalwork in which engraved and inlaid silver designs are made on an alloy (mainly zinc with some copper, lead and occasionally tin) base, which is afterwards blackened and highly polished; the blackening is carried out by rubbing a locally-obtained earth, containing alkali nitrates, mixed with ammonium chloride, on the fresh surface of the alloy.

Bibliography: Yazdani, op. cit., supersedes all previous work on the monuments: full references, extensive plates, drawings, plans, inscriptions, etc. See also J. Burgess, Antiquities in Bīdīr and Awrangabad Districts, ASI Tii (≡ NIS ili), 1878; ASI Annual Report, 1928-9, 5-11; Hyderabad Arch. Dept. Reports, passim; Sir J. Marshall, The monuments of Muslim India, Chap. xxi in Cambridge History of India, 1928; Percy Brown, Indian Architecture (Islamic period), Chap. xii. For Bīdīr as a fortified city, full description with measured drawings of fortifications in S. Toy, The strongholds of India, London 1957. For the history of Bīdīr see Gazetteer of the Bīdīr district; Sherwānī, Mahmūd Gauwān, the Great Bahmanī Wazīr, and The Bahmanīs of the Deccan, an Objective study.

For Bīdīrī ware, full references in T. K. Gairola, Bīdīrī Ware, in Ancient India, XIII, 1956, 166-8, which supersedes all previous technical work.

(H. K. Sherwani and J. Burton-Pack)

BIDIL, Mīrzā ʿAbd al-Ḵādīr b. ʿAbd al-Khālik Aḵūṣ (or Barlaš), of Bhūkhārā origin, was born at ʿAẓmābād (Paṭna) in 1054/1644, where his family had settled. He lost his father in 1059/1649 and was brought up by his uncle Mīrzā Kalandār (d. 1076/1665) and maternal uncle Mīrzā Zarrīf (d. 1075/1664), who was well-versed in Ḵurāšī literature and Ḵūšā (1070/1669 he visited a number of places in Bengal along his way to Calcutta (Orissa) where he stayed for three years. It was here in Orissa that Mīrzā Zarrīf, who also had strong mystic leanings introduced him to Shāh Kāsim Ḥuwaštāhī with whom he soon after contracted his baʿyā (1076/1665) he went to Delhi, where he met Shāh Kābul, a Ṣidṭ, to whom he devotes a lengthy chapter in Ḍawī Ṣanṣarī. For two years thereafter he wandered about the woods of Bindrābān and the streets of Muttra, ʿAẓmābād and Agra in search of Shāh Kābul, who had disappeared suddenly. While at Agra, Bīdil experienced hardship and starvation. In 1079/1668 he married, and entered the service of Prince Muḥammad ʿAṣʿam b. Awrangzīb, whom he served for a number of years. The Prince once requested him to compose a ḥaṣīdī in his praise; Bīdil refused to do so, and resigned his position. Khuṣūghī’s statement (as reproduced in Fāyūdī Ṣuds, 80) that Bīdil remained in the service of the Prince for twenty years is not supported by other writers. Soon after his resignation he again took to wandering; this time visiting several places in the Pandīrbāz, including Ḥaydarābād. His wanderings, however, ended in 1096/1685 when he finally settled at Delhi. He was offered a high post by Ṣafī Dīn I, the Niẓām of Ḥaydarābād, who was one of his pupils in poetry; although grateful for the offer, Bīdil refused to accept it. He died in 1133/1721 and was buried in the courtyard of his house in Old Delhi. The exact location of his grave in the ruined city has been a matter of great controversy. The present grave, with an inscribed head-stone, is spurious.

Essentially a mystic poet, said to have composed over ninety thousand verses, Bīdil is very popular in Afghanīstān and parts of Central Turkistān. In poetry he has been compared with Saʿdī and Rūmī, in prose with al-ʿAnsārī al-Harawi and al-Ghazzī (qq.v.).

He is the author of: (i) Čahār ʿUnsur, written in 1116/1704, a mainly biographical work interspersed with supernatural anecdotes (Cawnpore 1292/1875); (ii) Nikāt, a philosophical treatise dealing with certain abstruse problems like waḥāb, ilḵām, nubwawat, etc., profusely interspersed with ʿagāhs, kalāt wa ʿrābīʾiyāt, (Cawnpore 1292/1875); (iii) Muḥtār-i ʿAṣʿam, a mathnāwī on the lines of Ṣafīʾāl-Dīn’s Sāhīna, published as part of Ḳulffās Bīdīrī (Bombay 1299/1881); (iv) Ṣufmān, another mathnāwī, written in 1144/1732 and comprising 12,000 verses, deals with metaphysical problems as the author understood them (Bombay 1299/1881); (v) Ṭūr-i Maʿrīfāt, another mathnāwī comprising 6,000 verses, still unpublished (MS. Punjab Univ. Lib.), deals with natural phenomena; (vi) Tūsīm-i Ḥaydar, also a mathnāwī of the same length as Ṭūr-i Maʿrīfāt (Bombay 1299/1881); (vii) Diwān; no complete edition has been published so far; an incomplete edition, however, up to ṫarafḍāl only was published at Kābul (1334/1915), and another edition at Cawnpore (Nawalkahore: 1292/1875); (vii) Ṣurāt, a fine specimen of Persian letter-writing, containing useful informations about the numerous pupils of the poet and some of his benefactors (Cawnpore 1292/1875); select works of Bīdil have also been published at Tashkent, as he is very popular in the republics of Tadžikistān and Uzbekistān in the U.S.S.R.

Bibliography: Khalīl Allāh Khān “Khalīlī”, Fāyūdī Ṣuds, Kābul 1334 (Shamsi) 1956, (this work contains extracts from Bīdīrī in all the known published and unpublished sources); ʿAbd Allāh ʿAkhtār, Bīdīrī, Lahore 1952., (extensively reviews all the works by Bīdil except his Ṣafmān); ʿAbd al-Ghānī, Taḏḵīrāt-i Bīdīrī (in Oriental College Mag: Lahore, August 1956); “ʿAbd al-Ghānī “Nasāḥīh”, Sukhān-i Shūrād, Lucknow 1291/1874, 75; ʿAbd al-Hayy, Nadwī, Nuzkāt al-Ḵosarāt, Haydarābād (Dh.) 1300/1981, vi, 157; Kudrāt Allāh “Kāsim”, Muddanjāh-e Nagāh, Lahore 1933, i, 115-17; Maʿrīf (ʿAṣʿamgar) 33/1, 1934, May and July 1942, 58/ii, 1946; Šīḏīk Ḥasan Khān, Sham-i Andījum, Bhopal 1292/1876, 82-4; Mir Ḥusayn Dost Sambhāl, Taḏḵīrāt-i Ḥusaynī, Lucknow 1292/1876, 74-7;
... the Marathas in 1174/1760 for a sum of 6,000,000 rupees. On the overthrow of the Peshwa in 1234/1818 (f. 2v). All his books are written in a...
the British occupied Bijdapur and assigned it to the Râdâh of Satârâ in whose possession it remained till 1266/1848 when, on the lapse of the State, it formed part of British Indian territory. In 1281/1864 Bijdapur was made a separate district and in many of the old palaces were housed Government offices which were, however, later shifted elsewhere.

The 1Adil Shâhs were great patrons of art and literature. Malik Kûmmi, the poet and Zuhûrî, the celebrated author of the two Persian classics, Sîr Naâmî and Mînzâd Bâzîd, formed for a considerable time the Court of Ibrahim 1Adil Shâh, himself a poet, who composed in Dakhanî Urdu.

It is still remembered as the Skull Famine, the ground being covered with the skulls of the unburied dead. The second occurred in 1234/1818-19 reducing the once flourishing city to a mere township, of a few thousand souls, which has since then remained a city of desolate palaces and historical ruins. Other periods of severe drought were those of 1240/1824-5, 1248/1832-3, 1270/1853-4, 1280/1863-4 and 1283/1866-7.


(A. S. Bazmee Ansari)

Monuments.—The 1Adil Shâhs developed the building art upon all other, and their architecture is the most satisfactory of all the Deccan styles, both structurally and aesthetically; hence their capital, Bijdapur shows a more profuse display of excellent and significant buildings than any other city in India except Delhi alone. The Bijdapur style is coherent within itself, and there is a gradual progression between its two main phases. Most worthy of note are the doming system with its striking treatment of pendentes; profuse employment of minarets and gilded asas as ornamental features, especially in the earlier phase; elaborate cornices; reliance on morter of great strength and durability. The materials employed are either rubble-and-plaster or masonry; the stone used in masonry work is local, a very brittle trap. There is evidence to show that architects were imported from North India, and that use was freely made of local Hindu craftsmanship.

The long reign of 1All I saw much building activity: the city walls, uneven in quality since each noble was responsible for a section, completed 973/1565, with five main gates flanked by bastions and machicolated, approached by drawbridges across a moat, beyond which is a revetted counterscarp and covert way (many bastions modified to take heavy guns; inscriptions of Muhammad and 1All II); the Gagan ("sky") Mahâl, an assembly hall with much work in carved wood; a mosque in memory of sayyid 1All Shâhî Prî, small (10.8 m. square) but superbly decorated with cut-plaster, with a steep wagon-vaulted roof parallel to the façade, a tall narrow chimney-like vault over the mihrâb which has a door leading outside; the Shâhpur suburbs; outside Bijdapur, the forts of Shâhâbdr (966/1558), Dhâwîr (975/1571), Shânâhur and Bankapur (981/1573); 1All's own severely plain tomb; and his 1Dâmi Masjid, generally ascribed to 985/1576, a fine large (137.2 by 82.3 m.) building, not fully completed (only buttresses of tall minars were to be added, no kanguras over façade), sparingly ornamented (only the central arch of seven in the lintel façade is cusped and decorated with medallion-and-bracket spandrels), with the great hemispherical dome, standing on a square triforium, capped by the crescent, a symbol used by the 1Adil Shâhs alone among the Dakhâni dynasties. The cornice is an improvement on earlier works by showing deeper brackets over each pier instead of a row of uniform size. The vaulting system of the dome depends on cross-arching: two intersecting squares of arches run across the hall between the piers under the dome, meeting to form an octagonal space over which the dome rests; the pendentes thus overhang the hall and counteract any side-thrust of the dome. The exterior walls are relieved by a ground-floor course of blind arches over which is a loggia of open arches.

In Ibrahim II's reign fine sculptured stone work replaces the earlier rubble-and-plaster. The palace complex dates from about 990/1582 (Sât Manzil, 'Granary', Ćûl Mahâl); the first building in elaborate sculptured stone is Malika Dzhâhân's mosque (994/1586-7), which introduces a new shape by the dome forming three quarters of a sphere above its field of foliation. The Bukhârî mosque and three others on the Shâhpur suburb are very similar, and fine.
stonework occurs also in perhaps the greatest work of the 'Adil Shahls, the mausoleum of Ibrahim II and his family known as the Ibrahim Rawda; within a garden enclosure 137.2 m. square stand a tomb and mosque on a common plinth; the tomb (shown by inscriptions to have been intended for the queen Tadj Sultana only) has uneven spacing of the columns and other features, and the cenotaph chamber is covered with geometric and calligraphic designs, reputedly the entire text of the Kur'an. The mosque columns are regular. The whole composition is in perfect balance and was minutely planned before building. An inscription gives the date of completion, by abjad, as 1036/1626. Palaces of this reign include the Anand Mahall, built for entertainments (Basatin al-Salatin), and the Aghlar Mahall (1000/1591) with fine painted wood decoration including some fresco figure-paintings thought to be the work of Italian artists. The Anda ("egg") Masjid, 1017/1608, has the mosque (presumably for the use of women) on the upper storey, with a saraf below; the mosaic is polished and finely jointed, and above is a ribbed dome. In 1008/1599 Ibrahim proposed moving his seat of government some 5 km. west of Bidjapur where the water supply was better; but the new town, Navraspur, was sacked in 1034/1624, before its completion, by Malik 'Anbar, and little remains. Other work includes the mosque known as the Naw Gunbadh, the only Bidjapur building with multiple doming: the fine but incomplete mausoleum of the brother pir's Hamid and Latif Allah Kadir (ob. 1011/1602, 1021/1612); and, the supreme example of the later work of this reign, the Mihtar-i Mahall, really a museum complex, is formally simple: a hemi-mosque being the only two-storeyed one in Bidjapur, the gate of the last monarch, the minor Sikandar, closes the 'Adil Shahi effort with a simple grave in the open air.


**BIDJAYA** (Bougie), maritime Algerian town situated about 175 km. east of Algiers. Built on the lowest slopes of the Djabal Guraya, the city overlooks a spacious arid valley of the bay. Doubtless Roman and Carthaginian shipping anchored off Soldaie, the old town. At the beginning of the Christian era, it formed part of the domain of Juba, king of Cherchel. The emperor Augustus founded a colony there and settled it with veterans. An inscription dating from the second century extols Soldaie as "civitas splendidissima." Nevertheless, it played no significant part until the Muslim era. In the 5th/6th century, al-Bakri refers to it as a very ancient city, a pleasant winter resort, populated with Andalusians. From this period, the Spanish Muslims were strongly represented side by side with the Berber element, the Bidjaya tribe, to which the town owes its name.

The event which made Bougie historically famous took place in 460/1067. The facts are briefly as follows. The mid-5th/11th century witnessed the rupture between the Zirids of al-Kayrawan and the Fatimid Caliph of Cairo, and the reprisals which followed: the Hilalian invasion, the arrival of nomad Arabs sent from Egypt to take possession of the rebel kingdom. These reprisals were terrible. The nomads pillaged the countryside of Irikiya. The sacked inland towns were partly evacuated. The kingdom of the Hammedids first took advantage of this free-for-all. The end of the eleventh century was the
golden era of their Kalifa. At the same time the Arabs were not slow to spread westward and offered a serious menace to the Kalifa of the Banu Hamda. These decided to look about for a less exposed capital. Just as the Zirids had left al-Kayrawan and betaken themselves to the maritime town of Mahdiyya, the masters of the Kalifa withdrew to the coast. In 1067, the Hammadid al-Nasir occupied the land of the Bidjaya and set up his capital at Bougie which he wished to call al-Nasiriyya. Though he continued to spend part of his time at the Kalifa's, he gave priority to the expansion of his new capital, put himself out to attract settlers and built there the splendid Castle of the Pearl (Ka'ar-al-Lu't'a'lu'it). The son of al-Nasir, al-Mansur (483/498/1090-1104) left the Kalifa (which, however, he had embellished with new buildings) in his turn. He abandoned the Kalifa permanently and installed himself in Bougie with his troops and his court. Here he built the great mosque, planted gardens and erected the palaces of Aminun and the Sta (Ka'ar-al-Kawkab) and supplied the city with water, carried by aqueduct from the Djabal Toudja. The town is reputed to have been divided into twenty-one quarters and to have contained seventy-two mosques. Doubtless this is something of an exaggeration but it is certain that the first half of the 11th/12th century was the golden age of Bougie. The second capital of the Hammadids had inherited from the first. It had welcomed the intellectual elite, the wealthy bourgeoisie, the sages and artists of the fallen Kalifa. Life in Bougie was easy and free from austerity. The luxurious costume worn by the citizens, from the studied elegance of their turbans to their shoes, tied on with gilded ribbons, shocked Ibn Tumart, the future founder of the Kingdom of Rissani, and the student of the new masters went through hard times, encamped on the seaboard of the 'land of the infidels' without success. The city of the Hammadids must have been appreciably more spread out than the modern town, especially in the hilly section where the Plateau of the Ruins is situated. The names of seven or eight gates have come down to us. Some of these can be located: Bab Amalwan to the east, on the road leading to the Valley of Monkeys, Bab al-Bunud, on the site of the Fouka Gate, Bab al-Laws, in the same position, but lower down than the Bab al-Bunud. Outside the town, on both banks of the Soummam, stretched the famous gardens, planted in the twelfth century and restored in the thirteenth, the Badif, on the west bank, the Raff on the east. In 546/1152, Bougie was captured by Abd al-Mu'min and the last of the Hammadids set sail for Sicily. The ancient royal city became the chief town of an Almohad province subordinate to Marrakesh. Its downfall must have been painfully felt by its citizens. It is believed that the Almohads failed to win their affection, and one is tempted to attribute to this unpopularity of the new masters the choice of Bougie by the Banu Ghaniya, who landed there in the middle of the twelfth century in an attempt to restore the empire of the Almoravids.

Bougie was for the Banu Ghaniya merely an operational base. The Almohads were not slow to reconquer it and it remained under their rule thereafter until the collapse of the Almohad dynasty. From that time, Bougie and the region surrounding it became part of the kingdom of the Hafsids of Tunis. The remote position of this province seems to explain its rôle in Barbary from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries. This governorship, far from the capital, would have been bestowed by tradition on the heir to the throne, and, in spite of the distance, the army of Bougie on more than one occasion marched to Tunis to press the claims of a Crown Prince anxious to succeed to the throne without further delay. By virtue of its position as a frontier province, Bougie was coveted by the 'Abd al-Wadid sultans of Tlemcen, who attempted several times, though without success, to conquer it.

At the same time, Bougie remained an opulent mercantile town, into which Venetians, Pisans, Genoese, Marseillais and Catalans imported merchandise made in Europe and from which they exported local products, especially candied peel, wax, alum, lead and raisins. Meanwhile to the profits of trading were added the sometimes richer prizes of privateering. According to a famous work by Ibn Khaldûn (Hist. des Berberes, i, 619, trans., iii, 117), piracy from the year 761/1360 was carried out according to a well-tried method and with remarkable success.

The attack on the town and its capture by Pedro of Navarre in 916/1550 were entirely in the nature of reprisals. Bougie, now a Spanish town, remained so until 962/1555. During these forty-five years, its new masters went through hard times, encamped on the seaboard of the 'land of the infidels' without normal contact with the hinterland, threatened by the Berber mountain tribes and at the same time dreading the Barbary Corsairs who were blockading the coast. After a heroic stand, Don Luis de Peralta had to surrender the area, which had become terribly impoverished.

Bougie, subjected to the mistrustful authority of the Algerian Turks who kept in their own hands the practice and profits of privateering, was unable to recover from this decline. The town retained somewhat little importance by virtue of the karasta, the exploitation of timber for ship-building, which the masters of the Regency had supervised by
a local religious chieftain of the Amokran family. But the town profited little from this activity. "In Bollodh (Bol) were found the treasure room and the library, and the stone work is falling into ruins, for the Turks keep nothing in repair". In 1833, when the French troops, commanded by General Trezel, entered the town, it was nothing more than a rather sorry city of barely two thousand inhabitants guarded by a hundred and fifty janissaries.


BIDJNAWR (Bijnor), a town and district in the Rohilkhand division of the Indian State of Uttar Pradesh. The district has an area of 1,867 square miles with a population of 984,196, of which 36% are Muslims. The town has a population of 30,646 (1951 Census). Little is known of the district's early history. In 1399 it was ravaged by Timur. Under Akbar it formed part of the sarkar of Sambhal in the sāba of Dihd. During the decline of Mughal power it was overthrown by Rohillas under 'All Muḥammad. It contains the town of Nadžibbābūd founded about 1750 by Nagīb al-Dawla who became māsrīr of Dihd and whose son was the Rohilla leader Zābita Kāh. After the defeat of the Rohillas in 1764, Bidinawār was incorporated in Awadh. It was ceded to the British in 1801. During the 1875 insurrections Ḍaḥmā Kāh, a grandson of Zābita Kāh, was one of the formidable opponents of the British.

Bibliography: H. R. Nevill, Bijnor Gazetteer, Allahābād 1908. (C. Collin Davies)

BIDLIS (Bitlis), chief city of the wālidāt of the same name, in eastern Anatolia. It stands on the river Bitlis, 25 km south-west of the westernmost point of lake Van (38° 20' N., 42° 5' E.), at a height above sea-level variously estimated between 1,400 and 1,585 metres. Known to the Armenians as Bagesh (Paghash) and to the Arabs as Badlis, it is referred to as Bidlis in old Turkish works. The city is in a relatively wide part of the deep and narrow valley cut in the eastern Taurus by the river Bitlis before it descends to the upper Dījaẓra. The narrow and straggling streets, with their stone-built, earthen-roofed houses, are ranged one above the other from the valley floor, covered with poplars and fruit-trees, to the bare slopes of the hills. The quarters of the city are separated one from another by the main valley and its intersections, crossed by stone bridges. Although the picturesque aspect of the city has always been admired by travellers, its location gives it a harsh climate: summer days are excessively hot, winter is rigorous and long, with heavy snowfalls. Rainfall is also heavy (about 1 metre annually), particularly in spring, whereas drought is common in summer.

The valley in which Bitlis stands affords the only route across the Taurus from the Van basin to the plateau of Diyarbakr and the plains of the Dījaẓra. By this road, from time immemorial, caravans have made their way from the south to Erzurum and thence to the Black Sea; this was the route taken by Xenophon and his Ten Thousand. Throughout history the rulers of Bitlis levied toll on passing travellers and took care to maintain control of the plain of Mugh, which supplied the food they could not find in their own barren mountains.

When and by whom the city was founded is not known. An ancient legend tells that it was Alexander the Great who entrusted to one of his commanders, a man called Liš, the task of building here an impregnable citadel. When the building was finished, Liš refused Alexander admission. Alexander besought the citadel but failed to force an entrance. Liš then explained to him how he had carried out his orders to the letter. He was pardoned, and the city commemorates his name. The city played an important part in Armenian history, and is frequently mentioned in the old Armenian sources (Gelzer, Geogr. Cypr., Leipzig 1890, 168), which are however silent about the date of its conquest by the Muslims, recording only that the region of Daron (Mugh) was taken by them in 641. Streck (EP, i, 55. Bidlis) mentions Arabic inscriptions on the walls of the citadel, but according to Lynch these were destroyed without ever being copied. Muslim historians relate that Ṣyād b. Ghamm, 'Umar's commander in the Dījaẓra, after securing the surrender of Ārzān went on to Bitlis and thence to Akhli (Ahat). The Patriarch of Ahat accepted peace terms and attached Ṣyād's return the Patriarch of Bitlis agreed to pay tribute on the same scale as Ahat (al-Baladhuri, Futūḥ, Cairo 1901, 184; al-Wākidl, K. al-futūḥ, Cairo 1302, ii, 152-154). It was not long however before the region reverted to Byzantine rule. Mu'āwiyā subjugated it again, but after his death it was once more lost to the Muslims till the reign of Ṣāḥib al-Maklī, whose brother was attached to the province of al-Dījaẓra. In the 'Abbāsid period it fell under the successive Shaykhīd, Hamdānī and Marwānī dynasties of Diyarbakr. In the time of the two last-named dynasties, when Byzantium recovered the Euphrates basin, the Armenian King of Vasporkaran (Bāsūfījan, the Van basin) threw off Muslim sovereignty and gave his allegiance to Constantinople, whereupon Bitlis, like Ahat, became a frontier-city. The Muslim onslaught brought some branches of the tribes of Bakr b. Wā'il and Tāḥhib to the region, and under Marwānī rule various Kurdish tribes spread over these parts, notably the Humaydī, to which the Marwānīs belonged. Nāṣir-i Khusrūw, who visited the region in 1046, the year before the great Turkish invasion, states (Safar-nāma, Berlin 1841, 86) that Arabic, Persian and Armenian were spoken at Ahat, and we may suppose that the same situation obtained at Bitlis. Fāhr al-Dawla Muḥammad b. Dīlusay, whom the Sādūḳs appointed to govern Dīyarbakr in ton, created Marwānī rule and distributed their lands and fortresses to Turks. Bitlis was given to Muḥammad b. Dīmaḵ or Dīmāl, whose descendants continued to rule it until 1588/1592, when it was seized by the amir of Ahat. In 1207 both cities fell to the Ayyūbids, who settled large numbers of Kurds in the region. Though Ahat was devastated by Dīslāl al-Dīn Khrāzīmshāh in 1229, the cities
of Van and Bitlis began a period of prosperity, Bitlis in particular becoming an important centre of learning until the Mongol invasion. After the fall of the Ilkhanids, the Ruzheki tribe of Kurds established a dynasty at Bitlis, which managed to maintain itself, despite many vicissitudes, till the mid-19th century, having acknowledged in its time the suzerainty of Timurids, Kara Koyunlus, Aq Koyunlus, Şafawids and Ottomans. Sharaf Khan, a 16th-century member of this house (whose Sharaf-name, completed in 1596, is a principal source for Kurdish history) claimed descent from the Ayyubids, while his grandson Abd al-Allah Khan told Ewliya Celebi that he was descended from the ʿAbbasids. Ewliya's visit was in 1655. His observations include the following. The bādī was exacted from caravans passing through the city went to the Khan. The bādādi of the plain of Mush had been bestowed by Murad IV on the Khan for life; out of it he paid the warden and garrison of the citadel. On the other hand, the dīşaya paid by the Jacobite and Arab raʾidy of the city was reserved to the koli (administrative division) of Van, and was collected by an ağa who came from Van at the beginning of every year. Some 70 tribes were subject to the Khan. Within the citadel there were 300 houses, but half the area was covered by the ruler's palace. In the 17 city-quarters were 5,000 houses. In the environs were thousands of orchards, all containing summer houses. Of the mosques, with a total of 110 mihrābs, the most important was the Sharafiyya, built by Sharaf Khan. Tavernier, whose visit was at the same period, writes that the Bey of Bitlis recognised neither Shāh nor Pādīshāh, and could put into the field a force of 20,000 cavalry. At that time the population was largely Kurdish and Armenian. The Diwan, it is recorded, could put into the field a force of 20,000 cavalry. At that time the latter were in the majority. According to the Jesuits who visited the city in 1683, the nominal vassalage of the Bey to the Ottomans was preserved only in that he sent them tribute on his accession (Fleurian, Estat présent de l'Arménie, Paris 1694). The power of the Kurdish princes was not broken by the Turks till 1847, though the city remained a Kurdish political and religious (Nakşbandi) centre during the turbulent 17th and 18th centuries. On the establishment of full Ottoman sovereignty, Bitlis formed a bādādi belonging to the sandjāk of Mush within the great wilāyät of Erzurum, but after the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-78 it was made into a wilāyät to emphasise the dependence of the region on the central government. The area of the wilāyät, which was divided into 4 sandjaks—Bitlis, Siirt, Mush and Genç—was almost 30,000 square kms., with an estimated population of 400,000. According to Cuinet, the central sandjak, with an area of 5,500 square kms., had a population of some 108,000; 70,000 Muslims, 33,000 Armenians, 4,000 Syrian Jacobites and 1,000 Yazidis. The sādīname for the year 1310/1892-93 shows the population of this sandjak as 77,000; 46,000 Muslims, the remainder Armenian. Lynch, who quotes the total, says it ought to be increased by 13 per cent to compensate for deficiencies in the registration. For the population of the city itself in the 17th century no reliable figures exist. Lynch estimated it at 30,000 at the time of his visit (1898): 10,000 Armenians, 200 Syrians, the rest Kurds. A Russian source of the beginning of the 20th century gives the number of houses in the city as 5,100: 550 belonging to Turks, 3,000 to Kurds, 1,500 to Armenians.

The staple industry of Bitlis in the 19th century was weaving, with its ancillary craft of dyeing. Other exports of the city and the surrounding country included gall-nuts, gum tragacanth, madder, tobacco, honey and livestock.

Till the troubles of the end of the 19th century, Turks, Kurds, Armenians and Jacobites had lived side by side in Bitlis. The Jesuits who founded a mission there in 1683 had been well received by the Bey. In the 18th century an Italian priest, Maurizio Garzoni, lived and worked among the Kurds for 18 years. An American Protestant mission was founded in 1858. The insurrection of the Armenians, the measures taken to suppress it, and the Russian occupation during the First World War all contributed to a grave reduction in the population and to the disappearance of industry. The population of the city in 1927 was 9,050, in 1950 11,152.

Early in the Republican period each of the 4 sandjaks comprising Bitlis wilāyät became a separate wilāyät. In 1929 Bitlis was attached as a bādādi to the wilāyät of Mush, nearly 70 per cent of the population of which were Kurds according to the 1935 census. Bitlis was restored to wilāyät status in 1936, and is now divided into 5 bādāds: Bitlis, Taftan, Ahlat, Mutki and Hizan, with an area of 5,482 square kms, and a population (1950) of 88,422.

Bibliography: H. F. B. Lynch, Armenia, Travels and Studies 1898, London 1901, ii, 145-59; Ewliya Celebi, Seyyābname (ed. Ahmed Dbewlet); iv, 85 f.; Tavernier, Les six voyages, Paris 1676, i, 3, 303; Hadjdji Khalifa, Dīshānāmnā, (ed. Ibrāhīm Mutafarrika), 413; V. Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie, Paris 1892, ii, 521 f.; Sādīname-i wilāyet-i Bitlis, 1310 (first issue); Genel nüfus sayımı, 20. X. 1935, Vol. xlv, Mus vilāyeti. See also the two articles s.v. Bitlis in IA, by Besim Darkot and Mürkımın Halil Yunaq, of which the present article is a shortened conflation.

(G. L. LEWIS)
He died in Istanbul, soon after Selim, in Dhu 'l-Hijja 926/Nov.-Dec. 1520, and was buried at Eyyub beside the mosque founded by his wife, Zeyneb Khanun.

His great history, the Hādgī Bīkhūt (Hādgī Khalīla, ed. Flügel, no. 2131, and nos. 2152 and 14406), the 'Eight Paradises', i.e. the reigns of the eight sultans from Oghmān to Bāyezīd II, is written in the most elaborate style of Persian ircraft, avowedly on the models of the histories of Djiwuaynī, Wāṣṣāfī, Mu'īn al-Dīn Yazdī and Sharaf al-Dīn Yazdī. Though it was highly esteemed both by Sād al-Dīn, who frequently refers to it (cf. especially i 159), and by Hāmmer-Purgust (cf. i XXXII), it is still unpublished. It was begun in 98/1502-3 and finished in thirty months; the last political event described in detail is the relief of Miḍīlī in 907, but the latest date recorded is 912. The long Khadīma, entirely in verse, which was written in Mecca (cf. Rieu, CPM 2193), describes the civil war at the end of Bāyezīd’s reign; it concludes with a Shīkāyat-nāma, in which Hādī relates his misfortunes. A continuation (dḥayl) to Hādī’s history, covering the reign of Selim I, was written by his son Abu 'l-Fadl (on whom see Babinger, 95 ff.). A Turkish translation of the Hādī Bīkhūt was made by a certain 'Abd al-Bākī Sa'dī in 1146/1733-4 at the command of Maḥmūd; it is not altogether reliable (cf. M. Ẓūkūr in Iṣlām, XIX (1931) 138). The history of Kemāḏī Pāgādashā [q.v.], sometimes referred to as of Damlū’s reign; it concludes with a tfakk al-Yalṣīn, of Kemāḏī’s time.

He was made by a certain 'Abd al-Bakī Sa’dī in 1146/1733-4 at the command of Maḥmūd; it is not altogether reliable (cf. M. Ẓūkūr in Iṣlām, XIX (1931) 138). The history of Kemāḏī Pāgādashā [q.v.], sometimes referred to as of Damlū’s reign; it concludes with a tfakk al-Yalṣīn of Kemāḏī’s time.

The MSS in Istanbul, including autographs dated 919, and written to court, and Shāh Ismā’īl II, on his accession to the throne in 984/1576, conferred upon him the governorship of the province of Naḥāvīān and Shīrwān, with the title of amīr al-umard of the Kurds. At the time of the invasions of these regions by the Turks under Murād III in 986/1578, he joined the army of the victorious Khushar Pāgsha and in this way was placed on the throne of his ancestors at Bidlīs. In 1005/1596-7, he abdicated in favour of his son Shams al-Dīn Khān, and commenced the task of writing a history of the Kurds in Persian, under the title of Sharaf-nāma, a work in 15 chapters, of which the first of which are devoted to the most recent events and princes and the last (part 2) to the Persian and Turkish rulers of his time. This work was translated into Turkish first by Muḥammad Bey b. ʿAlāmī Mīrzā in 1078/1667-8, and later by Shamsī in 995/1684 (autograph MS. in the Bodleian). The Persian text was published by Veliaminof-Zernof (Sharaf-Nameh, or history of the Kurds, by Scherfel, prince of Bidlīs, published . . . translated and annotated . . . 2 vols., St. Petersburg 1860-2), and a reprint of the first part appeared in Cairo in 1931. F. B. Charmoy has translated it into French (Cherfel-Nameh, or history of the Kurdish nation, by Cherfel ou’dine . . . translated with a commentary . . . 2 vols. (4 books), St. Petersburg 1868-75).

The MSS in Istanbul, including autographs dated 919, and written to court, and Shāh Ismā’īl II, on his accession to the throne in 984/1576, conferred upon him the governorship of the province of Naḥāvīān and Shīrwān, with the title of amīr al-umard of the Kurds. At the time of the invasions of these regions by the Turks under Murād III in 986/1578, he joined the army of the victorious Khushar Pāgsha and in this way was placed on the throne of his ancestors at Bidlīs. In 1005/1596-7, he abdicated in favour of his son Shams al-Dīn Khān, and commenced the task of writing a history of the Kurds in Persian, under the title of Sharaf-nāma, a work in 15 chapters, of which the first of which are devoted to the most recent events and princes and the last (part 2) to the Persian and Turkish rulers of his time. This work was translated into Turkish first by Muḥammad Bey b. ʿAlāmī Mīrzā in 1078/1667-8, and later by Shamsī in 995/1684 (autograph MS. in the Bodleian). The Persian text was published by Veliaminof-Zernof (Sharaf-Nameh, or history of the Kurds, by Scherfel, prince of Bidlīs, published . . . translated and annotated . . . 2 vols., St. Petersburg 1860-2), and a reprint of the first part appeared in Cairo in 1931. F. B. Charmoy has translated it into French (Cherfel-Nameh, or history of the Kurdish nation, by Cherfel ou’dine . . . translated with a commentary . . . 2 vols. (4 books), St. Petersburg 1868-75).

The MSS in Istanbul, including autographs dated 919, and written to court, and Shāh Ismā’īl II, on his accession to the throne in 984/1576, conferred upon him the governorship of the province of Naḥāvīān and Shīrwān, with the title of amīr al-umard of the Kurds. At the time of the invasions of these regions by the Turks under Murād III in 986/1578, he joined the army of the victorious Khushar Pāgsha and in this way was placed on the throne of his ancestors at Bidlīs. In 1005/1596-7, he abdicated in favour of his son Shams al-Dīn Khān, and commenced the task of writing a history of the Kurds in Persian, under the title of Sharaf-nāma, a work in 15 chapters, of which the first of which are devoted to the most recent events and princes and the last (part 2) to the Persian and Turkish rulers of his time. This work was translated into Turkish first by Muḥammad Bey b. ʿAlāmī Mīrzā in 1078/1667-8, and later by Shamsī in 995/1684 (autograph MS. in the Bodleian). The Persian text was published by Veliaminof-Zernof (Sharaf-Nameh, or history of the Kurds, by Scherfel, prince of Bidlīs, published . . . translated and annotated . . . 2 vols., St. Petersburg 1860-2), and a reprint of the first part appeared in Cairo in 1931. F. B. Charmoy has translated it into French (Cherfel-Nameh, or history of the Kurdish nation, by Cherfel ou’dine . . . translated with a commentary . . . 2 vols. (4 books), St. Petersburg 1868-75).
(Said Naficy)

BIDPAY [see Kālīla wa-dīmnā]

Bigha (the Greek Βίγχα), a town in north-
western Asia Minor and now the centre of a hādād in the province of Čanāk-Ḵāle, is situated on the Kōdja Čay, i.e., the ancient Granicus, about 15 miles from the Sea of Marmara. At the mouth of the Kōdja Čay stands Kara Bigha (the πίστας of classical times), which is the port ("iskele") of Bigha. Bigha, under Ottoman rule, was at different times a sandjak of the eyalett-i Bahr-i Sefid (the province of the Kapudan Pāghā or High Admiral of the Ottoman fleet), a sandjak of the vilâyet of Khudawendīgār (Brusa), and still later a hādād in the Mutesarffillik of Bigha (the administrative centre of which was, however, not Bigha itself, but Kaʿl-ei Sulṭānyye, i.e., Čanāk-Ḵāle). The town had in 1945 about 8150 inhabitants.

(John V. Parry)

BIGHA [see misāḥa]

Bihāfrīd B. Farwardīn, an Iranian religious agitator who, in the later period of Umayyad rule—about 129/747—set himself up as a new prophet at Khawāf in the district of Nishāpūr. He gathered about him a large following and was put to death by his disciples on the orders of Abū Muslim in 131/749. Before this he is believed to have lived in China for seven years and on his return, to have revealed himself to certain people as resurrected and descended from heaven. Legend also has it that he pretended to be dead and remained for a year in the tomb which he had had built for himself. Enunciating his doctrine in a Persian scripture and claiming that he was in essence a Zoroastrian, he nevertheless adopted certain practices and prohibitions which seem to be inspired by Islam. Among these were the prohibition of wine, animals not ritually bled, and consanguineous marriages, the abolition of the sāmāna [δαμάν], the prescription of seven daily prayers to be offered up facing the sun, and obligatory alms-giving.

Doubtless, he intended by this compromise to give a new lease of life to his old religion. But Abū Muslim, incited to turn against him by the Mubādhī who did not approve of this reform and realising moreover the danger which this movement represented for the new converts, forced Bihāfrīd to rally to Islam and to support the ʿAbbāsīd cause. As, in spite of this, the reformer continued his preaching, he was later executed. Adherents of his doctrine, awaiting the return to earth of their master, were still to be found in the 4th/10th century.

(Samuel Ovendale)

BIHĀR, a province of India lying between 23° 48' and 27° 31' N. and 83° 20' and 88° 32' E., bounded by Uttar Pradesh on the west, Nepal on the north, Bengal and East Pakistan on the east and Orissa on the south; area, with Čhotā Nāgpur, 67,164 sq.m., population 38,784,000. The dialects of the predominantly Hindu population, Bhijpurī, Maṭhilī and Māghāl, are referred to as Bihārī, and are more akin to Bengali than to Hindi; the latter is, however, the official language of administration and education. The region is now of major economic importance on account of its coalfields and heavy iron industries.

Bihār—which takes its name from the now unimportant town of Bihār, surrounded by Buddhist monasteries (Skt. vihāra)—was in the British period from 1765 within the Lieutenant-Governorship of Bengal, later joined administratively with the now independent Orissa [q.v.]. This lack of independence reflects the position of the region—whose boundaries have only been formally defined in recent years— from the earliest days of Islamic supremacy in India, and its history is one of individual governors and towns rather than of dynasties and regions. Monghyr (Mungīr), for example, was taken during ʿAbīṭyār al-Dīn Muhammad b. Bakhāyār Kājah's raids on Bihār in 587/1193 and held by him under the Delhi sultan Kūth al-Dīn Aybak; it was annexed to Delhi by Muhammad b. Tughluk in 730/1330, belonged to Ḫiānpur (Jaunpur) from 799/1397, reverted to Delhi when overrun by Sikandar Lōdī in 893/1488, and was later held by the kings of Bengal before becoming subject to the Mughals. Parts of Bihār did form a separate administrative unit in the 7th/13th centuries (Shams al-Dīn Iltīmīsh established a governor in Bihār in 622/1225); under Akbar in 990/1582 it formed a sūba of eight sarkārs, subordinate to the sūba of Bengal. The capital remained at Bihār until transferred to Patnā by Shāh Shāh Shīrī in the 9th/15th century. The importance of the region was as a buffer between Awadh and Bengal until the Mughal period, when the emphasis was as a line of communication between them, as many fine bridges of the Mughal viceroys testify.

2. Monuments: There is no particular 'Bihārī' style of Indo-Islamic architecture. The finest group of buildings is at Sahsārām, including the justly famous mausoleum of Shāh Shāh (inscription of 952/1545) standing 50 m. high in a large artificial lake; its architect, Aliwāl Khān, had been a master-builder under the Delhi Lōdīs, but his treatment of
the octagonal mausoleum transcends any of the Lodl conceptions. Sher Shah obtained the fort of Rohtas garrison from its Hindu Rādīa in 946/1539, and it is attributed to the Dālānī Maṣjīdt; the reconstructed fortifications, the palaces, Habash Khan's tomb and mosque, etc., date from the viceregency of Rādīa Todar Māli, the long barrel-vault traversing the central bay of the Dīwan of this early Mughal style appears Mughal; Rādīa Todar Māli is known to have repaired the fortifications in 988/1578.

The two forts of Palmāw, built by local Cēro Rādīās in the 11th/17th century, were taken by the Mughal governor Dā'ūd Khan Kūrāyshī, who erected a mosque (1070/1660) and other structures; the Rānīwāl Shāh Darwāzpān, the tomb of Makhdum Monghyr has been mentioned above: the fort is reputed to have been built by early Bengal kings, but the style appears Mughal; Rādīa Todar Māli is known to have repaired the fortifications in 988/1578.

Bibliography: There are no primary sources specifically dealing with Bihār; for the various historical incidents involving Bihār see Cambridge History of India, Vols ii (1928) and iv (1937) (full bibliographies); also Imperial Gazetteer of India, Vol. viii, Oxford 1908, and, for local histories, relevant volumes of the Bihar and Orissa District Gazetteers, Patna c. 1930; some are revised versions of the former Bengal District Gazetteer.

For the monuments of Shēr Shāh Sūrī, see A. Cunningham, ASI Report, xi, 1880; Percy Brown, Indian Architecture (Islamic Period), Bombay n.d., Chap. xvi; H. Goetz, The mausoleum of Shēr Shāh at Sasaram, in Ars Islamica, v, i, 97; for other monuments also, ASI Annual Report 1923-3, 34-41, and (most important, with full descriptions and histories of monuments) Maulvi Muhammad Hamid Kuraishi, List of Ancient Monuments ... in Bihar and Orissa, ASI, NIS Vol. li, Calcutta 1931, 54-66, 139-141, 146-191, 197-202, 207-219. (J. Burton-Page)
Kubadh", a Sassanian king who reigned in the 5th century A.D. The districts bordered, to the south, on that of Kula, and on the Great Swamp of the Lower Euphrates. The three districts, sometimes referred to jointly as the Bihkubadhat, were those of Upper, Middle, and Lower Bihkubadh. The Upper district contained six sub-divisions (tassudi), those of the village and ruins of Babil (Babylon), Kutarniya, Upper and Lower Al-Talhiliga, *Ayn al-Tamr, and another. Middle Bihkubadh contained four subdivisions, those of the Badat Canal, of Marz and Barballsam, of Barusama, and of Nahr al-Malik. Lower Bihkubadh had five subdivisions, including those of Burat Badahl and Nistar.


BHURZ (Amir), son of Amir Rustam and, like him, chief of the Donboll. A loyal ally of the Safawids, he took part in the war between Shah Tahmasp and Sultan Sulayman al-Kâni in 1538. He died in 985/1577, at the age of 90, after having been in power for 50 years. His šâheb was Sulayman Khâlija. (B. Ninkite)

BHURZ KHân, son of Shaykh Bandar Khân, amir of the Donboll. He was known under the name of Sulayman Khân al-Thâni. At the time of Sultan Murad's attack on Adharbâjyan, he distinguished himself in the army of Shâh Safi. He died in 1041/1631.

*Bibliography:* *M. E. Zaki,* *Mashidhir al-Kurd wa-Kurdistan,* 144; *Târîkh-i Duwal wa 'l-imrâ' al-Kurdîyya,* 386, 387. (B. Ninkite)


On the basis of the existing work of Bihzad, one can assume that he was born during the decade 1450-60. Mirzâ Muhammad Haydar Dughlât, Dust Muhammad, and Kâdi Ahmad describe him as a pupil of Amir Rûh Allâh, known as Mirzâ Naḵkâš of Harât, the librarian of Sultan Ḥusayn Bâykarâ, who brought up the young orphan; the Turkish art historian Âli states, however, that his teacher was Pir Sayyid Ahmad of Tabriz; lastly Dowâhâr mentions Khâlîf Mirzâ as an artist whose style Bihzad continued (*Tûnsh-i Dâhâhâr*g, trs. Roger and Beveridge, ii, 116). He became recognised very quickly, and received great artistic opportunities through his first patron Mir *Allî Shâr Nawârâd* and, from some time before 893/1488 on, through the Timurid Ḥusâynu Bâykarâ, at whose court in Harât gathered the intellectual élite of the time with Nawârâd, Dâmîn and Khânândâr at their head. Bihzad remained in Harât after the dynasty was overthrown by Muhammad Khân Shaybânî (1507). Bâbur says that this prince had the presumption to correct Bihzad's miniatures. He moved, however, to Tabriz, the Safawid capital, with the latter's conqueror, Shâh Ismâ'il. The favour which he enjoyed with the latter is evident from the story told by *Âli* of Ismâ'il's anxiety about Bihzad during the campaign against Sultan Selim I, in 1534. The distinction in which he was held became even more evident from the fact that on 27th Dümâdâd 1528/1522 he was appointed head of the royal library and placed in charge of all the librarians, calligraphers, painters, gilders, marginal draughtsmen, gold mixers, gold beaters and lapis-lazuli washers. This document disproves the statement of Kâdi Ahmad that Bihzad remained in Harât until the beginning of the reign of Shah Tahmasp (1524). Under Shâh Tahmasp, Bihzad also received numerous marks of honour and was engaged along with Sultan Muhammad and Aka Mirak in the royal library. In the *Laid'ai-nâmâ* of Khâñ Sultan Muhammad (c. 927/1520; Brit. Mus. Add. 7,669, fol. 96) is a story which illustrates the aged Bihzad's manner of working: he took a Turkish assistant, Darwîsh Muhammad Naḵkâsh, as a colour-preparer, as his pupil and finally entrusted him with his own works. As other pupils are mentioned by Haydar Mirzâ: the portrait painter Kâsim 'Ali, Mas'ûd and Mullâ Yusuf; by 'Âli: Shâykhzâda of Khurâsân and Aka Mirak; by Kâdi Ahmad: Dust-i Dîwânî and the father of the painter Mu'azzafer 'Ali; he also called Bihzad a contemporary of Yârî Mughâshîb of Harât which is borne out by the fact that they jointly worked on the *Bâdân* of 893 H. in Cairo (see below). Kâdi Ahmad places Darwîsh and Kâsim 'Ali into a slightly earlier period than Bihzad, which would make the master-student relationship doubtful. Finally Iskandar Munshî states that Mu'azzafer 'Ali was one of his pupils. According to a chronogram given by Dust Muhammad, Bihzad died in 942/1536-1537 and was buried in Tabriz beside the poet Shâykh Kamâl of Khudjand; according to another tradition, he died earlier, in 1533-1534. Still another tradition preserved by Kâdi Ahmad has it that he died in Harât and that he was buried in the neighbourhood of Küh-i Muhktár within an enclosure full of paintings and ornaments. In the Yıldiz Library in Istanbul is an alleged portrait miniature which shows the aged Bihzad as an unassuming, apparently shy man in Safawid costume (A. Sakisian, *La miniature persane,* Paris-Brussels 1929, fig. 130).

The older sources yield little information for our knowledge of Bihzad as an artist, however much they praise him as the greatest of his age. Khânândâr's extravagant language seems to emphasise his great refinement, minute perfection and power of lifelike representation. Haydar Mirzâ compares him with his teacher Mirak, whose art is riper although not so finished; also with Shâh Mu'azzafer who seems to have been held in almost equal esteem, whom...
Bihzād surpassed, however, in control of the brush, in drawing and in figure composition, without attaining his delicacy. Kādī Aḥmad stresses his sense of proportion and he mentions the excellence of his bird images and that he was fluent in his charcoal drawings. Bābur praises his art as very delicate, especially emphasising the fact that he drew bearded figures admirably, while his beardless figures were not so good, and adds that he exaggerated the length of the double chin. Bābur’s successors on the Mughal throne were also among his admirers, eagerly endeavoured to get his works for their libraries and frequently mention the prices they paid (c. 3-5,000 rupees). His works had, however, already previously been collected, as some of his paintings formed part of an album of the Šafawīd prince Sultan Ibrāhīm Mirzā (d. 984/1577). Diāhāngīr is one of the first to mention the tradition, also recorded elsewhere, that Bihzād was specially distinguished for his drawing of battle-scenes. As a result of the general esteem in which he was held Bihzād’s name finally became proverbial. According to Kādī Andamir he should be put alongside of Mānī, the other traditional creator of incomparable masterpieces, while in typically Persian hyperbole, Kādī Aḥmad exaggerates this further by stating that Mānī would have imitated him had he known of him. All, however, hints that Bihzād’s success was to some extent due to the influence of his patrons. This presupposes intrigues and jealousies which may account for the fact that Bihzād is not properly listed in the account of Persian painters and calligraphers given by the Šafawīd Prince Šām Mirzā in his Tuhfa-yi Šāmi (M. Mahfuz-ul Haq, *Persian Painters, illuminators and calligraphers, etc. in the 16th century, A.D.*, in *Journal & Proceedings*, Asiatic Society of Bengal, New Series, vol. 38, 1932, 239-42).

Modern research has been mainly concerned with identifying Bihzād’s original works. It has been to some extent successful, especially since the London Exhibition of Persian Art in 1931 at which a large number of pictures ascribed to Bihzād were brought together. It is, however, not yet possible to isolate him completely from others in his artistic development and characteristic qualities, as a sufficiently large number of works have not yet been definitely attributed to his predecessors and contemporaries. The problem is greatly complicated by the fact that as a result of Bihzād’s fame his signature has been wrongly added to miniatures for centuries, be it for financial profit or to provide a collector with a page by the celebrated painter; or his works have been copied, including the signatures, either in toto or in parts, or they have been finished or restored after his death.

The basis for our actual knowledge of Bihzād’s work is provided by the paintings in the *Būsidn* MS. finished in Raḍāj 893/June 1485 in Harāt, in the Egyptian National Library, Cairo. It was written for Sultan Husayn Bāykara by Sultan ‘All al-Kāthī, illuminated by Yārī, and it has one double frontispiece miniature (with a now defaced signature) and four single-page paintings, dated 893 and 894. Two of the latter have Bihzād’s name in the architectural decoration, so that they could not possibly be a later addition, and 2 other signatures are so inconspicuously placed and modest in tone that they too seem to be genuine. As all paintings are in the same style and of the same quality, dated nearly universally as authentic works of the master. They prove to be the fulfilment of the Timūrid style which is shown to perfection. These paintings are most skilfully and harmoniously composed, also in relation to the inserted text units. Within the pictorial space which is treated according to the concepts of the period the none-too-large figures are well distributed in their proper numbers. The rich pigments are of a wide range and applied with a highly developed colour sense. They reveal that, on the whole, Bihzād seems to have preferred cool colours, such as blues and greens, particularly in interior scenes, but they are always balanced by complementary warm colours, especially a bright orange. All the units of the design fit into a decoratively conceived all-over picture which is perfectly executed. The branches of trees in bloom, the richly decorated tile patterns, and the designs on the carpets reveal in particular the artist’s decorative sense and the delicacy of his work. Its realism distinguishes it, however, from the paintings of the previous period. This is apparent in the iconography which is no longer purely of courtly nature and primarily devoted to the manly deeds and loves of kings; it brings in addition and on the same level everyday events (e.g., the odd behaviour of a drunken prince, the *ṣūdā* at a mosque, mares nursing foals in a stud farm, etc.) and shows also a concern for the activities of persons of lower social standing (a bawōš drunkenly chastising an insolent towerer, servants bringing food, peasants at work, etc.). Furthermore the figures are no longer mere types, puppets with mask-like faces, but are individualised and often shown full of spontaneous movement or with a sense for the dramatic. Even when they are shown in repose, their attitude is natural.

Since none of the other works connected with Bihzād has a safe signature, though some of them carry attributions dating from the first half of the 16th century, only their stylistic aspect—the perfectly executed combination of the decorative and the realistic—can serve as guide to other true Bihzādian paintings. Some additional help is provided by the custom of the period to work with stencils, so that individual figures known from a well established Bihzād painting can be traced in other, more uncertain works, although such a procedure could also have been done by a student. Unfortunately, our present ignorance of Bihzād’s paintings prior to 1485 and after 1500 leaves us in doubt about the master’s activities in his youth and old age. In view of so many uncertainties, it is natural that scholars have disagreed about certain attributions, but even if not all of the following works are by the master himself, they are at least from his school.


3. *GWādi*, written by Sultan ‘All Kāθī, Muḥarram 893/Jan. 1486. M. 4.4. Some of the miniatures are modelled on the famous *Mystics in Landscape*, but these have been accepted as authentic works of the master (e.g., “Ṣu’dāt and the youth of Kāshgār”) most likely by Bihzād. The drawings
of these 3 MSS. of 1485-86, if they are indeed by Bihzād, would represent the work of his youth, which has not yet quite reached the quality of the Care Bēstām MSS.

4. Double miniature “Sultān Ḥusayn Bāyḵārā with his Harīm and Retinue in a Garden”, ca. 1490-1495. Tehran, Gulistān Palace Library. Very close to Bihzād’s style, goes at least in part back to him.

5. Nīrāmī, Khamsa, text dated 846/1442, British Museum, Add. 25,900. 19 miniatures of later date, one dated 989/1583 which is the approximate date for 4 miniatures in Bihzādian style. Three paintings have small attributions probably genuine (fols. 121v, 161t, 231t), a fourth, unsigned on fol. 114t, (“Mādīnūn before the Ka’ba”) of such high quality that it could also be by Bihzād.

6. Nīrāmī, Khamsa, written for Amlī ‘Alī Fārsī Barlās, one painting dated 900/1494-95. British Museum Or. 6810. 16 miniatures attributed to Bihzād by Djāhāngīr and most likely either by him (fols. 32v, 135v, 190t, 214t, 225v, 233v) or by his students (fols. 27v, 72v, 93t, 106v, 128v, 132t, 144v, 154v, 157v, 175v).

7. Sharaf al-Dīn ‘Ali Yazdī, Zafar-nāma, probably written for Sultān Ḥusayn Bāyḵārā; according to a later colophon finished in 872/1467 by Sīrī ‘Allī, but six double-page paintings date from 1490s. John Hopkins University Library (R. Garrett Coll.). 8 (sic) miniatures attributed by Djāhāngīr to the early period of Bihzād. All paintings most likely by Bihzād, though in parts, possibly in collaboration with students; several show later retouches, probably Mughal.

8. Circular miniature “Fir and Youth in Landscape” in an Anthology dated 930/1524 written for Wazār Khānādā Malīk Ahmad. Washington, Freer Gallery of Art, no. 44, 48. The painting which may be earlier than the MS. closely paraphrases a miniature in no. 2. According to the introduction, the owner, a high official of the Šafawīd court, regarded it as a genuine work at a time when Bihzād was alive and connected with the royal library. It seems therefore to be a work of the master’s old age which would explain its weaker and repetitive character; alternatively, it may be a copy by a student, supervised by Bihzād and therefore regarded as his own work.

9. Single painting “Two Fighting Camels with Attendants”, Tehran, Gulistān Palace Library. According to its inscription this is a work by Bihzād when he was 70 years old. In 1017/1608 Djāhāngīr took it to be an authentic picture. A mid-15th century version of the same theme shows that this is much weaker than its prototype (R. Ettinghausen, Some paintings in four Isphahan albums, in Ars Orientalis 1, 1954, 102, figs. 3 and 63). Nos. 8 and 9 would therefore have to be regarded as possible works of Bihzād’s declining years.

Works mentioned in literature but not now known are: a Khamsa of Nīrāmī written by Mawlawī Mawdūd Nīghāpūrī for Shāh Tahmāsp, a Timūr-nāma written by Sultān ‘Allī Māshhādī, and the paintings in the album of miniatures for which Khwandāmīr wrote the preface and in the one owned by Sultān ‘Ībrāhīm Mīrzā.

Bihzād’s influence is first seen in his pupils, of whom some, like Kāsim ‘Allī and Aḥā Mīrah, almost attained their master’s level. In spite of the fact that and the change in style, this very soon under the Šafawīs, there was in the first three decades of the 10th/16th century a transitional style which shows many features of Bihzād’s work; a characteristic example is an “All Shīr Nāmah” MS. of 1526 (Bibl. Nat., Suppl. turc, 316). Harāt painters carried Bihzād’s style to Bukhārā where it became established at the Shaybahcourt. A MS. of ‘Abbās’s Mīhr-u Muḥāṣarī, copied in Bukhārā in 929/1523 is a good example of how much more faithful the Bihzādian style was preserved there than in Tabrīz (Freer Gallery of Art, nos. 32.5-32.8). Here the tradition of Bihzād and the Harāt school survived till beyond the middle of the 16th century. By the immigration of artists from centres still under Bihzād’s influence, the Harāt style and Bihzādian tradition were brought also to India.

Independently of the general development of style we find Bihzād’s miniatures and motives more or less faithfully copied down to the 17th century. “Dārā’s Meeting with the Horseherd” in the Cairo Būstān is found in Būstān MSS. of 1535 (Paris, Cartier collection) and 1556 (Bibl. Nat., Suppl. pers. 1187), and others. The “Fighting Camels” recur in many Indian and Persian miniatures, on a Persian carpet with animal designs of the 17th century (Berlin, formerly Schloss-Museum) and on a green glazed faience bottle of about 1600 (London, Victoria and Albert Museum), while as late as 1028/1619 and 1035/1626 ‘Abbās reproduces designs thought to be by Bihzād (Paris, Vignier collection and Gulistān Palace Library).

conquest one of the richest districts in the province of Damascus, one may mention, besides many sites renowned for their ancient ruins and cave carvings, the Umayyad residence of Ayn al-Djarr [q.v.], the straggling village of Karak Nûh, which was the Mamluk capital, and the little prosperous villages of today such as Zahla. The most important centre has always been Ba'labakk [q.v.] although in Mamluk times the authority of this citadel, which had for a long time commanded the whole of the country, had been considerably curtailed, and the neighbouring countryside, divided into two districts, had been entrusted to an independent governor. From that time, alongside the niyyâb of Ba'labakk there were two wilâyâhs, the Bîkâ' al-Ba'labakkî and the Bîkâ' al-'Azîzî.

The last name is to be connected according to Arab historians with that of a son of Salâh al-Dîn, al-'Azîzî [q.v.], and according to certain modern scholars with that of the ancient local divinity Asiys. Perhaps one can also see traces of ancient cults in the numerous popular dedications to which toponymy and monuments bear witness, and which evoke above all either the story of Noah and the memories of the flood, or the figure of Ilyâs, a hermit par excellence and desirer of the cult of Ba'âl.


BIBKASI [see BINBASH].

BILAD-I THALÂTHA, the three towns, a term employed in Ottoman legal and administrative usage for Eyyûb, Galata, and Üskûdar, i.e., the three separate urban areas attached to Istanbul. Each had its own kaçal, independent of the kaçal of Istanbul, though of lower rank. Every Wednesday the kaçals of the ‘three towns’ joined in the grand kaçal of Istanbul in attending the Grand Veizir. This judicial autonomy of the three towns goes back to early Ottoman times, probably even to the conquest. The three towns also enjoyed some autonomy in police matters, being subject not to the police jurisdiction of the Aga of the Janissaries, like Istanbul proper, but of other military officers.

Bibliography: 'Othmân Nûrî (= Osman Ergin), Meşelle-i Umûr-i Belediyye, i, Istanbul 1330 A.H., 299-300 and 1367; Gibb and Bowen 1/1 66 n, 111 n, 287, 323; 1/2, 88. See further ISTANBUL.

BILÂL B. ABI BURDA [see ABU BURDA].

BILÂL B. DJARIR AL-MUHAMMADI, Abu 'l-Nâdî, Zurayyîd [q.v.] vizier and governor of 'Adan. He was appointed governor of the city by the Zurayyîd prince Sâbî b. Abu 'l-Sûfîd at the time of his war against his cousin and co-ruler of 'Adan, the Mas'ûdî, 'Ali b. Abî 'l-Qâhir, 531-32/1136-38. With the death of Sâbî in 533/1138-39 his son and successor, al-Azzî, intensely jealous of Bilâl, intended to have him put to death, but died himself in 534/1139-40 before this could be achieved. At his sudden demise Bilâl had a younger son of Sâbî's, Muhammad, brought from Ta'izz, where he had gone into concealment from the hatred of his brother, placed him on the throne over the young
Figure A: "Entertainment at the Court of Husayn Baykarā". Left part of double frontispiece by Bihzād in a manuscript of Sa’dī’s Bustān, written in 893/1488. Cairo, Egyptian National Library.
(Courtesy, Egyptian National Library)
Figure B: "King Dārā and the Horseherd". Miniature by Bihzād in a manuscript of Sa'ādi's Bāstān, written in 893/1488.
Cairo, Egyptian National Library.
(Courtesy, Egyptian National Library)
Figure C: "Mosque Scene". Miniature by Bihzâd in a manuscript of Sa'di's Bûstân, written in 893/1488. Cairo, Egyptian National Library. (Courtesy, Egyptian National Library)

Figure D: "Battle Scene". Miniature by Bihzâd in a manuscript of Nizâmi's Khamsa, painted at the end of the XVth century. British Museum, Add. 25900, fol. 231v. (Copyright British Museum)
Figure E: "Iskandar and the Seven Sages". Miniature probably by Bihzād in a manuscript of Nizāmī's Khamsa, of 900/1494-95. British Museum, Or. 6810, fol. 214r°.

(Copyright British Museum)
sons of al-A'azz, and married him to his daughter. As a reward for his loyalty Bilal was appointed vizier of the new unified city, a post which he retained until his death in 546-47/1151-52. Following the accession of Muhammad b. Sa'da, Bilal was accorded the honorific titles of al-Shaykh al-Sa'id al-Mu'awfak al-Saddiq by the Fāṭimid caliph al-Hāfiz. He is reported to have amassed a considerable fortune while in office, all of which reverted to the ruler upon his death. Two sons of Bilal followed him in the office of vizier until the fall of the dynasty with the Ayyūbid conquest of South Arabia (569/1173).


BILĀL B. RĀBAH, sometimes described as Ibn Ḥāmama, after his mother, was a companion of the Prophet and is best known as his Mu‘ādhgin. Of Ethiopian (African?) stock, he was born in slavery in Mecca in the clan of Jumah, or in the Sarāt. His master is sometimes given as Umayya b. Khalīfah [q.v.] but also as an unnamed man or woman of the same clan. He was an early convert—probably of dark complexion, with a thin face and thick hair with full respect and honour. He emigrated to Medina, where at first he suffered from fever along with Abū Bakr and a number of Meccan Muslims. The Prophet established a tie of brotherhood between him and Abū Ruwayhah of Khāṭam, whom Bilāl later named as his representative for receiving his pension when he himself decided to campaign in Syria. As a result of this tie of brotherhood, 'Umar attached the list of African pensioners to that of the tribe of Khāṭam, and Ibn Išākh records that that was the case in Syria in his own days.

Bilāl became “official” mu‘ādhgin when the call to prayer was first instituted in the first year of the Ḥijra. He accompanied the Prophet on all military expeditions. At Badr he caused the deaths of Umayya b. Khalīfah and his son, both of whom had already surrendered, but their captor was completely powerless to defend them against the determined attack led by Bilāl.

Although best known as his mu‘ādhgin, Bilāl was also the Prophet’s “mace-bearer” [see 'Anāza], his steward (Khidrīn), his personal servant, and on occasions, his “adjutant.” The climax of his career as a mu‘ādhgin came when Mecca fell to the Muslims and Bilāl called the faithful to prayer for the first time from the roof of the Ka'ba.

After the death of the Prophet, Bilāl agreed to act as mu‘ādhgin to Abū Bakr but refused a similar request from 'Umar, and joined the campaigns in Syria, where he spent the rest of his life. Some sources say that he refused to act in that capacity after the Prophet’s death and called publicly to prayer on only two occasions afterwards—when 'Umar visited al-Djābiyya, and when Bilāl himself paid a return visit to Medina and was requested to call the adhākhīn by al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn. Both were moving occasions.

Bilāl seemed to have attained high prestige during his lifetime. An Arab tribe accepted his brother as a suitor in spite of his bad character, and (according to Tabāri, i, 2527) when 'Umar sent a representative to Syria to investigate the source of certain donations made by Khālid b. al-Walīd, Bilāl lent support to both the diffident commander Abū 'Ubayda and the Caliph’s representative, by himself removing Khālid’s turban and demanding an answer. When a satisfactory explanation was given, Bilāl restored Khālid’s turban with full respect and honour.

He is described as being tall and thin with a stoop, of dark complexion, with a thin face and thick hair strongly tinged with grey. The date of his death is given variously as 17, 18, 20, or 21 (638, 639, 641, or 642) and his place of burial is stated as Aleppo or, more probably, Damasc or Darayyā.

Bibliography: Ibn Hīšām, index; Ibn Sa'd, iii, 1,65 ff.; Tabāri, index; Balāḏurī, ii, 455; Ibn al-Aḥfīr, al-Kāmil, index; Yakūbī, ii, 27, 43, 51, 62, 158, 168; Mas'ūdī, Murādī, i, 146-7, iv, 137, 155; Ibn Ḥaḍārā, i, 336 f.; Usd al-Dhāba, i, 206; Nawawi, 176-8. (W. 'Arfat)

BILAWHAR WA-YŪḌĀṢAF, heroes of the Kitāb Bilawhar wa-Yūḍāṣaf (Būḥāṣaf), an Arabic work deriving ultimately from the traditional biography of Gautama Buddha, and subsequently providing the prototype for the Christian legend of Bartholomew and Josaphat.

Contents of story. To the long childless king Janaysār, a pagan ruler of Sollabat (i.e., Kapilavastu) in India, a son is born by miraculous means. The king names him Yūḍāṣaf (better: Būḥāṣaf = Bodhisatta). An astrologer predicts that the prince’s greatness will not be of this world; the king therefore confines the child in a city set apart, to keep him from knowledge of human misery. Growing up, Yūḍāṣaf frets at his confinement and insists on being allowed out. Riding forth, he sees two infirm men and later, a decrepit old man, and learns of human frailty and death. The holy hermit Bilawhar of Sarandib (Ceylon) then appears in disguise and preaches to Yūḍāṣaf in parables, convincing him of the vanity of human existence and the superiority of the ascetic way. Bilawhar spurns renown and riches, indulgence in food and drink, sexual pleasure and all fleshly delights; a vague theism coupled with belief in immortality is preached, but no specifically Islamic dogma advanced.

King Janaysār is hostile to Bilawhar and opposes Yūḍāṣaf’s conversion. In spite of the efforts of the astrologer Rākṣah and the pagan ascetic al-Bahwān, Janaysār is overcome in a mock debate on the faith and is himself won over. Yūḍāṣaf renounces his Islamic dogma advanced.

King Janaysār is hostile to Bilawhar and opposes Yūḍāṣaf's conversion. In spite of the efforts of the astrologer Rākṣah and the pagan ascetic al-Bahwān, Janaysār is overcome in a mock debate on the faith and is himself won over. Yūḍāṣaf renounces his Islamic dogma advanced.
TABLE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fable</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Georgian (Jerusalem)</th>
<th>Revised Arabic</th>
<th>The Bilawhar</th>
<th>Halla alternates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drum of Death</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Caskets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sower</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant and the Man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Chasm</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Friends</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King for One Year</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs and Carrier</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician and Patient</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sun of Wisdom</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, Wazir and Happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Couple</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Youth and</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beggar's Daughter</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowler and</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightingale</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amorous Wife</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demon Women</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources. The Kitāb Bilawhar wa-Yūdasaf is not a direct translation from any Indian Buddhist work, but a syncretic compilation built round episodes in the legendary life of Buddha; it embodies parables of extraneous provenance, including the New Testament parable of the Sower. The narrative framework contains sections reminiscent of such works as the Buddha-carita, the Mahāvamsa, the Lalita-tīrata and the Jātaka Tales. Note that in the authentic tradition, the Buddha had no teacher, however, the ascetic preacher Bilawhar figures in the fourth Omen, where the Buddha-elect encounters in Kapilavastu one who had become a wanderer “for the sake of winning self-control, calm, and utter release”.

Early clues to the story’s transmission to the West are provided by Central Asian Buddhist-Sogdian texts, where Bodhisatva is shortened into the form Petyeś, i.e., Būdhasaf, and by the Manichaean fragments recovered from Turfan in Chinese Turkestán. Le Coq published (SBP, Ak. W., 1909, 1202-18) a Manichean Turkish fragment containing the encounter of the Būdhasaf prince with the decrepit old man; the same scholar published (Türkische Manichäische aus Chotscho, 1, 5-7, in Abh. Pr. Ak. W., 1911, Anhang) and Radirov and Oldenberg (Izn. Imp. Akad. Nauk, 6th ser., VI, 1912, 753-3, 779-82) elucidated another, containing the story of a drunken prince who mistakes a corpse for a maiden, later incorporated in the Ibn Bābhūya version. Of particular importance is the discovery, communicated in 1957 by W. B. Henning to the 24th International Congress of Orientalists, Munich, of a fragment in the Berlin Turfan collection comprising portions of 27 couplets of an early Persian metrical rendering, in which the heroes’ names occur in the forms Bylasah and Būdysaf.

This fragment, containing part of Bilawhar’s exhortation to Būdhasaf and of the dialogue concerning Bilawhar’s age, is part of a manuscript written not later than the first half of the 10th century A.D. The occurrence of the Iranian name-form Būdysaf, as opposed to the Arabic Būdhasaf with -ā-, in the second syllable, shows that this version belongs to the earliest line of transmission; it has been tentatively attributed to Rūdaki (g.v.) or his school. These indications, pointing to a Central Asian environment and a Middle-Iranian language medium for the early development of the Bilawhar and Yūdasaf romance, are supported by Yūdasaf’s inclusion, together with Mānā, Bādāysān, Māzdak and others, in a list of false prophets condemned in ‘Abd al-Khāb b. Ṭāhir al-Baghdadī’s treatise Al-fārāk bayn al-firāq (ed. Muḥammad Badr, Cairo 1328, 333; pt. II, trans. A. S. Halkin, Tel-Aviv, 1933, 200-1). Authorities such as al-Birūnī (Chronology of Ancient Nations, trans. Sachau, 186-9) connect Būdhasaf with the Sabaeans, who were supposed to identify him with both Enoch and Hermes Trismegistus; Būdhasaf was also represented as having invented the Iranian alphabet.

Versions of the work. Among the books translated in early ‘Abbāsid times from Pehlevi into Arabic by Ibn al-Muṣaffā (g.v.) and his school, the Fihrist lists (305) the Kitāb al-Budd, the Kitāb Bilawhar wa-Yūdasaf (Būdhasaf) and the Kitāb Būdhasaf muṭraḍ. The last-named book survives a chapter of the Nihāyat al-trāb fi ʿAlhār al-Furs waʿl-Arab (Browne in JRAS, 1900, 216-7; Rosen in Zap. Vost. Od. Imp. Rus. Arkh. Obcheshka, 1901-2, 77-118). The first two are amalgamated in the Kitāb Bilawhar wa-Būdhasaf published at Bombay in 1306/1888-9 (Russian trans. by Rosen, ed. by Krakovskyy: Povest’ o Varaama pustnikhe i Yosaf tearetic indyyshm, Moscov, 1947). This Bombay edition is the fullest version extant: episodes introduced from the Kitāb al-Budd having been distinguished from the remainder, the original Bilawhar and Būdhasaf (Yūdasaf) story may be largely reconstituted, reference being made to the Halle abstract (edit. by Hommel in Verh. des VII. Int. Orient.-Cong., Semit. Sect., Vienna 1888, 113-65; trans. Rehatsek, JRAS, 1890, 119-55), the adaptation incorporated in the Shiʿī Kitāb thulal al-dīn waʿl-nīmaʿ by Ibn Bābhūya (g.v.), the longer Georgian Christianised version discovered in Jerusalem (Greek Patriarchal Library, Ms. Georgian 140: edit. Abuladze, Balavarianis k’art’uli redak’tebi, Tiflis, 1957), as well as to the early 13th century Hebrew paraphrase by Abraham b. Ḥasdai or Chisdai (see Steinschneider, Die hebr. Übersetzungen des Mittelalters, 863-7). The lengthy fragment of the Kitāb Bilawhar wa-Yūdasaf in the Taymuriyya collection, ʿAlḥālā section (Brockelmann, I, 158) has been identified by Stern as belonging to the same redaction as the Halle abstract; it supplies some of the text missing in the defective unique Ms. of this recension (notes supplied by S. M. Stern). The metrical version stated in the Fihrist (119) to have been composed by Abān al-Lāḥiqi (g.v.) has perished.

Note that in the Ms., the name of Yūdasaf is written in many different ways; the original Būdhasaf or Būdāsaf has been corrupted by addition of a diacritical point into Yūḍāsaf (whence Yūḍasaf) or Yūḍasaf, and thence Georgian Iodosaf, from which comes Greek Ioosaph, then Latin Josaphas.

Diffusion of the story. With its companion works, the Kāila wa-Dīmna and the romance of Sindbād, the book of Bilawhar and Yūdasaf was widely diffused in early Arabic literature. Note for instance the allusion in the Rasā’l Iḥyāʾīn al-Safāʾ (Cairo ed., iv, 120, 223) to Bilawhar’s fable of the King, the just Wazir and the Happy Poor Couple, in connexion with belief in immortality.

The Western Barlaam and Ioasaph (Josaphat) legend derives from the Kitāb Bilawhar wa-Yūdasaf via the longer Georgian (Jerusalem) redaction, wherein the heroes’ names appear as Balawbar and...
TABLE 2
Transmission of the Book of Bilawhar and Yuddsaf

Buddhist Sanskrit original
(relevant to Buddha-carita, Lalita-vistara, etc.)

Manichaean version
(Middle Iranian)

Turfan fragments
(Old Turkish)

Persian I: metrical rendering,
school of Rudaki
(Berlin fragment)

Arabic I: Kitāb Bilawhar
wa-Budhdsaf (lost)

Arabic II: metrical version by Abān
al-Lahiki (lost)

Arabic III: adaptation by Ibn Bābūya

Arabic IV: Halle abstract

Arabic V: Bombay edition, with
interpolations from Kitāb
al-Budd

Georgian I: Jerusalem
version, Life of the Blessed
Iodasap

Hebrew: Book of the
king’s son and
the ascetic
by Ibn Ḥasāy

Persian II:
translation of
Ibn Bābūya

Arabic II: Arabic III: Arabic IV: Arabic V: Georgian I: Halle abstract

Persian II:
translation of
Ibn Bābūya

Arabic II: Arabic III: Arabic IV: Arabic V: Georgian I: Halle abstract

Persian II:
translation of
Ibn Bābūya

Georgian II: The Wisdom
of Balahvar
(abridgement)

Hebrew:

Latin, Christian

Arabic, Armenian,
Old Slavonic,
and other
Christian versions.

Iodasap'; the Georgian was adapted and rendered
into Greek by St. Euthymius the Athonite and his
school about A.D. 1000. The mediaeval attribution
of the Greek Barlaam to St. John Damascene,
revised by F. Dölger (Der griechische Barlaam-Roman,
enm Werk des H. Johannes von Damaskos, Ettal
1953), fails to take account of the textual evidence
and is to be discounted.

Also to be rejected is the Ahmadī doctrine which
identifies with Jesus Christ the holy Yūz Asaf
whose shrine is venerated at Srinagar in Kashmir.
Many of the legends concerning the Yūz Asaf of the
Ahmadīs are simply extracts borrowed from the
Kitāb Bilawhar wa-Yuddsaf, with “Kashmir” sub-
stituted for “Kusinara”, the traditional place where
the Buddha died.

Bibliography: In addition to works cited in the
text, see: P. Alfaric, Les écritures manichéennes,
2 vols., Paris 1918-19; idem, La vie chrestienne du
Bouddha, in JA, 1917, 269-88; H. W. Bailey, The
word “But” in Iranian, in BSOS, v/2, 1931,
277-83; W. Bang, Manichäische Erzähler, in Le
Muslon, 1931, 1-36; Brockelmann, I, 158 & S 1,
164, 238-9, 322; Sir E. A. Wallis Budge, Baralām
and Iōasaf, 2 vols., Cambridge 1923; Chauvin,
Bibliographie, iii, 83-112; G. Graf, Gesch. der
christ. arab. Lit., i, 546-8; A. E. Krimskiy, Abān
al-Lahiki (in Russian), Moscow 1913; E. Kuhn,
Barlaam und Iōasaph, in Abh. Bayr. Ak., Philos-
philol. Klasse, xx, 1894; D. M. Lang, in BSOS,
iden, The Wisdom of Balahvar: A Christian
Legend of the Buddha, London, New York 1957;

Arkh. Obshchestva, 1889, 223-60 and 1897-8, 49-78;
S. von Oldenburg, Persiškii izvod povesti o
Arkh. Obshchestva, 1890, 229-65; P. Peeters, in
Analecta Bollandiana, 1931, 276-312.

(B. D. LANG)

BILBĀS, a confederation consisting, according to
C. J. Edmonds (220-222), of five tribes: Mangūr,
Māmūgh (I have rather heard it pronounced Māmāgh),
Prān, Sinn and Rāmk. The Mangūr of the mountains
are an important tribe who live in Persia on both
sides of the Lāwēn (the upper reaches of the Little
Zāb in Persia). The Mangūr of the plain live in
Irāk where they consist of two branches: Mangūr
Zūdī and Māngūr-a-Rūtā (the naked Mangūr). The Prān
have also one mountain branch in Persia to the north
of the Mangūr, west of the Lāwēn, and another in
Irāk. The Sinn and the Rāmk who had formerly
distinguished themselves in the cavalry of Nādir
Shāh (ibid., 145), were afterwards expelled from
Shāhriüzūr (ibid., 142-143) by Salīm Bābān (1743-
1757) and, fallen from their ancient glory, now
occupy five poor villages in Bitwēn near the Zāb. The
Rāmk are subdivided into Kečāl-u-Khiw Spīy
(bald and white hats) and Fakē Wāysi. Sometimes
classed among the Bilbās are the Udjàk who live in
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Irak above the Mangur Zudi, in 8 villages on the frontier. Minorsky counts the Odjak Kaššāf among the Bilbas but does not include the Sinn and the Rāmk. See M. A. Zakī (Khalij an-Naṣrīy, 391, 497, 447), on the subdivisions of the Bilbas tribes. In Wagner (ii, 116, 228) who had formerly (1852) visited the Bilbas, but who refers chiefly to Niebuhr (1766), Rich (1836-7) and Ker Porter (1822), some fuller information is to be found. He points out that when there is discussion on the affairs of the tribe, all its members enjoy equal rights of vote and veto. The blood-money if a man is killed, is 22 oxen. Adultery is punished by death. The girls are never allowed to marry men of another tribe, but the effects of inbreeding are diminished by the regular practice of abduction. C. J. Edmonds draws attention to the romantic character of the Bilbas girls but emphasises the real risk of abduction. C. J. Edmonds writes of the Sayyids of Bilgram, who outpaced their . . .


BILBAYS, a town in Egypt which, because of its site, was of considerable importance in the middle ages. Its name comes from the Coptic Phelbes and Arab authors, doubtful of its pronunciation, called it Bulbays or Bilbays as well. Situated on the natural invasion route, it was always the town's fate to be besieged by the armies which came to conquer Egypt. First, in the year 19/640, it was by the Arabs who were halted here for a month; at the time of the Crusades it was by Armenian crusaders, and armies often camped there; al-Ḥakim called it the 'gate of Syria'. It was, in fact, in the course of a formidable mobilisation against the Byzantines that the Fatimid Caliph, al-Aziz, fell ill and died there, and his son, al-Ḥakim, was invested with the Caliphate in the same place.

Bilbays used to be on the route of the mail couriers and to have a centre for carrier pigeons. Up to modern times it was the capital of the Sharqiyya province, but was supplanted in the 19th century by Zakākīzīk.

In the year 109/727 the financial administrator of Egypt installed part of the tribe of Kays in the region of Bilbays. These, about 3,000 in number, helped commercial traffic as camel-drivers and formed a troop which could be mobilised. The choice had fallen on Bilbays because the town was sparsely populated; the existing inhabitants were not harmed, and the tax receipts were not likely to decrease.

Bibliography: Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam, 59; Kindī, 8, 76-77, 94, 104, 180; Ibn Hawkal, 1, 144; Mukaddasī, 214; Ibn Muyassar, 48, 52 (in JA, 1921, 11, 104); Kalkashandī, iv, 27, xiv, 392, 396; Gaudfroy-Demombynes, La Syrie, 255-256; Pachymeres, Gesch. des Mazedonischen, 100; Moritz, ed. Wiet, iii, 188, 224-226, iv, 33, n. 1, 85; ʿUmāra of the Yemen, ii, French section, 133; Précis d'Histoire d'Égypte, ii, 83, 109, 130, 137 196; Histoire de la Nation Égyptienne, iv, 4, 57, 171, 195, 291, 359; and v a very full bibliography in Maspéro and Wiet, Matériaux pour servir à la Géographie de l'Égypte, 45-47. (G. Wiet)

BILEDJIK (the mazlum of Byzantine times) is a small town in north-western Asia Minor on the Kara Șū, an affluent of the Saṅkāyā. It is thought that the site of the ancient Agrilion (Agrillum, in the Feuinger Tables) lies not far from Biledjik. The Ottomans seized Biledjik from the Byzantines in the reign of Selim I (1475-1520), and during the reign of Bayārā (1520-1524) the town was occupied by Greek forces in 1521 and was not recovered finally by the Turks until the autumn of the next year. The population of Biledjik amounted, in 1950, to a little less than 4,900 inhabitants.


BILGRAM, a very ancient town in the district of Hardōī (India), situated in 27° 10' N. and 80° 2' E., with a population (1951) of 9,565. It has produced a remarkable number of great men. Abu Ṭạfḍīl speaks of the inhabitants as being for the most part intelligent and connoisseurs of music.

In early times it was peopled by copper-smiths (as recent discoveries have established), who were turned out by invading Ṭājputs from nearby Kannawādi. During the Mughal rule also Bilgram was a pargana in the sarkar of Kannawādi (Aṭṭān-i Akbari, tr. Blochmann, i, 434).

The town was conquered by Kālid Muhammad Yūsuf al-ʿUṯmānī al-Madani al-Kāzarīnī in 409/1018 for Sultān Mahmūd of Ghazna during his Indian campaigns. During the anarchy that followed the enfeoffment of Ghaznavid rule in India, it appears that the local Hindus drove out the Muslim ruler of Bilgram and reoccupied the town. However, during the reign of Sultān Shams al-Dīn Iltuḵī (q.v.), Sayyid Muhammad Šaghārī, a lineal descendant of Sayyid Abu Ṭạfḍīl, attacked Bilgram in 614/1217 at the head of a strong contingent of Imperial troops, and defeated Ṭāj-pūta Sīr, after whom the town had come to be known as Ṣrnagār, and the Muslims recaptured the town.

In 948/1541 a fierce engagement took place here between the forces of Humāyūn and Shīr Shāh Sūr, resulting in the complete rout of the former. In 1593 Akbar issued a jarmān prohibiting the public sale of wine and other intoxicants there.

The Sayyids of Bilgram, who outpaced their
rivals, the 'Utmaani and Farshawri 'Askari in almost all walks of life, attained fame in history as writers, scholars, poets and administrators. Prominent among them were: 'Abd al-Wahid Bilgrami, author of Sab Sanadil, 'Abd al-Dalili Bilgrami [see BILGRAMI]; his son Muhammad, whose tahkalilus was "Sha"ir"; Ghulam 'Ali 'Azad [q.v.]; Amir Haydar, a grandson of 'Azad Bilgrami and author of Sawanihi AKBari; Sayyid 'Ali Bilgrami and his elder brother 'Imad al-Mulk Sayyid Husayn Bilgrami, who was the first Indian Muslim to be nominated (1909) a member of the Council of the Secretary of State for India. Sayyid Murtadah al-Zabdi, author of Tadi al-'Arus, was also a native of Bilgram. Awaangiz is reported to have likened the Sayyids of Bilgram to the wood used in the Masjd al-Harum, which could neither be sold nor used as fuel.

Although the tahkalilus of Bilgram did not produce many men of distinction (except Ruh al-Amin), it invariably remained with them. It was mainly to vindicate this claim that Ghulam Husayn Farshawri who devotes lengthy chapters to him in his other of his tribe works their respective works (see BIBL.).

Bibliography: Ghulam 'Ali "'Azad", Ma'dhibr al-Kirmam fi Ta'irkh Bilgram, I Agra 1328/1910, ii (Sarw-i Azad) Lahore 1331/1913; Ghulam Husayn "'Thamin" Farshawri, Sharar'id 'Uthmani (MS Asafiyya 202); Ahmad Allah Bilgrami, Musaddidalis fi Ta'irkh al-Kudidi (MS); Wasi al-Hasan, Rawdat al-Kirmam Sha'dara-i Siddat-i Bilgram, Goraikhpir 1920; Muhammad Mahmu'd Hand, Tanbih al-Kalam fi Ta'irkh al-Bilgram, Aligarh 1930; Sayyid 'Dinmayd Sughravi Bilgrami, Dinmaydyiya (on the genealogy of the sayyids of Bilgram and Bahrab); Sayyid Muhammad "Sha"ir", Tabshirat al-Nasarim (MS); Sayyid Muhammad b. Ghulam Nabi, Nazm al-Lawi fi Nasab al-'Azad al-Din al-'A'li (MS); 'Sher 'Ali Alsos, A'rushi Sabhi, Calkutta 1808; Sharif Ahmad 'Uthmanin, Takhma'i Sharar'id 'Uthmanin (MS); Imp. Gaz. of India, VIII 234:5; 'Azad al-Din Pandin, Shadgar-a-Tayyibi (MS Asafiyya, ii no. 114); Storey i/a, 1183.

(AS. BAZMEE ANSARI)

BILGRAMI, (i) 'Abd al-Dalili B. Sayydi Ahmad al-Husayni al-Wasti was born on 13 Shawwal 1071/10 Nov. 1660 at Bilgram. He received his education first at his home-town from Sa'd Allah Bilgrami and later at Agra from Fad-adil Khan, one of the secretaries of Awaangiz. When Shah Husayn Khan was appointed disan of the sarkar of Lucknow he accompanied him there and remained with him for 5 years. It was here that he attended the lectures of Ghulam Naksband Lakhnavi (d. 1212/1741). He attained a high degree of proficiency in various branches of learning especially Arabic philology and literature.

He visited Deccan twice, first in 1104/1692 and later in 1111/1699 when he was appointed bahkki and wakil-nilgir of Gujrat (Sha'w Dawila). He held this job till his removal in 1116/1704. The same year he was, however, reinstated but transferred to Bhakkar [q.v.] with headquarters at Siwistan (modern Swhwan). In 1126/1714 he was dismissed, having made a curious entry in the official journal. It related to the raining of sugar-globules in the pargana of Djaot. He returned to Delhi where he attached himself to Sayyid Husayn 'Ali Khan Bahrab. He died at Delhi in 1138/1725 but his dead body was carried to Bilgram for burial.

He was the maternal grandfather of 'Azad Bilgrami [q.v.] who devoted lengthy chapters to him in his various works. A poet, primarily in Arabic and Persian, he also composed verses in Turkish and Hindi.


(A. S. BAZMEE ANSARI)

(ii) Sayyid 'Ali B. Sayyid Zayn al-Din Husayn was born in 1268/1851 at Patna. In 1291/1874 he graduated from Patna College with distinction in Sanskrit. In 1292/1875 he successfully competed for the Native (later Indian) Civil Service standing first in the whole of Bihar. Soon after he joined the London University for higher studies in geology, cartography, mineralogy and biology. On completion of his education he extensively toured the Continent. A polyglot, Sayyid 'Ali was well-versed in Latin, German, French, Arabic, Persian, Sanskrit, Bengali, Marathi, Telugu, Gujurati, English and his mother-tongue Urdu. For a number of years he was examiner in Sanskrit in the Madras University. In 1311/1893 he was awarded the title of Shams al-'Ulama' by the Government of India. In 1320/1902 he joined Cambridge University as Reader in Marathi. The same year he was commissioned to prepare a hand-list of the Arabic and Persian MSS, known as the Delhi collection, in the India Office Library. For several years he held various high offices in the former Haydarabad State. In 1909 Calcutta University conferred on him the degree of L.L.D. honoris causa. His fame chiefly rests on his Urdu translations of French and English works, notably: (i) Tamaddun-i 'Arab, a translation of Gustave Le Bon's work La civilisation des arabses (Agga, 1316/1898); (ii) Tamaddun-i Hind (Agga 1913), a translation of another work of Le Bon: La civilisation de l'Inde. He is also the author of Risala dar tahkik bidad Kallla wa-Dimma in which he critically examines the sources, editions, characteristics etc. of the original Sanskrit work. It was through his efforts that the Haydarabad codex of the Baddur-nama was published. He died suddenly at Hardoi in 1329/ May 2, 1911.


(A. S. BAZMEE ANSARI)

BILKIS is the name by which the Queen of Sheba is known in Arabic literature. The story of the Queen's visit to King Solomon (based on 1 Kings X, 10-13) has undergone extensive Arabic, Ethiopian, and Jewish elaborations and has become the
subject of one of the most wide-spread and fertile cycles of legends in the Orient.

The name Bilkis does not appear in the Kur'an but is current with Muslim commentators. Sûra XXVII, 15-45 reflects some of the principal elements of the Sheba legend and describes the sun-worship of the Queen, how a hoopoe (huhudh) carries a letter to her from Solomon, the Queen's consultation with her nobles, and the despach of presents to Solomon. When these are not well received by the King, the Queen of Sheba comes herself and, by a ruse (mistaking the polished floor for a pool of water), is made to uncover her legs. Eventually, she surrenders (together with Solomon) to Allâh, i.e. she becomes a Muslim.

Muslim commentators (Tabarî, Zamakhsharî, Baydâwî) supplement the story at various points: the Queen's name is given as Bilqis; the demons at Solomon's Court, afraid that the King may marry Bilqis, spread the rumour that the Queen has hairy legs and the foot of an ass. Hence Solomon's ruse of constructing a glass floor which the Queen mistakes for water thus causing her to lift her skirts. Solomon then commands his demons to prepare a special depilatory to remove the disfiguring hair. According to some he then married the Queen, while other traditions assert that he gave her in marriage to one of the Twabba's of the tribe of Hamdân.

In Jewish sources the combined narrative of Kur'an and Muslim commentators can first be traced in the 5th (?) century Targum Sheni to Esther where we find a most elaborate version of this story. This is further embellished in the 11th (?) century Alphabet of Ben Sira which avers that Nebuchadnezzar was the fruit of the union between Solomon and the Queen of Sheba. The fullest and most significant version of the legend appears in the Kebra Nagast ('Glory of the Kings'), the Ethiopian national saga. Here Menelik I is the child of Solomon and Makeda (the Ethiopic name of Bilqis) from whom the Ethiopian dynasty claims descent to the present day. While the Abyssinian story offers much greater detail, it omits any mention of the Queen's hairy legs or any other element that might reflect on her unfavourably.

Although the Kur'an and its commentators have preserved the earliest literary reflection of the complete Bilkis legend, there is little doubt that the narrative is derived from a Jewish Midrash. This judgement is based not only on intrinsic probability and our knowledge of the general influence of the Midrashic genre on early Islam, but is also supported by: (a) the curiously abrupt version of the story in the Kur'an which clearly presupposes prior development; (b) Talmudic misinterpretation (Baba Balâra 15b) that it was not a woman but a kingdom of Sheba (based on varying interpretations of Hebrew mikts) that came to Jerusalem (obviously intended to discredit existing stories about the relations between Solomon and the Queen); (c) the Ethiopic loanword sarâb in Sûra xxvii, 44 (cf. Nûldeke, NB, 51); (d) the probable derivation of Bilkis from Âlûlûs or the Hebraised Pîlbikûs 'concubine'.

In Persian art Bilqis may often be seen standing in water before Solomon. The same scene is depicted on a window in King's College Chapel, Cambridge.

Bibliography: G. Rösch, Die Königin von Saba als Königin Bilqis (Jahrh. f. Prot. Theol., 1880, 524-72); M. Grünbaum, Neue Beiträge zur sem. Sagenkunde (1893, 211-21); E. Littmann, The legend of the Queen of Sheba in the tradition of Aram (1917); E. A. W. Budge, The Queen of Sheba and her only son Menyelab (1932); L. Ginzberg Legends of the Jews (vols. IV and VI); The Queen of Sheba (The Times, 28 June 1954); E. Ullendorff Candace (Acts VIII, 27) and the Queen of Sheba (New Testament Studies, 1955, 53-6); idem Hebraic-Jewish elements in Abyssinian (monophyletic) Christianity (JSS, 1956, 216-56); D. A. Hubbard, The literary sources of the Kebra Nagast, 278-308 (St. Andrews University Ph. D. thesis, 1956).
terminus ante quem for the dating of the rock crystal object, the earliest of such termini falling within the years 973 and 982 A.D. Not a single one out of these 165 odd specimens—which include many chess pieces and other minor objects—bears a date, but two of them have inscriptions containing the name of a ruler, in both cases a Fatimid Caliph: a ewer in the Treasure of St. Mark’s in Venice made for al-‘Aziz (935/975-386/996), and a crescent-shaped object in Nuremberg, perhaps the head-gear of a harness, made for his grandson al-Zahir (441/1022-447/1036). A ewer in Florence must have been made for al-Husayn b. Diwbar between 390/1000 and 401/1011, during the reign of al-Hakim.

All these works in rock crystal are often spoken of as “Fatimid”, but quite a number of them must be of pre-Fatimid origin, and some of them may have been made at al-Baṣra.

The entire number of specimens referred to belong to the category described as manbaḥ; on the other hand we hardly possess any example of madrād work, unless we accept as such some of the faceted ewers that some scholars regard as Fatimid, while others think they were made in Europe (Burgundy, Bohemia, Sicily, or Spain).


**Billiton,** corrupted form of Belitung, island in Indonesia at about 108° eastern long. and 3° southern lat., a little larger than 1800 square miles. It owes its fame to its tin-mines, and it is probably for this reason that it is mentioned in Indonesian documents of about 900 A.D. A part of the indigenous population—less than 100,000 souls—was converted into Islam at the beginning of the 19th century. The population, numbering about 1500, consists of a settled negro race, the Kanuri, and the Guezebida, hybrids from Kanuri and Teda. These settlers have always been subject to the nomads who inhabit the neighbouring regions, first to the Touareg of the Air, then to the Teda. They cultivate palm-trees whose dates are sent to the Tibesti and to the Hausa countries; but their chief means of livelihood lies in the exploitation of the salt-works situated at 2 kilometres to the north-west of Billiton, at Kalala.

**Billit ton,** the title of a Turkish folk tale which gave its name to the oldest Turkish collection of such tales. Billur Koshk, the title story Billur Köşk (in the edition by I. Kūnos, cf. Türkische Volksmärchen, V, note 2, there is a further tale, Kehriš ule Yenemligi) and the farce Hırsu ule Yankesis ("The thief and the pick-pocket"). All of these have an oral tradition, and have only recently been somewhat modernised and brought out in book form. They have, however, lost nothing of their popular flavour in spite of their literary style. Numerous editions of this collection of folk tales have circulated in Turkey during the past hundred years, and since the writing reform in 1928, there have also been some in Latin script.

**Editions:** Billur Köşk Hikayesi, ed. Eminyet Kütübhâhenesi, Istanbul 1339; Billur Kösh Hikayesi, Istanbul 1928; Selâmî Müniy Yurdatap, Resimli Billur Köş Köşk Hikayesi, Istanbul 1940.

**Translations:** T. Menzel, Türkische Märchen I: Billur Köşk, 14 Turkish tales, translated into German for the first time, from the two Istanbul editions of the collection. (Beiträge zur Märchenkunde des Morgenlandes, edited by G. Jacob and T. Menzel, iii) Hannover 1923.


**Billima,** (Ar.) (in Tedaga: Togei or Taigeli), chief centre of the Kawar, a group of oases situated mid-way between Fezzan and Chad, on the main route from the Mediterranean to the Sudan. The palm groves extend for 90 kilometres from north to south, from Anay to Billima. At no point are they more than 2 kilometres wide. Billima is situated at the foot of a cliff which faces west; its base is formed by the marine layers of Upper Cretaceous, and its summit by the sandstone of the Continental terminal.

Although conquered by the Arabs in the 1st/11th century (expedition of Ḥāfa b. Nāfī reported by Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam), the Kawar was still partly pagan at the beginning of the 19th century. The population, numbering about 1500, consists of a settled negro race, the Kanuri, and the Guezebida, hybrids from Kanuri and Teda. These settlers have always been subject to the nomads who inhabit the neighbouring regions, first to the Touareg of the Air, then to the Teda. They cultivate palm-trees whose dates are sent to the Tibesti and to the Hausa countries; but their chief means of livelihood lies in the exploitation of the salt-works situated at 2 kilometres to the north-west of Billima, at Kalala.

These salt works are made up of about a thousand pits spread over about 15 hectares. The salt is mainly extracted in the hot season, from April to November, because of evaporation.

The pits are dug down to the underground water level (2 m.), the water is left to evaporate, a crust is formed which is broken with palm sticks, and the salt is deposited at the bottom. There are two main types of salt: 185, in the form of crystals which is...
not treated in any way and is used for human consumption, and the kantu, moulded into loaves in hollowed-out palm-trunks and used chiefly for the feeding of animals. The salt-works belonged first to the Koyom, a Kanuri tribe, who were driven back to the south-east of Kawar, between Kouka and Gouré; then, from the sixteenth century, to a Touareg tribe, the Kel Gress. Since the arrival of the French, they have belonged to the people of Bilma. The apply for authority to dig to the village chief who is master of the land, and exploit the works themselves, without paying royalties to anyone. All commercial activity is carried on during the autumn and spring, when the Touareg caravans bring in the millet, butter, dried meat, fabrics and cola nuts which are bartered for the salt. These great caravans comprising several thousand camels, with growing security have been replaced by smaller individual caravans, which are tending to get smaller still, following the infiltration into Nigeria of sea-water salt and European salt, but the family bartering system remains unchanged; only the rate of exchange varies from year to year.

Bibliography: Barth, Reisen, iv, ch. 6; Rohlfs, Quer durch Africa, i; Nachtigal, Sahara und Sudan, i; Monteil, De St Louis a Tripoli par le Tchad, ch. xiii; Gabriel, Notes sur Bilma et les oasis environnantes, in Revue Coloniale, 1907, 361-386; Cne. Grandin, Notes sur l'industrie et le commerce du sel au Kawar, et en Agram, in Bul. IFAN, xiii/2, 1951, 488-533; J. Chapelle, Nomades noirs du Sahara. (R. Capot-Rey)

BILMEDDE, the name given as a rule to popular riddles among the Ottoman Turks. Northern and eastern Turks use instead various words from the root tap- (‘to find’), such as tablkam, tapmadj, tapfrlsh, tabishkak, tabushturmak.

The true riddles of the people can generally be distinguished from artificial riddles such as the lughas or mu'ammd by their obviously simple form, their puns or double meanings, and their appearance of unreason or illogicality. This last characteristic of riddles, their irrationality, is manifested in this way: when speaking of various objects and happenings, certain traditional expressions are employed which have only a vague connexion with the ordinary natural way of looking at things, and which must be known before the meaning can be grasped. That is to say, it is not generally possible to find the solution to a riddle by using one's logical judgement. To solve a riddle, one must first comprehend the sense of the peculiar terminology, which has something of the quality of a hieroglyph. None of these features is peculiar to popular Turkish riddles. The riddles of any given people differ from those of any other only in details, usually of form. The specially Turkish character of the bilmedde is primarily bound up with geographical location and Turkish popular life. Broadly speaking, the Islamic stamp is secondary and unimportant.

At the present time, riddles chiefly constitute the branch of Turkish popular literature that is peculiar to children. Nevertheless, we have evidence suggesting that once upon a time they were regarded very seriously and formed a part of popular philosophy: we find stories in which riddling contests occur, with one man quoting a hemistich and his opponent capping it with another, sometimes with serious consequences for the defeated party. So too the existence of riddles relating to cosmology and sex shows clearly that these were not originally invented for children. With the change in their social role, riddles underwent considerable modification and took on new meanings. Indeed the solution of riddles is usually a shifting and fluid element in them.

Riddles are mostly in the form of a short proposition: consider for example this riddle, known to have existed as early as the 14th century and still widespread today: yer altinda yagilfl kast7k ('oily sliding underground') = 'snake'. Most of the popular riddles consist of two parts which are assonant or half-rhyming because of the syntactical balance between them: Allah yapar yapismi—bliak alar kaptiini ('God builds its structure, the knife opens its door') = 'water-melon'. Riddles of this pattern are often extended into regular quatrains (maw', a characteristic form of Turkish popular verse. Paronomasia and onomatopoeia abound.

A comparative examination of material so far collected shows that the various groups into which riddles may be classified are all variants of certain primitive types. In fact, because of the alterations incidental to the process of being passed orally from one person to another, and because they are consciously adjusted to suit new solutions, riddles are subject to constant change. This entails a wide-nigh infinite increase in the number of variants. Nevertheless there are some riddles which have changed neither their form nor their solution for centuries.

As early as Mahmud Kâshgari's Divan Lughat al-Turk (11th century) we find riddles, under the names tabusghu neng, tabusghuk and tabusgh. But the oldest known examples of Turkish popular riddles are found in the Codex Cumanicus and have formed the subject of numerous publications (G. Kuhn, Codex Cumanicus, Budapest 1880, 143-157, 236 foll.; W. Radloff, Das Turkische Sprachmaterial des C. C. (Mém. de l'Acad. de St. Petersbourg, 1887, xxxv, 2 foll., no. 6); W. Bang, Über die Rätsel des C. C. (SBPr. Ak. W., 1912, xxxi, 334-353); J. Németh, Die Rätsel des C. C. (ZDMG, 1913, lxvii, 577-608); S. E. Malov, K istorii i kritike C. C. (Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR, literary section, 1930, 348-375); J. Németh, Zu den Rätseln des C. C. (KCA, ii, 366 foll.).

There are also a good many collections of riddles recorded by contemporary scholars, but these are far from having exhausted the rich store existing among the Turkish peoples.

Bibliography: A. N. Samoylovitch, Zagadki sâhaspiyitskh Turkmencov (Zivaya Starina, 1909), 28-32. He has published a bibliography of studies of riddles of the Turkish peoples till 1932. This (RO, iv, 4 f.; till 1926) has been completed by Malov. For bibliography of Ottoman riddles see Kowalski's article Türkische Volksrätsel aus Nordbulgarien (Festschrift für G. Jacob, 1930 f. (till 1932). Important collections of Turkish riddles: I. Küno, Osmanlıdâlp nêphêlîcê zuytêmeny, Budapest 1889, ii, 147-177; T. Kowalski, Zagadki ludowe twerce, Krakow 1919; Sa'd al-Din Nuzhet and Ahmed Ferid, Konya wîlayeti khalîkiyât we harîhiyât, Konya 1926, 225-233; Hamamâ-zade Ihsan, Bilmedeler (articles on Turkish folklore), iii, Istanbul 1930; T. Kowalski, Türkische Volksrätsel aus Kleinasien, (ARO 1932, iv, 295-334).

BIMARÎSTân, often contracted to birîstân, from Persian bimar ‘sick’ + the suffix -istân denoting place, a hospital. In modern usage bimarîstân is applied especially to a lunatic asylum.
i. Early period and Muslim East.

According to the Arabs themselves (cf. Makrizi, Khitat, ii, 405), the first hospital was founded either by Mansurids, a mythical king of Egypt, or by Hippocrates, the latter of whom is said to have made for the sick in a garden near his house a *xenodokeion*, literally 'lodging for strangers'. The authority for this statement is given by Ibn Abi Uwaysiya ('Uyûn, ed. Müller, i, 26-27) as Book 3 of Galen's *Fi ahâdîk al-mafs* (Peri Ethôn), a work which has not survived in Greek. Since hospitals were not a feature of life in classical antiquity, the question of origin is not solved by these indications.

Al-Wald I (Caliph 86-96/705-715) is credited with having been the first to build a *maristân* in Islam, placing in it doctors and assigning them stipends (Makrizi, loc. cit.), but although this is stated in similar terms ('hospitals for the sick') by so early a writer as Ibn al-Fakhri circa 289-902 (106-107), the fact is open to doubt. According to al-Tabari (ii, 1196), Al-Wald restrained the lepers from going out among the people and assigned them stipends, — a bare statement somewhat amplified in another passage (ii, 1271), where al-Tabari mentions that Al-Wald 'gave donations to the lepers, telling them not to beg from the people and assigned to every cripple a servant and to every blind person a guide'. Ibn al-Ahîr (sub anno 88/702) has a short notice to the same effect, and al-Dhahabi adds that the servants and guides were slaves (Ta'rikh al-Islâm, iv, 67). It would seem that we have to do here with measures of segregation, somewhat as in Muslim Spain later, where a whole quarter at Kûrtuba (Cordova) was known as *Râbaâd al-Mârad, 'Suburb of the Sick' (cf. E. Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. mus., iii, 381-382, 434).

The establishment of the first real hospital in Islam depended on the continuing influence of the medical school and hospital at Dûndasbûr (Djundishapur) in Khûrâstân. Founded under the Sâsânids, this institution maintained its Syro-Persian and Indian, ultimately Greek, traditions, into the Arab period and from the time of the transference of the capital to al- lrâk exercised a profound effect on the development of Arabic medicine. As far as hospitals are concerned, contact with Dûndasbûr bore fruit in the reign of Hârûn al-Râshîd (170/786-193/809), who charged Djûbîrî b. Bahlîlî, a Christian doctor of that school, with the creation of a *bîmaristân* in Baghdad. At the same time a skilled dispenser in the *bîmaristân* at Dûndasbûr was sent to Baghdad. This man's son, Yûhânnâ (Yahyâ) b. Mâsâwây, afterwards became head of the new *bîmaristân* (Ibn al-Kîfî, Ta'rikh al-Hukmândî, ed. Lippert, 383-384; Ibn Abi Usâybi'â, i, 174-175). The original Baghdad hospital was situated in the S.W. suburb on the Kârkhây Canal. It was there that, following the catholic traditions of Dûndasbûr, the Indian Manka at the request of Yahyâ b. Khâlid al-Barmaûlî translated the Sanskrit medical work *Subrusa-saṁhitâa* into Persian (Fihrîst, 303) and al-Râzî (Rhazes) lectured, according to some

How long the *bîmaristân* of Hârûn continued to function alone is not clear. From the beginning of the 4th/10th century or somewhat earlier we hear of a spate of new foundations in Baghdad: the *bîmaristân* founded by Badr al-Mu'tâdîdî, the *khulûm*, 'page', of al-Mu'tâdiidî (278/892-289/902) in the Mûharrmin quarter on the E. bank of the Tigris (Ibn Abi Usâybi'â, i, 222, cf. 214); a *bîmaristân* in the Harbiyya quarter, N. of the City of al-Manfûr, endowed in 302/914 by the 'good wazîr' 'Ali b. 'Isâ, who gave the direction of it together with 'the rest of the hospitals in Baghdad, Ma'mûr and al-Mârad, to the learned Abû 'Uthmân Sa'id b. Yâ'sûbî al-Dimîshkî, otherwise known as a translator (Ibn Abi Usâybi'â, i, 234); the *bîmaristân* al-Sayyida on the E. bank, opened in al-Mubarram, 306/June, 918 by Sinân b. Thâbit, who appears to have succeeded Abû 'Uthmân al-Dimîshkî as general interendant of hospitals in Baghdad and elsewhere (Ibn Abi Usâybi'â, i, 221-222); the *bîmaristân* al-Mu'âtirîdî at the Bâb al-Sâmî, built about the same time (Ibn Abi Usâybi'â, i, 222); and the *bîmaristân* of Ibn al-Furât in Darb al-Mu'âaddir, over which Thâbit b. Sinân is said to have been given the charge in 313/925 (Ibn Abi Usâybi'â, i, 224). These hospitals derived their revenues from endowments (waqf) made by powerful and wealthy individuals. The funds were in the hands of trustees, who were not always very attentive to their responsibilities (Ibn Abi Usâybi'â, i, 221). An idea of the size of the hospitals may be gained from their monthly expenditure: at *a* Mûktadîrî 200 dinârs a month; at the *bîmaristân* al-Sayyida, 600 dinârs a month (ibid.). Some comfort for the patients was secured by the provision of blankets and charcoal in cold weather (Ibn Abi Usâybi'â, i, 222). Efforts in this direction sometimes went much farther (see below).

We know less about hospitals in the provinces, but some certainly existed before the 4th/10th century. The *bîmaristân* of al-Rayy, over which al-Râzî presided before coming to Baghdad, where he died as head of a hospital about 320/932 (Ibn al-Kîfî, 272), was a large institution (cf. Ibn al-Kîfî, 273; Ibn Abi Usâybi'â, i, 310-311) and had probably been in existence for some time. A lunatic asylum at Dayr Hîtkîl between Wâsît and Bagdad was visited by al-Mubarrad in the Caliphate of al-Mutawakkil, i.e., between 232/847 and 247/861 (Masûîdî, Murûdî, vi, 197 ff.).

In the time of Sinân b. Thâbit, who died in 332/942 (Fihrîst, 302), on instructions from 'Ali b. 'Isâ already mentioned the prisons were daily visited by doctors, medicines and potions were provided for sick prisoners, and female visitors were also admitted, evidently in the capacity of nurses (Ibn Abi Usâybi'â, i, 221). At the same period hospitals and a travelling dispensary (khusûnna la ilâdâiyâ wa-l-âqîbara) were sent round the villages of the Sawâd (i.e., lower al-Irâk). From correspondence between Sinân and the wazîr concerning this mobile medical unit it appears that at this time non-Muslims as well as Muslims were treated at the *bîmaristân* (Ibn Abi Usâybi'â, ibid.).

At least some of the Baghdad hospitals which have been listed were probably still in existence when the great 4Aâdûl *bîmaristân* was founded at the bend of the Tigris in W. Baghdad by the Buwayhid 4Aâdûl al-Dawla. Al-Râzî is repeatedly mentioned in connexion with this hospital, which from the time of its opening in 372/982, shortly before the death of 4Aâdûl al-Dawla (Dhahabi, Danîl al-Islâm, i, 657), was the most celebrated of the hospitals of Baghdad. It is said that al-Râzî chose the site by causing a piece of meat to be suspended in every part of the city, and discovering where there was least putrefaction, and also that 4Aâdûl al-Dawla selected him from more than a hundred doctors as first chief (the word is sâ'îr, from Syriac) of the new foundation (Ibn Abi Usâybi'â, i, 309-310). But al-Râzî had died 50 years earlier. The explanation of the anachronism,
already noted by Ibn Abi Uṣaybi'a (ibid.), may be the similarity in the script of the Bimaristan al-
Abūdī and that found in al-Rāzi's lifetime by al-
Aṭāddīl (see above). When first founded, the ʿAbūdī hospital had twenty-four doctors (Ibn al-
Kūfī, 235-236). Several classes of specialists are mentioned: 'physiologists' (tabāṣīyyūn), oculists (ḥabbālūn), surgeons (dharrā-
ṣīhyyūn) and bonesetters (muḍājābātūn) (Ibn Abi Uṣaybi'a, i, 310). The salary of Ḏījbrā'īl b. ʿUbayd Allāh, whose turn of duty at the bimaristan was two days and two nights every month, is given as 120 dinars, i.e., monthly (Ibn al-Kūfī, 148). Lectures were given at the ʿAbūdī hospital (Ibn Abi Uṣaybi'a, i, 239, 244), and we know of some of the works which were read in this way, e.g., the Aḥrābādīn (Anti-
dotarium) of Sābūr b. Sahīl of Dūjdaysābūr (Fihrīst, 297, cf. Brockelmann, i, 232), eventually superseded by another work of the same title by Ibn al-Tīmīlihā, a later dean (sa'īr, see above) of the ʿAbūdī hospital (Ibn Abi Uṣaybi'a, i, 161, 239). When Ibn Ḏiubayr visited Baghdād in 580/1184 the place was like a great castle, with a water-supply from the Tigrīs, and all the appurtenances of royal palaces (Riḥšā, ed. De Goeje, 225-226).

Another of the great hospitals of mediaeval Islam was founded in Damascus by Nūr al-Dīn b. Zānqī (541/1145-569/1175). The Nūrī hospital is said to have been built from the ransom of an unnamed king of the Franks (Maḵrīzī, ʿAlī, ii, 408). Ibn Ḏiubayr (Riḥšā, 283) describes how the staff kept lists of the patients' names and the amounts of medicines and food which each required. A typical day in the life of a leading doctor at the Nūrī hospital included going the rounds of the sick and writing down prescriptions of medicine and treatment, visiting private patients, then returning to the hospital in the evening to lecture for three hours on medical subjects (Ibn Abi Uṣaybi'a, ii, 155). There was also a Nūrī hospital at Halāb (Aleppo) (Rāghbī al-Tabbākh, Taʾrīḥ Haḥāl, ii, 77).

In Egypt no bimaristan existed till Ahmad b. Ẓūlūm constructed one in 259/872-261/874 (Maḵrīzī, ʿAlī, ii, 405). Here the rule was that no soldier or slave should be admitted for treatment. The institution was richly endowed, with facilities for men and women. The Nāṣirī hospital was founded by Salāh al-Dīn, but the great creation of al-Maṣūrī Ḫalālūn, completed in 11 months in 683/1284, was the most splendid of its kind in Egypt, and perhaps the most elaborate which had yet been seen in Islam. The endowment is said to have amounted to nearly one million dirhams, i.e., 283,000 lira (cf. Ibn al-Kūfī, 235-236). Formerly a Fatimid palace with accommodation for 8,000 persons, the Maṣūrī hospital possessed wards where fevers, ophthalmia, surgical cases, dysentery, etc., were separately treated, a pharmacy, a dispensary, store-rooms, attendants of both sexes, a large administrative staff, lecture arrangements, a chapel, a library, in fact all that the best experience of the time could suggest for the healing of the sick. The account of these matters given by al-Maḵrīzī (Maḵrīzī, ʿAlī, ii, 406-408) is an impressive tribute to the hospital science of mediaeval Islam.

Books were written about hospitals, e.g., the Kitāb fi ṣīḥāt al-bimarīsānīn of al-Rāzī (Ibn Abi Uṣaybi'a, i, 310), the Bimarīsānīnī par excellence (cf. Ibn al-Kūfī, 72). On the other hand, Ibn Ḏiubayr, ed. Fel.'du Sāyīd, 77, which, like the Kitāb al-bimarīsānīn of Ẓāhid al-Ulāmī, al-Fārīḵī, head of a flourishing hospital in Mesopotamia in the 5th/6th century (Ibn Abi Uṣaybi'a, i, 253), is now lost. Somewhat different are the Maḥbūba al-miṣriyya fi l-ʿdāwiya al-bimarīsānīn (also known as Ibn al-Tīmīlīhā, and the Description de l'Afrique, ed. Defremery and Sanguinetti, iv, 157). The endowment is said to have amounted to nearly one million dirhams, i.e., one million lira (cf. Leo Africanus, 154; trans. Beaumier, 306). The famous Almohad hospital at Marrakūṣh by the Almohad sultan Yaḥṣūb al-Manṣūr (380-95/1184-99) about a hundred years before the establishment of the famous hospital at Cairo. The sultan was a great builder and, after attracting to his court the most celebrated Spanish doctors of his time: Ibn Ṭūfāyīn, Ibn Rūshd, Ibn Iza b. Ḥaḥīd, and his son, he built in his capital, for sick foreigners both rich and poor, a magnificent hospital of which there is a description by ʿAbd al-Wāḥīd al-Marrākūṣhī (cf. al-Muṣṭaqīm, ed. Mohammed El-Fassi, 1938, 176-177). The same sultan also founded, in various parts of the empire, hospitals for the insane, for lepers and for the blind (cf. al-Kūfī, ii, 154; trans. Beaumier, 506).

The great Marīnī Sultans [q.v.], Abū Ṭūṣuf Yaḥṣūb, Abū ʿl-Ḥasan and Abū ʿl-Ḥanān, kept up these establishments and added many others (cf. al-Kūfī, ii, 214; al-Đaḥāḥira al-Saniyya, ed. Ben Cheneb, 100; Ibn Marrīk, al-Musnad, ed. Lévi-Provençal, in Hesperis v (1925), 36; Ibn Battūta, Riḥšā, ed. Defremy and Sanguinetti, iv, 347). At a later date, the ruling sultans appropriated the revenues intended for these hospitals, which consequently fell into decline or disappeared.

At the beginning of the 10th/16th century, Leo Africanus described the hospital at Fez as being in total decline and used primarily as a prison for dangerous lunatics. This is still its function, and it is also used as a prison for women (cf. Leo Africanus, Description de l’Afrique, trans. Schefer, ii, 78; trans. Épaludar i, 188; Le Tourneau, Fes, 255-257).

The famous Almohad hospital at Marrākūṣh seems to have disappeared without leaving any traces, and the hospital founded there by the Saʿdīd sultan ʿAbd Allāh al-Ghālib bi-l-Ilāh (965-8/1557-74) became a prison for women (cf. al-Nāṣirī, Kitāb al-Iṣtibād, trans. v, 63).

In 1247/1831-32, the ʿAlawīd sultan Mawlay ʿAbd al-Raḥmān built at Salā a hospital attached to the
sanctuary of Sayyid Ib'n 'Ashîr. This hospital, which is still in use, dispensed with doctors; instead, the sick relied for their cure upon the *burâba* of the same. The memory of old hospitals which have disappeared or fallen into disuse is preserved in some towns of Morocco, for example in Rabat and El-Ksar (cf. L. Brunot, *Textes arabes de Rabat*, ii: Glossary, 753), and also in Tangiers.

Leapers (plural *dâqâhîma*, or, euphemistically, *mardî*) were usually placed in a special quarter, called *al-hâra*, outside the towns. At Fez, they were originally settled outside Bab al-Khawkha, on the Tlemcen road. During the first half of the thirteenth century they were removed to coves outside Bab al-Sharîf. Then, in 658/1260, they were installed in other coves outside Bab al-Gisa. At the beginning of the 10th/16th century they lived in a town near the Sûk al-Khamis (cf. *al-Kirîs*: ed. Rabat 1936, i, 53-54; Leo Africanus, *Description de l'Africque*, trans. Épaulard, i, 229). At Marrâkîs, the *hâra* was originally outside Bab Âghmût, until, at the end of the 10th/16th century, the Sa'dîd sultan al-Manṣûr removed it to outside Bab Dukkâla.

At Tunis, the Hâfîsîd Sultan, Abû Fâris, founded the first hospital "for poor, foreign or infirm Muslims", completed in 823/1420 (cf. al-Zarkaşî, *Ta'rîkh al-Dawlatayn*, ed. Rabat 1929, 102). At Granada, the Naṣîrîd sultan Mu'âmmâd V, built a splendid hospital "for sick and poor Muslims", completed in 768/1367. The foundation inscription reads that "never, since the beginning of Islamic influence in these parts, has such an establishment been founded". Perhaps this is an exaggeration, for there were others, and in Granada itself. And, from the 7th/13th century onwards, the Valencia *Vocabulis*, translated *hospitalia* by dialectal and, therefore, living terms: *marastûn* and *malastûn* (cf. Ibn al-Khaṭîb, al-İhâ'a, ed. Cairo 1319, ii, 29; Lévi-Provençal, *Inscriptions arabes d'Espagne*, 164; L. Seco de Lucena, *Plano de Granada arabe*, 53).

A distinction must be made between "hospitals" intended for the sick and "hospices" or "night lodgings" (mansûl) intended for travellers. In the Muslim West, such hospices were established outside the gates of the big towns by most of the sovereigns who founded hospitals. They received the name *sânâyâ* [q.v.] (cf. G. S. Colin, *La saouâa mérino d'Amnîs, à Taza*, in *Hospîères*, 1953, ii, 1). Al-Khaḍârî appears to have repeated an earlier error in stating that the first *bîmarîstân* was set up by Hippocrates who gave it the name *išâqînudâkhîyan* (*Gîvôbôcêcîv*), "hostelry for foreigners" (cf. Shîkî 'al-Çhâlîl, ed. Cairo 1282, 56) (cf. above i).

The Moroccan author of the *Mu'âjîd* (cf. supra), writing in Baghdâd in 621/1224, is the only Western author to use the correct etymological form: *bîmarîstân*. All the others use a form, *marîstân*, which has lost the Persian preposition. Very soon, the word appears with the first *d* shortened. In the Spanish dialects, the *r* was followed by the vowel *a* (*Vocabulis*: *marastûn* and *malastûn*; E. de Alcalâ: *marastûn*), and this vocalisation is attested for Egypt in the 11th/17th century by Al-Khaḍârî (cf. Shîkî 'ed. Cairo 1282, 206). In present-day Cairo the word is pronounced *murastûn*.

In the modern dialects of the Maghrib, some velarisation has taken place in the word: *morsjîn*, the reason for the sound-change being perhaps affactive. In Tetuan it is pronounced *marjîrân*, and everywhere the meaning of the word is "prison for dangerous lunatics" (cf. W. Marçâs, *Textes arabes de Tanger*, 465). (G. S. Colin)
Sultan, mother of Murad III (982/1003-1574-95). This institution served as a hospital until 1927 when it became a tobacco warehouse. In the 17th century, Ahmed I (1022/1613-17) had a large hospital erected behind the old Byzantine Hippodrome near his famous mosque. The hospital was opened in 1525/1616 and has only recently been demolished to make room for a new school.

There was a recession in the establishment of Ottoman health and social aid institutions during the 18th century; but in the 19th century military service, styles of clothing, education etc. were modernised in the Ottoman Empire. In 1253/1837 the Qurban hospital was established in Istanbul at Edirnekapı in the Madrasa of Mihrimah Sultan. While this hospital was being modernised by Bezmi 'Alem Wâlide Sultan, mother of Sultan 'Abd al-Majid, new modern military hospitals and a medical school were established. These institutions were to meet the medical needs of the new army. A new school of medicine and surgery established in Istanbul in 1243/1827, by Sultan Mahmûd II (1223-1255/1808-39), began its teaching in Italian but switched to French with the coming of some good medical teachers from Austria in 1839. This medical school was enlarged by sultans 'Abd al-Majid, 'Abd al-'Azîz and 'Abd al-Hâmid II, and eventually included a rabies institute, a bacteriological institute and an inoculation centre. A number of physicians having knowledge of European languages and modern medical methods graduated from this school. They went to Anatolia and founded modern hospitals there. Immunisations against rabies and smallpox were started here nearly at the same time as they were begun in Europe. The Ottoman Government was one of those which helped to found the Pasteur Institute.

Shişli children’s hospital, which is one of the largest hospitals in Istanbul, was established by Sultan 'Abd al-Hamîd II, in 1316/1898.

These hospitals were the most important of the Ottoman Empire and although there are many others to be found throughout Turkey, space does not permit their inclusion. In five centuries the Turks established nearly seventy hospitals in Istanbul alone. (BEDI N. ŞEHİTVAHLEDİ)

BİNA, building, the art of the builder or mason. Building techniques depend partly on the materials used. In the Islamic countries we find very widely differing materials employed, from rammed earth to ashlar, with unbaked and baked brick, rubble and rough-hewn stone as intermediary stages. The choice of one of these materials depends on the resources of a given country, or the lack of them, but as well as this on local traditions or traditions brought in by foreign builders, which may for a time supplant local ones. Thus Syria, where the art of stone-cutting had long been known, reproduces in stone the complicated forms of the mukarnas (= stalactites) which were borrowed from Persia and probably derive from brick architecture. And on the other hand Egypt, whose quarries had yielded such fine free-stone, uses brick at the time of the Tulunids, they are taking their models and no doubt their chief architects from 'Irak, where brick was the normal material. Apart from such considerations Muslim builders seem comparatively indifferent as to choice of material, except in some countries such as Syria which cling to their preference for fine work. Of the three great Hispanic-Moorish towers of the 6th/12th century, which—no doubt wrongly—are attributed to the same architect, the Giralda at Seville is built of brick, the Hâsân tower at Rabat of ashlar and the minaret of the Kutubiyya at Marrakesh of rubble. This indifference on the part of the builder as to material and the carelessness of craftsmen in its use are seen more clearly in palaces than in religious buildings, especially in the West from the 7th/13th century. There are several reasons for this: speed of construction, the need being to satisfy a master's whim the shortest delay; the use of unskilled slave labour capable of nothing more complicated than ramming concrete between two boards; and finally the general use of facings (coverings of plain or sculpted plaster, inlaid-work of enamelled clay or earthenware tiles) which completely conceal the body of the walls.

It is remarkable that the technique of cobwork (tâbâra) should have been described in detail by Ibn Khaldûn in his Mukaddimâ, and leads us to assume that he thought it a characteristically Muslim practice. Earth with which chalk and crushed baked earth or broken stones are often mixed is rammed between two boards kept parallel by beams. The wall is plastered over, often in such a way as to simulate joints of heavy bond-work beneath. When this plaster falls, the regularly spaced holes left by the beams become visible. In the Muslim West cobwork became general in the 5th/11th and 6th/12th centuries, especially in military building. In the Maghrib it seems to have been an importation from Andalusia, where it had long been known.

Unbaked brick (tawb), which sometimes serves as a facing for cobwork, is made of earth and cut straw rammed together in a wooden former. It is still in common use in Sahara towns, and was employed very early in arid regions, especially in Mesopotamia and Arabia. The walls of the Prophet's dwelling in Medina were probably built of this material, as are those of the 'Abbâsid mosques of Sâmârâ. We find it employed at about the same time in Ifrîqiya. The excavations at 'Abbâsîyya, the seat of the Aghlabids of al-Khayrâwân, have brought to light carefully moulded specimens of tawb 42 cm. long by half that measurement in width, and a quarter in thickness, which suggests that the cube used by the builders was 4 cm. long.

Baked brick (âdjurr), used so commonly in the Iranian world and by the Romans also, notably in the public baths, is to be found in all the Islamic countries, but was always par excellence the building material of Persia. It is of varying dimensions, and is sometimes cut on an angle or partly rounded off. It is used alone or with rubble in parts of a building where accuracy of line is important (pillars, pedestals, stairways, arches, vaults, etc.). It functions as horizontal tying material alternating with courses of rubble, or vertical tying, to maintain regularity of construction, especially at corners (A). Brick is as a rule covered over with plaster, but it may remain visible and add an element of colour, either the pink of baked earth or that of some enamel applied to its edges.

Rubble or rough-hewn stone was used in Sâsânîd building and is still used in Muslim Mesopotamia, as in the stronghold of Ukhaydîr (mid 2nd/8th century). In the 5th/11th century it seems to have been the material most familiar to the Berber builders of North Africa. It is used above all for the ramparts of towns before the introduction of cobwork (cob walls will often have a foundation of rubble), and also in waterworks. The cementing mortar and protecting plaster are of chalk, sand, crushed fragments of tile, and wood charcoal. An analysis of their
composition reveals a pattern of evolution which has been studied by M. Solignac (Recherches sur les installations hydroïques de Kairouan . . . in AEO Algiers, 1952-3), and allows us to date the works.

The use of ashlar continues a Roman and Byzantine tradition. Its homeland is in Syria, where ashlar has remained a common building material until our time. It was temporarily replaced by brick in Egypt, but came into use again in the Fatimid period (4th-6th/10th-12th century) especially in the fortifications of the Armenian Badr al-Djamali. In Ifrikiya it is used for the religious and military buildings of the 3rd/9th century and from the 7th-13th century was popular again with the Tunisian architects. In Spain it is the regular material in the Umayyad foundations; local tradition was there reinforced by Syrian influence. The Magribi takes it over in the 6th/12th century in the Almohad buildings.

As in the Byzantine period, walls built of rubble-work are frequently faced with ashlar. The bond-work, not as massive as the Roman, shows combinations of tiles and headers, whose chronology Velázquez Bosco has contrived to establish, for Cordova (Velázquez Bosco, Medina Azahra y Alamiriya, Madrid 1912) (B, B', B''). Almohad bond-work is of alternate thick and thin courses, which from Morocco pass into Tunisia.

To these materials we should add wood: longitudinal beams at times sunk in walls; at al-Kayrawân heavy planks form architraves above the capitals; small beams form ceilings and sometimes lintels, a practice not without risk to the solidarity of the building concerned.

Walls, the composition of which we have just indicated, are often flanked by buttresses. Projecting semi-cylindrical abutments of the old Mesopotamian type were added to the stone outer walls of the Syrian Umayyad strongholds, and the brick ones of the mosques at Sâmmarrâ. The great mosque at Tunis (3rd/9th century) has at its four corners rounded buttresses of apparently the same origin, and they are found again in a building of the Kal'a of the Banû Hammad (5th-6th/11th-12th century). The great mosque at al-Kayrawân was given massive rectangular buttresses, partly later than the original construction. The mosques at Cordova have similar use of buttresses at regular intervals around its periphery.

Among the supporting members found principally in the halls of mosques, columns deserve first mention. In early centuries in such regions as Syria, Egypt, Ifrikiya and Spain they were taken from nearby pagan or Christian buildings. When these quarries of shafts and capitals were exhausted Muslim sculptors made their own. Columns are generally cylindrical and not entatic. In the 10th-16th century and after they were imported from Italy to North Africa.

The re-employment of columns of limited size in a hypostyle hall intended to produce an impressive effect led to these supporting members being prolonged upwards. It was doubtless from Egypt (Amr mosque) that the builders of al-Kayrawân borrowed the technique of superimposing, as in the classical entablature, the support (= architrave), the impost (= frieze) and the cornice, with wooden ties bedded in the impost (C). The architects of the mosque of Cordova were perhaps inspired by the Roman aqueducts to superpose two rows of arches linking the masses of masonry raised above the columns (D).

The Almohad mosque of Hassan at Rabat (6th/12th century) shows a rare example of columns formed of superimposed tambours.

The pillar, a masonry support of square, rectangular, cruciform, or divided plan or flanked by false columns, is in general use in Persian architecture.

From the 6th/12th century it replaces columns in Persian prayer-halls in the Magrib. Tunisian mosques retain columns. The situation is found in the inner courtyards of houses.

Apart from the straight lintel formed by a single stone or oblique arch-stones surmounted by a relieving arch (Egypt, Syria), arches assume very varied forms (semi-circular, horseshoe, Persian arch with rectilinear divisions, etc.). These forms are not dictated by constructional requirements, but serve as ornamentation according to the architect's caprice. The arch-stones they contain are often purely decorative in function.

To cover prayer-halls Syria, the Spain of the Umayyad period, and, no doubt in imitation of the latter, the Magribi regions, had recourse to timber-work protected by tiled saddle-back roofs. Square buildings had pavilion-shaped roofs, i.e., with four slopes. Egypt and Ifrikiya retained terraces, which were preferred also by the Turkish masters of Algiers in the towns along the Algerian coast. The scarcity of timbers of the necessary dimensions led architects to bring closer together the walls carrying them, and to give narrow, long proportions to enclosures with ceilings (naves, rooms, etc.). The use of waggons-vaults or small domes placed together answers the same need.

The problem of vault and dome was solved in different ways within the Sasanid and Byzantine traditions, but Persian genius was to add note-worthy variations.

The question alluded to above of suitable timbers or rather of their scarcity is the determining factor in building the vault, whether semi-cylindrical or elliptical. Setting up a stone arch or vault demands the use of a wooden former on which the archstones are successively placed. The use of bricks, their lightness and the fact that they can be mortared together, allows another method which dispenses with the former: the construction of the "edge vault". This is frequent in Sasanid architecture and finds its most logical use in the specifically Iranian type, the iwân (the iwân so constantly used in Muslim Iberia is a three-walled room open on the fourth side, like a large niche with a flat back surface). The builder cements a first row of bricks on the rear wall, tracing out the curve of the vault; a second row is then cemented to the first, a third to the second, so that row by row the vault advances across the space to be covered (G).

Apart from the waggons-vault Muslim architecture uses the groined vault so familiar to Roman and Byzantine builders (two semi-cylinders intersecting at right angles [E]), and more rarely the cloister-arch vault (in which the four walls curve in above the space to be covered) (F) which occasionally serves as the end and culmination of the waggons-vault.

As for the dome, the fine examples constructed in the Byzantine era were the prototypes of the Turkish domes, but this feature also was the subject of variations which Muslim art owes to Persia.

As is known, there are two main types of solution to the problem of how to place a semi-circular or eight-sided vault on a square base: the pendentive (H), the customary practice in the Byzantine world (cf. St. Sophia at Istanbul), and the more specifically Iranian squinch (I). This squinch, a quarter sphere of the head-arc of which projects over the corner of the square supporting it, sometimes assumes with its
radiating flutings and indented edge the grace of a marine shell (J). In the Grand Mosque at Damascus and that at Cordova it takes the form of a small niche, North-African and Sicilian architecture knew the squinch as a half groined vault (a groined vault cut diagonally) (K). Finally Persia contrived the super-position of several ranks of cell-like niches, the probable origin of the nakbaran (= stalactites) (L).

Above this zone where square and circle are brought into union there frequently rises a circular zone pierced with windows to let in the entry of light, and surmounted by the dome proper.

Persian architects, profiting from the advantages offered by brick, showed great ingenuity in erecting widely differing domes. Such is the ribbed dome, of light arches crossing above the space to be covered, and supporting counter-arches which fill the intermediary gaps. This type of dome, which was known from the time of the Sasanids (A. Godard, Voiles orientales, in Alhâr-e Irân, 1940), passed from Persia to Spain (3rd/9th century), then from Cordova and Toledo became known in the 6th/12th century, in the Magrib and about the same time throughout south-west France. (G. Marçais)

BINBASHI, ‘head of a thousand’, a Turkish military rank. The word appears at an early date among the Western Turks, and it appears early in use in connection with the military reorganisation said to have been made by Ordân in 720/1320-9 (e.g. Sa'd al-Din, Tâdi al-Tâvirdîkî, i, 40—‘onbashî, yüzbâshî, and binbashî were appointed to them... ’). In the form minbashî the term also occurs among the Eastern Turks, and is used, for example, of a rank in the Safawid forces in Persia (V. Minorsky, Tâdâkirat al-Mulâk, London 1943, 36, 74, 115). The title mîh-bea, with a similar meaning, also appears in the memoirs of Bâbûr. The term binbashî does not seem to have been much used in the regular Ottoman forces of the classical period. It reappears, however, in the 18th century, and is used to designate the officers of the newly raised mîrî ashkerîs, a treasury-paid force of infantry and cavalry. In the campaign of 1769 there were already ninety seven regiments of mîrî ashkerîs, each commanded by a binbashî. The binbashî received 2000 payats of piaster for the campaign, plus a tenth of the pay of his men. (D’Ohsson, Tableau général de l’Empire Ottomân, vii, Paris 1828, 381-7; cf. Remi Efendi, Khuldsatal-i’tibar, Istanbul 1286, 12 ff.). From the end of the 18th century, (Djewdet, Ta’rikh, vi, 367), binbashî became a regular rank in the new, European-style armies, style to be able to bring into union. After the accession of Abd al-Azîz, the pay of a binbashî was fixed at 1,500 piastres a month, or 4,140 francs a year (Ubcini, Lettres sur l’Asie, 1909). In Egypt the title binbashî, along with other Turkish military terms and commands, was used in the army of Muhammed ‘Ali Pasha, and remained current under subsequent régimes. In the Arab countries it is sometimes pronounced bikbashî, presumably through a distortion of the Turkish sakhrî nân (h = CastException).

BINGÔL, name of a town in ancient Turkish Armenia, previously called Çapakçur, capital of a vilâyet partly filled by the mountain range of Bingöl Dağı. It is situated on the Gûnîk Su, a tributary of the Aracani-Ararsan-Murâd Su, and on the road joining Elazîg via Palu and Mush (M. Canard).

BINGOL DAGI, name of a mountain massif, a raised but not volcanic plateau, which stretches south of Erzurum across the vilâyets of Erzurum, Mush and Bingöl (Çapakçur). Its highest peak in the east is Demir or Timur Kale or Ka’fa (Fortress of Iron), over whose height there is some disagreement among different writers: 2690 ms according to H. and R. Kiepert, Formae orbis antiqui, pl. V, 1910, Abos Mons, cf. above, 655; 3650 ms according to the Erzurum sheet of the Harta Genel Direktörülü, 1936; 3250 ms according to the road-map of Vâharlar Genel Müdurlü, 1951; 3700 ms according to Banse; 2977 ms according to Blanchard. It dominates the high plain of Varto (formerly Gümölm). The western peak, Bingöl or Toprak Kale (Fortress of Earth) is almost as high. The northern part of the mountain is cut of by two circular depressions separated by a sharp ridge.

Bingöl Dağı is a true water-shed. It contains numerous little lakes from which it gets its name of mountain (dağ) of a thousand (bin) lakes (göl). The Araxes (Aras, al-Rass) in the north, the Tuula Su, a tributary of the northern Euphrates, and the Bingöl Su in the west, the Gönûk Su in the south-west, the Carbughar Su in the south, and the Kînis Su, the four last tributaries of the Murâd Su, in the east and north-east, all rise here. Armenian legend makes it the site of the earthly paradise. In classical geography it is called Abos Mons. The Armenian name is Srmane (Greek Στρατεύματος). Arab geographers and historians do not refer to it, although there is some mention in the wars between the Hamdanids and the Byzantines in the 4th/10th century of the place Hâfîdji (Arm. Hâvîči) situated to the south of Kâlíkâl-Erzurum and in the Bingöl Dağı at the source of the Araxes. Tavernier is the first among European travellers to give the name of Bingöl Dağı. The Kâfi-Bâsh (q.v.) lived in this region.


BINYAMIN, the Benjamite of the Bible. In its narration of the history of Joseph (Yûsûf, [q.v.]), the Qur’an gives a place to the latter’s uterine brother (xii, 8, 59-79), without ever mentioning him by name. Tradition embellishes without any great variation the biblical story concerning him (it is aware notably that his birth cost his mother her life) and receives also Aggadic additions (summarised notably in the Encyclopaedia Judaica, xvi, 1904, 1171-144), such as the etymological connexion of the names of his sons with the lost elder brother. In Muslim mysticism, the pair Yûsûf-Binyamin symbolises the primordial relationship between God and the sinner.
Bibliography: Tabari, i, 360, 393, 397-404; idem, Tafsir, xii, 87, 100, 157; Tha'labi, 'Arul's al-Id, 82, 85; R. Blachère, Le Coran, 475 ff.; A. Geiger, Kat. arab., ed. A. von Kremer, I (1883), 17-34. Then the bucket is drawn up by hand; this hard work may be done also by animals, mostly camels (sawa'in, sing. samo'ya), accompanied by a driver (sakh) and moving from and to the well in wearing clothes (cf. Arabum Proverbia ed. Freytag, 1, 624, nr. 65; sayru s-sawa'ini s-safran l-a yamhali'). For the poetry the well is poured into drinking troughs or cisterns next to the well (bird, etc., sing. bard) the fallen-in remains of which are often described in the poetry (see Nöldeke on Zuhayr Mu'addil, 5).——Water-wheels set in motion by means of a crank and more complicated hydraulic machines were not known in ancient times; the use of "double buckets" ascending and descending at the same time (to which in Hamad and ed. Freytag, 439 v. 5 the two stirrups of a rider seem to be compared) was not indigenous and must have been very rare.

Numerous quotations of the well and its several designations or epithets, of its appurtenances, of the various sounds produced by the roller, the rope, the bucket etc. (see Bräunlich, Well, Index, 519-26) illustrate the vital importance of the well and its belongings for life throughout Arabia. Still more instructive are the frequent similes, proverbial and metaphorical sayings referring to the parts and functions of the well. For example, the lance: often compared with tightly stretched well-ropes (cf. Nöldeke to 'Arara, Mu'addil, 66 and Delectus 45, 6; 70, 2); a riding shooting forth is described as resembling labourers suddenly flying forward when the rope which they are drawing breaks (Dāwād Hādāyil ed. Kosegarten, 93, 36); the dead body is let down to the grave like the bucket to the well (Abū Dhu'ayyīb, 24, 11 f.; Hamadī, 439 v. 4; Ḥuṣayrā, 35, 5) kalbat matāhirūhā "his well-axles wobble" means "his affair became unsettled" (Lane, 667a); finally, a man keeping his word and incessantly striving towards his goal is praised in a marthiya as "one who, whenever he spoke a word, (like a well-digger) caused water to gush forth from the earth" (Hamadī 386 v. 2).

Bibliography: E. Bräunlich, The Well in Ancient Arabia, in Islamica, i, 1924-25, 41-76, 288-343, 454-528 (an exhaustive study, based on all the available lexicographical and literary references, to which the present article is greatly indebted); E. Wiedemann, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften, x, Erlangen 1906, 315, 335-337 (details from medieval times); H. Kiehe, Kraemer, curso Bibelworterbuch, 1903, 286, s.v. Jakobsbrunnen and J. J. Hess, in Der Islam 4, 1913, 317 f. (informative figures; see also the books of European travellers like Doughty, Euting, Musil etc.)——A Kitāb al-Bīr, composed by the famous philologist Ibn al-Arabi (died 231/844), but apparently not mentioned by the Arab bibliographers, is reported to be preserved in Cairo (see Brockelmann, S. I, 180).

Modern Arabia

The eastern Arab lands, with few rivers or none at all, place great reliance on springs and wells. The location and nature of watering places (mawrid or simply mār; pl. mawṣik; with various colloquial forms such as mol in southern Arabia) go far towards determining whether life is settled or nomadic. The flowing water of springs (sayr, pl. 'wayn) is usually...
abundant enough to sustain communities in oases of groves and fields. Water from wells (bîr, colq. bid, with the pl. abîyâr prevailing in Arabia; or badî, pl. budîn), which must be lifted out, may supplement the supply from springs, while in other instances it suffices to support large towns (until recently al-Riyadh, the capital of Saudi Arabia, drew almost all its water from wells). In still other instances, water comes from wells scattered throughout desert tracts. Even when desert wells endure much longer than ephemeral sources such as moisture-laden sands or seepages from rain in the rocks, there is rarely enough water for irrigation, and the wells are frequented by nomads and other travellers rather than permanent settlers.

In the oases private ownership of wells tends to be the rule; a landowner or husbandman nurtures his crops with water belonging to the one or the other. Large wells, however, may be communally or jointly owned; Philby, for example, estimates the ownership of the remarkable well of al-Haddâdî in Tayma as divided into about thirty shares, with each share holding about three pulleys for drawing up by camels.

In the desert the nomad's first concern is the presence of water, next its accessibility, and then its potability. Doughty has described the skilled well-sinkers of the towns. The Bedouins are perfected both water-finders and well-sinkers, gifted with amazing shrewdness in ferreting out sources where the uninitiate would never suspect them. The site may be entirely new (such a well is often called a bid, pl. budî, or badî, pl. budîn), or it may be an old well buried (mandafina) or dead (mawzita). The water may be close to the surface or deep in the earth. The Bedouins occasionally dig to depths of a hundred metres or more, the depth being measured in terms of the Arabian fathom (bid, the spread of a man's outstretched arms, or bidma, his height, i.e., about five feet six inches; a well of many fathoms is called tawila, pl. tawil, rather than 'amika). Mechanical drills now reach greater depths in even the most arid regions, such as al-Rubâ al-Khali (such wells are called kalama, coll. kalam). Much-used wells or those with sides likely to cave in are strengthened with casings of stone or other materials (a cased well is called mawtusya, and one cased with stone a mardis). The proportion of minerals in the aquifer determines whether the water is sweet (hâlî) or salty (mâtith). Although the Bedouins tolerate a much higher mineral content than an outsider does, even they cannot drink from certain desert wells (hâsnur, pl. hâshirân). In such cases their constant companion the camel swallows the brine and produces milk with the salt filtered out.

Wholly private ownership of desert wells is uncommon. If a man's name is associated with a well, such as Bîr Hâdi in al-Rubâ al-Khali (named after the late Hâdi b. Sultân of Al Murra), the eponym is usually the digger or redigger, who may as a consequence hold a title of sorts to the well. Wells falling within the dîra of a tribe may be considered its property, but the water is still free to nomads from other tribes not at war with the possessors. Water in the wilderness is too precious to be made an article of commerce.

In summer, when the desert pastures offer no vegetation to slake the thirst of the herds, the nomads camp for weeks or months at their favourite wells, sometimes with hundreds of tents pitched together. As places of assembly in hot weather and to a less degree in winter, wells have often been the scene of surprise attacks and battles in tribal warfare.


**iii. The Maghrib.**

Bîr is the common name given to various types of well, usually but not invariably to lined wells (rarely faced with stone but more often with dry stones or, in certain regions of the Sahara, with palm stems, for which reason they are sometimes cut on a square plan). It can designate also an unlined well, the type which is most common in the Sahara, where the earth is merely loosened and hollowed out into a basin at the bottom of which the water-level appears (Fezzan). But other terms besides bîr are used. Hâsî (pl. hasýan) is often the only term used in this sense in the Sahara for wells which are mostly unlined and without lips, whilst elsewhere it means a simple hole dug in the bed of a wâdî (Tunisian and Tripolitanian steppes). The word ogla ('ubla) usually a temporary pool stretching along the bed of a wâdî in the Sahara, and in this meaning synonymous with châdîr, in the Tunisian steppes can also mean a well several metres deep without facing or lips, dug at the bottom of a hollow where the underground water-level is near the surface; the same are sometimes to be found in the Sahara (Tindouf) where oglas exist in the beds of the wâdîs.

In fact the wells of the Maghrib and the Sahara at least west of Egypt, can be grouped into 3 principal types: (1) wells meant for the use of men and for watering animals. Lined or not, sometimes adjoined by a watering trough, they have no superstructure or at the most 3 branches meant to carry a pulley of wood or iron. The water is drawn by hand in a water-skirt or a leather bucket hung on the end of a rope. (2) Wells which have some sort of elevating mechanism and are used for irrigating gardens and palm groves; these are varied enough. (3) Artesian wells, situated within very narrow geographical limits, especially in the past, and used essentially for irrigation; since they are gushing they need no superstructure.

Among the wells with an elevating mechanism, the most common are those which use animal traction and a pulley; they are sometimes called sânsâya. The water is drawn in a dalw (bucket) holding 15 to 35 litres, made of ox or goat hide, which has a flexible pipe at the bottom; this, which is folded back during the drawing of the water, is straightened when it comes to emptying into the dalw into the little basin which feeds the sagyas (sâkiya = funnel). The uprights which carry the axis of the pulley are sometimes made of stone or clay but more often of wood or palm stems. The pulling is done by an ox or a donkey and sometimes by a camel (Tunisia), but only very occasionally by a mule (Tunisian Sahel); the animal is guided and helped in its journeys up and down an inclined path by a man or child who at the same time works the string which folds back or straightens the pipe which empties the dalw. The wells and their superstructures may be held in common by several owners, but each one draws water with his own dalw (with its ropes and strings) and by means of his own animal. These wells worked by animal traction can be found anywhere from India to the
Atlantic and art encountered especially in eastern Tunisia from Bizerta to Djerba, on the coast of Tripoli, in the Hawz of Marrakesh, in the north-west Sahara (Tafilalet, mzab), in the Touarag country, in the oases of southern Cyrenaica, in part of the southern Sahara, especially Lower Mauretania, and on the borders of western Sudan.

Wells with a balancing-beam, like the Egyptian ḥuḍāla, have various names: ḥofṭīāra (pl. ḥofṭīʿītār) in the Fezzân and the Souf, ḥarḥbaru in the regions of Zibâb and Gourara. The balancing-beam, made of a thin pole pivoting on a little wall or on a wooden crossbar resting on two uprights, has a counterweight at its base, and at its other end some sort of receptacle for drawing the water (hekma in the Fezzan, genino at Gourara), which only holds between 5 and 10 litres of water. It works more quickly than a dalâw but it is not usually capable of irrigating more than a few hundred square metres, for it is used where the underground water-level is not very deep (a few metres) and has a small yield. It is primarily the poor man's well; one man can dig it, set it up and work it, and it needs neither an animal nor an expensive dalâw. Well-known not only in Europe but as far afield as China, this type of well is very rare in the Mahgrib and on the coast of Libya. It is found in the Sahara the Lower Dra (Morocco) and in the region of Saoura at Tindouf, and in southern Mauretania, in the regions of Touat and Gourara, at Ouargla El Golea and at Ghadames, both in the north and the south of the Fezzan, in the oases of Cyrenaica at Kufra, in the regions of Aïr, Tibesti and Borku.

The noria or Persian well (ma'dîra and sometimes sânya) is an apparatus with buckets fixed onto a revolving chain, worked by an animal-driven wheel drawn by a horse, mule or camel. The traditional type is made of wood (most commonly olive-wood) with earthenware buckets fixed by means of ropes. It is being more and more replaced by a cast-iron apparatus with metal chain and buckets worked by an oil or electric motor, at least on the coastal plains of Morocco, Algeria and northern Tunisia, where it is sometimes used by European market-gardenerers of Mediterranean origin who were accustomed to using it in their native country. It has to compete there with various types of pumps. In the Sahara it is only to be found in northern areas such as Tafilalet, Oued Righ and Tripolitania. In Morocco, large hoisting wheels with well-base rims, worked by river-power, are also called norias. They are only used in the neighbourhood of Fes.

As for artesian wells, they were only to be found at one time in the region of Oued Righ (182 of them were active in 1856), and in small numbers in the eastern parts of the Shâtî (Fezzân) where they are called ʿayyân (sing. ʿaym); they were dug by specialists and were very fragile. They have increased in number, but are nowadays drilled and harnessed according to modern techniques, throughout the Lower Sahara from El Golea and Ouargla to Zibân, and from the Hodna to the Djerid and Netâzâwa; some have been drilled in Tripolitania and in the Fezzân.

Bibliography: G. S. Colin, La noria maro- canne, in Hesperis, 1932; R. Capot-Rey, Le Sahara (1953); J. Despois, La Tunisie orientale, 1955; the same, Le Fezzan (1946) and Le Hodna (1953); E. Lacoust, Mots et choses berbères, 1920; Ch. Monchicourt, La steppe Tunisiene, in Bull. de la Dir. de l’Agr., Tunis 1900; II Sahara Italiano, Feszen e oasi di Gal, 1937; E. Scarrin, Le oasi del Fezzan, 1934 and Le oasi cyrenaische del 29° parallelo, 1937; J. Lethienneux, Le Fezzan, ses jardins, ses palmeres, in IBLA, Tunis 1948; J. Bisson, Le Gourara, 1957; H. Isnard, La culture des primeurs sur le littoral algérien, 1935. (J. Despois)

BPR MAʿŪNA, a well on the Mecca-Medina road, between the territories of ʿĀmir b. Ṣaṣaʾaʾ and Sulaym, where a group of Muslims was killed in Ṣafâr 4/625. The traditional account is that the chief of ʿĀmir, Abū Barāʾ (or Abū ʿI-Barâʾ), invited Muhammad to send a missionary group to his tribe, promising his personal protection for them. So a group of “Kūrān-readers” (burra?) was sent from Medina. When they reached Bīr Maʿūna, they were massacred by clans of Sulaym, led by ʿĀmir b. al-Ṭufayl, who had failed to induce his own tribe of ʿĀmir to violate their protection for the Muslims. The Prophet grieved over the slain, and cursed the Sulamis daily until Kurān, iii, 169/163 was revealed.

This account has been interpreted to give a military failure the aura of religious martyrdom. The sources number the burra? variously as 70, 40 and 29, but Wâkidî names only 16. A large number cannot yet have existed, and was unnecessary for a religious mission. It was, indeed, an actual campaign, described as a raid (sariyya, ghazwa) in the sources; one specifically says its leader was sent “as a spy among the Najdî folk”. Muhammad had apparently been invited to intervene in an internal dispute of Sulaym, but the incident is also mixed up with the quarrel within ʿĀmir between Abū Barâʾ and ʿĀmir b. al-Ṭufayl. The latter cannot have led the attack, and may merely have encouraged the Sulamis from the background, since Muhammad did not curse him, unhesitatingly paid him the wergilds for two ʿĀmirites slain, on the way home, by the sole survivor of Bīr Maʿūna, and did not seek wergilds from him for the slain Muslims.

Bibliography: Yakût, i, 435-6, iv, 580; Ibn ʿAbi Ḥāshim, 618-51; Ibn Isbâk (tr. Guillaume, Oxford 1955), xlv; Wâkidî (Wellhausen), 153-6; Ibn Saʿd, ii, i, 36-9; Ṭabarî, i, 1448-8; Yaʿqûbî, ii, 75-6; Lyall, Disун of ʿAmir b. al-Tufail, London 1914, 84-9; W. Montgomery Watt, Muhammad al-Medina, Oxford 1956, 31-3, 67; Nöldeke-Schwally, Geschichte des Qurans, i, 246-8. (C. E. Bosworth)

BīR MAYMŪN, a well in the environs of Mecca. Although the well was famous in early Islamic times, the name no longer occurs in the Meccan area. Available sources fail to show whether Bīr Maymūn has been abandoned or is still in use under another name. The location of the ancient well is also uncertain. Much of the evidence places it between the Great Mosque and Minâ, somewhat closer to the latter. The account given by al-Ṭabarî, iii, 456, of the death of the Caliph al-Manṣūr at Bīr Maymūn in 158/775 indicates that the well lay inside the Sacred Zone (al-Barâm) and suggests that it was on the main road for pilgrims from Iraq (another version has the death of al-Manṣūr take place at the hill of al-Hadîj, not at Bīr Maymūn; see Wüstefeld, Gesch. der Stadt Mecca, Leipzig 1861, 160). Other evidence situates Bīr Maymūn farther north of Mecca near Marr al-Zâhrân (now called Wâdî Fâtima). According to al-Hamdânî, i, 128, Bīr Maymûn was one of the two oldest wells in the world; according to al-Bakrî, Muʿjam, Cairo 1945-51, iv, 1285, it was much older than Zamzam. If it was of any such antiquity, it must have been...
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... indications, was an Ismāʿīlī; he died about 719-20/1320.

Birdjand was for long eclipsed by Kā'īn, but in the 19th century it took the place of the latter as the chief town in Kūhīstān. It is now administrative centre of the districts (qāhīrāt) of Birdjand and Kā'īn, under a ārāmdār or governor. In 1946 the population was 23,488, but is now lower, due to the migration of some of the inhabitants to Maqhdad and elsewhere. The town has a piped water supply, the water being obtained partly from ḫanās from the Kūh-Bakrān to the south, and partly from a deep well in the town itself.

As in former times, the country round produces much saffron, and nuts of all kinds are also grown. The district has long been famous for the quality of its carpets and rugs, most of which are made in the village of Darakhsh, 80 km. to the north-east: it is also renowned for its barākās (garments made of camel’s hair). Birdjand enjoys some prosperity due to its being on the main road between Maqhdad and Zāhīdān; it is also connected by road with Kirmān.

Bibliography: In the article, and in addition: Major E. Smith, The Perso-Afghan Mission, 1871-72, in Eastern Persia, an Account of the Persian Boundary Commission 1870-71-72, London 1876, vol. i, 334-7; E. Reclus, Nouv. géogr. univ. (1894), ix, 227-9; Le Strange, 362; P. M. Sykes, Ten Thousand Miles in Persia, London 1902, 399; Ranzrāz and Nawtāsh, Farang-i Dīgreshtāt-yi Iran, ix, 71.

BIREDJIK, a town in Mesopotamia, on the left bank of the Euphrates. The name Birdjik (amongst the local population, Beledjik; also, according to Sachau, Bārdjīk in the Ḥalabī (Aleppo dialect) means “little Bira”, i.e., “small fortress” (Arabic bīra, with the Turkish diminutive suffix). The Arabic name “al-Bīra” (= Bireh in the later Syriac writers) derives from the Aramaic “Bīrā” = “fortress”. Birdjik, known to the Romans as “Birtha”, is to be identified (according to Cumont) with a certain Makedonopolis mentioned in some of the Byzantine sources. The town is called “Bile” in the Latin chronicles relating to the Crusades.

At Birdjik one of the main routes from northern Syria into Mesopotamia crosses the Euphrates. The river here flows out of the mountains into the Syrian-Mesopotamian plain. It is here, too, that the Euphrates first becomes navigable, after leaving behind the cataracts formed where it breaks through the Taurus range. An isolated cone of calcareous rock, which rises sheer out of the river at Birdjik, has been fortified from remote times as a protection for this important passage of the Euphrates. A bridge of boats existed here in Seleucid times, running from Zeugma on the right bank of the river to Apamea (= Bīrā) on the left bank (the Seleucid name Apamea was perhaps never in current use and disappeared in favour of the Aramaic “Bīrā”3). Apamea, at first a suburb of Zeugma, came in due course, owing to its possession of the fortress, to be far more important than Zeugma, which faded out of existence. There is evidence (cf. Khalīl al-Zahiri) that a bridge was still to be found at the river passage of Birdjik in the second half of the 13th century.

The older geographical works in Arabic make no mention of al-Bīra. This name first appears in such treatises about the middle of the 13th century, e.g., in al-Dimīshqī and Abu l-Fīdsī. References to al-Bīra in historical literature make their appearance, it
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would seem, at the time of the Crusades. The Latin Counts of Edessa held the town from 492/1098-99 until 545/1150, when the Christians, unable to maintain it after the loss of Edessa to the Muslims in 539/1144, surrendered it to the Byzantines, who soon lost it, however, to the Urtukid lord of Maridm. In 539/H44* surrendered it to the Byzantines, who

... 1936. i, 176 and ii, 39; R. M. Riefstahl, Turkish Architecture in Southwestern Anatolia, Cambridge (Mass.) 1931, 266 (index); I. H. Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı Devletinin Merkez ve Bahriye Teşkilatı (Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, VIII. Seri, no. 16), Ankara 1948, 404-405; M. van Berchem, Arabische Inschriften, in Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft, vii/Heft 1, Leipzig 1909, 101-107; V. Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie, ii, Paris 1891, 144, 234, 248, 265-269; Sâmil, Kâmas al-'A'dâm, ii, Istanbul A.H. 1306, 1436; Al-Dawûd, Ta'rîh ve Diğîrîfiya Lugâtî, Istanbul A.H. 1313-1314, 223-224; E[.] and IA, s.v. İbrahim Pâşâ (for bibliographical indications relating to the battle of Nisib in 1255/1839); M. Streck, in E[.] 1, s.v. Birge. (M. Streck-[V. J. PARRY])

**BIRGE** (Birgi, sometimes also Bergi or Biriki), a small town in western Asia Minor situated in the valley of the Köyük Menderes, is the centre of a nahiye belonging to the badem of Aydın. The town was known in Byzantine times as Χρηστοπόλεις and also as Πυγγίον. It was raised to the status of a metropolitan see between 1193 and 1199, being thus freed from the ecclesiastical control of Ephesus, but it became once more a suffragan bishopric of Ephesus in 1387. The Catalans under Roger de Flor drove the Turks from the town in 1304 and at the same time plundered it. Birge passed thereafter into the hands of the Turkish Beys of Aydın. Monuments dating from the period of their rule—notably the Ulu Djami—still are to be seen in the town. Birge came under the control of the Ottomans in 1293/1391 and remained in their possession thereafter, save for a brief interval during the war of the principes of Aydın, regained to empire by Timur Beg, held the land once more (1402-1245). The town suffered considerable damage between the years 1920-1922 during the course of the war which was then being waged between the Greeks and the Turks in western Asia Minor. Birge had, in 1945, about 2150 inhabitants.

BIRGE — BIRS


BIRGEWî (Birgiwî, Birgîlî), MEHME'D B. PIL 'ÂTî, a Turkish scholar whose fame still lives among the common people. Born at Ballkesir in 928/1522 (or 926/1520 if Katibi Celebi is correct in saying that he died at the age of 55), he began his education at home, but soon distinguished himself among his coevals and went to Istanbul, where he attached himself first to Akhlâzî Mehmed Efendi and then to the kâdî-i tâskar 'Abd al-Râmîn Efendi. Having completed his education he taught in the medreses of Istanbul, and during this time was initiated into the Bayramîyya by Shâykh 'Abd al-Râmîn Kâramânî. Through the influence of his master 'Abd al-Râmîn Efendi he obtained the post of kâsim to the army at Edirne, but soon afterwards desired to withdraw both from this office and from teaching. His shâykh however would not consent to his totally abandoning teaching and preaching, and when his fellow-townsmen 'Âtî Allah Efendi, the tutor of Selim II, offered him the position of muderris in the medrese he had built at Birgi, he accepted. His career of teaching, writing and preaching at Birgi, (whence his appellation of "Birgîwî, Birgîlî"), MEHMED B. PIL 'ÂTÎ died of the plague.

Like Ibn Taymiyya, he set himself firmly against all innovation in order to protect the sacred law, and no considerations of rank would cause him to concur at any non-observance of the faith. Towards the end of his life he even made the journey from Birgi to Istanbul to advise the grand vizier Mehmed Pasha about the rectification of some irregularities which he had observed. Birgîwî, an utter fanatic in religious matters, would not abide the slightest gloss at any of the sacred words. Commentaries on it were written by Kadîli Khâdîm Efendi and 'Abî al-Ghani al-Nâbulûsî, Evin Efendi adopted it as his guide to conduct, and was consequently dubbed "Tarîqâtî"; after him there even came into being a "tarîkah" of the text.


KASIM KUPREVÎ

BIRR (Kur'ânic term), "pious goodness" (R. Blachère's translation); see Kur'ân, ii, 189). In the analysis of the spiritual states (awâlî) and the attitude of the soul towards God, it must at the same time be compared with and distinguished from takhîz [q.v.].

BIRRS, also called BIRRS NIRMÔD, in the older literature Bûrs, a ruined site 9 miles S.W. of the town of Hillû on the Euphrates, about 12 miles S.S.W. of Babylon on the eastern shore of the Lake of Hindiyûa.

The place is the ancient Borsippa, the sister town of Babylon. Its immense ruins, the largest that have survived from the Babylonian period, were thought by the Arabs to be the palace of Nimród b. Kanîm (sarb Nimród, Yâkût, i, 136) or of Bûlûtmaşar (Yâkût, i, 165). Even in modern times they were thought to be the ruins of the Tower of Babel and this erroneous view used to crop up even after H. Rawlinson had proved from inscriptions that they were the ruins of the tower of the Temple of Nebo of Borsippa. Whether there was still a town on the ancient site in the early Islamic period is not quite clear. Balâdhirî only speaks of the "Adjamât Bûrs (Assy. agamîl, the land around the marshy lakes of Bûrs which were taken possession of by "âlî. Upper and Lower Bûrs appear in Kûdîm and are called al-Sibây and al-Wûsûf by Ibn Khûrûradîghî in the lists of taxes, as districts (kasûdî) of the circle (asûtûn) of central Bûlkubûhî.

In even ancient times the district of Babylonia and in particular Borsippa was famous for its textile industry (e.g., Strabo, xvii, 1, 7). This in-
industry survived into the Arab period. The garments made in the district of Burs were, accordingly, mentioned by Mas'udi (Muradi, vi, 59) called Bursiyya or al-Burs. The garments were made in the district of Burs, Babil and Hilla (following G. Hoffmann's emendation). In Yakyut, iv, 773, Narsiyya should therefore be emended to Bursiya.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Khuradadhbih, ii; Baba Džurđać,指数; Kudama (ed. de Goeje), 238; Mas'udi, Muradi, vi, 59; Bakri, 149; Yakyut, i, 136, 565, iv, 773; M. Streck, Babylonien nach den arabischen Geographen, 16; A. Berliner, Beiträge zur Geographie und Ethnographie Babylonien: in Talmud und Midrasch, 26; G. Hoffmann, Syrische Akten Persischer Märtter, 25, note 206; H. Rawlinson, *On the Birs Nimrud or the Great Temple of Borsippa*, in *JRAI* xvii (1860); H. V. Hüpprecht, *Explorations in Bible Lands*, 182 ff.

(E. HERZFELD)

**BIRN** in, Persian 'outside', the name given to the outer departments and services of the Ottoman Imperial Household, in contrast to the inner departments known as the *Enderen* [q.v.]. The Birun was thus the meeting-point of the court and the state, and besides palace functionaries included a number of high officers and dignitaries concerned with the administrative, military, and religious affairs of the Empire.


(B. LEWIS)

**AL-BIRUNI** (BERUNI) Abu 'l-Rayhân Muhammad b. Ahmad, also sometimes called by the nisba al-Khwârizmî by certain Arabic authors (e.g., Yâkut), and also, at the risk of a confusion of names, by some modern Orientalists (see al-Khwârizmî!), was one of the greatest scholars of mediaeval Islam, and certainly the most original and profound. He was equally well versed in the mathematical, astronomical, physical and natural sciences and also distinguished himself as a geographer and historian, chronologist and linguist and as an impartial observer of customs and creeds. He is known as al-'Usâlah, "the Master". He was born of an Iranian family in 362/973 (according to al-Ghadanfar, on 3 Dhu'l-Hijja/4 September — see E. Sachau, *Chronology*, xiv-xvi), in the suburb (birun) of Kâh, capital of Khwârizm (the region of the Amû-Darya delta, now the autonomous republic of Karâlkalpakistan on the southern shores of the Aral Sea). He spent the first twenty-five years of his life in his homeland, where he received his scientific training from masters such as Abû Naşr Mansûr b. 'Ali b. 'Irâk Dîjlânî, the mathematician. Here he published a few early works and entered into correspondence with Ibn Sînâ, the young prodigy of Bûkhârâ, his junior by seven years. It would appear that he went in person to see the Sâmânî sultan Mansûr II b. Nûb (387-389/997-999), whom he praised as his first benefactor. Next, he went for a long stay to Djurджan, south-east of the Caspian Sea, apparently in 388/998 at the Ziyârid sultan Abu l-Hasan Kâbûs b. Washmgir Shams al-Ma'llî returned from exile; from there he was able to go as far as Rayy (near Tehran). It was at the Court of Djurджan that he wrote his first great work, on the subject of calendars and eras, and important mathematical, astronomical, meteorological and other problems. This was dedicated to Kâbûs, probably about 390/1000, without prejudice to much later emendations and alterations; the *K. al-

**Athâr al-Bâbîyân 'an al-Kurâ'n al-Khâliya (Chronologie orientalischer Völker*, published by Edward Sachau, Leipzig 1876, reprinted by helioplan, Leipzig 1933; English translation entitled *D'Ohsson*, *Bibliography:*)

In *The Chronology of Ancient Nations*, London 1879). Brought up in the Iranian dialect of Khwârizm, al-Birûnî spoke Persian, but deliberately chose to use the Arabic language in his scientific writings, though some later works may have been written in Persian or in Arabic and Persian simultaneously. Having returned to his own country before 399/1009, and having been received by Prince Abu l-Hasan 'Ali b. Ma'mûn, he was able to give his services for seven years to the brother of this prince, the Khwârizmshâh Abu l-Abbâs Ma'mûn b. Ma'mûn, and was entrusted, because of his "golden and silver tongue", with delicate political missions.

After the assassination in 407/1017 of the Khwârizmshâh by his rebellious troops and the conquest of the country by the powerful Ghzawûd sultan Mâhmûd b. Subuktâkin, many prisoners were led away to Ghâzna in Sind (Afghanistan) in the spring of 408/1017, including learned and wise men among whom were al-Bûrînî, Abû Naşr already mentioned, and the physician Abu l-Khâyr al-Husayn b. Bûbû al-Khâmmâr al-Baghdâdî. Ibn Sînâ must have left Djurджanîyya for Djurджanî of his own free will in 398/1008 together with the Christian physician, Abû Sahl l-Isâ b. Yaḥyâ al-Maskil al-Djurджânî. This physician had collaborated closely with al-Birûnî, even to the point of writing a series of works in his name, as did also Abû Naşr (see below). Al-Bîrûnî, henceforth retained at the Court of Ghâzna, possibly as official astrologer, accompanied Sultan Mâhmûd on several of his military expeditions to north-west India. Here he taught the Greek sciences and received in exchange, with his initiation into Sanskrit and various dialects, the inestimable sum of knowledge which he put into his *Description of India*, completed in 421/1030 shortly after the death of Mâhmûd: the *K. Ta'rikh al-Hind (Al-Buruni's India*, ed. E. Sachau, London 1887; English translation, 2 vols., London 1888, 2 1910). The previous year, al-Birûnî had written an abstract of geometry, arithmetic, astronomy and astrology: the *K. al-Ta'khîm li-Awâ'î Sind'î al-Tângîm*, English translation facing the text by K. Ramsay Wright, London 1934.

It was to Sultan Mâshûd b. Mâhmûd (421-432/1030-41) that the Master dedicated this third principal work in 421/1030, reserving the right to add the finishing touches later: the *K. al-Kânîn al-Mâshûdî fi 'l-Hay'a wa 'l-Nâjîm* (Canon Masudicus, Haydarabad (Dn) 1954-56, 3 vols.). According to Yâkût, Ma'sûd offered the author an elephant-load of silver pieces for this work, but al-Birûnî refused the gift. In spite of this, he was provided with the means of carrying out his scientific and literary work to the end of his life. The treatise on mineralogy which he wrote during the reign of Sultan Mawdûd b. Mâshûd (432-441/1041-49) has come down to us; it is the *K. al-Dinâmîr fi Marjat al-Dinâmîr*, ed. F. Krenkow, Haydarabad, (Dn) 1936. In a last important work, still unpublished, the *K. al-Sayyadâl fi 'l-Tibb* on medicinal drugs, (see H. Beveridge, *An Unknown Work of Al Biruni*, in *JRAI* 1902, 333-5). M. Meyerhof, *Das Vorwort zur Drogenkunde des Birunî* (ed. and trans.), Berlin 1932 the Master declared himself to be over 80 (lunar) years old. The date of his death, usually fixed in 440/1050, according to al-Ghadanfar, must therefore be put back a little. Al-Birûnî must have died after 445/1050, probably at Ghâzna.
The total number of his works is considerable. In his *Risāla fi Fihrist kutub Muhammad b. Zakariyya al-Rākūn*, ed. P. Kraus, Paris 1936 he includes (in 427) the *Fihrist* of his own writings, of which 103 are completed, 10 unfinished (among which are the *Chronology* and the *Canon Masʿūdi*), 12 have been written in his name by Abū Naṣr, 12 by Abū Sahl and 1 by Abū ʿAll al-Ḥasan b. ʿAll al-Dīnī; making a total of 138.


BIRZÁL, BANû, a Berber tribe of the Zenata group mentioned as living in the Lower Zab (south of Mulla) at the beginning of the 4th/10th century. These Berbers, in conflict with the Fatimid Caliph, 'Ubayd Allah, who built the fortress of Mulla as a look-out against them, supported the Kharidiite group mentioned as living in the Lower Zab (south of Mulla) at the beginning of the 5th/nth century, the agitator, Abu Yazid and offered him refuge. His great-grandfather, Zaki al-Din Muhammad b. Baha al-Din, an official of the judiciary and scholar. He was born in Damascus in Djumada I or II, 665/February-April, 1267. A case could be made for the earlier date, 663, but al-Birzal was present in Syria at the beginning of the 7th/13th century. Zaki al-Din's additional nickname, al-Jibli, shows that he himself, or one of his ancestors, had previously lived in Seville. A work of his is preserved in Damascus (cf. G. Makdisi, in BSOAS, xviii/1956, 22); copies of two volumes of Ibn 'Asakir's History of Damascus written by him are preserved in Bankiopore (Cat., xii, 144 ff., nos. 800-801; cf. also v, 2, 223, no. 481). Al-Birzal's grandfather, who succeeded his father in the position of imam at the Fallus Mosque (Fils [?], according to the vocalisation indicated by J. Sauvaget, Les monumens historiques de Damas, Beirut 1932, 60; cf. al-Nu'aymi, Dâris, i, 86, ii, 361), died a young man of twenty-three years in 643/1245-46, leaving al-Birzal's father, Bahâ al-Din, to be brought up by his maternal grandfather. Bahâ al-Din, an official of the judiciary and accomplished scholar, died 699/1300 in his sixtieth year (cf. Ibn Kâdî Shuhba, Fîlâm, anno 699).

As a member of a family of scholars, al-Birzal, together with his brother Zaynab, received his instruction from his father and other famous scholars. Ibn Taymiyya, for instance, lectured in his home (Bankiopore, Cat., v, 2, 180). He started out very young, but precocious as he was, he retained his love for scholarship all his life. He went through the full curriculum of religious studies, served for a while as an official witness, but spent most of his life as professor of hadith in Damascus colleges, his principal position being that of the Nûriyya (ajdâzah from his courses there in Bankiopore, Cat., v, 2, 50 f., 198 f.). He undertook the pilgrimage several times and died at Khulays in the holy territory on 4 Dhu 'l-Hijja 739/13 June, 1339. His children, among them Muhammad and Fîtima, both gifted scholars, had died before him. Among his many students and colleagues were the most prominent scholars of the time, among them al-Dhahabi. There is unanimous agreement among his biographers that he was an unusually attractive person, good-looking, modest, generous with his books and his knowledge, blessed with a good handwriting, extremely industrious as a scholar, and enjoying the confidence of all scholarly factions, even those that were mutually hostile.

No list of his writings is available, and none of the preserved works has been published so far. His great History, ending with the year 736/1335-36, was often quoted. It was abridged and continued by later scholars. Its actual title appears to have been al-Mu' taba' (cf. al-Sakhawi, in F. Rosenthal, A History of Muslim Historiography, 414, but al-Nu'aymi, Dâris, i, 578, refers to a work entitled al-Mu'tabah [= al-Mu'tabah?] as if it were different from the History often quoted by him). The Mu'tabah is preserved in MS. Topkapsiaray, Ahmet III, ending with the year 736/1335-36, was often quoted. It was abridged and continued by later scholars. Its actual title appears to have been al-Mu' taba' (cf. al-Sakhawi, in F. Rosenthal, A History of Muslim Historiography, 414, but al-Nu'aymi, Dâris, i, 578, refers to a work entitled al-Mu'tabah [= al-Mu'tabah?] as if it were different from the History often quoted by him). The Mu'tabah is preserved in MS. Topkapsiaray, Ahmet III, 2951 (cf. al-Munadijima, in Revue de l'Institut des Manuscrits arabes, 1936, 101 ff.). His voluminous Mu'qidad, which was highly praised and often cited as a reference work for contemporary scholarly history, is not preserved. A small Mu'qidad of his early teachers is preserved in Damascus (cf. Y. al-'Ishsh, Fihrist makhtûdt Ddr al-Kutub al-Mukaddimah, 1918, 228 f.). A Mu'qidad al-Buldân wa l-Kurâ is cited by Ibn Tulûn, Luma'd (Damascus 1348), 35 and 43. A small historical work on those who participated in the battle of Badr is ascribed to al-Birzal on the strength of the handwriting of a manuscript preserved in Damascus, said to be similar to other autographs of al-Birzal in the Zâhiriyah Library (cf. al-'Ishsh,
Among his works on hadith an Arba'ın Buldānīyya is mentioned. Two selections of 'awāli al-hadīth collected from his teachers and a Thulā-thiyyat min Munadāt Ahmād b. Hanbal are preserved in Bankesic (Cat., V, 2, 104 ff., no. 462, 2, 3, and 6). A fifth work, on al-Sharī'ī, is extant in Cairo. Other works can be confidently expected to turn up in the future. However, al-Bīrūnī published less than he wrote, and the preservation of his works, therefore, remained a matter of chance. Al-Nu'ayml (Dāris, i, 113) considered it worth mention that he came across the last volume of the History in 894/1489.


**Bīsāt (see Kālā).**

**Bīsbarāy b. Harīgarbhādās Kayazī, also called Kārkarnī, Indian author who wrote in Persian; the correct pronunciation of his name in Sanskrit is Vighwarai (Rajah of the world), son of Harīgarbhādās (slave of God), of the well known family of Kayazī, which was particularly noted for its Persian culture. His surname Kārkarnī signifies “he who has ears as big as hands”. He translated into Persian, in 1065-1651-2, during the reign of Shāh Dījāhān, the Sanskrit tale Vikrama-caritram, making use of the work of his predecessors. (The Sanskrit original also bore the title Vikrama-caritram, that is to say, the life of Vikram, the Radja Vikram Aditi in whose reign commenced the Bikrami era, which has now reached the year 2015). This translation is also known under the Sanskrit title Sang-kāsan Bahitṛī (Sanskrit: Sang-kāsan-baṭṭisī, 32 tales of the lion throne), and has been translated into French by Leschallier (Le Trône enchanté, New York 1817). For the various editions of this Sanskrit text, and the Persian translations, see the works mentioned below.

**Bibliography:** Etbē, in Grundriß der Iranischen Philologie, ii, 353; Rieu, Cat. Pers. MSS. Brit. Museum, ii, 763 f.; Pertsch, Cat. Berlin, 1034 f. (Said Naficy)

**Bīsha, an oasis in western Arabia stretching about 25 miles along the banks of the wāḍī of the same name immediately north of 20° N. The headwaters of the wāḍī are east of Abhā in the highlands of 'Astr, and the channel extends c. 450 miles north to its junction with Wāḍi Ranya, whence the combined channels turn inland to Wāḍi Tahbīth and Wāḍi al-Dawāsir (see al-Dawāsīr). The tributaries Hardjāb and Tarjā, coming from the east and west respectively, empty into Wāḍi Bīsha south of the oasis of Bīsha, and Wāḍi Tabālā [see Tabālā] joins Wāḍi Bīsha in the heart of the oasis. The early poets mention Bīsha frequently, but on occasion confuse it with the wāḍī and settlement of Baysh in Tihmāt 'Astr (see A. Sprenger, Die alte Geogr. Arabiens, Bern 1875).

The oasis of Bīsha is noted for its dates, which are transported as far as Dīyānār, and the nearby Beduins raise a famous breed of white camels known as amārīk (i.e., eaters of arūk leaves). Bīsha, at the junction of routes from al-Tāf and al-Riyāḍ to Abhā, Nadārín, and all of south-western Arabia, has been an important stop on incense, pilgrimage, and invasion routes. Nimān and al-Rawshān (Yākūt's Rūshān?) are the principal towns of the oasis, the former with the most important market of the region and the latter the site of Kal'at Bīsha, where the Saudi Arabian Amir of the district is established. Al-Rawshān is divided into Rawshān 'Āl Mahdī and Rawshān Bānī Salāl. Among other towns and villages are al-Dāhw, 'Āfī al-Dābab, al-Rukaytā, al-Nakī, al-Shāhika, and al-Dīwānaya. Yākūt lists the tribes of Bīsha as Khaṭṭām, Hilāl, Suwā'a b. 'Amīr b. Ṣa'ā'a, Salūl, 'Ukayl, al-Dābak, Jīyān, and Bānī Hāşim al-Kurān. The sūfīs of al-Kahtān and Aklub (both of which stem from Khaṭṭām), Bānī Salāl, and Khaṭṭān predominated.

separate treatment of the two groups continued
under the Condominium until in 1928 a single chief
(nâzir) was appointed over the whole tribe. The recent history of the Bishân has been uneventful.

**Bibliography:** G. E. R. Sanders, *The Bisharin,* in *Sudan Notes and Seccords,* vol. 33, 1933, 179-184, Khartoum. See also under **BEDA.** (P. M. Holt)

**BISHBALIK,** Bishbalk, the Sogdian (?) Panjikâth (both meaning 'Town of Five'), a town in eastern Turkestan frequently mentioned between the 2nd/8th and 7th/13th centuries (concerning the name cf. Minorsky in *Hudâd al-‘Alâm,* 271 f. and 272 f.). It was rediscovered in 1908 by Russian explorers, with the aid of information found in Chinese sources. Its position is 47 km. to the west of Kûshang (Chinese Ku-ch'êng) which was founded in the 18th century, and 10 km. north of Tsi-mu-sa, near the village of Hu-pao-tse. Its ruins (known as P'o-ch'êng-tse) have a circumference of 10 km. (B. Dolbëvë in the *Izv. Russk. Komiteeta diya izucheniya Sredneyi i Vostochnoy Azii* IX, April 1909, 65 f.; Ed. Chavannes, *Documents,* 17; *Zap. Ak. Nauk XXIII,* 1915, 77-121; Sir Aurel Stein, *Innermost Asia,* 1928, 554-59).

From the 2nd century A.D. onwards, Bishbalik was mentioned in Chinese sources as the residence of local princes. From 658 onwards, it was the centre of a Chinese administrative area (with a Chinese or Turkish governor). This was due to its position as a capital of a 'Five-Town-Area', and as one of the Chinese 'Four Garrisons'. The town is also mentioned in the Orkhon inscriptions (II, E 28; Kul-ʻur-Inscription; cf. Wilhelm Thomson in the *ZDMG* 1924, 153; A. N. Bernstein, *Social'no-ekonomicheski stroi orykhon-yeniseyskikh Tyurok VI-VIII веков* (The social and economic structure of the Orkhon and Yenisey Turks from the 6th to the 8th century), Moscow and Leningrad 1946, index. The Chinese names Kinman, and in particular, Pei-t'ing (northern court) for Bishbalik, appear from this time onwards. According to the Tâng-schu (Chavannes, *Doc.,* 96-99) the Scha-t'ou ("people of the Sandy Desert"; cf. below) lived near Bishbalik between 712 and 818. After long disputes (cf. Chavannes, *Doc.* 113 f.; Râghibghâr, *Diaan,* i, 103, 317, (ed. Brockelmann 242); Marwazi, 73; *Hudâd al-‘Alâm,* 227, 272) the town fell into the hands of the Tibetans in 791 (Chavannes, *Doc.,* 305), and later it became the residence of the Turkish Basmil princes, whose inheritance was taken over (with the title of Iduk Kut, 'Holy Majesty') by the Uigurs in 860. According to a report by a Chinese mission in the year 982 (for list of translations cf. Wittfogel, 104), the town possessed more than 50 Buddhist temples, a Buddhist monastery, Manichaean shrines and one (artificial?) lake. Some inhabitants, making use of the artificial irrigation, made their living by growing vegetables, others bred horses and did metalwork.

The only early Islamic mention of the town (in *Hudâd al-‘Alâm,* 17 a, trans. 94) dates from the same year. It is mentioned as being the residence of the ruler of the Toghuzguzz (q.v.). Concerning this, and a comparison between the Toghuzguzz and the Scha-t'ou, cf. V. Minorsky and Minorsky in *Hudâd al-‘Alâm,* 266/72, 481. The mention of it made by Idrisî, i, 491, 502, is presumably based on a different report, namely that of Tamîm b. Bahûr al-Mû'awwî (cf. bibliography).

As the northern residence of the ruler (Iduḵ Kut, Idi Kut, or Idu'ut) of the western Uigur part of the state, Bishbalk came under the Kara Khîtây (q.v.) (there is mention of a Chinese work on this by Wang-Kuo-wei in Wittfogel 615, bottom left). In 1209, the Uigrîr ruler handed the town over to the Mongols of his own free will, and took part in their campaigns. Bishbalk came in close contact with the Islamic world within the Mongol Empire, and Islam gradually penetrated into the town until the 14th century, despite the resistance offered by the Uigurs, who realised that they would thereby lose their spiritual leadership of the Mongol Empire. After the Mongol governor of Central Asia, Mas'ûd b. Mahmûd Yalavâch ('Ambassador'), had taken up his office in Bishbalk in 1252/53, the Iduḵ Kut is said to have issued a secret order in September 1258, for the murder of all Muslims in the town. By order of the Grand Khân Möngke, he was taken and executed, but his dynasty remained (Diwâynt, ii, 34 f., 88; iii, 60 f.; Rashîd al-Dîn (ed. Blochet), ii, 304 f.; Hamd Allâh Mustawfâ, *Kazwini,* *Târîkh-e Gûsidâ,* 577; B. Spuler, *Die Mongolen in Iran*², Berlin 1935, 239).

After 1260, the town appears to have enjoyed a period of independence between the empire of the Grand Khân and the Çaghatay state. It repulsed an attack from the west in 1275. At that time, Bishbalk was the starting point of the postal route from China to Central Asia (Bretschneider, Not. 208). The region of Bishbalk then apparently belonged to the state of Çaghatay. Nothing is known about the subsequent fate of the town itself. It apparently vanished at the same time as the dynasty of the Iduḵ Kut, in the 14th century. Thereafter, the Chinese used the name Pei-t'ing only as a regional designation for an area which (according to Muhammad Ḥâdîr Dughlât, *Târîkh Raghîb,* trans. E. Denison Ross, London 1895, 365) was known as Mughulistan in the 16th century, and in which Islam was now firmly established. There is no further mention of Bishbalk itself.


**AL-BISHR,** scene of a battle in eastern Syria in 73/692-3 between the Arab tribes of Sulaym and Taghib. Khâlid b. al-Walid campaigned here in 12/633 (Tabari, i, 2068, 2072-3). Yâqût describes it as a range of hills stretching from ʻUrân near Palmyra to the Euphrates, corresponding to the *Hudâd al-‘Alâm* 266/472, 481. The mention of it made by Idrisî, i, 491, 502, is presumably based on a different report, namely that of Tamîm b. Bahûr al-Mû'awwî (cf. bibliography).
An uneasy peace was broken through the Christian Taghlibi poet al-Akhtas’s satires at the Damascus court, provoking the Sulami chief al-Djahhaf b. Hukaym. The latter secured a forged diploma authorising him to collect the *sadaqah* of Taghlib and Bakr, and on this pretext left with 10,000 Sulamis. Taghlibi were surprised in their encampments at al-Musulim, provoking the Sulami chief al-Djahhaf b. Hukaym. The latter secured a forged diploma of women was a reprisal for similar behaviour and released, but his son was killed. The ripping-open because a wergild of 100,000 dirhams to be paid to Taghlib territory to escape the Caliph I.e. ii, 262, 4. The counts him among the classics His poems were collected by al-Asma *Diwdn* Abd al-Kadir on his *c* 3 *Ala* Khazini in the second half of the sixth century. al-Farazdaq, *Diwdn* (ed. Saw!) 721, mentions him *Diwdn* *Abnd?* of the Banu Sa`d, *Akil al-Murar* xv, 87; see also *Abd al-Umer* b. Umm lyas, whom Bishr addressed in at least two poems, was a grandson of Hudjr Akil al-Mur`ur (*Aghmani* xv, 87; see also *Abd al-Kadir* l.c. ii, 182). Occasionally verses of a later poet of his tribe were attributed to him (Nakd*id* 241; 245 Bevan).

**BIBLIOGRAPHY:** In addition to the works mentioned in the article: Ibn Kutyaba, *Thi*r 145-7; *Khazinat al-Adab*, ii, 262-4; Marzubani, *Mufaddaliydt*, 59; Ch. Lyall, *Mufaddaliydt*, i, 268 f.; A. Hartigan, in *MFOR*, i, 284-302; (H. W. FOCK)
in the western quarter of Bagdad, in the Darb al-Marisi (or al-Maristi), from which he took his nisba. He died in Bagdad in 218/833.

Bishr was an assiduous disciple of Abû Yûsuf in fiqh, and although he held some opinions of his own, he is counted among the followers of the Hanafî school; he also heard traditions from Hammâd b. Salama, Sufyân b. U'uyayna, and others. In theology he shared the general position of the Mûrjâ'îs, and the Muslim haeresiographers regard his followers, sometimes called al-Marisiyya, as forming one of the branches of this movement. He defined faith (imân) as the ratification (tasdik) of the judgment (imân) of the Kalâm (the Islamic creed), and that everything that is not tasdik is not imân; conversely, it follows that prostrating oneself to the sun is not in itself unbelief but an indication of disbelief. On the other hand, he considered all acts of disobedience to Allâh as grave sins (kabâwîr), but his followers (and presumably he, too) regarded it as logically impossible, in the light of Kur'ân xxi, 7 f., that Muslim sinners should be kept in hell for all eternity.

Bishr held that the Kur'ân was created, a doctrine first explicitly propounded by Dîshm b. Sâfîwân [q.v.], so that he was later vituperatively called a Dîsmî. It is also one of the basic tenets of the Mu'tazîla [q.v.], so that the Muslim haeresiographers could, at the same time, include him among these last. A distinction which he made between two kinds of Allâh's "will", led him to adopt, on the question of predestination, a position intermediate between the two extremes of the Djabriyya and the Kadariyya [q.v.], similar to that which was to become orthodox doctrine, and opposed to that of the Mu'tazîla. His main disciple, al-Nâdi'î [q.v.], whose doctrine was said to approach closely to that of his master, was in fact attacked by his Mu'tazîlî contemporaries.

Bishr is said to have been persecuted for his opinions; in particular it is said that he had to keep in hiding for 20 years during the reign of the 'Abbasîd caliph Harûn al-Rashîd. This is probably a legend, because that pillar of orthodoxy, al-Shâfi', is reported to have lived with Bishr and his mother, a pious Muslim woman, in her house during his stay in Bagdad; he is credited in the biography with the middle of the alleged period of hiding. But it is true that the traditionalists (ahl al-hadîth [q.v.]), and in particular Ahmad b. Hanbal and his followers, opposed Bishr with implacable hatred, so that he later came to be regarded by the orthodox, notwithstanding his ascetic life, as one of the arch-heretics of Islam, and scurrilous features were added to his biography.


(CARRA DE VAUX-[A. N. NADER and J. SCHAFFT])

BISHR B. MARWAN B. AL-HAKAM, Abû Marwan, an Umayyad prince, son of the Caliph, Marwan [q.v.] and of Kutayya bint Bishr (of the Banû Dîjâ'î b. Kilâb, thus a Kayyite). He took part in the battle of Mûrjî Râhît (65/684) and there killed a Kilab chief. After his father's accession to the Caliphate he followed him at the time of his expedition to Egypt, for the sources tell us that when in 65/684 Marwan had regained this province for the Umayyads, taking it from Ibn al-Zubayr [q.v.] who had seized it in Sha'bân 64/March-April 684, and had put his son, 'Abd al-'Azîz [q.v.] in charge of the Prayer and the collection of khârâjî, he left Bishr there to keep him company and to help him to forget his separation from his family.

Some time later the relation between the two brothers changed and Bishr returned probably to Syria. The chroniclers bring up his name again in connexion with the events of 71/690-91 (al-Tabari, ii, 816), the year in which the Caliph, 'Abd al-Malik appointed him governor of Kûfa. It was only in 72, probably after the end of the campaign against Mus'âb b. al-Zubayr [q.v.] in which Bishr had taken part (al-Baladhuri, Ansâb, v, 335, 338), that he took up his residence there (al-Tabari, ii, 822), and had as counsellor not only his uncle, Rawh b. Zinba[b], but also Musa b. Nusayr whom 'Abd al-Malik had asked of 'Abd al-'Azîz with this in mind (according to the Kitâb Akhâdîth al-Imâmî wa 'l-Siyâsâ, in the appendix to P. De Gayangos, The History of Moh. Dynasties in Spain, London 1840-43, L-LII). In 73/692-3, the Caliph gave him in addition to the governorship of Kûfa, that of Basra, which he had taken away after only a few months from Khalîl b. 'Abd Allâh b. Khâlid b. Asd because of his unsuccessful conduct of the war against the Khabîridjîtes; at the end of the same year or in 74, Bishr transferred himself to this city, leaving 'Amr b. Hurayth al-Mâkhrûzî as his lieutenant at Kûfa. As governor of Kûfa, Bishr sent contingents to reinforce the troops in operation against the Khabîridjîtes on 'Abd al-Malik's behalf; but although he had been appointed commander-in-chief (amir), he received an order directly from 'Abd al-Malik to give the command of the army fighting this sect to al-Muhallab [q.v.]. This he did very much against his will when he reached Basra because he had intended to appoint 'Umar b. 'Ubayd Allâh b. Ma'mar. Shocked by the Caliph's not having left the initiative to him in this matter (al-Tabari, ii, 855 sq., etc.), he advised the commander of the Kûfa troops to oppose the military action of al-Muhallab, an action which provoked the indignation of the latter (al-Tabari, ii, 856).

On his arrival at Basra, Bishr was suffering already from some hidden disease (al-Balâdhîrî, v, 171, 179, etc.) or from an infection (Ibn Khâfir, ix, 7) and he died very soon afterwards at a few years over forty, according to Ibn 'Asîkîr, in 74/693-4 (according to al-Wâkidî, apud al-Tabari, ii, 852, in 73; in 75 according to al-Dhâhibî, Ta'rikh, ms. Bodl. ii, fol. 95r and Yâ'îfî, Mirât al-Djânân, ms. Paris 1589, fol. 55r.) He was buried at Basra but a few days later it was already impossible to distinguish his grave from that of a negro who had died on the same day, which shows how little interest was taken in tombs at that time. On the news of his death, there were some defections in the army of al-Muhallab.
Bishr was a very agreeable young man, a governor who could be approached without difficulty (see the verses of Aymān b. Khuraym in Aṣāḥ, xxxi, 113), remarkably inclined to be merciful; nevertheless he executed the emissaries of Ibn al-Zubayr who, even after the death of Muṣṭafā, continued his intrigues in the city of Basra. The only criticisms levelled against his government concerned some innovations in ritual (al-Baladhūrī, v, 170, etc.), and his failure to distribute food among the people, his custom being to reserve this for his guards and the members of his court (al-Baladhūrī, v, 180).

Like many other Umayyads, Bishr enjoyed drinking wine, yet drunk and lead a merry life with his companions (al-Masʿūdī, Mursūdī, v, 254-58): he tells us of the trick played by one of his friends to rid him of the somewhat too constraining presence of his uncle, Rawḥ; the latter's removal is nevertheless explained in a different way by Ibn Kūtayba, Uṣūm, ed. Brockelmann, 207 f.). He liked to listen to music and to write poetry, and poets enjoyed his sympathy and generosity (see a long panegyric and an elegy in the Dīwān of Farazdāk, ed. Boucher, Paris 1870, 173-75, 129, transl. 521-25, 361; ed. Hell, Munich 1900, index; poems in his honour in al-Aḥtāl, Dīwān, ed. al-Ṣāḥib, 38, 58, 68, 120). Other poets too lived in his entourage or addressed verses to him: Dāwr, Kūhāyru, Fāzūl, Nūsayy, Surūkā b. Mīrād al-Bārīkī, al-ʿAṣāfī of the Banū Ṣayyān, Aymān b. Khuraym al-ʿAsadī, al-Mutawakkil, Ibrāhīm b. al-Rūh, among others.

Bishr was able to win a large return to Baghdad, Bishr was able to win a large number of converts to the Sunnī (al-waṣl), three fundamental principles of the Muʿtazilite school. These verses found their way outside the prison precincts; they were recited at meetings everywhere. Al-Raḥīm, realising that Bishr's verses had more power over the masses than his teaching before his imprisonment, freed him. Bishr dedicated a veritable dithyramb to reason. He was at once a great poet and a great rhetorician. His advice to authors and especially to poets is quoted in a celebrated page of al-Ṭāhāṣīf (al-Bayān, i, 104): "The poet must feel that secret influence of the heavens and choose elegant and beautiful terms which are simple and clear of expression".

Only a few fragments of his writings on the Muʿtazilite principles have come down to us. He stressed especially the problem of "moral responsibility" and was the first to speak of "engendered acts" (al-taḥṣīld) with a view to clarifying the nature of this responsibility and of explaining at the same time the problem of sensation. The "engendered act" (taḥṣīld) is an act prompted by a cause which is itself the effect of another cause. Thus, in the act of opening a door with a key, there is first a voluntary act, then the movement of the hand which turns the key, and lastly that of the key which turns the tongue of the lock. This last movement is an engendered act for it does not emanate directly from a voluntary decision. Thus, he says, we are responsible for acts initiated by ourselves either directly or "engendered" by our direct (voluntary) acts in measure as we are aware of all their consequences. Bishr also explains sensation as an "engendered act" through the impression which is first made on the senses; the sense then naturally translates this impression into sensation. Reason, he says, once it has reached maturity, can comprehend the great moral problems: distinguishing good from evil, even before any revelation. And thus, merit or the lack of it depends upon ourselves alone, for we have freedom of choice and action. And he adds, "there is greater merit in the man who does good by his own means than in him who is helped by divine grace". He remarked also, that voluntary decision need not necessarily be followed by implementation, even in default of impediment. We are responsible in so far as we perceive the moral value of our actions; in actions where there is no responsibility. Repeatability is valueless, he says, unless it goes with a decision not to repeat the forbidden act and not to persist in it.

As to our knowledge of the external world, it may be partial and relative, but this need not cast doubt on the value of reason. He allows that movement lies between the two moments of rest through which the mobile agent passes; and, he says, cause must always precede its effect. He defends the principle of universal determinism; the only exception he allows is that of man's freedom of motion. Finally, he considers the soul as ineluctably united to the body in man.


BISHR B. AL-WALID B. 'ABD AL-MALIK, Unayyad prince, one of the numerous sons of the Caliph al-Walid and brother of the Caliphs Yazid III and Ibrahim. His learning earned him the title of scholar (zālim) of the Banū Marwān. He led many military expeditions (certainly in 92/710-11: al-Tabari, ii, 1269 etc.). He was nomi-
nated amir of the pilgrimage by his father in 95/714. His name does not appear in the sources until the Caliph which supported Yazid b. al-Walid (the future Yazid III). He was not, however, the only member of the family to do so, since Yazid was supported by thirteen brothers.

He was governor of Kinnasrīn when Marwān b. Muḥammad, the governor of Armenia and Mesopotamia, took the field against Yazid's successor Ibrāhīm in 127/744-45. Marwān, having succeeded in winning over the garrison of the town, largely composed of Kayestes, persuaded their leader to hand over to him Bishr and his brother Masrūr, and threw them both into prison. The date of Bishr's death is not known, but as Marwān in the course of his march after the battle of 'Ayn al-Diwar took over the caliphate, it is presumed that the two captives never recovered their liberty and died in prison.


BISHR AL-HĀFĪ, full name: Abū Naṣr Bishr b. al-Mu'tamīr b. 'Aṭā b. Hilāl b. Maḥr b. 'Abd Allāh (originally Bābar) al-Hāfī. He was a Sūfī, born in Bakīrī or in Mābarsām, a village near Marw (al-Shāhīḏān) in 150/767 (or 152/769), and died in Baghdād (some sources say that he died in Marw, but this seems unlikely) in 226/840 or 227/841-42. Little is known about his early age. He is said to have belonged to some young men's association, or a gang of robbers, whilst still in Marw. He has also been described as a great friend of wine. Another tradition has it that he earned his living by making spindles. We do not know how this fits in, or to which period of his life it belongs. It is a known fact, however, that like his maternal uncle 'All b. Khashram (165/781-238/872) he was a traditionist. With the exception of 'Abd Allāh b. al-Mubārak (who came from Marw but travelled a great deal), his teachers lived in the Arabic-speaking regions; so Bishr is certain to have continued his hadith studies after he left his home, and it may be these very studies that induced him to go away. He had already made a name for himself when he reached Baghdād from 'Abbadān for the first time, for a Baghdād traditionist was anxious to meet him. Bishr is also said to have studied under Mālik b. Anas (who died in 179/795) and to have gone with him on a pilgrimage to Mecca. For chrono-
logical reasons Abū Hanīfā cannot possibly have been one of his teachers, as Hujjāwīrī and Aṭṭār assert.

It is also not clear how and when he became a Sūfī. There is no mention anywhere of a novitiate, and two completely different events are mentioned as the reasons for his conversion. According to one version a certain Išāk al-Maghāzīlī (who is, unfortunately, otherwise unknown to us) wrote a letter to him in which he asked him how he meant to earn his living if he lost his sight and his hearing and was no longer able to make spindles. According to the other version he picked up a piece of paper in the street (one report of this even says that he was drunk at the time) with the name of God on it; he perfumed it and kept it reverently, with the result that either Bishr himself, or someone else, had a dream promising the exaltation of Bishr's name. In each case, the result mentioned is Bishr's conversion to a pious way of life. Quite apart from these con-
tradictions, we do not know what form this piety took—e.g., whether it included wāhidī and we have no proof that these events actually were the be-
inning of his life as a Sūfī. From Bishr's sayings which have survived we merely see that at some point, at the latest in Baghdād, he did turn away from traditionist studies, he buried his hadith writings and concentrated on Sūfī devotions. Traditionist studies, he says, do not equip one for death, they are merely a means to gain worldly pleasure, and they impair piety. He asked his former colleagues to impose a "poor-rate" on the hadith, that is to say, to follow truly 21/2% of the pious verses which they had learnt and which they proclaimed with such professoral self-complacency. He refrained from teaching hadith for the very reason why he so greatly wished to teach them, and promised to return to them as soon as he had overcome his longing to teach them: "Beware of the hadathānā, for in the hadathānā there is embedded a particular sweetness". He admitted the science of hadith only in so far as it was pursued "for the sake of God", and quoted hadiths only in conversation, where this would fit into the general framework of a training for a pious way of life. Still, as we do not know whether his earlier traditionism might not have been practised with this same idea in mind all along, we ought perhaps not to speak of an actual breach with his past.

Bishr's Sūfī piety is based upon the acceptance of the laws of Islam and the Sunni Caliphs, but he is also said to have held the family of the Prophet in loving veneration. He was greatly respected not only by Ahmad b. Hanbal, but also by Ma'mūn (Mu'ta-
zila, Sīhā). The statement that he took Faith to mean a positive confession, a belief in its truth and man's acting according to it, as Hujjāwīrī puts it, is, when formulated in this way, hardly true, although it is justifiable with regard to his practice. The decisive factor for Bishr was the deed itself. As an absolute minimum in this respect, he demanded that man should at least not sin, and to accomplish this he advised contemplation of God's greatness—before which he himself trembled, despite his own ascetic life, up to the very point of death. Before
the choice between God or the world, he made his choice unreservedly in favour of God, and he despised all forms of worldly ambition and selfishness. He preferred poverty, which was to be born with patience and charity, and it is said of him that if one day he met a man suffering from cold, and could not help him in any other way, he unclothed himself to show his sympathy and to give an example; he died in a borrowed shirt because he had given his own away to a poor man. He spoke against the avaricious, the very sight of whom "hardens the heart"; and he advised a man who asked for God’s help to start off on a pilgrimage to Mecca, to give his money instead to an orphan or to a poor man, for the joy caused thereby was worth a hundred times more than any pilgrimage. By saying this he hardly meant that the one pilgrimage to Mecca, which the law prescribes, could be replaced by some social act, as some other Sâfîs have taught, but must have referred to some additional pilgrimage. Tawûs b. Kaysân already (who died in 105/724) is said to have refrained from going on a pilgrimage because he chose to stay with a sick friend instead (Hilyat al-Awsiyâd, 4, 10; cf. Meier, Zwei islamische Lehrerschungen bei Tolsoji? in Asiatische Studien, 1958).

And Bishr called pilgrimages the holy war of women, but, unlike for instance Džâfar al-Ṣâdik (al-Kâdd al-Nu’mân: Da’â’im al-Islâm, 1, 346-47), he put the giving of alms above both pilgrimage and the holy war—because alms could be given in secret, without other people getting to know of it. The very wish to have one’s good deeds known by other people is, for Bishr, an example of worldly mindedness, and in this he sees an element capable of destroying even the good deeds of man. He condemned the wish to be well thought of by one’s fellow men to the extent of advising one against mixing with them at all—even if only to give testimony and lead the prayers. Here his teachings come close to the Malikatümiyya: “Do not give anything merely in order to avoid the censure of others!”; “Hide your good deeds as well as your evil ones”. He confesses that he himself still attaches a certain importance to the effect he makes on others, and to his appearance as a pious man, but he wages an unrelenting war against this tendency (isâdîyût)—in himself as well as in others. He only recognises those who wear patched cloaks (murâkâbât) as sharers of his views, when one of them has told him of his resolution to live up to this symbol of dedication to God’s service by an active furtherance of religion. He himself refrained, on one occasion, from accepting dates in the dark at the back of a shop, in order not to be different in secret from what he was generally considered to be. His abstemiousness (murâ) went beyond mere abstention from dubious things by putting a limit to the unrestrained enjoyment of what was permitted: “what is permitted”, he says, “does not tolerate immoderation (isârîf)”. Of everything he ate a little less than his conscience would have permitted, thereby creating the ‘Tabu-zone’ which had already been recommended in the Jewish Pirâté Abîth, and which was also observed by numerous other Islamic ascetics. Destitute, he often lived on bread alone, and sometimes he was starving. Where the question of faith in God’s providence (lauwâkîhâl) arose, he distinguished three types of the poor: (1) those who neither beg nor accept anything, yet receive everything they ask for of God; (2) those who do not beg, but accept what they are given; (3) those who hold out for as long as they can, but do then beg (Suâlâmî: Tabâsîyâ, 47; ‘Аtâr: Tadékhra, 1, 110), describing those who belong to the middle group as people trusting in the providence of God, however, another place (Tadékhra, 1, 110, 24-25) in the same context expresses this confidence as being the resolution not to accept anything from any man; whilst in a third place lauwaqîhû appears to be comparable with manual work provided the deed be done under the will of God (Hilya, 8, 351)—but the explanation of that oracular definition iṣârîf bîldâ suhâbân wa suhâbân bîldâ iṣârîf does not seem to me to be beyond all doubt. Admittedly, Bishr is said to have begged only from Sârî al-Sakâti, knowing that this man would rejoice in the loss of any worldly possessions; but some stories suggest that he lived largely on the earnings of his sister Mukhkâ, who looked after him and lived by spinning. (Bishr had three sisters who are all said to have lived in Bagdad). The question of begging links up with the one concerning ‘giving and taking’, which played a great part in Sûfism, especially later on (cf. Meier, Die Vida des Scheich Abû Ishâq al-Kâzarûnî, in Bibliotheca Islâmica, 14, 1948, Introduction 57-61). In spite of taking a great interest in the lot of the poor, Bishr did not—unlike Kâzarûnî for example—function as their spokesman and mediator, but rather withdrew into himself. He refrains from admonishing princes, he does not even drink of the water for which a prince has dug the channel. As a consolation when the cost of living is high he advises contemplating death. He knows that there is no way of satisfying mankind, and regards his own time (on a well-known pattern) as particularly far removed from the ideal of contentment: “Even though a cap should fall from heaven on to somebody’s head, that man would not want it”; nor, like Muâsîbî, does he have much to say in his days in favour of the readers of the Qur’ân: “Rather a noble robber than a base-minded reader of the Qur’ân”. He finds true piety restricted to the very few: “In these days, there are more dead within than without the walls”. A Sûfi is one who stands before his God with a pure (ṣâfî) heart, and perfect is only he whom even his enemies no longer fear; but in Bishr’s own days not even friends, he says, could trust each other. The opposition which a pious man has to overcome lies in his inclination (shahâwâdî); only those who have erected an iron wall against these inclinations, says Bishr, can feel the sweetness of the service of God. He advises silence to those who derive pleasure from speaking, speech to those who enjoy being silent. He declines teaching badîhâs, because he does not wish to give in to a desire to do so; he eats no aubergines in order to fight his craving for them, and no fruit in order not to satisfy the fruit’s own longing. He does not, however, advocate the repression of sexual desire, and does not even object to a harem of 4 women—though he himself remained unmarried.

In spite of the fact that Bishr puts the deed before knowledge, he is considered both knowledgeable and intelligent. This does not refer to his theological knowledge, but also to his ability to experience and expound religious feelings and to his pious way of life: “A wise man is not one who merely knows good and evil, but he who both does the former and refrains from doing the latter”; “First to know, then to act, then really to know”. Ahmad b. Hanbal is said to have claimed for himself greater theological knowledge, but to have referred to Bishr for knowledge concerning the reality of things, the higher facts (hakâtâbî). Without question, though only a few dicta and some verses in the style of the sâdîqîyût...
have survived, Bishr played his part through his word in expanding the teaching of the mystical shaping of man in Islam. Some sayings of his, however, belong to an earlier tradition which he simply passed on—one of his frequently quoted Sufi teachings is Fuṣṭal b. Ḥaydā. The men who learnt from him are recognisable from the ismāds of his dicta.

With regard to the origin of Bishr's cognomen "the barefooted" (ḥāfī), Ibn Ḥallikān tells the following story: Bishr once asked a cobbler for a new strap for one of his sandals, but the cobbler called this a nuisance, whereupon Bishr threw down both his sandals and henceforth walked barefoot. Much speaks in favour of this report, even if the explanation is not clear in every detail. Did Bishr fly into a rage at the cobbler's answer, and then, being a pious man, did he draw the consequences? Or did he, blaming only himself, soberly come to the decision never to inconvenience a cobbler again? Later referring to Sura LXXI, 19 "And God made the earth your carpet", he said that he did not step onto a king's carpet wearing shoes. As a further reminder he also says that at the "time when the pact was made" they too were barefoot. This probably refers to the pact of obedience which human beings are said to have made with God before their appearance on God's earth (Sura VII, 172: a-lasū bi-rabbikum). Such justifications belong to the symbolic associations which Sufis later attached to the various parts and colours of their clothes (cf. Meier, Ein Knigge für Schwärmer, in RSO 32, 1957, 485-524). The statement made by Ḥudūjwīrī and repeated by ʿAṭṭār that Bishr went barefoot because he was so deeply moved in contemplation of God, is hard to understand—and, together with the explanations given by Ḥudūjwīrī and ʿAṭṭār, mere theory. Bishr is said to have called himself "the barefooted" and to have been called to account for this by a girl who said "All you have to do is to buy a pair of sandals for two dinār, but then you would never have your beautiful name".

Al-Hafi is also the name of the dervish in Lessing's Nathan der Weise. Although Reiske's Abiljadede Annales Moslemici, i, Leipzig 1754, where our Sūfī appears on page 193, vulgo Beschir al-Hafi [sic nudis!] dicit, had already appeared by the time Lessing's play was written, it can hardly be regarded as its source. Lessing is more likely to have sought Reiske's advice personally, or to have derived the name from d'Herbelot (cf. Baschar al-Hafi and Haiji).


BISKRA, town and oasis of the Zibān in the south-east of Algeria and on the northern fringe of the Sahara. It is situated at an altitude of between 100-120 metres, on the alluvial cone and the west bank of the Oued Biskra, at the mouth of a wide depression which extends from the Awrās massif to the western Saharan peaks of the Atlas Mountains. This has always been a route much used by nomads and conquering shepherds. The blue sky, seldom streaked with clouds, its mild winter climate (mean temperature for January 11.2° = 52° F.) make of it a winter resort (it has numerous hotels); but its summer climate is torrid (33.3° = 92° F. in July) and favourable to the ripening of dates. Rains are fairly rare (156 mm. = 6.14 ins. per year) and, above all, irregular. The palm grove which covers an area of 1300 hectares, numbers more than 150,000 palm trees and thousands of fruit trees; it is irrigated by the waters of canalised springs. In the cold season, the surplus water makes it possible to irrigate vast fields of wheat and barley at the southern end of the oasis, where the harvest begins in April. The European town, which has grown into the administrative, commercial and tourist centre, is laid out on a grid plan; it was built upstream from the palm-grove, near a fort. The Muslim cultivators are dispersed in villages, in houses of brickude. These are mainly to the south, surrounding the ruins of an ancient Turkish fortress. These villages are: Msid, Bab al-Dorb, Ras al-Guerria, Sidi Barkat, Medjeniche, and Guedda; on the perimeter, a little apart, are Beni Mora, al-Kora, Filali and Aliya. Biskra, which is the chief centre of the Ziban group of oases, is a township of 54,500 inhabitants in all, among which are a few hundred Europeans. It is served by the railway which runs between Touggourt and Constantine, and by the pipeline, which, since 1958, has carried the petrol of Hassi-Messoud to the port of Philippeville, and will soon extend to Bougie.
In the 8th/14th century, the Banū Muznī committed more than one act of disloyalty to the Ḥafsids for the benefit of the rulers of Bougie, Tlemcen or Fes. Then, in 904/1402, the king Abu Fāris re-established the autonomy of Tunis over Biskra; he led away the last of the Banū Muznī as his captive and replaced him, as elsewhere, by a Kāʿid of his own entourage.

With the decline of the Ḥafsids at the end of the 9th/15th century, Biskra and the Zāb became the fief of the nomad Arabs, the Dawawida. The town was still "densely populated" but the people were poor, wrote Leo Africanus in the middle of the 16th century (trans. Épaulard, 440). This was the point at which the Turks, following the two expeditions of Ḥasan Aḡā in 949/1542 and Saλāḥ Raḥs in 939/1532 took over to establish a garrison and construct a fort. In practice, power was in the hands of the chiefs of the BuʿUkkāz family, who were given the title of Shaykh al-ʿArab. In the eighteenth century, the Bey Saλāḥ of Constantine, finding them too powerful, set up a rival family, that of Ben Ganah. Biskra suffered from this rivalry and from the abuses of the Turks: its inhabitants gradually abandoned the town to put a greater distance between themselves and the kašba and dispersed to small villages spanning the oasis.

After the French landing at Algiers (1830), the rivalry continued. Farḥāt b. Saʿīd, representative of the BuʿUkkāz family, finally appealed to ʿAbd al Kāḍīr, but the Ben Ganah family joined up with France in 1838, following the capture of Constantine. Biskra was occupied by the Duke of Aumale in 1844, in the following year a permanent garrison was established and a fort built on the site of the old kašba. The Ben Ganah retained their position as the most influential family and held most of the key appointments in the region. They have recently become reconciled with the BuʿUkkāz family (1938) and from the abuses of the Turks: its inhabitants were able to promise not to attack the clan of Saλāḥ al-Dīn and construct a fort. In practice, power was in the hands of the Shaybānī and the Sayyids, and the most influential family and held most of the key appointments in the region. They have recently been reconciled with the BuʿUkkāz family (1938) and still hold the power in the town.

Biskra was occupied by the Duke of Aumale in 1844, in the following year a permanent garrison was established and a fort built on the site of the old kašba. The Ben Ganah retained their position as the most influential family and held most of the key appointments in the region. They have recently been reconciled with the BuʿUkkāz family (1938) and still hold the power in the town.
by the Persian 'āmil at 'Ayn Tamr, ended with the defeat of the attackers and with the escape of Bistām (Anšâb, 1004 b). Bistām fought his last battle at Nakā al-Hasan. He was killed by a half-witted Dabbl, ʾĀsim b. Khâlifâ, who is said to have boasted of his deed at the court of ʿUthmān. The date of his death may be fixed at circa 615 A.D.

Very little is known about the posterity of Bistām. His grand-daughter Ḥadârâ, the daughter of his son Ẓâlîk was about to marry al-Fârâzdâk, but died before the appointed date.

Bistām is said to have been a Christian. He was the sayyid of his tribe; when the news of his death reached his tribe they pulled down their tents as an expression of their sorrow. Many elegies were composed on his death, and his person was glorified as the ideal of Bedouin courage and bravery. But in the times of al-Ǧâhîz, in the urban mixed society of the towns of ʿIrāq, his glory faded away, and the common people preferred to listen to the story of 'Antâra (al-Baydân, iii, 34) which came closer to their social equalitarian tendencies (cf. El, s.v. ʿAntâra, R. Blachère).


Bistām b. Kays, Kâfir b. Ahmad al-Ḥarrâf, was born in Antioch and appears to have witnessed the sack of Aleppo, by Tûrîq, in 803/1400. He studied in Cairo and went to Bursa, then the Ottoman capital and imperial residence. There he gained the favour of Sultan Murâd II, a patron of learning, to whom several of his works are dedicated; there he died in 858/1454.

He was a mystic, belonging, as his name indicates, to the Ḥurâfî (q.v.) order of dervishes, who attributed a mystical significance to the letters of the alphabet and to combinations of these (cf. his Kashîf Asrâr al-Ḥurâfî; his Šams al-ʿĀlî fi ʿIlm al-Ḥurâfî, written in 826/1423). Among works of this type is also his Muḥâlîf al-Ǧâlîr al-Ḏâmî. He wrote a number of Sûfî works, perhaps the best-known being Mandâkid al-Tarâṣûsî fi Muḥâbât al-Tarâṣûsî, and also wrote on history and geography, the most important work being the encyclopaedia entitled al-Fawâid al-Miskîyya fi l-Fawâid al-Makhtûya.

Bibliography: Brockelmann, ii, 300; Ḥâdîjî Khâlîfâ (ed. Flügel), iv, 468; JRAIS 1899, 907. (M. Smith)

Bistî [see Shika].

Bisútûn, (Bisti’un of the Arabic geographers, Bistûn in present local parlance), a mountain ca. 30 km. E. of Kirmânsâh on the main road from Baghdâd to Hamadân.

The name is found in Greek sources (Diodorus 2.13 and Isidore of Charax) to βασιλείαν ὅριος, and in early Islamic authors (as al-Khwârizmî and Ḥamza al-ʾIṣfâhânî) where we find the archaic form Baghistân, Old Persian* bâgastânâ “place of the gods”, (or one divinity in particular). Later Islamic authors have the form Bistiun (Bistûn) which in modern times became Bisútûn (Bistûn). The site is mentioned many times in Arabic literature since it lay on the main road from ʿIrāq to Khurâsân.

High above the road is the famous bas-relief of Darius the Great with cuneiform inscriptions in three languages, Old Persian, Akkadian, and Elamite. Beside the road below was the relief of the Parthian king Gotarzes, unfortunately now almost obliterated by a modern New Persian inscription.

Bisûtûn was regarded as a world wonder by the Muslims. In the books of those authors who follow Abû Zayd al-Balâqî appears a short description of the sculptures which was fanciful since the Bisûtûn sculptures are confused with those of nearby Tâk-i Bustûn (considered Khursâw II Parwiz with his horse, a work of ʿKaṭṣûs b. Sînimmar). Ibn Ḥâkîm gives the curious explanation of the Darius relief with his captives as a teacher and pupils. Most Islamic authors thought the sculptures depicted Shirîn and Khursâw II.

The trilingual inscription of Darius provided the key to the decipherment of all cuneiform inscriptions.


(E. Herzfeld-R. N. Frye)

BITIK, BITIKCÎ, Turkish words derived from the verb biti- “to write”. A deverbal-noun bitîg “written document book” is found in the Orkhon inscriptions and in the Turkish texts of Turfan. Bistîk, is a nomen agentis in -ti signifying “scribe, secretary”. It is first found in Qudadyu bitîg under the form bitîgî. The forms with a final surd (bitik, bitikci) are well attested in middle Turkish notably in Çağatay and Coman. The verb bitîg and its derivatives have almost disappeared from modern dialects. Khakas has preserved pitik, bitik, "written, document" as well as bitîtä “cultured, literate” and in Tuvin we have for example bitik “official document”.

The etymology of biti is unknown. The much quoted derivation from the Chinese ifu (> *piš) "writing brush" must be treated with caution. Comparison with Indo-European forms, such as Khotanese pišaka “written, document”, Sanskrit pišaka “collection of canonical books”, or Greek πίπτοσιν “letter”, is tempting but unsubstantiated by the phonetic history of these words.

In written Mongol the verb “to write” is biti-, a form which corresponds with the Turkish biti-. The deverbal noun biti- “written document, writing, letter, missive” occurs from the time of the Secret History of the Mongols and a nomen agentis bitiçî “scribe, secretary, copyist” is found in the Mongol administrative documents of the Il-khans. Mean-
while in Mongol-administered Persia the Turkish form bitik" seems to have been preferred to the Mongol form. One may see in this an indication of Uighur preponderance in the administration of the Mongol Empire. The words of literary Mongol are clearly observable in modern dialects. For example: modern Khalkha bitieg and biteli, Buryat bosog and bote, Kalmuk, bitieg and biteli, Ordos bitikh and biteli.

The most ancient Tunguz form is Ju-chen *biegi(i) "book". Mandju bitike "written document, as the book, document, letter" must be a loan-word as the derivation cannot be explained by the facts of Mandju. On the other hand bitikess "scribe, secretary" is a regular Mandju nomen agentis. In Evenki bichi "to write" and bitiga "written document" are borrowed from the Mongol, while the Oroch bitikh, Oltcha bito "written document, letter", is directly connected with Mandju forms.

It is reasonable to conclude that the Turkish words implanted in Mongol by Uighur scribes, followed the Mongol conquest which enabled them to become technical administrative terms. — These found ready use in the highly developed states of the Ju-chen and the Mandju. See further berat.

(D. Sinor)

BITILIS [see BIDLIS].

BITOLJA [see MANASTIR].

BITRAWSH, in Spanish Pedroche, a little place in the administrative district of Pozoblanco, 60 kms. north of Cordoba, on the Cordoba-Toledo road, and the same distance from Dar al-Askar now El Vacar). According to Idrisi, it was a heavily populated fortified town with high walls; situated in the region of Fañ al-Ballut of which Ghalfik (now Belalcasar) was the capital, it was the seat of a provincial judge. Its inhabitants like those of Ghalfik had won renown for their bravery in repulsing the attacks of the Christians. Its mountains and plains were, and to a great extent still are, covered with a variety of oak trees distinguished by the quality of their acorns, which the inhabitants cultivated with great care, and which in years of famine served them as food, for as al-Razi affirms, they were the best in all Spain. Abü Haç Úmar al-Ballut, who came originally from Pedroches, occupied Crete with the survivors of the "Battle of the Suburb" (al-rabad) and there founded a dynasty which lasted until 530/941. The Berbers settled in the district of Los Pedroches took part, under an Andalusian mystic called Abü Ali al-Sarrad, in a rising against the amir Abû Alá Allâh which ended in the rout and death of their chief in front of the walls of Zamora (268/901). Of its history during the Almoravid and Almohad periods, we only know that at the beginning of the year 550/1155, the governor of Cordova, Abû Zayd Abû al-Rahman b. Igit, made a sortie with Almohad troops against the forth of Pedroches and those of the Fañ al-Ballut region of which Alfonso VII had just taken possession in the course of a rapid invasion which had also enabled him to take Andujar. Ibn Igit routed the Count, the lord of Pedroche, whom Alfonso VII had left there as governor, and, in the course of his assault on the fort, took him prisoner and sent him to Marrakech.

Bibliography: Idrisi, 175, 213 (text), 211, 263 (transl); Ibn Abû al-Mun'im, al-Ra'af al-milâm, 45 (text), 57 (transl); Râzî, 51; Ibn Khalidun, *Ibar, iv, 211; E. Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Mus. Esp., i, 385; al-Bayân al-Mughrib, 3rd. part, MS. Tamgrut; Anales Toledoanos primeros, A. Huici, 348. (A. Huici Miranda)

BITRÎK, Arabised form of Latin Patricius. The patriciatus dignitas, was instituted by the Emperor Constantine (A.D. 306-337), an honorary dignity, not connected with any office, and conferred for exceptional services to the State.

I.—It is certain that no Arabs in the service of Rome were endowed with the patriciate before the Ghassânids [q.v.] and no Ghassânid before al-Ḫârîth b. Ḫabala, who was honoured with the dignity ca. 540 A.D., as was also his son and successor al-Munâdhir ca. 570 A.D. The assumption of this high Roman honour by the two Ghassânid dynasts is the most telling indication of their place and importance in the Roman hierarchy. Al-Ḫârîth and al-Munâdhir are the only figures in the history of the Arabs before Islam whose patriciate can be established with certainty; there is no positive evidence in the sources that the Romans conferred it again on a Ghassânid after al-Munâdhir.

II.—As the Muslim conquests in the seventh century changed the status and rôle of the Arabs in their relation to the Romans from subjects and "allies" to conquerors, the patriciate, which in the pre-Islamic period had been greatly coveted by Arab princes as a symbol of their Roman connexions, naturally ceased to be assumed by them. Instead, it survived as a term in their literature. Almost a hapax legomenon in pre-Islamic poetry, bitîrîk acquired three broken plurals and found its way into the literature of the Muslim period. It was woven into the texture of Arabic poetry by al-Mutanabbi and Abû Firsâ and was frequently mentioned by the historians and the geographers. Indeed, in the military annals of Arab-Byzantine relations it became the regular term for a Byzantine commander. Although other terms occur, like duns, paradoxically enough it was bitîrîk, a non-military term, which received the widest vogue.

III.—The frequent occurrence of bitîrîk in Arabic authors was, however, attended by confusions and inaccuracies. The patriciate was conceived as though it were (a) an office (b) hereditary (c) applicable to "allies" to conquerors, the patriciate, which in the military annals of Arab-Byzantine relations it became the regular term for a Byzantine commander. Although other terms occur, like...

AL-BITRJJI, NÚR AL-DÍN ABD AL-SÁ`Á, called Alpetragius by mediaeval European authors, a Spanish-Arab astronomer, the disciple and friend of Ibn Tufayl (about 600/1200). His astronomical theory, the origins of which must be sought in the return to Aristotelianism initiated by Ibn Badajja and other Arab philosophers of Spain like Ibn Tufayl and the astronomer Djäbir b. Afhâb, involved the reintroduction of the idea of impetus roughly formulated by Simplicius (6th century A.D.), the abandonment of epicycles and excentrics, and the view that the celestial spheres revolve around different axes, thus producing a spiral movement (haraka laulabiyya). The work in which he sets forth his principles, entitled Kâibil fi ‘l-Hâyâ, was translated by Michael Scot; Carmody published in 1953, at Berkeley, a critical edition of this translation compared with the Arabic text. In 657/1259, Moshe ibn Tibbon translated the work from Arabic into Hebrew, and in 934/1528, Kahonimos ben David made a Latin translation, based on the Hebrew version, which was printed at Venice in 1531, at the same time as the Treaite sur la sphere de Sacrobosco.

Bibliography: see the works quoted by F. J. Carmody, al-Bitruji, De Motibus Coelorum, Berkeley 1952; Sarton, Introduction to the History of Science, ii, 399 and index. (J. VERNET)

BIYÁBA/NÁK, an area in the central desert of Iran (Dasht-i Kawir), with some twelve oases. The area is included within E. Long. (Greenw.) 54° 15' and 55° 15' and N. Lat. 33° 5' and 34° 10', roughly 70 miles by 90 miles. The date palm and other crops, have enabled the oases to flourish isolated from the rest of Iran. The word is probably a diminutive meaning “little desert”, but the name does not appear before the 16th century (Tavernier).

We find no references to the area in pre-Islamic times, though local tradition claims that it was a place of banishment under the Sasanids, and the existence of site names such as Atashkada (6 km. N of Karmah, 43 farsakhs from Na'In, and says that the area was infested formerly with Kufidjan (Kufs), but in his time (5th/11th century). Amir Gilani of Tabbas had rid the region of them. Later the area suffered from Balúti raids until the 1920s. Apparently Arab tribesmen from Khuzistán raided this area as well, for European travellers in the last century report Arabs living here and local tradition tells of a tribe called the Ili Basíri which terrorised the area under the Kâddar. At present there are perhaps 10,000 people living in the oases, the nine principal oases being Djanak, Farrúkhi, Djarmak, Urdib, Iradir, Mîhrâjân, Bayâzâh, Çupánan, and the administrative centre Khûr. Dialects are spoken in all of the oases save Djanak where Persian is spoken. The date palm provides the principal livelihood for the people of the oases.


BIZÁBÁN [see DILVIZ].

BIZERTA [see BANZART].

BLIDA [see BULAYDA].

BOABBIDIL [see NASRIDS].

BOBASTRO [see BARASHTURU].

BODRUM, a small town situated on the west coast of Asia Minor, opposite the island of Istanbou (Kos). It stands near the site of the ancient Halicarnassus in Caria. When the Turks overran western Asia Minor in the years around 1300, this region came under the rule of the Beys of Menteshe [867–1879]. The Ottomans seized the emirate of Menteshe in 792/1390, lost it after their defeat in battle against Timur Lang at Ankara in 804/1402 and did not recover full and direct possession of Menteshe until 829/1425–1426. This second and definitive annexation of the emirate was not, however, destined to include the old Halicarnassus, for the Knights of St John at Rhodes, under their Grand Master Philip de Naille (1396–1421), had meanwhile occupied the site of the ancient town, and had built close at hand a fortress which received the name of "Castellum Sancti Petri" (Gr. Πετρού). It has been suggested that the name Bodrum derives either from the vault-like arcades amongst the ruins of Halicarnassus (cf. the Turkish bodrum: a subterranean vault, a cellar) or from the Latin name for the new fortress ("Sanctum Petrum").

The Venetian admiral Pietro Mocenigo, during the course of his sea campaigns in the eastern Mediterranean (1471–1474), ravaged the Ottoman-held hinterland of Bodrum. In 885/1480, the Ottomans, returning to Istanbul from their unsuccessful siege of Rhodes in that year, attempted, but without avail, to take the Castle of St Peter. Bodrum came under Ottoman rule only in 929/1522, when the Knights of St John, after a long and desperate resistance, surrendered Rhodes, together with its dependent possessions, to Sultan Sulayman Kanuni. Ewliya Celebí mentions that a naval engagement occurred in the harbour of Bodrum during the Ottoman-Venetian war of 1053–1060/1645–1669. Bodrum suffered bombardment from the Russian squadron operating in the eastern Mediterranean in the course of the Ottoman-Russian war of 1182–1188/1768–1774. It was again bombarded during the
Great War of 1914-1918, the fortress on this latter occasion receiving considerable damage, which was, however, repaired when Italian forces occupied the town in 1919-1920. Bodrum, under Ottoman rule, belonged to the sandjak of Menteşe in the eyalet of Anadolu. It had later the status of a badā‘, when this sandjak was subordinated, in 1864, to the newly formed vilayet of Aydınlı (Smyrna). The town is now included in the present Turkish province of Muğla and had in 1950 a population of about 4,800 inhabitants.

Bibliography:


BÖGHÂ AL-KABIR [see BÖGHÂ AL-KABIR].
BÖGHÂ AL-SHARABI [see BÖGHÂ AL-SHARABI].
BÖGHÂZ [see BÖGHÂZ-IÇI].

BÖGHÂZ-IÇI (Boğazici) (“interior of the strait”) is the expression used in Turkish to denote the Bosphorus, and especially the shores, waters, bays and promontories which constitute its middle section. The name Bosphorus (Gr. βόσπορος, Lat. Bosphorus, Bosphorus) derives from a word of Thracian origin (cf. Paulus-Wissowa). This narrow channel, the Thracian Bosphorus (so-called in order to distinguish it from the Cimmerian Bosphorus, i.e., the strait of Kertch between the Sea of Azov and the Black Sea) unites the Sea of Marmara (the ancient Propontis, Marmara Denizi in Turkish) and the Black Sea (the Pontus Euxinus of classical times, the Kara Deniz of the Turks). The Byzantines often referred to it simply as ἔκτροχον, “its strait”, while, to the Latins at the time of the Crusades, it was known as the “brachium S. Georgii” (cf. Tomaschek). It is mentioned under a number of different names in the Turkish sources, e.g., Kahlîjî-bahr-i siyâh, Kahlîjî-ı Kustâniyye, Kustâniyye boghaz, Istanbul boghaz, etc. This latter name means “throat” or “gullet” in Turkish, but has in geographical names the sense of “defile”, “strait” (cf., e.g., Külêk Boghaz, the Cilician Gates, or Çanak-kale Boghaz, the Dardanelles).

The Bosphorus has a mean length of about 30 km. and a width which varies from approximately 700 to about 3550 metres. A strong current (3-5 km. per hour) flows down the centre of the channel from the Black Sea to the Sea of Marmara, but a countercurrent runs in the opposite direction below the surface and along the shores. The more notable localities which border the strait can be enumerated as follows (the names are given in the modern Turkish form): on the European side, in order from south to north, are to be found Tophâne (the Byzantine Argyropolis), Beşiktaş (Byz. Diplokition), Ortaköy (Byz. Hagies Phokas), Ayvansaray (Byz. Anaplous), Bebek (Byz. Chalai), Rumeli-Hisarı (Byz. Phoneus), Istinye (Byz. Sosthenion), Yeni-Köy (Byz. Neapolis), Tarabya (Byz. Therapeia), Büyük-Dere (Byz. Kalos Agros) and Rumeli-Kavâği; on the Asiatic side, in sequence from north to south, are located Anadolu-Kavâği (Byz. Hieron), Beykoz, Paşa-Bahçe, Çubuklu (Byz. Ireneaeon), Kanlica, Anadolu-Hisari, Kandilli (Byz. Brochthol, Çengel-Köyü, Beylerbeyi, Kuzuncuk (Byz. Chrysokephalos) and Uskudar (Scutari; Byz. Skoutarion, an imperial palace in Chrysopolis). The Bosphorus proper ended, according to the view held in ancient times, at the present Rumeli-Kavâği and Anadolu-Kavâği, the waters beyond this line, towards the north, being considered as a part of the Black Sea.

The Byzantines fortified the northern end of the Bosphorus in the region of Rumeli-Kavâği and Anadolu-Kavâği, where the strait narrows to a width of about 1000 metres. Traces of a Byzantine fortress can still be discerned to the north of Rumeli-Kavâği. There is in fact a tradition that the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed II demolished this ancient fort (“Eski Kal’e”), the material thus acquired being used in the construction of Rumeli-Hisari in 856/1452 (cf. Gabriel, 77 and 81). A Byzantine fortress also existed at Anadolu-Kavâği. It was known to the Ottomans as Voros (Yeros) Kal’esi (cf. Byz. Hieron) or Dinevț Kal’esi. This latter name arose from the fact that the Genoese, in 1350, had taken over from the Byzantines control of the defences in the northern zone of the Bosphorus.

It was only with the rise and growth of the Ottoman empire in the 14th-15th centuries that the lands bordering on the Bosphorus came under Muslim rule. The Ottoman Sultan Bayazid I (791-805/1389-1403) built on the Asiatic shore of the strait a strong fortress called Anadolu-Hisâr (also known as Güzeldje Hisar), to which Sultan Mehmed II made various additions and improvements in 856/1452. On the European shore, opposite Anadolu-Hisâr and at the site which the Byzantines called Phoneus (Φωνέως, also Φωνάς and Φωνάζων), Mehmed II constructed, in this same year, the fortress of Rumeli-Hisâr (often called Boghaz-Kesen, i.e., “which cuts the throat” or “which cuts the strait”). The Sultan furnished both these fortresses with artillery capable of firing across the Bosphorus, here compressed to its narrowest width (about 700 metres). After the fall of Constantinople in 857/1453...
the Black Sea became in effect an Ottoman lake. Mehemed II brought to an end the former Genoese imperium over the Black Sea in 866/1461 and 882/1475. Moreover, in this latter year, the Khan of the Crimea was reduced to the status of an Ottoman vassal. Rumeli-Hisari and Anadolu-Hisari, together with what remained of the old Byzantine defences at the northern end of the Bosphorus, now lost their earlier importance.

After a long interval of calm, danger threatened from the north, when Cossack sea-raiders plundered Sinope on the south shore of the Black Sea in 1471, 1614 and ten years later, in 1633/1644, carried fire and sword into the Bosphorus itself, ravaging Sar-Yer, Büyüik-Dere, Tarabya and Yeni-Köy on the European shore of the strait. To ward off this menace, the Ottomans, in the reign of Sultan Murad IV (1032-1049/1623-1640), built two new fortresses, one in the region of Rumeli-Kavağ, the other near Anadolu-Kavağ. These forts (not to be confused with the former Byzantine defences in this section of the Bosphorus) are described in Ewliya Celebi (i, 461) as the kal'-i külda al-bahr, “the forts which are the lock of the sea” (bahr-i siyah, the Kara Deniz or Black Sea). No trace of them now remains, both having been demolished in the course of the 19th century (Gabriel, 82).

During their unsuccessful war against Russia in 1162-1168/1768-1774 the Ottomans began to recognize the defences of the Bosphorus. New fortifications arose, in 1167/1773-1774, at Kilyos (Kal'-e Baghdađdžik) on the European, and at Irva (Kal'-e Revândjik) on the Asiatic shore of the Black Sea, just outside the strait itself, and also at Fener-i Rumeli and Fener-i Anadolu on the northern exit from the strait. Additional forts soon made their appearance at Garipce and Büyük-Liman on the European shore of the strait. Additional forts (not to be confused with what remained of the old Byzantine defences in this section of the Bosphorus) are described in Ewliya Celebi (i, 461) as the kal'-i külda al-bahr, “the forts which are the lock of the sea” (bahr-i siyah, the Kara Deniz or Black Sea). No trace of them now remains, both having been demolished in the course of the 19th century (Gabriel, 82).

During their unsuccessful war against Russia in 1162-1168/1768-1774 the Ottomans began to recognize the defences of the Bosphorus. New fortifications arose, in 1167/1773-1774, at Kilyos (Kal'-e Baghdađdžik) on the European, and at Irva (Kal'-e Revândjik) on the Asiatic shore of the Black Sea, just outside the strait itself, and also at Fener-i Rumeli and Fener-i Anadolu on the northern exit from the strait. Additional forts soon made their appearance at Garipce and Büyük-Liman on the European, and at Poyraz-Limau on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus above Rumeli-Kavağ and Anadolu-Kavağ. This defence system received the name of “Kila'-i Seba” (the seven fortresses). A sustained effort was made during the reign of Sultan Selim III (1203-1222/1789-1807) to extend the defences of the Bosphorus. At the same time the older fortifications situated within the Bosphorus proper, southward from Rumeli-Kavağ and Anadolu-Kavağ in the direction of the Marmara Sea, underwent a process of repair and modernisation. These years witnessed, however, the emergence, in its modern form, of the Eastern Question. The control and defence of the Straits, i.e., of the Dardanelles as well as of the Bosphorus, was now to become a matter of prime concern, not to the Ottomans alone, but also to the Great Powers of Europe, who, during the 19th-20th centuries, imposed on the Straits a much debated and often altered, system of international control.


BOGHAZ KESEN [see RUMELI HISAR]

BOGDAN, originally Boghdân-îlî or Boghdân-wilâyeti (the land of Boghdân), which formed the principality of Moldavia, so called after Boghdân who in 760/1359 founded a principality between the Easternflanks of the Carpathians and the Dniester (Turia). The name Boghdân-îlî appears in the külm of Mehemed II dated 859/1455 (Kraelitz, Osm. Urk. Table I). The name Kara-Boghdan is found in the letter of Iminek dated 881/1476 (Belleten, no. 3, 4, 644) and in the Ottoman chronicles generally.

The principality suffered its first raid (akhîn) by the Ottomans in 823/1420 (unsuccessful siege of Ak-Kırımân). In 831/1428 the Khan of the Golden Horde, Ulugh Muhammed, proposed to Murad II that they should act in concert to destroy the Vlach infidels dwelling between them (cf. Kurat, Vlach infidels, 8). Hâджîî Gerey made an alliance against Boghdân-îlî with Mehemmed II, and an Ottoman fleet attacked Ak-Kırımân in 858/1454. As a result the voyvode Petru Aron accepted Ottoman suzerainty, agreeing to pay an annual tribute of 2000 ducats (autumn 859/1455) (Fr. Babinger, Beitrgze zur Frühgesch. der Türk. in Rumeliem, 21), and the sultan granted the merchants of Boghdân freedom to trade in the Ottoman dominions (Kraelitz, ibid.).

Stephan the Great (1457-1504) renewed the vassalage to the king of Poland, repulsed a attack by the Crimeans in 873/1466 and entered into diplomatic relations with Uzun Hasan [q.v.], and defeated the Ottoman beylerbeyi of Rûmeli on 2 Ramadân 879/
Finally Mehmed II invaded Boghdan and burned its capital Su'ceava (Rabîî I, 880/July 1475). In 889/1484, as a result of the joint action of Bayazid II and his vassal the Crimean Khan Ak-Kîrmân and Kili were occupied by the Ottomans, and Kavschan and Tombasbar by the Kîhân. In 897/1492 Stephen, by sending tribute and his son to the Porte, acknowledged Ottoman suzerainty.

Under the Ottomans Ak-Kîrmân and Kili became more actively engaged in the commerce of the Levant (this can now be seen from the records of the Ottoman customs houses of this period, at the Başvekalet Arşivi Istanbul, Maliye no. 6). With its exports of cereals, meat, butter and wax the trade of Boghdan became, under a monopoly system, more and more dependent on the Istanbul market.

Ottoman-Boghdan relations rested on the Islamic principle of the dâr al-'âshqî [q.v.], as expressed in the 'âshqî-nâmes granted by the Ottoman sultans and the berdâts issued to the voyvoodes (cf. the berdât of Alexandru VI Iliaș in Ferîdun, Mûnschêldî, ii, 398). The bonds attaching the voyvoode to the Porte were made still stronger when he received his appointment directly from the sultan, the first voyvoode so appointed being Petru IV Râresh (933/1527). The voyvoode's whole authority emanated from the sultan. The sultan, in his berdât, enjoined upon all the boyars, priests and people that they should recognise the voyvoode as their ruler (beg); if they failed to do so their land would be regarded as dâr al-'âshqî. The voyvoode's symbols of authority were the standard, the robe of honour (khîṣ săd), and the red bôrk (felt cap). An aqlî accompanied the voyvoode to his capital, seated him on his throne, and had the proclamation read to the people. As late as the 19th century it was felt to be important that the voyvoode should be a descendant of a former voyvoode (cf. Ferîdun, ii, 398, 446). Nevertheless the wishes of the local boyars were taken into consideration. The Ottomans, assisted by the Crimean Tatars, had no great difficulty in removing pretenders supported by Poland or the Cossacks and who refused to recognise the voyvoode or the sultan's order of deposition. After the treachery of Dimitri Kantemir in 1123/1711 the people of Boghdan were regarded as khârâdî-gâtâr raś'îyyet of the Sultan, who was obliged to defend them against their enemies and to depose voyvoodes who oppressed them. The boyars never formed a hereditary nobility. In the 17th-18th century they were no more than a class of wealthy peasants. The Porte was able to strengthen its control of the country by playing off the boyars against the voyvoode and vice versa. In the 12th-17th century the boyars became great landowners and the peasants were reduced to serfdom; but the Phanariot voyvoodes tried to break the power of the boyars, and in 1155/1740 Constantine Mavrokordato abolished serfdom and freed the peasants from their control. From then on the boyars looked for support more and more to the Christian powers, especially Russia. By the Regulament Organic, which was drawn up in 1247/1831 during the Russian occupation, the council of boyars was given the right to elect the voyvoode.

In the course of time the Ottoman state had absorbed various parts of the principality into the dâr al-Islâm. Sûleyman I's campaign of 945/1538 represents a turning point in many respects: the voyvoode was brought into closer dependence on the Porte, and the district of Bugâjk [p. 240] was annexed to the sultan's dominions. After the treaty of the Pruth under an Ottoman Pasha. In 1189/1775 Austria seized the north-western part of the country (Bukovina), and in 1227/1812 Russia annexed Bessarabia. After the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca (1188/1774) Russia posed as the protector of Moldavia, and eventually after the Treaty of Ak-Kîrmân (5 Rabîî I 1242/7 Oct. 1826) Ottoman suzerainty over the principality became nominal and Russia was recognised as the Protecting Power. In 1270/1859 the twin principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia (Mamlûkatayn) were united, though the Sultan did not recognise the union until two years later (28 Dümâda I 1278/2 Dec. 1861).

dominantly Muslim; even before the partition of the sub-continent in 1947 it had the largest number of Muslims in the whole of Bengal. They are mostly converts from the Kóor or Rádháns of the northern areas although there are some Patháns and Sayyids also. The district and the town are both liable to cyclones and floods, sometimes of a terrible nature. In 1281/1864 many houses and trees were levelled to the ground by the cyclone which swept over the district. In 1304/1886 the town was inundated when 18” of rain fell within a short span of 1½ hours. Earthquakes of great intensity have also frequently occurred. The severe earthquakes of 1885, 1888 and 1897 did considerable damage to both life and property. Many of the brick buildings in the town were destroyed in the earthquake of 1897.

The district seems to have been converted en masse to Islam in the 7th/13th century as most of the villages still bear Hindu names but have no Hindu inhabitants. In 1905/1906 when the district was re-conquered by Rádž Mán Singh, the Mughal viceroy, he built a mud fort at Shirpur and named it Salinnagar after Džاجhángr. A fort was also built at Mahásthán, now desolate. Shirpur, to the south of Bógra, was founded by Shír Khán, the Afgáhn ruler of Bengal (c. 666-70/1268-72). These two places abound in archaeological remains while in the town itself the “Bogra Palace”, the seat of the Cawdhari family, is the only place of some antiquity and interest.


Bóhora (Bóhras, Buhrah), a Muslim community in Western India (mainly of Hindu descent, with some admixture of Yemenite Arab blood), for the most part Shíis of the Ismá’ílî sect, and belonging to that branch of the Shíís which upholds the claims of al-Mustá’íl (847-945/1442-1537) to succeed his father al-Mustánṣir in the Fátimid Caliphate of Egypt. For the history of the Fátimids, see the articles Fátimids and Ismá’ílīs. Mustá’íl opposed his brother Nizár, whose adherents (the so-called Assassins) are represented in India by the Kídájas [q.v.]. The name bóhora denotes a “trader, merchant” (from the Gújjarátí bohórâ, “to trade”) and records the occupation of the earliest converts to Islam. This is clearly mentioned in an Arabic work, al-Tardiama al-gdhira li-Firfyat Borhat al-Báhiyya. A copy exists in the library of the Bombay branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. It has been translated into English by K. M. Jhaveri, A Legendary History of the Bohoras, Journal Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society, 1933, New Series, Vol. 9, 37-52. The text has been edited by H. M. Fakhr (Tálib), in the Journal Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society, 1940, N.S., Vol. 16, 88. Other accounts give Muḥammad ‘Abd Allah, whose tomb is still revered in Cambay, as the name of the first Mustá’ílî missionary in India (died, 532/1137). The Cúlykya dynasty of Anahílávída was then ruling over Gújjarát and the Ismá’ílî missionaries seem to have been allowed by the Hindu government to carry on their propaganda without interruption and with considerable success. In 1297 the Hindu Kingdom came to an end and for a century Gújjarát remained more or less in subjection to Díhlí. However, under the independent Kings of Gújjarát (1396-1572), who favoured the spread of the Sunnî doctrine, the Bohoras were on several occasions exposed to severe persecution.

Up to 946/1539, the head of the sect resided in the Yemen, and the Bohoras made pilgrimages to him, paid tithes and referred their disputes for decision and settlement. In 946, however, Yúsuf b. Sulaymán migrated from the Yemen to India and settled in Sídhpúr (Bombay State). About fifty years later, a schism occurred after the death of the dâ’í Dá’úd b. ‘Adjak Shâh in 966/1558. The Bohoras of Gújjarát, in fact the large majority of the community, chose one Dá’úd b. Kúshr Shâh as his successor, and sent the tidings of his appointment (Ar. názîr) to their co-religionists in the Yemen, but the latter, including a small proportion of the community in India, supported the claims of a certain Sulaymán, who claimed to be the rightful successor in virtue of a
formal mandate from Dā'ūd b. 'Aḍāb Ẓāhīr. This document is still in the possession of the Sulaymānī da’wat (the communal administration is called da’wat; the t is pronounced by the community), and its authenticity has never been subjected to a scientific, critical or legal examination. Sulaymān died in Ahmādābād, where his tomb and that of his rival, Dā’ūd b. Kuṭb Ẓāhīr are still reverenced by their respective followers. Those who recognise the claims of Sulaymān are called Sulaymānīs and their da’wat is in the Yemen. His chief agent in India is called the ma’ṣūm, and the seat of the Sulaymānī da’wat is in Baroda, where there is a good library of Ismā’īlī MSS. Another difference is that the Da’ūdīs use a form of Gudjarāti language which is full of Arabic words and phrases, write in the Arabic script for all official purposes and deliver their sermons in this language, whereas the Sulaymānīs use Urdu for the same purposes.

The head of the Dā’ūdī Bohoras resides generally in Bombay, but his headquarters are in Sūrat and are known as the Deorhi. In both places there are good collections of Ismā’īlī madrasa ll MSS. numbering 160 to the Library of Bombay University. There is at Deorhi a well-served by local officiants, called da’wat. In his presence a large number of sectarians perform a form of obeisance, the sadida.

As regards marriage and death ceremonies, and ritual prayers, the Bohora community is in general well-served by local officiants, called ‘adī’s, who are appointed by the Mullādī Ẓāhīr and are the servants of the da’wat. They perform duties similar to those of the ḥādis of the Sunnīs, but in addition refer disputes to the Mullādī Ẓāhīr and have a much greater hold over their “parishioners”.

A feature of the Bohora community both in India and elsewhere is that they form themselves into guilds, have little to do with others, and do not intermarry even with other Muslims, much less with adherents of other religions, and take little part in public affairs. In general, they restrict themselves to trade; but in some parts of India, Ceylon and East Africa, and particularly amongst the Sulaymānīs, certain families have entered public life and taken to Government service.

Two insignificant secessions from the Dā’ūdīs may be mentioned: (i) The ‘Aliyya Bohoras, who in 1624 supported the claims of ‘Ali, the grandson of Shakhīy Ẓād, the head Mullā, in opposition to Shakhīy Tavyib, whom Shakhīy Ẓād had nominated as his successor, and (ii) the Nāgūšhās, who broke away from the ‘Aliyya sect about the year 1789; their name indicates that they consider the eating of flesh as sinful. The Dūfārī Bohoras are mainly descended from the Dā’ūdī Bohoras who became Sunnīs in the reign of Musaffar Shāh (810-813/1407-1411) and succeeding Kings of Gurjārāt, but they have received accession to their numbers from Hindu converts. They derive their name from a saint named Sayyid Ahmad Dūfār Ẓāhīr (15th Century), whose descendants they reverence as their spiritual guides.

The Bohoras keep their religious books secret, but recently some of their works on law (such as Da’dī al-Mu’āmmadī), history (such as Sirat Sayyidi al-Mu’āwwiyad), and philosophy (such as Ṣirat al-4‘ābī and al-Risāla al-Djāmī’s) have been printed. Further details will be found in the bibliography by W. Ivanow, Guide to Ismaili Literature, London 1935, of which a second edition is contemplated. For sect religion and doctrines see Zāhid ‘All, Ḥamārī Ismā’īlī Madīḥāb awr uskhu Ḥabībat (Urdu), Haydarābād, Deccan, 1954/1373. In this work a full exposition of the kābi’ah (the Ismā’īlī term for their secret philosophical doctrines) has been given by a learned Bohorā. Recently A. A. A. Fyzee has given his collection of Must‘ālī Ismā’īlī MSS. numbering 160 to the Library of Bombay University.


History of the da’wat: No exhaustive history of the Bohorās has been written so far on scientific lines. See however an Arabic work still unpublished, Munītasa al-ʿĀkhrār (2 vols., see W. Ivanow, Guide, no. 335), on which is based the Gudjarātī work lithographed in the Arabic script, Ma’wīsī Bahār fi Ṣāḥab al-Du’dī al-ʿĀkhrār, 3 vols., by (Miyān Ẓāhīr) Muḥammad ‘All b. Ǧilwābāḥ, Bombay, n.d.

The literature of the da’wat is still mostly unpublished, but has been described by W. Ivanow, op. cit. (with addenda by Paul Kraus in RB1, 1932, 483-90). For further bibliographical material see A. A. A. Fyzee, Materials for an Ismaili Bibliography, 1920-1934, Journal of Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1935, 59-65, and ibid., 1940, 99-101. Several important texts have recently been edited and published by Dr. Muḥammad Kāmil Ḥusayn (Cairo).


BOHTĀN [see KURDS]

Bolor Daghi [see PAMIR]

Bolu (Boli, near anc. Bithynium, later Claudipolis) 40° 15’N 31° 30’E. The capital of a forested NW Anatolian widyet, elevation 710 m., area 11,140 sq. km., lying between the Saḵrya river bend and the Black Sea. In 1955 the population was 11,884 (town) and 318,612 (province). Bolu lies in a plain on the Bolu Suyu and subject to severe earthquakes, notably that of May 26, 1957. It is on the highway 263 km. from Istanbul and 208 from Ankara. It boasts 32 mosques: a bath dated 791/1388-9, a women’s teachers college, forestry school, other fine primary and secondary schools, a hospital, and new "briquette" and lumber factories. Bolu is the home of Korgöl, Kāšk Ẓāhīr Dūrī and good cooks. Lake Abant lies 37 km. SW. Atatürk visited Bolu from 17/19/vii’34 and İnönü from 5-7/vii’39. Its kādi’s are Akchakollla, Bolu, Düzɟle, Gerede, Göynük, Kübrajk, Mengen (where lignite has been exploited since 1956) Madurdur, Sebn and Yığhisu. Bolu fell to the Ottomans circa 726/1325, to the
Isfendiyaroghullari from 805-27/1402-23, was retaken,
governed by Prince Siileyman (914-15/1509) ... 832/1428-9, rebuilt,
partly by Sinan (mosque, bath and fountain of
Rustem Pasha, cf. Uzuncarsili, . . . Kitabeler, ii),
till 1231/1864, attached to Kastamonu till
1341/1923. It became a
served as base of the abortive
Khildfet ordusu
in April
of the
of Anadolu till HO3/
In Anatolian Turkish, from the time of the
and in Persian to designate a province or a region.
In the old Ottoman military organisation, the term
functions. As a result of the mutiny organised by the
Segbdns
of Solak guards).
was the
boluk
of camel drivers), the 28th
boluk
of the
shuturbdn (diemd'at
boluk
of various groups of functionaries in the admini-
strative organisation of the Ottoman State. In the old
Ottoman military organisation the commanders of the
boluks [q.v.] in the odiak [q.v.] of the Janissaries
were generally known as yayabashi or ser-piyade
(chief infantryman), while the commanders of the
boluks in the odiak of the tashjam-oqians [q.v.] were
called tufengbishi. It was only the commanders of the
“bölük of the agha” (see bölük) who were called
boluk-bashi, the most senior being known as Bash-
boluk-bashi. The Bölük-băshis were mounted and had
an iron mace and a shield tied to their saddles. When
the Sultan left the palace to go to a mosque, the
Bölük-băshis were present wearing ornate clothes
and holding in his hand a reed instead of a spear. Under
Suleyman the Magnificent there were 58 böyük-
băshis of “bölük of the agha”; their daily pay was
9 aspers. Their numbers and pay were later increased.
The Besh-bölük-bashi was appointed on promotion
junior agha of the odiak known as that of katar-
aghalari (aghās of trains or caravans). Bölük-băshis
of the böyük of the agha, when invested with a
timdr, were numbered among the wardens of for-
tresses and received a life pension of 5,000 to 8,000
aspers). Apart from the odiak of the Janissaries, the
mounted kapt-i buls [q.v.] had their bölük-băshis
commanding separate böyük, as had the segbdns
(keepers of the Sultan’s hounds), levonds (irregulars)
and tufengbishi (fusiliers). For more details see
Ismaïl Hakkı Uzungarşılı, Osmanlı Devleti Teshhid-
danand Kapısı Kulu Ocakları, i, 1943, and Gibb
and Bowen, i, index. (I. H. UZUNÇARŞILI)

BÖLUK (from the verb bölmek), meaning a part,
a section, or a category, was used in Eastern Turkish
and in Persian to designate a province or a region.
In Anatolian Turkish, from the time of the Tansımât
[q.v.] onwards, it designated units of infantry or
cavalry under the command of a yüzbaşı (captain).
In the old Ottoman military organisation, the term
bölük was used in the kapt-i buls [q.v.] odiaks [q.v.]
as well as in provincial troops and the military
retinues of senior officials. The size of the böyük
varied. In Janissary odiaks, for example, which numbered
1,000 men, there were 20 böyük of 100 men each.
The commander of the böyük was known as
yayabashi (chief infantryman). The Gelibolu
(Galipoli) odiak of ‘tajjami-oqians [q.v.], which numbered
at first 400 men, consisted of 8 böyük of
50 men each. These böyük were commanded by an
officer known as torbaş. Janissary odiaks were
later enlarged to include 101 böyük, known also as
djemdaşı and orta. Each böyük had a different name
and function. Thus böyük 1-3 were known as djemdaš-i
shuturbdn (djemdaşı of camel drivers), the 28th böyük
was the böyük of imâm-i hudut agha, böyük 60-63 were
known as solah-ortası (the orta of Solak guards).
The Segbdns (Keepers of the Sultan’s Hounds),
who constituted an independent odiak until 1451,
were assigned on that date by Sultan Mehemmed II to the
odiak of Janissaries as the 65th orta. They retained,
however, an autonomous organisation consisting of
34 bölük. Each böyük had a different size, name and functions.
As a result of the mutiny organised by the
aghā (commander) of the Janissaries under Bayezid II or Selim I, an aghā was appointed by the Palace
and put in charge of a separate organisation
consisting of 61 bölük of the aghā, in the hope that
he would maintain a balance of forces in the odiak.
It was these that were usually meant when the term
bölük was used. Otherwise if a böyük consisted of
armourers, artillerymen, artillery drivers etc.
meant, its name and the name of the odiak were
usually given. There were 6 böyük in the mounted
odiak of kapt-i buls. Their members were known as
“the people of the böyük or «the people of the six
bölük”. Excluding the sipahîs and silâhdârs, they
were known as böyük-i erbaa (four böyük). The
seven Ottoman odiaks in Egypt were called elli-
seb’a (seven böyük). The officers of these various
bölük enjoyed different rates of pay and were
subject to different rules of promotion. As in the
case of odiaks, the importance of böyük in the eyes
of the Government varied from time to time.
For detailed information on odiaks and böyük see
Ismaîl Hakkı Uzungarşılı, Osmanlı Devleti Teshhid-
danand Kapısı Kulu Ocakları, i, 1943, and Gibb
and Bowen, i, index. (I. H. UZUNÇARŞILI)

BOLU (BOLWADIN), the title given to the headmen
of various groups of functionaries in the admini-
strative organisation of the Ottoman State. In the old
Ottoman military organisation the commanders of the
bölük [q.v.] in the odiak [q.v.] of the Janissaries
were generally known as yayabashi or ser-piyade
(chief infantryman), while the commanders of the
bölük in the odiak of the tashjam-oqians [q.v.] were
called tufengbishi. It was only the commanders of the
“bölük of the aghā” (see bölük) who were called
boluk-bashi, the most senior being known as Bash-
boluk-bashi. The Bölük-băshis were mounted and had
an iron mace and a shield tied to their saddles. When
the Sultan left the palace to go to a mosque, the
Bölük-băshis were present wearing ornate clothes
and holding in his hand a reed instead of a spear. Under
Suleyman the Magnificent there were 58 böyük-
băshis of “bölük of the aghā”; their daily pay was
9 aspers. Their numbers and pay were later increased.
The Besh-bölük-bashi was appointed on promotion
junior agha of the odiak known as that of katar-
aghalari (aghās of trains or caravans). Bölük-băshis
of the böyük of the agha, when invested with a
timdr, were numbered among the wardens of for-
tresses and received a life pension of 5,000 to 8,000
aspers). Apart from the odiak of the Janissaries, the
mounted kapt-i buls [q.v.] had their böyük-băshis
commanding separate böyük, as had the segbdns
(keepers of the Sultan’s hounds), levonds (irregulars)
and tufengbishi (fusiliers). For more details see
Ismaîl Hakkı Uzungarşılı, Osmanlı Devleti Teshhid-
danand Kapısı Kulu Ocakları, i, 1943, and Gibb
and Bowen, i, index. (I. H. UZUNÇARŞILI)

BOLWADIN (BOLVADIN, sometimes Karamuk, anc.
Polybotomu) 38° 44’ N, 31° 05’ E. A municipality
and kadâ in the wilayet of Afyun Kara Hışar [q.v.],
with its own and Ishâkli nahiye (its former nahiye
of Çay, with 20 villages, became a kadâ on April 1,
1938/1357), consisting of 26 villages. The population
in 1956 was 12,604 (town), 65,250 (district); ele-
vation 900 m., area 2,420 sq. km. Bolvadin lies 45 km.
E of Afyun, 8 N of Çay railway station, N of the Sazlı
and Eber lakes and a fertile plain watered by the
Akar Çay, on the old Bagdad road and the modern
Eskisehir-Konya highway. Bolvadin was under the
Aşraglı-oğulları [q.v.] circa 702-742, taken by
Murad I, regained by the Germiyan-oghulan after
805/1402, retaken by Murad II in 832/1429-30, rebuilt,
partly by Sinân (mosque, bath and fountain of
Rustem Paşa, cf. Urunçarşılı, . . . Kitabeler, ii),

Bibliography: R. Aker, Bolu Géshi, Istanbul
1949; G. Arikis, 5, προτάσσον όμοιαν, Athens
1947, 147 ff., 200; Barkan, . . . Kanunlar, 28 ff.;
Bolu Levânsel Sâl-nâmesi, Bolu 1925; Cuinet,
Turquie d’Asie, iv, 40-61, 506-39; Z. Danuman,
Çamlar ve Göller Uلكesi Bolu, Istanbul 1935;
Dokhum, Âşık Mecmua, No. 2, “Bolu”, i-60;
İller Bankası, Bolu İmar Planı, Ankara 1958,
1: 2,000; T. Z. İştăm, Bolu Cografyası, Istanbul
1938; M. Z. Konrapa, Bolu’num Osmanlı
Turkisi’ne Girisi, in Tedrisat Mecmuasi, No. 10
(April, 1952) 30-33, also Nos. 8 & 9, 34-6; A. D.
Mordtmann, sen., Anatolik, . . ., Hanover 1925,
267-75; L. V. de St.-Martin, Description . . ., Hanover
1925, Mordtmann, sen., . ., Istanbul 1953, no. 14,
“Bolu”, t-12; and I.A, s.v. (B. Darkót) for further references.
(H. A. REED)
under Süleyman I, and fell briefly to the rebel Uzun Khalll in 1014/1605. It was a key military HQ before the great nationalist counter-offensive against the Greeks in August 1922.

Bibliography: Cumhuriyetin 15 yil icinde Aiyon, Istanbul 1938; I. H. Danişmend, ... Kronoloji, passim.; Hammer, Staats., i, 275, ii, 255-6; F. Kiper, Aiyon Karahisar. Valilik notalarından bir haça hârûn, Istanbul 1945; Murray’s Handbook for Travellers in Asia Minor ... ed., Sir Charles Wilson, London 1895-1905, 132; ed. 1890, 302; ed. 1877, 375; I. Okbay, Aiyon Karahisar gazeteleri, Filibe 1938; Sül-nâmê’s for Khudawendîkar wîldyêti, years 1266 A.H.: 1301, 377; 1320, 1315-16; 1321-23; L. V. de St-Martin, Description ... de l’Asie Mineure, Paris 1852, ii, 559, 611; W. Shepherd, Hist, passim; M. Y. Süslü, Esrefgullari Tarihi — Baysahir Kilavuz, Konya 1934; F. Taeschner, ... Anatolisches Wegene, ... i, 102, 126, tables 7-8, 197 ff.; idem, M. Neschri, Sultan, i, 249, ii, 171; Türk Anıskılodilâsi, vii, 250; Türkiye Bibloqrafiyası, 1928—passim; Türkiye Kilavuzu, Ankara 1946, i, 37, 57-60, map, i:1,000,000 facing 70; Türkiye Yülük 1947, Istanbul 1947, 138; 1948 ed., 82; I. H. Uzuncarşılı, Aiyon Karahisar, Sandhî, Bolawadîn ... 2deh Kiataber, Istanbul 1929; idem, Osmanlı Tarihi, Ankara 1947—i, 12-13, 169; ii, 94; IA s.v. (B. Darkot) for further references. (H. A. Reed)

BOMBAY CITY, capital of Bombay State, one of the chief ports of India and an emporium of trade and manufacturing industries. Its area is 111 sq. miles, and the population of the city in the census of 1951 was 2,839,270. Of these, 281,975 had Urdu as their mother tongue. The figures include Pashto, 2,536 Arabic, figures which indicate the major centres of Muslim population. Among the important classes of traders, Memons, Bohorás & Khodjas [qq.v.] constitute an appreciable number. Their enterprise in trade & commerce is well-known and they are prominent in trade relations with East Africa, the Persian Gulf, Malaya, Singapore and other places.

The history of the city is interesting, the present emporium having grown out of seven detached islands with mud swamps in between. There were Muslim rulers before the advent of the Portuguese, and a prominent relic is the tomb of Shaykh ‘Ali Pârâ, built about 835/1431-2 and repaired in 1674 A.D. An annual fair is held here and it attracts a large number of visitors. There is a Dîâmî Masjid also dating from 1902.


BOMBAY STATE, one of the States of the Indian Union, covering the territories of Cutâ, Saurâshtrâ, Gujîrât, Mahrâshtrâ, Marâthwâdâ and Vidarbh. The present limits of the State territory were decided upon in consequence of the reorganization of the States of the Indian Union that took place in 1956. The composition of the State differs from that of the other States of the Union inasmuch as it comprises areas having two different languages, namely Marathi & Gujarûtî. The total area of the State is 190,872 sq. miles and the total population is 48,264,622. The figures of population are based on the census of 1951. The whole of this State was at one time under Muslim rule, and even now, in many of the important centres, population statistics reveal the existence of a substantial proportion of Muslims. The Muslims constitute the second most important religions group in the State, though their numbers have gone down in recent years due to the emigration of some Muslims from the State to Pakistan after partition. In 1951, at the last census, 5.33% of the population of the State had Urdu as their mother tongue. The major centres of Muslim population apart from the city of Bombay are the districts of Ahmedâbâd, East Khandesh and Sorath. The majority of the Muslims are Sunnis.

to September and the coldest months whose coolness
is increased by the NE. winds then blowing con-
stantly and frequently heavy with sand. The
index of aridity compares with that of Tanezrouft,
but the country differs from the central Sahara in
that it does not have long series of dry years; the
rains, even if the fall is slight, come each year at
least from May to September. This regularity is not
in itself enough to explain the existence of profuse
vegetation which round the springs takes on an
almost tropical aspect. Water in fact is abundant:
salt lakes at the foot of the Emi Koussi, pure or
natronated springs of the central depression, layers
of water saturating the sands of the valleys or
appearing on the surface on the southern basins,
the lakes of Ounianga. These waters apparently have
their origin in the spates of the wadis of the Emi
Koussi, which soak between the volcanic outcrops
and percolate through the sandstone to reappear
in the depressions.

The character of the steppe changes from north
to south. The 'had' which preponderates in the north
and which supports a few species of grassy plants
gives way about the 17th parallel to the 'cram-cram'-(cenchrus biflorus). Then Sahilian species appear,
forerunners of the savannah; the domain of the
ariels and ostriches begins. Islets of woodland in
the northern valleys and especially in the central
depression—doum palms and particularly handsome
acacias—seem to bear witness to a time more
extensive and denser woodlands.

Oases and pasture have attracted the populations
of the neighbouring mountains since the 10th
century. The nomad tribes of eastern and central
Tibesti (the two branches of the Tûbû people: Teda
and Dazâ) occupied the oases of Gouro then the
central oases (Woun), pushing back the Donza who
seem to have been the aboriginal inhabitants,
towards the palm groves to the south of the Emi
Koussi, their present habitat. The nomads belonging
to the lowest caste clans have become sedentary,
sometimes partially, being enabled by the 'had' and
supplies of natronated water close by to keep
their camels. The others have drifted to the southern
steppes which are richer in pasture. Some tribes
have reached as far as the Chad lowlands where
they have changed from camel to cattle rearing.

Other populations, coming down from Ennedi
and Wadai, have mixed with the Tûbû. The Anak-
kaza, who constitute the most important group in
Borkou, were formed in this way, whereas the
Gaëda seem to be descended from the Tundjûr of
Kanem. Borkou has thus been a melting-pot in
which, however, Tûbû influence has predominated.
The Dazà language is spoken by most of these
populations, their customs are those of the Tûbû,
and the Tûbû physical type—non-negroid black—is
the commonest. One can understand that the Arabs
should have lumped the whole of the Borkouans
together under the single name of Kura'sân. According
to official statistics the Borkouans now number about
20,000.

The nomads live by stock rearing supplemented
by the resources of the oases, whether they
still enjoy over these suzerain rights acquired in
the past, or whether the gardens are cultivated for
them by the sedentary Kamadjas, whose origin,
though certainly servile, is ill-known. The Kamadjas,
who had become share-croppers of the nomads,
have gradually freed themselves from their tribute-
obligation with the support of the French
administration. The palm groves contain at present about
1,000,000 productive trees of which 90 per cent are
in the central depression. They produce 30,000
quintals of dates per annum. The irrigation
channels in the gardens are fed by balance-arm wells and
produce on the average 120 tons of wheat and 200
tons of millet per annum; vegetables (onions,
tomatoes, sweet potatoes, and pimentos) are also
grown. Salt-pans from which salt is obtained by
evaporation are numerous in the northern valleys,
and their product, joined with that of Ennedi,
represented (in 1930) half the Saharan production.
The nomads of the southern steppe bring meat,
butter, and tanned skins to the oases to exchange
for their products. Sedentary and nomadic popu-
lations alike obtain their tools and arms from the
despised smith caste. These smiths, known in
the Tûbû domain as Azzas, deprived of local supplies
of ore which are now exhausted, use as their raw
material scrap iron or raw iron plates bought in
Boru.

These exchanges suffice for local needs. 1,200 miles
from the Mediterranean coast by the economically
unimportant Kufra track, detached from the trade
routes joining the Sudan with the Mediterranean
(which avoid Tibesti and its brigands), detached
from the tracks leading to the Nile lands passing to
the south of Wadai, Borkou has always lived turned
in on itself. For this reason archaic modes of life have
survived in these oases until the present day and
paganism had, not retreated before Islam, in the
19th century. This isolation has of late years been
twice violently broken. For half a century after
1842 the country was ravaged by the waves of the
Awlad Sulaymân who swept down from the Fezzan
in flight from the Turks. Then, about 1900, the
Sanûsiyya, falling back from Kanem and Manga,
settled themselves firmly at the two ends of the
central depression, at N'Galakka and at Woun
(alias Faya, later Largeau). They made their
saduwiyyas, especially that at Gouro, agricultural
centres as well as intellectual and religious centres
from which Islam was propagated. But they indulged
in raids which, by forcing the nomads to choose
between the palm groves occupied by the Sanûsiyya
and the pasture lands to the south controlled by
France since her occupation of Wadai and Bahr al-
Ghazâlâl, disorganized and so ruined economic life.
The Sanûsiyya had the backing of the Turks, who
placed garrisons in the country in 1911, but the
Italo-Turkish conflict brought about the with-
drawal of these garrisons in 1912, and in 1913
France occupied the whole of Borkou.

Bibliography: Nachtigal, Sahara et Soudan
(tr. Gourdault), 1881; Carbou, La région du Tchad
e du Ouaddi, 1912; Ferrandi, Le Centre Africain
français, 1930; médecin Capitaine Pujo, le Borkou
et ses habitants, vie et moeurs, in Revue Militaire
de l'A.E.F., xi, 1939; R. Capot-Rey, Le Sahara,
1953; idem, Introduction à une géographie humaine
du Borkou, in Travaux de l'Institut de Recherches
Sahariennes, xvi, 1957, 44-71. (M. Ch. LE COUR)

BORNEO, the corrupted form of Brunai (which
is a town in British North Borneo at about Lat.
5° N. and Long. 115° E.) applied to the largest of
the greater Sunda Islands in Indonesia, probably as
early as the 14th century, and in any case by the
Portuguese since the 16th century. The greater part
of the island is now called Kalimantan and consti-
tutes a province of the Indonesian Republic. From
the view-point of Muslim studies the importance of
the island is small, as practically the whole population
of the interior of Borneo is pagan. Islam and Christi-
anity penetrated in the coast areas whence they have been slowly spreading into the interior; since 1942 political conditions favour the propaganda of Islam rather than the spreading of Christian denominations. The character of the local Islam is not different from what we find elsewhere in Indonesia (q.v.). The only important centre of Muslim activity is Pontianak (q.v.) on the West Coast. (C. C. BERG)

BORNU, or Barnů, the name—of doubtful etymology the root of which reappears in Beriberi (=Baribari) as their neighbours call the Kanuri—given to a region in the hinterland of West Africa and used:

(a) loosely, of an area never precisely defined in geographical terms, were there was established one of the major states of that part of the Western Sudan,—see para. 6 below,—and

(b) of a province;—area, according to 1931 census, 45,900 square miles—lying between latitudes 10° and 13.5° N. and longitudes 10° and 14° E., in Northern Nigeria, containing that part of (a) west of the Anglo-German and south of the Anglo-French original international boundaries, plus an adjacent narrow strip on the eastern frontier of the former German Kamerunus mandated to Great Britain after the war of 1914-18; including the Shavaahods of Bornu and Dikwa, together with some other administrative units.

2. Geography. Bornu consists in the main of a vast sandy plain, drained by two rivers,—the Yobe running from west to east in the north and the Yedseram from south to north in the south,—into the marshy shores of Lake Chad which lies in its north-eastern corner. The only mountainous features occur in the extreme south and south-east of the Province. In earlier times the Shari River which also flows from south to north into Lake Chad was regarded as the eastern border of Bornu, dividing it from Bagirimi (q.v.) country. The early medieval geographers and historians were cognisant of the region under this name, which appears on the Catalan atlas of Charles V (1375 A.D.), and is mentioned by al-'Umari (d. 1348 A.D.), Ibn Khalduan (d. 1406 A.D.), al-Maghiri (d. 1447 A.D.) and others. It was visited and described (Book VII) by Leo Africanus (d. circa 1552).

3. Transport and Trade. The main modern motor road (Kano-Maiduguri-Fort Lamy) runs from west to east across the region, with feeders from north and south, as did the former caravan route (Kano-Kukawa-Bilma). There is a permanent aerodrome at Maiduguri and emergency landing grounds elsewhere. Of old slaves and ivory were the main exports, now groundnuts, hides, gum, cotton and numerous minor items have replaced these. Imports consist of manufactured articles, especially cotton goods. There is a considerable internal trade in dried fish from the Lake Chad area, salt and kola nuts.

4. Economy. The region is not industrialised and contains no cities. It is self contained so far as the needs of life are concerned, and its population is mainly agricultural. In the 1952 census, of 790,361 males, 376,561 are shown as engaged in agriculture and fishing. Its capital wealth consists in numerous herds of cattle, sheep and goats, together with the fisheries of Lake Chad.

5. Ethnography. (a) The population of the region described in para. 1 (b) above comprises the Kanuri, Fulânî, Hausa (q.v.), Shuwa Arabs and some other tribes. At the census of 1931 the salient figures for the Bornu Province of Nigeria were—Kanuri 752,683; Fulânî 168,944; Hausa 84,729; Shuwa Arab 98,909; Bura 89,826. Total—including other less numerous mostly pagan tribes situated mainly in the hilly south and south-east of the Province,—1,595,708. The comparable total in the 1951 census was 1,128,360.

(b) Languages. Kanuri (q.v.) is the major language of the region, but of importance also are the colloquial Arabic spoken by the Shuwa Arabs, and Fulufülde spoken by the Fulânî (q.v.). Hausa is little spoken except by the trading elements in the towns. The pagan tribes have their own tongues. English is also used by those who have been educated in the more advanced schools.

6. History. The early history of Bornu is linked with that of the Kanem Empire. In 666 A.D., 'Uqba b. Nafi' penetrated the east central Saharan desert as far as Tibesti in the Tebu country to the north of Lake Chad, the inhabitants of which, according to legend, were the So, a giant race originating from the Fezzan. According to tradition the first king of Kanem in this area was one Sayf, claiming descent from Sayf b. Dhi Yazan of the Banû Himyar. This tradition may be post-Islamic and fabricated. The ruling class of old in this area was called the Maghumi, a word the root of which appears in the Kanuri words Mai (ruler) and Maghira, the title of the Bornu Queen Mother, an office which carried and still carries considerable power. There is strong traditional and some written evidence that this ruling class was 'white-skinned', and a reasonable supposition is that it was originally matrilineal and probably of origins connected with the Tawârîk, (plur. from sing. Tarî, vulg. Tuareg). The Saiwafa were a nomadic people who absorbed or conquered the Tebu peoples to their north, and founded the Empire of Kanem, with capital at Njimi. Their rulers are said to have given 'the Sultan of the Beriberi' permission to settle, and tradition speaks of an invasion by Muslim Beriberi from Yaman via Fezzan and Kuwar in 800 A.D. The Empire of Kanem had received Islam by the 11th century if not earlier, and by the 13th century was powerful enough for its influence to reach as far as Egypt in the north east and Dikwa in the south. Ibn Khalduan speaks of the 'king of Kanem and the Master of Bornu', the last word apparently describing the southern part of the Kanem empire from Lake Chad to Dikwa. But, circa 1389 A.D., the Saiwafa dynasty was driven out of Kanem by a kindred tribe, and the consequent tribal movements resulted in the advance of the Kanuri nation to the west of Lake Chad, and finally to their founding, circa 1470 A.D., on the River Yo, of Birni N'gazargamu as the capital of Bornu and of the Kanuri nation. It remained their capital for three centuries, though, circa 1507 A.D., Njimi itself was recaptured by the Kanuri, and old Kanem became a province of the new Bornu Empire. In the 16th century and under a succession of able 'Mai's or rulers (Muhammad 1526-45, Dunama 1546-65, Abdallah— in whose reign Fulânî settlers in Bornu are first mentioned—1564-70) the Bornu Empire expanded greatly, and this process was no doubt helped by the conquest, in 1592 A.D., by Morocco of Bornu's rival in the western Sahara, the empire of Songhay. Of these rulers the greatest was probably Mai Idris Atuma, (ob. 1602), who successfully campaigned as far afield as Kano, and also subdued the tribes of Air (q.v.) and the Tebu. Mai Idris made the pilgrimage to Mecca and was buried in Alò Lake near Maiduguri. This peak was followed by two centuries of quiescence (Mai Ali, 1645-84 A.D., made the pilgrimage thrice), during part of which
at least the Bornū Empire seems to have been on the
defensive, for 'All was besieged unsuccessfully in his
own capital by the Tawārīḫ and the Kwararafta.
Contributing causes may have been a series of
severe famines,—one is recorded of seven years' 
duration,—and the general dislocation which followed
the Moorish conquest of Songhay. The Fulānī ḏāḥīḏ
further to the west at the beginning of the 19th
ten century soon had repercussions affecting Bornū, the
suckerinity of which over the Hausa states lying
between Bornū and Sokoto was challenged. In 1808
the Fulānī in Bornū assembled at Gujba, defeated
Mai Ahmad b. 'All and sacked his capital at
N'gazargamu. (One of the successful Fulānī leaders
in this campaign later founded the town and amirate
of Katagum with the title of Sarkin Bornū). Mai
Ahmad fled to Kanem where he invoked the aid of the
Fulānī, who, however, on Mai Ahmad's death soon
after, returned to defeat his successor, Dunama b.
Ahmad. The last named in turn sought the aid of al-
Kanemi, and at this point the modern history of
Bornū may be said to begin. Al-Kanemi, victorious
again over the Fulānī and Baghirmi, restored the old
Sayf ruling house as titular kings and established
himself at Kukawa, where he was visited by Denham
in 1822, as the power behind the throne. His further
attempts, circa 1826, to re-establish the empire of
Bornū over the Hausa states were less successful,
and, after being defeated, he died in 1835, and was
succeeded by his eldest son 'Umar who made peace
with the Fulānī. During the absence of 'Umar on
these negotiations, the Sayf royal house called in
the ruler of Wadai to help them expel the house of
al-Kanemi. This plot failed. The then Mai, Ibrāhīm,
was executed in 1846, and the last of the Sayf
dynasty, his son 'All, was killed in battle. 'Umar now
became de jure as well as de facto ruler of Bornū,
adopting the title Shehu (= Shaykh) instead of Mai,
thus inaugurating the Kanembu dynasty. He rebuilt
Kukawa which had been destroyed by the men of
Wadai, and was visited here by Dr. Barth in 1851
and 1855. War with Wadai was almost continuous,
seriously weakening the strength of Bornū, and the
outlying western territory of Zinder became virtually
independent. In 1853, Rabeh [q.v.] entered Bornū
from Wadai with a well armed and trained force of
some two thousand men, which was altogether too
strong for any forces with their antiquated weapons
which could take the field against him. He defeated
a general of the then Shehu, Hāshim, at Amjā, next
Hāshim himself near Ngala. He then took and
plundered Kukawa, after which he returned to
Dikwa where he made his headquarters, and built
the fort which can still be seen. A cousin, Muḥammad
al-Amin nicknamed Kiarī, of Shehu Hāshim caused
the latter, now a fugitive, to be secretly murdered and
himself advanced against Rabeh from Geldam. The
two forces met at Gashegar and Kiarī's troops had
some initial success, even taking Rabeh's camp, but
were finally put to flight by Rabeh's army. Kiarī
himself was taken and executed. This ended the
resistance to Rabeh in Bornū. Rabeh established a
military regime at Dikwa and sent out columns on
preatory raids. His rule was entirely destructive and
caused incalculable loss and dislocation over a
wide area. In 1900 Rabeh was defeated and killed
by French troops under Commandant Lamy. Rabeh's son, Fāḍl Allāh, fled westwards before the
French, was pursued and finally, on 3 Aug. 1901,
killed by them under command of Captain Dangeville
in an engagement at Gujba in Nigeria, (150 miles on
the British side of the Anglo-French boundary which,
though approved on paper, had not yet been delimited
by boundary commissions on the ground, thus
causing considerable confusion in the then so un-
settled state of the country). The French authorities
offered restoration to Sanda, a son of the late Shehu,
but he was unable to meet their conditions, and
finally the Kanemi dynasty was restored by the
British authorities with Shehu Bukar Garbai, his
brother. Shehu Bukar set up first at Mongonu, then
moved to Kukawa and finally, in 1907, to Yerwa
near Maidugari which has remained the capital of
Bornū to the present time. Dikwa became part of
the German Kameruns, which, after the German
defeat in the 1914-18 war, were mandated to Great
Britain and France by the League of Nations,
Dikwa falling into the former's area. Details on
the history of Bornū in the present century will be
found in the reports of the Government of Nigeria.

7. Religion. Islam is the religion of the Kanuri,
Fulani, Shuwa Arabs and Hausa, and their maddhab
Mālikī. Of the Ţārīḵas, the Kādirīyya [q.v.] and
the Tidjānīyya [q.v.] are the best supported, though
representatives of others will also be found, including
the Sanūsīyya [q.v.] and the Shādhilīyya [q.v.]. The
Church of the Brethren (American Protestant)
Mission operates among the Bura tribe in the south
of the Province. It seems certain that, in modern
conditions, the animism of the pagan tribes will
gradually disappear.

8. Miscellaneous. Notable European explorers
who visited Bornū were Denham, Oudney and
Clapperton (1823), Barth, who made long stays at
Kukawa between 1851 and 1855 and collected much
information about the history and circumstances
of the region, Vogel (1854-6), Beurmann (1860),
Rohlf (1866), Nachtigal (1870-2), Matheucci and
Massari (1880-1), Monteil (1892).

**BOSNA (BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA).**

1. General outline.

Bosnia and Herzegovina, with a total area of 51,129 km², lies within the latitudes 42° 26' and 45° 15' North and longitudes 15° 44' and 19° 47' East; it thus occupies the western—largely mountainous—region of Yugoslavia, rich in mineral resources, water-power, and forests. It is divided into two geographical and historical entities—Bosnia and Herzegovina. The name of Bosnia refers to the larger northern part of the country, while Herzegovina comprises the southern districts with the basin of the river Neretva. The name “Bosnia” is derived from the river Bosna (of uncertain meaning but doubtless of Illyrian origin) which flows through the central part of the country. It was round the source and the upper basin of the river that traces have been found of a district called Bosna (first mentioned by Constantine Porphyrogenitus, who thought it belonged to Serbia), inhabited by early settlers, members of Slav tribes. After many changes of fortune brought about by a succession of foreign and native rulers, the region became an integral part of a new State bearing its name, which—under the reign of King Tvrtko I (1353-1391)—comprised not only the present territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina, except for a small district in the north-west, but also a large part of the Adriatic coast with the neighbouring districts in the south and south-east. Under Turkish rule, Bosnia was one of the sandjak of the Ottoman Empire, and from 988/1580 an eyalet which comprised a larger area than that of the present Bosnia and Herzegovina, not only before but even after the loss of territory suffered in the second decade of the 18th/end of the 17th century. The name of Herzegovina dates from the middle of the 15th century when the magnate Stjepan Vukčić Kosača rebelled against the then king of Bosnia and had himself proclaimed “Herzeg (Duke) of St. Sava”. The region later came to be called “Herzegovina” (the land of the Herzeg) and in Turkish: Hersek ili Hersek sandıği. The present territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina roughly corresponds to the area that constituted the province of Bosnia and Herzegovina under Austrian rule (1878-1918) and which was part of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (from 1918). The boundaries and the extent of the region remained unchanged during the later administration of the new Kingdom (under the so-called Vidovdan Constitution). After the suppression of parliamentary rule in Yugoslavia (1929), an authoritarian Kingdom of Yugoslavia emerged, made up of nine large administrative units called “banovinas”. This division altered the boundaries of the country, for the two banovinas with their seats within Bosnia and Herzegovina (those of Sarajevo and Banjaluka) now comprised parts of the neighbouring area, with the result that part of Bosnia and Herzegovina territory came to belong to the banovina the seat of which was in Split, while part of Herzegovina was included into the banovina whose seat was in Montenegro. In present-day Yugoslavia a separate people’s republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina has been formed within its traditional historic boundaries.

The social and political organisation of Bosnia and Herzegovina as one of the republics of Yugoslavia, is based on the written Constitution of the Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia, passed 17th January 1946, the Constitution of the P.R. of Bosnia and Herzegovina dated 31st December 1946, the Constitutional Law of 13th January 1953 concerning the foundations of the social and political organisation of the F.P.R. of Yugoslavia and the federal organs of government, and the Constitutional Law of 29th January 1953 concerning the social and political organisation of the P.R. of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the republican organs of government.

The P.R. of Bosnia and Herzegovina has, as does each of the Yugoslav republics, its own People’s Assembly with its Executive Council and Secretariats in Sarajevo, the capital city of the Republic. The country is divided into 12 districts and 134 communes (1958).

The population of Bosnia and Herzegovina shown by the census taken in 1953 was 2,847,790. Serbo-Croat is the language spoken by the people (except for small numbers of Slovenian and Macedonian settlers and national minorities) who are, however, divided—as regards nationality—into Serbs (largely of the Orthodox Church, the rest being Muslims), Croats (largely Roman-Catholics, the rest being Muslims) and those that abstained from declaring their nationality (very largely Muslims).

According to the preliminary results of the census of 1953 there were in Bosnia and Herzegovina: 10.3 per cent of no denomination, 35.1 per cent Orthodox, 21.4 per cent Roman-Catholics, 32.3 per cent Muslims, and 0.9 of other denominations.

The official and final results, now in print, of the census taken in 1953 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,264,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(including 35,228 Muslims)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Croats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>654,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(including 15,477 Muslims)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undeclared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yugoslavs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>891,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(of whom 860,486 were Muslims)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The common language and close ethnical affinity of the population notwithstanding, the people are split into three groups owing to historical influences but mainly to different religious beliefs which were responsible for the formation of national differences between Serbs and Croats. The Islamisation of Bosnia and Herzegovina—the centuries-old borderland of the Ottoman Empire, situated at the very confines of East and West with their respective influences—came to introduce yet a third denominational element. Under Austro-Hungarian rule, the population of Bosnia and Herzegovina was officially classified according to denominations—except for a small number of settlers whose nationality was duly recorded—although the greater part of the people was becoming nationally conscious, i.e., the Orthodox population professed to be Serbs, and the Roman-Catholics Croats. Up to the World War II, Belgrade and Zagreb had each claimed national kinship with the Moslems of Bosnia, hence it seemed that a certain part of the Muslim population—mostly urban intelligentsia had declared themselves Serbs and Croats respectively.
Concerning communications, Bosnia and Herzegovina is still suffering from the consequences of adverse former conditions, especially as regards the railway network. In 1957 the country had 2,111 km. of railways, 1,339 km. of which was of standard gauge as against 772 km. of narrow gauge.

The total value of national production in Bosnia and Herzegovina during 1956 was 215,639 million dinars, the chief sources and amounts (in millions) contributed by each being as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industry &amp; Mining</td>
<td>108,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>46,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>11,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>19,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>10,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicrafts</td>
<td>5,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade &amp; Catering</td>
<td>13,640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to the inherited underdeveloped state of the country's economy is the inherited cultural backwardness of the people, particularly in rural areas. The Austro-Hungarian government set up state-controlled primary schools without abolishing denominational schools. Compulsory primary education was introduced in 1911, yet in 1912/13 there were in Bosnia and Herzegovina only 374 state-controlled primary schools. The small number of schools, state-controlled and denominational together, could only cope with 18.55% of the children of school age. The Government of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia would only recognise the State primary schools, yet hardly one third of the children of school age were able to attend. The number of primary schools in 1938-39 was only 1,092, hence the large-scale illiteracy at the time. After World War II, despite the great efforts made to increase the number of schools and reduce illiteracy of adults, the official returns of 1953 showed that there were 225,000 illiterate males and 615,000 illiterate females in Bosnia and Herzegovina out of a total of 2,116,000 persons over the age of 10.

In 1945 and over the following years special efforts were made to raise the standard of literacy and education in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Thus in 1957 there were altogether 2,406 primary schools (including the continuation and eight-year schools), 37 "gymnasiums" (secondary classical or grammar schools), 130 professional training schools and 27 others. For adults there were 26 two-year elementary schools, 10 secondary schools, 12 technical schools for workers, 19 schools for skilled workmen and 11 others. Some time after the war a university with seven faculties was founded in Sarajevo, as well as an academy of music and a number of science institutes. In addition to these, there are now three Teachers Training Colleges in Bosnia and Herzegovina, several higher (professional) training colleges, six theatres, sixty science libraries, three hundred and twenty-five public libraries, eighteen museums and a radio broadcasting station.

2. History of Bosnia and Herzegovina under Turkish rule.

(a) During the rise of Turkish power

The establishment of Islam in Bosnia and Herzegovina is associated with the setting up and strengthening of Turkish rule. The first Turkish invasion occurred in the year 788/1386 during the reign of the first Bosnian king Tvrtko I (1353-91, king from 1377) when he was at the summit of his power. The next invasion took place in 790/1388 when the Turkish army was defeated by the Vojvoda Vlatko Vukčić. In the following year, a Bosnian army led by Vlatko Vukčić took part in the battle of Kosovo in support of the Serbian Duke Lazar. In the course of fighting Sultan Murād was mortally wounded and died when the battle had ended, yet Prince Bāyāzīd succeeded in carrying the day and taking Duke Lazar prisoner. After the battle of Kosovo the Duke's successors had to acknowledge Turkish suzerainty. The vassal Serbs considerably weakened the position of Bosnia. King Tvrtko's successor was allowed to rule over the lands that actually belonged to him, while the greater part of Bosnia was in the power of independent magnates each exercising full control over their respective districts. The conquest of Skopje (in Turkish Üsküp) by the Turks in 794/1392 brought about the formation of a Turkish March bordering on Serbia and Bosnia. Skopje became the seat of the first Sandjak-beyi Pasha Yigit, who was succeeded by his son İbşak. From 818/1415 frequent Turkish invasions took place; as a result, Turkish influence made itself increasingly felt in the internal affairs of the country and in the ever growing dissensions among Bosnian barons and pretenders to the throne. Soon after the accession of Tvrtko II (1420-43), who had to acknowledge Turkish suzerainty, Bosnian kings were subjected to tribute by the Turks (from 832/1428-29) who had temporarily occupied and garrisoned a number of towns on several occasions. It was not until the middle of the 9th/15th century that the Turks became firmly established in the town of Hodiđe and the surrounding country — in the present district of Sarajevo—where a frontier March was formed and administered by the Governor ʿĪṣa Bey of Skopje, the son of İbşak Bey, under the direct control of a Turkish dignitary with the title of vojvoda. The area was under dual control, for the Bosnian lords of the surrounding districts were vassals of the Turks. This administrative area is recorded in a Turkish cadastral register of the year 859/1455, but no mention is made there of a settlement called Saray Ovasl though a district of the same name is recorded. However, the origins of Sarajevo date back before the final downfall of the Kingdom of Bosnia, for the townlet of Saray Ovasl is recorded in 866/1362. At that time the Bosnian throne was occupied by Stjepan Tomaš (1443-1461), who relied on the support of the West but failed to obtain release from the obligation to pay tribute to the Turks. On that occasion, the Pope demanded not only the conversion of the king to catholicism but the suppression of "heresy" as well, a region which, despite constant persecution, had taken firm root and become the established church. However reluctantly, the King finally ordered the persecution of the heretics who took refuge in the districts held by Turks and in the region of later Herzegovina. The Turks continued to exploit not only the religious antagonism in the kingdom but social differences as well. The attempt made to unite the Kingdom of Bosnia and the Despotate of Serbia by means of an arranged marriage between the King's son Stjepan Tomašević and a Serbian Princess, brought about the fall of the Despotate and its capital city of Smederevo (1459). Stjepan Tomašević (1451-1463), the last Bosnian kings, came to depend upon the West for support to a much larger extent than his father ever did.

In 867/1463 when the King refused to pay tribute, the Turkish armies, led by the Sultan himself, invaded and rapidly conquered Bosnia. Soon after the withdrawal of Turkish troops, the Hungarian King Matthias Corvinus marched into Bosnia and occupied the town of Jajce with adjacent districts. During the following year Hungarian forces conquered Srebrenik, when two "banats" were set up—the seat of one in Jajce and of the other in Srebrenik—which formed a Hungarian March reinforced by the belt to the South of the Sava. During the 9th/15th century several incursions were launched from here, culminating in a three-day occupation of Sarajevo. King Matthias made every effort to unite the Kingdom of Bosnia. The Turks had earlier given the conquered districts of the kingdom to a cousin of the former dynasty and had founded a titular kingdom which had lasted only up to 881/1476.

The first Sandjak-beyi of Bosnia was Mehmed-bey Minnet-oglu. The sandjak of Herzegovina was founded in 874/1470 (the rest of Herzegovina was conquered by the Turks at the end of 886/beginning of 887); another sandjak was later set up, the seat of which was in Zvornik. The Banat of Srebrenik fell to the Turks in 918/1512, who also captured Jajce and Banjaluka after the battle of Mohac (in 1527 or 1528). From Bosnia the Turks penetrated into Lika and occupied the greater part of Dalmatia with the castle of Klis. The Bosnian sandjak-beyi took part in the conquest of Slavonia.

The seat of the sandjak of Bosnia was in Sarajevo (until the middle of the 10th/16th century) where many imposing buildings were erected by the sandjak-beyi Ghazl Khusrew-bey, who came there as sandjak-beyi in 926/1520 and died in 948/1541. By that time the town of Sarajevo had become a large and important place. However, the seat of the sandjak was moved to Banjaluka (towards the middle of the 10th/16th century), the lay-out and building of which, as a Muslim city was completed by Ferhad Sokolić (Sokollu), a Governor of Bosnia who became the first Bosnian pasha (beyler-beyi). In the year 988/1580 the eyalet of Bosnia was formed, with Banjaluka as its seat, which comprised seven sandjaks (Bosnia, Herzegovina, Klis, Krka, Pakrac, Zvornik and Požega). In addition to the present area of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the eyalet included parts of Slavonia, Lika and Dalmatia, as well as the frontier districts of Serbia. At the beginning of the 11th/ end of the 16th century the eyalet was composed of eight sandjaks, and at the end of the first decade of the 11th/the beginning of the 17th century the sandjak of Požega was incorporated into the newly formed eyalet of Kruna.

The Turkish conquest brought about great changes in the social pattern of Bosnia and Herzegovina. At the time when Bosnia came under Turkish control, the foundations of the structure and organisation of the Ottoman Empire had been completed.

Having conquered the country, the Turks proceeded to introduce their own social structure, a strictly centralised government, and their military
and feudal systems. This resulted in great changes in economic and social relations. Mining, next to agriculture the most important branch of former Bosnian economic activities, was taken over by the new rulers, and all the mines became the property of the sultan. The days of high and powerful feudal lords, masters in their own districts, were gone. In agrarian relations, the timar system was introduced controlled by a central authority. The sandjakbs were administered by governors directly controlled by the sultans, whose incomes were the largest next to those of emperors. Governors used to be replaced too frequently. On the other hand, the pressure on the peasant eased and sheep-raising began to improve. In the countryside generally, patriarchal ways of life and a measure of autonomy became apparent.

At the same time, great religious and ethnic changes occurred involving the whole population. There was a large-scale islamisation. An improvement in animal husbandry in certain mountainous districts, particularly in those of Herzegovina, became evident, sheep-raisers resettled in fertile agricultural districts which had been laid waste by wars and the like. Settling down on fertile lands, thousands of sheep-raisers turned to tillage, thus providing fresh manpower for the improvement of devastated areas. In view of the great importance attached to their work as colonisers, the settlers were allowed to retain their former privileges as sheep-raisers; however, with the growth of the feudal system and more settled conditions the settlers very largely became common re'dâya. Because most of these settlers were Orthodox Serbs, many districts which had been devoid of Serbs now became populated with them.

On the other hand, Islamisation helped the reigning religion to win adherents and partisans among all classes: peasants, feudal lords and townspeople. The islamisation of Bosnia and Herzegovina has not been the subject of comprehensive studies so far, so it still presents a problem awaiting solution. Before the World War I the generally accepted opinion was that of the heretic Church, the so-called Bogumils had passed over to Islam in a body, allegedly because of a similarity of views on moral law, and owing to the earlier persecutions on the part of the Church of Rome. This opinion is still shared by many scholars today (A. Solovjev and others). By passing over to Islam en masse, Bosnian nobles had been allowed to retain their estates, and the traditional pattern of land-tenure in Bosnia and Herzegovina had thus remained unchanged until the 13th/14th century. The timar system was only introduced as a superstructure. One of the chief supporters of this theory, before the World War I, was C. Truhelka. According to Truhelka and others, Bosnia had from the very beginning enjoyed a separate status in the Ottoman Empire.

During the interval between the two world wars some Yugoslav historians (V. Cubrilović, V. Škarić) sought to prove the groundlessness of these views. They were of the opinion that (a) the Islamisation had been carried out gradually, (b) the Bosnian nobles had not retained their estates after the conquest because of the setting-up of the timar system, and (c) the system of land-tenure, such as prevailed during the 18th century and was continued in the following century, had developed only gradually within the framework of the old agrarian system.

Attention has been drawn by modern Yugoslav historians to Turkish sources of the first order, particularly to cadastral registers, which are likely to throw light on the history of the Yugoslav peoples during the period in question; however, the results of the investigations have not all been made public as yet.

Before 859/1455, while the Turks held part of Bosnia under their control, there were no sipâhs timârs in the outlying districts of the borderland governed by Isa Bey, the only timârs being those owned by men of the garrison of the fort at Hodjied. Moreover, in the interior of the borderland, within the estates of Isa Bey, there were a number of sipâhs, mostly Muslims with a few Christians. After the conquest, it was mainly from here and Macedonia, then from Serbia and other regions that the bulk of sipâhs were drawn. Among the sipâhs that were sent to Bosnia there were many of Slav origin. After liquidating the leading representatives of the old Bosnian nobility during and after the conquest, the Turks at first left a few members of noble families and a good number of the old minor feudal landowners in possession of their estates. The conquerors also gave lands to headmen of sheep-raisers. This accounts for the presence at the time of many Christian sipâhs, particularly in Herzegovina.

The coming over of Bosnian feudatories to the side of Turks began rather early, at a time when they had to rely on influential Turks in the settling of disputes. Thus the land of the ducal family of Pavlović was recorded in the cadastral register of 859/1455 as land paying tribute in a lump sum (mukâfa'a) (see Başvekâlet arşivi, Maliye deft. 544). Herzog Stjepan's line of policy was for long one of complete reliance on the Turks. His sons had some time to rely on the Turks as well. His youngest son went over to the Turks, embraced Islam and as Hersekzade Ahmed Pašâ held the office of Grand Vizier five times during the reigns of Bayazid II and Selim I. A considerable number of natives of Bosnia and Herzegovina belonging to Muslim feudal families, as well as boys collected from the re'dâya by devşirme and educated at the Court, were to hold the offices of Viziers or Grand Viziers. Mehmed Pašâ Sokolović (Sokollu), one of the foremost Ottoman statesmen, Grand Vizier 972/1564-987/1579, was descended from a distinguished Serbian family in Bosnia, whose Christian relatives were Patriarchs of Serbia after the restoration of the Patriarchate of Peć (1557). The bonds of blood and kinship between men of Bosnian descent who held high offices and their kinsmen helped greatly to raise the fortunes of certain Bosnian families.

Although the ranks of sipâhs were partly filled with foreign newcomers, the majority were of native descent, raised from among the old Bosnian feudalists or the new sipâhs created during Turkish rule. In the earliest cadastral registers of the sandjaâhs of Bosnia, the names of islamised sipâhs and their Christian relatives are recorded. Likewise, the members of their whole families are found grouped around the names of outstanding dignitaries (see Başvekâlet arşivi, Tapu deft. 18 and 24). During the period there were in Bosnia, adjacent to Sultans' and Sandjaâhs' estates, a number of eñâiks held by feudal landlords and others of the same rank. Some of the sipâhs were likewise owned eñâiks in addition to timârs, but most of the latter contained no eñâiks as a rule. The eñâiks were hereditary possessions and remained as such because the sipâhs have lost possession of the timârs. On the whole it would seem that a number of earlier feudatories, converted to Islam, had kept their inherited land in the form of eñâiks. The latter, however, were few in number and consisted of
small estates, thus the theory can hardly be upheld, as C. Truhelka would have it, that the Bosnian nobles had remained in possession of their estates at the time of the conquest and had succeeded in holding them till the 13th/14th century. As a matter of fact, the number of çiftlik continued to increase, however slightly, until the beginning of the 10th/ the end of the 15th century when, during the reign of Sultan Süleyman the Lawgiver, the çiftlik of this kind were finally abolished. Such çiftlik, however, were to serve as a basis and pattern for the future development of new agrarian relations out of the old.

Muslim descendants of Christian sipahis and members of islamised families who had mended their fortunes under Turkish rule were to be found later as sipahis and za'ims, as disdiers of fortresses and higher functionaries. The importance attached to Bosnia as a frontier land favoured the rise to influence and power of the native Muslims. True, after the break-through of the Turkish armies and the invasion of areas under Hungarian rule, a great many sipahis were ordered to settle in newly conquered regions, yet this was not followed by the same consequences as in Serbia where the process of islamisation virtually stopped with the Turkish invasion of Hungary. In Bosnia and Herzegovina islamisation had resulted in the creation of a broad basis of Muslims recruited not only from the townspeople but also from the peasantry.

The creation of conditions necessary for the development of town communities in Bosnia—particularly those of mining centres—had begun during the period preceding the Turkish conquest. After the establishment of Turkish rule, Bosnian towns began to develop and grow. Turkish craftsmanship, particularly the handicraft characteristic of the Near East, was far advanced as compared with the craftsmanship of the earlier Bosnian period. Consequently, handicrafts and trade guilds of an oriental type developed greatly over the first two centuries of Turkish reign in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Great progress was made in trades related to the manufacture of leather, in goldsmiths' work, and in crafts connected with the production of military equipment and of goods required by townsmen. On the other hand, the Ottoman mining industry was less developed than in Bosnia or Serbia where Saxon settlers had introduced their mining technique and rules.

Owing to the introduction, by the Turkish authorities, of bureaucratic administrative measures in mining areas which became merged with the Imperial domains (Hâkim), the mining industry suffered a setback in the first century of the Turkish rule, with a consequent falling off in production and, more particularly, in the output of precious metals; the production of iron, however, showed a slight increase. For these reasons, the growth of towns in Bosnia and Herzegovina during the period of Turkish rule was associated—apart from military considerations, which were the most important factor in the siting and building of towns—not with the development of the mining industry but rather with the advancement of crafts and the related trade. The towns built by the Turks were all situated on sites ensuring good communications. Over the second half of the 10/15th century, the islamisation of the old Bosnian mining market-towns proceeded but slowly and was less conducive to their future development than in the case of new towns built by the Turks on the sites of former market-towns. A good instance are the towns of Sarajevo and Banjaluka, among others, which, as the seats of Turkish authorities and military garrisons, expanded and developed into crafts centres and trading settlements. Beside the Muslims, the baptized Serbs, the servants and soldiers, the populations of similar towns continued to grow because of the migration of Muslims from various places who brought in Oriental customs and ways of life. At the beginning however, it was the merchants of Dubrovnik who were the only traders on a large scale.

The building of the most important towns in Bosnia and Herzegovina was due to the initiative of individual governors. It was in and around these towns that governors had their estates, mills, houses, hamams and shops, which they would bequeath and leave, during their lifetime, to religious and charitable endowments (wakf). Thus a great number of mosques, tekiyes and religious schools were built, with libraries adjoining mosques or schools. Dervish orders introduced mystic rites and ceremonies likely to please the urban population. Briefly, the towns of Bosnia became the strongholds of Turkish power and the mainstays of Muslim culture. The towns also had an influence on the countryside and attracted great numbers of peasants and people from rural areas. Most of the migrants were peasants converted to Islam, and the non-Muslims soon became converts as well. Christians and Jews living in towns were few in number from the peasantry.

The earliest Turkish cadastral registers of the sandjak of Bosnia and Herzegovina provide documentary evidence bearing out the contention that the islamisation en masse had its origin in towns and the surrounding country districts. At the beginning of the period, as shown in the records, converted peasants in the sandjak of Bosnia were to be found only around the town of Sarajevo. In 894/1489 there were in the sandjak over 25,000 Christian houses, 1,300 odd Christian widows' houses, and over 4,000 unmarried Christian men, as compared with approximately 4,500 Muslim houses and over 2,300 single Muslims (cf. Başvekâlet arşivi, Tapu deft. no. 24). The earliest cadastral register of the sandjak of Herzegovina for the year 882/1477 (Tapu deft. no. 5) clearly shows—and so do the other cadastral registers—that the islamisation was not instantaneous; nor is there any evidence to prove the assumption that the conquerors had been joined by masses of partisans that belonged to the heretic Church of Bosnia. Only in some mountain villages of Herzegovina, as shown by the registers, were to be found the "devoted believers of the Church of Bosnia" (krstijani); also, some believers of the Church of Bosnia were recorded to have lived in a deserted village in the sandjak of Bosnia, this being the only instance. It would seem that twenty years' persecution of Bosnian heretics during the reigns of King Stjepan Tomáš and King Stjepan Tomasević had broken up the heretic Church of Bosnia; the change-over to Orthodoxy of Herzeg Stjepan Vukčić must also have had its share in weakening the position of the Bosnian Church in Herzegovina. The Turkish government recognised the Serbian Orthodox Church. Under the Sultan's berât [q.v.], the Orthodox Church enjoyed considerable rights and privileges. The Catholic Church was also granted certain privileges by Mehemmed II the Conqueror. It is evident from data in the cadastral registers that the "devoted believers of the Church of Bosnia" had retired into remote secluded districts of Herzegovina. There is no recorded evidence of any islamisation of those parts of the country or the people at the time. The inference
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could therefore be drawn that the Bosnian heretics in most areas had already been brought into the fold (Orthodox or Catholic), which would exclude the possibility of a general conversion to Islam of the followers of the Church of Bosnia.

However, the probability is that the earlier persecutions on the part of the Catholic Church, combined with the pressure brought to bear by the Orthodox Church, which had the right to collect church-dues, had created conditions favouring the conversion to Islam of the former followers of the Bosnian Church. At all events, the development of towns as centres of Islam, and their influence on the surrounding countryside resulted in a steady spread of Islam among the peasantry of certain areas as early as the 9th/10th century. Thus a foundation was laid for a major Islamisation of the peasantry. The Islamised peasants were given the distinctive name of pasha. Their religion was a mixture of Islamic and other elements, christianised pagan, Christianian and heretical-Christian. It was on these grounds that the Muslim feudatories and religious intelligentsia were inclined not to regard the Muslim peasantry as their equals.

During the reign of Süleyman Kânum measures were taken to check the growing power of the feudal class, which had been completely Islamised by then. Bosnian sipahis were made to move to newly conquered areas, the vacant timârs being made over to sipahis from other districts. Çiftlikts were transformed and made part of reşâyâ lands. It was at this time—and to a greater extent later on—that by graft and bribes a number of courtiers began to acquire estates in Bosnia. However, at the same time concessions had to be made in view of the needs of defence, particularly those of the borderland, and the existence of many devasted areas. Over the second half of the 10th/16th century the number of çiftlikts in possession of feudal lords and army officers continued to grow, particularly in frontier districts. The post of hâpudan (captain), formerly concerned with service on rivers in the borderland, came to be that of an officer in command of forts and defensive works of a district. The native feudal class could always rely on the hâpudan’s office for effectual support. The setting up of the eyalet of Bosnia added greatly to the ever increasing importance of the native nobility.

The second half of the 10th/16th century proved to be a period of rapid growth and development of certain Bosnian towns. There followed a steady rise in the volume of trade with Italian towns by enterprising home traders and Dubrovnik merchants. Being in the majority, the Muslim inhabitants of towns enjoyed certain privileges and lived in special quarters apart from the Christian population. Owing to the influx of newcomers certain guilds closed their doors, hence a migration of Muslim population to places and towns beyond the Sava.

In the second half of the 10th/16th century, the signs of a crisis in the Ottoman general administrative structure became increasingly apparent in the country’s finances. One of its effects was a consid-erable weakening of Turkish military power. This crisis became evident in Bosnia as well. The last military ventures and offensive operations made under the leadership of Hasan Paşa Predojević, the beyler-beyi of Bosnia, ended in the capture of Bihac. In the following year (1002/1693), a Bosnian army led by Hasan Paşa suffered a heavy defeat at Sisak, which brought about the war between the Habsburgs and Turkey.

(b) The period of crisis in the Turkish state and military defeats of the Ottomans

The administrative structure and extent of the eyalet of Bosnia, which took definite shape at the beginning of the 11th/17th century, remained unchanged until about the end of the century. At this time, the governor of the eyalet bore the title of Vizier, and the seat of government was transferred from Banjaluka to Sarajevo in 1049/1639.

The crisis in the economic and financial affairs of the Ottoman Empire and the cracks in the Osmanli structure were also reflected in the conditions that prevailed in Bosnia where disorders were frequent and corruption rife. Owing to financial difficulties and the rising costs of maintaining control over wide areas of the conquered territory, the central government had to extend the system of lease of all public and imperial revenue and to raise the taxes and introduce new ones. The system of lease was extended to include the renting of local rates, and even the incomes from timârs and şâfâmets acquired by courtiers, officials attached to central offices, and by many other prominent men living in the capital. The widespread centralised bureaucratic system, designed to control and check oppression, became a source of corruption, practised by local authorities as well. From the second half of the 10th/16th century on, the financial burdens and exploitation of the reşâyâ (peasantry) increased, the pressure being put on the sheep-raisers of the autonomous districts likewise. The long war (1593-1606) was a constant drain on Turkish resources and manpower, with Bosnia bearing the brunt in her exposed position. Owing to the war there was much unrest and many risings of the Serb people in Herzegovina both during and after the war. Over the first two decades of the 11th/17th century, former rebels from Anatolia were sent to Bosnia as governors and would turn rebels in Bosnia as well; they could always rely for support on a large number of malcontents among the native sipahi class who were embittered because courtiers and those near to central authorities would be given timârs and şâfâmets as a present, thus enabling individuals and local bureaucrats to acquire estates as large as several timârs put together. Turkish governors, whose term of office was rather short, were anxious to amass riches and explored the country for their own profit, as did the officials of the central government sent to investigate malpractices and causes of unrest.

Despite such conditions the native feudal class continued to prosper and grow in strength. The process of transformation of peasant lands into çiftlikts owned by military commanders, sipâhis and wealthier citizens was gaining ground as was alienation of free bağımaskas (inherited possessions) of knez-es (village headmen) and other categories of land. Peasant tenants (~îfâc, kmet) of such çiftlikts were required to deliver one third of a fourth (at a later period a fifth, or a ninth in some instances) of corps to their owners (çiftlik ~îshib-i ard) should the çiftlik happen to be part of a timâr or a şâfâmets, which was usually the case. The system of government by hâpudan was extended and came to be applied in the inland areas of the country, for the central government could not afford the means required for the upkeep of as large an army of mercenaries as was needed.
In the circumstances, kapudans tended to grow overbold and defy orders issued by Pashas. Yielding to the demands of Bosnian sipahıs supported by the Pašha, Sultan Ahmed (1603-1717) issued a firman establishing timarı within rights of family succession (ağābāt), the successors being sons or brothers of the deceased, or else kinsmen living with the family (oğāb).

Changes in land tenure and economic policy mainly affected the Christian peasantry; the land of Muslim peasants was seldom interfered with. Increased taxation and growing exploitation deepened the existing divisions between the two classes of peasantry, hence the frequent flights of Christian peasants over the border and increasing numbers of outlaws (haydut in Turkish), who as highwaymen became a menace to safety on the roads.

The trends of development in agriculture and other branches of national economy, apparent in the earlier period, became more pronounced during the second half of the 10th/16th century and during the 11th/17th century. Mining industry continued to decline and was at its lowest at the end of the century. The towns grew and developed during the second half of the 16th and the first half of the 17th centuries as a result of the expanding trade and commerce. The opening of the port at Split (1592), a rival to the port of Dubrovnik, proved an event of great importance to Bosnian trade. The town guilds came under the exclusive control of the janissaries, and this led to the further transformation of guilds into closed organisations. Town notables (a'ydn, q.v.) and powerful ağhas made their appearance in growing numbers. However, part of the inhabitants of towns were Christians, some of whom were craftsmen and tradesmen. Following the increasing migration of country people into towns the tax on abandoned land was very increased. Over the second half of the 10th/16th and the first half of the 11th/17th centuries, some of the towns grew both in extent and importance, particularly the town of Sarajevo. The amassed money-capital, however, served to advance the practices of usury. Besides the prosperous Muslim class, there were in towns certain Christian families of rich traders and merchants—Christians usurers. The urban social pattern showed a marked tendency towards a sharper division between the wealthier, politically influential class and the lower class of the urban poor. In the 11th/17th century there occurred several serious outbreaks of disorder and rioting among the poor of Sarajevo, largely Muslim.

While in the first half of the 11th/17th century the Thirty Years War in Europe prevented any major military undertaking against the Turk, in the second half of the century two long wars caused much suffering and lowered the standard of living conditions and the economy of the eyalet of Bosnia. The war against Venice (1644-1669) and the shorter war against the Habsburgs (1653-1664) were waged in areas belonging to the eyalet of Bosnia, where frequent incursions took place. The consequent flights of Christian population across the frontier resulted in the enlistment of many of the fugitives, called uskoci, in the military service of Venice. In Herzegovina also there was unrest and risings of the people. After the wars there followed a 14-year period of welcome peace, which on the whole resulted in consolidation of Turkish power. The attack on Vienna started the new war with the Holy Alliance which was to last a long time (1683-1699). For once the Bosnian territory south of the Sava escaped being the main scene of the operations, but a Bosnian army had to take part in the war and defend the frontiers. Austrian troops temporarily occupied some districts south of the Sava (1688), and nine years later Prince Eugene, after the battle of Senta, advanced as far as Sarajevo, burning it down in 1109/1697. The Christian population, particularly the Roman Catholics, migrated and retreated with the invading armies. The long wars left an epidemic of plague in their train.

Under the terms of the peace-treaty of Kазlovec (1110/1699) the eyalet of Bosnia retained, with minor changes, the present frontiers of Bosnia and Herzegovina on the north and west. However, on these frontiers new fortifications began to be built and the old ones repaired; more “kapudanships” were established. The eyalet now consisted of five sanjaqs (Bosnia, Herzegovina, Klis, Vornik and Bihac), the last being abolished soon after. It was at this time that the residence of the Bosnian vizier was transferred from Sarajevo to Travnik.

Muslim refugees from the ceded areas of Hungary, Slavonia, Croatia and Dalmatia came to settle in Bosnia on lands abandoned or sparsely populated, which they were allowed to hold as çiftliks. The new settlers were embittered against the Christian Powers and the insurgents, which added to the division and differences between Muslims and Christians. A number of settlers came to stay in towns, for the most part tradesmen, craftsmen and soldiers.

The exposed position of the eyalet of Bosnia called for great efforts on the part of the Muslim population. Under the peace-treaty of Požarevac (1130/1718) Austria was given a belt of territory south of the Sava, and some areas around the western frontier were also lost to Austria and Venice. Despite the ravages wrought by the plague coupled with a succession of bad harvests and heavy loss of life suffered by Bosnian sipahıs, a Bosnian army led by Hekim-oghlu ‘Ali Paša gained a decisive victory over the Austrians at Banjaluka in 1150/1737. The treaty of Belgrade (1152/1739) deprived Austria of all the territories held under the treaty of Požarevac, except for the castle of rich traders and merchants—Christians usurers. Bosnian feudal nobility and Muslims in general had by now lost confidence in the power of the Empire. The arrival of janissaries from the abandoned regions strengthened the privileged position of certain towns, particularly that of Sarajevo, which were now granted virtual autonomy, the greatest power being yielded by municipal a’ydn and military commanders (“bajaks”) with kapudans. These dignitaries came to be the main representatives of political power. In the time of ‘Ali Paša a Council of a’ydn was set up, composed of municipal a’ydn, kapudans and men of note from different parts of the eyalet. The Council was meant to exercise control over the vizier himself and was given powers to determine certain vizier’s incomes.

Sprung from this privileged class, the new native Muslim nobility was founded on the subjection of peasantry and depended on further extension of villainage. Beys and ağhas as land and çiftlik lords took over or seized new çiftliks, causing peasants from stock-rearing districts to settle on deserted land, and generally acting independently of the central authority. Kapudans usurped the powers and functions of officers of state, renting the state’s revenue, taking over çiftliks, and acquiring property by every means. Certain families of kapudans recorded in the first decades of the 12th/18th century
had reached a high position in society by the end of the century.

In order to acquire riches and indemnify themselves for taxes paid and bribes offered to obtain the appointment to the office, viziers of Bosnia would raise the rate of taxation and impose new rates, taxes and other dues. Indeed, immediate delivery of certain goods was often demanded as advance payment for taxes 6-9 months before they were to fall due. This provoked a series of revolts and risings of poor citizens and Muslim peasantry over a period of ten years about the middle of the 12th/18th century.

Such circumstances had an adverse effect on trade in town and country alike. The prevailing conditions acted as a serious set-back to economic growth of the country.

In the war between Austria and Turkey (1788-1791) the responsibility for the defence of the frontier districts rested with the Bosnian forces. Apart from capturing certain frontier castles (1788-1790) the Austrian armies had but few successes. Under the terms of the peace-treaty of Svishtov (1791) Turkey surrendered a little part of her territory, and Austria evacuated the captured frontier castles.

At the beginning of the 13th/end of 18th century Sultan Selim III introduced a series of reforms and measures largely designed to curb the power of janissaries. The policy of the proposed reforms ran counter to the established foundations and prevailing influence of Muslim nobility and the privileged position of Muslim population of towns in the Bosnian eydlet.

(c) The Period of Reforms in Turkey and Risings in Bosnia.

The new Turkish reforms could not but be met with indignation by Bosnian Muslims, interfering as they did with the established military structure and being directed against the janissaries and the sipahis army. In several campaigns against the insurgents in Serbia, Bosnian boys, aghas and the urban population took part in large numbers; however, the Bosnian army suffered a heavy defeat at Mişar (1806). A short time after, several risings of Serb peasantry occurred in Bosnia but were soon put down. Far greater efforts were needed for the final suppression of the rebellion of the Drobnjaks in Herzegovina. Bosnian Muslims also took part in the suppression of the rising in Serbia in 1813.

The transit trade improved during the period of Napoleonic continental blockade. Bosnian roads were chiefly used at the time for the transport of cotton, undertaken by Serbian and Jewish traders, many of whom grew rich in consequence. Muslim tradesmen in towns were dependent for their prosperity on the preservation of privileges and special rights. Sarajevo, the most important town, had acquired a large measure of independence in regard to viziers; there were frequent cases of serious differences and quarrels between the citizens and the vizier, which at times led to armed resistance. With the appointment and arrival of Djalal al-Din Pasha in 1820 law and order was restored at a great sacrifice of life. The abolition of the order of Janisaries was the cause of another rising of the people, particularly in Sarajevo, which was suppressed by 'Abd al-Rahmân Pasha. The general dissatisfaction and resistance to the reforms continued none the less. In 1846/1837, when attempts were made to carry the reforms into effect and reorganise the army, a rebellion broke out headed by Bosnian Muslim nobles under the leadership of Husayn-kapudan Gradaščević. The insurgents demanded complete autonomy for Bosnia and Herzegovina and the right to elect their own vizier; Bosnia had to pay a yearly tribute to the Sultan. The demands, if met, would have safeguarded the privileges of the nobility and the existing military structure. However, at the very start of the conflict the kapudans of Herzegovina, led by 'Ali Ağa Rizvanbegović, separated themselves from the movement. Despite the victory of Husayn-kapudan over the imperial troops and of the understanding reached with the Grand Vizier, the initial great successes soon came to nothing because of personal ambitions of the leader (elected to the viziership in the early part of Dirhamad 1 1247/8-17 October 1831) and the rivalry between Bosnian leaders. The insurrection was put down (1832) and Herzegovina proclaimed a paşalîk to be governed by 'Ali Paša Rizvanbegović (1833).

After the suppression of the insurrection the hereditary kapudanîlks were abolished (1835) and replaced by müseâlimîlks. Many former kapudans, a'yân, and sipahis as well (after the abolition of their order) were appointed müseâlims and given posts of commanders. The iron hand in a velvet glove was the means used by the Ottoman Porte in dealing with Bosnian nobles and stubborn malcontents. Nevertheless, the conflicts still continued, particularly between the citizens of Sarajevo and the viziers. The resistance was finally broken by 'Umar Paša Latas, a former Austrian petty-officer, born in Lika (Croatia). Sent to Bosnia (1850-1852) with special powers at the head of considerable forces, 'Umar Paša succeeded in breaking the great political influence of Bosnian nobility and carrying the reforms into effect. He had 'Ali Paša put to death, and abolished the paşalîk of Herzegovina. Bosnia was divided into six kârimâbîlîlks and Herzegovina into three kârimâbîlîlks. The town of Sarajevo became the official residence of the vizier.

Further reforms were made in the administration of the eydlette of Bosnia during the tenure of office of the Vizier Topal 'Othmân Paşa (1861-1869). The country was divided into seven sandjaklaks. The wilâyet Council was set up in 1866—an advisory body of representatives, on denominational basis. A start was made with modernisation of living conditions, health service and communications (the first railway—Banjaluka-Novi—was opened in 1872). In the sixties of the century the wilâyet printing-office was set up and a number of schools opened.

The reforms and measures taken favoured the development of certain branches of national economy. Commerce and trade improved, but the guilds were endangered owing to the development of the market. Many urban Serb families rose to prosperity and, as a result, the influence of Serbian citizens began to make itself felt in rural districts.

Yet the reforms were not far-reaching enough to deal with the essence of agrarian structure and its problems. With the abolition of the order of sipahîs the *uşır (tithe) was made a tax of the state, and to indemnify the sipahîs for loss of income a pension scheme was introduced in lieu of the rents. However, to recoup themselves for their losses, the sipahîs proceeded to convert into sipahîs the remaining peasant free-holdings. By the middle of the 19th century the process had been completed; thus feudal land-tenure and tenantry came to be
associated with Christian peasants, for the Muslim peasantry had remained in possession of their tiftiks. The burden of heavy taxation was meant to be borne largely by the peasant. Moreover, the amount of rates and other dues exacted from the kmets (tenants) was not fixed but collected arbitrarily. Such conditions were a cause of general discontent among the peasantry, and provoked frequent rebellions.

Tahir Pašha, Vizier of Bosnia, undertook (in 1848) to settle the agrarian question. Under his new scheme, tiftik owners were to collect a third part of the annual crop, and forced labour was to be abolished except in Herzegovina, where the kmets were allowed to hand over less than a third of the crop. Certain obligations of the tiftik owner in the district of Sarajevo, e.g., to provide his kmets with seeds, ozen and dwellings, were to apply to all Bosnian districts. However, tiftik owners proceeded to collect the third of the crop everywhere, insisted on forced labour and failed to perform their own obligations. This caused much discontent among the peasants; nor were the tiftik owners satisfied. Several unsuccessful attempts had to be made before the question was finally settled—after the passing of the Agrarian Act (during the Ramadan of 1274)—by decree proclaimed in the month of Safar 1276/September 1859, enacting the customary practices in regard to kmets. No provision was made, however, for a uniform system of taxation and other dues applicable to the whole of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The regulations of the decree in regard to this system of land-tenure remained in force until 1918.

The unsatisfactory conditions gave rise to a series of peasant risings about the middle of the 19th century. The great rising of 1875, when masses of Christian peasants, kmets of agbas and beys, joined hands, was given a political colouring by the participation of the Serbian town population, particularly following the entry of Serbia and Montenegro into war against Turkey. True, the rising in Herzegovina was a mass movement, while in Bosnia it was only the frontier districts that were involved. The rising called forth the intervention of the Great Powers. The Treaty of San Stefano, Turkey should grant autonomy to Bosnia and Herzegovina. However, Bosnia was unwilling to take sides after the withdrawal of Turkish authorities and the army—and incited the people to rise against the invader should grant autonomy to Bosnia and Herzegovina. Under the terms of the Congress of Berlin, Bosnia and Herzegovina was mandated to Austria-Hungary. The Austro-Hungarian troops sent to occupy the country met with unexpected resistance from Bosnian Muslims. The rebels were led by men of the lower classes—since prominent Bosnians were unwilling to take sides after the withdrawal of Turkish authorities and the army—who incited the people to rise against the invaders and set up a government of the people in Sarajevo. The occupation began on July 29th and was completed on October 20th, 1876. Drastic measures were taken to break down the strong resistance offered at some places, particularly around and in the town of Sarajevo.

Bibliography: Historical studies relating to the period of Turkish rule in Bosnia and Herzegovina are far from being complete though much progress has been made of late. Most of the relevant historical material dealing with the period has not yet been published. The collecting and editing of the material is in charge of the Oriental Institute of Sarajevo. For the early years of the period of particular importance are the Turkish cadastral registers (with kuman-namas), kept in the Bajvekale arşivi in Istanbul, wakfi-namas (reported on by F. Spaho, H. Kreševljaković, G. Elezović, H. Šabanović, and others), and documents stored in the archives Glasnik Zem. Bosnij i Hercegovine and others; also important are the hadji sigils of the 17th century with fragmentary records from the 16th century, and public records material (Oriental Institute, Khusrwe-bey Library, etc.). Some public records of the vilayet of Bosnia (from the middle of the 19th century) are kept in the Oriental Institute of Sarajevo. Valuable information concerning the latter part of the period is to be found in the unpublished chronicle entitled Ta'rikh-i Diyar-i Bosna, written by Zâlih Şidki Ef. Hadžihuseinović, known by the name of Muweĉkit, at the second half of the 19th century, the autograph of which is kept in the Oriental Institute of Sarajevo.

The more important collections of sources are the following: C. Truhelka, Tursko-slovjenski spomenici dubrovacke arhive, Glasnik Zem. Bosnija i Hercegovina 1911; H. Šabanović, Najstarije vukun name u Bosni, Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju, ii (1951), iii-iv (1952); Monumenta Turcica historiam Slavorum Mer. illustrantia, I, Kanuni i kanun-name, Vol. i (edited by Oriental Inst. of Sarajevo), Sarajevo 1937; J. Matazović, Fojnička regesta, Spomenik Srpske Akademije Nauka, lxii (1930); inscriptions in oriental languages discovered in Bosnia have been published by M. Mujev佐ivić, in Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju, i (1951), ii (1952-53), and others. Among the more important travel-books containing valuable information and data are those by Kurpišić (1530) and Ewlija Celebi from the middle of the 17th century. The sources concerning the beginning of the Rising in 1875 have been published by H. Hadžibegić, Turski dokumenti o početku ustanaka u Hercegovini i Bosni 1875, Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju, i (1950).

General histories of Bosnia: S. Bašagić, Kraka upula u prošlost Bosne i Hercegovine, Sarajevo 1900; M. Prelog, Posijest Bosne doba osmanlijske vlade, i-i, Sarajevo 1912-1913. Others are out of date. V. Ćorić, Historija Bosne i, Belgrade 1940 (published first book only, to 1482); Istorija naroda Jugoslavije, i, Belgrade 1953, 574-576 (to 1482 also). An outline of the history of Bosnia and Herzegovina under Turkish rule is to be found in Istorija naroda Jugoslavije, Book ii (in print); the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries are by N. Filipović, the 18th century by H. Kreševljaković, and the history of culture by H. Šabanović. Unpublished Turkish historical material has been used, particularly cadastral registers, and references given concerning sources and bibliography.

Monographs and treatises: H. Šabanović, Pitanje turske vlasti u Bosni do pohoda Mehmeda II 1453 god., Godišnjak 1. društva Bosne i Hercegovine u Sarajevu (1956); H. Šabanović, Bosanski pašaluk do kraja XVII vijeka—postanak i upravna podjela (dissertation in print); H. Kreševljaković, Kapetanije u Bosni i Hercegovini, Sarajevo 1957; M. Handžić, Poljega na sudstvo u Bosni i Hercegovini za vrijeme turske vlasti, Sarajevo 1940; C. Truhelka, Historička podloga agrarnog pitanja u Bosni i Hercegovini u XVII vijeku, Sarajevo 1925; V. Cubrilović, Poroklo muških plemenstva u Bosni, Jug. než. časopis I (1935); M. Handžić, Islamizacija Bosne i Herce
The most lasting traces of the influence of Islamic culture are the elements of oriental culture—in towns—as in the other provinces of the Ottoman Empire. The mainstays of Islamic culture in Bosnia and Herzegovina were town settlements, for the manifest features of the culture were predominantly urban in scope and character. The way of living of the Muslims in this period are less monumental in appearance except for a few edifices erected by Governor-Generals or some high Turkish dignitaries, as for example the Hadži-Sinan's Tekije (1640) in Sarajevo. The architecture of the third period shows signs of decadence and, towards the latter part, of the penetration of European ideas as well as imitation of styles prevalent in the towns of Turkey. There are also signs of direct influences. The period nevertheless has produced many interesting examples of technical ingenuity. The development of the town of Travnik, as the official residence of the Vizier, is typical of the period.

The Suleymaniyya mosque (the present building—dating from 1816) has been constructed over a bezistan. A number of ancient mosques were restored during this period. In the construction of monumental public buildings the Islamic architects displayed the fundamental features of the Ottoman artistry, though not all of the latter's forms and characteristics found expression in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Smaller mosques and public buildings, as well as dwelling-houses were built by native master builders, hence certain individual features of this style of architecture. In the post-Turkish period the examples of Islamic architecture show unmistakable signs of decadence. The Austro-Hungarian Governments attempted to develop the characteristics of Islamic architectural art by copying the Moorish style. The buildings in this style contrasted with both the earlier examples of Islamic architecture in Bosnia and Herzegovina and those of the latter period of the Austrian rule, besides being in disharmony with Bosnian inland scenery and unsuited to climatic conditions. Buildings in this style proved a failure. The most representative example of this style is the Sarajevo Town Hall. The Bosnian and Herzegovian style of architecture, as applied to dwelling-houses, held its own a while longer before it finally disappeared.

A very large number of words and idioms of Turkish, Arabic and Persian origin are in everyday use in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and to a greater extent than in other areas where Serbo-Croat is spoken. The early literary style also made full use of such borrowings. With the development and
under the influence of standard Serbo-Croat, since 1878, and more so since 1918, words and phrases of Turkish origin have been falling out of use in everyday speech. During the period of Turkish rule a cursive Cyrillic alphabet was in use in private correspondence among Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslims, particularly among native Muslim nobles. Arabic characters were used in the writing of Serbo-Croat literary texts done by Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslims. The same characters were used in certain Serbo-Croat religious texts written during the period of Austrian rule and that of pre-war Yugoslavia. Some religious books printed in these characters are still available. The orthography was rather arbitrary at first but gradually became standardised. Since 1930 however, the characters have hardly ever been used even in religious texts.

No comprehensive study has so far been made of the literary production, in Serbo-Croat or oriental languages, of Bosnian or Herzegovinian Muslims.

In their devotion to folk-songs and popular poetry the Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina differed little from their Christian compatriots. The earlier epic compositions of Bosnian and Herzegovinian *guslars* have all the basic characteristics of traditional Serbo-Croat epic poems. The difference merely lies in a different religious and political attitude; a more frequent use of Turkish idioms, and a tendency away from heroic poems towards ballads. *Hasanaginica*, a popular Bosnian poem, is well known in the world of literature. Popular epic poems of the earlier type are preserved in the south of Bosnia and Herzegovina. A later type of popular Muslim epic poetry developed among the people of a western frontier district called Krajina. Such poems were recited with a *tamburica* (mandolin) accompaniment, and differed in several respects from the popular poems of the *guslars*. Popular lyrics of Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslims, when compared with those of their compatriots, likewise show—and to a higher degree—a number of characteristic features of their own. The most familiar and popular among these are the love poems called *sendalinkas*. Apart from oriental influences of language, motifs, and music apparent in their composition, the *sendalinkas* are essentially typical poems of Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslims, liked and enjoyed throughout Yugoslavia.

Judging by the results of studies published so far, those Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslim poets who wrote in oriental languages did so mainly in Turkish, to a lesser extent in Persian, and in a few instances in Arabic. Among Turkish writers, there were several of Bosnian origin, some of whom were noted poets, as for example Derwish Pasha, son of Bâyazid Agha (killed in 1022/1613), born in Mostar (Herzegovina), and the well-known stylist Mehmed Nergisi (died 1044/1634), born in Sarajevo. Not only were they born in Bosnia and Herzegovina but also held office for rather a long time, the former as Pasha of Bosnia and the latter as Mûderris and Kadi. Likewise of Bosnian origin was Ahmed Südf (died 1005/1596-7), the well-known commentator on the Persian classics. One of the most copious writers of poetry in the Persian language, who also wrote in Turkish, was the sheykh Fewzî of Mostar (died about 1160/1747). Ahmed Wahdet (died 1007/1598-9) of Dobrun near Visegrad, as well as some other poets of Bosnian origin, devoted himself to Muslim orthodoxy. Hasan Kâzî of Sarajevo (died 1103/1694-5) and Uksin of Bosnjev, also called Havâyi (died about 1061/1650-1), born in Tuzla Donja, as well as a number of other

Bosnian and Herzegovinian poets, wrote both in Turkish and Serbo-Croat. The latter compiled a Serbo-Croat dictionary written in Turkish verse. In the 13th and 14th and 15th centuries up to the present time there were a number of poets who wrote religious poems in the spirit of old traditions. Of this poetry worthy of note are the poets in praise of the birth of Muhammad (mewlud), the compositions of the early period being mere versions imitative of the Turkish texts, latterly followed by some original writings.

The early prose of the Muslim writers of Bosnia and Herzegovina mostly in Arabic, is largely concerned with Islamic theological subjects, *shari'a* laws, State administration, and history. Many of the writers, natives of Bosnia and Herzegovina, lived and worked in Istanbul and other parts of the Ottoman Empire, as for example Abd Allah Bosnevi—died in 1054/1644—a writer of mystical-philosophical tracts and commentator on the *Fusus al-Hikam* by Ibn al-Arâbî. Noted as a writer on law and politics was Hasan Kâfî, born in Prusac (Akhisar), whose literary merit gained him a lifetime *ködilik* in his native place, where he died in 1025/1616. In addition to his other writings, Kâfî was the author of the well-known work *Nisâm al-‘Îâm*. As many as forty authors might be mentioned who were active in the field of religious and law studied during the Bosnian and Herzeogvina literary period. A number of well-known Ottoman historians were descended from Bosnian Muslim families (e.g., Ibrâhîm Pećevi); however, the historiography in the Turkish language in Bosnia and Herzegovina is of a later growth. A noted Bosnian historiographer of the 12th/18th century, who wrote in Turkish, was the kâzł Umar of Novi, the author of *Gilâme-i Hekim-OGlu* (*Ali-pasha*), a work dealing with historical events in Bosnia from the beginning of Muharram 1149/1736 to the end of Djuamaddâ I of 1152/1739. The first printing of the work was done by Ibrâhîm Mütferferî (1154/1741); it was later reprinted and translated into English and German. During the transitional period between the end of the 12th/18th and the beginning of the 17th/19th centuries, a few prominent chroniclers (Mu斯塔fa Bahşeshi, Sâîlî Şidîkl) are on record, who wrote accounts of contemporary events. Among the historians dealing with the latter period of Turkish rule and the events following the Austrian occupation of the country are the following: Sâîlî Şidîkl Ef. Hadžihsenović (died 1305/1888), Muhammed-Enveri Kadić (1274/1852-1349/1931), a collector of historical material which he transcribed himself (28 books—a copy of the manuscript is housed in the Ghâzî Khursrew-bey Library, Sarajevo). The transition from the old historiography to be noted in the work of the sheykh Sejîf al-Dîn Ef. Kemura (died 1335/1917). Likewise, certain characteristics of the earlier Islamic studies and some conceptions of the earlier historiography are also manifest in the works of Dr. Salvet bey Bašagić (1870-1934), the first modern historian of the Turkish period and the first oriental scholar in Bosnia and Herzegovina, who was a poet as well.

However, since 1878, and particularly since 1918, the literary activities of Bosnian Muslims—apart from the romantic school of thought which still clings to earlier beliefs (with Dr. S. Bašagić as the outstanding representative)—have tended more and more to become merged into Serbian and other literatures. A. F. Džabić (died 1918), mufti of Mostar and fighter for religious autonomy, attained
prominence in Turkey as professor of Arabic language and literature. He also brought out a collection of choice poems of Muhammad's contemporaries.

The nurseries of Islamic education and culture in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as in every Turkish province, were the mektebs and medreses and religious institutions (mosques, tekkiye, and the like). As a rule adjacent to mosques, the mektebs provided primary education mainly consisting of instruction in the reading of the Kur'an, writing and basic religious principles. Medreses, the secondary and higher schools, were also set up on the Turkish model. The earliest medrese on record in Sarajevo dates from the first quarter of the 10th/beginning of the 10th century. By the waqf name of 943/1537 the Ghazi Khusrew-bey Medrese with its own Library was founded by Ghazi Khusrew-bey, the sanduk-beyi of Bosnia. The building was completed in the following year and is still standing opposite the entrance gate to the harem of the Khusrew-bey Mosque. The Medresa Library has since been made into an independent public institution of Ghazi Khusrew-bay's waqf, which has helped to extend its scope. The present inventory comprises the original stock of volumes, in oriental languages as well as a large number of additional copies, manuscripts and Turkish documents acquired, as well as ninety-two schools of the reformed type (mekteb-i ittiddi). The rushdiyyes were founded in 1892 as a training college for Muslim pupils of the State grammar school. Church of Sarajevo the responsibility for educational services and the training college. Muslim pupils of the State grammar school of Sarajevo had the choice of being taught Classical Greek or Arabic.

In the new Yugoslavia religious bodies and societies are separated from the State, but the latter may render assistance to religious communities. Religious instruction may be given only in the immediate vicinity of places of worship (under the provisions of the Religious Communities Act of 1953); however, the religious communities are free to open schools for the training of religious functionaries and staff. The mektebs' attendance at which was considered compulsory for Muslims by the Islamic religious community, were in existence until 1952, when they were abolished in the whole of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

During the Austro-Hungarian administration and in pre-war Yugoslavia, the study of Islamic branches of knowledge concerned with religion and oriental languages was closely associated with the activities of the above mentioned schools and colleges. At the same time, the Zemaljski Muzej of Sarajevo was engaged in collecting oriental manuscripts and records from Turkish archives. Among the staff of the museum there were a number of workers who had studied oriental literary and historical records. It was here that conditions were created for the development of modern scientific studies and work...
4. The Islamic religious community in Bosnia and Herzegovina since 1878.

The Sultan’s sovereign rights over Bosnia and Herzegovina were recognised until 1908, when the province was annexed by Austria-Hungary. Nevertheless, the position of Bosnia and Herzegovina within the Dual Monarchy remained undefined, largely because of the dualist constitution of Austria-Hungary.

Bosnia and Herzegovina were under a dual control exercised by the Austro-Hungarian Ministry of Finance, both before and after the annexation. Each of the two powers had definite rights regarding administrative policy, the building of railways and matters concerned with the country’s trade and finances.

The Austro-Hungarian system of government in Bosnia and Herzegovina was bureaucratic and police-ridden throughout the period. A military commander was responsible for the government, the number of departments being four, and later six. A Governor’s “civil adlatus”, was appointed in 1882, who was in effective control of the Civil Service. For administrative purposes the country was divided into six okrugs (departments)—Banjaluka, Bihac, Mostar, Sarajevo, Travnik, and Tuzla—and these in turn into srez-es (districts) and spostanas (the smallest administrative units). Only in 1906—the administration of justice was separated from the government of the country. Following the annexation, a Constitution with a “Sabor” (Assembly) was granted in 1910. The Sabor consisted of seventy-two deputies and twenty appointed (ex officio) members, the latter being partly religious representatives (among Muslims: the reis al-‘ulama”), the Director of waibf Administration, and three muftis), and partly high officials. The deputies were elected to three “curiae” according to their ranks, the first of which was of two classes, the Muslim owners of large estates belonging to the first. The curiae were organised by electoral districts on a denominational basis. The constitution restricted within narrow limits the powers of the assembly in respect of the Government, at the same time imposing restrictions on the authority of the latter in respect of the Austro-Hungarian Ministry of Finance.

In 1912 the Governor was given additional powers concerning the Civil Service. The Assembly was adjourned and did not sit during the World War I.

Despite the fact that the Austro-Hungarian government introduced a modern system of administration, developed trade (and mining and timber industries in particular), built roads, railways, and established schools and a number of scientific institutions, the framework of society remained in many respects unchanged. True, the Austro-Hungarian authorities were by this means able to win over to their side the greater part of the Muslim nobility, yet the unsolved agrarian question led to the stagnation of agriculture and told heavily upon the peasantry and in particular upon the kmeti (mostly Orthodox Christians). Nor was the agrarian problem brought about any nearer by the passing of the Facultative Redemption of Land Act, 1911, whereby only minor changes were effected in the existing relations.

From 1882 to 1903 the leading rôle in the direction of Austro-Hungarian policy in Bosnia and Herzegovina was played by B. Kallay, the minister of finances of the Dual Monarchy, otherwise a well-
known historian. In order to keep Bosnia and Herzegovina as a corpus separatum within the Dual Monarchy and to check the spread of Serbian and Croatian nationalism, Kallay attempted to create a "Bosnian nation" and a "Bosnian language". This policy, however, failed to attract a sufficient number of partisans among the native population, for the Serbs and Croats had become nationally conscious, and the nationally "undeclared" majority of the Muslims looked on Turkey as their mother country. Moreover, many Muslim families had settled in Turkey and Muslim leaders had always stressed the sovereign rights of the Ottoman Sultan over Bosnia and Herzegovina. Only a small part of the Muslim intellectuals and landowners adopted the cause of "Bosnian nationalism".

The Serbian political movement directed its main efforts towards achieving autonomy in Church matters and freedom to conduct Serbian community schools. The idea found supporters among the great mass of the Serbian population and the new-born intelligentsia, but it was the Serb gazdas (moneymen) who thrust themselves forward as leaders. There was general discontent among the latter because their usurious trade practices were obstructed by the predominance of Austro-Hungarian moneymen interests and trade capital. The efforts of the movement proved successful, and autonomy was granted in matters of religion and denominational instruction in 1905.

Muslim opinion became increasingly suspicious of certain measures taken by the Austro-Hungarian authorities. In order to gain control over Muslim religious institutions, the Government, in 1882, created the office of re'is al-'ulema, the supreme religious head of Bosn-Herzegovinian Muslims, as well as the highest religious authoritative body (ulema medlis) presided over by the re'is al-'ulema with four members. This organisation went so far as to control the rights of the Wakf Board. Dissatisfied and alarmed, the Muslims presented a petition to the Emperor (in 1886) asking to be granted autonomy in matters concerning the administration of the wakfs. A resolute struggle for the achievement of autonomy, religious and educational, for all Muslims in Bosnia and Herzegovina began in 1899 under the leadership of A. F. Džabić, the mufti of Mostar. The struggle became linked with the Orthodox (Serb) movement. Džabić insisted on demanding maximum concessions but was outvoted. In 1900 a draft statute for the Islamic religious community was transferred to Belgrade; whereas a special emphasis was placed on the Sultan’s sovereignty over Bosnia and Herzegovina, a principle which the Austro-Hungarian authorities were unwilling to accept. When Džabić, the mufti of Mostar, left for Istanbul to consult the Sultan, he was forbidden to re-enter Bosnia and Herzegovina. From 1906 onward the movement took a more organised and definite shape. An Executive Committee of the Muslim people’s organisation was elected, presided over by Ali Bey Firduş. While championing the interests of the propriated classes, the organisation at the same time entered into negotiations with the Government for the granting of religious autonomy. The negotiations hung fire, for the Austro-Hungarian authorities refused to lend an ear to the slightest hint about the Sultan’s sovereign rights over Bosnia and Herzegovina. Following the annexation, the negotiations were brought to a satisfactory conclusion with the Emperor’s sanction of the Statute concerning Autonomous Government of Moslem Religious Affairs in Bosnia and Herzegovina Vakf-Medlis. Under the statute the supreme administrative authority as regards wakfs and endowments of schools and mosques consisted in a Vakf-Medlis Assembly (Sabor) consisting of eight nominated (ex officio) members (the re'is al-'ulema, six muftis and the Director of the Vakf Board) and twenty-four members elected by district board committees. The president of the Sabor was the re'is al-'ulema ex officio. The Vakf-Medlis Committee was both the administrative and the executive organ of the Sabor. Other minor bodies of the Vakf-Medlis Board were the district committees, elected by district assemblies, and, among the latter, the đemal assemblies and đemal medlis. The highest religious authority was exercised by the Ulema Medlis, consisting of four members, with the re'is al-'ulema at its head. The re'is and members of the Ulema Medlis were elected by a separate electoral body consisting of six muftis and 24 elected members. Three (elected) candidates for the post of re'is were submitted by electoral body to the Emperor, one of whom was appointed re'is by decree. The re'is entered upon his duties only after obtaining the authorisation (mengšara) for the performance of religious duties from the sheykh al-Islām of Istanbul. The relevant petition had to be conveyed to Istanbul through the Austro-Hungarian Embassy. A vacancy in the Ulema Medlis was filled by appointment, on the part of the joint Ministry of Finance, of one of two elected candidates. Each obrug (department) had its mufti, who was selected by the Government from among candidates submitted by the Ulema Medlis. The salaries of higher religious functionaries and civil servants came from the provincial budget. The statute also settled the question of Muslim denominational schools, as well as the rights of religious functionaries in respect of sharfa judges.

With the incorporation of Bosnia and Herzegovina into Yugoslavia the question of the Islamic religious community was in the forefront again. Moreover, there were Muslims in Yugoslavia outside of Bosnia and Herzegovina. However, the statute of 1909 remained in force in Bosnia and Herzegovina until 1930. There was a separate Muslim religious organisation covering Serbia, Macedonia and Montenegro. The putting into effect of the agrarian reform hit some Muslim property owners much harder than it did the wakfs in Bosnia and Herzegovina, for most of the latters' property consisted rather of town sites than land in the countryside. Nevertheless, the decentralization of the wakf administration in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as disordered financial management and malpractices caused serious damage to wakf property.

Following the abolition of the parliamentary régime in Yugoslavia a law was passed in 1930 concerning the Islamic religious community and its Constitution in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. Thus the former autonomous Muslim religious communitities were united under one head—the re'is al-'ulema—and one supreme authoritative body composed of the re'is and the two presidents of the Ulema Medlis. The official residence of the re'is al-'ulema and the seat of the Board of the Islamic religious community were transferred to Belgrade; however, there existed, in addition, two Ulema-Medlis and two Vakf-Medlis Councils with their administrative committees, whose central offices were in Sarajevo and Skopje. Lower in authority were the muftis, the district Vakf-Medlis board with
a sharīa judge at its head, and the dīmat-medīlis presided over by the Dīmat lāmām. The main features of the Act and Constitution are to be seen in the fact that the majority of posts were held by appointment, and also, that the office of reʿis al-ʿulemaʿ took precedence of the Ulema-Medīlis. The reʿis was, in fact, the head and symbol of a unified Islamic religious community in the State, while the administration was dual (Sarajevo and Skopje). Special enactments regulated the election of candidates for the post of reʿis, of Ulema-Medīlis members and of muftis. The electoral body was expected to choose three candidates for the office of reʿis, one of whom was then appointed by royal decree on the recommendation of the minister of justice and that of the prime minister. Also nominated by royal decree were the members of the Ulema-Medīlis and the muftis, on the recommendation of the minister of justice.

With the passing of a new law and Constitution in 1936 changes were brought about which, however, did not interfere with the unity expressed by the function of the reʿis or with the dualism of the other governing bodies. The chief organs of the Islamic religious community were now the following: the Dīmat-Medīlis, the District Vakf/Commission, the Ulema-Medīlis in Sarajevo and Skopje, the Vakf-Mearīf Assembly (Sabor) in Sarajevo and Skopje, with the assembly committees, vakf boards, and the reʿis al-ʿulemaʿ with a select or full Council. The official residence of the reʿis was in Sarajevo. The function of mufti was dispensed with. The main feature of the regulations was the selectivity of governing bodies and functionaries. For the election of members to the Ulema-Medīlis each Assembly selected an electoral body of ten members, who in turn formed one electoral body for the election of three reʿis candidates. As before, one of the candidates (usually the one with the majority of votes) was appointed reʿis by royal decree on the recommendation of the minister of justice. It was through this organization that the Yugoslav Muslim Organization, the party led by M. Spaho, secured its position in the religious community.

In the new Yugoslavia, the position and privileges of the Islamic religious community have been safeguarded by provisions made in the Constitution and regulated by the 1953 Law concerning the legal position of the different religious communities. Religious organisations are separated from the State, the holding of religious beliefs being regarded as a private matter. Religious communities may conduct schools for the training of religious functionaries and staff. The State may also lend its aid to religious communities.

The Islamic religious community in Yugoslavia is governed by the provisions of the Constitution of the Islamic religious community in the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, made and passed by the Supreme vakf Assembly in 1947. Some of the regulations have since been changed and others added. The Constitution has effected the unity of the religious organisation of Muslims in Yugoslavia not only through the function of the reʿis al-ʿulemaʿ, but also through the establishment of the Supreme vakf Assembly, allowing at the same time for the federal structure of the State in that separate Ulema-Medīlis and vakf assemblies have been set up in the four republics where Muslims form a considerable part of the population. The supreme authority is vested in the reʿis and four members from the four vakf assemblies. The reʿis al-ʿulemaʿ and the four members of the supreme authority are elected by the Supreme Vakf Assembly (see Yugoslavia).


BOSNA-SARAY [see SARAJEVO]

BOSPHORUS [see BOHáz-içi]

BOSRÁ (Bostra), a town of southern Syria in the fertile plain of the Núkra, in the province of Hawrán (Hauranitidis of the Notitia dignitatum), the Idumea of the Bible. Situated in 32° 30' N., 36° 28' E., and called today Bošra Eski Şam (to distinguish it from Bošra al-Ḥariri on the southern edge of the Lādja), 12½ miles from Ezra, Bošra is 19 miles north of the present frontier of Jordan on the road joining Darʿa on the west to Salkhād on the east. It is close to two intermittent streams, the Wādī Zaydī and the Wādī Butm, tributaries of the Yarmūk. The name Bošra is attested in the sense of 'citadel' (De Vogüé, Inschr. Palm., 25). The town, fortified since its foundation, seems to have been a stronghold towards the north of the 'Arab', i.e. Nabataean, kings. Damascus (Via Isa., § 199), writing in the 6th century, describes it as an ancient fortified town provided with ramparts by the Arab kings. The book of Maccabees (I, v, 26) makes it dependent on the great fortified region of Perea and calls it Bossora. The extensive Nabataean cemeteries which surround it are evidence that it belonged to the kingdom of Nabatene. Two inscriptions from the neighbouring town of Salkhād (Salcha of the Romans) bear, for the eighth decade of the first century, the name of king Malkhū (Malchus of Damascus) (Littmann, Semitic Inschr., in Syria, iv, A, nos. 23 & 28). The use of Nabataean was kept after the Roman conquest (ibid., 12, 102, 103, 106). Certain Nabataean inscriptions include a Greek text.

When Bošra had been introduced into the Roman empire, after the annexation of the old Nabataean kingdom, by Cornelius Palma in 105-6 A.D. (Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. Bostra, ii, 359, 12 f.) it was reorganised on the initiative of Trajan. Writers on Roman history differ as to the date of its foundation. B. Ritter (Erdkunde, xv, 469) sees it as a town of Roman foundation. Damascus assigns to Alexander Severus the honour of incorporating it as a town. The latter did indeed confer on Bostra the title of Colonia Bostra concurrently with that of Nova.
Trajana Alexandrina (222-35 A.D.). Malalas takes its foundation back to Augustus.

It is certain that the town of Bostra was enlarged at the time of its incorporation into the Roman Empire, as a study of its plan shows. Though it remained a stronghold in the 4th century—the most important in the province of Arabia, with Gerasa and Philadelphia 'muros firmitate firmissimae' (Ammianus Marcellinus, xiv, 8.18)—the withdrawal towards the south of the true line of defence made of it no longer simply a garrison town, station of the Third Cyrenaican Legion (Notitia Dignitatum, Ptolemy, v, 17, 7), but an important centre, soon to become Christian, and seat of the government of the province of Arabia under the name of Néa Trajânè Bostra. The Era of Bostra (105 A.D.) testifies to its importance. Thanks to the trade routes which attached it to Philadelphia and the Persian Gulf and those which gave it access to the Mediterranean across Palestine, it was also an important centre of commerce dependent on Damascus, to the north, to which it was joined by two roads. It had extensive markets, of which the ruins subsist; it had its own coinage: that struck by the emperor Philip 'the Arab', who was a native of Bostra, gives to it the title of Metropolis as well as that of Colonia (Butler, Syria, A iv, Bosra, cap. II, xvi, nos. 42, 43). Philip the Arab stationed a squadron of cataphractaries there.

At the time of the first form of the Manichean controversy Titus, bishop of Bostra (about 360), took up (Part, graeca xviii, 1069-1264) a doctrinal position and engaged in activity which placed him in the front rank of the ecclesiastical writers of his time by his knowledge, his philosophical teaching, and his secular activity. Before him Beryllus (222-331), under the influence of Origen, had testified against the heresy by returning to orthodoxy. Byzantine Bostra played the part of a frontier market where Arab caravans and pastoralists alike came to buy provisions under the watch of the troops stationed there.

As an administrative centre Bostra included a large population of functionaries and civic officials. It was the centre of a bishopric subordinate to the patriarchate of Antioch. Anastasius (Butler, op. cit., no. 561) secured the stability of offices there by ridding them of corruption and devoting to them revenues derived from the annona and the grain trade, as also from the 'twelfth'. Romano-Byzantine inscriptions are testimony of the administrative importance of the town. It was the residence of the governor of the Provincia Arabia, who besides the titles of proconsul and dux (Gr. ὑπάρχων and δυσ) bore the military title of scholasticos (488). As a municipium the town had its praeses (prokéfados) and a college of four synarchontes to which was joined a council (bouleutai). For the time when Christianity had not yet triumphed dedicatory inscriptions are to be found to the official Gods of the Empire and to those of Ἰαωράν with their original or Hellennised names (D. Sourdel, Guides du Hauran, Paris 1952). Later, during the Christian epoch, numerous inscriptions mention the reconstruction or restoration of churches dedicated to the Virgin and Sergius or anonymous patron saints, and also of two monasteries of which at least one, dedicated to Saint Cyrilus, was for girls. To judge by funeral inscriptions the population had kept its old Semitic basis, sometimes partially Romanised, with infusions of new blood from Italy, Asia Minor, Corinth, and even (thanks to the transfer of a garrison) from Pannonia. By virtue of its archbishopric Bostra for a long time kept a basilica, of which substantial remnants remain, and a bishop's palace of which nothing much is left. The convent possibly dedicated to Saint Sergius stood not far from there. It had a big church of which the walls and theapse are still standing. It is there that folklore places the sojourn of the monk Bahtr (q.v.), he who, as is well known, was one of the Christian witnesses to the Prophet's mission. (His name, which is still unexplained, may conceal that of Paghurdi attested by a Nabataean inscription from Sallkhād (Littmann, Nabat. 247—and likewise, Bartholomew of Edessa, P.G., 104, 1420.) The Muslim epic legend later made of the taking of this town, 'the first Byzantine centre conquered by the Arabs', a sign of the divine mission of Islam (Pseudo-Wākidi, Kitâb Fudâh al-Shām, Cairo 1954, 16-7).

The Arab conquest and then the establishment of the Umayyad power brought about its decline, in spite of the advantages accruing from its position on the pilgrim route, by depriving it of its status of provincial capital and permanent major frontier garrison. It preserved a certain prestige because of two legends, that of Bahtr and that of the 'kneeling' of the camel bearing the 'Syrian' copy of the Kūr'ān (Nöldeke-Schwally, Gesch. des Korans, ii, 112 ff.). This seems to have made of it the site of a pious folklore which is attested by the accounts of pilgrimages (e.g., al-Harawi, ed. J. Sourdel-Thouvene, 17) and the names of its mosques: al-'Umari (Sauvaget, in Syria, xxii, 41), Fātima, Khādir, al-Mabrak, and the popular tales attaching to them. Numerous inscriptions bear witness to their restoration from the time when the Saljūq princes of Damascus exercised suzerainty over Bostra and devoted themselves to strengthening it against the Fātimids whose possession (in theory) it still was. The spoliation of the town by Abū Ḥānīm's Carmathians had made this needful. The 'Umari mosque, anterior to 128/745 (date of a restoration by 'Uḏmān b. al-Ḥakam, Ar. inscr. Littmann, no. 30), was renovated in 508/1114, then rebuilt in 618/1221 under the Ayyūbids with the supervision of an Egyptian architect. In 526/1326 the mosque and its name were restored by 'Uṯmān ibn-Gūmān. The 'very old' Mabrak mosque had a Ḥānāfī madrasa built beside it in 530/1136 (Sauvaget, in Syria, xxiv, 231).

The Ayyūbīd governors made the town richer by another Ḥānāfī madrasa in 60/1223 (Littmann, op. cit., no. 38). The college mosque known as the 'Dabbāgha' dates from 655/1257. The Mabrak mosque was—and still is—surrounded by a celebrated cemetery which formed a pair with the 'Martyr's cemetery' to the south of the town. Inscriptions attest the construction and restoration at this time of other monuments now lost.

The period of these constructions was that when the town regained under the Ayyūbīds a major importance due to its military rôle, whether in face of the Crusaders or in the course of the conflicts between Saladin's successors. The great witness of this military function is the citadel of Boṣrā. Under the governors representing the Atabeks of Damascus, the old Roman theatre on an esplanade to the south of the town outside the ramparts had been adapted for defence by a wall and three flanking towers. Between 681/1089 and 694/1295 the pites which successively held Boṣrā under their sway enlarged this citadel which ended by becoming one of the chief military monuments of the Muslim world. In
1956 it still remained the most complete authentic document on the successive techniques of fortification from the Fatimid period to the Mamluk. After the Mongol invasion of 659/1261, which left the fortress badly damaged, Baybars sent a mission from Egypt which restored, made even bigger, and strengthened this monument. (A. Abel, La citadelle eyzyn deserialize de Bosra Eski Cham, in Annales archéologiques de Syrie, vi (1956), 95-138, XI pl.). This restoration, by using up a huge quantity of material, no doubt completed the destruction of the old Roman hippodrome which once stood to the south of the theatre. The extensive ruination and depopulation consequent on the brief Mongol invasion seem to have plunged the town once more into obscurity. The restoration of the citadel 'outside the walls' only partially concerned it (al-Makhriz, Hist. des Sultans Mamelukes, tr. Quatremére, i, 141). However, the town enjoyed a certain importance in the 15th century, for it furnished the Mamluk administration in Syria with several notable personages bearing the family name of al-Busrawi. It remained the place through which pilgrims passed on the old Roman road from Damascus to Philadelphia-Amman. Its Birkat al-Hadjji still bears their graffiti.

The development of Egyptian trade by the Red Sea and the fact that the Holy Cities, becoming more and more impoverished, lived principally on Egyptian aid, deprived it, however, of the character of trading centre which it had had originally. The Ottoman invasion and conquest turned it into a minor provincial centre, the exile of obscure functionaries who did not always possess the means to defend the town.

The administrative centre of Hawrân was transferred to Mzeiryb and Merkez in the 10th/11th century.

In the 11th/12th century the 'Anazeh Bedouins, with their flocks, pushed to the edge of Hawrân. The threat of their pillaging expeditions hung over the whole region on dwellers and travellers alike. The pilgrims then adopted the western route by Šanamayn, and Mzeiryb which has remained till today the 'darb al-Hadjji' and alongside which the Hejaz Railway was built at the beginning of the present century.

Today the agricultural centre of Bosrâ earns its living by the cultivation of the fine wheat fields of the Nukra when the rain is sufficient. It enjoys also an excellent water supply which allows the maintenance, in confinement, of a fair number of livestock. It has kept its fine vines and still produces a small quantity of very good wine.

The town is of enormous archeological interest. Since the beginning of the 19th century travellers have been struck by the sight of its Roman ruins and have paused with interest before its gradually crumbling ramparts and its citadel. The Princeton Expedition (1904-5, 1909) published a great number of inscriptions in Greek and Latin (Littmann, David Magie Jr., and Duane Reed Stuart), Nabataean (Littmann), and Arabic (Littmann). The efforts of the members of the Institut Français de Damas and of the Institut Français d'Archéologie de Beyrouth have contributed in Syria, in the publications of the Institut de Damas, and more recently in the Annales Archéologiques de Syrie, to the increase in our knowledge of the town. Restorations, due principally to the work of J. Sauvaget, have been successfully carried out to the ʿUmari mosque. The Syrian Service of Antiquities has made extensive excavations.

The exact study of ancient and medieval hydrological techniques, of the nature of the monuments and their chronological assignment, and, above all, of the successive levels of construction, still remains to be carried out within the framework of a master plan.

Bibliography: On the history of journeys to Bosra and of the ancient descriptions: Brunnow, Provincia Arabia, i, 481-507, iii, 397-398.—For archeological investigations in general: Publications of the Princeton University Archeological Expeditions to Syria in 1904-5 and 1909 (Div. II, Howard Crosby Butler, Ancient Architecture in Syria; Div: III, Greek and Latin Inscriptions in Syria, Section A, Southern Syria, part 4, 'Bosra'; Div. IV, Enno Littmann, Semitic Inscriptions, Section A, Nabataean Inscriptions, Section D, Arabic Inscriptions); Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. 'Bostra' (Ben- zinger); Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastique, s.v. 'Bostra'; J. Sauvaget, Les Inscriptions arabes de la Mosquée de Bosra, in Syria, xxii, 53-65 (from 102 to 618); F. Lassus, Sanctuaires chrétiens de Syrie (Publ. de l'Inst. Français d'Archéologie de Beyrouth), Paris 1947; H. Seyrig, Sur les trés de quelques villes de Syrie, in Syria, xxvii, 42; idem, Inscriptions de Bosra, xxii, 44-8; idem, Postes romains sur la route de Médîne, xxiv, 221-3; J. Sauvaget, Quelques monuments musulmans de Syrie, in Syria, xxiv, 231.—Bibliography by Bühl in EI, s.v. Bosra.—Besides the interesting descriptions (which should be compared) in the old Baederker and the Guide Bleu, a convenient manual is provided by Sîlan ʿAbd Allah al-Muqadd, Bosra, published in Arabic and French, Damascus n.d. (A. Abel)

BOSTANİJ (Bostandji, from Persian bostānān "garden"), the name applied in the old Ottoman State organisation to people employed in the flower and vegetable gardens, as well as in the boathouses and rowing-boats of the Sultans' palaces. As long as the law of daşğûrme (forcible recruiting, [q.v.]) remained in force, these were recruited in accordance with its provisions. The bostândîs formed two independent oğâls [q.v.], of which one was in Istanbul and the other in Edirne (Adrianople), commanded by the bostândî-bashi. Only the strongest and most vigorous of those forcibly recruited were accepted in the two oğâls of the bostândîs, either directly or from the oğâl of the 'ajami-oğâls [q.v.]. There were nine grades in the oğâl of the bostândîs. New recruits were round their waists a belt made of the fringe of State cloth (beylîk), while bostândîs of the highest rank wore a green belt known as mubaddem. After a specified length of service the bostândîs were promoted to the oğâl of the Janissaries. Each man received on promotion the sum of 1,000 akçes for his equipment. At the end of the 17th and in the 18th century there were cases of bostândîs assigned to the mounted oğâl of kapı-bulus [q.v.]. Bostândîs were employed both inside and outside the palace. Others worked directly in flower and vegetable gardens, in boathouses or in connexion with them. There were also bostândîs in Sultans' estates, as, for example, in Amasya, Manisa, Bursa and Izmit. Apart from the services mentioned above, the bostândîs of Istanbul, were entrusted with duties such as guarding the palace, transporting material for the construction of palaces and mosques for the Sultans; working in boats used for the transport of timber from the environs of Izmit (v. Kanunname-i Al-i 'Olmân, ed. Aref Bey, TOEM, appendix 2, 25). Two different classes are shown in the paybooks of
the bostandıls, the "quilmân-i bâšîlet-i hâssa" (boys of private gardens) and "quilmân-i bostandîyan" (garden boys). In a paybook dated 984/1576 those employed in the Sultan's private gardens are shown as 20 böluks [q.v.], and those working in the vegetable gardens as 25 djeimdâats [q.v.]. At that time there were 644 working in the private gardens and 972 in the vegetable gardens. Paybooks for 1152/1739 and 1192/1778, show 20 böluks in the private gardens and 64 djeimdâats in the flower and vegetable gardens outside. Bostandıls were also concerned with keeping order in the places where the gardens in which they were employed were situated. There was a djeimdât in each district, commanded by an officer known as üstâ (master). The üstas performed functions analogous to those of police commanders of the districts. These üstas were appointed from among the four baltadıls [q.v.] of the oğjak of the bostandıls. Terms such as "the üstâ of Kadi-Köy or the üstâ of Bebek", seen in some documents refer to the üstas of the gardens in these districts. The retnue of each üstâ consisted of 20 to 30 bostandıls, in accordance with the importance of the district. The bostandıls of the boathouses and the rowing-boats were specially chosen for these jobs, and pulled the oars of the 24-oar private boat of the Sultan, under the command of the kamladil-bashl (chief oarsman), when the Sultan wanted to travel by sea or to have a sea trip. Thévenot says that "adjami-oghlânls sat by the right oars, and Turkish youths by the left oars, but this is not certain.

A record of the revenue of the flower and vegetable gardens run by the bostandıls was presented every year in November to the Sultan through the bostandil-bashl, and the money paid into the privy purse. Of this money, one purse (500 piastres) was bestowed on the bostandıls and one purse given to the wâbi of the Dâ'ûd Pasha mosque. In this way, when the revenue was presented, property tenable on a life tenure was bestowed on the twelve most senior bostandıls who were then promoted to the mounted oğjak of the kapi-bâlus or to the rank of müteferrika [q.v.].

When the occasion arose, bostandıls were sent on expeditions, e.g., in 1152/1739, 3,000 of them were dispatched by ship to Bender to fight against the Russians (v. Subaşi, 127). The numbers of the bostandıls varied from time to time. At the beginning of the 18th century these numbered 3,396, at the middle of the century 2,947 and at the end 1,998. At the beginning of the 18th century there were 2,400 bostandıls.

The independent oğjak of bostandıls at Edirne had its own organisation. It numbered considerably fewer people than the Istanbul oğjak: 445 at the beginning of the 17th century, 751 at the end of the century, 751 at the beginning of the 18th century. There were 12 oğjak of the bostandıls working in the Sultan's private gardens at Edirne, apart from whom there were bostandıls employed in three other gardens. Bostandıls wore a hat known as barata. Those recruited originally among the đevshirme conscripts were celibate. Later marriage was allowed. Apart from their commandes, the bostandil-bashl, bostandıls had officers known as keshubdu of bostandıls, hâsseli-âgha, kamladil, hâsa-bâlus, helfastili and oda-bashl. Four senior members of the oğjak were known as baltadıls. At times the bostandıls took part in mutinies and lost, in consequence, the confidence of the Sultans. For this reason, Ahmed III had to make changes among them. Among the murderers of Selim III there was a bostandil known as Deli (mad) Mustafa. Bostandıls were also opposed to the military reorganisation measures, known as the nişâm-i djeidî and segbân-i djeidî. When the oğjak of the Janissaries was abolished and the organisation of the new Ottoman army, 'asâhir-i manşûre (victorious army), was extended, these took over the task of keeping order in the districts previously entrusted to the bostandıls; the latter officials' functions being now restricted to gardening and acting as night watchmen. As from Muharram 1242 (August 1826), bostandıls were incorporated in the new organisation. According to the new law, 1,500 persons chosen among the bostandıls, commanded by a major, bâbîbâshl were entrusted with the task of guarding the palace and its environs (Orta-Köy and Dolmabahçe). These formed the nucleus of the corps of guards, known in Ottoman times as hâssa 'askeri. A ministry, known as the Ministry of bostandıyan-i hâssa (bostandıls of the Sultan) was formed to look after them. The oğjak of bostandıls at Edirne was at the same time abolished.

Bibliography: Eyyübi Elendi, Kânûn-ı-name (in a private library); Naşım, Ta'rîhî, iv, 386; Râşid, Ta'rîhî, iii, 85, 89; Şübhî, Ta'rîhî, 127; Lutfî, Ta'rîhî, i, 200; a document referring to the reign of Muştafa II (Başvekalet Arşivi, Eminîl's classification, no. 14954); reports by Hâsib Elendi, Minister of the Sultan's bostandıls, and the bostandil-bashl, Öhmân Khayrî Ağa, concerning the organisation of the oğjak of bostandıls (Başvekalet Arşivi); law concerning the oğjak of bostandıls (Başvekalet Arşivi, cupboard no. 3, case no. 92); Artisans' Register (Ehî-Şânat Defteri) (Başvekalet Arşivi, Kâmil's classification); Chalcondyle, Hist. Générale des Turcs (Paris 1662, section on organisation); Rycaut, Hist. of the present state of the Ottoman Empire; Le voyage de M. d'Aramon (ed. Scheler, Paris 1889) 39; A. Ollivier, Voyage dans l'Empire Ottoman (1801, i, fasc. 4); Enderûnî 'Atâ, Ta'rîhî, 1; Quilmân-i 'adjemîyânı maşîch idâmîelleri (summaries of pay-books of 'adjami-oghlânls) (Başvekalet Arşivi); M. Thèvenot, Relation d'un voyage fait au Levant (1663), 114, etc.; Gibb-Bowen, 1/i, index.

(B. I. UZUNÇARŞILI)
occasion find enough animals to hunt during a journey from Edirne to Istanbul. Incensed, he dismissed the Bostandji-bashi Sha'bân Ağâ, replacing him by Bodur Sinân Ağâ, the Bostandji-bashi of Edirne. Veteran bastandjs objected, however, on the grounds that it was not customary to appoint a commander from another odâjak (Silahdar, Ta'rikh, i, 223). Bostandji-bashis used to entertain the Sultan every spring at a banquet at Kâğıthkhane (the Sweet Waters of Europe) in Istanbul (Wâsi, Ta'rikh, i, 13). When Bostandji-bashis were appointed to an outside post they were usually given the rank of Kapudan-bashi or Sandjak-beyi. Those favoured by the Sultan were appointed to the rank of Beyler-beyi. Later, when the rules of organisation became more lax, there were cases of Bostandji-bashis becoming Grand Viziers. Such were the Paşhas Derviş, Hasan, Topal Rğjeûb, Khâli, Moldovandji 'Ali, Hâfiz, Isâ'âmî and 'Abd Allâh.

Bostandji-bashis, apart from commanding bastandjs proper, were also in charge of the odâjaks of Topkapî, Yalı-Köşk, Sepetçîler, Soğuk-Çeşme, Bagcîlar, Islemiciler, Baamyacalî, Kûshhânî, Gülhânî, Incili, Dolap-Defterî, Balikhânî, Mezbele-Keşan etc. According to Enderûnî 'Â'tâ, this responsibility was passed on to the Bostandji-bashi by busy palace officials, such as the siûlhdar (Chief Armourer), the Çubhâdar (Master of the Wardrobe), the kapl-âghâsi (Chief White Eunuch) or the kudîkhdar (intendant) of the kapl-âghâsis (Imperial Warders). The Bostandji-bashi also commanded a group of hâsîsîs (members of the Sultan's bodyguard). Among the odâjaks commanded by the Bostandji-bashi, that of Balikhânî (fish market) had an evil reputation. Ministers and Grand Viziers sentenced to be exiled or executed were taken there. The fate of the Grand Viziers detained in this odâjak was indicated by the colour of the sherbet offered to them by the Bostandji-bashi. A white sherbet meant exile, while a red sherbet meant death.

When the Bostandji-bashi was dismissed or transferred, he was usually replaced by the kudîkhdar (intendant) of the bastandjs or the ağa (commander) of the hâsîsîs. There were, however, exceptions to this rule. It was customary for newly appointed Bostandji-bashis to be invested with their robe of honour (hâsîev) in the presence of the Grand Vizier ('îzzî, Ta'rikh, 110). There is a register in existence of the coastal residences of the Bostandji-bashi in Istanbul.

The Bostandji-bashi of Edirne was responsible for the maintenance of law and order in Edirne and its environs. Edirne, as the second capital of the State, was not subject to the Wall of Rûmelî, the government of the city being directly in the hands of the Bostandji-bashi. The Bostandji-bashis enjoyed great revenues and were in a position to commit great abuses. New recruits were, for example, sometimes farmed out against payment.

Bibliography: Silahdar, Ta'rikh, i, 223 & ii, 347; Wâsi, Ta'rikh, i, 13; Râşîdî, Ta'rikh, iii, 89, 144; v, 90; Râşîdî and Çelebi-zade, Ta'rikh, 61, 371; 'Îzzî, Ta'rikh, 246, 287; for other works see bastandji bibliography.

BOSTANZADE, the name of a family of Ottoman 'ulûmîs who achieved some prominence in the 16th and early 17th centuries. The founder of the family was (1) Muştafa Efendi, born in Tire, in the province of Aydîn,

(1) Muştafa b. Mehmèd
(2) Mehmèd
(3) Muştafa
(4) Muştafa
(5) Yahyâ

in 904/1498-9, and known as Bostân (or Bûstân); his father was a merchant called Mehmed (thus in the text of 'Â'tâ and on the tombstone preserved in the Türk-İslâm Eserleri Müzesi in Istanbul; the heading Muştafa b. 'Â'tâ is no doubt an error due to confusion with his namesake Muştafa, known as Kûşkûc Bostân; 'Â'tâ 132. cf. Hüseyin Gazi Yurdaydın in Bell, xix, 1925, 289, n. 136). After studying under various teachers in his native town and in Istanbul, he held a succession of teaching and judicial appointments, and in 954/1547 became Kâdî of Anatolia and shortly after of Rumelia. His appointment was terminated in 958/1551, in connexion with an unfavourable ruling given by him in a case in which the Grand Vezir Rûstem Paşa was interested. Though exonerated by subsequent enquiries, he was not reinstated, and died on 25th Ramadan 977/3 March 1570 (thus the tombstone; 'Â'tâ says 27th Ramadan 977; 'Othmanî Müellifleri puts his death in 968). He was the author of several works of Kurân commentary and theology, some of which have survived in manuscripts in Istanbul libraries. Recently it has been suggested that he was the author of the Sâleymânname that was previously attributed to Ferdî (Yurdaydın, Bell, xix, 1935, 137 ff.).

Bibliography: 'Â'tâ, Dhayl al-Şubûhî, 129 ff.; Yurdaydın, loc cit. 189 ff.; 'Othmanî Müellifleri, i, 253; Sidîqi-i 'Othmanî, iv, 346.

(2) Bostânzade Mehmed Efendi, the son of the preceding, was born in 942/1535-6 and graduated, i.e., obtained his mulâzemet [q.v.], at the age of 21. After holding various teaching appointments, in 983/1573 he abandoned the teaching in favour of the judicial branch of the 'Ilmiyye profession, and became Kâdi of Damascus. His subsequent promotions were rapid; after serving as Kâdi in Bursa and Edirne, he became Kâdi of Istanbul in 984/1576, Kâdî'asker of Anatolia in 985/1577, and of Rumelia in 988/1580. The following year he was retired and in 991/1583 sent as Kâdi to Egypt, where he stayed for three years. In 995/1587 he was reappointed Kâdî'asker and in 997/1589 became Shaykh al-Islâm. In 1000/1592 he was retired (on the circumstances see Na'înî amâno 1000), but returned to active duties as Kâdî'asker of Rumelia and, in 1001-1593, for the second time became Shaykh al-Islâm. He remained in office until his death in 1006/1598. In addition to poems in Arabic, Persian, and Turkish, he prepared a translation of the Ikhâ al-'Ulûm and a commentary on the Muallâk, Hâdîddi Khalifa mentions a fêtûnî in verse declaring coffee leaf (Mizân al-bâhî, ch. VI; tr. G. L. Lewis, 60, 62).

Bibliography: 'Â'tâ, 410; Rifat, Da'wata al-Mâşûhî, 33; 'Ilmiyye Sâlînamesi, 410; 'Othmanî Müellifleri, i, 256; Sidîqi-i 'Othmanî, iv, 133; Hammer-Purgstall, index.

Other eminent members of the family of the Shaykh al-Islâm Mehmed Efendi were his younger brother (3) Muştafa Efendi (946/1539-40—1014/1605-6), who rose to the posts of Kâdî'asker of Anatolia and Rumelia ('Â'tâ, 506-7; SO, iv, 381); his sons (4) Muştafa (980/1572-3—1010/1601), who taught at the Sâbâ-i Thaymân [q.v.] and then became Kâdi of Uskûdar ('Â'tâ 449), and (5) Yahyâ (d. 1049/1639) who became Kâdi of Istanbul and then

**BOZJA-ADA,** the Turkish name for Tenedos, an island inhabited mainly by Greeks and commanding the approaches to the Straits. By the Treaty of Turin (1381) Venice and Genoa agreed to demilitarise Bozja-Ada. The Venetians removed the population to Crete and it was still uninhabited in Clavijo's time. Meldemmed II built a castle on Bozja-Ada; Ewliya calls it *metin.* Ships sheltered at Bozja-Ada while awaiting favourable weather for entering the Straits and it is often mentioned in accounts of naval campaigns. The Venetians captured it in Ramadhan 1066/July 1656 and held it for just over a year. The Greeks seized it in 1912. The London settlement of 1913 provided, at Germany's insistence, that Bozja-Ada should be returned to Turkey but owing to the outbreak of war Greece retained control. By the Treaty of Sèves Bozja-Ada and Imroz (Ibros) were ceded to Greece (art. 84) but demilitarised (art. 178). By the Treaty of Lausanne they were returned to Turkey but given "a special administrative organisation composed of local elements", the police were to be recruited locally and the islands were excluded from any Greco-Turkish arrangements for exchange of populations.

**Bibliography:** There are many incidental references to Bozja-Ada in the chronicles and brief descriptions by Clavijo, Buondelmonti, Tafur, Ewliya Celebi, Spon, Covel, Grelot and Tournefort. (C. F. BECKINGHAM)

**BOZOK** [see Yozgat]

**BRAHOY** [see BALUÇTAN]

**BRAVA** [see Barawa]

**BROACH** [see bharo]

**BRUSA** [see Bursa]

**BRYSON** [see taubir-al-manzil]

**BSHARRA** or Bècharré, one of the oldest villages in northern Lebanon, 1400 metres above sea-level. It is situated at the bottom of an amphitheatre at the entrance to the Kadisha gorge, a hollow ravine of many coves and hermitages, where traces of very ancient monastic settlements are to be found. The Arab geographers refer to the district under the name of Dhidhe Bsharrîyya or Bsharrî. At the time of the Crusades it was one of the fiefs of the County of Tripoli, under the name of Buissera.

**Bibliography:** There are many incidental
This is the 'Road of the Cedars' which the Sultan Kaytbay used at the time of his journey of inspection (9th/10th century), and by which during the 18th and early 19th centuries, armed bands from the Bik'a, suspected of helping the Ottoman authorities, were passing on their way to harry the Maronites. These last had also to defend themselves against the Turkish governors of Tārābulus.

The little town to-day has 4,000 Maronite inhabitants whose houses are scattered over a hillock where vines and mulberries are cultivated in terraces. A little above Bsharrā, there is a clump of trees, a remnants of the famous cedars of Lebanon, which since 1843 has been placed under the care of the Maronite Patriarch.

**Bibliography:** I. Dja’dja’, Bsharrā Madīnāt al-Mukaddamīn, in al-Ma‘ārī, 1932, 46-9, 53-8, 68-9, 77-9; G. Le Strange, Palästina unter den Moslems, 352; H. Lammens, La Syrie, ii, 38; R. Dussaud, Topographie Historique de la Syrie, 32, 397; A. Imsia, Histoire du Liban du XVIIIe siècle à nos jours, 55, 123.

**BTEDDIN** (a dialectal contraction of Bayt al-Dīn derived from the Syriac Bēth-Dīnā), a place with 800 inhabitants, situated 800 ms. above sea-level and 45 kms. from Bayrūt; the terraces surrounding it grow chiefly vines and olives. BTeddin constitutes with Dayr al-Kamar, a Maronite administrative enclave in the Druze region of Shīḥ. It owes its fortune to the fact that the amīr Bashīr Bilī Shīḥ (q.v.) (1788-1840) chose it as his residence in 1807 and brought the water of the Safa there by means of a viaduct between 1812 and 1815. Hence a certain number of administrative buildings were constructed in the village as well as the palace, a remarkable oriental blend of styles, the work of an Italian architect and Syrian labourers. Built on a rocky escarpment dominating a deep ravine, this palace was from 1814 to a resort of poets (Nicholas the Turk), and Lamartine, who visited it in 1832, has left us a long description of it.

At the end of the Egyptian occupation in 1840, the palace fell into ruins and a serious fire damaged these in 1912; it was partly restored in 1940. In 1948 the ashes of the amīr Bashīr the Great were transferred there from Istanbul. To-day BTeddin is the summer residence of the President of the Republic of Lebanon.


**BÜ [see KUNYA]**

**BÜ HṀĀRA**, a Moroccan agitator who got himself recognised as sultan in north-east Morocco from 1902 to 1909. His real name was Dījlīl b. Idrīs al-Zārkān al-Yūsuf, and he was born about 1865 in the mountains of Zarbān. He had been a member of the corps of engineering students which Māwlāy al-Ḥasan had tried to establish, and then he became a minor civil servant. He was accused of dishonesty and imprisoned, and then became an exile in Algeria. He returned thence in the summer of 1902, and thanks to frauds and alleged miracles managed to pass himself off as a sharīf and even as Māḥammad b. al-Ḥasan, the elder brother of Māwlāy ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (q.v.), who was then living in seclusion at Meknā. Many sections of the tribe of Ghiyātā in the Taza region recognised him as sultan, and were soon followed by other tribes in the neighbourhood. He was installed at Taza, which he made the capital, in the autumn of 1902. He was generally known as Bū Ḥmāra (Abū Ḥmāra) because it was his custom to ride a she-ass, or as al-Rūfī, from the name of a pretender of the Ruwāğa tribe who had been in revolt in 1862 and had been quickly captured. He incited a revolt against the sultan on account of his relations with Europeans.

ʿAbd al-ʿĀzīz sent two expeditions against him which were beaten successively in the last weeks of 1902, when Fez was threatened. But the Sharīfiyya troops ended by beating him near Fez on January 20th 1903, and reoccupied Taza for a time on 7 July. Bū Ḥmāra, wounded and humiliated, reorganised his forces and retook Taza in November. From there he made contact with two other agitators: Raysūl, who was active in the Tangier area, and the Algerian Bū ʿAmāma, who was fighting against the French in the south of the department of Oran. With the latter he besieged Oujdā for many months from the end of 1904 to June 1905 without result. Between them, he sought refuge near Melīla in the Kaṣbat Salwān and got into touch with the Spaniards, showing them the possibility of mining concessions in the region, which brought him discredit in the eyes of the neighbouring tribes. He however succeeded in recapturing Taza in June 1908, and, taking advantage of the troubles at the time of the accession of Māwlāy ʿAbd al-Ḥāfīs to power, he threatened Fez yet again. The new sultan launched several expeditions against him, one of which succeeded in capturing him about 100 kms. north of Fez, on 22 August 1909. Shut in a cage prepared for this event, he was led into Fez and exposed to the scorn of the inhabitants, but after some days the sultan, weary of his bravado and fearing a European intervention in his favour, had him shot on 15 September 1909. His body was half burnt.

**Bibliography:** The principal source is: Dr. Louis Arnaud, Au temps des Mehlalis, Casablanca 1952, 153-214 and 269-285; then: E. Aubin, Le Maroc d'aujourd'hui, Paris 1904, 108-131 and 402-19; G. Saint-René Taillandier, Les origines du Maroc français, Paris 1930, 104 and 140; Dr F. Welschger, Au seuil du Maroc moderne, Rabat 1947, 131-5 and 195-8; W. Harris, Morocco that was, London 1921; finally the novel by M. Le Glay, La mort du Rogui, Paris 1926, which is based on a solid knowledge of the facts.

(R. Le Tourneau)

**BŪ SAʿĪD**, the reigning dynasty of ʿUmān and Zanzibar, of Azdī origin. The founder, Ahmad b. Saʿīd, became Wāli of Suṣār under the Yaʿrubī Imām of ʿUmān, Sayf b. Sūtan II. He defeated Suṣār successfully against Nādir Shāh's general, Muḥammad Taṭi Khān Shīrāzī, who came to terms. Within a few years, by force, diplomacy and treachery, Ahmad made himself master of ʿUmān. The Shāh was preoccupied with a Turkish war and did nothing to retrieve his position. The date of Ahmad's formal assumption of the title of Imām is uncertain; it cannot be 1154/1741 as usually stated, and there is some evidence for 1163/1750. He naturally favoured Turks against Persians and helped the former to defend Baṣrah in 1189/1775. He fostered commerce and helped to suppress Indian pirates. His son Saʿīd succeeded him in 1198/1783 but was unpopular and withdrew to al-Rastāk, leaving power to his son Ḥamīd, but retaining the title of Imām. No subsequent member of the dynasty used this title; later rulers were called Sayyīd, though
generally known as Sultan to foreigners. Sa'īd was still living in 1226/1811 but died during the next ten years. Ḥāmid (d. 1206/1792) was succeeded by his uncle, Sūltān, who captured Cāḥbār, Hormuz, Kīšīn, Bandār ʿAbbās and Bahrayn. Persia agreed to lease Cāḥbār and Bandār ʿAbbās to the Bu Saʿīd, who already held Gwādār. In 1213/1798 he concluded a treaty permitting the British to build and fortify a factory at Bandār ʿAbbās and promising not to allow the French or Dutch to establish factories in his realm so long as they were at war with Britain. In 1216/1801 he gave the French resident representatives whom Saʿīd confirmed in office. Saʿīd's attempt to obtain Nossi Bé was foiled by the French. In 1270/1854 he ceded the Kūrīa Bū Sāʿīd territory. By its decision Barghash was recognised as ruler of Zanzibar, Pemba, islets within 12 miles of them, the Lamu archipelago, the coast from Tungi to Kipini to a depth of 10 miles, Kismayu, Barawa, Marka, Makdishū and Wāshayyīm. Lamu was later ceded to the British East Africa Co. and the Somali ports to Italy. In 1307/1890, in accordance with another Anglo-German agreement, Bu Saʿīd possessions north of the Umba River were purchased by Germany, and almost all the rest became a British protectorate. The mainland territories were then leased. In 1309/1892 the administration was reorganised and a British First Minister (Gen. Lloyd Mathews) was appointed. Khālid b. Barghash attempted to seize power in 1310/1893 and in 1313/1896; his second revolt led to the bombardment of the palace by a Bantu tribus hardly recognised his authority on the mainland. Even on the principal islands Saʿīd merely received tribute from the chiefs of the Wahadīmū (the Mwenyī Mkuī), the Wāpemba (the Diwāni) and the Watumbatu (the S̱eḥa). In the middle years of the century the coast from Vanga to Pangani was, except for Tanga, held jointly by Saʿīd and the King of Usambara, who sent representatives whom Saʿīd confirmed in office. Saʿīd's attempt to obtain Nossi Bé was foiled by the French.

On Saʿīd's death (1273/1856) his son Thuwayni remained in control at Maskat and his other son Mājīd at Zanzibar. By the decision of Lord Canning, to whom the dispute was referred, Mājīd kept Zanzibar and paid annual compensation, specifically stated not to be tribute, to Thuwayni. Mājīd's successor was Barghash who had tried to seize power on Saʿīd's death and again a few years later. The influence of the British representative, Sir John Kirk, became paramount and in 1290/1873 the slave trade was prohibited. German penetration in E. Africa resulted in the appointment of an Anglo-Franco-German Commission to delimit Bū Saʿīd territory. By its decision Barghash was recognised as ruler of Zanzibar, Pemba, islets within 12 miles of them, the Lamu archipelago, the coast from Tungi to Kipini to a depth of 10 miles, Kismayu, Barawa, Marka, Mākdishū and Wāshayyi, Lamu was later ceded to the British East Africa Co. and the Somali ports to Italy. In 1307/1890, in accordance with another Anglo-German agreement, Bū Saʿīd possessions north of the Umba River were purchased by Germany, and almost all the rest became a British protectorate. The mainland territories were then leased. In 1309/1892 the administration was reorganised and a British First Minister (Gen. Lloyd Mathews) was appointed. Khālid b. Barghash attempted to seize power in 1310/1893 and in 1313/1896; his second revolt led to the bombardment of the palace by a

**GENEALOGICAL TABLE OF THE AL BO SA'ID DYNASTY**

Arabic numerals indicate rulers of 'Umān and Zanzibar, Roman numerals rulers of 'Umān only, and letters rulers of Zanzibar only. The dates are those of the accession of each ruler.

1. Ahmad b. Sa'id b. Muhammad b. Sa'id, Imām, 1163/1749

2. Sa'id, Imām, 1198/1783

3. Ḥāmid, 1200/1786

4. Sūltān, 1206/1792

5. Sālim, 1220/1806

6. Saʿīd, 1220/1806

7. Thuwayni, 1226/1811

8. Turki, 1267/1849

9. Aḥmed, 1273/1856

10. Ḥāmid, 1282/1866

11. Khālid, 1287/1870

12. Aṣṣān, 1285/1868

13. Ibrāhīm, 1287/1870

14. Khālid, 1286/1868

15. Eḥāmid, 1310/1893

16. H. Khalfā, 1320/1911 (regnant)

17. Faysāl, 1305/1888

18. Taymūr, 1331/1913

19. Saʿīd, 1350/1932 (regnant)
British warship. In 1314/1897 the legal status of slavery was abolished. The British minister ... in a passage in the Merveilles de l'Inde (ed. trans. M. Devic, 5; Memorial J. Sauvaget, i, 192); this sense appears of Muzayna; their leader was Hudayr b. Simak.
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slave trade was prohibited under British pressure. About 1319/1901 a dissident movement began in the interior under lIsa b. Sālīh. In 1331/1913 Sālim al-Kharūsī was elected Imām and in 1333/1913 Mīqār was attacked by the rebels and saved only by an Indian detachment. Sālim was murdered in 1338/1920; his successor, Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh, made an agreement with Sayyid Tāynūr by which the tribes of the interior enjoy autonomy. Modern Umān includes Zūfār and is bounded by the territories of the Sūltān of Kīshm, the Shaykh of Ra's al-Khayma and the desert. An enclave on the coast around Fugīyār constitutes a separate Trucial state.


(C. F. Beckingham)

BU'ĀTH, the site of a battle about 617 A.D. between most sections of the two Medinan tribes of Aws and Khaṭṭaḍā. It lay in the south-eastern quarter of the Medinan oasis in the territory of the Banū Kūrāyba. The battle was the climax of a series of internal conflicts. The Aws, whose position had deteriorated, were joined by the two chief Jewish tribes, Kūrāyba and Al-Nadīr, and by nomads of Mūzaynā; their leader was Ḥuṣayn b. Sīmāk.

The opposing leader 'Aẓm b. al-Nu'mān of Bayāḍa was supported by most of the Khaṭṭaḍā, and by some nomadic Djihāyana and Ashdād, but 'Abd Allāh b. Ubaṣy [q.v.] and another Khaṭṭaḍā leader refused to join him. The Awsite clan of Ḥuṣayn also remained neutral. In the fighting, the Aws were at first forced back, but eventually routed their opponents. Although the leaders of both sides were killed, the war ended with an uneasy truce rather than a definite settlement.

Bibliography: 'Ibnu Ḥishām, 385-7; Ibn Sa'd, ii, 99-100; 'Alī b. Abī Al-Ṭūrī, Dāhiri, vi, 97; Badhūrī, Fudak, 35 ff.; Ibn Ḥīṭām, 807; Ibn Ḥadījār, Isbība, no. 614; Ibn al-Ḥādhīr, Usd al-Ḡibāba, i, 170; Caetani, Annali, ii, Part i, year 8, nos. 21, 39, 40, 43, 46, 61, 67. (H. Lammens)

BUDD (pl. bidāda; Pers. būd) is used in Arabic in three different senses; it denotes either a temple, a pagoda, or Buddha, or an idol (not necessarily the Buddha). The principal instance of the use of the word in the sense of pagoda occurs in a passage in the Merveilles de l'Inde (ed. trans. M. Devic, 5; Mémorial J. Sauvaget, i, 192); this sense appears
to be the rarest, although given as the primary sense in the LA.

*Budd* denotes the Buddha in authors such as al-Dhahīrī (Tarbī, ed. Pellan, 76), al-Maṣūdī, al-Birūnī, al-Shahrastānī; al-Maṣūdī, speaking of the temple called "the house of gold" at Mūlānā (Tanbihā, 202; cf. al-Birūnī, *India*, trad. Sachau, i, 368, ii, 18; Reinaud, in *JA*, 1844-5), says that the appearance of the first Buddha among the Indians dates back 12,000 times 33,000 years. Al-Birūnī, though possessing such a good knowledge of Brahmanism, knew little about Buddhism; the reverse is true of al-Shahrastānī (ed. Cureton, 67 ff.; Fr. trans. Barbier de Meynard, 334); al-Maṣūdī al-Dimashkīi, ed. Mehren, 170 ff.; Eng. trans. R. Levy, London 1918, 284 ff.).

Finally, the word *budd* is often used in the sense of *idol*. We should probably read *budd Kumayr* "idol of Kuvera" in al-Dhahīrī (Tarbī, 40), and Ibn Durayd (apud LA) renders *budd* by *ṣanam*. The author of the *Akhbār al-Ṣin wa’l-Hind*, ed. trans. Sauvaget, 36.

Above *Shaykh ʿAbd Allāh* and in his turn practised the teachings of the order, handed them down to others, and led seekers of Truth to the *Shaṭṭārī* path. *Shaykh Rizk Allāh Mūghtābī*, the paternal uncle of the famous *Shaykh ʿAbd Allāh* was instructed in the method of "the remembrance of God" (dikhr) by him. *Shaykh Budhan*, who flourished under Sultan Sīkāndar Lodhī (regn. 894-923/1489-1517) is described by Khwēshād as "a saintly and blessed person" (*mardī buzurg wa muṭabāḥah*). He died in Panipat and was buried there. His *khālija*, *Shaykh Wali* (d. 956/1549), carried on his work in the town of Badoli and left several *khālijas*.

**Bibliography**


**Būḍhāsaf** [see bilawhar wa yūḍásaf]

******Budin** (Budin, Bedin, Bedon, Budin, from the Slav Budin), the Latin and the Hungarian Buda, the kernel of that part of the present Budapest, is situated on the right bank of the Danube, was conquered three times by the Turks in the second quarter of the 16th century (1526, 1529 and 1541). It was declared an Ottoman possession on 29 August 1541, and made the centre of that part of Hungarian territory which was converted into an Ottoman province (*Budin ildiyeti*).

The Hapsburgs, who were the Central European power most concerned with the expansion of the Turks, and who laid claim to the Hungarian throne, made in 1542 an unsuccessful attempt to recapture Budin. No further attack was launched for the next fifty years. It was only at the turn of the 16th and 17th centuries, at the time when the Ottoman Empire was at war with the Hapsburg Empire (Nemce), that the coalition armies led by the House of Hapsburg again repeatedly laid siege to Budin (1595, 1602, 1603). These attacks were, however, repelled by the defenders of the fortress (the most violent attack, that of 1602, was driven back under the leadership of Kādżād ʿAll and Lālā Mehmed). Following this, the Turks enjoyed undisputed possession of Budin for a fairly long period and the fortress had to face hostile armies only after Kāra Muṣṭafā’s defeat under the walls of Vienna in 1683. While the siege of 1684 failed against the resistance of the defenders (Siyāṣuṣ Pāṣa and Sheyṭān Ibrāhīm Pāṣa), the next siege brought victory to the attacking armies. *Abd al-Rahmān Pāṣa*, the defender of the castle, was killed in action, and Budin, termed at the time the "place of the Ghāzī" and the "strong wall of Islam", passed into the hands of the Holy Alliance on 2 September 1686.

The fortress of Budin was built on the castle hill running along the Danube from north to south. The foundations of the fortress were laid in the 13th century by Bīdā IV; it was developed by subsequent Hungarian Kings, and converted, especially by Sigismund of Luxemburg and Mathias Corvinus, into a central royal residence in renaissance style, rich in artistic buildings.

The fortress was protected by high rams erected on the upper slopes of the steep castle-hill. During the Turkish occupation the southern part of the castle-hill, with the medieval royal palace and its
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The fortress of Budin was built on the castle hill running along the Danube from north to south. The foundations of the fortress were laid in the 13th century by Bīdā IV; it was developed by subsequent Hungarian Kings, and converted, especially by Sigismund of Luxemburg and Mathias Corvinus, into a central royal residence in renaissance style, rich in artistic buildings.

The fortress was protected by high rams erected on the upper slopes of the steep castle-hill. During the Turkish occupation the southern part of the castle-hill, with the medieval royal palace and its
dependencies inside the walls, formed the closed inner fortress (iç kale); it was here that the gun-foundries (topkâhes) and magazines were placed. The rest of the castle-hill was called the middle fortress (orta hisâr) and served to some extent as the residence of the civilian inhabitants as well. The town (sarayı), situated at the foot of the castle-hill, next to the Danube, formed the outer fortress (dişk hisâr) which was surrounded by a simpler town wall and fortified with bastions at the gates. To protect Budin from sudden attacks, guard-houses had been erected at some distance, around the northern thermal springs (Barukbâhâne or Bunar Hisâr, Weî Bey meterisi), further in the neighbourhood of the present Csatárka (Cardak) and on the Gellért-Hill (Gürz Ilyás tepesi).

Although Budin was always considered by the Ottomans an important fortress of the Empire, and a former royal city of great repute, they cared little for the development of the castle and the town. Some of the more active Turkish provincial governors, especially in the 17th century, fortified or reconstructed some points here or there on the castle-hill; a record of these activities was preserved for a considerable length of time in topographical denominations (Weî Bey kulesi, Murad Paşa kulesi, Silâvûr Pasha kulesi, Kârâkâş Paşa kulesi, Kâşim Paşa kulesi, Mahmut Paşa kulesi etc.). The governors, however, were able to do but little towards the fortification of Buda, because their building activities lacked co-ordination and guidance from a central authority and because they were not permitted by the Turkish Governments to remain long at the same place. Not less than 75 persons, several of them repeatedly, enjoyed the rank of Paşa of Budin during the 145 years of occupation, so that the average length of their office was scarcely a year and a half. Thus there was never a general modernisation of the castle, and its system of fortification remained on the same basis at the termination of the Turkish rule as it had been centuries before under the Hungarian Kings. Both material supplies and general equipment were at all times antiquated and deficient. (Pieces of ordnance a hundred years old were found in the artillery stations at the recapture of the fortress.)

The Turkish régime did not leave behind it any architectural works of artistic value, and this applies not only to structures of a military character but to other kinds of buildings as well. The medieval Royal Castle and the buildings of the town, taken by the Turks in 1541 intact, exceeded the modest needs of the conquerors and were thus easily able to meet the requirements of a provincial head-quarters. Slight alterations were needed to make the churches suitable for Muslim religious services (the Church of Our Lady under the name of Sultan Sûleyman Dîâmî; or Büyük Dîâmî; the Church of the Royal Castle under that of Saray Dîâmî; the Church of Saint George under that of Orta Dîâmî; the fortress-of Mary Magdalen under that of Fethiye Dîâmî etc.); other public buildings could be used as barracks, while the empty office buildings and the derelict private houses provided homes for the officials.

Still, even the little building activity that was manifested in the transformation or refurbishing of various buildings (e.g., minarets added to the churches), the Muslim-style bathing establishments added to the thermal springs (erected, at the very beginning of the Turkish period by Weî Bey and Şâkollu Muşafâ) as well as the new constructions necessitated by conflagrations, earthquakes, etc., succeeded in giving the town, in the course of one century and a half, a new exterior sufficient to make it appear a new-style Muslim city in the eyes of any visitor coming down the Danube from the west. As regards appearance and general atmosphere, Budin was indeed a Turkish and Muslim city.

Being at a great distance from the Turkish capital, a centre in the borderlands, it was usual for the Governments to appoint persons of distinction to be the heads of the province of Budin, persons “who were prominent among their contemporaries”. Important special tasks were entrusted to the Paşas of Budin, the guardians of that western borderland of the Empire, which was at the same time the most important frontier zone. At the beginning of the period of occupation, when the Ottoman dynasty enjoyed preponderance over the Hapsburg dynasty, their task was to maintain this preponderance, whereas after the Peace of Zsitvatorok (1606) by which the Hapsburg rulers—called up to then Kings of Vienna (Beğ șîrâll)—had become exempt from the obligation to pay a yearly tribute, and when Turkish preponderance disappeared, the Paşas of Budin were given the task of concealing the weakening of the Empire. To this end the Paşas utilised and inspired controversies among local elements and supported the movements of the discontented Hungarians against the Hapsburgs. The dealings of the Turks with the Vienna Court of the Hapsburgs and the Court of the Princes of Transylvania resulted in a number of inter-state agreements, the ground for which had been prepared by the Paşas of Budin (Peace of Zsitvatorok in 1606, the agreements of Vienna in 1666 and Komôrom in 1618, the peace treaties of Gyarmat in 1625 and Szîny in 1627 and 1642).

The population of the town underwent a radical change under Turkish rule; it is to be noted that Budin was not a populous city before the Turkish occupation, the number of inhabitants being probably below 5,000. A part of them had already left Budin during the civil wars, while a still greater part, viz. the employees of the Royal Household, Hungarian, Caucasian, Albanian, Greek, and army officers and officials as well as the persons in the employment of the Church, emigrated after the Turks had taken Budin. The oldest known list of Turkish tax-assessments enumerates among the inhabitants of Budin 238 Christian (göpr), Hungarian, 75 Jewish and 60 gipsy (kippi) heads of families. As the military personnel of the Turkish garrison (about 2,000 men at the beginning), the employees of the Turkish offices, and the Muslim religious functionaries outnumbered the original or native population at the ratio of 5 to 1, the change in the population was far-reaching from the very first days of the occupation onwards. Budin had thus become a Turkish military town, the population of which was nevertheless far from being Turkish in origin; most of the people in Budin with Muslim names were but newly converted Slavs from the Balkans. (This is clearly evident in the case of the gipsies, the majority of whom bore the theophoric name N. b. 'Abd Allah). Turks of pure extraction formed a minority in the population of Budin, as did the Hungarians, Jews, Albanians, Greeks etc. and they remained in the minority throughout the period of occupation.

The spiritual life of the town was not remarkable. The magistrate and public offices were occupied by the “men of the pen” (el-i kalem); viz. the officials of the administrative authorities, the
Pasha's divan, the local financial administration, the school-masters and the employees of the mosques. We know of religious works (mostly copies only) written in Budin, and we are also aware of certain exponents of religious life at the very beginning of the epoch. Both the names and locations of several dervish establishments are known; the names and memory of a number of bábás, together with the mystery clinging to their persons, lived for a long time, the memory of one of them, that of Gáb-Baba [q.v.], having survived the age of the Turkish occupation by many centuries. As a result of the joint action of the Ottoman and the Crimean Tatars the town of Budin in Sokollu Mustafa's lifetime. There is only sparse data concerning secular intellectual life. We know that folk-singers and minstrels recited epic poems to the frequenter of coffee-houses and of local literary circles, in which poems the history of past centuries and the daily fights of the neighbouring borderland were commemorated; it is further known that Budin's beauty was glorified in meditative songs by local poets (Wügjüd and perhaps others as well). In the towns and the border provinces traditional Turkish folk songs were sung and new ones probably composed. Of works in prose we know the rather sketchy biography of Şoqollu Muştafa, the ablest Ottoman governor of Budin (1566-1578): it was most probably compiled in Budin in Şoqollu Muştafa's lifetime. There is only one among Budin's literary figures who achieved universal repute: İbrahim Peşevlı [q.v.], the historian. He was employed by the local dejterkhâne for some time, lived for many years in Budin, and, after having left it, returned there on many occasions because of his family connexions.

The spiritual life of the Christians (oriental and western) and of the Jews was, as far as can be judged from the sporadic records, rather primitive. The Turkish occupation meant a radical change in the town's economic life as well. The markets had to satisfy the new needs of the new inhabitants of the town, the soldiers of the army of occupation, who brought with them some tradesmen of their own. The craftsmen dealing in household articles and clothing imported not only patterns and fashions but also a quantity of various materials, such as cloth from Bosnia, Djanbolu, Salonica, frieze carpets, finished leather-goods, household articles, vessels, arms etc. These articles were certainly more numerous on the local market than the scarlets, velvets, muslins and fabrics imported from the West.

Industrial development adapted itself to the new requirements. While the artisans from the Balkans (tailors, shoemakers, barbers, tinsmiths, gunsmiths), manufactured clothes, boots, vessels and arms that suited Balkan and Turkish taste, the market of Budin could offer similar articles (Hungarian apparel, Hungarian boots) manufactured in the Hungarian style for the Hungarian inhabitants of the countryside. However, only one or two of the new industries succeeded in taking root, e.g. the production of simple broadcloth (babayé) as made by the Jewish women in Budin, and further the dressing of the skins. The Turks had methods of skin-dressing that were different from, and superior to, the methods employed by the tanners who worked in Hungary before their arrival; the new type of leather industry was then adopted not only in the towns inhabited by the Turks but also in the country, as is evidenced by the topographical term "taban" (the Turkish debdgahkâne) still preserved in many Hungarian townlets.

During the sieges of 1684 and 1686, Budin fell completely into ruin, its medieval buildings, together with those built in the Turkish era, were destroyed, and its Turkish and Muslim inhabitants were either captured or emigrated at the termination of the hostilities. The Budin of later times and the voyvode of Boghdan [q.v.] around 802/1400. As a result of the joint action of the Ottoman and the Crimean Tatars

**Bibliographical references**

There are scattered data concerning the external history of the town in the writings of the Turkish and Hungarian authors of the epoch. We even possess some sparse data concerning secular intellectual life. We know that folk-singers and minstrels recited epic poems to the frequenter of coffee-houses and of local literary circles, in which poems the history of past centuries and the daily fights of the neighbouring borderland were commemorated; it is further known that Budin's beauty was glorified in meditative songs by local poets (Wügjüd and perhaps others as well). In the towns and the border provinces traditional Turkish folk songs were sung and new ones probably composed. Of works in prose we know the rather sketchy biography of Şoqollu Muştafa, the ablest Ottoman governor of Budin (1566-1578): it was most probably compiled in Budin in Şoqollu Muştafa's lifetime. There is only one among Budin's literary figures who achieved universal repute: İbrahim Peşevlı [q.v.], the historian. He was employed by the local dejterkhâne for some time, lived for many years in Budin, and, after having left it, returned there on many occasions because of his family connexions.

The spiritual life of the Christians (oriental and western) and of the Jews was, as far as can be judged from the sporadic records, rather primitive. The Turkish occupation meant a radical change in the town's economic life as well. The markets had to satisfy the new needs of the new inhabitants of the town, the soldiers of the army of occupation, who brought with them some tradesmen of their own. The craftsmen dealing in household articles and clothing imported not only patterns and fashions but also a quantity of various materials, such as cloth from Bosnia, Djanbolu, Salonica, frieze carpets, finished leather-goods, household articles, vessels, arms etc. These articles were certainly more numerous on the local market than the scarlets, velvets, muslins and fabrics imported from the West.

Industrial development adapted itself to the new requirements. While the artisans from the Balkans (tailors, shoemakers, barbers, tinsmiths, gunsmiths), manufactured clothes, boots, vessels and arms that suited Balkan and Turkish taste, the market of Budin could offer similar articles (Hungarian apparel, Hungarian boots) manufactured in the Hungarian style for the Hungarian inhabitants of the countryside. However, only one or two of the new industries succeeded in taking root, e.g. the production of simple broadcloth (babayé) as made by the Jewish women in Budin, and further the dressing of the skins. The Turks had methods of skin-dressing that were different from, and superior to, the methods employed by the tanners who worked in Hungary before their arrival; the new type of leather industry was then adopted not only in the towns inhabited by the Turks but also in the country, as is evidenced by the topographical term "taban" (the Turkish debdgahkâne) still preserved in many Hungarian townlets.

During the sieges of 1684 and 1686, Budin fell completely into ruin, its medieval buildings, together with those built in the Turkish era, were destroyed, and its Turkish and Muslim inhabitants were either captured or emigrated at the termination of the hostilities. The Budin of later times and the voyvode of Boghdan [q.v.] around 802/1400. As a result of the joint action of the Ottoman and the Crimean Tatars
first Ak-Kirmán and Kili in 889/1484, and then the whole of Bugdjak in 945/1538, came under direct Ottoman rule (see BOGDAN). Bugdjak formed the Ottoman sanjak of Ak-Kirmán [q.v.], the boundary running from Sollukta on the Bionta through Gradishče to Kili (Chilia); the Crimean Khan who had cooperated with Suleymán I during the 945/1538 campaign settled the Noghay tribes in Budjak (the Manşûrs, the Orâks, the Kașâyis, the Mamâys, the Or-Mehmeds, the Tâtmûz, the Yadieko, the Diamboyluk) (cf. Sa-âbî al-sâyârî, 168), thus reinforcing the earlier Tatar inhabitants. In 1077/1667 Eyleiyâ Celebi reported (v, 106) that these Tatars formed 200 villages and were very wealthy; the villages towards Bender contained some Tatars or were composed entirely of Wallachs; the villages of Ismail were wholly Tatar. Toward 978/1570 Bender and Ak-Kirmán were centres of sandjakîs under the beglerbegi of Orz (q.v.), whose seat was at Ak-Kirmán or Silistre. The Tatars of Bugdjak were under the administration of a Yâll-aghârî appointed by the Crimean Khan, and later under the second heir to the Khanate (the next to the Khan, the Nâr al-Dîn), who resided at Khan-Kishlâsî, south of Bender.

In the struggles against the Kazaks (Cossacks) and Poland in 1620, the beg of the Noghayûs, Kantimir distinguished himself, and the Ottomans supported him against the Crimean Khan and made him beglerbegi of Orzî, in an endeavour to wrest control of the Noghayûs Tatars from the Khan. In 1111/1659-1113/1701 the Noghayûs of Bugdjak (6000 families) threw off their obedience to the Khan and asked to be made Ottoman subjects; on this occasion the Porte did not encourage them, and Dewlet Gerey (Giray) forcibly transferred 700 to 800 families to the Crimea (Al-Sâbî al-sâyârî, 262-66).

In 1784/1770 Bugdjak was temporarily invaded by the Russians, and thereafter Orthodox Christian Gagauz Turks and Bulgars began to immigrate from Dobrudja (q.v.) into Bugdjak. By the Treaty of Bucharest (28 May 1812) the Porte ceded Bugdjak to Russia, and the majority of the Tatars emigrated to the Dobrudja, Bulgaria and Anatolia.

Bibliography: N. Jorga, Hisît. des Roumain, 11 vols., Bucharest 1856-70; idem, Studii istorice, 10 vols., Bucharest 1936-39; idem, Le vizirat 'abbâsid, i, Damascus 1909, index.

BUDÎNJîR (Borunîrd). 1. Town in Khurâsân situated at the northern foot of Mt. Alââdâgh, 57° 17' E. Long. (Greenw.) 37° 29' N. Lat., alt. 698 m. We find no information about the town before the time of the Saffawids, when the Shâhid tribe of Kurds was settled in this area by Şâh 'Abbâs I. It is uncertain whether Budinûrd was called Bâzanjîr before this time, but the ruins of an old citadel (arg) and other structures indicate that the town is old.

2. District of which Budinûrd is the capital. The population of the Khurâsân has been estimated ca. 150,000 (1950), composed of Turkomans, Kurds and Persians.


BUDÔR (see supplement).

BUGHÂ AL-KâBIÎR (the elder), a Turkish military leader who played a political rôle during a troubled period under the 'Abbâsid caliphate. Under al-Mu'tâsîm and his successors, he distinguished himself in several expeditions against rebellious tribes in the region of Medina in 10/844-45, in Armenia in 1227/851-52, and against the Byzantines in 1244/857. Absent at the time of the assassination of al-Mutawakkil in 247/861, he returned subsequently to Sâmarra and, making common cause with the other Turkish officers, compelled the succession of al-Musta'în in 248/862. He died in the same year.

His son, Muḥâammad b. Bughâ, came also to occupy an important place in the political scene at Sâmarra, and to direct for a time the hadîd service.

Bibliography: Tabari, index; Ya'qûbî, index; Baladhuri, 202; Baladhuri, Futâh, 18, 21; Ibn al-Athîr, index; D. Sourdel, Le vizirat 'abbâsid, i, Damascus 1909, index.

BUGHÂ AL-SHÂRÂBI (the cup-bearer), also called Al-Sâgîr (the younger) a Turkish military leader who bore the title ma'sûd al-mu'mînîn, and who is not to be confused with his contemporary of the same name, Bughâ al-Kabîr. After having fought, under al-Mutawakkil, against the rebels of Aḥbarbayânî, he led the plot against this caliph, whom he suspected of wishing to reduce the influence of the Turkish officers, and had him assassinated. With his ally Wâsîf, he subsequently held power under al-Muntasîr and al-Mu'âtîzâz, however, ascending the throne in 252/866, sought to rid himself of this ancient enemy, the murderer of his father, and after relieving him of his functions and privileges, succeeded in 254/868 in having him imprisoned and put to death.

Bibliography: Tabari, index; Ya'qûbî, index; Baladhuri, 202; Baladhuri, Futâh, 330; Ibn al-Athîr, index; A. Amin, Zak al-tâlîm, iii, 11, 20-22; D. Sourdel, Le vizirat 'abbâsid, i, Damascus 1909, index.

BUGHÂRÎ KHÂN [see KARAKHÂNIDS].

AL-BUÎHTCRÎ, MA'RÎN B. MUHAMMAD, İbdîte historian and biographer born in the village of Boghdûrî (also: Buftûrî) in the western region of the Diabal Nafusa (q.v.). According to the Kitâb al-Sîyar of Abu l-'Abbâs Âbrahîm b. 'Abd al-Îzîm of the same name, Bughâ al-Kabîr. After having fought, under al-Mutawakkil, against the rebels of Aḥbarbayânî, he led the plot against this caliph, whom he suspected of wishing to reduce the influence of the Turkish officers, and had him assassinated. With his ally Wâsîf, he subsequently held power under al-Muntasîr and al-Mu'âtîzâz, however, ascending the throne in 252/866, sought to rid himself of this ancient enemy, the murderer of his father, and after relieving him of his functions and privileges, succeeded in 254/868 in having him imprisoned and put to death.

Bibliography: Tabari, index; Ya'qûbî, index; Baladhuri, 202; Baladhuri, Futâh, 330; Ibn al-Athîr, index; A. Amin, Zak al-tâlîm, iii, 11, 20-22; D. Sourdel, Le vizirat 'abbâsid, i, Damascus 1909, index.

BUGHÂRÎ KHÂN [see KARAKHÂNIDS].

AL-BUÎHTCRÎ, MA'RÎN B. MUHAMMAD, İbdîte historian and biographer born in the village of Boghdûrî (also: Buftûrî) in the western region of the Diabal Nafusa (q.v.). According to the Kitâb al-Sîyar of Abu l-'Abbâs Âbrahîm b. 'Abd al-Îzîm of the same name, Bughâ al-Kabîr. After having fought, under al-Mutawakkil, against the rebels of Aḥbarbayânî, he led the plot against this caliph, whom he suspected of wishing to reduce the influence of the Turkish officers, and had him assassinated. With his ally Wâsîf, he subsequently held power under al-Muntasîr and al-Mu'âtîzâz, however, ascending the throne in 252/866, sought to rid himself of this ancient enemy, the murderer of his father, and after relieving him of his functions and privileges, succeeded in 254/868 in having him imprisoned and put to death.

Bibliography: Tabari, index; Ya'qûbî, index; Baladhuri, 202; Baladhuri, Futâh, 330; Ibn al-Athîr, index; A. Amin, Zak al-tâlîm, iii, 11, 20-22; D. Sourdel, Le vizirat 'abbâsid, i, Damascus 1909, index.
During Mamlûk times risings of Arab tribes and Bedouin of the Western Desert are frequently recorded. These rebellions began towards the end of the 9th/15th century; there were terrible punishments; summary executions; the enslavement of women and children, and confiscation of flocks. In the Ottoman period the troubles quite often provoked punitive expeditions, and the province was far from being quiet during the French occupation, as one sees from the massacre of the small French garrison of Damānah. After the departure of the French great importance was accorded to the Bedouin of the district, in whose favour an imperial firmân was promulgated, confirming their ownership of their territories. But their turbulence, of which the Mamluk bey Muhammād Alî momentarily took advantage, could scarcely be overcome. Muhammād Alî made no attempt to conciliate the Arabs of the province in his struggle against Muhammād Alî.


**AL-BUḤJAYRA AL-MAYYITA (OF AL-MUNTINA)**

[see Bahr Lût]
that he has been confused with various characters similarly possessing the name of Buhlul, and among whom to be found genuine traditionists (see particularly Ibn Hadjar, _Sudan al-Mtan_ , s.v.). One of them, who lived in Iraq and who died in 218/739, was named Buhlul b. Rāṣḥid, which perhaps explains the persistent tradition (see Ibn Tagihrbardi, i, 518; _ZDMG_ , xiii, 113) which identifies Buhlul with al-Sabṭī, legendary son of Hārūn al-Raṣḥid (279/892). He then left Iraq and became court poet, and among them, who lived in Ifrikiya and who died in particular Ibn Hadjar, whom are to be found genuine traditionists (see Chauvin, _Bibli. ar._ , vi, 193, and bibli. quoted).

Buhlul's tomb in Baghda was described by N. den Boer (Reisbesch., ii, 371 f.; Le Strange, _Baghdad_ , 350), and an inscription dating from 501/1100-8 designates him as the sultan of the _madjīdahs and as an "obscure, dim soul" (naṣṣ mutammama). People called him Buhlūḍānā, "the wise fool", and they made of him the kinsman and the buffoon of al-Raṣḥid, and they told stories in the coffee houses about his wit and subtlety. The culmination of the development of the legend of Buhlul was reached when he became the hero of erotic tales as in _al-Rawf al-Aṣ'ir_ (ed. 1315, 9) of al-Nafzāwī (8th/14th century), which makes him a contemporary of al-Ma'dūn (see also Meissner, _Neurab, Geschichten, v_ and 73-83).

The word _buhlū_ is given in Arabic dictionaries with the meaning of "merry, jolly" ( _dakhbī_ ), "a generous and distinguished man", and it is still this sense which Redhouse ( _Turkish and English Lexicon,_ 416a) and Dozy offer (following Bocchtor, although the latter does not fail to call attention to the meanings of "booby", "idiot", etc. which are already encountered in Ibn Batṭṭa (ii, 89) and Ibn Khaldūn ( _Mubādima, ed._ Quatremère, i, 230 f.). Currently, and particularly in North Africa, it has the general meaning of "simpleton", "ninny", etc., and H. Wehr, _Wörterbuch_ , gives "wag, clown, buffoon". Owing to the fact that _bahlūš/bahlūd_ still sometimes denotes an intense hilarity (see Doutté, _Marabout_ , D. B. Macdonald, _EP_ , s.v.) infers that the present use of the word rests also on its literal sense and not on the existence of an historical Buhlul. It is of course possible that there may be some confusion with _bahlūš/bahlūd_ , which has the same meaning, but it is probable that the modern meaning proceeds from the proper name. 

Bibliography: Add to the references given in the text, Brockelmann, _S I_ , 350. (Ed.)

AL-BUṬṬURI, Aḥūbāda al-walijd b. ʿUbayd (Allah), Arab poet and anthologist of 3rd/9th century (206-284/827-937), born at Manbij (some state his birthplace to be the neighbouring village of Ijurduna), into a family belonging to the Buṭṭur, a branch of the Tayy; not only did he never completely sever connexions with his native town, where the fortune amassed during his long career as court poet allowed him to acquire property, but he took advantage of his tribal origin to make useful connexions for himself.

After having dedicated his first poetic efforts (223-6/837-40) to the praise of his tribe, he sought a patron, and found him in the person of the Taʿṣī general Aḥūb Saʿdī Yūsuf b. Muhammad, known as al-Taḥṣī (s.v.), at whose house he met for the first time the poet Aḥūb Tammān, who also claimed to be a Taṣī. Aḥūb Tammān, attracted by his youthful talent, apparently recommended him at first as a panegyrist to the notables of Māʾarrat al-Nuʿmān, who made him an allowance of 4,000 dirhams, but nothing remains of his output during this period. In any case al-Buṭṭuri was not slow in joining Aḥūb Tammān in the retinue of his patron Māʾīk b. Tawk, governor of Mesopotamia, and then in following him to Baghdad, where, by attending the courses of the most celebrated women (notably Ibn al-Arṭābī) and by striving to acquire the manners of the capital, he prepared himself to extol important personages in the hope of getting close to the caliph.

However, he had scarcely any success with Ibn al-Zayyāt, and instead allied himself to a family of his own tribe, the Banū Ḥumayd, some members of which were established in Baghdad, and he dedicated several odes to their chief, Aḥūb Nāḥag; then he left Ḥirā at the same time as Aḥūb Tammān, in 230/844, to return to al-Taḥṣī, then at Mosul.

Contrary to all expectation he does not seem to have grieved at the death of Aḥūb Tammān (231/845), from whom nevertheless he had received his first encouragement, and part of his poetic training; this was the first instance of the ingratitude and opportunism of which he gave ample proof later.

No sooner had al-Mutawakkil succeeded than he returned to Baghdad, and thanks to the offices of Ibn al-Munajdīn we have our first instance of his Hamāsa and a number of panegyrics; he also praised numerous great figures of the empire, but it was for the caliph that he kept the greater part of his poetic output; he lived on familiar terms with him, enjoying his confidence, supporting government policy even when this clashed with his personal views which had a ʿAbbāsid bias, and proclaiming the virtues and rights of the ʾAbbāsids. The verse of this period contains many allusions to political happenings—the rebellion at Damascus (236/850), the revolt in Armenia (237/851), the rising at Hims (240/854), the caliph’s visit to Damascus (244/858), the building of al-Mutawakkiliyya (245-6/859-60), etc.

Whereas heretofore the erotic prelude to his _baṣdās_ had been dedicated to a conventional Hind, there now appeared in his verse a woman of the same rank and blood, ʿAlīa bint Zurayka, who lived at Aleppo and had a country house in the district, at Bītās; without doubt he used to see her during his journeys in Syria, for his stay in Ḥirā was never interrupted, and it is possible that he had a great passion for her, although he mocked her in a somewhat indecent poem.

After having been concerned, as al-ʾMasʿādī reports of him, in the assassination of al-Mutawakkil and al-Fath (247/861), he thought it prudent to retire to Manbij, but he reappeared soon afterwards with a panegyrical of al-Muntasir, and afterwards addressed his praises to the ʿawr Ahmād b. al-Khaṣbī, against whom, incidentally, he did not hesitate to incite al-Muṣṭaʿ in some time later. He tasted fame once more under al-Muṭṭāz, to whom he dedicated numerous poems, in which are echoes of the unrest which was watering the provinces of the empire with blood, but which by no means prevented him from welcoming al-Muhtadil as if nothing had happened, and from becoming temporarily a poet of piety to humour the new caliph. His fame declined under al-Muṭṭamid, whose fiscal policy caused him some anxiety over his fortune, and his last poem dedicated to a caliph is in praise of al-Muṣṭāḍil (279/892). He then left Ḥirā and became court poet.
In the beginning of his career, al-Buhturi wrote almost exclusively, vainglorious poetry or poems about his desert wanderings (a notable example is the famous poem of the jackal, ii, 110), but as soon as he became court poet the panegyric became the main form of his work. In this style he respected, except perhaps at the end of his life, the tripartite form of the ḫasīda, painting a conventional portrait of his various patrons; however, the panegyric is successfully heightened by splendid descriptions (not a particular of the palace) where, thanks to a fine sense of poetic imagery and picturesque detail, al-Buhturi stands unchallenged; it was only later that he devoted an entire poem to describing a palace, the Iwan of Chosroes (see ʿAbd al-Ḵādir al-Maghrībi, in MMIA, 1956, 77-88, 241-52, 427-36, 577-85).

According to Abu Tammām and al-Mutanabbi, as one of the most classic poets, and this label suits him perfectly. For interest in al-Buhturi, class him among the neo-classics, or in describing monuments, or in mentioning occurrences which historians appear to have overlooked.

The Diwan was published at Constantinople in 1882, then at Beirut and Cairo in 1911, but these editions are rather faulty and incomplete, so that a new publication taking into account the various MSS. (notably that in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris) would be most welcome. A commentary compiled by Abu ʿIṣāʿ al-Maʿṣūrī, ʿAbāt al-Walād, was published at Damascus in 1355/1936.—Of the Ḥamāsa only one MS. (University of Leiden) has been discovered, which is evidence of the lack of success of this anthology, in which the verses are grouped according to their themes and not according to their genres, as in that of Abū Tammām; there have been three editions: Leiden 1909, Beirut 1910, Cairo 1929.—A third work attributed to al-Buhturi, Maṣʿīn al-Ṣhīr (or al-Ṣhūrāt), is lost.


BOK, the generic name for any instrument of the horn or trumpet family. Wind instruments played by means of a cup-shaped mouthpiece may be divided into two classes, viz.: 1. the horn or conical tube type; and 2. the trumpet or cylindrical tube type.

1. The horn type. Whether the ʿūr and nāḥār mentioned in the Kurʾān (vi, 73; lxiv, 8; lxviii, 18) were horns, as Ahmad b. Ḥanābal (d. 241/855) and al-Ḍjawahirī (d. ca. 396/1005) say respectively, the early Persians and Arabs certainly knew of a conical tube instrument of the animal horn type. An example may be found in Greek art of the 14th century B.C. in which an Asiatic warrior is displayed sounding such an instrument, whilst a Greek warrior is sounding a straight trumpet (Gerhard, Apulische Vasen, pl. ii). The Arabs appear to have known the crescent-shaped horn as the bārn (Seybold, Glossarium Latino-Arabicum, 519), cognate words being found in the Akkadian bānu and the Hebrew šerēm. This instrument is still used by the perambulating darwīshes in Persia. According to Turkish tradition the darvāz borusu (būrīsī) (dervish horn) was invented by Manūʿīnīsī the legendary Persian king (Ewilīyā Čebebe, i/i, 238). For a design of the instrument see Advienne, 9, and Lavignac, 3075, by whom it is wrongly called a nafīr. Actual specimens may be found in museums, e.g., the Crosby Brown Collection, New York, no. 2454. There is a large Hispano-Moorish horn of ivory of the 14th-15th-16th century in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London (no. 2953/ 1862). Much larger instruments were also in use. Ibn

Indeed it forms a useful supplement to the chronicles of the time to which it often adds details, whether in giving the full names of personalities, or in describing monuments, or in mentioning occurrences which historians appear to have overlooked.
Batūtah (d. 779/1377) describes such an instrument of the Sudan made from an elephant’s tusk (Voyages, iv, 411), hence the term oliphant horn. An Andalusian Arab, Al-Shakundi (d. 692/1293), speaks of a monster horn (karnā) known as the ābā ḍurūn (‘father of horns’) as related by Al-Makfari (Analectes, ii, 144), which would be comparable to the monster horn (bāk al-kabīr), the height of a man, referred to by Muḥammad al-Saghir (Tadhkirat al-Nisyān, 45).

A horn made out of a shell was known to the Arabs of the Peninsula in the 2nd/8th century. Al-Layh b. al-Muṣṭafārī says that it was used by millers, and that it was a spiral conical one resembling the minkāb and apparently something like the ṣammāk of India (Day, Music and Musical Instruments of Southern India, 151). It was probably the instrument which the Arabs called the bāk. It was not a warlike instrument in the early days of Islam, as the Arabs did not use horns in battle at that time (Ibn Khaldūn, Muḥaddidā, xvii, 44). A poet quoted by Al-ʿArmāʾī (d. 828) says that the bāk was used by the Christians for that purpose, and, according to Al-Djawharī, the Arabs borrowed that usage from them. In fact the word bāk appears to have been derived from the Greek ποικιλὸς or the Latin buccina (Dozy, Suppl.), although in the Tādż al-ʿArās the Persian word būrū is considered to be the etymological original, an ‘obviously improbable’ derivation (Lane, Lexicon). In the 4th/10th century the Iḫwān al-Ṣafwān refer to the bāk to illustrate their discussion on acoustics (Bombay ed., i, 89). From that time the bāk began to play an important part in martial and processionel music in all Islamic lands (see Tābl-Kūāna). In the Alī Laylā wa Laylā (ed. Macnaghten, i, 80, ii, 382, 403) it is in constant use for those purposes, whilst the nafir or trumpet is only mentioned once (ii, 656). Yet it should be understood that the term bāk was used for all instruments with a conical bore, whether crescent-shaped or straight, irrespective of the material of its facture,—shell, horn, or metal. Incidentally, the metal horn (Turkish pişendil borusı) is claimed to have been introduced by the Saldūqids of the 5th/11th century (Ewlyā Celebi, i/i, 238). In view of the use of metal instruments by both Persia and Byzantium much earlier, that statement cannot be accepted. The bāk is mentioned in Persian as early as Firdawsi (d. 1020) and one supposes that the instrument was little different from the straight horns depicted on the Tāk-i Bastān sculptures (590-628 A.D.), and is still the type to be found there (Advilex, 9; Lavignac, 3075). In Moorish Spain the būk of Al-Ḥakam II (d. 369/979) were mounted with gold. It was this monarch who, having devised the boring of the tube with finger holes and the insertion of a beating reed at the blowing end instead of a cup-shaped mouthpiece, introduced an instrument of the saxophone type (see Mızmār). The Spanish albugue is its lineal descendant.

The Turkish and Persian equivalent of the bāk was the borū (būrī) (Ḥādīdī Khālīfah, i, 400; Meninski, s.v. bāḥ; Ewlyā Celebi, i/i, 238; Toldernī, i, 238). The word is to be found in modern Egyptian and Syrian Arabic (Amery, English-Arabic Vocabulary, s.v. bugle; Ronzevalle, MFOB, vi, 29). It has become the Balkān bore and boreyé (cf. the Sanskrit bhariya and the Ghanaian buro). The burgha or burghā, a Caggatay word, was a huge horn introduced into the Islamic armies during the Mughal and Tatar regime. Ibn Ghaybī (d. 1435) says that it is longer than the nafir. The name survives in the buruga of India (Day, 153; Lavignac, 358) where it is another name for the karnā. Another instrument of the same group mentioned by Arabic authors is the shābūr. Al-Djawhari says that it is a non-Arabic word, which Ibn al-ʿAṣāfī Madjd al-Dīn (d. 1310) has rightly surmised was borrowed from the Hebrew ḍābhar. Firdawsi includes the ḍāyātār among the ancient martial instruments of the Persians. The existence of the Arabic word nafir, as mentioned by A. X. Idelsohn (Jewish Music, 495, and J. Reider (JOR, Jan. 1934), must be accepted with reserve. Félix mentions a modern Arabian trumpet under the name shābār (Hist. gén., ii, 155), but see Mahillon (i, 182; and the Saturday Review, June 1882, 696).

2. The trumpet type. The chief instrument of the cylindrical tube class was the nafir, although the name is frequently given to the straight instrument of the horn type (see Host, Nachrichten von Marokos og Fes, pl. xxxi). The name nafir in this connexion occurs first in the 5th/11th century under the Saldūqids, although the type may have been known earlier. Kurt Sachs (Reallexikon der Musik-instrumente, s.v.) erroneously derives the word from nāṭakha (‘to blow’). Originally the term nafir meant ‘a call to war’, and so a trumpet used by such was called a būk al-nafir, i.e., ‘a military horn or trumpet’. Ibn al-Tiktāka, in al-Faḥīrī (30) speaks of a large būk similar to the bāk al-nafir, from which we may reasonably deduce that the ordinary bāk was smaller or shorter than the nafir. The bright incisive tone of the nafir, which was due to its cylindrical tube, was better for signalling purposes than the hoarse sound of the būk with its conical bore. The difference between them may well be illustrated by the verbs used to describe their sounding. We read for instance that the būk player ‘blew’ (nafakha) his horn, whilst the nafir player ‘cried out’ (Ṣiḥā) with his trumpet. For the respective numbers of the nafir and būk used in the Islamic army bands, see Tābl-Kūāna. In the time of Ibn Ghaybī the length of the nafir was 168 cm. (= 2 gas).

The karnā, according to Ibn Ghaybī, was a trumpet folded in the centre of its tube into a ‘S’ shaped figure. Some of them were of enormous length. The Persian dictionaries give the form as harrandīyā, and it is thus vocalised in the Persian literature. It is generally acknowledged (Buhle, 28; Schlesinger, xxvii, 326, 353; Galpin, 200) that the cylindrical bore instruments were borrowed from the East. Perhaps those buccins Turcs and cors sarraynos which the Crusading chronicles record included the nafir and harrandīyā. Richard Cour de Lion, in the Third Crusade (1189-92), was well equipped with tubae, italianum et buccinum, but at Messina in Sicily, we read of a trumpet which was different from the tuba. Could this have been the nafir of the Hohenstaufen Saracen troops on the Island? Yet if the Occident was indebted to the Orient for the cylindrical nafir, the compliment was returned, since we know that Morocco, under Sultan al-Manṣūr (1576-1602) had a tuba (Turc. = Spanish trompeta) which was made of brass and was as long as the nafir (Tadhkirat al-Nisyān, 117; the translator writes negir). Turkey also knew of the European trumpet (tūrmpotā borusu) as well as the English trumpet (ingilis borusu), the latter being the modern wreathed instrument (Ewlyā Celebi, i/i, 238). Both Niebuhr and Villoteau give designs and descriptions of the 17th-19th century instruments.

Bibliography: Ābd al-Ḵādir b. Ghaybī, Bodleian MS. (Marsh, no. 282, fol. 80); Abu Ḥadīl, ...

**BUK**

One of the leaders of the group of the Oguz of Khurasân which, after the capture and death of its leader Arslan b. Saldjayik (427/1036?), was expelled from the province by the Ghaznavid troops on account of its depredations, and continued its pillaging across central and western Iran as far as the borders of Armenia and Upper Mesopotamia, where it was annihilated by the Bedouin and Kurds in 435/1044. See *EI*, s.v., the article *saldâqêk*, and Cl. Cahen, *Le Mikahemeh et l'histoire des origines seldjukides*, in *Orients*, 1949, 57. (Cl. Cahen)

**BUÇA**

A place, no longer extant, in northern Syria, whose name is very probably a word of Syriac origin meaning "mosquito", from which fact H. Lammens has inferred that the region was a marshy one. It is figured in the Arabic texts of the first centuries of Islam. Nothing is known of its more ancient history, but it is mentioned in the narratives of the conquest by Abu 'Ubayda of the provinces of Antioch and Kinnasrin, and appears to have had a certain importance in Umayyad times. Then it was near the territory of the Djadirjuma, placed by al-Baladhuri in the *Djedal al-Lukkan* (Amanus) between Bayda and Bâb. It was one of the places chosen for the establishment under Mu'awiyah or al-Walid of the Zu'a [q.v.] from Sind, who arrived there from Iraq and installed themselves with their buffaloes. Later its defences were strengthened by the caliph al-Hâjûm, who built a fortress there. The Byzantines besieged it in 338/949-50, during a raid on Syria by Leo Phocas, and it then belonged to the territory of the *Awâqima* [q.v.], but the mentions made of it in the 6th/12th century by Ibn Shaddâd and Yûkût seem to reflect an earlier state of things. Although it is not known in what circumstances it fell into ruins or was abandoned, by the time of the Crusades it had lost its previous importance, and H. Lammens (*EL*) could establish only by conjecture, based on literary data, the site which it presumably occupied in the *Amk* [q.v.] depression, not far from the lake of Antioch.

**Bibliography**


**BUK**

A term employed in Algerian Arabic (cf. *bâkâ*<sup>2</sup>) to denote a two-handled pottery vase used by women in the course of the divinatory practices to which it gave its name. The operation consisted, basically, of the woman who officiated improvising, after an invocation, a short poem which was also called *bâkâ* and from which portents were drawn. These practices, which seem to have enjoyed a certain vogue during the period when piracy was at its height (women wanted to have news of their men who were at sea), developed into a parlour game. They were recently the subject of an excellent study by S. Bencheneb, in *AIEO*, Algiers 1956, 19-111 (with numerous texts in *EO*). (Ed.)

**BUÇALAMON** [see *BUÇALAMON*]

**BUÇAREST** [see *BUÇREȘT*]

**BUÇAY** [in particular] denotes a little plain situated north of the Bîcă [see *BUÇA*] and south-east of the *Diebol Anşariyê*, at an average altitude of 250 m. It is characterised by an abundance of springs which give birth to the Nahr al-Kabîr. It was known in the time of the Crusades by the name *Boquêle* and was dominated by the *Hiss al-Akrâd* [q.v.] whose ruins still overlook it today (see M. van Berchem and E. Fatio, *Voyage en Syrie*, Cairo 1914-5, 42; R. Dussaud, *Topographie historique de la Syrie*, Paris 1923, 92; J. Weulersse, *Le pays des Alcoulas*, Tours 1940, *index* s.v. *Bouquela*).

The name *Buçay* is found likewise in Transjordania, where it denotes a small inland plain to the north of the *Balâk*<sup>2</sup> whose ruins still overlook it today (see M. van Berchem and E. Fatio, *Voyage en Syrie*, Cairo 1914-5, 42; R. Dussaud, *Topographie historique de la Syrie*, Paris 1923, 92; J. Weulersse, *Le pays des Alcoulas*, Tours 1940, *index* s.v. *Bouquela*).

**BUÇAY b. MÂHÂN**

Abû *Hashîm*, propagandist of the *Abbâsids* at the end of the Umayyad caliphate, was a native of Siǧîstân and had at first been secretary of the governor of Sind. He was born in *Djûrayd b. Abû al-Râhîm*. In 332/946-7 he was converted to the anti-Umayyad cause by Maysara...
al-ʿAbdī and Muḥammad b. Khunayr, and he put at the disposition of their party the fortune which he had amassed in business in Sind. After the death of the governor, which occurred at the direction of the movement in 1057/1224-5 and he was unusually active in gaining supporters among the population of Khūrāsān. In 1077/1226-7 he also sent many emissaries to this region, who, with one exception, ʿAmmār al-ʿAbdālī, were at once taken and put to death by the governor Asad b. ʿAbd Allāh. Later, in 118/736, he appointed ʿAmmār b. Yaʿqūb as chief over other agents who had been first imprisoned and then succeeded in freeing themselves. ʿAmmār established himself at Marw, took the name of Khīdāsh, and met with some success, but having adopted the doctrines of the Khurramīs [q.v.] was in his turn imprisoned, tortured, and put to death by the governor Asad. This situation disturbed the shaykh Muḥammad, who was not content with the explanation offered in 1207/1324 by the delegate of the Khūrāsānīs, Sulaymān b. ʿAlī b. ʿAbd al-Qādir [q.v.], and despatched Bukayr himself to repudiate publicly the doctrines of Khīdāsh. Bukayr was badly received the first time but the second time succeeded in convincing the ʿAbbasīd partisans. Afterwards, in 1224/1412-13, having returned to Irāq and being held responsible for political meetings which took place in a house at Kāfā, he was imprisoned. There he won over to his cause ʿĪsā b. Maʿṣūm, from whom, according to an unreliable tradition, he bought a slave, the future Abū Muslim [q.v.]. Set at liberty, he went to Khūrāsān in 1227/1414-5 to announce the death of the shaykh Muḥammad to the partisans of the ʿAbbasīd, and to make them swear allegiance to his successor Abū Saʿīd al-Maghzī [q.v.]. He returned to Irāq and was imprisoned. There he won over to his cause Abū Salāma Ḥāṣl b. Sulaymān [q.v.], a choice which Ibrāhīm later accepted.  

**Bibliography:** ʻAbd al-Qādir, Dīnawarī, index; L. Caetani, *Chronographia Islamica*, (or Bukhara Khudat) by the Islamic sources; on the coins we have *pee)v* found on coins, indicates on palaeographic grounds that the name may have been used several centuries earlier. The derivation of this word from Sanskrit vihāra “monastery” is not improbable in spite of linguistic difficulties, since there was a vihāra near Numidi-kāth, a town apparently the predecessor of Bukhārā, and which merged into the latter (cf. Frye, *Notes in HJS*, below).  

The native dynasty was called Bukhārā Khudāt (or Bukhārā Khudā) by the Islamic sources; on the coins we have *pee)v* found on coins, indicates on palaeographic grounds that the name may have been used several centuries earlier. The derivation of this word from Sanskrit vihāra “monastery” is not improbable in spite of linguistic difficulties, since there was a vihāra near Numidi-kāth, a town apparently the predecessor of Bukhārā, and which merged into the latter (cf. Frye, *Notes in HJS*, below).  

The accounts of the first Arab raids across the Oxus River are partly legendary and require critical examination. The first Arab army is said to have appeared before Bukhārā in 54/674 under ʿUbayd Allāh b. Zīyād. The ruler of Bukhārā at that time was the widow of the late ruler Būdūn, or Bandūn. (In *Tabarī*, ii, 169, in place of her Kabad[ ] Khatun is Kayikh, as the Turkish tribal name?). According to *Narshākhī* (ed. Schefer, 7, trans. Frye, 9) she ruled for 15 years as regent for her infant son Tūshkhādā (*Tabarī*, ii, 169), has Tūk Sīyādā; cf. reference by O. I. Smirnova, *K imeni sogd'yanskogo vikhada Tukshadaka, in Trudy Akad. Nauk Tadzhikskoy SSR*, Stalinabad 1953, 209). This same Bukhārā Khudāt appears again in al-*Tabarī* as a youth in 917/1019 when Ḥutayba b. Muḥammad, after overthrowing his enemies, installed him as prince of Bukhārā. The rule of Islam in Bukhārā was first placed on a firm footing by Ḥutayba. In Ramadān 111/Aug.-Sept. 739, Tūshkhādā was murdered in the camp of the governor of Khūrāsān, Nasr b. Sayyār. During his long reign several rebellions against the Arab conquerors took place in Bukhārā and the Turks invaded the country several times. In 1107/1289-90 the town of Bukhārā itself was lost to the Arabs and they had
to besiege it but regained it the next year (al-
Tabari, ii, 1514, 1529).

The son and successor of Tughshād, called
"Kutayba" in honour of the conqueror, behaved at
first like a good Muslim. When in the year 133/750,
the Arab Sharīk b. Shaykh raised a revolt in Bukhārā
gainst the new dynasty of the 'Abbāsids, the
rebellion was put down by Ziyād b. Šālih, lieutenant
of Abū Muslim, with the help of the Bukhārā Khudāt.
Nevertheless the latter was a short time later
accused of apostasy from Islam and put to death by
order of Abu Muslim. His brother and successor
Bukhārā, at although another brother Skān, reading
uncertain, may have ruled a few years between) met
the same fate during the reign of the caliph al-Mahdī
(probably in 166/782), for the Caliph had him put to
death as a follower of the heretic al-Mukanna
. After this period the Bukhārā Khudāt's appear to
have been of little importance in the government
of the country but they an influential position
bought at their great estates. In the early years of
the reign of the Sāmānīd Ismāʿīl, mention is made
of the Bukhārā Khudāt who were deprived of his
lands but allowed the same income (20,000 dirhams)
from the state treasury, as he had previously derived
from his estates. It is not known how long the govern-
ment fulfilled this obligation.

Besides the native prince there was of course in
Bukhārā, at least from the time of Kutayba b.
Muslim, an Arab amir or 'āmil who was subordinate
to the amir of Khurāsān whose headquarters were
in Marw. On account of its geographical situation
Bukhārā was much more closely connected with
Marw than with Samarkand. The Bukhārā Khudāt
had even a palace of his own in Marw (al-Tabari, ii,
188, 14; 1987, 7; 1992, 10). In the 3rd/9th century,
when the amirs of Khurāsān transferred their seat
to Nihāpūr, the administration of Bukhārā remained
separate from that of the other parts of Transoxania.

Till 26O/874 Bukhārā did not belong to Sāmānīd
territory but was under a separate governor imme-
diately responsible to the Tāhirsīd. After the fall of
the Tāhirsīd (259/873) Yaʿṣūb b. Layḥī was recog-
nised only for a brief period in Bukhārā as amir of
Khurāsān. The clergy and populace applied to the
Sāmānīd Naṣr b. Ahmad who was ruling in Samar-
kaṇd and he appointed his younger brother Ismāʿīl
governor of Bukhārā. Bukhārā was henceforth
ruled by the Sāmānīds until their fall. Ismāʿīl
continued to live in Bukhārā after the death of his
brother Naṣr in 279/892 when the whole of Mā warā
'nihr (Transoxania) passed under his sway, and
also after his victory over 'Amr b. Layḥī in 287/900
when he was confirmed by the Caliph in the rank
of amir of Khurāsān. The city thus became the
seat of a great kingdom although it never equalled Samarkand in size or wealth during this
period. It was in Bukhārā that the New Persian
literary renaissance bloomed.

The Bukhārā of the Sāmānīd period is described
in detail by the Arab geographers and we also owe
much to Narshakhi and later editors of his work.
A comparison of these accounts with the descriptions
of the modern town (particularly detailed is N.
Khanikov, Oplisanie Bukharskago Knyazstva, St.
Petersburg 1843, 79 ff.) shows clearly that in
Bukhārā unlike Marw, Samarkand, and other cities,
only an expansion of the area of the town and not
a shifting from one place to another, may be traced.
Even after destruction Bukhārā has always been
rebuilt on the same site and on the same plan
as in the 3rd/9th century.

As in most Iranian towns, the Arab geographers
distinguish three main divisions of Bukhārā, the
citadel (NP bukhanida, from the 7th/13th century
known as the arc), the town proper (Arabic maudaemon,
Pers. shahristan), and the suburbs (Arabic rabad)
lying between the original town and the wall built
in Muslim times. The citadel from the earliest times
has been on the same site as at the present day,
east of the square still known as the "Rigistan".
The area of the citadel is about one mile in circum-
ference with an area of ca. 23 acres. The palace of
the Bukhārā Khudāt was here, and, as Iṣṭakhrī shows
(306), it was used by the early Sāmānīds. According
to Mukaddasī (280), the later Sāmānīds only had their
treasuries and prisons there. Besides the palace
there was in the citadel the oldest Friday Mosque,
erected by Kutayba, supposedly on the site of a
pagan temple. Later this mosque was used as a
revenue office (diwān al-kharādā). The citadel was
several times destroyed in the 6/12th and 7/13th
centuries, but was always rebuilt.

Unlike most other towns, the citadel of Bukhārā
was not within the shahristan but outside. Between
them, to the east of the citadel, was an open space
where the later Friday mosque stood till the 6th/12th
century. One may determine what part of the modern
town corresponds to the shahristan for, according to
Iṣṭakhrī (307), there was no running water on the
surface of either the citadel or the shahristan
because of their height. According to the plan given
by Khanikov, this high-lying portion of the town
is about twice as large as the citadel. It had a wall
around it with seven gates, the names of which are
given by Narshakhi and the Arab geographers.

According to Narshakhi (text, 29, trans., 30) at
the time of the Arab conquest the whole town
consisted of the shahristan alone, although there
were scattered settlements outside which were later
incorporated into the city. Narshakhi gives us a
detailed account of the topographical details of the
shahristan. A new Friday Mosque was built by
Arslān Khān Muh. b. Sulaymān in 515/1121 in
the shahristan, probably in the southern part of it
where the Madrasa Mir ʿAarb, built in the 10th/16th
century and the great minaret still stand.

It was not till 235/849-50, according to Narshakhi,
that the shahristan was linked with the suburbs to
form one town and surrounded by a wall. In the
4th/10th century another wall had been built
enclosing a greater area; it had eleven gates, the
names of which are given by Narshakhi and the
Arab geographers.

Besides the palace in the citadel there was one in
the Rigistan from pre-Islamic times. The Sāmānīd
Naṣr II (301-365/914-943) built a palace there with
accommodations for the ten state divāns, the names
of which are given by Narshakhi (text, 24, trans., 26).
During the reign of Mansūr b. Nūḥ (350-365/961-76)
this palace is said to have been destroyed by fire,
but Muḥaddasī tells us that the Dār al-Mulk was
still standing on the Rigistan and he praises it
highly. During the Sāmānīd period there appears
to have been another royal palace on the Dībūl-
Mūliyān Canal to the north of the citadel.

In the reign of Mansūr b. Nūḥ a new muṣallā was
built as the Rigistan could not contain the multitude
of believers. The new area of prayer was built in
360/971 at one-half farṣāḥ (ca. 2 miles) from the
citadel on the road to the village of Samatān.

In the 4th/10th century the town was over-
crowded and insanitary, with bad water and the like
1 Muḥaddasī and some of the poets (al-Tha`lībī,
Narshakhi, Khanikov, St. Petersburg 1843, 79 ff.) show clearly that in Bukhara unlike Marw, Samarkand, and other cities, only an expansion of the area of the town and not a shifting from one place to another, may be traced. Even after destruction Bukhara has always been rebuilt on the same site and on the same plan as in the 3rd/9th century.
Yatima, iv, 8) describe the town in the most scathing fashion.

Narshakhl and the Arab geographers give information on the villages and country around the city. Istakhli (30) gives the names of the canals which led from the Zarafshân to water the fields. According to Narshakhl some of these canals were built in pre-Islamic times and many of the names have survived to the present. Traces also survive of the long walls which were built to protect the city and surrounding villages from the incursions of the Turks. According to Narshakhl (text, 29, trans., 33) these walls were begun in 616/922 and completed in 215/830. The town itself was not in the centre but in the western half of the area enclosed within the walls. After the time of Isma'îl b. Ahmad the walls were no longer kept in repair. At a later period the ruins of these walls were given the name Kanparak, and as Kampir Duwâl ( "wall of the old woman") traces survive to the present on the borders of the steps between the cultivated areas of Bukhâra and Karmina.

On the fall of the Samânids (892-990) the town lost much of its earlier political importance and was governed by governors of the Ilek Khâns or Karâkhânids. In the second half of the 9th/10th century Shams al-Mulk Nasr b. İbrahim built a palace for himself to the south of the city and prepared a hunting ground; it was called Shamsabad, but fell into ruins after the death of his successor, Khîdîr Khân. A musâlà was made of the hunting ground in 513/1121.

Even during the period of decline Bukhâra retained its reputation as a centre of Islamic learning. In the 6th/11th century a prominent family of scholars known as the Aî-i Burhân [see Burhân] succeeded in founding a kind of hierarchy in Bukhâra and making the area independent for a time. After the battle of Kâtâwin (5 Safar 536/9 Sept. 1141) the Karâ Khâtîy ruled Bukhâra through the sâdr (pl. sudr) or head of this family. The sâders maintained good relations with the pagan overlords and in 1207 took refuge with them when they were driven out of Bukhâra by a popular (Shî'î?) rising ("Avâlî, Lubâb, ii, 385). In the same year the city passed under the rule of Muḥ. b. Taqâşî Khâwârizm Shâh. He renovated the citadel and erected other buildings. According to Ibn al-Athir (xii, 239) Bukhara submitted to the army of Cîngiz Khan on 4 Dhu l-Hijjah 616/10 Feb. 1220. The citadel was not taken until 12 days later. The town was sacked and burned with the exception of the Friday Mosque and a few palaces. Bukhâra soon recovered and is mentioned as a populous town and a seat of learning under Cîngiz Khân's successor.

In 636/1238 a peasant revolt occurred under the leadership of one Maḥmûd Sarîb who posed as a religious leader. After initial successes, mainly against the aristocracy, the revolt was suppressed by the Mongols (cf. Diuwayni, i, 86, trans. J. A. Boyle, 100). Little is known of early Mongol rule in Bukhâra; mullas and sayyîds, like the clergy of other religions, were exempted from all taxation. A Christian Mongol princess even built a madrasa called the Khânîyya in Bukhâra at her own expense (cf. Diuwayni, iii, 9, trans. Boyle, ii, 552).

On 7 Radjab 671/28 Jan. 1273 Bukhâra was taken by the army of Abâkâ, Mongol Il-Khan of Persia, and the city was destroyed and depopulated. It was rebuilt and again ravaged in Radjab 716/19 Sept.-18-Oct. 1316 by the Mongols of Persia and their ally the Câghâtâî prince Yasawîr. Bukhâra seems otherwise to have been of no importance in the political life of Transoxania under the rule of the house of Câghâtâî or later under the Timûrids. The Kitâb-i Mulkâsâd of Muḥ. al-Fârâbî, written in the 9th/10th century, gives information about the town in this period (cf. Frye in Avicenna Commemoration Volume, Iran Society, Calcutta 1955). Bahâ al-Dîn Nâkhbândî (d. 791/1389) and his order of dervishîs [see Nâkhbândîyya] flourished in Bukhâra. Ulugh Bêg (d. 853/1449) built a madrasa in Bukhârâ in the centre of town.

Towards the end of the year 905/summer 1500 Bukhâra was taken by the Uzbeks under Shlbâni, from whose title of Khân and remained with them till the Russian Revolution except for two brief periods, after 916/1509 when Shlbâni was killed, and in 1153/1740. The dominions of the Uzbeks were regarded as the property of the whole ruling family and divided into a number of small principalities. Samârkhân was usually the capital of the Khân (usually the oldest member of the ruling house), but the prince who was selected Khân retained his hereditary principality and frequently resided there. Two princes of the house of Shlbâni, ʿUbâydi Allâh b. Maḥmûd (ruled 928-946, 1322-1339), and ʿAbd Allâh b. Iskandar (ruled 964-1006/1557-1598) had their capital in Bukhâra. Through them Bukhâra became again a centre of political and intellectual life. The princes of the next dynasty, the Dînârîs or Ashtarshânîs, also ruled from Bukhâra while Samârkhân lost its importance.

The materials for the history of Bukhâra during the Uzbek period are mostly in manuscripts, such as the Taʾrîkh-i Mîr Sayyid Sharîf Râkhîm from 1113/1703, the Bâdâr-i al-Wâbîsî of Wâsîfî, and the Bahâr al-Arsâr fî Manâkîb al-Âlîyâr of Amîr Wâl (on these works see Storey, 361 ff.). A. A. Semenov has translated into Russian two important works on Uzbek history of special value for Bukhâra, the Ubaydalla-name of Mir Mukhammed Amin Bukhârî, Tashkent 1957, and Mukhammedon istorîyas of Mukhammed Yusuf Munshî, Tashkent 1957.

From the 17th and 18th centuries there was trade intercourse between Russia and the Uzbek principalities. In the 17th and 18th centuries all merchants and emigrants from Central Asia whose settlements were to be found as far as Tobolsk were known to the Russians as "Bukhartsi". The same name was also extended to the inhabitants of Chinese Turkistan which was called "Little Bukharia".

The reign of Khân ʿAbd al-Azîz (1055-91/1645-80) was regarded by native historians as the last great period of their history. After him various princes made themselves independent and the Khân in Bukhâra ruled only a small portion of his former kingdom, and even there the authority was rather in the hands of an Atâlik ruling in his name.

In 1153/1740 Nadîr Shâh conquered Bukhâra but after his death it regained its independence but under a new dynasty, for the Atâlik Muḥ. Râhîm of the tribe of Manîkî had himself proclaimed Khân. His career has been recorded by Muḥ. Wâfî Karînî on the title Twâfî al-Akhrîs. His successor Dânîyâr Bêg was content with the title of Atâlik and allowed a sanâdawâr called the Khânîyya in Bukhâra to bear the sovereign title. His son Murâd or Mir Maṣûm, however, claimed the royal title for himself in 1199/1785 and called himself amîr.

Under his successor Haydâr (1215-1242/1800-26) the observance of religious ordinances was much more harshly enforced than under his predecessors. He was the last ruler of Bukhâra to strike coins in his own name till the last amîr. His successor Naṣr
Allāh (1242-1277/1827-1860) succeeded in strengthening the power of the throne against the nobles and in extending his domains. The native chroniclers agree with European travellers in describing Nasr Allāh as a bloodthirsty tyrant. Instead of tribal levies a standing army was created.

In 1258/1842 the capital of the rival Kāhāhāte of Khokand was taken but the conquest could not be held. When Nasr Allāh’s successor Murāfār al-Dīn (1860-1885) ascended the throne the Russians had already secured a firm footing in Transoxania. After being repeatedly defeated the Amir had to submit to Russia and give up all claims to the valley of the Sir Daryā which had been conquered by the Russians. He had to cede a part of his kingdom, with the towns of Dīzak, Ura-tūbe, Samarqand, and Katta Kurgān (1868) to the Russians. In 1873, however, Bukhārā territory was increased in the west at the expense of the Kāhāhāte of Khīwā. In the reign of ‘Ābd al-Abād (1883-1901) the boundary between Bukhārā and Afghanistan was defined, England and Russia agreeing that the river Pandj should be the boundary. The relationship between Bukhārā and Russia was also defined during the same reign. Beginning 1887 a railway was built through the amīr’s domains but the station for Bukhārā, ten miles away, is now a town called Kagan. In 1910 Mīr ‘Ālim succeeded his father after having been educated at St. Petersburg. He ruled until the Revolution drove him to Afghanistan where he lived in Kābul till the end of World War II. Since the Revolution Bukhārā has become part of the Uzbek SSR with its capital in Tashkent. It has become a large cotton producing area vying with Farghāna and other parts of Central Asia in cotton production.

The archæological and topographical investigation of Bukhārā has made great progress from the 1930s, and the work of Shīkhīn, Fugachenkova, Sukhareva, and others, has greatly added to our knowledge. The existing architectural monuments of Bukhārā which are of importance are: 1) the “so-called” mausoleum of Ismā‘īl ʿAbānī from the 4th/10th century; 2) the minaret-i kalān, 148 ft. (45.3 m.) high (6th/12th century); 3) Mosque of Maqākī Attār (the last construction of which dates from 1547); 4) Mosque of the Namāzgāh (musalla), dating from 1119 A.D.; 5) Mausoleum of Sayyid al-Dīn Bukhārā (d. 1261); 6) Mausoleum at the site of Čaḥmā Ayyūb (end of 14th century); 7) Madrasa of Ulūgh Bēg, restored in 1585; 8) Maṣjid-i kalān, 16th century with the older minaret nearby; 9) Madrasa Mir ‘Arab (of 1535); 10) Maṣjid Khwādja Zayn al-Dīn, many times restored. Other monuments exist in great numbers outside the town, mostly in ruins.


(B. W. BARTHOLOWE[R. N. FRYE])

AL-BUKHĀRĪ, MUHAMMAD B. ISMĀ‘ĪL

Abū ’l-Ma‘ālī ’Allāh al-Dīn al-Makki, Arabic writer who in 901/1535 composed a treatise on the eminence of the Abyssinians (after al-Suyūtī and others), entitled al-Tirās al-Munabbī fi Mathān al-Hā‘ābī and existing in numerous manuscripts. The work has been translated by M. Weisweiler, Buntes Prachtgewand . . ., Hanover 1924; extracts from the text in Bibliotheca Bodleiana cod. miss. or. coll., ii, 2163. An extract, by Nūr al-Dīn al-Ḥalābī (d. 1044/1635?); 8 al-Ḥalābī, Nūr al-Dīn) was printed in Cairo, 1307.

Bibliography: Flügel, in ZDMG, v, 8t, xvi, 606-709; Brockelmann, ii, 504, S ii, 519. (C. BROCKELMANN)

AL-BUKHĀRĪ, MUHAMMAD B. ISMĀ‘ĪL

Abū ’l-Mu‘āhib B. Bardizbāgh Abū ’abd Allāh al-Dū‘ūfī, a famous traditionalist, b. 1294/1879, d. 1360/1928. In 1873, however, Bukhārā was taken but the conquest could not be held. When Nasr Allāh’s successor Murāfār al-Dīn (1860-1885) ascended the throne the Russians had already secured a firm footing in Transoxania. After being repeatedly defeated the Amir had to submit to Russia and give up all claims to the valley of the Sir Daryā which had been conquered by the Russians. He had to cede a part of his kingdom, with the towns of Dīzak, Ura-tūbe, Samarqand, and Katta Kurgān (1868) to the Russians. In 1873, however, Bukhārā territory was increased in the west at the expense of the Kāhāhāte of Khīwā. In the reign of ‘Ābd al-Abād (1883-1901) the boundary between Bukhārā and Afghanistan was defined, England and Russia agreeing that the river Pandj should be the boundary. The relationship between Bukhārā and Russia was also defined during the same reign. Beginning 1887 a railway was built through the amīr’s domains but the station for Bukhārā, ten miles away, is now a town called Kagan. In 1910 Mīr ‘Ālim succeeded his father after having been educated at St. Petersburg. He ruled until the Revolution drove him to Afghanistan where he lived in Kābul till the end of World War II. Since the Revolution Bukhārā has become part of the Uzbek SSR with its capital in Tashkent. It has become a large cotton producing area vying with Farghāna and other parts of Central Asia in cotton production.

The archæological and topographical investigation of Bukhārā has made great progress from the 1930s, and the work of Shīkhīn, Fugachenkova, Sukhareva, and others, has greatly added to our knowledge. The existing architectural monuments of Bukhārā which are of importance are: 1) the “so-called” mausoleum of Ismā‘īl ʿAbānī from the 4th/10th century; 2) the minaret-i kalān, 148 ft. (45.3 m.) high (6th/12th century); 3) Mosque of Maqākī Attār (the last construction of which dates from 1547); 4) Mosque of the Namāzgāh (musalla), dating from 1119 A.D.; 5) Mausoleum of Sayyid al-Dīn Bukhārā (d. 1261); 6) Mausoleum at the site of Čaḥmā Ayyūb (end of 14th century); 7) Madrasa of Ulūgh Bēg, restored in 1585; 8) Maṣjid-i kalān, 16th century with the older minaret nearby; 9) Madrasa Mir ‘Arab (of 1535); 10) Maṣjid Khwādja Zayn al-Dīn, many times restored. Other monuments exist in great numbers outside the town, mostly in ruins.

also contains other material, such as on the beginning of Creation, on paradise and hell, on different prophets and, in greater detail, on Muhammad, on Kur'anic commentary, etc. Although al-Subki includes al-Bukhari among the Shihâb, this is not accurate, for he did not hold consistently the doctrine of any particular school. The titles of the bâbân are meant to indicate the subject-matter and teaching of the traditions they contain, but al-Bukhari has sometimes been criticised because the contents of the traditions do not always seem to be relevant to the title. Some bâbân have a title but no traditions, which may mean that al-Bukhari drew up the scheme of his book and left blanks when he had no scound traditions to illustrate a particular subject, hoping that he might yet find some relevant material of sufficient authority. There have been many commentaries written on the whole or part of the Shihâb, notable among which are those of al-Ayni, Ibn Haldar al-Askalânî and al-Kâtâlînî. While the Shihâb was considered in al-Bukhari's time as just one among others, it was soon recognised as outstanding, and by the 4th century it came to be placed along with Muslim's Shihâb at the head of collections of Sunni tradition. In time, although criticisms have been made on matters of detail, it was accepted by most Sunnis as the most important book after the Kur'an; but in the West there was a tendency to prefer Tâlîmîn's Shihâb. Al-Bukhari wrote his Tavâkhâr, which gives biographies of the men whose names appear in isnâds, when a young man, saying he wrote it on moonlight nights at the Prophet's tomb. Other smaller works are detailed by Brockelmann. In his lifetime al-Bukhari was recognised as an outstanding traditionist, noted for his minute knowledge of detail and his perspicacity in detecting defects in traditions.


**BUKHÂRLIK** (or Bugharlits of Siberia). A small ethnic group, Muslim (Sunni of the fiânaî school), made up of the descendants of merchants and caravanners originating from Turkestan and established in western Siberia since the 16th century, when the commercial relations between the Emirate of Bukhârâ and Siberia were flourishing.

The Bukhârlîs live in contact with the Tatars of Siberia [q.v.] to whose Islamisation they have contributed, and with whom they are gradually mingling. They live principally near Tobol'sk, Tumen and Tarâ, and an isolated group of Bukhârlîs are found close to Tomsk. In 1926, the Soviet census numbered 12,012 of them. The Bukhârlîs speak the local Tatar dialects, but with the difference that they preserve in their own speech a large number of Persian terms. They employ the Tatar of Kazan as their literary language.

Bukhârlî (Ar.; also vocalised bakhârî, bakhâlî, bakhâlî, bukhalî and bakhîlî; pl. bakhâhlî; less often bakhîlî, pl. bakhâhlî) mean respectively 'avarice' and 'avaricious, miserly'. Just as in the ancient poems the virtue of generosity is constantly sung, so avarice furnishes a theme for satire which is widely exploited by the poets, though it seems that this fault, at least in its most sordid forms, was scarcely widespread among the ancient Arabs. It is however a fact that it is castigated in a number of Kur'ânic verses aimed at combating avarice in the full sense (xvii, 102/100; lii, 24) or simple hoarding (ix, 35, civ, 1 ff.), or at the encouragement of generosity in general (ix, 77/76; lix, 9) and almsgiving in particular (iii, 40/38, 175/180; iv, 127/128; lxv, 16 ff.); moreover, numerous hadâds against avarice are attributed to the Prophet, especially ayyâ da'ârâ adwa 'min al-bakhlî?). These condemnations and exhortations, however, seem to result less from an absolute moral principle than from the necessity in which the newly-founded Islamic community found itself of receiving spontaneous gifts and then of collecting regularly the contributions of its members (see Sàdakà, Zakât, and cf. bâb al-zakât in the hadâd-collections).

After the conquests the Arabs were brought by the entry into Islam of new racial elements into contact with peoples of a somewhat different temperament, and when, brought before the bar, they had to put up a defence, shrewder minds did not fail to sing out the generosity of the Arabs in order to contrast it with the avarice of the non-Arabs. It is doubtless not by mere chance that, under the 'Aabâsî, it is the Kûrânsâns who supply the analogies with anecdotes about misers. The relationship: generosity=Arabs/avarice=non-Arabs takes practical shape in the polemics of which al-Dâjjîz gives several specimens in his remarkable Kîdâb al-bakhlâh, the first and probably the only attempt in Arabic literature to analyse a character and portray him through anecdotes, though with political undertones. This psychological analysis which had its origin in al-Dâjjîz, was ignored by later writers who, in their adab-books and then in the popular encyclopedias, confined themselves to reproducing the Kur'ânic verses, hadâds, anecdotes, and poems about misers (see for example Ibn ʻAbd Rabbih, ʻIbâd, passim; al-Abghûlî, Mustârraf, i, 233), but omitting, however, to mention that history knows but four (sic) Arab misers: al-Ḥûṣayn, Ḫumayd al-ʻArâqî, Abu ʻl-Aswad al-Duṣâlî, and Khalîl b. Šafwân. (C. Pellar)

Bukht-Nâsî shar, the Neuhchadnessar of the Bible. The Kur'ân does not mention him. He is a very complex figure in Muslim tradition and here we can record only the outstanding points. It retains in the first and probably the only attempt in Arabic literature to analyse a character and portray him through anecdotes, though with political undertones. This psychological analysis which had its origin in al-Dâjjîz, was ignored by later writers who, in their adab-books and then in the popular encyclopedias, confined themselves to reproducing the Kur'ânic verses, hadâds, anecdotes, and poems about misers (see for example Ibn ʻAbd Rabbih, ʻIbâd, passim; al-Abghûlî, Mustârraf, i, 233), but omitting, however, to mention that history knows but four (sic) Arab misers: al-Ḥûṣayn, Ḫumayd al-ʻArâqî, Abu ʻl-Aswad al-Duṣâlî, and Khalîl b. Šafwân. (C. Pellar)
Temple) and some elements of a folklore character (an obscure Babylonian man of the people, for a long time hopelessly ill, he believed that he heard his future glory proclaimed and achieved it by his intelligence and a remarkable concurrence of circumstances). In the second place he is found forming part of the epic cycle of the ancient kings of Persia (the deformation of the name of which Bukht-Nasār is the result seems to indicate some imaginary Iranian etymology); he is then reduced to the rank of satrap (masābān) of Bīghtāsāb or of his father (Lūhrāsāb), or even of Bahram, the son of the first named. In the third place he is said to have led an expedition against the Arabs (to which Kurānān uses 111 fl. would refer). There is perhaps here a memory of Nabonidus's settlement at Taymānī (cf. above, art. AL-‘ARAS) combined with that of Arab infiltrations into the region of the Euphrates. Al-Maṣūdī and al-Bīrūnī know an era of Bukht-Nasār (cf. the article of Carra de Vaux in EJ). Al-Bīrūnī sought also to disentangle the chronological difficulties raised by the confused traditions of which he had knowledge.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Kūtayba, Ma‘arī, i, 23-4; Tabari, i, 643 ff.; Masūdī, Murādī and Tanbih, index; Pseudo-Balḥāšī, al-Badī wa l-ta‘rikh, ii, 140-54, iii, 46-8, 93-5; Thalhibī, Arādīs al-maḏjalis, 192-205; Bīrūnī, Aṯur, 25, 27, 301 (Chronology, 28, 31, 297); P. Tannery, Recherches sur l’histoire de l’astronomie ancienne, Paris 1893, 153, 162.

**BUKHTISHŪF,** the name borne by several physicians of a celebrated Christian family originally established at Diūndaysābūr. It was from there that Djiḏrīs b. Djiḏrīl b. Bukhtishūf, who was director of the hospital of this town and well known for his scientific writings, was called to Baghdād in 148/765 to attend the caliph al-Manṣūr, ill with a stomach complaint. By successful treatment he won the confidence of the sovereign, who asked him to remain in the capital, but he wished to revisit his native land in 152/769.

Bukhtishūf b. Djiḏrīs, to whom his father had left the direction of the hospital at Diūndaysābūr at the time of his departure for Baghdād, was called in his turn to the capital when the future al-Hāḍī was gravely ill, but the hostility of al-Khayzarūn, who favoured the physician, difficulties raised by him from establishing himself there. Nevertheless, in 171/787, Ḥārūn al-Raṣḥīd, suffering violent pain, had him brought back to Baghdād and appointed him physician-in-chief, a post which he held until his death in 185/798.

Afterwards Djiḏrīl b. Bukhtishūf, whom his father had recommended to Djaḏrīt al-Barmakīsīd in 175/791, succeeded in 190/805 in winning the confidence of the caliph, following a successful treatment of one of his slaves, but he fell into disgrace during the last illness of Ḥārūn at Tūs, because he did his duty as a doctor with too much frankness. He was condemned to death by the caliph because of the accusations of a bishop, but was saved by al-Fadl b. al-Rabūf, who stayed the execution of the sentence, and he then became al-Amīn’s physician. At the time of al-Maṣʿūdī’s triumph he was imprisoned, not to be set at liberty until 202/817, when al-Hasan b. Saḥil had need of his services. Three years later he was again in disgrace, and was replaced by his son-in-law Mihkhaḥī, but was recalled in 212/827 because Mihkhaḥī was unable to cure an illness of the caliph. He was reinstated, and his goods, confiscated after his fall, were restored, but he had not long to enjoy the prince’s favour for he died the same year, and was buried at al-Madā’in in the monastery of Sirgūs.

His son Bukhtishūf, who took his place, accompanied al-Maṣʿūdī on his expeditions into Asia Minor, then, under the caliphate of al-Wāḥīkī, was exiled to Diūndaysābūr. Recalled during the caliph’s last illness, he arrived in the capital too late, but remained there highly esteemed for twelve years, under al-Mutawakkīl, until his exile to Bahrain. He died in 216/830.

Bukhtishūf had a son, ‘Ubayd Allāh, who was a finance official of the caliph al-Muhtadīr, and whose fortune was confiscated after his death by the caliph and his widow married a physician, and his son Djiḏrīl followed in the footsteps of his fathers, but received his training only in Baghdād, where he had betaken himself penniless after his mother’s death. Having treated an envoy from Kīrmān successfully, he was called to Shirāz by the Buwayhid ‘Aḍūd al-Dawla, but returned to Baghdād, which thereafter he only left for short periods of consultation, during which the offer of the Fāṭimid al-A‘ṣrī who wished to establish him in Cairo. He was, however, retained at Mayyāfārīkūn by the Marwānīd Mumahhīd al-Dawla Abū Manṣūr who had summoned him there, and he died on 8 Ramadān 396/8 June 1006.

Abū Sa‘īd ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Djiḏrīl, a friend of Ibn Butlān [i.e.], lived at Mayyāfārīkūn and died in the second half of the 3rd/10th century, leaving some known works, in particular a dictionary of medico-philosophical terms and a treatise on love.

Another member of the family, Bukhtishūf b. Yahlīs, was physician to the caliph al-Rādī and was held responsible for the death of prince Hārūn in 324/936.

**Bibliography:** Fihrist, 266; Ibn Abī ‘Usayyībī, ed. Müller, 123-48; Kīfī, ed. Lippert, 100-4, 132-51, 158-60; Djaḏshīyārī, K. al-Wuzārāt, Cairo 1938, 225-6; Tanbihī, al-Farādī, Cairo 1938, ii, 113-4; al-Sūfī, Abī Ḥātēr al-Rādī, tr. Canard, i, Algiers 1946, 70 n. 1, 130; Leclerc, Histoire de la médecine arabe, i, Paris 1876, 370-4; E. G. Browne, Arabian Medicine, Cambridge 1921, 23, 57; Brockelmann, i, 676, S I, 414, 885-6. (D. SOURDEL)

**BÜKIR** [see ARĪRIG].

**BUKOVINA** [see KHOΤIN].

**BUKHARAT** [see SUPPLEMENT].

**BÜKRESI (Bucharest)** a town in Wallachia on the Dâmbovița river about fifty km. north of the Danube. It is mentioned for the first time in 769/1368 by the name of Cetatea Dâmboveți, a name used since by side with Bucharest until the 15th century, when it became the seat of the Wallachian princes. Vlad the Impaler issued documents from there in 865/1459 and 865/1461 and Radu the Handsome, the prince installed by Mehmed II in 866/1462, established himself in that town, protected by a Turkish garrison from Giurgiu. For more than two centuries the history of Bucharest was linked to the relations of the Romanian princes with the Porte. Those princes who rebelled against Ottoman suzerainty preferred Târgoviște, less exposed to Turkish raids. At the end of the 16th century, Bucharest witnessed the massacre of Michael the Brave's creditors and Sinān Pasha's occupation. Solely tried by the revolts against the Turks, as well as by epidemics and fires, the city had a turbulent history, With the Treaty of Berlin (1877) the last vestiges of Ottoman suzerainty disappeared. The peace conference convened at Bucharest in 1913 relieved Turkey of the greater part of her European possessions.
Information on the population during the earliest periods is lacking. The sources mention the presence of Greek, Armenian and native merchants. Towards 1590/1640 Bucharest had 12,000 houses; fifteen years later only 6,000 are mentioned, and Ewilya Celebi speaks of 12,000 houses and 1,000 shops. During the 17th century the population of Balkan origin increased, and became quite significant in the 18th. Popular revolts broke out, inspired by members of corporations discontented with the competition of foreign traders protected by the Phanariot princes. At the end of the 17th century the town had 50,000 inhabitants. The number varied between 20,000 and 60,000 for the end of the 18th and between 30,000 and 100,000 for the first half of the 19th.

Absorbed for three centuries in the Ottoman Empire, Bucharest acquired an oriental imprint which became stronger under the Phanariots during the 18th century, when the town became an important centre for the study of Greek. The princes initiated the publication of religious books for Christians in the Ottoman Empire, and monastic revenues provided for the monasteries of Athos, Constantinople, Trebizond and the Holy Land. The Austrian and Russian occupations introduced the first occidental influences and a knowledge of French, which, in the first half of the 19th century, supplanted Greek. Under the impact of ideas engendered by the French Revolution, the town became the centre of the struggle for the political unity of Roumania which led to the union of Moldavia and Wallachia (1859).


BUKŪM, al- (sing. Bašmil, a tribe in Western Arabia, traditionally held to have descended from Al-Azd. Although considered a Hijāzī tribe, the Bukūm range over the region east of Al-Ṭāfīf and in the vicinity of the lava fields of Harrat Hadd and Harrat al-Bukūm, where the boundaries between the Hijāz and Najd are not clearly defined. The tribe is estimated to have close to 10,000 people, of whom less than half are nomads. For at least several centuries a majority of the Bukūm have been engaged in oasis cultivation in the district of Wādi Turaba (also Turaba), with the town of Turaba (N. 21° 14', E. 41° 37') being their main centre of population. The Bukūm are subdivided into two sections: al-Maḥāmīd and Al Wāzīf.

During the early period of Wahhābī expansion, the Bukūm were partisans of the Sharīf Ghālibī in his wars against Najīd. From 1228/1813 the Bukūm defended their territory against the troops of Muhammad ʿAlī, the Ottoman Viceroy of Egypt, during which campaign a woman named Ghaliyya notably distinguished herself. The Bukūm finally surrendered and Turaba was occupied in 1230/1815. In the early years of the present century the loyalty of the Bukūm was divided between ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Ibn Saʿūd and the Sharīf Husayn, the Maḥāmīd having declared for the Sharīf, while Al Wāzīf fought for Ibn Saʿūd. The Maḥāmīd surrendered to Ibn Saʿūd after his victory at Turaba in 1337/1919, and members of both sections of al-Bukūm participated in the later Saʿūdī campaigns in the West.


BULĀK, a small town quite close to the Cairo of Mamlūk and Ottoman times, and its port on the Nile for traffic with Lower Egypt. It was built on the sand which the Nile left when its bed shifted one to one-and-a-half kilometres westwards between the time of Saladin and the 8th/14th century [see AL-KĀHIRA]. It was separated from Cairo by the Nāṣīrī canal, dug in 725/1325 by the sultan Muhammad b. ʿAlāʾūn, who encouraged people of affluence to build their villas (mansūra) at Būlāk, to which were added later mosques, hammāms, etc. The customs transferred there from Cairo. About 1800 Būlāk had some 24,000 inhabitants, 24 mosques (including that of Abu ʿl-Sāhir, a place of pilgrimage and maṣṣuṭ), ‘okelles’, dépôts for agricultural products, shipyards, etc. Muhammad ʿAli built workshops and foundries there, designed to modernise Egyptian life. Būlāk is well known for its printing works, the first established in Egypt after the short-lived ones of Bonaparte’s expedition. A small Egyptian team, trained at Milan, returned in 1821 with presses. In 1822 the Būlāk Printing Press was able to work at full capacity, under the direction of Nicolás al-Masābkī, of Lebanese origin (d. 1830). Owned by the state, modernised several times, it was transferred to private ownership in 1862 (to ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Rūshdī Pāhīn, then in 1865 to a son of the Khedive Ismāʿīl). The state took it over again in 1880, and it was further developed after 1894 under Egyptian direction, under Egyptian Egyptian once more. It was founded for army needs (manuels, etc.) and for the administration (official journal, al-Wākīn’ al-Misriyya) and was an important factor in the modern Renaissance. It printed on its own account or on that of individuals translations and numerous classical works in Arabic, Turkish, and Persian, and some books in European languages. The rapid growth of the private presses which made Cairo the centre of the Arabic book trade eventually deprived it of the virtual monopoly which it enjoyed. At the present time Būlāk is no longer anything more than a quarter of modern Cairo.

Bibliography: Makrizī, Khuldsat al-Tāfīf, Cairo 1324, iii, 227-25; 235; Description de l’Égypte, xviii (part 2), Paris 1820, 472-76; J. W. McPherson, The Mouïads of Egypt, Cairo n.d. (after 1940) Abu ‘l-Futūḥ Ridwān, Tārīḥ majāba′l Būlāk, Cairo 1953, where full references will be found. (J. JOMIER)

BULANDSHAHR (BARAN), an ancient town in India situated in 28° 15' N. and 77° 52' E. on the main road from Agra and Aligarh to Meerut. Population (1951) was 34,496. Its old name was Baran (by which it is now sometimes called but only in the nīsba Baranī) given to it by its legendary founder, one Ahībaran. Its antiquity is
established by the discovery of inscribed copper-plates of the 5th century A.D. and coins of much older dates. It came to be called Bulandshahr ("hightown") from its elevated position near the bank of the Kali Naddi, which flows past the town. This name is clearly Muslim and appears to have been given to the town sometime during the Mughal period, although Sudjan Ray's Khuldsat al-Tawdrlkh (compiled as late as 1107/1695-6) still mentions it as Baran. It was conquered by Mahmud of Ghazna in 409/1018 when the Hindu Radja, Har Datt, offered submission and accepted Islam with 10,000 of his followers. The town was restored to Har Datt whose descendants forsook Islam and Candra Sen, the last of the line, was killed while defending the town in 590/1193 against Kutb al-DIn Aybak, a general of the Ghurt Sultan Muhammad b. Sâm, who bestowed it as an ikthd* [q.v.] on his son-in-law and successor. Djaypal, a kinsman of Candra Sên, accepted Islam and was rewarded, for betraying the garrison to the invaders, with the headmanship of the town. His descendants still flourish in Bulandshahr. During the reign of Muhammad b. Tughluq [q.v.] it was the centre of a peasants' rebellion; this was ruthlessly suppressed by the king who laid waste the country all around and perpetrated horrible atrocities on the residents of Baran. In 802/1400 the rebel Amir Ikbâl Khan (Faḍl Allâh Bakhl) took refuge here when he rose against Sultan Nasir al-DIn Mahmûd (644/1246-665/1266). In 810/1407 the town was occupied by Sultan Ibrâhîm Shah Shard of Djownpur (805/1399) but he had to vacate it hastily on learning that Munâfîr Shah I of Gudjarat was about to attack Djownpur.

Thereafter nothing is heard of the town as it continued to enjoy a period of peace and tranquillity during Mughal rule. Awrangzib's proselytising zeal won a large number of converts, mostly among the Radjputs, in and around Bulandshahr. During the 12th/18th century when the entire country was disturbed the Marâthas overran and captured Bulandshahr and administered it from Koli ("Alligarh"). With the fall of the fort of Alligarh, Bulandshahr came into the possession of the British in 1818/1853. During the upheaval (Mutiny) of 1857 the town was badly disturbed and Walâdâd Khan of Mâlâgâr drove out the British garrison and assumed the reins of government. He and his confederates, the Gudjârs and Muslim Râjpûts, proved irreconcilable enemies of the British and surrendered the town only after a five months' resistance. This town is familiar to students of Indo-Pakistan history as the birth-place of Diya al-DIn Barani [q.v.], the scholar-historian of the 9th/14th century. There are some very old mosques and tombs including a dargâh that of Khâdîja Lâl Barani, which was built in 590/1193 to commemorate the Muslim victory. A small town at the commencement of the British rule, it is now a thriving centre of trade and commerce.
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(A. S. BAZMEE ANSARI)

BULAY, the Arabic transcription of Poley, the old name of a stronghold in the south of Spain the site of which (as has been shown by Dozy, Rech.4, i, 307, on the strength of information supplied by a charter of 1258) is the modern Aguilar de la Frontera, a small town in the province of Cordova, 12 miles N. W. of Cabra and of Lucena. The town, which played a considerable part in the rising of the famous Umar b. Hafsûn [q.v.] against the Umayyad amirs of Cordova, is again mentioned in the 6th/12th century by the geographer al-Idrisî.


(E. LÉVI-PROVENÇAL)

BULAYDA (BLIDA), a town in Algeria 51 kms. S.-W. of Algiers, at the southern end of the plain of the Mitidja. There was no ancient settlement on the site. It has been identified with the town Mitidja known in the Middle Ages, which was ruined at the time of the campaigns of Banû Ghâniya (beginning in the 7th/13th century). According to tradition the place which in 942/1535 was called Bulayda (little town) was founded by a religious personage known as Sidd Ahmed al-Kabîr. He, after many wanderings, came to stay in the valley of the Wâdi al-Rumâmân, nowadays the Oued el-Kebir. He was joined by his disciples, then by Andalusians coming from Tipasa fleeing from the attacks of the Kabyles of the Chenoua. Sidd Ahmed al-Kabîr obtained from the Ulâd Sultan who occupied the region the land necessary to build homes for the new arrivals. The beylerbey of Algiers, Khayr al-DIn, made of this settlement a veritable city, by providing it with a mosque, hammâm, public baths and bazaars. Bulayda prospered quickly thanks to the Andalusians, who planted orange orchards around it and applied there methods of irrigation of their own country.

Under Turkish domination Bulayda formed part of the dâr al-sulûl, that is to say the region administered directly by the bey of Algiers, who was represented there by a bakîm of Turkish origin. A detachment of janissaries had a garrison there. The population, composed of the descendants of the Andalusians, Moors, Jews, and Mozabites, was renowned for its urbanity and love of pleasure. A saying attributed to Sidd Ahmed b. Yüsûf praises it and calls it Urîda (little rose). The town offered a pleasant sojourn to the élite of Algiers, who were interned there found their exile easy to hear. It suffered many earthquakes, of which the most severe almost entirely destroyed it in 1827. The town was shaken again by a tremor in 1865.

After the occupation of Algiers by the French, Blida remained for some time independent under the administration of its bakîms. It was effectively occupied in 1839.


(G. YVER-[G. MARÇAIS])
BULBUL, the nightingale. To the nightingale belongs a large place in Oriental literature, particularly Persian and Turkish literature. The characteristics of the bird are its beautiful voice and its tuneful and harmonious song. In the season of roses it laments the whole night long; the hours before dawn are enlivened by its singing. It is in love with the rose. This love is its most outstanding characteristic. Its other characteristics are grouped around this.

In Persian literature the nightingale is treated according to the poet's inclination. In some it sings of figurative love which has no aim, in others of figurative love which is a stage on the path to real love. To understand its meaning in Sufi writing, we must look at the Mantık-i Taşrī, written in the year 583/1187-8 by one of the important Sufi writers of Persian literature, Farīd al-Dīn Āṭṭār (died 607/1209). In this work the nightingale's main characteristic is that it is drunk and ready to lose its material substance because of the perfection of its love for the rose (see Garcin de Tassy, Le langage des oiseaux).

The Persian poet Khwādžū Kirmānī (679-752/1280-1351), in a work entitled Rawdat al-Anwār, represents the bird of the meadow (murgh-i zamān) as a bird tried by passion and desire, that sings at night and drives away sleep; then he likens the nightingale and the rose to the fabulous lovers Wāmiḵ and Āḏḏārā. In a ḥīfā of Sa’dī of Shirāz (died 690 or 691/1291-1292), who speaks of the nightingale fairly often especially in his ghazals, the poet treats the moth as the real lover. Ḥazīn-i Lāhījī (died 1180/1766) makes clear the contrast of the nightingale and the moth, saying, "The nightingale complains because it has only just learnt of love. We have never heard a sound from the moth". Mawānān Rūmī-ī Barizī has a work too (tadhkira) of Shāh Muhammad Kāzwīnī which contains disputes between nightingale and rose, candle and moth. The Persian poet Zamān-ī Yazdī also confronts the nightingale and the moth.

Hāfīz (died 791/1386) raises the nightingale somewhat towards real love in this verse: "Settling on the cypress branch last night the nightingale chanted the lesson of spiritual stations with the Pahlawi warcary", One of the poets of the circle of Mahmūd of Ghaṣna, Farrūqī-i Sistānī (died 470/1077), also imagines the nightingale on a cypress branch: "Nightingales are khatībūs reciting ḥudūs upon trees". "Now the nightingale recites the Taʿwārī on the cypress.

In one of his ḥasīdas Manūcēhrī (died after 423/1034) gives its song a religious significance, saying "On the rose branch the nightingale performs the ḥalādī". In Anwārī (died after 580/1184) a characteristic of the nightingale is its eloquence; "The nightingale catching the scent of spring has grown eloquent, the rose entering the garden has grown fresh".

The Persian Sūfī poet Muḥammad Shīrīn Mağribī (died 809/1404) likens the soul to the nightingale, fallen into the cage of flesh. Here the cage of flesh is the spirit, that has fallen from the world of unity into the world of elements. Another Sūfī poet, Kamāl Khudjmāndī (died 803/1400), brings out another characteristic of the nightingale in the verse: "Kamāl recites no ghazals unless he has fallen in love with a face of roses. The nightingale does not sing when it is not drunk". Sa’dī too in one of his ghazals puts spring and the nightingale side by side: "The trees are in bud, the nightingales are drunk, the world has grown young, the lovers are lost in joy and merrymaking". He views the nightingale essentially as the harbinger of spring. The giver of bad news is the owl. Hilālī-ī Caghatāy (died 939/1532) also makes this contrast in the verse: "The nightingale nests in the garden, the owl in the ruins, everyone makes his home according to his desires". It is appropriate in this connexion to mention the proverb: "Of the nightingale's seven chicks only one becomes a nightingale" (Dihkhuda, Āmālī wa Ḥikām).

The nightingale has provided an opportunity for more delicate and refined conceits among poets writing in the 'Indian style'. In this literature with its generally Sūfī colouring, the nightingale occupies a position between figurative and real love. The seventeenth century poet Shawkat Buğhāri sings thus of the nightingale in one of his ghazals: "How long will the beloved fail to recognise the lovers that are its prisoners? As the nightingale sorrow's and sheds its tears its nest comes to resemble a basket of roses. The rose branch is a seat that gives rest to the nightingale's aching head".

The idea that the nightingale is hunted and caged because of its beautiful voice has passed into literature; thus in a verse of Begdīl (1134-1105/1722-1781): "Because of its lament it is captured and deprived of its freedom".

The bird is encountered in the oldest Turkish literary texts. In various Turkish dialects the nightingale is called as follows: in the Kutadgu Bilig, sanval, sinvaal, sanduval. In other dialects saducal (gec, Kuz), sandigal (Tel.), sandval (Rab.), sanduval (S.S.). In his Dictionary, Shakh Sulaymān Buğhāri Caghatāy mentions this as a bird like the nightingale and explains that it is the canary. The verse in Kutadgu Bilig (1069/1707) "The nightingale sings in the flower garden in thousands of voices (hasār destān) as though reciting the Māzāmir night and day" (v. 78) recalls the Pahlawi warcary and the Tawādī just as we found in Persian literature.

Entering the Islamic period, Turkish literature in time lost the sanduval and used in its place the words sandalih, hasar (only in classical literature), and bülbul (in both classical and folk literature). In folk literature the nightingale is the lover of the rose, it is a stranger, in spring time it sings at night and before the dawn (Karadja Ogłan). In both folk and classical literature the nightingale in the cage is like the soul in the body. The characteristics of the nightingale in Turkish Divān literature may be seen in the mathnawi "The rose and the nightingale" composed by Fadlī for Sultan Suleymān's son Mustafā (960/1553). According to this work the nightingale "is a heart-sore and agitated dervish, love is its nature. Its voice is lovely, its ways are pure and charming. It is a witty fellow, a drinker. Love is the place of its frequenting. Love has set a polish on the mirror of its heart. Its dress is a dervish's cloak of felt (namad) so that the mirror inside the felt may not grow rusty". After numerous adventures the nightingale and the rose are united. In this work Fadlī uses the nightingale to express a purely Sūfī idea. In this allegorical treatment the nightingale is the heart, the rose the spirit.

When we come to Divān literature of the seventeenth century, the nightingale is a lover consumed by the fire of love. This is embodied in the poetic concept that the rose resembles fire in its colour, and kindles the nightingale and burns it to ashes. The nightingale is the colour of ash. There is a pun
between gul, rose, and kül, ash. The elimination of the material existence of the lover (tossing up his ashes) is an idea that comes from Sufism. Consequently the likening of the nightingale to ashes is an idea that comes from Sufism. Consecutively the likening of the nightingale to ashes has become so firmly established that the word bhakhista, ash, has come to mean nightingale.

The ghazal with the rediif "bulbul" by Na'îlî (died 1634) and Naqshî (died 1674) are both major works of the literature of that period, tending towards the Indian style. The last verse of Na'îlî's ghazal reveals to us the Şifî connexion of the nightingale and the rose.

In the 18th/19th century Nedîm (died 1743/1730) mentions this bird in a number of his poems. In a ghazal with the same rediif he writes: "Do not suppose that the nightingale's nest is filled with bloody tears. That nest is a pot of red ink made ready to write down the secrets of longing. Do not fancy that the cup-bearer of spring poured dew upon the rose; he filled the nightingales' cup with rahî!"

After the Tanjimdât, in the poets of the Âdîgîm-e-i Shawkâr who imitated older literature, the nightingale shows no new development. Like Maghibî among Persian poets, one of these, Herseker bî Yaṣîr Işık (1839-1902), in a poem entitled Ḥabî-b-i Ǧâlî, treats the nightingale from an entirely Şifî point of view. Reşîdî's poem with the rediif "bulbul" bears the somewhat shallow marks of his melancholy temperament and tender poetic gift. In these there is nothing new. But ʿAbd al-Ḥaḳḳ Hâmil [q.v.] in the nastâre he wrote to Herseker's Ḥabî-b-i Ǧâlî, and in the poem Walking through Hyde Park, produces new ideas appropriate to his age with regard to the nightingale: "In the morning it recites the adhîn. Its nest in the darkness is a sublime symbol for patriotism. Its songs have become the model for love-bhâstas. The form of its expression is as new as modern literature (teddîddu edebiyydti). It is God's poet. Its bâstâdas are read from the page of nature" (Nastîne Ḥabî-b-i Ǧâlî).

(Âlî Niḥât Tašlân)

BULDUR [see burdur].

BULGARIA, a country in the Balkans. It drew its name from the Bulgars, a people of Turkic origin, who first invaded Europe under Asparukh or Isperikh in 679 A.D. and founded an independent state in the Byzantine province of Moesia. Adopting Orthodox Christianity from Byzantium (865) and identifying themselves with the native Slavs who had previously settled Bulgaria, the Bulgars built up a strong empire in the Balkans which extended from the Danube to the Adriatic Sea under Çzar Symeon (977-997).

The first Islamic accounts of Bulgaria belonged to this period through the reports of Muslim al-Diarrîl (about 231/85), Harûn b. Yahyâ (349/960) and İbrahîm b. Yaṣîkub (349/960). Harûn reported (in Ibn Rusta, ed. De Goeje, 127) that the Christianized Slavs, al-Salûbîa al-Mutanâssîra, had adopted Christianity after Sûn, the ruler of the Bulgars. Incorporated into the Byzantine empire between 1018 and 1186 Bulgaria was organised in two themes, the theme of Bulgaria with its centre at Skoplje (Şşkub) and that of Paristrion or Paradun-avon with its centre at Silistrâa.

The invasion and settlement of the Cumans in the lower Danube prepared the way for the creation of the so-called second Bulgarian empire under the Asenids (1285-1320).

In 1362 Michael VIII, the Byzantine emperor, took Anchialus and Mesembria from the Bulgarians and settled in the Dobrudja the Anatolian Turks who had taken refuge in Byzantium with ìzz al-Dîn Kaykawsîî [q.v.]. Most of them returned to Anatolia in 707/1307 and those who remained were thought to be the ancestors of the Gagauzes [q.v.]. (P. Wittek, Yastîlgüllü: Ali on the Christian Turks of the Dobruja, in BSOAS, xiv/3).

Terter I (1279-1300) recognised Noghay's [q.v.] overlordship (1285) and gave his daughter in marriage to his son Çaka, who later took refuge in Trnovo and seized his father-in-law's throne (1300), but soon was killed by Terter II (1300-1322).

In the contemporary Arabic sources (Baybars, Zubdat al-Fîbira, in I. H. Izmirli, Altnordus ..., Ist. 1941, 221; Abu 'l-Fidâ, 295) Bulgaria is shown as the land of the Ülak. We know that Kalojan had called himself imperator totius Bulgarie et Vlachie (G. Ostrogorsky, Hist. of the Byzantine State, 358). It appears that the Christianised Cumans in Bulgaria, must have been shown under the general term of Vlach.

The Shishmanids (1323-1395) came to the Bulgarian throne with Shishman, a Cuman magnate in Vidin.

The Anatolian ghâzi Turks came in contact with the Bulgarians when Aydınlâhî Ümûr [q.v.] allied himself with Cantacuzenus. First in 742/1341 Ümûr aided him against Ivan Alexander, the Bulgarian Çzar, and, then, on 12 July, 1345 destroyed Momcilo, the Bulgarian adventurer who had been dominating the Rhodope region (P. Lemere, L'Emirat d'Aydin, Paris 1957). The Ottomans replacing Ümûr in his alliance with Cantacuzenus appeared to come into contact with the Bulgarians first in 753/1352 when these came to support his rival John V. After the conquest of Edirne [q.v.] in 764/1364 Lâlâ Shâhîn seemed to be active in the direction of Zagora (Berrhoea) and Filibe [q.v.] (different dates in the chronicles: 762/1362, 765/1364, 766/1365), but the Byzantine-Bulgarian clash in 765/1364 is thought to be connected with an Ottoman-Bulgarian agreement. In 766/1365 Çzar Ivan Alexander divided his realm between his two sons: Stratsimir got the Vidin region and Shishman the Czardom of Trnovo. Dobrotîc in the Dobrudja and Varna were actually independent [see dobroudja]. The same year Hungary seized Vidin, threatened Trnovo, and Amadeo of Savoy not only occupied Ottoman Gallipoli but also Mesembria, Sopolis and Anchialus for Byzantium in 767/1366. With Ottoman auxiliary forces Shishman tried to recover Vidin (769/1368), and gave his sister Thamar in marriage to Murâd I. According to the Ottoman chronicles (see Sa'd al-Dîn, j, 84-87) the Ottomans reached the main Balkan passes by taking Kılıklâğaç-yenidje, Yânîbol (Iambol), Karîn-ovâl (Karnobat), Aydos (Aitos), Sö zbellow (Sopolis) under Timûrtaşî in about 770/1368. İhtiman and Samakov under Lâlâ Şahîn in 772/1370 and 773/1371. Filibe on the one side and the Yânîbol-Karîn-ovâl region on the other were then the main ügls [q.v.] where the ākânlîs, Yûrîks [q.v.] and Tatars were settled in large numbers. Nîgh was taken by the Ottomans only in 787/1385 (Nehri, Taeschner ed. i, 58). Sofia was still in Shishman's hands in 780/1387 (C. Jireček, Gesch. der Bulgaren, Prague 1876, 339). It seemed to surrender between this date and 787/1385. In 789/1387 when Murâd I found that his vassals Shishman in Bulgaria and Ivanko in Dobrudja were not on his side against the Serbians he hastily sent an army under ʿAli Pasha to
secure his rear. Our information on this expedition comes from Neshrl and Ruhl who both used here a detailed and well informed source, and there is no need to change its chronology (cf. F. Babinger, Beiträge zur Frühgesch. der Türkenherrschaft in Rumelien, Munich 1944, 29-35). In the winter of 790-1/1388-9 ‘Ali Pasha took Provadia (Pravadi), Venčan, Madera and Shunnul (Shumen) and passed the winter in the latter. In the spring of 791/1389 he sent Yakhsul Beg against ‘the son of Dobrudja’ in Varna, then went to meet the Sultan in Vânboll. Shishman came there, too, and made his submission to Murad I. But on his return he did not surrender Silistre (Silistria) to the Ottomans as he promised. Upon this ‘Ali appeared before Timnova (Trnovo), Shishman’s capital; ‘the infidels brought him the keys of the city’ which meant submission. Accepting the submission of several other towns on his way ‘Ali came and laid siege to Nikeboll (Nikopol, Nicopolia) where Shishman had taken refuge. He asked a pardon which was granted. ‘Ali was to join Murâd’s army.

After the battle of Kossovo Bâyazid was detained in Anatolia while Mircea, supported by Sigismund, took Silistria and the Dobrudja and made a successful raid on the akla of Karh-ovaš, in 793/1391. Only in 795/1393 was Bâyazid able to come and take Trnovo by force (6 Ramadan/17 July) and he also subjugated the Dobrudja and Silistria. But still Shishman was left in his stronghold, Nikeboll, as a vassal. He then appealed to Sigismund; this caused Bayâzid’s invasion of Transylvania and the battle of Argeš against Mircea (26 Rađajab/17 May, 1395). We find in a newly discovered document (Topkapâ Sarayî Archives, Istanbul, no. 6374) the following ‘Crossing Arapesh river Yildirim Khan came before the fortress of Nikeboll the ruler of which was a lord named Shishman. He was paying tribute to the Sultan in the same way as the Vojvode of Wallachia. The Sultan asked him to send ships, which he furnished. As soon as the Sultan was on the other side he fetched Shishman, beheaded him, and seized Nikeboll and transformed it into an Ottoman sanâbîf.‘ The Slavic sources (see J. Bogdan, Archív J. slav. Philo., xiii, 496) dated Shishman’s death as 12 Sha‘bân 797/23 June 1395 which fits in with the Ottoman evidence.

The battle of Nikeboll (24 Dhu ‘l-Hijdžja 798/28 September 1396) sealed the fate of Bulgaria. After his victory Bâyazid invaded Stratimir’s Vidin too. He settled in Vidin, Silistre and Nikeboll the powerful aqîl of Vânboll against Hungary and Wallachia. In 847/1443, when a Hungarian army advanced into Bulgaria, the Bulgarian re’dîd and voynuks in the region of Sofia and Radomir joined the invaders, who appointed a ‘Vladika’ in Sofia for them. They were soon repressed by the Ottomans (see Inalcık, Faith Devri, Ankara 1954, 20).

During this period, and especially after 805/1402, Bulgaria became stronglyottomanised. In Eastern Bulgaria the Muslim population was definitely in the majority as the surveys of 1520 show (see O. L. Barkan, Akitat Fâhîleste Mecmuası, vol. xi, map). In 859/1455 in Filibe there were four thousand Muslim households as against 50 non-Muslim. Bulgaria was divided into the sanâbîs of Çirmen, Sofya, Silistre, Nikeboll and Vidin in the eyalet of Rûmeli [q.v.]. In the 11/17th century the sanâbîs of Nikeboll and Silistre were included in the eyalet of Özi which was created against the Cossacks. Its capital was Özi and Silistre. The sanâbîs of Silistre included Pravadi, Vânboll, Harsova, Varna, Aghyboll (Anchialus), Aydos, Karh-ovaš and Rûsl-quaš (Rhoukoskastro) in 924/1518. Bulgaria was put under typical Ottoman administration with the re’dîd [q.v.] system (see the laws and regulations in O. L. Barkan, Kâmûl-i Devrîd, Istanbul 1943, 255-285). Most of the members of the pre-Ottoman military class were integrated in the Ottoman military organisation (see my Faith Devri, 136-138, promiçars as imârî-holders, woiniks as Ottoman voynuks [q.v.]. As to the bulk of the Bulgarian population, they were given the status of gümni re’dîd [q.v.]. But among them many groups enjoyed financially a special status as derbandddjîs (guardians at the mountain passes; Silistria) or suppliers of rice, meat etc. for the palace or army (see ʿawārîd), and the Dewżiîme [q.v.] was also extensively applied in Bulgaria.

As Istanbul and the army were dependent for a great proportion of their food supply on Bulgaria the government put restrictions on the export of the Bulgarian meat. In 973/1565 the appointed sheep owners in western Bulgaria were ordered to provide 174,200 sheep for the construction of the warships at Akhyoli in 979/1571 (A. Refik, Türk İdersinde Bulgaristan, Istanbul 1933, document no. 3). The rice production in the upper Marişa (Merici) valley brought to the state as muhâçîna [q.v.] a yearly revenue of about one million akâ (20 thousand gold ducats) in about 888/1483 (T. Gökbilgin, Edirne ve Paşa Livası, Istanbul 1952, 131). Timber from Shunnul, Hezargrad, Timnova (Trnovo) and iron from Samakov were supplied for the construction of the warships at Akhyoli in 979/1571 (A. Refik, doc. 19, 22). An industry of cloth and felt developed in Filibe, Shunnul and Islîmîye (Sliven) in this period which was exported in other parts of the empire (A. Refik, doc. 18). Bulgaria experienced neither an enemy invasion nor an insurrection from 1450 to 1595. The Bulgarian towns, especially Filibe, Sofya and Silistre, developed as military and commercial centres on the main routes in Rûmeli [q.v.]. In these cities new Muslim districts sprang up around Diâmî’s, ʿimârîs, bedestâns and bazaars with rich muhsîs (see Ewliya Celebî’s detailed description in 1061/1651, vol. III, 301-421, and H. J. Kissling, Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thrakiens im 17. Jahr., Wiesbaden 1956). According to the Ottoman census in 1520 (see O. L. Barkan, JESHO, vol. I, Part 1, 1957, 32) the sanâbîs of Silistre, Çirmen, Nikeboll, Vidin and Sofya had about 125 thousand households altogether excluding the population in the places belonging to Paşhâ in Bulgaria.

From the end of the 16th century onwards the rate of several taxes was raised and the complaints of the Bulgarian re’dîd from the exactions of the local officials and soldiers began (A. Refik, doc. 37, 38, 41, 42, 46, 47). In 1014/1605 the re’dîd of the Sofya region complained that the agents of the Patriarch were trying to raise the rate of duties from 6 akâ to 12 for the re’dîd and from 60 to 400 for the local priests (A. Refik, doc. 38). The first important uprising in Bulgaria took place at Velikof-Trnovo in 1003/1595 when Michael, Wallachian Prince, made successful raids in Bulgaria. Sinân Paşhâ [q.v.] put down the insurrection and thousands of Bulgarians took refuge in Wallachia. Also from this time on the Bulgarian kayâdkâs or ephîbîyâs begin to be mentioned more frequently in the Ottoman sources (A. Refik, doc. 52, 54, 75). Now almost with every enemy invasion the re’dîd were joining them and when they withdrew large groups of re’dîd followed them in spite of the assurances on the part of the Ottoman government (for example in 1109/1698 the re’dîd of the region of...
Bulgaria — Bulghar

In 1150/1737 the reýd of the region of Íznil (Znepolje) (A. Refik, doc. 59) in 1208/1793 those of the region of Ismail and Stanišnaka). In 1304/1899, seventy or eighty thousand Bulgarians followed the Russian army to settle in Bessarabia; in 1861 ten thousand of them left their home for the Crimea.

In the second half of the 18th century the aýán were particularly powerful in Bulgaria. As mutalasims [q.v.] and hereditary possessors of the large state lands, eýilik [q.e.], they became real masters of the country since the government had to rely on them to collect the taxes of the reýd and most powerful of them such as Trestenik-oglu Ismáíl, Bayrakdar Mustafá [q.v.] in Rusdük, Ḵadjí Umar in Herzograd even maintained private armies to which the Sultan had to have recourse at critical moments (A. Refik, doc. 90). The Rhodopes and the Balkan mountains sheltered an increasing number of bands called Kızyl in this period. Profiting from this anarchy a soldier of fortune, Pazwand-oghlu or Pasban-oghlu ʿOṯmân [q.v.] rebelled, and then, as the Pasha of Vidin, ruled over Western Bulgaria between 1212/1797-1212/1807 (Diewadt, Taʻrīḫ, vii, 237, 240, 250, viii, 146-48). Under Mḥmød II [q.v.] the aýán were eliminated and the central authority was established in Bulgaria. In the period of the Taʻṣṣifiat in 1263/1846 Bulgaria was reorganised as the eydilat of Silistre, Vidin, Nísh with the provincial councils in which the Bulgarian representatives were admitted. But the administrative reforms did not prevent unrest among the Bulgarians. An insurrection in the Nísh region in 1257/1841 and a more violent one in the Vidin region in 1266/1850 broke out partly because of the provocation of the revolutionists in Serbia and Wallachia, and partly because of the abuses of the eýilik system maintained there by the Muslim aḡás or gospodars (see my Taʻṣṣifiat ve Bulgar Melesi). Ankara 1943.

Many observers in the middle of the 19th century (N. V. Michoff, La population de la Turquie et de la Bulgarie, 3 vols. Sofia 1915-1929) came to the conclusion that one third of the population of Bulgaria was Muslim. Out of this about 400 or 500,000 were the Fomak (Pomatsi), the native Bulgarians who had adopted Islam in the 16th and 17th centuries, in the central and western parts of Bulgaria, and the Rhodopes. Muslims were in the majority in the cities of Filibe Vidin, Shumn, Rusdük, Razgrad, Varna, Plevne, Osman-bazar, Eski-druma, Yeni-zaghrá and in the minority in those of Gabrovo, Nísh, Sofya, Tírnova, Karnobat (Karín-ovasi) by 1293/1876. After the Crimean war the Bulgarian government had settled in Bulgaria 70 or 90,000 ĉerkés and about 100,000 Tatars (in A. H. Miḥdāt, Miḥdāt Pağa, Cairo 1322/1904, 35: 350,000 immigrants). Tension between these and the native Bulgarians was exploited by the Bulgarian revolutionists who had finally organised a Central Committee of Revolution in Bucharest in 1868/1869. In 1281/1864 the new administrative reform was for the first time applied in Bulgaria. The sandjak of Rusdük, Varan, Vidin, Tülçi (Tülka), Tírnova (Trnovo) formed the wilyat of Tuna and those of Sofya and Nísh that of Sofya. Miḥdāt Pağa [q.v.], first governor of the wilyat of Tuna, made it the most progressive province of the empire (A. H. Miḥdāt, 24-56). Although the tax revenue of the wilyat increased fifty per cent under his administration, the peasantry had to pay more and do forced labour for the construction of the new routes. In 1285/1870 the struggle for an independent Bulgarian church resulted in the establishment of the Exarchate which was regarded as a national victory. In the same period the increased activities of the Bulgarian revolutionists, ļomlāğdāğ, supported actively by the Russians, resulted in the great insurrection of 1293/1876 (April-May). Bulgaria became the main field of operations of the Ottoman-Russian war of 1293/1877. It caused an exodus of the Muslim population to the south. With the Treaty of San-Stefano Russia attempted to create under her protection a great Bulgaria from the Danube to the Aegean Sea. But the great powers replaced it by the Treaty of Berlin which created a principality of Bulghıristan Emârâtı, under the Sultan’s suzerainty, and the autonomous Province of Eastern Rumelia (Rûmeî-i Şarkî Vilâyeti). It united with the Principality as a result of a revolution in Filibe in 7 Dhu l-Ḫidijâ 1302/18 September 1885 (A. F. Türkgeldi, Mesal-i Miḥimmit-i Siyâsîyye, Ankara 1957, 193-246). At the time of the revolution of 1326/1908 in Istanbul Prince Ferdinand declared the independence of Bulgaria and assumed the title of Czar (7 Ramadân 1326/3 October 1908).


(H. Inalcić)

Bulghár, in Islamic literature the name of a Turkic people by whom two states, one on the Volga, the other on the Danube, were founded in the early middle ages.

Early history: The original Bulghars seem to have arrived in the south Russian steppes with one of the Hunnic waves. They are mentioned for the first time by Joannes Antioch. (Miiller, Frgm. Hist. Graec. iv, 619) in the year 481 A.D., when they helped the Emperor Zeno in his fight against the Goths. The centre of the Bulghár country was then the steppes in the vicinity of the Kuban river and the Maeotis (Azov Sea), but some of their hordes dwelled also in the region of lower Danube and in the Caucasus. In the Byzantine chronicles
their original country, Kuban, is known as Great Bulgaria (Theophanes, Nicephorus). After the death of Khán Kuvrat in 642 A.D. the unity of these Bulghars was brought to an end under the pressure of the growing power of the new Khazar kingdom. One section of the Bulghars remained in their ancient settlements on the Kuban and in the Maeotis till the 10th century. At this time this country was called by Constantine Porphyry. (De adm. imp., 12, 42) “Black Bulgaria” and the Russian chronicles give them also the name of “Black Bulgars”. This section of the Bulghars did not play any great part in history and was probably absorbed by the successive waves of Magyars, Pechenegs and Kumans. By far the greatest group of Bulghars, under Khán Ispërukh, left their home country in 678 for the Balkans and the Danube, where they founded a state among the South Slavonic tribes. In a comparatively short time the numerically weak group of Turkic Bulghars was assimilated and absorbed by the more numerous Slavs. In Islamic sources this state and its inhabitants are known as Burdjan.

The third and smallest group had retreated along the Volga to the north (this fact is now confirmed by archaeological data) and settled down by the confluence of the rivers Kama and Volga. There they subjugated the Finnish aboriginal population and founded a new state. This group are the Bulghar of Armenian, Bulkär of Persian sources, and this name is applied also to the country and to the capital of their state.

Sources: Our outstanding authority on the Bulghar is Ibn Faḍlān, who in 309-10/921-22 took part in an embassy sent by the Caliph al-Muqtadīr billāh to the Bulghar king. A little earlier is the source preserved in Ibn Rusta, Ḥālid al-ʿĀlam, Gardīzī, al-Bakrī and Marwāzī. Some decades younger than Ibn Faḍlān are the accounts of al-ʿIstāḥqārī, al-Maṣʿūdī and al-Mukaddasī, and from the second half of the 4th/10th century we have the report of Ibn Ḥawkāl. Beside these main sources we find some few remarks in other Arabic and/or Persian works, such as those of al-Burānī, Bayḥakī, Ibn al-Nadīm etc. In the 6th/12th century Bulghar was visited by Abū Ḥamīd al-Andalūsī and two centuries later by Ibn Baṭṭūṭa; but the report of the latter is not free from the suspicion of invention. The historians of the Mongol epoch, such as Ibn al-ʿAṯīr, Abū ʿl-ʿFidaʾ, Ṣaqrī, al-Dīn, Diwānī and others, inform us about the end of Bulghar state. European sources are represented only by the Russian chronicles, which are valuable for the time before the Mongol invasion and after. As our sources come chiefly from the 4th/10th century, the following picture of the internal state of affairs in Bulghar is drawn mainly from these and applies to later times only indirectly.

 Territory and population: The centre of the Bulghar kingdom was formed by the triangle between the Volga and the Kama and the country south of the confluence of both these rivers. As to the frontiers of the Bulghar territory, our sources leave us entirely in the dark, and chapter 52 in the Ḥālid al-ʿĀlam (erroneously captioned Būrṭās) is totally useless in determining its neighbours. Nevertheless, we can gather some indications about these neighbours and their relation to the Bulghar kingdom.

To the north lived various Finno-Ugrian tribes, as Wēu (in Russian sources Vēs, today Veps) and Yūra (Russ. Yugra); both of them at different times were under Bulghar domination, at least nominally. In the east, the Baṣdīr (Baškīrs) were subject tot he Bulghars, and to the south-east some Pecheneg and Qāzū tribes led their nomadic life quite independently of the Bulghars. Between the Bulghars and the Khazars, in the forests, dwelled the more primitive Būrṭās/Būrdās, probably ancestors of the Mordva; they were subject to the Khazars and the object of frequent raids by the Bulghars and in later times also incorporated in the state of the latter. According to al-ʿĪṣṭāḥqārī it was 15 days' journey from the land of the Khazars to the land of the Būrṭās and thence another 15 days' to the limits of this people, probably to the north-west.

To the west lived various Slavonic (Russian) tribes, but the limits of their eastern colonisation are uncertain. That some of these were in the 10th century subject to the Bulghars is evident from the fact that the Bulghar ruler is frequently called by Ibn Faḍlān melk al-ʿĀlamī (king of the Slavs).

The Bulghars were divided into many hordes and groups, known under different names to Islamic authors. Barsūlī, Iṣṭīkūl (or Askīl) and Bulkār are the three main groups named in Ibn Rusta and his epigons and Ibn Faḍlān mentions, apart from Askīl, the tribe of Suwār and a group or a large clan, called al-ʿBarāndārūl, who were already Muslims and had a wooden mosque. In the forests dwelled the subjugated Finnish tribes and in the towns (at a later period) a mixed population formed by merchants and craftsmen from Russia, Khazaria, Central Asia and even from Baghdad.

Political institutions: The Bulghar ruler bore the title ylīlwawar (in Ibn Faḍlān ylīlwaw) a Turkic title known also in the form ilteber from the Orkhon inscriptions. This title indicates the status of a lesser prince, vassal of a khābān, in this instance of the Khazar khābān, and shows also that the Bulghar country originally formed only part of a greater empire and that their ruler was not entirely independent. The Bulghars paid to the Khazars a sable for from each house as a tax, and their dependent status was manifested also by the fact that a son of the Bulghar king lived at the court of the Khazar khābān as a hostage. These feudal relations were probably loosened by the Bulghar alliance with the caliph in Baghdad, but it seems that only the fall of the Khazar empire in 965 allowed them to become an absolutely independent state. The Change of the position of the Bulghar ruler after the alliance with the Caliphate is expressed also in the change of the old title ylīlwawar to the new one amir as a symbol of the cessation of the former allegiance to the Khazar khābān.

The state of Bulghar did not form a political unity, since the tribal leaders (Ibn Faḍlān calls them mulāk) did enjoy a large independence and freedom; this is apparent from Ibn Faḍlān's report of the refusal of the mulāk of the tribe Askīl to obey an order of the king. Although the Russian chronicles mention continuously only one Bulghar state, we read sub anno 1183 of a war waged by one Bulghar prince, allied with the Romans, against the Great Town of Bulgaria and in the Mongol epoch that another 'state, that of Zhukotin (Djuke-Tau), was founded.

In Ibn Faḍlān's time the relation of the ruler to his people was still quite patriarchal. He used to ride through the capital (a town of tents) alone, unaccompanied by a bodyguard or escort; at the sight of their ruler his subjects rose from their seats and bared their heads. The ruling class was formed, besides the family of king and the tribal leaders, of 500 important families.

Economy and trade: Until the first half of
the 10th century the Bulghars led a nomadic life, like other Turkic peoples in the Russian steppes, and cattle-breeding was their chief occupation and the foundation of their economy. This is clearly shown in the earlier sources, for according to Ibn Rusta the taxes were paid in horses. Ibn Faḍlān already found the society in a state of change from nomadism to settled life. Many customs of the former way of life were then still surviving, i.e., no permanent capital served as the seat of the ruler, who wandered from one place to another and lived in a large tent. Al-Iṣṭakhrī mentions that the inhabitants spent the winter in wooden houses and the summer in tents. In the latter part of this same century Bulghār was already a flourishing agricultural and trading centre.

The chief products were millet, wheat and barley (Ibn Rusta, Ibn Faḍlān) and these formed also the main food together with horse-meat. From the produce of their fields the people paid no sort of taxes to the king. According to archaeological finds agriculture played a leading role, and for export. At a later period Bulghār leather (the modern Russian leather yuft?) and the Bulghār shoes (Pers. maʿāz-i bulghārī) were particularly well-known, especially in the East. Archaeology has brought to light many other industrial products such as copper-ware, ceramics, jewels and implements of a comparatively high degree.

The main source of the country's wealth was, however, international trade. The river Volga is one of the most ancient trade-routes in the world and the favourable site of the town of Bulghār at the cross-roads of east-west and north-south trade was fully exploited. The Bulghārs themselves traded mainly in the north and in a lesser degree also in Central Asia, but the importance of Bulghār was due in the first place to its function as a meeting-place of foreign merchants, Russians, Chagars, and Muslims. The king levied a duty of 10% on all water-foreign merchants, Russians, Khazars, and Muslims. This was made by dumb barter (see Ibn Fadlan, Birunī, Al-Mukaddasī, 325, gives a long list of Bulghār exports: furs of many different kinds, horse and goat skins, shoes, kalansuwa, arrows, swords, armour, sheep, cattle, falcons, isinglass, fish-teeth, birch wood, walnuts, wax, honey and Slavonic slaves. Many of these items are mentioned also by other sources and as Ibn Rusta, al-Iṣṭakhrī, Abū Ḥāmid etc.

From Islamic countries the chief imports were textiles, arms, luxury goods and ceramics. There was also silver money current which had been imported from Muslim countries, this money being used to buy the goods of the Russians and Slavs. From the beginning of the 10th century the chief dinars there were in Bulghār imitations of Sāmānī dirhams, with the name of the original mint and original date, but with the name of the Bulghār amīr Miḥrāb b. Ḫaṣib (probably the son and successor of Qaṭīfā r. ʿAbd Allāh, the ruler in Ibn Faḍlān's time). From 337/948-49 we have the first dirham from a Bulghār mint (Suwar), struck in the name of Thiʿb b. Abū Ḥāmid, and further coins till the year 357/ 968. Other coins bear the names of Muḥammad b. Abū Ḥāmid (366/976-77), struck in Suwar and Bulghār, and of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan (between 366/976-77 and 370/980), struck in the same mints (see Vasmer, Wiener Num. Ztschr. 57, 1924, 63 f.). Besides the names of the rulers there also appear on the coins the names of ʿAbbāsid caliphs.

At the time of his visit Ibn Faḍlān did not notice any towns or villages, as the Bulghārs was a nomadic life. It seems that the building of the fortress, which was one of the principal tasks of the Baghdaḍi embassy, laid the foundation of the future town of Bulghār. The non-existence of towns in Bulghār prior to the embassy is confirmed on the one hand by the silence of the Ibn Rusta group of sources about these, and on the other hand by the use of the name Bulghār: this name signifies to Ibn Rusta and Ibn Faḍlān always the country or the people, never the town. Al-Iṣṭakhrī is the first author who mentions the existence of the towns Bulghār and Suwar, with wooden buildings and mosques and 10,000 inhabitants. This account is then repeated by all subsequent authors with some small additions (Hudūd al-ʿAlam: 20,000 inhabitants; Gardizi: 500,000 families). The Russian chronicles know a number of Bulghār towns, but owing to their lack of details it is impossible to ascertain their locations. The most important of these towns was Velikiy gorod Bolgary (the Great town of Bolgary), which is mentioned many times in the chronicles.

During the past half-century the Russians have undertaken numerous archaeological excavations on the sites of the ancient towns in Bulghār territory. The ruins near the village of Bulgarskoie, a distance of 6 km. from the Volga, show a high culture in the 13th and 14th centuries. All the buildings such as palaces, mosques, baths as well as the walls were of stone; the town had a circumference of about 6 miles and was surrounded by suburbs to the north and west. It must have had a population of some 50,000 souls at this time. The more recent discoveries in Bilyar and Suwar are richer than those in Bulgarskoie and it seems that Bulghār (i.e., the ruins at Bulgarskoie) was the capital only in the 10th and 11th centuries and then in later times its rôle was transferred to Bilyar in the central part of the country, on the river Cheremshān. Which of these two was the "Great town of Bolgary" of the Russian chronicles is difficult to tell.

Religion: According to our oldest sources (Ibn Rusta, ca. 300/912, but with an older account) Islam was well established amidst the Bulghārs and there were some wooden mosques on their territory. This is fully confirmed by Ibn Faḍlān, who during his visit found many Muslims, mosques, and a khaṭīb and muʿāḍāhān. The early Arabic sources are silent about the beginning of islamisation in Bulghār and only the 12th century traveller Abū Ḥāmid relates a legendary account, connected with a popular etymology of the name Bulghār; this
legend, however, is not known to the later Tatar traditions. One of the purposes of the Baghdad law, the building of a mosque and a minbar in the islamisation of the whole city. It seems that this task was successfully accomplished. It was from Central Asia that Islam first reached Bulghar; the manner in which the adhan was performed clearly followed the madhhab of Abu Hanifa, then ruling amongst the Central Asian Turks. Because Ibn Fadlan followed the Shafi'i madhhab, a dispute arose between him and the Bulghar mu'adhdhin, backed by the king. The Bulghars remained true to their Hanafi madhhab throughout the whole of their history. In towns there were mosques and Friday mosques, and the Hudud al-'Alam confirms that the inhabitants of Bulghar and Suvwar were zealous fighters for the faith. According to Mas'udi (Murugj, ii, 16) a son of the Bulghar king had made the pilgrimage to Mecca during the reign of al-Muqtadir; another proof of the religious zeal of their rulers was the presentation to Sabzawar and Khusrawjud, of a gift in 415/1024 by the Bulghar amir Abu Ishak b. Ibrahîm b. Muhammad b. B.I.t.wâr (see Ta'rikh-i Bayâk, ed. Tehran, 63). It seems that the Bulghars exercised a decisive influence on the conversion of nomadic Turkic tribes, such as Pechenegs and Kumans, to Islam, and they also nurtured hopes of spreading the Muslim faith in Russia, in the 10th century still pagan. In the year 986 an embassy was sent to Kiev in order to convert prince Vladimir to Islam and some time later this same ruler, searching for a suitable religion for himself and his people, invited Bulghar Muslims to explain to him the principles of their faith and to take part in a religious disputation between the representatives of the chief religions.

This northernmost Islamic country posed some ritual problems, owing to the short days and long nights during the winter and vice versa during the summer. To perform the daily five prayers in a short day was not an easy task and it was impossible to hold to the prescribed times; similar problems arose in Ramadân. The peculiarity of this is found in other Islamic lands, soon attracted the attention of Muslim writers and led to lengthy discussions as to what should be the right solution of these problems. As late as 1860 the Kazan historian Mardjam wrote a treatise concerning this problem (see Togan, Ibn Fadlan, 170, where there are further references).

Language and literature: The language of the Bulghars, like that of the Khazars, has left very few remnants, mainly in toponymy and onomastics, and, beginning with the 12th century, also a fair number of epitaphs. The linguistic affinity of their language remained a problem a long time. Al-Istakhri, 225, tells us that the language of the Bulghars resembled the speech of the Khazars, but both are unlike the languages of Burtas and Ris. (An analysis of Kashghari's account of the Bulghar language together with a discussion of the whole problem is to be found in Fritsak, in ZDMG 109, 1959, 92-116). It is however, now established that the Bulghar language belongs to the so-called "Bolgarian" group of the Western (or West-Hunnic) branch of Turkic languages, the other groups being Ghuzz, Kipchak and Karluks. The "Bolgarian" group consists, apart from the Khazarian, of the following languages: 1) Proto-Bulgarian—the language of the Proto-Bulgarian inscriptions and of the so-called "List of Princes" of the Bulgars of the Danube, found in an ancient Russian chronicle (see O. Pritsak, Die bulgarische Fürstenliste, Wiesbaden 1955); 2) Kuban-Bulgarian; remnants of this language are found in loan-words in Hungarian, and 3) Volga-Bulgarian, the language of the epitaphs, written in Arabic script, found on the territory of Bulghar. The degree of affinity between this language and that of the modern Cuvâsh has not yet been satisfactorily investigated and explained. As the Cuvâsh have been very little affected by the highly developed Muslim culture of the Bulghars, it is improbable that they are descendants from these; a greater right to claim such descent belongs to the modern Kazan Tatars.

With the sole exception of the above mentioned tomb-inscriptions, dating from the 12th until the 14th centuries, we do not possess any remnants of literary activity of the Bulghars. Ibn al-Nadîm mentions in his Fihrist that the Bulghars, prior to their islamisation, used the script of the Chinese and of the Manichaeans, but no sample of this writing has come down to us. Abu Hamîd reports a Ta'rikh Bulghar, a work of Kâddî Ya'qûb b. Nu'mân al-Bulghârî from the beginning of 12th century; in the year 989/1581 Sharaf al-Dîn Husâm al-Dîn al-Bulghârî composed in the Tatar language a Risâla-Tawârikh-i Bulghar-ryysa, which contains nothing but fabulous stories about the propagation of Islam and the lives of saints; it was printed in Kazan in the year 1902.

History: The scarcity of our sources does not permit us to follow the course of Bulghar history closely. The Bulghars came into the light of written history only at the time of Ibn Fadlan's visit; at this period their ruler was yllawar Almush b. Shila, who subsequently changed his title and name into amir Diyarfar b. 'Abd Allah. The coins supply the name of his son and successor Mikall b. Diyarfar and also the names of another three rulers: Talib b. Ahammad, Mu'min b. Ahammad and Mu'min b. al-Hasan (for the dates see above, section on economy). The Bulghars remained till the fall of the Khazar khâkânate a vassal state of the latter. In the year 964 the country in the Volga basin was devastated by the Kievan prince Svyatoslav; an echo of this is found in Ibn Hawkal's story of the conquest of Bulghar, Burtas and Kazar in the year 358/968-69. This is, however, not the date of the Russian expedition but that of the year in which Ibn Hawkal received the information of these events. This invasion had no lasting effects on the prosperity of Bulghar; similarly the second Russian campaign, led by Vladimir, the son of Svyatoslav, in the year 985 did little damage. On the contrary, the Bulghar gained by the downfall of Khazar khâkânate; as the Russian armies after their victory retreated, the place of the mighty Khazars was occupied by the Pecheneg nomads, representing no real danger to the Bulghars. For a short period the relations between the Russians and Bulghar improved, as is shown by the trade treaty concluded in the year 1066 on equal terms. Yet both these states were in the same way interested in the fur trade in the north and this led to continuous fighting since the second half of the 11th century; Bulghar history is from this time a history of their wars with the Russians.

In 1088 the Russian town of Murom was captured by the Bulghars, but remained in their hands only for a short time. After this event they were on the defensive and on many occasions—in the years 1120, 1164, 1172, 1183, 1220—the town of Bulghar was
besieged by the Russians. Only two instances of a Bulghar offensive are mentioned: in 1107 they
sacked the town of Suzdal' and in 1218 they unsuccessfully attacked the town of Ust'yug, situated far
in the north. The further fighting with the Russians was interrupted for nearly two centuries by the
Mongol invasion.

Abū Hāmid, who visited the town of Bulghar and the Volga basin in the first half of the 12th century,
says nothing about political history except the statement, that in the town of Saḵšin on the lower
Volga there lived a Bulghar āmīr and stood a Bulghar mosque.

When the Mongols were returning to the east after the victory over the Russians on the river
Kalka (1224) they were ambushed by the Bulghars and suffered heavy losses (Ibn al-Athlr, xii, 254).
This was avenged in a most sanguinary fashion; in 1229 the Bulghar vanguard on the river Yayik
(Ural) was put to flight, and, in 1236 according to Muslim sources, in 1237 according to Russian
chronicles, the Mongols attacked the Bulghar state and destroyed the capital with all its inhabitants.

From then on the country of Bulghar formed part of the kingdom of the "Golden Horde", the
Mongol empire in the Eastern Europe [see BATU'IDS]. The capital Bulghar appears to have risen to a
flourishing condition in a relatively short time again; the archaeological finds show a high culture dating
just from this period, and the majority of the epitaphs is dated in the Mongol epoch. The subsequent
history of the country and the capital is very little known and we are not even told why and when
the town was abandoned by its inhabitants. It was not affected by Tūnūr's campaign of the year 1395,
but Bulghar was soon afterwards, in 1399, destroyed by the Russians. The town probably suffered more
from the rise of Kazan (called also Noviy Bulgar, New Bulghar), which was founded just before this
time by Batu-Khan, than from these wars. The selection of this town as capital of an independent
Tatar state, founded by Ulugh Muhammad (died 1446), sealed the fate of the town of Bulghar. Its
importance as the greatest market on the central Volga passed first to Kazan and then to the Russian
town of Nižnij-Novgorod (today Gorkiy).

The word Bulghar still remained in use in literature, though only as the name of a country, and as late
as the 19th century the Tatars called themselves Bulghars.

Bibliography: Muslim sources: Ibn Rusta; Ibn Faḍlān; al-Maṣūdī; Muḥaqqaq; al-Ṣaḥḥārī; Ibn
Ḥawkal; al-Mukaddasī; Hūdād al-‘Ilam; al-Birūnī; Gardizi; al-Bakrī; Abū Hāmid al-Andalusī;
Ṭabāqa (ed. Ferrand); idem, Muḥrib (ed. Dubler); Yākūt; al-Kazwīnī; Abu ‘l-Fadlādī; al-Mamāshī. For

BULGHAR-DAKH [see TOROS].

BULGHAR-MA’DEN [see TOROS].

AL-BULKÎNĪ family of Egyptian scholars of Palestinian origin, whose ancestor Sālih settled at
Bulqina in al-Gharibiyya.

(1) ‘Umar b. Raslān b. Naṣīr b. Šālih, Sīrat-Dīn Abu Ḫāṣa al-Kinānī, born 12 Shawwāl 724/4 August 1324, died 10 Dhu ‘l-Ka‘a’d 805/1 June 1403. He studied at Cairo under the most famous scholars of the day, including Ibn ʿAḍlī (q.v.), whose daughter he married, and served as mufti during Ibn ʿAḍlī’s brief tenure as Grand Kādī in 759/1358. Appointed mufti in the Dar al-ʿAdl in 765/1363, he became the most celebrated jurist of his age (cf. Ibn Khaldūn, Muḥaddith, ch. 6, § 7 [Quatrempère iii, 8]), but except for a short term as Slāhiyye Grand Kādī at Damascus in 769/1367-8 (made notable by rivalry with his teacher Tāj al-Dīn al-Sabkī) he was never promoted Grand Kādī, but only to the lesser (though lucrative) office of Grand Kādī ʿl-ʾAskar, in addition to a number of teaching posts. In later life, however, he was honoured with the title of Shaykh al-Islām, ranked along with or above the Grand Kādīs, and regarded by some as the "Mudjaddid of the eighth century". With his stupendous knowledge he was seldom able to finish any literary work, and besides a treatise on Maḥānām al-Šīrī as-Fīhil, he left only an
uncompleted work, al-Ṭadrīb, on Slāhīyye fīhil. He was the founder of the family’s madrasa in Hārat Bahā’ al-Dīn Karīkābī.

Bibliography: Sakāwī, Daw’ Lāmī, v, 85-90, 182; Ibn Ṭabaribardī, Nuḍūm (Popper) v (= Cairo xii), index; vi, 136; Manhal Šāfi‘ī, index by Wiet, no. 1723 (with family table and additional bibliography); Ibn Ḥadijār, Durar Kāmina, ii, 267, 427; Suyūṭī, Ḥums al-Muhādara, i, 148 (135); Brockelmann II 93, S II 110; Ibn Ḥadijār, Inbā‘ al-ʿQūnī (BM. MS. Add. 7321), 1434 A.H., b.

(2) Muḥammad b. ʿUmar, Badr al-Dīn, 759/1358-799/1398, eldest son of (1), succeeded him as
Kādī ʿl-ʾAskar and muftī Dār al-ʿAdl in 779/1377.

Bibliography: Ibn Ḥadijār, Durar Kāmina, iv, 105; Wiet no. 2288. His son, Tāj al-Dīn Muḥammad: Daw’, x, 172; Wiet no. 2350; and grandson, Wali al-Dīn Ahmad, kādī of Damascus: Nuḍūm, vii, 545; Daw’, ii, 188; Suyūṭī, Nazm al-Dīyān (Hittil), 90.

(3) Abū al-Raḥmān b. ʿUmar, Djalāl al-Dīn, 765/1362-824/1421, succeeded his brother Muḥammad as Kādī ʿl-ʾAskar in 793/1389. He lived in luxurious style, had a retinue of 300 mamlūks, and in 804/1401 obtained the office of Slāhīyye Grand Kādī, which he held with intervals until his death.

Bibliography: Sakāwī, Daw’, iv, 106-114; Ibn Ṭabaribardī, Nuḍūm vi, 548-9 and index; Wiet no. 1361; Kākāshandī, Subh, ix, 180, for his extant works on Kurān and nihā, Brockelmann II, 112; S II, 139. His sons: Tāj al-Dīn Muḥammad, Kādī ʿl-ʾAskar, Nuḍūm, vii, 362; Daw’, vii, 294-5; Suyūṭī, Nazm al-Dīyān, 151; Wiet no. 2180; and Sayn al-Dīn Kāsim, nāṣīr al-dīwānī, Daw’, v, 181-2; vii, 295; Wiet no. 1807; Ibn Ḥadijār, Inbā‘ al-ʿQūnī, BM. Or. 5311, 1058, Add. 23,330, 1064, 6, Add. 7321, 258a, b.

(4) Sālih b. ʿUmar, ʿAlam al-Dīn Abu’l-Bakr, 792/1389-868/1464, youngest son of (1), eight times
Slāhīyye Grand Kādī of Cairo from 1402 until his death, professor in various madrasas, and nāṣīr
of the Baybarsiyya Mənkəb. He was the teacher of al-Sakhawi and of al-Suyuti in fiqh. In addition to editing his father's fatwas and Muḥammad, completing his Tadhrib, and writing his biography, he composed a tasrif and other works on tradition and law.

**Bibliography:** Sakhawi, Daw', iii, 312-4; iv, 40 (biography of his brother Dīyā‘ al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Khālid); Ibn Taghribirdi, Nuṣūm, vii, 792-3 and index; Wiet no. 1197; Suyuti, Ḥasan al-Muhādara, i, 205 (1898); Nasr al-Tihān, 119; Brockelmann, ii, 96; vi, 114-5.

(5) Muḥammad b. (Ṭāhir-Dīn) Muḥammad b. ʿAḏr al-Rāmān, Badr al-Dīn Abū’l-Saʿādat, 81/1917 or 821/1419-848/1898, grandson of (3), served as al-ḏabīb for his uncle Sāliḥ, appointed on his father's death in 855/1451 to succeed him as Kādī ʿl-ʿAskar, obtained for 7000 dinars the office of Shāhītī Grand Kādī in 871/1466, but held it for only four months, and greatly disgraced the family by his extravagances.

**Bibliography:** Sakhawi, Daw', ix, 95-100: Ibn Taghribirdi, Nuṣūm, vii, 742; Ibn Ṭūnus (Kahlé), iii, 211. His brothers: ʿAlī al-Dīn ʿAlī, Daw', v, 310, Shihāb al-Dīn Abūn, Daw', ii, 119; his sons, Daw', iv, 28; vi, 102; vii, 70.

Collateral branches descended from Abū Bakr b. Rasūl and Muḥammad b. Muṣṭafā b. ʿAbd al-Qadir, cousins of (1), held office as kādīs of al-Mahāllah, Alexandria, etc.; see table in Wiet no. 1723 (to be supplemented as above), and Sakhawi, Daw', i, 253; iv, 228, 232; vi, 296; vii, 62.

(H. A. R. Gibb)

**BULUGGĪN b. MUḤAMMAD** [see HAMMĀDIĐ].

**BULUGGĪN** (in Arabic: Bulukki, also spelled Buluk). ZIRI b. MANĀD, first Zirid of Ifriqiya (4th/10th century). As a reward for distinction in the service of the Fatimids as amīr of the Shanqūd against the Zanqata, he was appointed governor of Ifriqiya by al-Muʿizz li-Dīn Allāh. As he was almost always on campaigns in the central Maghrib, he entrusted the administration of al-Kayrawān and eastern Ifriqiya to his uncle al-Askar, obtained for 7000 dinars the office of Kādī ʿl-ʿAskar, obtained for 7000 dinars the office of Shāhītī Grand Kādī in 871/1466, but held it for only four months, and greatly disgraced the family by his extravagances.

**Bibliography:** Houtsma, op. cit., preface; Brockelmann, i, 321, and S I, 354 (where the author is incorrect in distinguishing a Taʿrīḵ Bagdadī from the Dhaylī to that of Khatīb, cf. ibid. 503), [M. Th. Houtsma-[CL. CAHEN]]

**BUNDUĶ ĪKA** [see BAYBA].

**BUNDUKĪA** [see SIKKA].

**BUNDUĶĪYA** [see BAYBA].

**AL-BUNT, Spanish Alpuente, a small municipio in the north-west of the province of Valencia, on the eastern slopes of the mountains forming the valley of the Guadaiatir-Turia; it belongs to the partido judicial of Chelva, 87 kilometres from the chief town. Situated at the junction of two mountains, Monte del Castillo and loma de San Cristobal, its castle stands on a crag sheer on all sides, which could only be reached by the steep and narrow ascent of an artificial covered way defended by a tower of dressed stone. In the ruins one can see traces of Roman and Arab masonry. It was reached by a drawbridge, some 40 metres long, which has perhaps given its name to the place. It has no history before the time when, at the beginning of the fitna which put an end to the Umayyad caliphate, the Banū Kāsim, Kutāma Berbers, bound by a long-standing alliance with the Arab tribe of Fihār, became independent in their small, steep territory, which formed part of the kūra of Santiberia.

Of the four petty kings who ruled it, the first was ʿAbd Allāh b. Kāsim al-Fihr, an ʿAmīrīd masūd, who took the title of bādīb and ruled as an independent sovereign. After the caliph al-Murtadhā was routed before Granada and killed at Cadiz, his brother Abū Bakr Ḥṣaym sought refuge in Alpuente and, having been acclaimed by the Cordobans as caliph at the end of Rabī‘ 11 418/June 1027, lived peacefully in this obscure place for over two and a
half years, welcomed and well-treated by the Amirid mawlid, who was a supporter of the Marwanid dynasty notwithstanding the harm which the last caliphs had done to his predecessors. When he at last decided to make his official entry into Cordova it was with a retinue as small and countryfied as the place from which he came; he was quickly deposed and it was thus that the Umayyad caliphate came to an end.

Abd Allah b. Kaisim, who ruled with the title of Nizam al-Dawla and died in 421/1031, was succeeded by his son Muhammad b. Abd Allah Yamin al-Dawla, who died suddenly in 440/1048, leaving a son six years old. The son was dethroned after a few months by his paternal uncle Abd Allah b. Muhammad, who married the queen mother and lived on good terms with the neighbouring reyes de taifas until his death in 485/1092.

Alpuente next passed into the hands of the Almoravids and then into those of the Almohads. When the Almohads were expelled from Andalusia, the sayyid who was governor of Valencia, Abu Sa'id Zayd, grandson of Abd al-Mu'min, allied himself with James I the Conqueror and offered Alpuente to him; afterwards, when he sought refuge at his court and turned Christian, he submitted Alpuente to the jurisdiction of the bishop of Segorbe, Don Guillel.

There is another Al-Bunt, a farm near Granada, where in 428/1037 Badis, the successor of Habbas, and his brother Buluggin treacherously killed the Amirid fadl Zuhayr, lord of Almeria.


BUR [see Bâl]. AL-BURĀK, the beast on which Muhammad is said to have ridden, when he made his miraculous "night-journey". According to Sūra xxii, 1, the "night-journey" led the Prophet from the sacred place of worship, i.e., Mecca, to the "remote place of worship". This latter place has been identified by B. Schrieke and J. Horovitz with a point in the heavens, and by A. Guillaume, recently, with a locality near Dīfrānā on the border of the sacred precinct of Mecca. The addition of the phrase "the environs of which we have blessed" makes it probable, however, that the passage refers to a place in the Holy Land, namely Jerusalem (cf. Sūra xxi, 71, 81; Sūra vii, 137; Sūra xxxiv, 18; allātā hārašnā fidā). Be this as it may, the "remote place of worship" has always been understood, in the indigenous tradition, as a reference to Jerusalem. It was accepted, moreover, that Muhammad made the journey from Mecca to Jerusalem and back, not merely in a dream, but—accompanied by Gabriel—in the living flesh and within the space of a single night. The miraculous speed of such a feat was held to be explicable on the ground that Muhammad rode a beast of exceptional fleetness. It was in this connexion that the legend of al-Burāk arose.

In one of the numerous hadīths that Tabari, in his Kurān commentary, gives on the "night journey", Muhammad's mount is described simply as a horse (xy, 61). Most hadīths of the earlier times call it, however, al-Burāk and define it as "a beast (in size intermediate) between a mule and an ass", sometimes with the further detail that it is white. It is also declared to be long (Muslim, Imān, 259), with a long back and long ears (Ibn Sa'd, i, 1, 143), with shaking (Tabari, Taṣfîr, xv, 10), saddled and bridled (ibid., 12). The root b'dr is also described as a beast having "wings on its shanks, with which it drives forward its legs". These words are intended to mean, of course, that al-Burāk could move its legs extremely quickly, and not that it was capable of flying. Genuine wings are first ascribed to it only in later texts. It is generally depicted in miniatures as a winged creature (see below). Grammatically al-Burāk is construed both as masculine and as feminine.

It is reported in some hadīth, that al-Burāk at first resisted the attempt of the Prophet to mount him and was therefore brought to obedience by Gabriel. Muhammad, after the arrival in Jerusalem, is said to have dismounted and tied the beast to a rock (ṣabbār Tabari, Taṣfîr, xv, 7), or "to the ring, to which the Prophets were wont to tie it" (Muslim, Imān, 259; Tabari, Taṣfîr, xv, 10; Ibn Sa'd, i, 1, 143 f.). Al-Burāk, in certain hadīths transmitted by Bukhārī and Muslim, serves as the steed for Muhammad's actual "journey to heaven". The legends of the "night-journey" (ṣīrāt) and of the "journey to heaven" (mi'rād) became combined at an early date. Al-Burāk was also included in this confusion of legends and thus developed gradually into a flying steed. The ascent into heaven (mi'rād), in the original form of the legend, occurred however by means of a ladder.

The etymology of the name Burāk is not yet fully elucidated. E. Blochet believed it to come from the Middle Persian bdrag, "steed". J. Horovitz has rightly questioned this interpretation and has declared himself in favour of a derivation from the Arabic root ḏ-lk, "to lighten, to flash". According to this view, Burāk could be explained as a diminutive form. The "miraculous beast would thus have received its name "the little lightning-flash" on account of its fleetness or of its brilliant colour". Yet even this explanation is not wholly convincing. The possibility must also be envisaged that the name Burāk goes back to a pre-Islamic tradition now unknown to us. In general, much that is reported about the steed of the miraculous "night-journey" will derive from pre-Islamic tradition. It is, however, difficult to uncover the various links in all their detail.

The later development in the conception of the Burāk is to be discerned rather in figurative representations than in literary documents. This statement is also valid in relation to the fact that eventually al-Burāk received a human face. Horovitz has pointed to a hadīth of Ibn 'Abbās, transmitted by Thalabī (d. 1035), as the earliest literary evidence declaring that al-Burāk had "a cheek like that of a man". Balkhi, in his description of the ruins of Persepolis (beginning of the 6th/12th century), designates the monster in the gateway of Xerxes, "whose face resembles a human face", as Burāk. The earliest picture yet known of al-Burāk dates from the year A.D. 1131 (in a MS. of the Dī'amī al-Tawārikh of Rashād al-Dīn). None the
less, it is clear that the real development occurred within the sphere of the visual arts. The decisive stimuli arose out of those forms of representation which—from the figures guarding the gates of Assyrian palaces onwards—remained alive in the shape of centaurs, griffins or sphinxes and have again and again reappeared as artistic forms. The winged creatures, which in the course of time became petrified into a formal element no longer understood, obtained at last a new meaning in connexion with the legend of the *mir'ādī* of the Prophet. In illustrations to Persian poetry, and especially to the works of Niżām-al-Burak, with his rider and with Gabriel as guide came to be a much cherished subject. The splendidly composed picture of the “journéy to heaven” in the Niżām MS. Or. 2265 of the British Museum constitutes the highest point of artistic achievement in this evolution.


**Burāq** (or more correctly, *Barāk*) Ḥādīb, the first of the Kutlugh Khāns of Kirmān. By origin a Kara-Khitayan he was, according to Diuwaynī, brought to Sultan Muhammad Khwārazm-Shāh after the defeat of the Kara-Khitay on the Talas in 1220 and taken into his service, in which he rose to the rank of ḫādīb or chamberlain. According to Nasawi he had held this same office at the court of the Gūr Khan or ruler of the Kara-Khitay. Being sent on an embassy to Sultan Muhammad he was forcibly detained by the latter until the final collapse of the Kara-Khitay and was only then admitted into his service. When the sultan had met his death in flight before the Mongol armies and his son Djalāl al-Dīn Khwārazm-Shāh [q.v.] had taken refuge in India, another son Ghiyāth al-Dīn Pir-Shāh succeeded in establishing himself in Persian ʿIrāq (winter of 1221-2). Here he was joined by Burāqī, whom he appointed governor of Isfahān. On account of a quarrel with Ghiyāth al-Dīn's vizier, Burāqī obtained permission to leave for India in order to enter the service of Sultan Djalāl al-Dīn. Attacked *en route* by the governor of Kirmān he not only defeated his assailant but made himself master of his territory, and he then renounced the idea of proceeding to India (1222-3). This is Diuwaynī's version; Nasawi represents Burāqī as being appointed governor of Kirmān from the outset. When Sultan Djalāl al-Dīn appeared in Kirmān in 1224 he confirmed Burāqī's appointment, though not without some misgivings. In 1226, whilst campaigning in the Caucasus, he received information that Burāqī had risen in revolt. In his haste to deal with the rebel he travelled, according to Diuwaynī, from Tiflis to the borders of Kirmān in the space of 17 days. He then turned back, either because of Burāqī's conciliatory attitude or because of the strong defensive measures he had adopted. In 1228 Ghiyāth al-Dīn, having quarrelled with his brother, came as a fugitive to Kirmān. His mother was forced to marry Burāqī against her will and was then accused, together with her son, of complicity in a plot against his life. They were both put to death though Diuwaynī and Nasawi disagree as to the details. According to the former Ghiyāth al-Dīn was executed first; according to the latter he was kept a prisoner for a time after his mother's death and there was even a rumour that he had escaped to Isfahān. Diuwaynī relates that Burāqī now approached the Caliph announcing his conversion to Islam and asking to be recognised as an independent sultan. The Caliph granted his request and gave him the title of *bulūq sultan* (“Fortunate Sultan”). In 650/1253-2 the Mongol commanders operating in the Sittān area called on Burāqī to submit to the Great Khan. He excused himself from proceeding to Mongolia in person but sent his son Rukn al-Dīn instead. Rukn al-Dīn was still *en route* when he received the news of his father's death, which occurred in the late summer or early autumn of 1235.

was organised, under the suzerainty of Kaydu, a kingdom completely independent of the Great Khan. Kaydu and Burak hailed each other as anda ("blood brother") and an agreement was reached that the princes should live in the mountains and on the steppes, keep their herds of horses out of the cultivated areas and not exact from the population anything beyond their legal dues. Two thirds of Mā warāʾ al-Nahr were left to Burak but the government of the cultivated areas was placed in the hands of Masʿūd Beg, a governor appointed by Kaydu. At the time of this kuriltay Burak had expressed his intention of invading the territories of Abaka, the Il-Khan of Persia, and had been encouraged by Kaydu, who hoped to see the back of a dangerous rival. Masʿūd Beg was sent to Persia, ostensibly to collect the revenues due to Burak and Kaydu, but in reality to spy out the land. Soon after his return Burak crossed the Oxus and occupied parts of Khurasān and Afghanistan. However he received little support from the troops sent by Kaydu and was soon left in the lurch. On 1 Dhu l-Hijjah 668/22 July 1270 Abaka inflicted a crushing defeat on his opponent, who withdrew across the Oxus with only 5,000 men.

Accounts differ as to how Burak passed the last year of his life. According to Waṣṣāf, he spent the winter in Bukhārā, where he adopted Islam and assumed the title of Sultan Ghīyāt al-Dīn. In the following year he undertook a campaign in Sīstān, but his plans were frustrated by the defection of several princes and he was obliged to throw himself upon the mercy of Kaydu, who caused him to be poisoned. According to Raṣḥīd al-Dīn's more circumstantial account the defection of the princes took place immediately after Burak's retreat across the Oxus. He appealed for help to Kaydu, who advanced very slowly at the head of a large army, and an agreement was reached that the al-Hasan's estate at Fam al-Silh, near Wasit, at a reasonable price, and Burak and an ample supply of fine salt which once made the region a famous market for horses, camels, and water from al-Khubub, and the central position of the city on the Basra—Medina route were all factors in developing Burayda into one of the great trading centres of Arabia. The mixed population, comprising settled elements of Ḥab, ʿAnaza, Mutayr, ʿUtyāba, and Banu Tamīm, traded throughout the Arab world. Men from Burayda belonging to the corporation of ʿUqayl became known from Cairo to Bombay as livestock dealers and caravan men.

The origin of the city is not clear. Vāqīṭ mentions Burayda as a watering place of Banū Daibina of the tribe of Ḍabs, and the modern Arab geographers, al-Khāndī and Ibn Bulayhid, accept this toponym as the source of the present city's name. Without further evidence, this identification appears still unestablished. The date of the city's founding is confirmed by no sound evidence, although local tradition and Western travellers agree roughly that the 10th/11th century is a reasonable possibility. Caskel places the founding of Burayda in 950/1063-4, without citing his source. In any event, the city is first mentioned as a political power by the chief historian of modern central Arabia, Ibn Bighr, who gives a brief note on a battle between Burayda and ʿUnayza in 1037/659-60.

The local history of Burayda is to a large extent the story of four families and their participation in the politics of central Arabia, either independently or as provincial governors. The first was Āl al-Duraybi (or perhaps al-Buraydi, v. Ibn Laḥbūn, 22), from al-Ḥānūk of Banu Tamīm, whose ancestor, Raṣḥīd al-Duraybi, Corancez credits with the founding of Burayda. Little is known of this family other than the fact it carried on an internecine struggle with its cousins, Āl ʿUlāyyān of al-ʿAnākīr. The perennial feud with ʿUnayza caused Āl al-Duraybi to assist military assistance from Āl Saʿūd in 1874/768-9. This step soon brought Burayda into the Saʿūd orbit, placed Āl ʿUlāyyān in power, and made al-

Bibliography: Yaʿqūbī, Tabāri, index; Ibn Tayfūr, Kuṭūb Baqḥādād, Cairo ed., 102, 113-8; Ibn Khallīkān, no. 119 and Cairo 1948, i, 258-61; Thaʾlābī, Latīf al-maʿārīf, ed. de Jong, 73-4; G. Le Strange, Baqḥādād during the Abbasid Caliphate, Oxford 1900, 243-6. (D. SOURDEL)
Kašm the cockpit of the long struggle between Al Rashid of Djabal Shammar and Al Sa‘ud.

Al ‘Ulayyân ruled Burayda from 1313/1757-6 to 1326/1808-9 as governors of Al Sa‘ud and, at times, under the Turko-Egyptian invaders from al-Hîdżâz. Their unreliability brought about the appointment of Dîawl b. Turkî Al Sa‘ûd as governor of al-Îsna from 1265/1848-9 to 1270/1853-4 and the establishment of the family of Mu‘annân of Al Abî Al-Ka‘îyl of ‘Anasza as governors of Burayda from 1280/1863-4 to 1326/1908-9.

When Al Sa‘ûd finally regained al-Îsna in 1326/1908-9, the redoubleable ‘Abd Allâh b. Dîawl Al Sa‘ûd, son of the former governor, was installed in Burayda as governor of al-Îsna in order to eliminate permanently the local intrigues in this strategic area. ‘Abd Allâh was succeeded by his cousin, ‘Abd al-Azîz b. Musa‘ûd Al Sa‘ûd, the present Governor of Hâfîlî, and later by ‘Abd Allâh b. ‘Abd al-Azîz b. Musa‘ûd, now Governor of the Northern Frontiers.

The anarchical years preceding the consolidation of the kingdom by King ‘Abd al-‘Azîz Al Sa‘ûd discouraged the commerce of Burayda, and his subsequent conquests of al-Îsna and al-Hîdżâz gave central Arabia unrestricted access to ports on both coasts, cutting into the entrepreneurial trade of al-Îsna. Since 1374/1954-5 the destruction of the city’s most famous landmarks, the great city walls and citadel of Al Mu‘annân, and the construction of modern government buildings, schools, and hospitals have altered the formerly grim face of Burayda.

The accuracy of this identification seems open to question, with the possibility existing of confusion with some place actually on the Persian coast, cutting into the entrepreneurial trade of al-Batîna; it also lies on the principal route from Dubayy through al-Zâhîra [q.v.] to Dîawl b. ‘Ibrî and Naswâ, the capital of Inner Oman and long the seat of the Imâm of the Ibâds. The inhabitants of the oasis, numbering about 10,000, belong in the main to the tribe of Nu‘aym (the two major divisions of which are Al Bû Khuraybân and Al Bû Shâmsî), some of whose members are nomadic or semi-nomadic, or to the tribe of al-Zawâhir, a settled folk not found in any number outside the oasis. Other elements in the oasis belong to Bâtî-în, Bâtî Kûfî, Bût Hâmîr, Bût Fa’lâsâ, and Al Bût Fa’lâh.

The network of aqueducts running under the settlements has resulted in the interdependence of the villages, some of which are in a position to control the vital water supplies of others. Dates, alfalfa, vegetables, and fruit—including mangoes and sweet and sour oranges—are exported from the oasis, the principal port of which is Dubayy [q.v.]. The town markets do a good business in livestock and are distribution centres for the tribes and communities of the interior.

Al-Buraymi has been identified as the place early Arab geographers and lexicographers call Tu‘âm (La gives the variant Tu‘âm, and other variants are listed in Lane), described as a centre for the purchase of pearls (whence tu‘âmiyya as a synonym for iswâ’ and di‘âra). The accuracy of this identification seems open to question, with the possibility existing of confusion with some place actually on the Persian Gulf. Authors from eastern Arabia also give al-Dîaww and al-Dîawf [q.v.] as old names for the oasis.

Very little is known of the history of the oasis before the nineteenth century. According to local historians it was occupied by the army which the Caliph al-Mu’tadîd sent overland from al-Bahrayn in 280/893. Between 1353/1934 and the outbreak of World War II, discussions took place between Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom, acting on behalf of the Ruler of Abû Zaby, regarding the southern orders of Ziyâd b. Abîhi. According to Ibn Hâdjar he died in 63/1265.
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(K. V. Zetterstéen-W. ‘Arafat)
and eastern boundaries of Saudi Arabia, but Buraymi was not then specifically at a point at issue. In 1371/1952, a Saudi Arabian official (amir) arrived in the oasis and established himself in Ḥamdā waṣa to assert Saudi sovereignty against that of Abū Zaby and Muscat. In 1373/1954 the United Kingdom and Saudi Arabia agreed to refer to arbitration the dispute arising out of this action and out of conflicting claims to over 70,000 sq. km. of territory to the south-west of al-Buraymi. Thanks to the arbitration, the geography, modern history, and demography of al-Buraymi have been recorded in great detail, both sides submitting to the arbitral tribunal elaborate memorials in which these matters are treated. Saudi Arabia contended that the whole oasis is an integral part of its Kingdom. The British maintained that exclusive sovereignty in the oasis should be vested in the Ruler of Abū Zaby and the Sultan of Muscat. The British held that the traditional loyalty of Nuwaym (predominant in al-Buraymi town, Ḥamāṣa, and Saʿrā) is to Muscat, and that of al-Zawāhir (predominant in most of the other settlements) is to Abū Zaby.

Following British charges of Saudi bribery and other misconduct, the British member of the tribunal resigned, whereby the arbitration lapsed in Muḥarram 1375/September 1955 without the tribunal having had an opportunity to pass an opinion on the charges or the merits of the case itself. In Rabīʿ I/October 1955 troops of the Trucial Oman Levies under the command of British officers occupied the oasis, which was partitioned between Abū Zaby and Muscat. The Sultan of Muscat appointed a wāli in al-Buraymi town, and the Ruler of Abū Zaby designated one of his brothers as his representative in the oasis. Saḵr b. Sulṭān, the paramount shaykh of Nuwaym, and other shaykhams with adherents went into exile in al-Dammām, the capital of the Eastern Province of Saudi Arabia.


(G. RENTZ and W. E. MULLIGAN)

**Bibliography:** R. Basset, *Les Manuscrits Arabes des Bibliothèques des États-Unis du Madīn and Temaizin...*, Algiers 1886, 46-54; I. Goldziher, in *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, Vol. xxx, 304 ff.; Broeckelmann, I, 264-265 (R. Basset); *BURDJ* (pl. buriḍi, abriḍi, and abridi), square or round tower, whether adjacent to a rampart or isolated and serving as a bastion or dungeon.

Special meanings: each of the twelve signs of the zodiac, considered as solar 'mansions'; more or less fortified country house standing alone amidst gardens (Eastern Maghrib); tower used as a lighthouse (burdi al-mansir); tower used as a dovecote, especially for carrier pigeons (burdi al-hamim; see J. Sauvaget, *La poste aux chevaux dans l'empire des Mamlouks*, Paris 1941, no. 157); masonry pier of a bridge; mode (in music), slice, quarter of certain fruits having natural divisions (melons, oranges); row of grains in a head of corn.

In the diminutive feminine al-Buraydija was the name given by the Moroccans to the fortress of Mazagan (see AL-QADISIA) during its occupation by the Portuguese.

The word certainly seems to be connected with the Greek πύργος and the Latin burgus (whence Germanic burg) and has also passed into Hebrew and Aramaic (see Fraenkel, *Aram. Fremdwörter im Arab.*, 235). But the borrowing must be very old, for it is to be found already in Sabaean inscriptions (see De Landberg, *Glossaire Datinois*, 1, 148).

(G. S. Colin)

**BURDJ**

I. Military architecture in the Islamic Middle East

The different forms of towers which the word burdi signifies in its usual sense (especially in inscriptions) have always formed the principal elements in the fortifications which were erected in Islamic territories from the years following the Conquest and which were to remain of real importance until changes gradually arose in military ideas as a result of the development of heavy and field artillery. The importance of the protective role played, in the middle ages proper, by these lofty and massive edifices in defending town and citadel ramparts, in serving as defensive strongholds (donjons), or on occasion standing as isolated defensive works (watch-towers, signal towers), should not distract attention from the fact that towers less strictly military in their functions had long existed in the same regions, the buttress-towers which have sometimes happened to be confused with simple architectural devices. To this category—disregarding the minarets of mosques, which have a separate evolution of their own—belong the first specimens of Muslim towers preserved in the Middle East in the ruins of the Umayyad residences, which have a rectangular plan and have their exterior walls appointed with semicircular salients [see Architecture].

These castle-towers, and the towers of fortified enclosures (bașq), most frequently of modest dimensions, are disposed symmetrically so as to lend rhythm to the blind façades and to give height to the entrances, and are usually solid at the base, or else equipped at ground-floor level with strongholds to which access was not easy (entrances being blocked by partition walls or even opening into a residential room), and are at times used as latrines; they differed greatly in effect from the defensive towers of the Roman and Byzantine camps, which were, on the other hand, conceived with chambers on all storeys and were easily accessible to the troops of the garrison who could, in the last resort, entrench themselves therein. They must rather be considered as the adaptation of those round buttress-towers which had been known in the Middle East for centuries, an adaptation that the fortress towers of Sassanid Iran, less perfect in their arrangements than the *castrum* of the times, had always employed. Without being absolutely devoid of any military efficacy, since their upper platforms did allow of fire being brought on their assailants, or at least of a watch being kept on the approaches to a castle, and again without differing very much from the towers of the Umayyad forts erected at a similar period on the Byzantine frontier, they became indispensable accessories of princely buildings, secular as well as religious, whose appearance they enriched.

The essentials of this style, typical of the great Umayyad residences, were however soon to become more flexible. Indeed, the custom of strengthening walls in this way, of a particularly happy effect: when it was a matter of avoiding the monotony of large surfaces in regular coursed brick, was not to disappear completely, for one finds it recurring in an 'Abbasid building of a function as uninaltial as the great mosque of al-Mutawakkil at Samarra, the perimeter wall of which is punctuated by forty-four semi-cylindrical brick towers; but especially it persists in the partially fortified residences, the tradition of which was to be continued later by ribāds and caravanserais, and of which an excellent example is provided, at the end of the 2nd/8th century, by the Irrāt palace of Ukhaydir, with numerous half-round towers (angle towers 5.10 m., intermediate towers 3.15 m. in diameter) each with a small firing chamber on the top to which access is given by a covered gallery itself equipped with loopholes, and a device providing for downward fire throughout the length of the gallery which almost amounts to continuous machicolation, (see Creswell, *A Short Account of Early Muslim Architecture*, in Bibliography).

We thus meet again classical flanking towers which in their turn had been retained in mediaeval Arab fortification, having played a part in the Byzantine defences, where their defensive equipment assured, whatever their size and shape (square, polygonal, circular), an increased protection of the sectors of the curtain walls included between their salients. Not only did the new conquerors retain this principle without improvements, most often they were content to keep up or to restore by makeshift means the remarkable circumvallation walls of the towns they had occupied, in the Syrian sites of Aleppo and Damascus as well as later in Asia Minor (Kayseri) or in Upper Mesopotamia (Amid). There are, however, as many cases where it remains difficult, in spite of frequently copious epigraphical evidence, to establish a firm difference between previously existing work and later repairs of the Muslim era, which reflect the hazards of the much confused historical events. However, clear differences are evident between one region and another, and the provinces which had been longest under Byzantine occupation were to be also those where the tradition
of the older military architecture was to establish itself most distinctly, only rarely allowing the Saljūq and Artuqid creations to display originality in this field. Their towers, which are distinguishable only by a few details of structure and ornament, are similar to the preceding types with their super-imposed vaulted casemates, with variations that are essentially related to the configuration of the terrain and to the particular problems to which the latter gives rise.

More interesting are the remains of the Fāṭimid era preserved in the Syro-Egyptian lands. Certainly there is often a straightforward accumulation of re-used materials, later integrated within more complex systems which render their study difficult.

At this time the experience acquired by the builders during a permanent state of war with the Frankish kingdoms of Palestine, where the Western master-engineers had introduced their own traditions, together with the sudden rise of the Ayyūbid principalities, led to the erection of imposing fortifications which reflected the recent advances in ballistic technique. In the considerable works undertaken at the beginning of the 7th/13th century by al-Malik al-ʿĀdil (specially the citadels of Cairo, Boṣrā, Damascus and Mount Tābūr) and al-Malik al-Zāhir (at the citadel of Aleppo and in the more important fortresses in north Syria) towers are seen to attain gigantic proportions; to strengthen their defensive sectors, but at the same time to make room for large airy quarters capable of housing permanently a large number of troops who would be assured of communication with the galleries of the enceinte, and with the magazines of the interior, by subterranean passages or covered stairs; and eventually to compensate, by the thickness of their walls and the quality of their construction (by then constructions in fine ashlar were normal), for the weakening which the multiplication of fortified chambers and gangways could have caused. This is shown for example by the two towers of the citadel of Damascus (dating from 606/1209-10) shown here in section. The first (Fig. 1), an asymmetrical salient of great size (rectangular plan of 27 m. by 13 m., walls 3.40 m. thick, projecting 8 m. from the curtain wall, attaining a height of about 25 m.), composed of three vaulted rooms, easily accessible and defended by five loopholes pierced in tunnel-vaulted recesses; its balcony, rising 18 m. above the level of the courtyard, is surrounded by a chemin de ronde equipped with loopholes (five in number, as in the lower rooms), leading to four machicolated brattices and bearing a crenellated parapet with 15 arrow-slits in the merlons, an arrangement completed by roughwallings in wood, thus showing the importance attached to the upper works in the general plan of the construction. The second tower (Fig. 2), which well deserves the name of donjon, is distinguished from the former only by its approximately square form (21 m. by 23 m.) and by the presence of a large central pillar, sufficiently massive for a small cell to have been contrived within it at its top storey. To these enormous rectangular bastions, where one occasionally notices, as in the donjon of Boṣrā (612/1215-6), the existence of reception chambers, must be added the less powerful salient towers, which could command the chemin de ronde without obstruction, and the isolated post-towers whose role is essentially one of surveillance.

After this the Mamluk period, where no innovations in the means of attack and defence are at first apparent, was content to continue this splendid heyday of military architecture in Syria. The towers underwent the effects of a slow transformation which substituted small smooth blocks for the powerful courses and the rugged embossments of Ayyūbid masonry, and which delighted in showing off, by sheer virtuosity, a variety of constructive techniques, while enriching the whole with delicate relief
ornaments and equally extraneous polychromatic devices. Mention must, however, be made of a work so remarkable as the Tower of Lions (burdí al-Sibd*) at Tripoli, a coastal fortification of large dimensions (28.50 m. by 20.50 m.) and of an imposing appearance due to the equilibrium of its proportions and a sure which saw also the erection by the sultan Kayt-bāy of an impressive fortification over the entrance of the citadel of Aleppo in place of the towers of al-Malik al-Zāhir. About this time there appeared the embrasures for pieces of ordnance, and terrepleins to bear heavy cannon, which marked the vain

Fig. 2. Ayyūbid donjon at the citadel of Damascus (from J. Sauvaget)

feeling for ornament, agreeing perfectly with a complex interior composition which corresponds, in its two great upper rooms (Fig. 3), to variations imposed by the requirements of the defence (numerous firing ports, arrangements assuring the safety of the doors on the ground and other storeys) and the inclusion of living quarters (the cistern, mosque, and windows lighting the upper part). The style may be recognised as that of the end of the 9th/15th century, attempt to adapt the tower to those very conditions of warfare which were to bring about its rapid disappearance.

Meanwhile, however, a somewhat weak synthesis, though more westernised in certain constructional details, had been conceived by Ottoman military architecture, which had been able to erect, in order to command the passage of the Bosphorus and maintain the investment of Con-

Fig. 3. Longitudinal section of a Mamlūk tower at Tripoli (from J. Sauvaget)
stanbul, the last specimens of fortresses where the utilisation of cannon was reconciled with adherence to the principles of mediaeval fortification. The towers of the two castles of Anadolu Hisar (begun 793/1390-1) and Rumeli Hisar (dated by its inscription of 856/1452), to which may be added those of the castle of Yedi Kule (erected shortly after this by Mehemmed II Fatih within the enceinte of his new capital of Istanbul), are characterised by the perfection of their system of defence (Fig. 4), realized at Rumeli Hisar on a colossal scale (diameters

Fig. 4. Reconstructed section of an Ottoman tower of Rumeli Hisar (from A. Gabriel)

of three donjons ranging from 23.80 m. to 26.70 m., thickness of walls varying from 5 m. to 7 m.), and by certain features (hollow cylindrical interiors divided into many storeys by joists, circular chemin de ronde surrounding, at the upper level, a covered drum with conical roof) which show the imitation of the flanking towers of the Genoan enceinte of Pera.

sometimes as much as ten metres high, with crenellated parapets; their thickness was considerable, averaging three metres. Towers, set at intervals a bowshot apart, round the curtain walls, which, generally they were semicircular, 5-6 m. in diameter, less usually square or oblong, and most usually built on the outer side of the ramparts. The angle towers were often large bastions, solid at the base, containing at least one defensive chamber, and higher by one storey than the curtain.

The gates gave access to the interior of the enceinte by a direct passage with an open section between two covered rooms, which made it possible to overwhelm any opponent who might have forced his way into the building; these were flanked by towers with several tiers of defence. The solid mass of the gateway itself gave on to the interior of the ramparts. Town gates sometimes returned to the monumental arrangements of those of the Roman empire, opening by a double or triple passage.

No fortifications are known which could have been erected in the Mediterranean provinces of Spain after the reconquest by Justinian; but the Byzantine fortresses of Africa are well known to us. The plans of the plains fortresses or castella are very regular in form. Only the square tower is used, external to the curtain and projecting markedly; it is always solid at the base. The construction is of stone with no additional brickwork. When older materials are not re-utilised, coursed rubble preponderates, strengthened by freestone lacing-courses. The curtain, less thick than in the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries, bears a chemin de ronde with crenellated parapet which gives access to the towers’ defensive chambers. The gate is no more than a simple passage, with straight corridor. In all this we see only the survival, and frequently the impoverishment, of the methods of the Late Empire.

2. Ifriqiya: fortification from the 3rd/9th to the 6th/12th century, and its continuations.—Aghlabid fortresses.—Aghlabid fortification is known from vast complexes, the enceintes of Susa and Sfax, which go back to the 3rd/9th century in the main lines of their construction: e.g., the ramparts of unprepared or roughly prepared rubble, with lacing-courses at the corners, and with freestone toothing. The curtain is flanked with oblong towers—canted with a batter in exceptional cases—one storey higher than itself. In Susa the chemin de ronde is in places carried on a deep arcading. Some small ribâb are very similar to Byzantine forts.

Mixed with these local traditions are some Western influences, especially in the Susa ribâb and the primitive ribâb at Monastir. Their rectangular enclosures are flanked, at the corners and at the middle of each side, by bastions which are nearly all semicircular. Within there are some buildings against the four walls, leaving the large courtyard free. The influence of the Umayyad castles of Syria, themselves derived from the Roman castella, is noticeable here. The pyramidal form of some towers, imitated from the lower stages of minarets of the same period, reveals Egyptian influence.

Rammed earth (pisé) would have been used in some rapidly erected fortifications. In the ramparts of al-Kayrawân and in the government towns of al-‘Abbâsîyya and al-Rağîda it is probable that bricks of mud or baked earth replaced stone. The old traditions of the desert countries paved the way for other eastern influences coming from Mesopotamia and Persia.

All this Aghlabid fortification is a happy and lively synthesis of a still dominant local tradition and of importations from the East.

3. The fortification of Muslim Spain and its expansion in Africa.

i) The 3rd/9th century.—Muslim fortification in Spain is understood here as not beginning until the middle of the 3rd/9th century, with the Conventual of Merida, built by the Amir Abd al-Ra‘man II. This castle, which guards the approach to the bridge over the Guadiana, forms an almost regular oblong. The curtain-walls are flanked with oblong towers which do not project far beyond them and are very closely spaced. Without doubt the architect was inspired by the counterpart towers which punctuate the walls of the great mosque of Cordova. At the entrance one finds the arch of horseshoe shape (the intradosial curve being greater than a semi-circle) which is as dear to Umayyad as to Visigothic art. Pilasters support the springing of the entrance arch and protect the hinges of the door-leaves. The construction is in freestone, which is employed by preference in Visigothic architecture and to which the initial phase of Umayyad art remains faithful. Here, however, it is a question of the reutilisation of stone from previous work, and the arrangement of it as headers and stretchers, dear to the Cordovan architects, is never regular.

ii) The 4th/10th century.—Under the Cordova caliphate, military architecture was rapidly developing, as indeed was all monumental art. There are many variations in the plans employed: in mountainous country the enceintes are adapted to the irregularities of the terrain, and on the plains they tend to a geometric regularity which is fully realised in works of the more modest dimensions.
The towers, oblong or very rarely polygonal, project more noticeably than those at Merida and are more widely spaced out. The enceinte is never doubled and has no keep, and no buildings are erected in the interior.

The gateway gives on to a straight passage of little depth. In the larger enceintes it opens between two towers, and in the smaller castles is protected by a bastion. The curtain is of varying height, from 7 to 10 metres, and bears a chemin de ronde with its exterior parapet capped, as on the towers themselves, with pyramidal merlons. This form of merlon, different from those which were employed in the Middle East and Ifriqiya, seems to be derived from the crenellated chemin de ronde of the Byzantine Empire, the capping of which was pyramidal in form.

The stone header and stretcher courses, regularly arranged, which are at their best in the great monuments of this dynasty, are employed in the finest fortresses. But usually a more economical material is preferred, a concrete of gravelly soil and lime, consolidated in formwork; this had very ancient Iberian origins and doubtless never ceased to be employed in the construction of provincial and popular buildings. In certain fortifications in mountainous sites rubble appears. Frequently also dressed stones, in varying proportions, are used together with the concrete cast in forms.

All the Umayyad fortresses succeed, in their simplicity, by the precision of their proportions—often very different from one fortress to another—and by the happy balance of their masses. The very spirit which is exhibited in military architecture is that which inspired the whole art of the caliphate, a twofold soliciquate for originality without exclusiveness and for faultless harmony.

iii) The 5th/11th to 7th/13th centuries in Spain.—The 5th/11th century, under the mulak al-faukhāf, sees the emergence of the palace-fortresses which, in a complex of moderate dimensions, array a whole range of rooms against the ramparts. This type of isolated palace perhaps existed also in the preceding period. When one sees a Mudejar castle, like that of Santa Maria del Puerto, following the lines of the Sûsa ribât (itself inspired by the Syrian Umayyad form), one is tempted to believe that the foundation in question has had a Muslim ancestry within Spain itself, doubtless deriving from the founder of the dynasty who had tried to re-create in Andalusia something of his lost motherland. The castle of al-Rušafa, which preserves the name of a palace of his ancestors, did manage to recapture the plan of the great rural residences of the Caliphs of Damascus.

Outside the Castillejo of Murcia stands a fortress of regular oblong plan with towers closely spaced; but living quarters fill the entire space between the ramparts and the patio, the voids of the towers are used to break up the largest rooms medially, and the courtyard is replaced by a garden of sunken parterres with crossing paths.

On the other hand, the enclosures of towns or of large fortresses no longer tend to a geometrical regularity as in the days of the caliphate; the trace of the curtain walls is adapted to the lie of the land. Sometimes they are still flanked by narrow, closely-spaced towers, but more frequently the bastions are of greater size, and, while defending a more or less regular interval, they strengthen the irregularities in the trace or the weaker part of the ramparts. Occasionally there is a double enclosure with inner and outer wall, and the more vulnerable points may be strengthened by barbicans. The kasaba, forming

an acropolis above the town and containing the royal residence, has always its own single or double enceinte.

The bastion with superposed vaulted rooms makes its appearance at this time. These powerful works are arranged round the enceinte itself, and not as donjons or keeps. Muslim Andalusia brings in a new form at the same period, the albarrana tower, which projects in front of the curtain to which it is connected by a wall, through which usually runs an arcade. The vaulted bastions and the albarrana, which give excellent flanking protection, may be combined.

The gate, which opens sometimes between two towers, sometimes under the wing of a sharply projecting bastion, has always an angled passage; at the entrance and exit are two arches with springing on pilasters, which enclose the housing of the door-leaves. The portcullis is not found.

Freestone becomes increasingly rare, except in the gateways, and is sometimes combined in lacing courses with ashlar or concrete. This latter material almost always preponderates.

Thus, perhaps as a matter of necessity—for Christian pressure had become more and more formidable and had extended its conquests—the fortification of Muslim Spain made great progress in the 5th/11th and 6th/12th centuries.

iv) The 5th/11th to 7th/13th centuries in Africa.—

The same type of Spanish fortification tended to spread, from the beginning of the 6th/12th century, in the African empire of the Almoravids and the Almohads, the rulers of Muslim Spain. The first Almoravid fortresses are of rubble, and still remain within the Maghribi traditions in their coursework and in other details; but in fortification, as in mosques and palaces, Andalusian influences quickly asserted their superior sway. This is the great period of concrete enceintes with strongly projecting oblong towers, arranged at more or less regular intervals. In Africa the lines of this fortification tended to be simplified, as large vaulted bastions and albarrana towers do not appear. However, some innovations occur in the fortified gateway, where the opening is always framed by two towers, usually strongly projecting, and the gate itself constitutes a massive bastion which extends to the rear of the curtain and contains a passage with two or three bends, with an undefended gallery. The arch of the gateway, its jambs, and their framing, show a rich decorative treatment of carved stone. The great Almohad gateways of Rabat and Marrakesh are among the finest—certainly the richest—of fortified gateways of Islam.

4. Fortification in the Muslim West from the 8th/14th to the end of the 9th/15th century.—In spite of the fundamental unity of the architectural styles then current in Muslim Spain and the Magrib, the evolution of fortification was different in the Peninsula and in Africa. Spanish Islam was then confined to the small kingdom of Granada, a vassal of Castile but often in revolt against its suzerain, which depended on the shelter of a fortified frontier. A good number of the castles of this frontier imitated some of the Christian fortresses which confronted them. Built of stone, with a double enceinte and a donjon, they appeared as strangers, almost, in the Muslim fortification of the West. But soon Christian influences, far from revitalising the traditions of Muslim Andalusia, became degraded into bastard types. They are not found in the capital itself, nor in the works of rather later date.
We have here the forms created in the 5th/11th and 6th/12th centuries reproduced without much modification. The gateways with their sinuous passages are powerful works. At the Alhambra in the 8th/14th century, and at the castle of Gibralfar at Malaga, large bastions, widely spaced, replace the smaller and closer towers of the common enceintes. Where the introduction of cannon gave no time for modifying the fortification, rudimentary cannon platforms were installed at the feet of the earlier works.

In North Africa, in the kingdoms of Fez and Tlemcen, Almohad traditions were maintained almost unchanged. Curtains and towers were made of concrete. The gateways, always imposing and with sinuous passages, were rather more often constructed of brick than stone. Irfikiya, while admitting some Almohad influence, remained faithful to stone and to her traditional forms of detail. Thus, in this long period, fortresses, as well as palaces and sanctuaries, scarcely went beyond a mere repetition of the forms of the past.

5. Fortification in modern times in the Muslim West.—The development of artillery brought about a profound transformation of ideas of fortification in all European countries; but North Africa created no new forms, being content to imitate more or less faithfully the models which Europe provided. Again, she admitted these imports only when it was necessary to defend herself against a European nation, as in the coastal regions. Everywhere else, however, the older mediaeval fortification continued to prevail; the governments which divided Barbary had only to keep order among, or to bring to subservience, tribes who were without cannon.

In Morocco, the fine fortifications which the Portuguese erected in the 10th/16th century at different parts of the coast were imitated only accidentally at the Sa'did ḥṣaba of Agadir. All other coastal forts were the work of Europeans, often renegades, in the service of the sultans. In the 18th century the fine complex at Mogador, planned by a Frenchman, was the work of an English renegade and Italian architects. These European-inspired types of fortification were imitated in the 19th century by local master-builders.

In Algeria and Tunisia the Ottomans introduced a modernized type of fortification more or less inspired by European models, and fairly close to the works which were being erected here and there on the Moroccan coast. The gun bastions and the enceintes, often defended by ditch and counterscarp, were still high; low-built fortifications in the Vauban style were unknown in North Africa.

Thus the Muslim West, in its fortresses as in all its military organisation, showed its archaism. The few borrowings it made from Europe were overlaid on mediaeval traditions, but did not modify them.

6. The fortified Berber works.—North Africa, Morocco in particular, had fortified buildings also in several mountainous regions and in the oases bordering the Sahara. Some stone villages and trading stations, of a plan almost always irregular, had no enceinte except such the constructions whose joint exterior wall formed the rampart; but almost everywhere this old architecture made way for buildings in pisé and mud-brick brought from the oases. Some villages, especially in the hills, are irregular in form and are made of an assembly of houses presenting a continuous front. But the architecture of the oases has its own very characteristic design and decoration. On the plains the fortified villages (ḥusār) are of very regular plan; they are surrounded by an enceinte pierced with gates which are often of great size and protected by the means of angle bastions. The influence of Hispano-Moorish fortification is here very apparent.

The isolated residential castle, the Moroccan ṣa'iğrem, has a more distant origin. It has the form of a castellum with four angle-towers, less commonly with two. If the plans are in the Roman tradition, the plastic art is of a more ancient stock: the pyramidal towers, often with an entasis, derive without doubt from Pharaonic Egypt. The minarets of the early centuries of Islam in Barbary were also often truncated pyramidal towers. In the gates and on the wall cappings of some ḥusār one finds in many cases the Moroccan oases a rich ornament in mud-brick, derived from Hispano-Moorish geometrical elements. The older Berber buildings have taken in, at different times, forms of the Muslim middle ages which had been adopted by official works of fortification in the country.

Hence Barbary, Morocco in particular, is an astounding museum of fortifications inspired by very ancient traditions.


(H. Terrasse)

III. The tower in Islamic architecture in India

1. General.—The word burdż in Urdu, whence it has spread into other languages of India, means always 'tower' or 'bastion', including those towers on the walls of fortified palaces whose function is decorative and residential rather than functional in any military sense, those bastions which, taking the form of a protuberance in the trace, may in fact include several tower-like buttresses, and also those massive bastions within the enceinte, built after the introduction of cannon, as mountings for heavy pieces of ordnance.

The following accounts relate to the use of towers only; the history of Islamic fortification in India is treated in a separate article (see HISAR). Minarets (Urdu minār) have a different development and are not considered here.

2. The Dihli Sultanate from the 6th/12th to the 10th/16th century.—The earliest Muslim invaders had found a land already well provided with fortified works, of which Hindū India had a long tradition which remained active later wherever Islam had not spread; their earliest static military enterprise was the occupation and modification of existing works. In Dihli, for example, it was the old fort of Prthvirāj Cāwān, kil' a Rāy Pithorā, which was garrisoned first by Muslim troops, and within the citadel of which (Lāl kōt) the earliest Indian mosque, named Kūwāt al-Īslām, was erected in 587/1191 by Kūth al-Dīn Ayybak. The curtain here is faced by closely spaced towers, defended by a broad ditch, with gates set in the re-entrant angles of powerful bastions formed
by a bulge in the trace with several small counterfort towers. Most of the standing fortification is probably of the period of 'Ala‘ al-Dîn Khalîjî, c. 704/1304 (Beglar, ASI Report IV, 1874), probably following the trace of the Hindu work; the towers are for the most part counterforts of shallow projection. The walls of 'Ala‘ al-Dîn’s newer capital Siri were built at about the same time to the north-east of the old capital (Campbell, Notes on the history and topography of the ancient cities of Delhi, in JASB, xxxv, 1 [1866] argues that Siri was the name given to the ‘Kutb citadel’, i.e., Lâlki, and that the site now generally accepted as Siri was built by Bahlîl Lôdî in the 10th/16th century; this is convincingly refuted by Cunningham, ASI Report I, 1871); some stretches of walling remain, with semicircular battered bastions spaced about a bow-shot apart, capped like the walls with merlons, and with a continuous

Fig. — Section of angle bastion at Tughluqabad
A — Battlements; B — Mural gallery; C — Exterior gallery (access from mural gallery in curtain); D — Inner vaulted corridor; E — Bolster plinth; F — Rock scarp.

chemin de ronde supported on an arched gallery. The principles employed are similar in the new capital, Tughluqabad, built in 720/1321-2 by Ghiyâth al-Dîn Tughluq, and its appendage 'Adilâbâd built by Muhammad b. Tughluq in c. 725/1325: the walls of both, of rubble core faced with rough quartzite ashlar, are punctuated with strongly projecting semicircular bastions, and these and the walls, both of which are strongly battered, have three tiers of defence consisting of external gallery, main mural gallery, and battlements, the latter with two ranks of loopholes. The rock outcrop below the wall trace is scarped, over which is a bolster plinth faced with masonry to the base of the wall proper, forming both a continuous buttress and a protection against sapping (see Fig.). The bastions are most closely spaced around the citadel. Gates open between two bastions, and are often defended by barbicans. 'Adilâbâd is defended further by a bailey and outer wall. Within many of the towers are the remains of grain silos. The tomb of Ghiyâth al-Dîn forms a strong fortified outwork to the south of Tughluqabad, with similar bastions except for the absence of an outer gallery.

Besides 'Adilâbâd, Muhammad b. Tughluq formed yet another ‘city of Dihli’ with the building of Djahânpanâh (725/1325), the walls of which enclosed the ground between Kîl‘a Rây Pitthorâ and Siri; these have semicircular counterfort bastions similar to those of 'Adilâbâd, though without the external gallery, and are at one point interrupted by a dam and sluice, called Sât Palâh, obviously to retain water within the walls for the use of the defenders.

This reign saw the Dihli diaspora and the transfer of the capital to Devagiri, renamed Da’lânabâd (q.v.). The three lines of defences between the pass and the acropolis consist of walls with regularly spaced battering round bastions, projecting less than in the contemporary northern work, and without exterior galleries. Bastions round the gates are larger and of greater projection, some being of the form of a half ellipse; a succession of rounded bastions forms a hornwork with two courts where the city is entered over the lower moat. The many modifications made during the Bahmanî period are referred to below.

Firûz Shâh Tughluq was responsible for building yet another ‘Dihli’, his new capital of Firûzâbâd (755-71/1354-70), which was later sacked by Tîmûr and of which no traces remain beyond his citadel or koldâ, much ruined. Walls and towers here have a strong batter; the towers are semicircular, and it is probable that they were crowned with open kiosks (chatris). Traces of low barbicans outside the gates have angle towers of smaller dimensions, presumably for the use of sentries. The contemporary complex housing the Kâdâm-i Sharîf, which, protected by its sanctity, escaped the Tîmûrid sack, is protected by a strong bastioned curtain which shows the principles of Firûz’s fortification better than the ruined koldâ: walls and towers have lost the bolster plinth, and defence against sapping is effected by small box-machicolations. Many buildings of this period, especially tombs and dargâhs, are contained within fortified enclosures. At this time the burdi is developed as an ornamental feature: mosque enclosures and guldast platforms regularly show angle and end bastions, capped by circular or square chatris or by low domes, always with the typical Firûzîd batter, which is imitated in those purely decorative buttresses, where the slope is carried up into a guldasta finial, which flank the gates of Firûzîd mosques in Dihli (Begampuri, Khîfki, Sandîjar, Kalân masjids: see Dihli, Monuments), of which echoes occur in the Lôdî buildings at Dihli, and in Dâwnapur (q.v.) and elsewhere. Firûz Shâh Tughluq is known to have restored many of the buildings of his predecessors, and, though he speaks of having restored the towers of the tomb built by ibn Tîmûr—i.e., the tomb of Abu l-Fätî Mîhmûd Nasîr al-Dîn at Malikpur—it is probable, from the style, that the corner towers are, at least in their upper stages, Firûz’s work.
It seems that the later Tughluq s and the ‘Sayyids’ created no new fortified works, except that it is recorded that Mubarak Shāh in 824/1421 replaced the walls of Lahawr, destroyed by Timur, by a mud fort. His own tomb (836/1433), however, lies in the fortified complex of the small town of Mubarak-kabād, yet another ‘city of Dihl’, where the towers are small but otherwise differ little from preceding patterns. Sikandar Lodī is said to have built a fort at Agrā in 908/1502; but there had already been a fortress here, and the present fort is the work of Akbar, and it is thus difficult to assess how much of the trace is due to Sikandar.

3. The Deccan forts from the 8th/14th to the 11th/17th centuries. — Here again there were many fortified Hindū works which the Muslims found and later occupied, and to some extent modified even in their earlier years. Their first original production seems to have been at Gulberga (q.v.), where the thick (16 m.) walls are doubled, with towers on the inner curtain. All towers are very solidly built, of semicircular form; many have barbettes added later for the use of artillery, and this modification is to be attributed to the 'Adil Shāhs of Bīdāpur, since an inscription on the Kāla pahār Burdij claims that in 1066/1655 ‘Muhammad ... rebuilt every burdij, wall and gate’ (Haig, EIM, 1907-8). Within the enceinte, on high ground, stands a large isolated masonry bastion, the mounting for a large piece of ordnance. In Bīdār (q.v.), already a Bahmanian outpost, whether the capital was transferred by Ahmad Shāh al-Wall, there had been a double line of Kākatiya fortifications in 722/1322 (Diyā al-Dīn Barni, Ta'rikh-i Firdūs Shāhī, Bibl. Ind., 449) when it first fell into Muslim hands; in the rebuilding of 832/1429-32 Persian and Turkish engineers are known to have been employed, as in a further rebuilding in the time of Muhammad Shāh III (867-87/1463-82) by his wasir Māhmūd Gāwān, after the introduction of gunpowder in the Deccan. The older round bastion is largely superseded by the polygonal variety, although some round and square towers remain; large trapstone blocks with fine joints in the older work give way to smaller rubble set in deeper beds of mortar in the repairs and restorations. The towers are solid at the base, defended by chambers at the same level as the curtain battlements and by their own battlements one stage higher; like the curtain, they are further defended by heavy box machicolations. At the angles of the irregular trace, and also standing free within the enceinte, are large and massive bastions, some of imported trapstone and others of the local red laterite, built as mountings for heavy pieces of ordnance; these may be, as in the Kālānī Burdij, defended by two or more successive machicolated curtains, and may provide room for the accommodation of a large number of troops. The walls of Bīdār town are of the Barid Shāh period (built 962-3/1555-6); the 37 bastions include the massive Mūndā Burdij of two defended stages, approached by steps built on the back wall of the bastion itself, which mounted a long-range gun. The disposition of the bastions is here, as in the case of the fort curtain, variable: they are closest at those points in the curtain most vulnerable to attack. The Cawbārā in Bīdār town, presumed to be part of Ahmad Shāh’s defences, is a tall conical watch-tower, 23 m. high, commanding a view of the entire plateau and lowlands, with a massive circular plinth with guard-room and an internal stairway. There was much activity in the construction of military works in the Deccan in the heyday of the Bahmani dynasty (q.v.): Daulatibād, Bīdāpur, vilgāf, Bīlcpur, Narmāl, Pārendā, Naldrug, Panahāl, Warangal, Golkonda, Mughal, Raypur, etc. At Daulatibād the old defences were strengthened and heightened, in smaller stone or brick, in the time of Akbar. A further rebuilding in the time of Muhammad Shāh I (completed 973/1565), which have of uneven quality since each noble was responsible for one section, have some 96 bastions, mostly semicircular, with embrasures protected by stone hoods. Many are later modified to take heavy guns (inscriptions of Muhammad and ‘All I), one, the Farangī or Tābot Burdij built to accommodate several large dindīls. On high ground, well within the walls, is the Uprī Burdij, a massive cavalier oval in plan and some 24 m. high, built (insc. 992/1583) to mount a large (over 9 m. long, 15 cm. bore) piece of ordnance. The Sherza Burdij, one of the largest, is built out from the curtain, to which it is connected by a broad passage forming a ‘head and neck’.

Later fortifications in the Deccan, constructed or rebuilt during the Marāthā supremacy, generally follow the patterns of the Muslim period.

4. North India from the 10th/16th to the 11th/18th century. — Babur’s conquest in 932/1526 brought no new style of building in its early days, although his interest in the Hindū fortress of Gwalīyar communicated itself to his successors who developed the palace-fort par excellence. His son Humāyūn began yet another city of Dihl, called Dinpanāh, but this was railed by the Afghan usurper Shīr Shāh, who commenced building his own capital of which now little but the citadel remains, constructed on a site identified with the ancient Indraprastha and known as the Old Fort (Pūrān Kīlā, Ki lā-i kuhna). The walls and widely spaced bastions of the trapezoidal trace are of roughly
coursed rubble, while the gates, each flanked by two strongly projecting bastions, are of fine polychrome ashlar. The towers are semicircular, solid to the height of 5 m. with stone rooms and galleries, with small box machicolations; one gate has an internal machicolis, a rare feature in India. Humāyūn's re-occupation of the Purāṇā Kīlā added nothing, and Mughal building of forts starts with Akbar. Sikandar Lodī's fort at Āgrā had fallen into ruin, and was razed and re-constructed in 1572/1564. There are semicircular bastions on the inner and outer curtain, each the same height as the walls; the inner ring is much higher than the outer, reaching 30 m. Outer and inner bastions are concentric, and both have crenellated battlements defended by two or more ranks of loopholes, some protected by stone hoods for downward firing. The inner Ādilī gate on the west is defended by two magnificent half-octagonal bastions, with a blind arcade at ground-floor level finely decorated with marble and polychrome ashlar, a wide arch in each face on the first floor with an exterior balcony, and a defended chamber above with two ranks of loopholes. The bastlements above have some merlons equipped with stone hoods, and others are pierced. Each of these towers is topped by a chaṭārī. The work throughout the walling is in red sandstone ashlar over a rubble core. Akbar's new city (1578-1579) of Fatehpur-Sikrī is undistinguished in its fortification: the outer single curtain is incomplete, and its half-round bastions are simply bulges in the trace. The citadel was enclosed rather than fortified, though boasts one large bastion, the Sangīn Burdi, semi-octagonal with an internal hall, for a guard which was probably ceremonial rather than defensive. The new city was soon abandoned, and Akbar moved back to Āgrā, which was later occupied by his son Dāhāngir. From his time presumably the Mughal Ādilī Burdī (later called Samān ["jasmine"] Burdī), a half-octagon projecting on the river side of the fort summarizing a semicircular buttress; it is of two storeys with open arcades on each face, with fine pictra durā decoration. Some of this work is probably of the time of Shāhjāhān, whose principal buildings were, however, at Dihlī [q.v.] and Lāhāwar (Lahore) [q.v.]. The New Fort at Dihlī (Lal Kīlā's) was commenced in 1648/1638 and completed within ten years. The nearly rectangular trace has semicircular bastions at regular intervals, defended by one tier of loopholes at about half their height and by two rows in the bastlements; the merlons are decorated by cusping. Each tower is surmounted by a chaṭārī. Similar towers on the barbicans are of the time of Awarangzīb. The north and south bastions on the river front are larger, two storeys in height above the level of the courtyard, crowned by chaṭāris Shāh Burdī, Aṣad Burdī; between them is a larger half-octagon, the Muḥāmman Burdī, originally known also as Burdī-i Tīlā on account of a gilded copper dome; the five sides which overlook the river are filled with marble screens. Lāwāhī fort, built by Akbar at about the same time as Āgrā fort (Abū 'l-Faḍlī, Amīn-i Abhārī, Blochmann's trans., i, 438) has a similar Shāh Burdī, also called Muḥāmman Burdī insc. showing completion 1041/1631-2, of great size (45 m. diameter). Manucci in his Storia del Mogor says of these works: "At each place [Dihlī, Āgrā, Lāhāwar] there is a great bastion named the Xaabar Burdī ... they are decorated with architectural adornments of curious enamel work, with many precious stones. Here the King holds many audiences for selected persons, and from it [sic] he views the elephant fights. . . .' (Irvine's trans., ii, 463). Certainly also the Muḥāmman Burdī in Dihlī was used for the emperor's daily darshān (ceremonial showing himself to the people). These Mughal Burdīs had no pretence of being fortified works, and thus what started as a grim military work was transformed into a vehicle for Mughal art. The walls of Shāhjāhān's Dihlī were bastioned, certainly; but these were so rebuilt in the British period that it is not possible to recapture the Mughal arrangement.


**BURDJ [see nūrūn].**

**BURDIYYA.** The Burdiyya regiment was second in importance only to the Bahriyya [q.v.] regiment throughout the history of the Mamlūk sultanate. It was created by Sultan al-Mansūr Kala'ūn, who selected for this purpose 3,700 of his own Mamlūks and quartered them in towers (barbican, sing. burdī) of the Cairo citadel. Hence its name. The sources mention the creation of this unit only when they sum up Kala'ūn's career at the end of his rule, without specifying any date. It was composed of Mamlūks belonging to Caucasian peoples (al-Qurash wa l-'Ās = Circassians and Abkhasians). Al-Makrī (Khālid, ii, 214, II. 22-26) mentions Armenians (Arman) instead of the Ās. The Khuṭābiyya and Kipčakīs mentioned by him in the same passage as performing duties pertaining to the Khāṣābiyya [q.v.] do not seem to have belonged to the Burdiyya.

During the reign of Sultan Kala'ūn (678-697) and that of his son al-Ashtar Khallīf (689/697-709/703), the participation of the Burdiyya in the affairs of the state was not very conspicuous. Immediately after Khalīf's murder, however, they are mentioned as the main body supporting amīr Sandjar al-Shudjāfī, while the main supporters of his rival, amīr Kitbughā, were the Wādiyya [q.v.] Tatars and the Shahrazuri Kurds. Kitbughā defeated Sandjar, ascended the throne after having deposed the boy-king al-Nasir Muḥammad b. Kala'ūn (694/1294) and retaliated against the Burdiyya by expelling part of them from the citadel and quartering them in different parts of the
BURDJIYYA — BURGAS

This was the first blow inflicted upon the regiment. Kitbûghâ, however, was soon deposed and replaced by Lâdjûn (696/1296) and the Burdjhâyâ recovered their former position. They became extremely powerful after having murdered Sultan Lâdjûn (698/1298) under the leadership of their commander Kurdi al-Mukaddam al-Burdjhâyâ. During the second reign of al-Nâṣîr Muhammad b. Qâlîn (698-708/1308) the leaders of the regiment gradually became de facto rulers of the Mamûlûk sultanate. In the struggle between the amīrs Baybars al-Diâshnâkir and Sallûr over the Mamûlûk throne, the Burdjhâyâ naturally were on the side of the first, who was one of their number, whereas the second was supported by the Shâlîhiyya (the remnants of the Bahriyya regiment created by al-Ṣâlih Naḍîm al-Dîn Ayyûb) and by the Zâhîriyya (the Mamûlûks of al-Zâhir Baybars). Baybars defeated Sallûr without difficulty and succeeded al-Nâṣîr Muhammad as sultan (708/1308).

Under al-Muâṣâfâr Baybars, the Burdjhâyâ reached the peak of their power, but their success was short-lived, for al-Nâṣîr Muhammad soon ascended the throne for the third time (709-741/1309-1340) and dislodged the Burdjhâyâ from their powerful position. As al-Nâṣîr subsequently ruled for more than thirty years without interruption, the Burdjhâyâ gradually degenerated, and after his reign they are hardly mentioned by the sources.

Orientalists usually call the first and second periods of Mamûlûk rule “the Bahri and Burdjh period”. This terminology is hardly ever used by the Mamûlûk sources, which call the early part of their reign they are hardly mentioned by the sources.

As al-Nâṣîr subsequently ruled for more than thirty years without interruption, the Burdjhâyâ gradually degenerated, and after his reign they are hardly mentioned by the sources.

Orientalists usually call the first and second periods of Mamûlûk rule “the Bahri and Burdjh period”. This terminology is hardly ever used by the Mamûlûk sources, which call the early part of their reign they are hardly mentioned by the sources.
naival base for Balkan campaigns and as a ship-
building centre notably after the battle of Lepanto,
1571 (Uzunçarşılı, op. cit., ii. 230, iii. 21). An
Ottoman reform commission studying modern fortifi-
cations visited its castle in 1198/1784 (ibid., iv, 483)
and it was a Russian staging point in their advance
on Edirne in 1245/1829. The exiled Polish poet Adam
Mickiewicz resided there briefly in 1272/1855. Burgas
is also the name of one of the Prince’s islands
(ancient Antigone) off Istanbul (G. Schum-
berger, trs. N. Yungiil, Istanbul Adalarî, Istanbul
1937; Cuiinet, iv, 684-7; E. Mamboury, The Tourists’
Istanbul, Istanbul 1953) and of 10 villages in western
Turkey (Türkiye’de Meskun Yerlerle Klasavu, i-ii,
Ankara 1946-7, ii, 181), and appears in Arababurgaz,
Çatalburgaz and Lülburgaz, none of which is des-
cribed here.

Bibliography: Bulgaria: territorial-adminis-
trative organization ... [Washington] 1956;
Bulgarska entsiklopedia, Sofia 1936, i, 170; L. A.
and passim; A. Girard, Les minorités nationales,
ethniques et religieuses en Bulgarie, Paris 1932;
Great Britain, War Office, Bulgaria, [London 1945];
Bosl’hasha sotsial’shka entsiklopedia 2nd
rev. ed., 1951, iv, 295; R. Rochlin, Die Wirtschaft
Bulgariens seit 1945, Berlin 1957; A. Stokolinok,
Travels Through Bulgarla (in Russian), Moscow
1955, 112-117; E. D. Valev, Bulgarpkia; ekonomiko-
geograficheskata karakteristikha, [Sofia] 1957, 46-9,
passem, with good maps. (H. A. Reed)

BURGHUSH, Sp. Burgos, capital of the province
of the same name, in a valley on the banks of the
Arlanzón. It has 80,000 inhabitants and is one of the
most interesting towns of Spain because of the
monuments there which, show the importance of the
place in the Middle Ages, when it was known as
Caput Castellae. It was repeopled in 268/882 by Count
Diego Rodriguez and attacked in 308/920 by ʿAbd
al-Rahmān III, who destroyed it once more in
322/934, after having besieged Ramiro II at Osma.
As far back as 328/939-40 the famous Ffrrn González
was already count of Burgos and declared
himself independent of León. His borders stretched
to Castile, the Asturias de Santillana, Cerezo,
Lantarón, and Álava. At the close of the reign of
ʿAbd al-Rahmān III Burgos, like León and Pam-
plona, paid him tribute. In the middle of the 6th/
12th century Burgos was, according to Idrisī, a
large town with many markets and a lively trade,
a flourishing city. The river divided it into two
parts, each being bounded by ramparts; in one half
the majority of the population was Jewish. Among
its monuments is the celebrated Hospital del Rey,
contemporary with that liberally endowed by the
Almohad caliph Yaʿqūb al-Mansūr at Marrāqesh.

Bibliography: Idrisī, in Saavedra, Geografía
de España, text 67, tr. 81; E. Lévi-Provençal,
Hist. de l’Espagne musulmane, ii, 41, 53; Gómez
Moreno, Anales castellanos, 14.

(A. HUICI MIRANDA)

BURGHŪTHIYYA take their name from
Muhammad b. ʿIsa the secretary, who was called
Burghūth (Ar. ʿfeet). They hived off from the Nadj-
dā’iryya (q.v.), holding with them that God has a
nature (māhiyya), that His attributes only tell what
He is (generous says that He is not stingy) and
He always knows what would happen. Peculiar to
the Burghūthiyya is the doctrine that God always
speaks from His self or essence, i.e., that speech is
action (fahu’ kalim ʿarḍī) whence it was concluded that the
Kūrān was not the word of God. He must not
be called “doer” or “creator” for both these
words can be used of man in a bad sense;
“you create a lie” (Sūra 29, 16/17). Secondary
acts (muwa‘lladāt) are the work of God
through the nature of things. God is empty space
and (at the same time) a body in which the (created)
things occur (Ibn ʿAbī Hadīd, i, 295).
Man is a combination of accidents, capacity (iddāh)
occurs together with part of the act and, if a
limb moves, the limbs at rest have some share in
causing the movement just as the moving one has
some share in keeping the others at rest. He who
“acquires” an act cannot be called the doer of it. If
Burghūth is the Muhammad b. ʿIsa of Maḥdāl 522,
he is important for the development of theology,
for he taught that God cannot compel a man to any
particular act, to become a believer or an unbeliever.
This does not conflict with his being called a ǧāibrī
for al-ʿAsharī, too, was so called.

Bibliography: -al-ʿAsharī, Maḥdāl al-Islāmiyy-
yn, Istanbul-Leipzig 1929; al-Baghdaḍī, al-Farīq
bayn al-Fīrāq, Cairo 1910; al-Khayyāt, Kūlāb al-
Istiqār, Cairo 1925; al-Murdaṭa, al-Munya wa
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indices); al-Shahrastānī, al-Miṣāl wa l-Nihāl,
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al-Murdaṭa, Ghiyūd al-ʿAshār wa Nihāyat al-ʿAmār
(B. M. Or. 3937) 36r, 56v, 158v, 1971; W. Mont-
gomery Watt, Free Will and Predestination in
Early Islam, London 1948. (A. S. TRITTON)

BURGOS (see burgos)

AL-BURHĀN, “decisive proof”, “clear demonstra-
tion”. The term is Kūrānīc and signifies a
“brilliant manifestation”, a “shining light” come
from God (iv, 174), a “manifest proof” (xii, 24), which
may take the form of that supreme argument of
authority which is the miracle (xxviii, 32).
In correlation, burkān is also the decisive proof which
the infidels are called upon—in vain—to furnish as
justification of their false beliefs (ii, in; xxi, 24;
xviii, 75).
The first connotation of burkān is not properly
directive reasoning; it rather is the manifest
evidence of an irrefutable proof. But consequently,
It designates also the mode of argumentation, and
the argument itself which leads to that certitude.
Thus it can take on several meanings according to
the rules admitted in apodeictic demonstration
(baʿf).

1. In the initial development of fikh, burkān
refers to the quality of certitude which is proper,
especially in al-Shafiʿī, Ibn Ḥanbal and Dāwūd,
to reasoning (istiḍālāl) “in two terms”, from greater
to lesser or from lesser to greater, in order to prove
the radical distinction between or the identity of
two comparable “things” and to conclude: “certain-
ly”, “it is so” (inma, rather than anna). That is the
burkān inni. It is based upon an argument of authority,
which can be either a scriptural text or the
eye-witnessing of an obvious fact.
The form of argumentation (cf. Massignon,
Passion d’al-Ḥadīṣ, 578): reducing to the absurd
(biḥāl), exposing an effective comparison (muwa‘lāb),
indicating an internal contradiction (muḍāḥā),
establishing the obvious univocality of a term (lahkīb).
The certitude thus obtained is considered
more reliable than that obtained by rational investigation of motive or cause (illa).

2. The investigation of the "illa was, on the contrary, one of the characles of the Hanafi school, where the juridical argument took the form of a syllogism. In the logic of the falsafa, use of the 'illa became recourse to a universal mean term. Kiyds [q.v.], reasoning by analogy from the "sources of the law", was transformed into an Aristotelian syllogism, and burhdn came to designate syllogistic reasoning by analogy from the "victorious presence of the fact" (Massignon). But transposed into a logic of Aristotelian terms, the "decisive proof" of the reasoning in two terms becomes an inductive syllogism which states, as opposed to a syllogism of causal inference which explains. One may compare this analysis (although there is no complete identity) with the Aristotelian distinction between the knowledge of the reason (Posterior Analytics, 78a, 22-27). Ibn Sinä and after him al-Djurjani (Ta'rifi), emphasise that in every burhdn the mean term of the syllogism is the 'illa which connects the major to the minor premiss. If this mean term has an explanatory value and a causative scope in the actual nature of things, we have to do with the burhdn al-illa; if on the other hand it is only an affirmation of the mind which states a fact, without making explicit the raison d'être of the major premiss nor the inclusion in it of the minor, we are then dealing with a burhdn inni. If we keep the reading in, the passage could be interpreted: if such a fact exist, it follows that.

The later 'ilm al-kalim, which undertook to refute the falsafa but which was thoroughly influenced by it, lost sight of the testimonial evidence which the fact, as an argument of irrefutable authority, brought to the burhdn inni of the ancients. It took it to be the simple affirmation of existence of the quia, whilst the burhdn al-illa alone remained explanatory of premiss. In his commentary of al-Idji, al-Djurjani wrote: "The reasoning (istidâl) which moves from effect to cause is called burhdn inni; that which proceeds from cause to effect, is causal inference (ta'li) and burhdn lami".

Whether it refers to the extra-mental cause or not, whether it proceeds by lami or by innâ, burhdn thus becomes a syllogistic demonstration: to the extent to which Aristotelian logic, adopted by the later 'ilm al-kalim as well as by the falsafa, circumscribes in this sense the rules of human reasoning. But going back beyond the Kitâb al-Burhdn (Posterior Analytics), and primarily with reference to Ku'nânic terms, it still retains its original sense of "overwhelming proof", whatever way leads to certitude, discursive reasoning by a universal mean term, or testimonial proof by the argument from authority.

and the mention of his name in the Friday Prayer or khutba).
The eighteen years of his rule as Sultan are filled
with ceaseless conflict against rebellious Begs at home and with wars against such powerful neigh-
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Istanbul 1944 (facsimile of the unique MS., Brit.
Mus. Or. 4126, of the year 796/1393-1394:
A splendid manuscript, probably prepared for
the prince-poet himself and revealing on the margin
corrections presumably from his own hand);
Muharrem Ergin, Kads Bûranddîn Divans
uzerinde bir gramer dememesi, in Türk Dili ve
Edebiyats Dergisi, iv/3, Istanbul 1951, 287-327;
A. Nihat Tarlan, Kads Bûranddîn' de tasaovnî,
in ibid; v/ii/1958, 8-15.
BURHAN AL-DIN GHARÎB, i.e., SHAHYK MU-
HAMMAD b. NÂŠIR AL-DIN MAHMÛD, sister's son of
Shahtây Dîmâl al-Dîn 'Ammûd Hansawî (for
him see Akhyâr 67) and one of the earliest and most
devoted disciples, and a hâlîqa of the shahtây
al-Islâm Nizâm al-Dîn of Delhi (d. 725/1325). He was
born in Hänî (East Pandîbî) in 654/1256 and died in
Dêğtîr (Dawlatbâd) on 11 'Sâfîr 738/8 Sept. 1337
(Nușka after Rawdat al-Asrâr),20 and other
others (e.g., Khatima) in 741/1340-1, and was buried at
Rawđa (Khuldâbâd). After spending his early years
in Hânî, he went to Delhi and studied jîhîk,
usîl, and 'arâbîyya [qq.v.], from the savants of his
time. He then attached himself to the shahtây
al-Islâm, and attended on him as long as the Shahtây
was alive (cf. Nușka 143, Sîyâr 279/15, Mir Hâsan,
Fawdî'îd al-Fawdîd, Lucknow 1908, 15, 33 (708 A.H.)
BURHAN AL-DIN GHARIB — BURHAN AL-DIN KUTB-I ALAM
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44 (709 A.H.), 84 (712 A.H.); Ulughkhanl, gafar al-Wdlih, Bib. Ind., 237; for the opposite view, that the Shaykh al-Islam sent him and others to (Burhànpur and) Deogir see Firishta, Safina, Mânduwil, Aghdur-Fi Abrdr (tr. of Guldur-Fi Abrdr), Agra 1326, 90, Ma'uddi, Khurda 322; contemporary authorities are silent as to the reason why he went to Deogir. There he spent the rest of his life doing almost pioneer work in the dissemination of Islam and the spreading of the culture of Islam in the Deccan (Safina), and trained a batch of distinguished adepts (Khutina 333) to follow up his work. One of these (Rukan al-Din) collected his obiter dicta in the Nafdr al-Anfus (nine of these quoted in the Ma'uddi 1326), while Rukan al-Din's two brothers and Hamid Kalandar also collected them (Nuzha, Aghdur-Fi 86).

He had a magnetic personality, and enjoyed great popularity in the circle of his Master—he was a dear friend of the poets Amir Khusrav, Mir Hasan, and Mas'ud Bak (who eulogises him in his works, especially in his Yusuf Zulaykhd), also of Shaykh Na'ir al-Din Girakh-i Dihlawi (d. 757/1357), Kirmanl etc. (Siyar al-Awliydr, 278 f.). He is described as an embodiment of longing and love, a man of asceticism, piety and ecstasy who charmed people by his heart-alluring discourses, an extremist in the matter of sama, who had a peculiar style of his own in the ecstatic derwish-dances, his fellow-dancers being overshadowed by him. Around his tomb there was a great crowd of people at the anniversary of Shaykh Burhan al-Din's death. Ddr Shukoh also visited it, and Awrangzib and two Nizam al-Mulks were buried near it (Kutb, ii, 549 = 572; Ma'dhir al-Umard, ii, 834).

Bibliography: Apart from the works mentioned above the following are important: Muhammad-i Mubarak Kirmanl, Siyar al-Awliydr, Delhi 1302, 278 (= 'Abd al-Hakl, Aghdur-Fi-Akhbdr, Delhi 1309, 93 = 'All Ardashlnd, Mafiit al-Asfiydr, Aghdur Coll. MS. Pandjdr University f. 760); Abu 'l-Fa'l, A'in-i Ahrdr, ed. Blochmann, Calcutta, ii, 216, tr. Jarrett iii, 365, ii, 223 n. 3; Aml-i Ahmad Razi, Hafif lIsm, Shayrdn MS. Pandjdr University, f. 137b (s.v. Deogir); Firishta, Bombay 1832, ii, 750; Ddr Shukoh, Safina al-Awliydr; Lucknow 1878, 121; 'Abd al-Hakl Kalandar, Ma'dhir al-'Alam; Aghdur Collection MS. Pandjdr University f. 123b-125b; Sabzawdr, 'Awshmd (see Storey; not available to me); Ghuldm 'All Azad, Rawdat al-Awliydr (available to me only in Nuzha i.e.); Mutfi Ghuldm Sarwar, Khudn al-Asfiydr, Lahore 1284, 332; 'Abd al-Hayy Lucknow, Nuzha al-Khawdr (II) 143; Beale, Oriental biographical dict., Calcutta 1881, 75; Storey, 1025, 1027. (Mohammad Shafi)

Encyclopédie de l'Islam
Burhan al-Mulk, an otherwise good man, was ambitious to the extreme degree and his passion for self-aggrandisement did not spare even a person like Husayn 'Ali Khan, whose favourite and client he had been both as a Sayyid and a Shi'i. A disused canal in a part of the city of Delhi is still known after him as Nahr Sa'ādat Khān. It appears to be an extension of the Fayd Nahr, the main source of the water-supply of Delhi during the later Mughal period.


**BURHĀNPUR, town in Madhyā Pradēṣh (India) situated in 21° 18' N. and 76° 14' E., along the north bank of the Tapti, with bathing-steps (ghāts) on the river-side and a solid masonry wall, pierced by a number of massive gates and wickets, on all the other sides. This wall was constructed by Nīzām al-Mulk Ṣafādī lī Ḏhā 1 fg.v.) in 1141/1728, during his governorship of Burhānpur. The population in 1951 was 70,666. While the walled town occupies an area of 4½ sq. miles, numerous remains outside show that the suburbs, which now comprise Ādil-pūra, must have been very extensive.

This town, which was of great strategic importance
during the medieval period, was founded by Nasir Khan al-Faruki, founder of the Faruki dynasty of Khânâdâgh (renamed Dândêsh by Akbar after his son Mirzâ Dânîyâl, but the name never caught the popular fancy) in or about 801/1398-9 and named after the Deccan saint Burhân al-Dîn Gharîb [q.v.]. Another town on the other side of the Tâpti was also founded at the same time and called Zaynâbâbâd, after Shâykh Zayn al-Dîn Dâ'ûd al-Shirâzî, one of the khânâdâgh of Burhân al-Dîn Gharîb.

In 969/1561 Bûrhnâpûr was sacked by Fir Muhammad Shîrânî, a servant of Bayram Khân [q.v.], who massacred the inhabitants and carried off immense booty. It continued to be the capital of the Fâruki dynasty till its overthrow by Akbar in 1010/1601 when the kingdom was annexed to the Mughal empire, although the town itself had been occupied by the imperial forces under the command of Abu 'l-Fâdil 'Allâmî [q.v.], in 1008/1599. 'Abd al-Rahîm, khân-i khânân [q.v.] was appointed governor and stayed in Bûrhnâpûr for a very long period. It was here in Bûrhnâpûr that his eldest son, Mirzâ Îriq (entitled Shâhnâwâz Khan), died; his father built a tomb over his grave. Sir Thomas Roe, the English ambassador, had waited on Fârîwâz, Diårânî's eldest son, in this very town in 1023/1614. In 1025/1616 Shâhdjâhân, then prince Khurram, made it his general headquarters during his Deccan campaigns. Prince Fârîwâz died here in 1036/1626 and Arwândjâb accused his father Shâhdjâhân, after the latter's deposition, of having poisoned him. In 1040-2/1630-2 it again formed the base of Shâhdjâhân's military operations against the Deccan states when a great famine, resulting in an extremely heavy death-roll, devastated the town. In 1041/1631 the empress Mumtâz Mahall, consort of Shâhdjâhân, died here and was temporarily interred in Zaynâbâbâd, before the removal of her dead body to Agra for a permanent burial. In 1046/1636 Arwândjâb, then a youth of 18 years of age, was appointed governor of the Deccan, including Khânâdâgh, and he made Bûrhnâpûr his headquarters. It was during his viceroyalty of the Deccan that Arwândjâb came to know Shâykh Niẓâm Bûrhnâpûrî, who remained in his employment for nearly forty years and was subsequently appointed chairman of the board of 'ulamâ and jurists responsible for the compilation of al-Falâsîd al-Âlamgirîyya [q.v.]. It was again in 1092/1681 that Arwândjâb encamped at Bûrhnâpûr before investing Bidiapur [q.v.]. Soon after the emperor left the town in 1096/1685, it was sacked by the Mârâtâhs. There followed a series of battles in its neighbourhood, and peace could only be restored to the harassed town in 1132/1719 when the demand of the Mârâtâhs for levying the jâzâr (one fourth of the revenue) was formally conceded. In 1133/1720 when Niẓâm al-Mulk Âsâf Dîhî I was appointed to the government of the Deccan, he also made it his headquarters. After his return from Delhi in 1137/1724 till his death in 1161/1748 Bûrhnâpûr continued to remain an important outpost of the new principality which Âsâf Dîhî founded, and also served occasionally as his headquarters. After the death of Âsâf Dîhî I it was occupied by the Mârâtâhs, who were only dispossessed by Lord Wellesley in 1218/1803. It then changed hands several times and became finally a British possession in 1277/1860. In 1268/1850 it was the scene of a terrible Hindu-Muslim riot which claimed many lives. In 1268/1850 a great fire completely gutted Ghîndihpûra, a quarter of the town peopled mainly by the descendants of early migrants from various towns in Sind. Next year a large number of houses in Dâwûdpûra were gutted, while the third fire of 1314/1897 destroyed a part of Lohâr Mandî, including the mosque in the Cawk. In 1321/1903 bubonic plague took a very heavy toll of life. Bûrhnâpûr contains a large number of tombs and shrines of saints and mystics, many of them, from Sind and Gujârât, find mention in the Gulsâr-i Aâbrâr, whose author, Muâmmâd Gâhwîlî, visited Bûrhnâpûr frequently. Among other buildings of note are the tombs of Mubârak Shâh al-Fâruki and Râdžî 'Alî Khân entitled 'Adî Shâh al-Fâruki, the Khânâmî Masjîd, built by the latter in 997/1589, and the old fort, along the bank of the Tâpti, now in a state of utter disrepair. A caravanserai built by the khân-i khânân 'Abd al-Rahîm is still extant.

Diårânî's system of water-supply for the town, completed in the 11th/17th century by the Khân-i Khânân, compares favourably with any modern waterworks system. During the Mughal period Bûrhnâpûr housed a number of imperial factories which produced quality and expensive cloth for the royal household. The workers in these kârkhânas were mostly skilled weavers from Thatta (Sind), who had migrated to Bûrhnâpûr during the governorship of the khân-i khânân.

Bibliography: Mawlâlî Khalîf al-Rahmân, Ta'rikh Bûrhnâpûrî, Delhi 1337/1893; 'Âmî-î Akhârî (Eng. transl. Blochmann and Jarrett) iii 223 and index; Muâmmâd Kâsim "Fîrîghâ'î, Guhshau Ibrâhîmî, Bombay 1831; 'Abd al-Hamîd Lahorî, Bûrhnâpûr (Bib. Ind.) index; Muâmmâd Sâkî Mustâ'îdî Khân, Ma'âthîrî 'Alamgirî (Bib. Ind.) index; Samsân al-Dawla Shâhnâwâz Khân, Muhâdhir al-Umarî (Bib. Ind.) index; Pierre Mundy, Travels in Asia (ed. Richard Temple) Hakluyt Society, ii 114, iii 1915; Traverrers, Travels (ed. V. Ball) London 1889; Bîhm Sên, Nushkâ-î Dilughî (MS); Yûsuf Husayn Khân, Niẓâm al-Mulk Âsâf Dîhî, Mangalore 1936 index; Sayyid Muâmmâd Muñîf 'Allâh Râshîd Bûrhnâpûrî, Bûrhnâpûr ke Sindhi Awliyâ (MS. in Persian, being the Malikzâd of Bûrhnâpûr); 'Abd al-Bâlî Nihâwândî, Ma'âthîrî-i Rahimî (Bib. Ind.), index; Muâmmâd Sâlîh Kânbîhî, 'Amdll-î Sâlîh (Bib. Ind.), index; Mu'âthîr (Urdu monthly), A'zângârî 67/iv, 72/vi; Cambridge History of India, iv 575-6; Kâ'fî Khân, Mûstâkhab al-Lubûb, (Bibliotheca Indica), index; The Embassy of Sir Thomas Roe to India (ed. William Forster), London 1856, index; Niẓâm al-Dîn Aîmâd, Tabâhâk-i Akhârî (Eng. transl.), index. (A. S. Bazmee Ansârî)

Bûrî b. AYYÛB [see ayyûbîs].
Bûrî TADJ b. AL-MULûK [see bûrîs].
Bûrî-BARS b. ALP ARSLAN, the Sâldjîk, was sent by Barkhîrûk against Arslân Ahrânî, another son of Alp Arslan, who was trying to make himself independent in Khurâsân. In the struggle between the two brothers, Bûrî-Bars was at first successful, but in the second encounter, in 1088/1095, his troops were scattered and he himself was taken prisoner and strangled by his brother's order.

Bibliography: Iba al-Ahihî, z, 179; Houtsma, Recueil, ii, 257. (Ed.)
BORâTAKIN — BûRIDS

BORâIDS, a dynasty of Turkish origin which reigned in Damascus from 497/1104 to 549/1154. Its founder was the alâbeq [q.v.] of Shams al-Mulk Dukâk, son of the Saljuqid sultan Tutush (see SALJUQIDS). This alâbeq, named Tughtakin and called Ẓahr al-Dîn, was the confidant of sultan Tutush, and was entrusted with the direction of affairs in Damascus as early as 488/1095 by Dukâk, whose mentor he had been. After the death of Dukâk (12 Ramaḍân 497/18 June 1104), Tughtakin continued to exercise power in the name of the deceased prince's young son, Tutush, who in turn died shortly after his father. From that moment, Tughtakin became the master of Damascus. His dynasty was founded, and it endured until the capture of Damascus by Âmir Nûr al-Dîn Zankî on 10 Saḥâb 549/25 April 1154. Tughtakin ruled until his death, 8 Saḥâb 522/11 February 1128. He was replaced by his son Tâdî al-Mulûk Bûrî, who died as a result of an attempt made against his life on 21 Râdhab 549/6 June 1132. Just before he expired he named as his successor his son Abu 'l-Ťafîl Ismâ'îll, called Shams al-Mulûk, who was himself assassinated by his slaves on 14 Râbî‘ 529/30 January 1135, by order of his own mother. His brother, Shihâb al-Dîn Maḥmûd, followed him, and was murdered by three of his servants on 23 Shawkâl 553/23 June 1139. His brother Dîmâlâl-Dîn Muhammâd, governor of Baḥbâk, was summoned to replace him, and died as the result of an illness 8 Shawkâl 554/29 March 1140. The military chiefs then raised to power the son of Dîmâlâl-Dîn, 'Abd al-Dawla ʿAbâb al-ʿAbâb, called Mudîlir al-Dîn, who left the responsibilities of administration to his alâbeq, Muʾîn al-Dîn Unûr, until the death of the latter on 23 Râbî‘ 544/30 August 1149. He then took the direction of affairs into his own hands, but was very soon obliged to accept the domination of the Zangid Nûr al-Dîn, by whom he was driven from Damascus in 1154.

During the fifty years that the dynasty lasted, the Bûrid rulers received their investiture from the caliph and from the sultan of Baghdaḏ, who, in exchange for considerable gifts, did not interfere in the internal affairs of the principality. Throughout this period, the Bûrid princes were confronted by situations which often were very difficult. When Tughtakin assumed authority, the territory of Damascus was in immediate proximity to the Frankish states of Antiqa, Tripoli, and Jerusalem. The Franks of Jerusalem menaced the regions from which Damascus clearly acquired its food provisions; that is, Ḥawrân and the plains of Upper Jordan and of Yarmûk. In order to avoid risking the entire loss of these indispensable territories, and to safeguard the communications of Damascus with Egypt and Arabia, the Bûrid princes were induced to negotiate with the Franks on several occasions, and even to conclude with them genuine treaties of alliance. They made them all the more easily since the treaties were not always looked upon with very much apprehension by their Muslim neighbours. Tughtakin did try to co-operate with the Egyptian garrisons, who still held some coastal positions, Tyre for example, but with little success or effect. On the other hand, the masters of Baghdaḏ were prejudiced by the tortuous politics of the Damascus rulers, so much so that the latter were repeatedly obliged to appear before the sultan and the caliph to justify their actions. Finally, from 524/1130, when the Zangid amir, ʿImâd al-Dîn and his son Nûr al-Dîn became masters of Aleppo, they grew progressively more threatening toward Damascus. With the exception of Shams al-Mulkûk, who was preparing to deliver the city to ʿImâd al-Dîn when he was assassinated, the Bûrid princes were therefore not displeased to find support in the Franks against the covetousness of the princes of Aleppo. However, the unprofitable attack by the Franks on Damascus during the second Crusade (July 1148) ended this policy and hastened the taking of Damascus by Nûr al-Dîn.

The internal situation of the city was no less troubled during the Bûrid epoch. The lower orders of the town, organised into a sometimes very turbulent militia (ahdâd), frequently participated in the political life of the city under the direction of those enterprising persons known by the term raʾîs. Over against the militia and actively opposing it, at least on one occasion, was a rural class. Led into action by the Ismâʿîlls [q.v.] or Bahārîyâs, this group also played an important rôle, particularly in 522/1128, with the complicity of some highly placed persons. It was not the first time that the Ismâʿîlls used Damascus as the arena of their activities; several political murders had been perpetrated there by them, notably that of Âmir Mawdûd the ruler of Maʿwshî, on 18 Râbî‘ 507/2 October, 1113. Âmir Tâdî al-Mulûk Bûrî was also their victim in 1134.

Until the end, or until just a little before the end, the Bûrid princes could count on the support of their Turkish troops whose loyalty was unfailling, and on the neutrality, growing steadily less benevolent, of the bourgeoisie. The latter were no longer opposed to the dynasty so long as it maintained order and assured, as best it could, the security of commercial transactions. But as the situation deteriorated after the death of Tâdî al-Mulûk Bûrî, the middle classes of Damascus showed themselves to be increasingly impressed by the prestige of Nûr al-Dîn, and facilitated his entrance into Damascus.

Thus, as long as the Bûrid dynasty was represented by men of ability such as Tughtakin and his son, it had no difficulty in retaining its power in Damascus; but the last twenty years, apart from the administration of Muʾîn al-Dîn Unûr, were characterised by sometimes bloody rivalries and by growing economic difficulties. Also the population of Damascus, principally the bourgeoisie, who had been whole-heartedly supported the Bûrids, no longer saw any reason for linking its destiny with that of the dynasty. The last prince, Muḍîlir al-Dîn, left the city amid indifference, if not hostility.

AL-BINN — BURSA

AL-BINN, AL-HASAN B. MUHAMMAD AL-DIMASHKI AL-SAFFURI BADR AL-DIN, an Arab historian and poet, born in the middle of Ramadan 959/July 1556, at Saffuriyya in Galilee, came when 10 years old with his father to Damascus, where he received his education at the Madrasa al-Salahiya. After the completion of his studies, which he had to interrupt in 974/1567 by a four years' stay in Jerusalem on account of famine, he lectured in various madrasas. In the year 1020/1611 he acted as Kadi to the Syrian pilgrim caravan. He died on the 13th Dhumad 1021/June 1615. His chief work is the collection of biographies entitled Taridjam al-A'yan min Abd al-Zaman, containing accounts of 205 individuals which he had collected at long intervals and completed in 1023/1614; it was edited by Faqi Allah b. Muhibb Allah in 1078/1667 and published with a supplement (cf. Ahlwardt, Verzeichnis der arab. Hss. . . . Berlin, no. 9889; Flügel, Die arab., pers. und lütt. Hss. . . . Wien, no. 1190; Fihrist al-Kutubkhane al-Khedivey, v. 33); his Dīwan is preserved in Istanbul (Köprülü, no. 1287). There are some of his poems in Berlin (Marāthi on the Soff Muhammad b. Abī 'l-Barākat al-Kadiri, s. Ahlwardt, op. cit. no. 7858, s); Goa (poetic epistle to As'ad b. Mu'in al-Din al-Tibrizi al-Dimashki, with the latter's reply, cf. Fertisch, Die arab. Hss. der herzogl. Bibl., no. 44, 23 and London [Catalogus Cod. Or. Mus. Brit., ii, no. 630, 2). Lastly he also wrote a commentary on the Dīwan of 'Umar b. al-Fārid, lith. Cairo 1279; he completed the commentary on the Tā'īyya al-Sughra in 1002/1593, cf. Derenbourg, Les MSS. Or. de l'Escorial no. 420, 4.

Bibliography: al-Numānī, al-Raawd al-'Ajīr (cod. Wetzstein), ii, 289; Ahlwardt, op. cit., no. 9886), fol. 112; Muhibb, Khālidat al-Ahsar, ii, 31; al-Khaḍāyī, Runnīn at-Ahsbāb, Cairo 1934, 17-22; Wüstenfeld, Die Geschichtsschreiber der Araber, no. 555; Muhammad Kurd 'All, in MMIA, iii, 193-202; Brockelmann, II, 374, S II, 401. (C. Brockelmann)

BURMA. Islam made its first major impact in the early 15th century through the King of Arakan, Narameikha. This monarch returned from exile in Bengal in 1430, accompanied by Muslim followers. He set up his capital at Mrohaung, where the Sandikan mosque was erected. Subsequent Arakanese kings, although Buddhists, used Muslim designations, and even issued medallions bearing the kalima. Muslim influence was intensified when Prince Shudja, brother of Alamgir, fled to Arakan in 1660. Shudja was murdered by King Sandakhtumma and his treasure sequestrated, but his followers were retained at court as Archers of the Guard, in which rôle they frequently intervened as kingmakers. Descendants of these Mughal courtiers remain distinctive to this day. Before the 19th century, Muslim presence in Burma proper was confined to small numbers of Gujjarāt traders and certain gunners and other foreign technicians conscripted into the service of the Kings of Ava. The British annexation of Arakan in 1826 led to an influx of Muslims from Cittagong into coastal towns, particularly Akyab. The annexation of Lower Burma (1852) was followed by large-scale Indian immigration from the 1880's onwards. The 1931 Census (the last to be completed in detail) gives a Muslim population of 584,839, out of a total of 14,667,146. Of the Muslims, 396,504 were of Indian origin; 1,474 were Chinese (Panthay); and 186,861 were indigenous, mainly Arakanese. Muslim Arakanese were among the early officials and police officers under the British; they took advantage of higher education and many were prominent in government service, banking, and business. Cittagongi Muslims supplied most of the crews of the coastal and river-steamers. Ismaʿīlls (Khodjas) and Gujjarāṭis dominated the retail trade. The 1930's were a decade of depression and some resentment was vented upon Muslims, conspicuous in the economy. Violent riots occurred in 1930 and '38; the latter lasted from July to December, and were fiercest in Rangoon and Mandalay; some 200 Muslims were killed. Following the Japanese invasion (1942) many Indians fled; numbers returned after the war, but they are less than before. The total Muslim population in 1958 is probably slightly higher than in 1931, perhaps 600,000 (the Census of 1953-4 is quite incomplete). About half are from India and Pakistan. A political organisation, the Burma Muslim Congress, was formed in 1945 and is affiliated to the Anti-Fascist People's Freedom League, the government coalition party. Two Muslims have been Cabinet Ministers during the greater period since independence: M. A. Rashid (b. 1912) a leading trade unionist and business man, and U Khin Maung Lat (Abd al-Laṭīf, b. 1913) a lawyer. The leaders of independent Burma, notably U Nu, lay great stress upon their Buddhist heritage; Muslims are accepted as equal citizens, but a number of irritants to good relations have existed. The Muḍjahids revolt in northern Arakan led by Kāsim, a fisherman, aimed at union of this area with Pakistan. The Muḍjahids terrorised the Buthidaung-Maungdaw area from 1948 to '54, but with the imprisonment of Kāsim in a Pakistan gaol their activities were greatly reduced. In September 1954, a national political creation was made by widespread monastic protests against Islamic teaching in state schools, but in general relations are harmonious. In Arakan, where Buddhists and Muslims are intermarried, many Muslim customs are followed by the Buddhists, even beef-eating. But in Lower Burma beef-eating and animal sacrifice at the 'Id are actively discouraged. The Burma Muslim Dissolution of Marriages Act, passed in March 1955, gave Muslim women equal rights to those of Buddhists: equal opportunity to divorce their husbands, and the right to retain their marriage portion on dissolution of the union. The act evoked Muslim protests outside Burma, but was accepted by the Burma Muslim Congress. Married Burmese Muslim women do not take the veil or observe purdah. In 1955, U Nu as Prime Minister initiated a project to translate the Kur'an into Burmese.

Bibliography: Census of India, 1931, xi (Burma), Rangoon 1933; H. Tinker, The Union of Burma, London 1957. (H. Tinker)

BURSA, also called BURSA by the Ottomans after the ancient city of Prusa (Pronoaea) on the northern foothills of Mysian Olympus, became the main capital of the Ottoman State between 735-805/1326-1402. It was mentioned by Pachymeres along with Nicaea and Philadelphia as one of the three principal cities still in the hands of the Byzantines when the Turkish borderers invaded the whole of western Anatolia about 699/1300.

According to 'Ashik Pashazade (ed. Fr. Giese, 22-23) the Ottomans were able to lay siege to Bursa for the first time when they invaded the Bursa plain after their victory over the Byzantine Tekfur (q.v.) of Bursa who, in alliance with the other Tekfurs had
attempted to stop the Ottomans at the pass of Dinboz, about 717/1308. This first siege failed. After blocking it for many years (cf. ʿĀshīk Pashazāde, 249-250; Ibn Battūta, Paris 1877, ii, 1; ʿĀshīk Pashazāde quoted by A. Wächter, Der Verfall des Griechenums in Kleinasien, Leipzig 1903, 55), the starved city had to surrender to the Ottomans (a Dījmādā I 726/1326), and to pay a heavy tribute (Pachymeres, loc. cit.; in Neshrī, ed. Taeschner, i, 39, 30,000 florin). The Byzantine commander was allowed to leave Bursa for Istanbul but his chief adviser, Šaroz (?) who was responsible for the surrender, remained with the new rulers (ʿĀshīk Pashazāde, 26; Neshrī, i, 39). The Greek metropolitan of Bursa continued to exercise his duty there under the Ottomans but his revenues diminished considerably (A. Wächter, loc. cit.). The Greeks were apparently removed from the castle to a district below it where we still find them in the Kādi records of the 15th century. The castle itself was settled by the Ottomans and the court. In 836/1432 B. de La Broquière (136) reported that the castle contained 1000 houses. Another description of it, in 1050/1640, is found in Ewliyā Celebī (Vol. ii, 9). Orkhan [q.v.] had his palace (Beg-sarayi) within its walls near the Byzantine church which had been converted into a mosque (Ibn Battūta, ii, 322). This locality overlooking the plain is called today Tophane. An inscription of 738/1337-38 found near it shows that he had also a mosque built there (A. Tewhid, Bursa da en eski kitâbe, in TOEM, v, 318-320). Orkhan made Bursa his capital and had his first silver coin, the akba, struck there in 727/1327 (Belleten, x, 207). In 740/1339-40 below the castle on the plain he built a group of public buildings inside its walls near the Byzantine church which had been converted into a mosque (Ibn Battūta, ii, 322). This locality overlooking the plain is called today Tophane. An inscription of 738/1337-38 found near it shows that he had also a mosque built there (A. Tewhid, Bursa da en eski kitâbe, in TOEM, v, 318-320). Orkhan made Bursa his capital and had his first silver coin, the akba, struck there in 727/1327 (Belleten, x, 207). In 740/1339-40 below the castle on the plain he built a mosque, an i̇maret, a bath and a caravanserai (Beg-khan). This group of public buildings became the centre of Ottoman Bursa and the place is still the most lively commercial centre in Bursa. New districts such as 'Alā al-Dīn-beg, Çobān-beg, Kodja Nābī, came into existence in this period, and towards 734/1333 Ibn Battūta (ibid.) described Bursa as 'a large and great city with attractive bazaars and large areas of open land'. During the subsequent reigns new religious and commercial centres with generous endowments were established by the Sultans and high officials in other parts of the locality. These became nuclei of the new districts of Bursa such as Yıldırım, Emir-sultan, Sultan-Mehmed (today Yeşil), and others. An idea can be obtained about the population growth of the city from the figures included in the Ottoman registers of the time for the years 734/1333 (Ibn Battūta, 322). This locality overlooking the plain is called today Tophane. An inscription of 738/1337-38 found near it shows that he had also a mosque built there (A. Tewhid, Bursa da en eski kitâbe, in TOEM, v, 318-320). Orkhan made Bursa his capital and had his first silver coin, the akba, struck there in 727/1327 (Belleten, x, 207). In 740/1339-40 below the castle on the plain he built a mosque, an i̇maret, a bath and a caravanserai (Beg-khan). This group of public buildings became the centre of Ottoman Bursa and the place is still the most lively commercial centre in Bursa. New districts such as 'Alā al-Dīn-beg, Çobān-beg, Kodja Nābī, came into existence in this period, and towards 734/1333 Ibn Battūta (ibid.) described Bursa as 'a large and great city with attractive bazaars and large areas of open land'. During the subsequent reigns new religious and commercial centres with generous endowments were established by the Sultans and high officials in other parts of the locality. These became nuclei of the new districts of Bursa such as Yıldırım, Emir-sultan, Sultan-Mehmed (today Yeşil) etc. A particularly great development of the city took place during the reign of Bayazīd I [q.v.]. Ulū-Dījāmī, the Great Mosque, was erected in 802/1399. J. Schiltberger, a contemporary eye-witness, says: 'The city contains two hundred thousand (7) houses and eight hospitals (i̇maret) where poor people are received whether they be Christians, infidels or Jews' (ed. Teller, 40). After Timūr's victory over Bayazīd I in 804/1402 a contingent of his army plundered and burned down Bursa. From that time on Adrianople (see Edirne) replaced Bursa as the principal capital (dār al-saltana) of the Ottoman state, though during the civil war (806-813/1402-1409) each party tried hard to gain control of Bursa as well as Adrianople. During the prosperous reign of Murād II [q.v.] who was enthroned in Bursa, the city made a quick recovery and greatly expanded. The new districts named after and endowed by Sultan Murād, Faḍl Allāh Pasha, Hādījī, ʿIbad Pasha, Hasan Pasha, Umūr Beg, Dībeʾ-All Beg, Şahāb al-Dīn Pasha and Rezkān were formed. In 836/1432 B. de La Broquière observed: 'Ceste ville de Bourse est bien bonne ville et bien marchande, et est la meilleure ville que
le Turc aye'. Before Mehemmed II [q.v.] made Istanbul his capital, Bursa had risen as a rival of it, and then many of the citizens of Bursa were ordered to migrate to the new capital. Bursa, however, benefited economically from the great expansion of the empire under this Sultan. Moreover he continued to use it as headquarters of his campaigns in the east. During the civil war after his death (886/1481) the people of Bursa took sides with Diem [q.v.] who maintained himself there as sultan for 18 days. He had coins struck there in his name and planned to rule at least over Anatolia with Bursa as his capital. The town continued to be considered one of the three capitals of the empire and the palace of Bursa was maintained and occasionally used by the Sultans as late as in the 11th/12th century (Pecėwi, ii, 313; Ewliyā Celebī, ii, 10).

An idea can be obtained about the population growth of the city from the figures included in the Ottoman registers of the time. The newly formed eyâlet of Khudawendīgīr or Beg in the eyâlet of Anadolu [q.v.] included the muṭasarriftlik of Bursa, Karabīšar, Kütahya, Bileğişik, Erdek, and Biga, and when in 1281/1864 a wilâyet of Khudawendīgīr was formed with the liwād of Karesi, Kütahya, Kōhān, Kōhān, Kūhān, Kütahya, Bursa became the seat of the liwād. It had in 1310/1892 a population of 76,000 of which 5,158 were Greeks, 7,541 Armenians, 2,548 Jews and the rest Muslims. There were 165 mosques, 57 schools, 27 madrasas, 7 i̇maret, 7 churches, 3 synagogues, 49 caravanserais, 36 factories (Khudawendigīr Wilâyeti Sâlimânesi for the year 1310/1892).

It can be said that Bursa had a greater economic than political significance in Ottoman history. It soon became an international market as it was, under the Ottomans, one of the closest of the Muslim centres to the Christian world. In fact Iranian silk caravans increasingly came to the Bursa market, partially abandoning earlier ones such as Trebizond and Aleppo. Already around 802/1400 it was, as can be understood from Schiltberger (34), one of the international centres of the silk trade and industry. The main silk route to Bursa passed through Tabriz, Erzurum and Tokat. Other important trade routes also converged in this city then. The ancient diagonal route Aleppo-Konya-Kütahya seems to regain its importance during this period. In 856/1452 B. de La Broquière (55-59) joined a Mecca caravan in Damascus which followed this route, and the spices it brought were sold to the Genoese merchants of Pera in Bursa.
The Damascus–Aleppo–Bursa route on the one hand and the sea route of Antalya–Alexandria on the other grew in importance during the 9th/15th century because of the active trade in spices, sugar, dyestuffs, soap and perfumes coming from Egypt and Syria to Bursa. Moreover, merchants from India used these routes to come to trade in Bursa. Thus for example about 885/1480 the agents of Maḥmūd Gāwān [g.v.] were importing Indian goods to Bursa. This trade must have been important enough for the Florentines about 874/1470 to hope to obtain their spices in the Bursa market. But it must be added that, because of higher prices in Bursa the spice trade there never developed to such a degree as to make it a competitor of the Egyptian markets. About 892/1487 the customs duties on dyes and pepper brought to Bursa amounted to 100 thousand akātas (about 2,500 Venetian ducats) yearly (Byzvekâyet Arşivi, Istanbul, tapu def. no. 23, muhādahati of Bursa). But Bursa remained the most important emporium of Eastern goods for Istanbul, the Balkans and even for Eastern Europe until the 11th/12th century.

The silk trade and industry in Bursa was the basis of its prosperity. Caravans from Tabriz brought to Bursa the precious silk of Gilān, Astarābdād and Sāfīr, and this was the subject of a very active trade there as the records of the kādūs of Bursa (preserved today in the Bursa Museum) and the Medici documents published by G. R. B. Richards (Florentine Merchants in the Age of the Medici, Cambridge, Mass. 1932) attest. The Genoese, Venetians and Florentines, who usually had their agents in Bursa, were in keen competition to buy as much silk as they could, and the usual practice in this trade was to exchange the silk for the woolen cloth which they imported. In 906/1501 Maringhi, an agent in Bursa for the Medici, estimated that one load (fardello) of silk made 70 to 80 ducats of profit. In the year of 884/1479 the total value of the silk imported there from Iran amounted to about 150 thousand Venetian ducats. Most of this silk was consumed by the local silk industry. In 907/1502 an official inspection showed that more than one thousand looms were active in this industry in Bursa (Bursa İhtisab Kanunu, ed. O. L. Barkan, Tarik Vesti, halari Dergisi, vii, 30). It was in private hands and had created there a prosperous Muslim bourgeoisie. The upper and middle class people constituted about 70 per cent of the population of Bursa in the second half of the 15th century (see İhtisāb Fakulteleri Meinuusun, Istanbul, xv, no. 1-4, 55-57). Workers in the silk industry were mostly slaves and after a time many of them were freed and became in turn entrepreneurs themselves. The ihtisāb [g.v.] regulations mentioned above describe in detail various groups engaged in this business and the processes by which different kinds of silks were manufactured. The precious brocades (kandīh) and gold velvets (muḍawbah ḥadīf) of Bursa were exported and much sought after in Europe, Egypt and Iran, but the main consumer was the Ottoman court (see T. Öz, Türk Kumaşlar, Istanbul 1946; R. Anhegger-H. Halıcı, Känämne-i Sültanim deb mürce-i 'Or-i Osmānî, Ankara 1956, 36). Light silks called vête and tāftha (taffeta) were produced in Bursa and exported in great quantities for wider use.

The considerable commercial activity of Bursa is further attested by many caravanserais (khāns) built in the 9th/15th century such as Ipek-khana under Mehmed I, Maḥmūd Pasha-khana under Mehmed II, and the larger khān called Kozha-khana and Pirinçekhānī under Bāyezid II. Bursa became also an entrepôt for the cotton textiles of western Anatolia, which were exported especially to Rumel and to Eastern Europe. The yearly tax revenue of the imported goods in Bursa amounted to about 140 thousand ducats in 892/1487 (Byzvekâyet Arşivi, tapu def. no. 23). The principal mint (see PARBÂNE) of copper and silver coins was located in Bursa, and this monopoly brought in a yearly revenue of 6,000 ducats at the same date.

Between 1007/1599 and 1037/1628 ʿAbbās the Great attempted to divert Persian silk from the Ottoman market (see Belleten, no. 60, 665), and this induced the Ottomans to encourage silk production in Bursa and its environs. In the 12th/18th century the production of good quality silk in Europe (Italy, France) and the competition of İzmir [g.v.] as a market of Eastern goods affected Bursa's former prosperity (P. Masson, Histoire du commerce français dans le Levant, Paris 1911, ii, 492). It, however, continued to produce Bursa silk cloth for internal consumption. In the 13th/19th century this local market too was invaded by cheap cotton and silk products from Europe. In 1262/1846 D. Sandison, the British Consul in Bursa, wrote that "Bursa silk and cotton stuffs were always falling in disuse" (Public Record Office, F.O. 78,701). British, German and Swiss imitations of the Bursa silks and cottons were in great demand in Bursa itself. But, in 1253/1837, Bursa was saved from becoming a mere producer of raw silk for Western countries by the introduction of steam power in the local industry. Filatures were 35 in number twenty five years later and the production of raw silk reached one thousand tons by 1332-1914. This development was greatly affected at the time of war of independence (1337-1341/1921-1922). But under the protectionist policy of the Turkish Republic a partial recovery was achieved in silk production (140 tons of raw silk in 1958). On the other hand Bursa textile industry made tremendous progress because artificial silk now provided the raw material (6,000 power looms in 1938). Moreover the establishment of a large woolen factory in 1938 emphasised the industrial character of the city. Its population almost doubled from 77,000 in 1940 to 131,000 in 1955.
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BURSA — BURSUK

1336

BURSA (Eastern Turkish = “badger”), one of the local officers of the Great Saljūq, whose descendants also played a notable role at the beginning of the 6th/12th century. Bursuk, although youthful, entered history as one of the principal amirs in the service of Ṭūghrīl-Beg, who after restoring control in Baghdād following the tragedies of the years 450/1058-59, made Bursuk his first ğiına (military commander) in Baghdād. However, under the pacified Saljūqī organisation, the essential power belonged to the ‘amīd, the civil administrator, and it is not certain that there had been a ğiına with any permanence in Baghdād for a dozen years. In any case, Bursuk did not remain in the position since we find him in 455/1063 as hādīgī of the sultan who had accompanied (Ṣīhī Ibn al-Djawzī, Mir‘īd al-Zanīn, Bib. Nat., Paris, Arab. 1506, 87v); then, in 456/1064, he was charged by the new sultan, Ṭup Arslān, to go and extract from a vassal a reprise of tribute (ibid., 99v, 100v). Then, without our being able to explain the reason, silence ensambles him for 15 years. We discover him again only around 471/1078, under Malikshāh, sent to Anatolia against the Saljūqī rebel sons of Kutlmūgh, one of whom, Mansūr, he killed but without being able to crush the other, Sulaymān (Bar Hebræus, Chronography, trans. Budé, 227). In 479/1086, together with Būzān, he led the advanced guard of Malikshāh’s army, which on the death of Sulaymān occupied Aleppo; and probably from there was dispatched to Asia Minor to combat the heir of Sulaymān at Nicaea who, despite the efforts of the sultan, was supported by Alexius Comnenus, the Byzantine Emperor (Anna Comnena, Alexiad, Bonn ed., 302-11). It was probably on this occasion that he obtained from Constantineople the tribute of 300,000 dinārs about which Bundar speaks (ed. Houtsma, 70). A little later Bursuk organised the celebrations in Baghdād honouring the marriage of the caliph to a daughter of Malikshāh. Following the death of the sultan, in the quarrels among the latter’s heirs he took the part of Barkyarūk, particularly in the resistance to Tutūq, and followed his prince to Isfahān, there falling victim to the Assassins. His sons avenged him by participating two years later (490/1091) in the execution of the Shī‘ī mustawfi of Barkyarūk, Majdī al-Mulk al-Balāsānī, whom they suspected of having been the instigator of the murder of Bursuk and of others as well.

The sons of Bursuk—Zenghl, ʿAbdūr, ʿIlbeki, and Bursuk—appear, generally speaking, as a close-knit family group, which remained attached to Barkyarūk as long as he lived, but which was more normally established on their ichtā of the province of Ahwāz, which, with Tustar, foremost town of the province, were acknowledged to be hereditary, either legally or by fact of possession. Bursuk assisted Barkyarūk in recapturing Cappadocia from his brother Muhammad. Probably it was for this reason, when in 498/1005 Muhammad succeeded Barkyarūk who had died, that we find Zenghl incarcerated by the new sultan. But the family found a way to reconcile itself with Muhammad by refusing to follow the rebel Mangubār and by betraying him to the sultan. Zenghl, who would have been put to death, was set free, and although the sultan demanded from the Banū Bursuk the return of their ichtā, in exchange he conceded to them Dinawar. Furthermore, even this exchange appears to have been provisional; for we find the Banū Bursuk subsequently once more in possession of Tustar. Meanwhile, Bursuk (the son of Bursuk) was made by Muhammad governor of the province of Hamadān, one of the capitals of the Empire (ibn al-Kalānī, ed. Amedroz, 174).
Firmly installed in power, Sultan Muhammad sought to organise war against the Franks in Syria. Bursuk b. Bursuq was one of the principal participants of the expedition of 509/1115, which miscarried because of quarrels among the chiefs and the jealousies of the Syrian princes toward the “Easterners”; moreover, he was ill almost the whole time. But he received command of the expedition of 509/1115. Again the circumstances were difficult, Iğhâzî, the principal chief of the Diyâr Bakr Turkomâns, Tughîkîn of Damascus, and Lu’î’un, regent of Aleppo, having made an alliance with the Franks against him. With such bases as Hims, where the prince was his friend, and Hamâ, which he conquered, Bursuq attempted to dislodge the coalition army. He succeeded only on making contact, withdrawing, returning, and finally being overrun at Dânhîl, to the east of the Orontes, by Roger, Prince of Antioch. He was preparing to take his revenge when he died, as did his brother Zenghi, in 530/1136. This death and that of Sultan Muhammad two years later, meant the end of political intervention by the Sultanate against the Franks.

It is only on the occasion of the dissensions among the Saljûqids that the last heirs of Bursuq are heard of again, re-established in Kûhîzîstân. Akbûrî and some of the sons of Zenghi and Ikhbeî figured in the army employed by Sultan Mahmûd against his uncle Sandjâr, and Bursuq b. Bursuq participated in the complicated quarrels of Lower ʿTrâk. At the death of Mahmûd, the brothers Tughîrî and Bursuq were found in the party of Tughîrî who protected Sandjâr; then, when he (Tughîrî) died, they joined the party of Dâhdî, who had the support of the Caliph. Nevertheless, they were able in time to reconcile themselves with the conqueror Mas’îd (533/1139–1140). We cannot say whether it was one of these two whose death, under the name of Hamza b. Bursuq, is mentioned by Ibn Abî Taâyîl (cited by Ibn al-Furat, NS. Vienna II, 1157°), as lord of Tustar in 533/1139. In any case, it appears this is the last mention of a member of the family whose heirs are no longer encountered among the vassals of the subsequent masters of Kûhîzîstân.

It was as an officer of the first Bursuq that Abû Sunkar al-Bursuqî [q.v.] began his career. Bibliography: In addition to the references given in the article: Ibn al-Āṯîr, Kâmil, x, xi, Index; Ṭîmâd al-Dîn al-Isfahânî in Bundârî’s version (Houtsma, Recueil, ii, index); RâwANDî, Râhât al-Ṣâdîr, ed. Muḥ. Ikhbâl, index. For the Syrian campaigns, the sources are elaborated in Cl. Cahen, La Syrie du Nord etc., 271–3, 271–4; cf. also Grousset, Histoire des Croisades, i, 463 ff., and 1495 ff. (Cl. Cahen)

AL-BURSUQî [see AK SUNKUK]

AL-BURT, pl. al-Burtât, a Spanish-Arabism derived from the Latin portus, the meaning of which the Arab authors explain as the equivalent of Arabic bûbî, pl. abûnî. The triangular shape which the Arabs gave to the Iberian peninsula is well known. Following Ptolemy, they fixed its points at Tarin in the south, at Cape Finisterre in the west, and in the east in the Narbonne area according to some, or the valley of the Llobregat according to others, or at Port-Vendres (Portus Veneris/Haykal al-Zuhara) according to a third group. The disagreement over the fixing of the third point arises from two causes, to which nobody has given the attention they deserve. In the first place, the Arab geographers of the Middle Ages had no clear idea of the Pyrenees, nor did they give a definite name to them; in the second place, they show the north-east frontier in ways which differ markedly according to the ideas of the times in which they lived and the political situation of the region.

Some, the earliest, such as al-Râzî and after him Ibn Ḥâyîn and al-Yasaî, follow the Visigothic tradition and take the limits of the peninsula, as in Wamba’s time, to the Narbonne area. Others, coming later, such as al-Bakrî, who knew of the Frankish conquest of the Spanish marches, and had travelled through the country several times by land and sea, on hearing the Catalans of Barcelona and the Pyrenean countries called Franks and taken for such, place the north-east limit on the line of the Llobregat; on this frontier al-Bakrî mentions al-Burt (the Gate) in the Catalan coastal range; and in order to leave no room for doubt that the frontier between al-Andalus and the continent (al-arḍ al-habîra) stands on that river whose Latin name (Rubricatus) he knew, he states that the gates (abûnî) of the Djabal al-Burt face the islands of Majorca and Minorca. This testimony is confirmed by Ibn Sa’îd, and al-ʿAbdārîkâr accepts it as the most accurate since it is corroborated by many travellers. Ibn al-ʿAbbâr mentions more than once the famous battle during which the Almoravid amir Ibn ʿAbî Thââsî died and calls it mabkât al-Burt (Christian sources refer to it as the battle of El Conquistador de Mallorca) and Ibn Khâlîdân mentions the embassy which the Frankish count of Barcelona who was living on the other side of al-Burt sent to ʿAbd al-Rahmân III. Al-Idrîsî, on his part, who was writing in the second half of the 6th/12th century, and witnessed the independence of the Catalan-Aragonese kingdom, takes care not to call the Catalans Franks and puts the frontier of Spain at Port Vendres; in enumerating the 26 provinces or iklims of Andalusia he puts Tortosa, Tarragona, and Barcelona in the iklim of al-Burt, further south than the Pyrenees, appearing to show that this Djabal al-Burt or al-Burtât was the centre of the iklim.

Bibliography: Idrîsî, text 176, tr. 211; Makārî, Analecites, i, 252–3 (quotations from Râzî, Bakrî, and Ibn Sa’îd, i, 82–3); Ibn al-ʿAbbâr, Takmilah, in BAHI iv, 55, 309; Ibn Khâlîdân, id, i, 142; Chronicle of Ripoll and Chronicle of Tortosa in Villanueva, Viaje literario, v, 247. (A. Huici Miranda)

BURTAS, or BURDAS (in al-Bakrî Furdâs), pagan tribe of the Volga basin. For an account of the Burtas and their neighbours the Khazars and the Bulghârs, to the north and south, see BULGHAR. Al-Mas’dî (Murûdî, ii, 14 & Tanbî, 62) lists Burtas also as a river flowing into the Itil (Volga); Marquart identifies this stream with Samara (Streifziige, 336). The sources do not mention any adherents to Islam among the Burtas, which contrasts with their accounts of the Khazars and Bulghârs. Yâkût’s report on the Burtas (i, 567) is based on a misunderstanding, as he applied Ḥāṣîrî’s remarks on the Bulghârs (225) to the Burtas. The sources in which they are mentioned, Ibn Rusta (140 ff.), al-Bakrî (Kunîk & Rosen, Iwritsiyya al-Bekî, etc., i, 44) and Gardîzî, (Barthold, Olot o poyezdirki v Srednyuyu Asiyu, 96 ff.) content themselves with saying on the subject of the Burtas religion that they adhere to the same beliefs as the Ġuzz (Turks) and that some of them burn while others bury their dead. They allowed themselves to be outdistanced by their neighbours more in contact with civilization. They lacked government authority, the direction of affairs
being entrusted to the elders of each tribe. The only commercial dealings of any importance between the Muslim World and the Burtas was the traffic in furs—the ḫirā' mentioned by Yākūt (loc. cit.).

The majority of authorities (V. V. Holmsted, A. P. Smirnov, P. D. Stepanov) identify the Burtas with the Finnish Mordve-Moksha (the “Moksel” of Rubruquis), clans which at the beginning of the Middle Ages inhabited the area between the upper basins of the rivers Khooper and Medveditza and the right branch of the Volga, extending so far northwards until the Finns were the immediate neighbours of the Slavs. Others (A. I. Popov, A. E. Alikhova) locate their place of origin in the northern Caucasian steppes and argue that the Burtas emigrated northwards only at the time of the Golden Horde; others again (Sboev, Rittich) place them among the ancestors of the Čuwaš. Tokarev believes that the Burtas were a Finnish tribe more or less Turkicised, and which finally was assimilated partly by the Mordve-Moksha and partly by the Čuwaš.

Russian chroniclers from the 11th century onwards mention the Burtas as vassals of the Golden Horde. After the downfall of Kazan, their land was conquered and colonised by the Russians in the 16th century. At the beginning of the 18th one reads of insurrections among them but from that time the name Burtas ceases to figure in Russian documents.

The present Mordve (Mordva in Russian) are divided into two distinct groups: the Moksha and the Erzia, numbering about 1,450,000 souls (Soviet census 1939), living in an autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (Autonomous SSR of the Mordve, capital Saransk). A large number of the Mordve, however, live outside their republic, notably in Tatarstan, Bashkiria and Siberia.

The Mordves were subject to strong Russian cultural influences, and from the 17th century adopted the Orthodox faith. One must, however, mention the existence of another Mordve-Moksha group living in the Tartar region (in the district of Kamsko-Ustinsk of the autonomous SSR of Tatarstan)—the Karatai. These from the 17th century have been subjected to Tatar influence and adopted the Orthodox faith. One must, however, mention the existence of another Mordve-Moksha group living in the Tartar region (in the district of Kamsko-Ustinsk of the autonomous SSR of Tatarstan)—the Karatai. These from the 17th century have been subjected to Tatar influence and from about 750 onwards, the withdrawal owing to famine of large numbers of the new inhabitants of the NW. (mostly Berbers) provided conditions for the beginning of the Reconquista. Alfonso I of Asturias (739-757) or, according to Ibn Hayyān (Maḳṣarī, Naṭḥ, i, 213), his son Frueila I (757-768) made himself master of the north of modern Portugal, including the towns of Oporto and Braga north of the Douro and Viseu south of the same river. Another son of Alfonso, Aurelio (reigned 768-774), is given by Ibn al-Khaṭṭāb (ʾA‘māl al-A‘lām, 373) as conqueror of 'ard Burtukāl. Alfonso II (791-842) is said to have taken Lisbon in 828/798 and to have sent a message to Aix-la-Chapelle announcing the news to Charlemagne. But these successes, if authentic, were transitory. It was not till the time of Alfonso III that the line of the Douro was more or less effectively held by the Christians, after the definitive capture of Oporto in 868.

Kulumriyya (Coimbra) fell in 357/987 but was retaken in 575/985 by al-Mansūr, whose extraordinary march from Cordova to Shānt Yaḵtūb (Santiago de Compostela) was directed via Coria and Viseu. Al-Ughbūna (Lisbon), which still belonged to the expiring Caliphate of Córdoba, was retaken in 375/985 by al-Mansūr, whose extradosed, iii, 201-202, and see below).

Another son of Alfonso, Aurelio (reigned 768-774), as conqueror of 'ard Burtukāl. Alfonso II (791-842) is said to have taken Lisbon in 182/798 and to have sent a message to Aix-la-Chapelle announcing the news to Charlemagne. But these successes, if authentic, were transitory. It was not till the time of Alfonso III that the line of the Douro was more or less effectively held by the Christians, after the definitive capture of Oporto in 868.

Kulumriyya (Coimbra) fell in 357/985 but was retaken in 575/985 by al-Mansūr, whose extraordinary march from Cordova to Shānt Yaḵtūb (Santiago de Compostela) was directed via Coria and Viseu. Al-Ughbūna (Lisbon), which still belonged to the expiring Caliphate of Córdoba, was retaken in 375/985 by al-Mansūr, whose extradosed, iii, 201-202, and see below).
speaking Christians encountered by al-Mu'taḍad of Seville on an expedition into Portugal circa 1020 at Bihayn al-Khawān, now represented by Alafenes or Alafenes (Platae) of Viseu, who claimed to hold their land by treaty from Mūsā b. Nuṣayr (cf. above) and, though doubtless Moazzars, alleged their descent from Djabala b. Ayyam, a Christian Arab of Syria contemporary with Muḥammad (Fernandez y Gonzalez, ibid., cf. Dozy, Loc. de Abbadadis, ii, 7).

Under the Caliphate several kāras (i.e., provincial districts with chief town, governor and garrison, see jur. al-Andalus, 2, iii) belonged in whole or in part to the territory of modern Portugal. 1. In the extreme S, corresponding to the present-day province of Algarve, was the kāra of Ukhsinuba (Ocsonoba), so called from the ancient town of that name, inland from modern Faro. The town declined in importance after the Arab invasion and gave way to Shīb (Silves) as provincial capital, but was still in existence in the 5th/11th century (Ibn 'Iṣḥāq, iii, 215). Silves was situated more to the W. near the estuary of two small rivers, is first mentioned as a port at the time of the descent of the Norsemen in 229/844 (cf. al-Bahr al-Muḥīṭ), and grew to be a flourishing city, especially perhaps after the fall of the Caliphate under the 'Abbadids of Seville. Other towns or large villages in the province were, according to Ibn Sa'id (al-Mughrib fi Hulāl y-Maghrib, Dhakhdhak al-Arāb, x, Cairo 1953-1955, 1, 380 f.), Shannahūs or Shannarūs (Shannahūs for São Brás), Ramāda, Shantamariyya (Santa Maria de Algarve, now Faro), al-Ulāy (Loulé) and Kastalla (Cacela). Al-Idrīsī (circa 1154) in his description of Silves mentions that the inhabitants of its villages, as well as its townspeople, spoke pure Arabic. 2. Immediately N. of Ukhsinuba, i.e., corresponding to modern Baixo Alentejo, was the kāra of Bādja (Beja), with principal town of the same name (cf. Beja). This province, according to Ibn Sa'id, included Mārtula (Mertola), which is placed by Ibn al-Khaṭīb (A'mādī, 287) in the kāra of Shadhūnū (Sidonia). 3. Further N. lay the kāra of al-Usba'ūna or Lisbon (Maḳkāri, Nāḥi, i, 90), which included Shantaran (Santarem), Shantara (Cascais) and al-Kibbahā or al-Kabdjah (cf. al-Kabdjh or Acanet! between Cordova and Granada). Other kāras in Portugal are not named. Yābura (Evora) N. of Beja is included by Ibn Sa'id in the kingdom of Badajoz, and perhaps in Caliphal times formed part of a kāra of Mārida or Merida (cf. Maḳkāri, Nāḥi, i, 103). While it still belonged to Islam before 264/878 Kārumriyya (Coimbra) may have been the centre of a kāra (cf. L. P. 'Provençal, Esp. Mus., iii, 51).

Like other outlying parts of al-Andalus, Muslim Portugal affords plenty of examples of particularism throughout its history. Partially successful attempts to assert independence of Cordova were made in the 3rd/9th century by ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. Marwān, often called Ibn al-Dīlijī (son of the Galician) and his descendants, operating widely from Badajoz, and by the Banū Bakr at Santa Maria de Algarve in the same century. Much later a militant religious movement in the W. headed by Ibn Kast, who revolted at Mertola in 539/1144, contributed to the downfall of the Almoravids. Ibn Kast became master of Silves, and he and his contemporary Ibn Wazr were perhaps the only Muslims to coin money on Portuguese soil.

The last period of the struggle in Portugal between Christians and Muslims was marked by a great though unsuccessful effort of the Almohad Abū Yaḥyūb Yusuf in 580/1184. The Almohad fleet, it seems, failed before Lisbon, and the main land assault on Santarem had to be abandoned. In a Portuguese attack on the sākh or rearguard of the Almohads Abū Yaḥyūb received a wound from which he died near Evora on the march back to Seville.

The set-back in Portugal was contrary to general expectation, for at this time Almohad power and prestige stood high. In 1189, the year in which it first fell into Portuguese hands, Silves was described by an anonymous Crusader (Anonymous of Turin) as much stronger than Christian Lisbon and ten times as rich. After the victory of the Christians at al-Iṣkāb (Las Navas de Tolosa) in 609/1212, in which Portuguese forces took part, the issue of the prolonged struggle came within sight. Silves fell finally in 1249 and the Muslims lost Algarve, their last holding in the territory of modern Portugal.

At a battle fought near Tarifa on the Río Salado in 741/1340 the Portuguese under their king, Alfonso IV of Portugal, joined forces with the Castilians to oppose the African troops of the Marinid ruler of Fās, Abu 'l-Ḥasan 'All and the contingents of Yusuf I, Sultan of Granada. Ibn al-Khaṭīb describes how the Andalusians almost broke the ranks of the Portuguese at the first charge, but their valour was in vain and the day was lost (A'mādī, 386). Henceforward there was no hope of restoring Muslim rule in the West of al-Andalus.

The principal towns of Muslim Portugal produced a respectable number of literary men, whose names are given in the Arabic biographical works. Among the best known are the historian Ibn Bassām, Abu 'l-Walīd al-Bāḍī (cf. A-baḍī), Ibn 'Ammār, the poet and friend of Muḥamūd b. 'Abbād, and Ibn Kast, already mentioned, author of the Muḥ-loss al-Na'la'īn fi 'l-Taṣawwuf and other works.

Some itineraries in roth century Portugal are given by al-Iṣṭakhrī (BGA, i, 46) and Ibn Hawkal (ed. Kramers, i, 116-117).

Bibliography: F. Codera, Los Benimerudn en Mérida y Badajoz = Noticias que referentes al Algarbe de Alandalus en todo el siglo III de la hégira y principios del IV, o sea desde el 200 al 317 (815 a 929 de J.C.), encontramos en los autores árabes, en Estudios críticos de Historia árabe española, secundae serie, (Colección de Estudios árabes, ix, Madrid 1917, 1-74; the same, Decadencia y Desaparición de los Almoravidos en España, (Colección de Estudios árabes, iii, Saragoza 1890, 29-52; D. Lopes, Os Árabes nas Obras de Alexandre Herculano, Notas marginales de língua e historia portuguesa, Academia das Ciências de Lisboa, Boletim da Segunda Classe, iii-iv, Lisbon 1910-1911; the same, A Batalha de Ourique e comentário leve a uma Polémica, in Biblios, iii, nos. 11-12, Coimbra, 1927-34; José D. García Domínguez, Historia Lusco-Árabe, Epístolas e figuras meridiana, Lisboa 1945; Ambrosio Huici, Los Almohades en Portugal, in Annais da Academia Portuguesa da Historia, Series ii, Vol. 7, 1919; R. Dozy, L'expédition du Calife almohade Abou-Yacoub contre le Portugal, in Recherches ed. 3, ii, 443-480; E. Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. mus., i-iii, indices. (D. M. Dunlop)

AL-BURUDJIR [see NUDUM].
BURLAIRD [see BURGLIR].
BURUCLUS, i.e., Procullus (A.D. 410-485), head of the pagan philosophical school at Athens (the *Platonic Academy*), outstanding scholastic...
systematiser of Neoplatonic thought' and one of the chief links between ancient and medieval philosophy. Although it would be premature to attempt a monograph about the influence he exercised upon medieval Arabic thought, the information at present at our disposal is not so scanty that its complete neglect in R. Butler's comprehensive article on Proclus (Pauy-Wissowa-Kroll 45, 1957, col. 186 ff.) appears justified. Better information is available in E. Zeller, Philosophie der Griechen III 2', 839 n. 1 and E. R. Dodds, Proclus The Elements of Theology, Oxford 1933, xxviii f.

A list of those works by Burullus which in some way became known to Arabic scholars is to be found in Ibn al-Nadīm, Fihrist, 252 Flügel (=333 Egypt, ed.); it was reproduced, with a few omissions, by Ibn al-Kīfī, Ta'īrīh al-Ḥuhāmād, 89, (ed. Lippert).

1. Some works by Burullus appear in Arabic under very inappropriate false names.
   a. The work referred to by the bibliographers as Kītāb al-Ṭalāhīyāt and ascribed by Ḥādīḍī al-Ṭhāfī, v, 66 (Flügel) to Proclus and (!) Alexander appears to have been the systematic manual of Neoplatonic metaphysics known as Elements of Theology (Στοιχεῖα τῆς Θεολογίας). The Arabic text of propositions 15-17 (16-20 Dodds) has been published by A. Badawi, Arisū'un ārā' al-ʿArab, Cairo 1947, 391 f. from a 11th century Damascus MS, where it is wrongly attributed to Alexander of Aphrodisias. The truth was discovered independently by B. Lewin (Orientalia Suecana 1955, 101 ff.) and S. Pines (Orients 8, 1955, 195 ff.). The translator was Abā Uḥmān Saʿd b. Yaʿqūb al-Dīnāshī, a minor member of the school of Ḥunayn.
   b. A work K. al-Ṭāhā fī iʿlāhīyyah al-Makhlāf, based on 33 propositions of the Elements of Theology, is known in the West since the days of Gerard of Cremona (second half of s. xii) as Aristotle's Liber de causis. A critical edition of the Arabic text (which ought to be based on the Latin and Hebrew versions and be minutely compared with the Greek) is being prepared by G. C. Anawati (cf. B. Lewin, Melanges A. Dies, 8, 1955, 195 ff). The translator was Abī Uḥmān Saʿdī b. Yaʿqūb al-Dīnāshī, a minor member of the school of Ḥunayn.

2. Proclus himself is mainly familiar to Arabic thinkers as proclaiming the eternity of the world. His 18 propositions about this tenet (Ἐν παρώνιῳ πάντων ἐξής τούτου καὶ ἑλθεῖν), which are lost in the Greek original, were as well known to the Arabs as John Philoponus' reputation (De aeternitate mundi contra Proclus)—of which the Greek MSS. lack the beginning. The first nine propositions are now published by Iṣḥāq b. Ḥunayn's Arabic version by A. Badawi (op. cit., 35 ff.); eight of them were known from John Philoponus' quotations but the first is preserved in Arabic only (cf. C. G. Anawati, Mélanges A. Diès, Paris 1956, 21 ff.). Muhammad Ibn Zakāriyyā al-Rāzī in his book "On doubts which arise against Proclus" (K. al-Ṣukūk al-ʿālāt ʿalā Burāqīs) referred to this work (cf. S. Pines, Beiträge zur islamischen Atonlehre, Berlin 1936, 93 n. t)—he may have made use of John Philoponus—and so does, for instance, Al-Shāhriṣūṭī (K. al-Mīlād wa-l-Nihāl, 338 ff. Cureton), who rightly points to Ibn Sinā's use of Proclus' arguments; Al-Ghazzālī was familiar with them as well (cf. S. van den Bergh, Averroes' Tahāfuṭ al-Tahāfuṭ, London 1954, i, xvii; ii, 1).

b. Additional proof for the popularity of Proclus among Arabic philosophers is provided by the chance discovery of fragments of some other writings. There are eight Προβληματα φωστικά evidently part of a larger treatise which may well be genuine, published by A. Badawi (op. cit., 43 ff., cf. B. Lewin, Orientalia Suecana 6, 1958) and a small fragment about the concept of ἄγαθον from the Lesser Στοιχεῖα τῆς Θεολογίας, mentioned by the Arabic bibliographers (Badawi, op. cit., 257). F. Rosenthal made known, in English translation, a passage from his work On the immortality of the Soul according to Plato, and a small section of the lost part of his huge commentary on the Timaeus is available in German [see article Ἡφαίστης]. The Arabs knew of his commentaries on the myth of the Gorgias and on Plato's Phaedo but neither Syrian nor Arabic remains of them have hitherto been traced. A commentary on the pseudo-pythagorean Golden Verses is a misattribution, due to the misreading of B. for the less known Neoplatonist Hierokles (which can be easily explained).

(R. Walker)
ever, have been battles following the landing of the Byzantines in 53/673.

The inhabitants of Burullus had the reputation of being expert trackers.

**Bibliography**: Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, 85, 124; Yaʿqūbī, 338; trans. Wiet, 1995; Ibn Hawkal, 2nd ed., 178-179; Harawi, 47; trans. Sourdoul-Thomine, 110; Yaʿqūt, i, 593; Ibn ʿAtṭūṭa, i, 58; trans. Gibb, i, 35; Ibn Dhuʾmāk, v, 113; Mustafaṣr, i, 101; trans. Rat, ii, 176; Makrizi, ed. Wiet, i, 114; ii, 92, 96; iii, 142-143; iv, 39, 81; Zāhirī, 108; trans. Venture de Paris, 1907, Mecpero and Wiet, Matières pour servir à la géographie de l’Égypte, 36, 41, 43, 211; Omar Toussoun, La géographie de l’Égypte, dans Mémoires de la société royale de géographie de l’Égypte, viii, 18, 52, 68, 223; ʿAbd al-Latif, 708; Nuwayri, Nihayat al-Arab, viii, 263; x, 323. (G. Wiet)

**AL-BURZULI, ʿABU ʿL-KASIM B. AHMAD B. MUḤammad, of the tribe of the Banū Bīrzāla, a Mālikī author.** Born in al-Kayrawān, he studied under Ibn ʿAraba for thirty or forty years and under other great masters, and became himself a teacher of Islamic law in Tunis and an imām at the Zaytūna mosque. In 806/1403, he passed on the pilgrimage through Cairo, where he issued several iḥāṣas. He died in Tunis in 841/1438 (according to others, in 842 or 843 or 843), at the age, it is said, of 103 years. He is famous on account of his collection of fatwās and handbook entitled Dīwān Maṣdūl al-ʿĀkham min maqāmul al-Kadīyil bin Muṭṭin waʾl-Ḥubbām, in two volumes, numerous manuscripts of which are known; it is one of the main sources of the Miṣʿar of al-Wansharīšī (d. 914/1508); two extracts were made from it in the 9th and in the 12th century. The innumerable responsa which al-Burzuli mentions there together with the names of their authors, famous jurists who can easily be situated in space and in time, make his work the most important source for the history of society in Irīkīya under the źirids of al-Ḵayrawān and al-Mahdīyya (10th-12th cent.) and the Ḥaṣīds (13th-14th cent.).

**Bibliography**: Zarkashī, Taʿrīḫ al-Dawlatayn, Tunis 1289/1872, 61, 109, 226; tr. E. Fagnan, Constantine 1895, 112, 202: 226; Ṣāḥib Bābā al-Tunbukhī, Nayī al-Ṭabīḥī, Cairo 1329/1911, 225-6; al-Sakhawī, al-Dawʾ al-Lāmiʿ, Cairo 1355/ 1356, xi, no. 629; M. Ben Cheneb, Nihayat al-ʿĀkham, no. 263; Ibn Maryam, al-Tunbukti, Algiers 1908, 150-2; tr. E. Fagnan, Nihayat al-ʿĀkham, no. 263; al-Fawāṣir, al-Dawʾ al-Lāmiʿ, Cairo 1355/1356, xi, no. 629; M. Ben Cheneb, Nihayat al-ʿĀkham, no. 263; Ibn Maryam, al-Tunbukti, Algiers 1908, 150-2; tr. E. Fagnan, Nihayat al-ʿĀkham, no. 263; F. Provenzali, Algiers 1910, 164-7, index 588; Brooke, the name of Bandar Nādīrīyya (see the Gombroon Diary of the English East India Company, 3rd/4th July 1734, in vol. iv of the Persia and the Persian Gulf Records, India Office Library, and L. Lockhart, Nādīr Shāh, London 1938, 92-3). Subsequently, an unsuccessful attempt was made to build a large warship at Būghār, using timber that had been brought overland from the forests of Māzandarān at a vast expenditure of labour. Sir W. Ouseley saw the remains of this vessel when he landed at Būghār in 1811 (see his Travels in Various Countries of the East, more particularly Persia, London 1819, Vol. i, 188). Although this shipbuilding experiment failed, Būghār prospered in consequence of the attention that Nādīr Shāh gave to it. Moreover, it subsequently benefited commercially when the English and Dutch East India Companies transferred their factories there from Bandar ʿAbbās [q.v.]. Another factor of great importance in the development of Būghār in those times was the fact that Shīrāz, with which it was connected by a caravan route, became the capital of Persia in the reign of Karīm Khān Zand [q.v.]. The consequence was that Būghār took the place of Bandar ʿAbbās as the chief port of the country, a position which it was destined to hold for over a century and a half. Abraham Parsons, who visited Būghār in 1775, stated that, when approached from the sea, the harbor was so large that the land itself came into view. So shallow was the sea there that large vessels had to anchor some 3 miles off shore. He estimated the population in normal times at nearly 20,000, but when he was there two-thirds of the inhabitants were absent at the siege of Baṣra [q.v.]. See his Travels in Asia and Africa, London 1808, 187-8.

In the 19th century Būghār easily maintained its supreme position as a port. During the brief Anglo-Persian war, British forces occupied the town in December 1856, and held it until the conclusion of peace in the following March. The British connexion with Būghār, at first only commercial, but later also political (for it became the headquarters of the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf), increased in importance as time went on. Other nations too participated in the trade of the town. Particulars of this trade and also of the movement of vessels in the latter part of the 19th century are to be found in the Administration Reports of the British Resident from 1876 onwards; these reports were published in Calcutta in Selections from the Records of the Government of India, Foreign Department (the tables covering the years 1893 to 1897 in Freiherr M. von Oppenheim’s Von Mittelmeer zum persischen Golf, Berlin 1900, ii, 310-17, are based on these publications).
For the first quarter of the 20th century Bushahr continued to prosper, but, with the completion of the Trans-Iranian Railway in 1938 and the development of Bandar Shapūr and Khurramshahr, it lost its position as the principal port of the country. Unlike Bushahr, both Bandar Shapūr and Khurramshahr have wharves and jetties where large vessels can berth, and they are, moreover, connected with Tehran and other places in the interior by rail.

In 1946 the population of Bushahr was 15,000. It is understood that the Persian Plan Organisation intends to improve the port and other facilities of the town, but it seems unlikely that, even if this project is fully carried out, Bushahr will ever regain its former predominant position as a port.
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Travels to the City of the Caliphs, 
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London 1857, 123-134; H. Petermann, 
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Am Euphrat und Tigris, 
Leipzig 1900, 12-14; A. T. Wilson, 
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(L. LOCKHART)

BUSHAK, FAHR al-DIN AHMAD B. HALLAJ D
AHU ISHAK (kunya 
intakhtalus 
BUSHAK). Born in Shīrāz, he lived principally in Ṣafāvīs at the court of Iskandar b. ʿUmar Shāhī, grandson of Timūr and governor of Fārs and Isfahān, where he died (582 or 530/1427 or 1424). That is almost all we know concerning him (apart from an anecdot reported by Dawlatshāh). As an old iskandar b. Ṣawr (ibid., line 8; Ibn Rusta, 172, line 17 f.; 
J. de Morgan, 
Leipzig 1871, i, 90; 
C. Ritter, 
Leipzig 1861; F. Spiegel, 
Gastronomie und Donner, 
Paris 1800), but he nevertheless rescued from oblivion a series of technical terms, as did his imitator Mahrūn Karl, who wrote his 
dīwa-n of Dress 
(diwān-i albisa) on a plan analogous to that of Bushāk's dīwa-n.

Bibliography: H. Ferté, 
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(F. Horn [H. Masse])

BUSHANDJ, also known as BUSANDJ, in Middle Persian probably Pǔshang, ancient Ira-
After the Mongol conquest, under the vassal dynasty of the Kults (or Karts [q.v.], 1245-1398), Bushandj had a comparatively quiet period until it was conquered and ruthlessly destroyed by Timur in the middle of Dhu 'l-Hijjah 782/March 1381. It was rebuilt soon afterwards. It is also repeatedly mentioned in the 15th century [by Ḥāfīẓ-i ʿAbrā, [q.e.]], and a ribāṭ supposedly founded by Abraham (Iṣfīzārī, Raudād . . . fī . . . Ḥerdī, printed in Jā, v, 76 [July-Dec. 1865], 403 f.) was shown nearby in 897/1491-2. Later on, the place vanished from history; it was presumably destroyed during the Ōzbek and Türkmen raids. According to W. Tomasek (Topographie, i, 78), the modern Ghūrīyān is situated on its site. (W. Barthold-[B. Spuler])

**AL-BUṢṢIḤ ARĀṬ** (pastures) (sierras de yerba y de pasos), is the origin of the Spanish name Alpujarras; the Arabic toponym really applies to all the mountainous region which forms the extension of the Sierra Nevada southwards to the Mediterranean, from Motril to Ædra and Almeria; but more particularly designated by this name are the many fertile valleys which intersect this country (Padul - Bézmār - Lanjārān - Órgiva - Ċádiar and Óġjār - Alcóela - Laujar - Canjāýar - Rágol - Gádor). In the Middle Ages the Alpujarras were of greater extent because the capital was Jaén, and in addition to many fortresses it had more than 600 silk-producing places in which the god Osiris was the object of special veneration.

By Kudama. About this town developed a small, ephemeral province, Būṣūriyya, which lay between those of Aṭṭāh and Bahnaṣā.

Opposed to this documentation, another school of writers places the final defeat of the Umayyad in a locality also called Būṣūr, opposite Ashmūn, on the other bank of the Nile, about 180 kilometres south of Būṣūr al-Malāk. The region claimed to be the place of origin of Pharaoh's "magicians" and, according to al-Idrīsī, the inhabitants of his time had a certain reputation as sorcerers. This particular Būṣūr has left no traces.

Finally, there is a Būṣūr-Dafadnu in the province of Fayyūm.

**Bibliography:** Yaḳūbī, Kuldān, 331; trans. Wiet, 185; Ḫudānā, 247; ʿIrīsī, Descri. de l'AFriqu, 45, 145, 155; ʿAbd al-ʿLāṭif, 171, 202-206; Ibn Māmnūtī, 114, 117, 118; ʿVāḵtī, i, 760; Masʿūdī, Tanbīh, 328, 331; Aversissement, 423, 427; Abu ʿl-ʿFrīdāʾī, Taḵwīm, trad., i, a, 148; Ibn Dukmān, iv, 131, v, 135; Vattier, L'Égypte de Mursīdād, new ed. Wiet, Introduction, 100-101; Mašīrī, ed. Wiet, iii, 194, iv, 7, 139, v, 66-79 (where the question of the death of Marwan is examined); Ibn Dīḵān, 64, 73, 139, 151, 159; ʿAll Pāḵā, viii, 25, 6-11; Amelinoue, Geographie, 7-11; Salmon, Répertoire, in BIFAO, 1, 65; Breccia, Alexandria ad Aegyptum, 123-130; J. Maspéro and G. Wiet, Matériaux pour servir à la géographie de l'Égypte, 53-56. (G. Wiet)

**AL-BUṢṢIRD (see supplement)**

**BUSR** or ABUSIR, the name of several places in Egypt, which is not unnatural since it refers to places in which the god Osiris was the object of special veneration.

The name Abūṣir is found in the large suburban area west of Alexandria, a memory of the site of Taposiris Magna.

Būṣr, on the west bank of the Damietta branch of the Nile, in the province of al-Ghāribiyā. In the middle ages this small town was connected to a neighbouring settlement, Banā, so that one spoke of Būṣr-Banā. Famous in antiquity, Būṣr was an episcopal seat and the administrative centre of the pagarchy (kūra).

Būṣr al-Sidr, in the province of al-Dīža where there are still pyramids. The description of it by ʿAbd al-ʿLāṭif is a document of the first order, as are also the discoveries which he mentions in the cemetery of the town.

Būṣr, called Būṣr-Kūridīs in the Middle Ages, and, from the 13th/17th century at least, Būṣr al-Malāk, is located at the entrance to the Fayyūm within the western strip of Middle Egypt. Owing to the great number of places called Būṣr, Arab authors have found it difficult to situate exactly where the Umayyad caliph Marwan died. It is more than likely—and is in addition supported by a local tradition—that Marwan spent his last days at Būṣr al-Malāk. The information is already given by Ḫudānā. About this town developed a small, ephemeral province, Būṣūriyya, which lay between those of Aṭṭāh and Bahnaṣā.

The great rebellion of 1568-70 which was directed by Aḥmad ibn ʿAbd Allah b. Ṣafī, opponent of ʿAbd al-Latif, 171, 202-206; Ibn Māmnūtī, 114, 117, 118; ʿVāḵtī, i, 760; Masʿūdī, Tanbīh, 328, 331; Aversissement, 423, 427; Abu ʿl-ʿFrīdāʾī, Taḵwīm, trad., i, a, 148; Ibn Dukmān, iv, 131, v, 135; Vattier, L'Égypte de Mursīdād, new ed. Wiet, Introduction, 100-101; Mašīrī, ed. Wiet, iii, 194, iv, 7, 139, v, 66-79 (where the question of the death of Marwan is examined); Ibn Dīḵān, 64, 73, 139, 151, 159; ʿAll Pāḵā, viii, 25, 6-11; Amelinoue, Geographie, 7-11; Salmon, Répertoire, in BIFAO, 1, 65; Breccia, Alexandria ad Aegyptum, 123-130; J. Maspéro and G. Wiet, Matériaux pour servir à la géographie de l'Égypte, 53-56. (G. Wiet)

**AL-BUṢṢIR** (see补充).
measure subdued the last armed partisan of 'Ali. We later find him leading several naval expeditions against the Byzantine Empire.

After the year 356/969, this agent of Muṣ'ūdiya's ambition, general and admiral by turns, disappears from the field of politics. He is said however to have lived at court till the death of the sovereign. According to the Shi'ites, he went mad because he brought down 'Ali's curse upon himself. He reappears in the reign of Walid I, when he is said to have taken part in an expedition to Africa. Other authorities make him die at Medina in the reign of 'Abd al-Malik. He seems to have lived to a great age and fallen into his dotage.

Bibliography: H. Lammens, Études sur le règne de Mo'tawka I, 42-48; 284; Baladhuri, Futuḥ, 226-228; 456; Ibn Ḥajaj, Isbāba, i, 300; Ibn al-ʿAthir, Usd al-ʿAshab, i, 179-180; ii, 392; Mas'udī, Murādī, v, 474-475; Aḥmadīnī, iv, 131-132 1; 45-47; Tamīrī, i, 2109, 2442, 3400, 3430-3432; ii, 11-14, 22; Turmīḏī, Ṣobāḥ, i, 274 (Buṭūk); Taḥṣīl al-Muhaddithīn, (Ms. Bibl. Khediv. Cairo); Ibn Abī l-Hadīd, Sharḥ Nahdi al-Balāgha, i, 116 ff.

(H. Lammens)

BUSRA [see Boškār].

BUST, a ruined city in Sīdījāstān, among whose imposing remains are the two principal groups of Kaʿlāʾi Bist and Lashkār-i Bāzār. It lies in the south of Afgānīstān on the now deserted banks of the Hilmand, near its confluence with the Arghandāb, on the stretch of the route through Girīḡk between Harāt and Kandāhār. Its present isolation, to which recent American efforts to rehabilitate the region will no doubt put an end, stands in contrast to the ancient prosperity of the area, celebrated in the middle ages for its great fertility, well irrigated orchards between two water-courses, and for its rôle as stage on the principal route between Khrūrāsān or Fārs on one hand and Sind on the other, that is, between Baghdād and India, at the very place where a pontoon-bridge crossed the river just as it became navigable in the direction of Zarānd. The Arab geographers of the first centuries, criticising Bust because of the frequent epidemics there, pointed at the same time to the commercial and intellectual activity of the city, and to the produce of its surrounding area, planted in fruit trees, vineyards and palms.

Such prosperity dates very likely from an early period. Precise knowledge is lacking however for the first stages of the development of Bust, whose existence was attested in the time of the Parthians, though we are ignorant of its exact rôle in the province of Sīstān, quarrelled over by the Sāsānīd s and the rulers of the Chionite-Hephthalite kingdom of Ṭabūlīstān.

Aʾso rather confused is the history of Bust from the moment when ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Samura [q.v.] annexed it to the territory of Islam, perhaps in 29/649-50 during the caliphate of ʿUṯmān, but more likely in 42/661-62 at the beginning of the Umayyad period. The first Arab expeditions were doubtless no more than raids of little permanent consequence, resulting in the payment of a tribute by the region but not in its occupation. In the second half of the 15th/7th century, Bust "became it seems, the advanced post of Muslim domination against the indigenous and independent princes of the frontier countries of the east, who bore the name or title of Zumbīl". (R. Hartmann). And the early sources mention several armed encounters in the neighbourhood, the Umayyads and first ʿAbbāsīd s having sent Arab governors there to suppress local rebellions in Sīdījāstān, or troubles instigated by the Khūrijītes (troubles emphasised in the Taʾrīḵ-i Sīstān) to fight or to negotiate with the ruler of Ṭabūlīstān. In particular we know the events of the revolt of Ibn ʿAbd al-ʾAshʿāb [q.v.] which took place at Bust and, somewhat later, its suppression by Maʿn b. Zaʿīda al-Shābānī before he was assassinated there in 156/773. Although Yaʿkūbī speaks of the place then held by Bust, the principal city of a province which rivalled in wealth Khūrāsān, and though one can imagine the strategic rôle then played by its fortresses, we nevertheless lack detail of the administrative organisation of a city which, in especially troubled political circumstances, seems, like other localities in eastern Iran and central Asia, to have enjoyed relative autonomy.

Subsequently, the Saffārid Yaʿkūb b. al-Layth, after having taken Kībul in 257/871, extended his domination as far as Bust, cited several times in the Taʾrīḵ-i Sīstān in connexion with his campaigns against his eastern neighbours and visits he made to the region. In their turn the Sāmānīds tried to establish a foothold in the area, and confused quarrels, accompanied by military expeditions, opposed the people of Bust to the envoys from the court in Khūrāsān as well as those sent by the caliphs at Baghdād. But it was during the period of the Ghaznavīds that Bust, taken by Subuktānī in 366/976 and thus separated from the province of Zarānd, enjoyed for nearly a century its most brilliant development. It served as a subsidiary residence for the rulers of Ghazna, who had there a permanent camp (al-ʾAshkar) mentioned by al-Mukaddasī, and al-Bayhaḵī describes the brilliant life led there, between ambassadorial receptions, hunting, and pleasure parties on the Hilmand, by a ruler such as Masʿūd I during his visit in 448/1056. It was there too, that the troops of the Ghaznavīd ʿAbd al-Rašīd successfully opposed in 441/1049-50 the advance of the Sāfīdūs, who had already been defeated several times trying to take the region. The sack of Ghazna, however, in 544/1149 by the Ghurīd ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn, followed shortly after by the conquest of Bust, its pillage and the burning of its mosques and minarets, marked for the latter city the beginning of a decline, echoed in the text of the contemporary geographer Yaḵūt.

The destruction of Bust was at that time far from complete. The old palaces of the Ghaznavīds were soon restored and inhabited by the governors of the region on behalf of the Ghurīd s, later of the Khwārizm-Shāhīs. Despite the various struggles in which the city was the stake, its continued existence is attested above all by funeral steles of beautiful execution, dating from the end of the 6th/12th century or the first half of the 7th/13th century and bearing the titles of important personages, undoubtedly the holders of a power at once religious and temporal established on a basis exclusively local. The destruction resulting from the Mongol invasion, however, about 618/1221, and from the passage of Timūr's hordes at the end of the 8th/14th century, brought about the final abandonment of the site, whose cultivated lands became steppe. Only the citadel, which played a rôle during the wars of the Great Mughals against Persia, and underwent at that time architectural modifications which are still visible, was maintained until Nādīr Shāh had it dismantled in 1738.

The facts relative to the history of Bust have been illuminated especially since D. Schlimmeberger's discovery, and the careful study by the French
Archaeological Delegation in Afghanistan, of an architectural group until then unexplored and scarcely mentioned by earlier investigators. North of a field of ruins, about 7 kilometres long and in places 2 kilometres wide, whose southern end alone had previously attracted attention, with its remains of the city wall proper, its citadel and the high silhouette of the "Arch of Bust", the royal residence itself has been identified, the ancient al-‘Aškar of the Arab authors and the lavqaragah of the Persian writers. Its three monumental palaces, formerly surrounded by gardens still indicated by the high walls,—they constituted, together with a mild climate, the charm of this subsidiary capital of the Ghaznavids—rise from within the enclosure of the "royal city", and the southern castle in particular has been almost completely cleared in the course of several excavations. Fronted by a spacious esplanade, on which opens a large mosque, and approached by an avenue a half-kilometre long bordered by shops behind a colonnade, it displays about a central court with four iwans, rooms grouped in bāyts, among which are several larger and luxuriously appointed chambers. Not only have the characteristic details of its plan been revealed. Beneath the heaps of earth caused by the fall of the higher parts—the construction is made largely of rough brick—and despite two successive fires the traces of which are still evident on the ground, it was possible to discover important elements of its exterior and especially its interior ornamentation, based on bare brick, of facings sculptured in earth or plaster and sometimes in the sense of "orchard"; it is used in Turkish in the sense of "kitchen-garden", and in Arabic in the sense of "garden" in general (pl. bāsātīn); in the Algerian dialect it denotes "cypress" (Beaussier), and at Beirut a "plantation of mulberry-trees" (Cuche); it forms part of several Middle Eastern geographical names.—It is the title of a didactic poem by the eminent Persian poet Sa’dī (q.v.), written at Ghīrāz in 655/1257, in ten chapters. The work is a classic, and has been read in primary schools in every country where Persian has been cultivated, especially in Iran, India, Central Asia and Ottoman Turkey. Indian authors have written several commentaries on this work in Persian, and there exist further commentaries in Turkish, notably those of Şāhī and Sīdī both (at the end of the 16th century). It was translated into Turkish by the scholar Taftāzān (q.v.) in 755/1354 (Gibb, Ottoman Poetry, i, 202), and into various other Oriental languages, such as Bengali, Sindi, and Pāndjābī. The principal translations into European languages are those of Forbes Falconer into English (Selections, London 1838), of Graf into German verse (Sa’dī’s Lustgarten, Jena 1856), of Baron Schlecht-Wesehrd into German (Vienna 1852), of Barbier de Meynard into French (Paris 1880), and of Constantin Caikin into Russian verse (Moscow 1935). The oldest MSS. give this work the title of Sa’dī-nsima. (SAID NAFICY)

I. — Gardens in Islam

The part played by gardens in the past and present life of the Muslim peoples appears to stem from the conception of Paradise, the ideal garden, as portrayed in the Korān, which paints so detailed a picture of the state of blessedness reserved exclusively for Believers that it might have served as a model for the creators of gardens both in East and West. There are to be found lawns interspersed with winding streams, trees bowed down with fruit, seats on which it is possible to recline in comfort, pavilions occupied by virgins waiting to welcome the elect. It will be noted that there are no flowers, but instead a wealth of fruit trees. Also worthy of note are the open summer-houses and in particular the streams of running water, cooling the air. The layout clearly has much in common with that of the oasis, a haven of freshness and fertility, the more delightful because it is found in the midst of those desert regions in which Islam principally spread.

It is to Iran, the home of most of our (European) fruits, the land par excellence of irrigated plantations and cultivated shrubbery, that the Muslim world would appear to owe its initiation into the art of landscape gardening. The fact that Arabic terms such as bustān or frīdāw derive from the Persian gives substantial support to this conjecture.

Persian horticulture flourished long before the birth of Islam and was associated with princely life. Even as early as Xenophon, we find references to the beautiful layout of the park planned at Sardis by Cyrus the Younger (407 B.C.). The palaces of the Sasanid kings, such as the Kār-i Shīrin of Chosroes II, look out on extensive vistas of water and greenery. There are, moreover, bas-reliefs to remind us of the vast wooded enclosures stocked with game where the sovereign could give himself up to the pleasures of the chase. Gardens in an architectural...
framework, such as esplanades and courtyards planted with trees, on the one hand, and on the other properties outside the towns, as spacious as parks, and embellished here and there by a solitary pavilion. — these two styles of gardens were adopted by the Muslim world and spread, with more or less continuity, across the nations and the centuries.

The first style influenced the architects of the 'Abbasid era, who built Samarra. The Dilawās al-Ḫākānī of the Caliph al-Mu'tasim (218-227/833-842), made up of an edifice at the front comprising three fāns and a suite of apartments, behind which was a vast esplanade walled with ramparts. “Parallel to these encircling walls were canals which were doubtless bordered by beds of flowers. Marble pools, fountains and other decorative features completed the scene”. H. Viiolet, who describes this layout, relates it to the “French style” garden with its ample spaces, straight lines and architectural aspect. These common features are perhaps not purely fortuitous, rather they may point to a distant common ancestry. These “French-style” gardens, of which Versailles is the most notable example, were inspired by the Italian garden which in turn derived from the Graeco-Roman garden, such as is found at Pompeii or Hadrian’s villa. These last certainly seem to have been much influenced by the gardens of the East.

Nevertheless, it was in Persia, the country of its birth, that this style of garden was to be preserved. The Šafawid miniatures in particular bear witness to its permanence. The Prince sits enthroned in a summer-house looking out on to a paved walk broken up by canals and lakes and separated by wooden fences from stretches of ground planted with flowers and trees. No less evocative are the Persian carpets known as “au jardin”. The area is divided into rectangles by intersecting canals. Fish swim in the canals and the rectangles are filled with flowers and shrubs (see, for instance, W. Bode, *Antique Rugs from the Near East*, New York, 1929, fig. 58). This same style of garden is also to be found at the opposite end of the Islamic world.

The private houses of the 'Abbasid era doubtless had their interior gardens. It is well-known that the art of the Tūnids which dominated Egypt in the 3rd/9th century was closely linked to that of Sāmarrā. In the houses of Fustāṭ, which can be assigned to this period, the rooms opened on to a central court in which brick-lined hollows were dug. Some of these were filled with water, others with soil for growing plants. The townsman, moreover, showed a remarkable taste for gardens. The Persian traveller Nāṣir-i Khusrav draws attention to those which adorned the terraces. An irrigating machine on the top of a seven-storey house and operated by oxen was used for watering orange, banana and other fruit trees as well as many kinds of flowers and fragrant plants.

At this time Ifriqiya was held in the name of the 'Abbasids by the Aḥūlabid amirs, who disseminated the fashions of Bagdad throughout the lands of the Berbers. They had first one and then a second residence on the outskirts of al-Ḫayrawān. The second, Raḵḵāda, was seven kilometres distant from the town. The grounds, which according to al-Bakrī, were surrounded by a wall more than 10 kilometres long, must have been mainly laid out as gardens, irrigated by cisterns of which remnants are still in existence. The largest of these hydraulic works is a huge quadrangular reservoir with solid walls reinforced on both sides with buttresses, in whose waters a raised pavilion was reflected.

The tradition of these country seats must have persisted in Ifriqiya in spite of hardships which in the 9th/11th century ruined the country. We come upon gardens again in the 8th/14th century under the Hāfsids of Tūnīs. The vast domain of Abū Fīrḥ, created by al-Mustansīr (647-75/1249-77) in the neighbourhood of his capital (near the present village of Ariana) included various features which foreshadowed the Maghribī taste for the agdāl. Ibn Khaldūn describes it with a wealth of detail which is unusual for him.

“One found there”, he tells us, “a forest of trees, some of which were trained on to trellises, while the rest were left to grow in complete freedom. The branches of the lemon and orange trees mingled with those of the cyprus, while, below, the myrtle and jasmine smiled upon the water-lily. In the midst of these groves, a large garden encircled a lake so vast that it might be taken for an ocean. Water was brought there by the ancient aqueduct (which in former times supplied Carthage and which the Hāfsid al-Mustansīr had had repaired). Following this conduit, the waters gush through a huge outlet into a square reservoir [serving as a decantation basin] and, thence, through a fairly short canal, to the great pool which they fill in swirling torrents. At each end of the pool stands a pavilion, one large, one small, whose roofs rest on columns of white marble and whose walls are faced with marble inlay”.

This same period witnessed in Morocco the creation by the Marinid sultans of vast cultivated enclosures such as that attached to the Palace of Fez al-Djādīd, called Amina al-Mariniyya, in which terraces and raised pavilions dominated the plantations and the surrounding countryside. Abandoned after the fall of the Marinids, this park was restored between 1240 and 1250/1824-34 by the 'Alawīd sultan Mūlāy 'Abd al-Rahmān. This same sultan created the agdāl of Marrākūsh, which the modern historian al-Nāṣirī describes for us. It was an immense park or rather a group of gardens planted with one or two species of fruit trees or perfumed flowers, either indigenous or imported, cultivated for sale. In the midst of the plantations there were lakes with pleasure boats. The streams which filled these lakes provided water for the gardens and even turned the wheels of water-mills. Pavilions stood in this central section.

We can still see enclosures of this kind in the agdāls of the imperial cities of Morocco such as Marrākūsh or Meknes. Away from the dense urban centres, the agdāl is adjacent to the official quarter, a rural annex to the urban palaces. It is profit-making land, enriching the coffers of the sovereign. It also provides a place of recreation and repose for his harem. This type of plantation may have some links with the oriental tradition of royal parks. Nevertheless, the name by which it is known and its general resemblance to the great domain of a Berber chieftain inclines one to look to the West for the models which inspired its creation.

This is not the case with the riyād, the interior garden of the palaces and rich dwellings of the Muslim cities of the west. It is almost certainly to Iran that we should look to find the origins of this style of garden whose layout is preserved for us in the Persian carpet: straight pathways, intersecting at right angles and separating square patches of green on which fruit trees and decorative plants abound. Sometimes canals with flowing water cross the
pathways, sometimes their intersections are marked by ornamental fountains. A summer-house at one end of the garden dominates the vista, unless the garden is divided by two or four sides by galleries, in which case the doors of the apartments give on to this open space. The riâyâd seems, in fact, to be an extension and elaboration of the patio. It is designed in harmony with the architecture of the house and completes its lay out.

If the Maghribî house with its interior courtyard is inspired by the Graeco-Roman peristyle house, the riâyâd which fills this courtyard seems to be a legacy from Persia, like so many other elements in the Muslim civilisations of both East and West. We do not know at what period the West first adopted this style, though we find traces of it as early as the first half of the 6th/12th century.

Excavations carried out at Marrâkûsh beneath the ruins of the first mosque of the Kutubiyya have yielded the plan of a small riâyâd which can be dated as belonging to the period of the Almoravid 'Ali b. Ýûsûf (500-537/1106-1142). Here a rectangular patio is divided by two intersecting paths. The remnants of Castillejo have been uncovered near Murcia. This appears to have been built by Ibn Mârdânshâh (541-566/1147-1171). Its rooms enclose a riâyâd intersected by pathways, with two pavilions at the narrower ends. This type of riâyâd appears to be classical in Andalusia. In the 8th/14th century, the Granadan poet Ibn Lûûûn enumerates its features. He recommends the laying out of a garden which offers "in its centre trellises shading walks which should encompass the flower-beds like margins". A summer house, wide-open, surrounded by rambler roses and myrtles, affords a place of rest which commands the whole domain at a single glance. The Nâşrid sultans of Granada incorporated this domestic theme into the sumptuous architecture of their palaces. In the Alhambra of Muhammad V (763-93/1362-91), the famous Patio of the Lions is nothing more than a riâyâd. Pathways intersecting to form a cross separate four plots which must have been intended to be planted. Two pavilions raised on columns jut out at the two narrow ends of the rectangle. In addition to this interior garden, the guests at the Alhambra had the Generalife (Djanaân al-ûrâf) at their disposal. Here again, we find shrubberies, canals fed by fountains and galleries enclosing the open space.

It is very probably via Andalusia that this style of town garden, originating in Persia, spread throughout the three countries of North Africa. In Morocco, the Alhambra inspired the Sa'dîd Ahmad al-Mânsûr, who adopted its design on a grandiose scale in the palace of the Badî of Marrâkûsh (986-1012/1578-1603). A court measuring 135 metres by 110 metres, surrounded by apartments and pavilions, looked out on shrubberies alternating with vast lakes. Up to our own day, Moroccan townsw like Marrâkûsh and Fès have seen the creation of enchanting riâyâds. In Tunisia, the Andalusians, driven out of Spain, spread the fashion in the towns in which they had taken refuge. As for Algeria, the gardens of the beautiful country houses which are scattered about the outskirts of Algiers were among the luxuries enjoyed by the Corsairs and were tended by a vast number of captives who laboured in them all the year round.


II. — MUGHAL GARDENS

The Mughal emperors of India, Akbar [q.v.], Djahângîr [q.v.] and Shâhdâjahân [q.v.] were all great lovers of nature, a quality which they inherited from their progenitor, Bâbur [q.v.] who after the conquest of Hindûstân, lamented the absence of well-planned gardens in his new dominions. Bâgh-i Wâfâ was the first garden which he laid out near Kâbul in 914/1508, followed by larger and more magnificent ones in Agra [q.v.], his Indian capital.

His grandson Akbar, after constructing the fort of Harî Parbat (Kashmir) in 1066/1557 laid out the Nasîm Bâgh flanking the Dal lake. This garden is now in ruins, with the exception of stately shânîr trees planted by Shâhdâjahân (1037-1627-1659). But the most charming of the Kashmir gardens is the Nasîhât Bâgh laid out by Afsâf Khân (c. 1035/1625), a brother of Nûrâdâjahân [q.v.], the queen of Djahângîr. In natural beauty and architectural skill this garden is considered matchless. It was built in 12 terraces, representing the 12 signs of the Zodiac. Its water-supply was temporarily stopped by Shâhdâjahân, who considered it too splendid for a subject, but was soon restored. The most-famed Shâlîmâr was founded in 1029/1619 by Djahângîr. The etymology of the word Shâlîmâr or Shâlîmâr is dubious; it was in vogue even in pre-Mughal days, being the name of a Dal cascade in the times of Djahângîr (Tuwûb-i Djahângîrî, trans. Rogers, li, 151). Nâdir Shâh's historian, Mirâ Khâtû, spells it Shâh Mâh, while the Sikh chieftain, Randîl Singh (1214/1759-1255/1839), changed it into Shâkh, declaring that the word Shâlîmâr had ominous implications (see S. M. Latîf, History of the Panjab, Lahore 1892, 260).

Apart from the Srinagar (Kashmir) Shâlîmâr, there is an equally famous one of the same name at Lahore; a third one, at Delhi, is no longer extant. The Kashmir Shâlîmâr is remarkable for a pavilion, built by Shâhdâjahân, with exquisitely carved pillars of black marble. This pavilion, which is surrounded by a series of cascades, contained four large stone doors in the days of Bernier (1679-1826).

The Lahore Shâlîmâr was founded, in three terraces, by 'Ali Mârdân Khân, an Iranian nobleman who, after surrendering the town of Kandahâr, of which he was the Governor, to the investing Mughul armies, had come down to Lahore in 1048/1638. He was warmly received by Shâhdâjahân, who appointed him Governor of Kashmir and, in 1049/1639, of the Pandîjâb also. Being a celebrated canal engineer, he was, immediately on his arrival, entrusted by the Emperor with the digging of a canal from the Râwî which would supply water
to the gardens. He was, however, transferred to Kabul before the canal reached Lahore. On completion, a year later, it cost the Imperial exchequer a sum of 100,000 rupees. The garden suffered much damage during the Sikh rule, most of its marble having been looted and taken to Amritsar.

The Mughal gardens follow a definite plan, a salient feature being the construction of a central channel and shallow tanks in the centre surrounded by soft green turf, a lofty boundary-wall, or four-fold garden. Taken as a whole, the garden looks like a combination of rectangles and straight lines; no curved paths or even circular parterres are allowed.

Great care was taken in the selection of the sites, and the foot of a wooded hill, or a charming natural feature, had often to be selected, and a large area around it purchased. The foot of a wooded hill, or a charming view, was the best specimen of Mughal horticulture. The Mughal gardens are generally arranged in squares or geometric patterns, usually in the form of terraces placed thus as to make the distribution and flow of water easy. Each terrace has four divisions to conform to the traditional plan of the Cahir bâgh or four-fold garden. Taken as a whole, the garden looks like a combination of rectangles and straight lines; no curved paths or even circular parterres are allowed.

The gardens of the Great Moghuls, London 1913; A. S. Bazmi Ansari, Td'rikh Gulzdr-i Kashmir, Lahore, 1863, 93-5; Kirpa Ram, Tabakdt al-Shafi'iyya, Damascus 1304 (recte 1299 A.H.) ii, 53; Subkt, Miftah al-Sa'da, Cairo 1286 A.H). i, 204, 216; Tha'alibl, Damascenus 1304 A.H., iv, 204-231; iili, 225; iv, 73; 160 f.; 232; 236; 281; Bayhaq, Tafsirat Sunnan al-Ikhsha, i, 34 f.; Yâkût i, 612; Ibn al-Athîr, i, 155; Ibn Khallîkûn (1299 A.H.) ii, 53; Subkt, Tabahât al-Shâ'ibiyâ, iv, 4-6; Damiri s.v. al-thâ'abân; Dawlatghâh, Taghdkra, 26 f.; Taghdkprûzaďe, Mslfâh, Sa'dâ, i, 299 f. Brockelmann i, 291 S I, 445. (J. W. Fook).
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- Abu 'l-Fadl, Âlam-i Akbarî, truns. Jarret i, 361; 'Abd al-Hamîd Lahorî, Al-Bustl, an Egyptian poet of the 5th/nth century. He was much praised for his skill in applying the taginis (paronomasia) and especially the taginis mutashibih i.e. the use of homonyms for the sake of puns. This technique he developed gradually after having heard in his youth a quibble from the poet Shu'nab. 'Abd al-Malik al-Bustl (Yatimat al-Dahr, iv, 233 f.). He was on friendly terms with Tha'alîbî, who composed his Ahsan mâ sam'i'tu on his instigation and gives of Bustl's art an appreciative selection in his Yatimat al-Dahr. His Dwan was published at Beirut in 1294/1877-8. Especially famous is his didactic poem al-Nâhiyya or 'Usvnûn al-Ishâm.

Bustl wrote also some poems in his mother-tongue, Persian, but they were never collected (see H. Ethâ, in Morgenländische Forschungen, Festschrift H. L. Fleischer, 1875, 55-7). He is sometimes confounded with his namesake Abu 'l-Fath al-Bustl (reote al-Baynî) an Egyptian poet of the 5th/11th century (see Ibn Raşıh, al-UMda i, 200, 18 and Ibn Sa'dî, Mughrîb 103 Tallquist).

Bibliography: Utbl, al-Yamini (margin of the Commentary of al-Manîlî, Cairo 1286 A.H.), i, 67-72; Tha'alîbî, Yatimat al-Dahr, Damascus 1304 A.H., iv, 204-231; iili, 225; iv, 73; 160 f.; 232; 236; 281; Bayhaq, Tafsirat Sunnan al-Ikhsha, i, 34 f.; Yâkût i, 612; Ibn al-Athîr, i, 155; Ibn Khallîkûn (1299 A.H.) ii, 53; Subkt, Tabahât al-Shâ'ibiyâ, iv, 4-6; Damiri s.v. al-thâ'abân; Dawlatghâh, Taghdkra, 26 f.; Taghkprûzaďe, Mslfâh, Sa'dâ, i, 299 f. Brockelmann i, 291 S I, 445. (J. W. Fook).

**BUT** [see Budd].

**BUTAYN** [see Nuğûm].

**BUTNÁN, the name of a wâdi located thirty kilometres east of Aleppo. At this place springs feed a large stream, Nahr al-Djabab, which flows south and empties into the salt lake of Djabâb. These natural conditions have permitted the development...**
of essentially agricultural villages (fruit trees and cotton), of which the most important are the market-towns of Bâb and Buzâ‘a. A convenient stage about a day's march from the valley of Kuwyak, it was always a halting-place on the routes from Edessa and Rakka, and the revenues drawn from the saltbed of Diabdûl formed consistently an appreciable support for the finances of the governors or rulers of northern Syria.

Popular etymology relates Butnân to the root \( b-h-t \) and gives it the meaning of "low-lying ground". In fact the name preserves the memory, beyond a Byzantine Batnai and a Roman Batnæ, of the principality of Pâtîn.

Conquered by Ḥabbîb b. Maslama, Butnân fell very soon under the influence of the new centre, Aleppo, and henceforth played only an episodic rôle. In 70/689-90, the caliph ʿAbd al-Malîk wintered in the valley, during a struggle against Muṣ‘ab b. al-Zubayr. The Carmathians made a disastrous appearance there in 90/708. Under Sayf al-Dawla's rule, it was devastated by Nicephoros Phocas in 966/365. In the time of the Mirdâsids the valley was under the authority of Tutush in 1080/472. The Crusades and the Frankish occupation of Edessa and Antioch opened a period of insecurity which began in 1098/491-92 with an Armenian raid, doubtless in connection with the siege of Antioch. A prompt response by the Saljûqs of Aleppo ended in the extermination of the large Ismâ’îlì community at Bâb. Burned by Joscelin of Tell Bâshîr in 1125/518, Buzâ‘a as well as Bâb was taken by the Emperor John II Comnëns in 1138/532. The arrival of Nur al-Dîn in Aleppo brought back security. The Butnân of this period is known owing to the descriptions, as numerous as they are stereotyped, of the Arab geographers (cited by Le Strange and Dussaud).

With the Saljûqs, Butnân disappeared from the political scene. The region was administrated by two Mamlûks, Dûndûs, appointed by the nâṣîb of Aleppo, one for the towns of Bâb and Buzâ‘a, the other for the neighbourhood of Diabdûl. The Turks made it a ḍâirî, where a ḍâirîmâbîd subordinate to the Paša of Aleppo kept an eye on the salt-mines of Diabdûl (400-500,000 pounds annual revenue for the exchequer in the middle of the 19th century). He resided at Bâb, which had 6,000 inhabitants at this period.


**AL-BUTR**, the name given to one of the two groups of tribes who constitute the Berbers \( [q.v.] \), the other being called al-Barânis \( [q.v.] \).

The chief groups of whom al-Butr was composed were the Lawâta, the Nafûsa, the Nafzâwa, the Banû Fâtîn and the Miknâsa. Their earliest habitat is the region of steppe and plateau which extends from the Nile to southern Tunisia; they were thus originally Libyan Berbers. But, very early, several of these peoples (Miknâsa, Banû Fâtîn, and a part of Lawâta) moved towards the west—to Algeria (the areas round Awrâs, Tiaret and Tlemcen) and Morocco (the Moulouya valley, the Saharan country between Sidjîlmâsa, Figîg and Twât, and the Sebou basin), and from the western Maghrîb many elements penetrated into Spain. An attempt has been made to present the Butr as the Berber nomads and camel-drivers par excellence. This was perhaps their primitive way of life, which is no doubt why Arab historians have attached to this group peoples of definitely nomadic habits, such as the Hawaiîra and the Zanâta. The Nafûsa, the Nafzâwa and a part of the Lawâta appear nevertheless to have become stabilised rather early in the mountains of Libya, perhaps at the time of the Arab conquest. As for those who moved into Algeria and Morocco, they were soon settled and even established a number of small towns.

The greater part of the tribal names of which this group is composed are still current, but the collective name itself has disappeared. It is the plural of the Arabic \( al-ābâr \), the alleged surname of Mâdhûs, whom these peoples recognised as their common ancestor. The word means "he whose tail is docked, mutilated, he who has no descendants". The last sense is hardly suited to an eponymous ancestor; the first two are bizarre. However, the eponymous ancestor of the other group, Burnus, bears a name coincident with the Arabic word (an early borrowing from the Greek \( bîros \)) designating the garment which we call burnous. Thus, the Burnüs might be "the (wearers of) burnous, or long garments" and, in contrast, the Butr would be "those clad in short garments". In fact, in the Arabic dialect of north-west Morocco, there is an adjective \( gûftî \) (a quadriliteral expansion of the root \( h-r-t \)) meaning "he who has his tail cut short", and is applied in particular to the very short jelldbas of the mountaineurs (cf. W. Marçais, Textes de Tanger, 439).

For other ethnic appellations derived from
peculiarities of dress, note that of the Şanşâda Berbers [q.v.], who are called mulâbbâhimân “those who wear a veil over the mouth”; and that which has been suggested for the Masmûda [q.v.] Berbers, who are called Shulûh (cf. Milanges Gaudroy-Demoty, Cairo 1939, 305).


BUWAYHIDS or BOYâIDS, the most important of the dinasties which, first in the Iranian plateau then in Irâk, side by side with the Sêmánâds of Khûrsân and of Mâwâtâ al-Nâhî, marked the “Iranian intermezzo” (Minorosky) between the Arab domination of early Islam and the Turkish conquest of the 5th/11th century. Its name derives from Buwayh or Bûyeh, the father of three brothers who founded it, ʿAll, al-Ḥasan, and the youngest, Abûnâd. Conducîvers of humble birth, they belonged to the population of the Daylamâs [q.v.] who, newly won over to the Shiîte Islam, were at that time enlisting in large numbers in all the armies of the Muslim East, including those of the Caliphate.

To some extent, it was the Daylamâs who, with the advent of the Buwayhids, assumed power and imposed on the régime something of their own character. While the Daylamâs remaining in Daylam formed small principalities, sometimes extending as far as Adhâkarbaydân, the others, in Iran and ʿIrâk, developed in consequence into a political factor of growing importance. The Buwayhidâs, who, to begin with, had followed one of their compatriots, Mâkkân b. ḳâkî, who had entered the service of the Sêmánâds, and then their Gilânî ally Mardawîdî [q.v.] in his struggle against their common enemy, the Zaydî state of Tabaristân (sometimes extending as far as Rayy), continued as far as the Gilânî Mardawîdî whom he carved out for himself in central Iran a vast autonomous principality. Soon, however, they began to adopt a somewhat intractable attitude towards him. Having become for a time master of Isfâhan, then, more permanently, of Fârs, ʿAll, to protect himself against Mardawîdî, and in spite of being a Shiîte, got his authority in the government of the province recognised by the Caliph, as the ʿAbbâsid armies had been incapable of reconquering it. He still had possession of it when in 332/945 Mardawîdî was assassinated. After confused struggles (see the articles ʿIMĀD AL-DÂWLA, MUʿizz AL-DÂWLA and RUKN AL-DÂWLA) against the lieutenants of allies of the Sêmánâds or of the various clans who shared among themselves an influence with the Caliphate, ʿAll, the eldest, kept the province of Fârs, while his brother al-Ḥasan occupied almost the whole of Dîbâbâl and the youngest, Abûnâd, entrenched himself on the one hand in Kirkân and on the other in Khûzistân. These important strongholds, and more especially this last acquisition, drew the Buwayhids into the interplay of factions for power in ʿIrâk and the other territories of the Caliphate under the successive amîr al-umârât. Only a very close study can determine whether, in the general post of intrigues and betrayals, the Buwayhids were allied to any one specific faction. However that may be, in 334/945, Abûnâd entered Bagdad. The régime which he set up there lasted until 447/1055. The new era was at once inaugurated by a change of name: Abûnâd, ʿAll and al-Ḥasan respectively had bestowed on them simultaneously by the Caliph the honorific titles (šâhâb) of Muʿizz al-Dawla, ʿImâd al-Dawla and Rukn al-Dawla, by which they were henceforth known to history. Before long, ʿImâd al-Dawla died without an heir, leaving Fârs to ʿAdûd al-Dawla, son of Rukn al-Dawla. When the latter died (366/977), after Muʿizz al-Dawla, ʿAdûd al-Dawla, finding himself head of the family, dispossessed his nephew, ʿĪzz al-Dawla Bakhtîyâr, of ʿIrâk, and only allowed his brother, Muʿâyyid al-Dawla, to remain master of the rest of Buwayhid Iran, by virtue of his incontrovertible loyalty. ʿAdûd al-Dawla, who was the most distinguished personality of the dynasty, achieved the fullest unity that the family was to enjoy.

Outside ʿIrâk, the new principalities merely joined the number of those which, for a century, had been carving up the ʿAbbâsid Empire. The Buwayhid princelyship of ʿIrâk in a sense did little more than implant in this last ʿAbbâsid redoubt the form of government which had triumphed elsewhere. But there was, in this instance, a factor of greater importance, in that Bagdad was the very centre of the Caliphate. It is true that its seizure by the Buwayhids did little more than set the seal on the developments which had, in effect, placed the Caliphate under the domination of the army chiefs, promoted amîr al-umârât. But this time there was the added fact that the Buwayhids were professing Shiîtes, so much so that it might have been asked whether they were not about to suppress a Caliphate whose legitimacy had no special meaning for them. Nothing of the sort happened. Doubtless Muʿizz al-Dawla was aware that the Shiîtes were in the minority, and that, had he destroyed the Caliphate in Bagdad, the institution would have reappeared elsewhere. It was better therefore to keep it under his thumb, both to legitimise his authority over the Sunnis in his states and to strengthen his diplomatic relations with the world outside by the weight of the respected moral authority which the Sunni princes still enjoyed by right. In fact, deriving their official authority from the Caliphate, the Buwayhids behaved as though they believed genuinely in the legitimacy of the ʿAbbâsid Caliphate.

The question of the relations between Buwayhids and Caliphate is moreover bound up with that of their religious adherence. It has sometimes been thought that the Buwayhids were Zaydîs because Daylam had been the scene of the activity of the emissaries of these same Zaydîs who had set up political hegemonies in Tabaristân and, on the very borders of Daylam itself, by those of their rival al-ʿUtrûgh, around the year 900. All the same, there were also Ismâʿîlîs (Misk., ii, 32-33) in Daylam and, in the entourage of al-ʿUtrûgh or his descendants, Twelvers (E1, s.v. al-ʿUtrûgh), and Mardawîdî, affected perhaps by Ismâʿîlî propaganda, had at any rate joined the Sunni Sêmánâds in fighting the Zaydîs of Tabaristân. At this time, Twelver theology proper was only just beginning to be elaborated, and there is consequently nothing remarkable in the persistence, in later Buwayhid society, of Zaydî doctrinal influences or, linked to these, Muʿtazzî influences. But, for the Buwayhid conquerors, politics took precedence over religion. The notion, for a time entertained, it is said, by Muʿizz al-Dawla, of conferring the Caliphate on a certain Zaydî ʿAlîd in his entourage was set aside, never to be taken up again, precisely because it would have been necessary to obey such a Caliph. The distinction between the various branches of Shiîsm was probably not yet clearly defined outside the Zaydî states (leaving Ismâʿîlîm aside), and the Twelver tendency, certainly in
'IRĀK  FĀRS  KIRMĀN  DJIBĀL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hijri year</th>
<th>'IRĀK</th>
<th>FĀRS</th>
<th>KIRMĀN</th>
<th>DJIBĀL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>'Imād al-Dawla</td>
<td>[period of confusion]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Imād al-Dawla]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mu'izz al-Dawla]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Rukn al-Dawla]</td>
<td>[period of confusion]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td></td>
<td>'Aḏud al-Dawla</td>
<td>[Confusion]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>Rukn al-Dawla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Captured by Fadlūyeh

Captured by Toghrul-Beg and imprisonment of al-Malik al-Raḥim.

Complete genealogical tables are to be found in Zambaur 212-16 and Q.

'IRĀK and Fārs were united from 367 to 372, 376 to 379, 388 to 415, and 435 to 447.

'IRĀK and Kirmān were united from 334 to 336, and 380 to 388. Kirmān was united with Fārs from 338 to 367 (to 372 with 'IRĀK), 380 to 403, 419 to 440; it stood alone from 403 to 446 and from 440 to 448.

'IRĀK stood alone from 334-367, 379 to 380, 416 to 435. Fārs stood alone from 322 to 338 and from 372 to 380.

A union between 'IRĀK, Fārs and Kirmān was achieved from 367 to 372, 388 to 403, 435 to 440.

The DJIBĀL always stood alone, except during the early days of the dynasty.

Umān, except for a short time under Šams Šam al-Dawla, when it was united with 'IRĀK, was united with Fārs. Basra and Ahwāz, after 'Aḏud al-Dawla, were often separated from 'IRĀK or constituted an autonomous government at the heart of the 'IRĀK kingdom; they were often incorporated in the kingdom of Fārs.

Simāl-Dawla [then KAKWAYHIDS]

Ghaznavid conquest

Simāl-Dawla

Non-simultaneous possession, but identity of person.

Simāl-Dawla - Fārs

Partial, disputed possession.

Simāl-Dawla - Fārs

Simultaneous possession.
Mesopotamia and probably in central Iran, was the majority form of Shi’ism. In fact, about the time when the Buwayhids were seizing power (and was this purely fortuitous?) the doctrine was spreading among adherents of that movement that after the period in which the imāms were present in person, followed by that in which they were represented by a wakil, the time of the “great occultation” was coming, when nothing more would be known of them. Thus, if the ʿAbbāsīd Caliph was not, strictly speaking, legitimate, at least, if he tolerated Shi’ism, there was nothing discreditable in putting up with him. It is certain that the Buwayhids welcomed somewhat indiscriminately Shi’is or Mu`tazilis of different shades of opinion, but politically they were Twelvers. At no time did the Buwayhids plan the persecution of the Sunnis by the Shi’is — both sects were represented in their army; rather they intended to set up a sort of ʿAbbāsī-Shi’i condominium, which freed the Shi’is from the obligation of a certain faitya and provided them, as well as the Sunnis, with an official organisation. Basically, they were reviving, from the Shi’i angle, what had been the dream of many ʿAbbāsids from the time of al-Ma’mūn. Thus, they believed, they acquired a strong following, without at the same time alienating the rest of the population. Without the smallest doubt, Twelver Shi’ism owes to the Buwayhids régime not only this organisation, but even a part of its doctrinal structure. The importance of the rich Shi’is and the Shariʿis towards the end of the ʿAbbāsīd era is well-known. It was upon them that —leaving aside the army — the Buwayhids régime depended in its social relations with the local population. The régime organised the ʿAlids—or as they are more usually called, the Tālibids—into an autonomous body to counterbalance the ʿAbbāsids, whereas formerly this family unit was merely integrated into, though, of course, dominated by, the ʿAbbāsids. On the doctrinal level, the presence of Imāms in the 3rd/9th century and the fact that the Twelvers had for a long time been, in a somewhat negative fashion, those among the Shi’is who had not joined in active rebellion, had obstructed the work of the traditionists and theoreticians. The Buwayhids now made up for lost time. While al-Kulainī, the first of the great theologians whom the Twelvers recognised as specifically their own, died at the dawn of the Buwayhīd régime in Iraq, the second and more important, Ibn Bābawīya (Bābawīya) was encouraged in his work by the Buwayhids in the third quarter of the century. He was followed by others among whom—also important in Iranian Shi’ism—were Arabs from the old ʿAlid citadel of Kūm. In Baghdad, the brother ʿAbbās-ibn al-Raḍī and al-Murtadā were, throughout the whole of the first quarter of the 11th century, the real masters of the town, acting as intermediaries between the Buwayhīds, the Caliphs and the population, at the same time as the Shi’is scholars and traditionists. It is said that at this moment when the four schools remaining to the Sunnis were beginning to be defined by them as exclusively orthodox, they wished that their form of Shi’ism might be recognised in the heart of the umma as a sort of fifth authorised school. More readily apparent from the outset of the régime is the organisation or recognition of forms which are still those of Shi’ism to this day. Influenced perhaps by Daylamite practices, Muʿtaz al-Dawla openly created or consecrated the lamentations of the ‘Ashore. He also created the festival of Ghabīr Khunn. The ʿAlid maṣḥafs, genuine or conjectural, were embellished, and ʿAḍud al-Dawla was the first to be buried there after ʿAlī. Shi’i schools were created, such as the Dār al-ʿilm of the vizier Sāḥib, endowed with maḥāfs, a replica (921/1512) of the Fatimid “University”, and considerably earlier than the Sunni Nizāmīyya of the Salджiḥids; and in the mosques, the Shi’i cult, including the public call to prayer, was in dangerous competition with the Sunni cult.

Naturally, it was out of the question that the recognised Caliph should govern effectively. In the same way as the laḥabs of Nāṣir al-Dawla, the first of its kind conferred on the Ḥamdānid, the Buwayhīd laḥabs show that, while it was the Caliph who legalised their power, they alone were its custodians. Al-Mustakfi, the Caliph who welcomed them, had joined forces with many others before them. He was replaced by his personal enemy al-Muṭīʿ, who nineteen years later himself had to yield the throne to al-Ṭāʾī for having backed the wrong side in the struggle between the heirs of Muʿtaṣ al-Dawla. Al-Ṭāʾī in his turn abandoned the throne to al-Kādir. Nevertheless, the life-span of the Caliphs in the time of the Buwayhīds—three and a half reigns in a century—was appreciably longer than that of their predecessors—precisely because they no longer ruled in anything but name. As to the laḥabs, they became more numerous as they declined in value. As each prince in the family, then little by little princes of other dynasties, claimed them too, it was necessary first to double and then treble those of the head of the Buwayhīds. Thus ʿAḍud al-Dawla was also called Tāḍī Al-Milla etc. The last Buwayhīd went so far as to claim that he had conferred upon himself a title ending in dīn, faith,—a procedure and implication (a condemnation of Sunnism) which obviously the Caliph could not accept. In the same way, the supreme prince marked his superiority over his umārā’ relatives by proclaiming himself from ʿAḍud al-Dawla onwards, maṣīḥ, and even, in Iran though not in ʿIrāq, šīkhangi, the old Sasanid title. The last of the Buwayhīds committed the sacrilege of styling himself al-Malik al-Raḥīm, a title properly reserved for Allāh alone. The exalted position of the Buwayhīds was shown also in the attribution of their name, after that of the Caliph, in the ḥudba, except in the Caliph’s quarter, and on coins, as well as in the privilege of having the fals’is beaten in front of the princely residences at the three principal, and later five, hours of prayer.

To turn to the exercise of power, the essential point is that there was no longer any instrument of government in Baghdad which depended even in law upon the Caliph—though for a time under Nāṣir al-Dawla this had been the case. Everything, especially the wazīrat, was now an institution directly attached to the amirate, though this transfer did not in itself mark any change in the distribution of functions. Topographically, everything in Baghdad was now at the Dār al-Mamlaka [see below]. During the period in which the power of the régime conferred on the wazīrat, as on the principality, a certain stability, there were Buwayhīd wazīrs who were by no way inferior to the greatest wazīrs of the Caliphate, and who stayed even longer in office. Such was al-Muhallabī under Muʿtaṣ al-Dawla, Ibn al-ʿAmdī under Rukn al-Dawla, the ʿṢāhib Ibn al-ʿAbbād under Muʿṭayyid al-Dawla and Fāghr Dawla. All three of these were very cultured men and at the same time great administrators. Nevertheless, some
of the Buwayhids, principally 'Aḍūd al-Dawla, the greatest of them all, preferred to keep the co-ordination of the instruments of government in their own hands and, in practice, devolved the functions of the wazirs, with or without the title, among two or three high dignitaries. Their inadequate knowledge of Arabic had made it impossible for the Buwayhids of the first generation to do more themselves than reap the benefits of the work done by their more effective wazirs. Under the last of the Buwayhids, the wazirate was more unstable although wazirs were frequently drawn from a single family. Of course, the Caliphate still kept a secretariat and a Chancellery, but these were exclusively occupied with the administration of matters pertaining strictly to the Caliphate or with international correspondence on behalf of the amirs.

The functions of the Caliphate comprised the administration of its goods and the organisation of the palace, the representative duties which devolved upon the Caliph, the control of the good works and religio-legal life of the Sunnis and a certain moral share in the administration of Baghdad. The income of the Caliph, apart from family and private means, was no longer what he set aside for himself out of State revenue, for it was no longer the Caliph who authorised wages and salaries. On the contrary, as was already the case in the time of Nāṣir al-Dawla, an allowance was given to him by the amirs out of the public funds which, in former times, had been administered by himself. The total was smaller than before though still worthy of his station—two or three hundred thousand dinārs under the early Buwayhids—to which must be added the numerous gifts made to him by the entire Muslim world and by the foreign ambassadors, as well as what he received from the Buwayhids themselves at festivals and investitures. Against these however, must be set the forced contributions extorted by the Buwayhids in times of crisis. As to his religio-legal powers, they consisted in the nomination and control of the personnel of the mosques and the holders of the office of kāfd for the Sunnis, in particular in Baghdad where the Caliph al-Kādir compensated for his powerlessness to oppose the Buwayhid government by a drive to enforce the letter of Sunnite orthodoxy, especially among the Mu'tazilis and the Ismā'īllis.

The transfer of government from the Caliphate to the amirate did not ipso facto alter the character of the government. In practice, the Buwayhid régime established the absolute supremacy of the army in the government. However, since the general functions of public administration still had to be carried out, this supremacy meant also that, in a sense, the military authority now extended its competence to fields which previously had been outside its province. The innovation which probably had the most serious consequences was the transformation of the ik̄hāf régime. For a long time, faithful supporters and, increasingly, the military chiefs, had been rewarded by the Caliphate with the grant in quasi-ownership of lands appropriated from the state domain. In fact, for the last hundred years or so, this source having been inadequate, high-ranking officers were sometimes granted the right to the taxes of a fiscal district, with no further obligation than to pay the standard Muslim tithe to the public Treasury. The Buwayhid régime, following in the footsteps of the Hamdānids, extended and ruthlessly intensified this practice. Many districts were systematically distributed as ik̄hāfs of this new type, now without even tithe obligations to the Treasury. Miskawayh, or, before him, Thābit b. Sinān, have described perfectly some of the consequences of this system. From the point of view of the central administration it meant that the princes exercised a clean-cut authority over the field of control of fiscal transactions in part of the country and, in the long run, even of factual knowledge of the nature and extent of the tax levied. In so far as the fiscal value of each district remained roughly calculable, it tended no longer to be within the province of the diwān of Taxes, but that of the Army. The diwān of Taxes, deprived of part of its functions, correspondingly reduced its staff and the number of its departments. Nevertheless, the Buwayhid ik̄hāf was not a fief, but an assignment of salary; the beneficiary would exchange it, at his own or the government's wish, if the revenue of the district were no longer equal to the balance due to him, or for any other expedient cause. He had no permanent ties with the district and therefore no interest in its development. At best, the means thus placed at his disposal enabled him to build up more stable properties. Nevertheless, they were not yet either ik̄hāf-holders of the provincial governments—these functions, when they exercised them, were paid in the normal way—nor bound to maintain their troops out of their ik̄hāf. Each soldier received his pay direct from the Treasury in whatever form it might be given to him. One should not exaggerate: a variable proportion of the pay was still paid in kind, a part of the land was still administered in the traditional manner by the traditional authority, of which some fiscal handbooks for this period have been preserved for us.

With these reservations, socially and economically, a new and more powerful aristocracy, that of the military leaders, was gaining ascendancy over the middle-class and slowly declining aristocracy of the great merchants, civilian landlords and high-ranking officials who had been at the height of their power in the 'Abbasid era. But, under the great Buwayhids, the princes exercised a clean-cut authority over these leaders and made it their business to see that the new aristocracy respected their strict control in such matters as the police, public order (ṣīmāya) and even taxation. There was, of course, no question of relaxing the tax on all subjects which was the basis of the upkeep of the army, whether this applied to or for any other expedient cause. He had no permanent ties with the district and therefore no interest in its development. At best, the means thus placed at his disposal enabled him to build up more stable properties. Nevertheless, they were not yet either ik̄hāf-holders of the provincial governments—these functions, when they exercised them, were paid in the normal way—nor bound to maintain their troops out of their ik̄hāf. Each soldier received his pay direct from the Treasury in whatever form it might be given to him. One should not exaggerate: a variable proportion of the pay was still paid in kind, a part of the land was still administered in the traditional manner by the traditional authority, of which some fiscal handbooks for this period have been preserved for us.

With these reservations, socially and economically, a new and more powerful aristocracy, that of the military leaders, was gaining ascendancy over the middle-class and slowly declining aristocracy of the great merchants, civilian landlords and high-ranking officials who had been at the height of their power in the 'Abbasid era. But, under the great Buwayhids, the princes exercised a clean-cut authority over these leaders and made it their business to see that the new aristocracy respected their strict control in such matters as the police, public order (ṣīmāya) and even taxation. There was, of course, no question of relaxing the tax on all subjects which was the basis of the upkeep of the army, whether this applied to or for any other expedient cause. He had no permanent ties with the district and therefore no interest in its development. At best, the means thus placed at his disposal enabled him to build up more stable properties. Nevertheless, they were not yet either ik̄hāf-holders of the provincial governments—these functions, when they exercised them, were paid in the normal way—nor bound to maintain their troops out of their ik̄hāf. Each soldier received his pay direct from the Treasury in whatever form it might be given to him. One should not exaggerate: a variable proportion of the pay was still paid in kind, a part of the land was still administered in the traditional manner by the traditional authority, of which some fiscal handbooks for this period have been preserved for us.

With these reservations, socially and economically, a new and more powerful aristocracy, that of the military leaders, was gaining ascendancy over the middle-class and slowly declining aristocracy of the great merchants, civilian landlords and high-ranking officials who had been at the height of their power in the 'Abbasid era. But, under the great Buwayhids, the princes exercised a clean-cut authority over these leaders and made it their business to see that the new aristocracy respected their strict control in such matters as the police, public order (ṣīmāya) and even taxation. There was, of course, no question of relaxing the tax on all subjects which was the basis of the upkeep of the army, whether this applied to or for any other expedient cause. He had no permanent ties with the district and therefore no interest in its development. At best, the means thus placed at his disposal enabled him to build up more stable properties. Nevertheless, they were not yet either ik̄hāf-holders of the provincial governments—these functions, when they exercised them, were paid in the normal way—nor bound to maintain their troops out of their ik̄hāf. Each soldier received his pay direct from the Treasury in whatever form it might be given to him. One should not exaggerate: a variable proportion of the pay was still paid in kind, a part of the land was still administered in the traditional manner by the traditional authority, of which some fiscal handbooks for this period have been preserved for us.
who built themselves sumptuous palaces. In east Baghdad the whole group of these buildings formed the Dār al-Mamlaka, as opposed to the Dār al-Khila'fa, and the buildings erected at it at gates of Shirāz by 'Adud al-Dawla at Kard Fānah Khurraw enchanted al-Muqaddas. The close union of 'Irāk and Fārs resulted in some attempts to introduce 'Irāk customs into Fārs, although no administrative unification was ever achieved. This union, from which local industries may have derived some profit, was in contrast with the periods which preceded and followed it, when the ties between 'Irāk and Iran were directed, across the central plateau, towards Khūrasān.

Culturally, the early Buwayhids were rough fellows without education, but their successors were moulded by the cultured indigenous aristocracy of Iran. In contrast with the remote Iran of the Sāmanids, the Buwayhid sphere of influence in Iran—not to mention a fortis, in 'Irāk—had the appearance of a strongly arabised area. We have already observed that the early Buwayhids, with Ibn al-'Amīd and Ibn 'Abbād as their wazirs, thus commanded the services of two of the most illustrious Arabic scholars of their day. Furthermore, a galaxy of Arabic poets were present at their courts. It was under the Buwayhids that Abu l-Parāqī al-Iṣṭahārī's "Book of Songs" and al-Nadīm's Fihrist, two treasuries of Arabic literature, were compiled. If Abū ʾĪṣāq al-Sābī had grounds for complaint against 'Adud al-Dawla, his grandson, the historian Hūlāl al-Sābī lived comfortably in the Baghdad of the later Buwayhids, who also protected the philosopher-historian, Mīsawānī. Generally speaking, sages were well-received by the Buwayhids, especially those whose special knowledge could be put to practical use. Such—leaving aside the religious sciences—were the geographer, Iṣṭakhrī, the mathematician, Abu ʾĪnisfāt al-Buzūdānī, al-Nasawī, who disseminated the "Indian numerals", the astrologers, for whom Ṣharaf al-Dawla built an observatory in Baghdad, the physicians (such as al-Madīṣī), who had cause for self-congratulation especially on the foundation by 'Adud al-Dawla of a remarkable hospital in the ancient capital, and another at Shīrāz [see Bimarstān]. The libraries of Shīrāz, Rayy, Iṣṭaḥān, organised by successive Buwayhids, excited universal adoration. It is common knowledge that Avicenna found sanctuary and high preferment (as a wazir?) under Șams al-Dawla. The great patron-wazirs were scarcely less munificent as long as they did not see in their protegés possible rivals for glory (Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawhīdī as against Ibn ʿAbbād). Ibn al-Bawwāb, a high Buwayhid dignitary, was one of the inventors of nāshī calligraphy.

But, while the Buwayhids and their ministers patronised literature and science of a traditionally Arabic character, they also showed a genuine interest in neo-Persian literature. If the first Daylami generation were not sufficiently polished to have any such pretensions, those who followed were in the widest sense more fully Iranian than Daylami. It was not for nothing that, as Mārdawīdī had dreamed, they revived the title of Shahanshah and caused to be drawn up for themselves a Sāsānī genealogy which, however, was universally recognised by their contemporaries as being historically unsound. Though their rôle in literature cannot be compared with that of the Sāmanids, they nevertheless had their Persian poets, and Firdawīs found a welcome at the court of Bahāʾ al-Dawla. The indubitable decline of Zoroastrianism, still flourishing in the Fārs province at the dawn of the Buwayhid régime, is probably in part linked with the fact that henceforth it was possible to form a separate block within Islam itself, under a "national" dynasty.

The place of the Buwayhid era in the history of Persian art would perhaps seem equally great if more thoroughly reliable testimony were available. Their buildings have already been mentioned in another connexion in which their places of worship perhaps count for less than their palaces, fortresses, hospitals, etc. Recent finds of textiles have now made it possible to study in actual examples this apparently traditional branch of Iranian craftsmanship. A good recent study on the art of the Buwayhid period is that of E. Kūhnel [see Bibliography], to which the reader is referred.

More generally, it is certain that, among the Buwayhids as elsewhere, the establishment of regional principalities, by setting up many new courts and cultural centres outside what until then was the more or less unique cultural centre of Baghdad, enriched and disseminated the life of the spirit and, by bringing it into contact with the varying requirements of different peoples, conferred upon it a new vitality.

The foreign policy of the Buwayhids seemed scarcely to have been affected by doctrinal considerations. In Iran, their great opponents in the 4th/10th century, were the Sāmanids, with their Ziyārid (descendants of Mārdāwīdī) and Šāfārīd (of Sīstān) vassals. Very naturally, they supported the Khurāsānī rebels, especially the Sīmājūrīs, against the Sāmanids, and took advantage of the ascendency of the Gharānīwīdīs at the beginning of the century and of the final ruin of the Sāmanids at the end. In the north-west, their policy was to establish or maintain a vague protectorate over the small Daylamlī dynasties, as to have them on their side in the fight against the Ziyārids on the one hand and the Kurds on the other. The struggle against the Kurds falls partly under the heading of "foreign policy", on the Adharbaydānī side, and partly of internal security—in other words mere public order—or on the Bidābī side (the Ḥamānīs and Kurds). The same is true of the hostilities, carried out for the most part in the time of 'Adud al-Dawla, against the Kūfīs and the Balūch of Kirmān and Makrān. Finally, the occupation of the ʿUmān, or more precisely of the vital strategic coastal areas of the region, at times by the Buwayhīs of Fārs, at others by those of 'Irāk, was clearly related to considerations of economic security. In Mesopotamia, following the liquidation of the Barīds of Baṣra, the main efforts of the two first generations of Buwayhīs consisted above all in the neutralisation and then the liquidation of the Ḥamānīs who, though Šīʿīs like themselves, were Arabs, and had been only recently their rivals in Baghdad. Naturally, a small semi-permanent war was essential for the maintenance of order on the borders of Arabia, and, in 'Irāk itself, in the Balūch as also in the Persian Gulf against the Carnamha of Bahrayn.

The appearance of the Fāṭimīs in 658 in Egypt, then in Syria, confronted the Buwayhīs of the second generation and their descendants with a problem unknown to the first. The claim of the new dynasty to be ʿAlīīd could not fail to excite interest among all Šīʿīs. Nor could this dynasty, with its "imperialist" ambitions, fail to try and further its own expansion by claims of this kind. It would, however, have been necessary for all Šīʿīs to accept
the heterodox doctrines of the Isma'illis which were the official doctrines of the Fatimid State, and, further, it was difficult to avoid clashes between two powers bent on dominating the territories between Egypt and 'Irak. The Buwayhids occasionally joined forces with the Carmathians, when they quarrelled with the Fātimids, and also, of course, with the Arab tribes fighting the Fātimids on one front and the Ḥamdānids or their heirs fighting them on another. It is difficult to assess just how far the anti-Fātimid manifesto of the Caliph al-Ḳādīr (402/1011) was an exact reflection of Buwayhid policy or whether it was also instigated by the desire to counteract Isma'ili infiltration. At any rate, there is nothing to support a view that it was done against the wishes of the Buwayhids, and it is remarkable that it was signed jointly by the Sunnī and Twelver sages. It was not until the end of the dynasty that a Buwayhid, Abū Kālidjār, lent a complacent ear to the explanations of al-Mu'ayyad al-Shirāzī, the Isma'ili missionary, though, officially at least, nothing came of it (Ṣīra of al-Shirāzī, al-Balkhī, 118; Abū Shudjā', 232). And the fact that after the fall of the dynasty in Baghdad their Turkish general, al-Basāṣīrī [q.v.], thoroughly intransigent while they were in power, declared his allegiance, against the Saljiqīd conqueror, to the Fātimid Caliphate, which alone was capable of coming to his aid, cannot be regarded as characteristic of Buwayhid policy in general.

However stable the Buwayhid dynasty may have appeared from the outset, however brilliant some of its achievements, it was not without its weaknesses. Some of these were common to other régimes; others were peculiar to itself, others again came not from within but from without. In this last category was the maritime trading crisis which had an appreciable effect upon the end of the Buwayhid era. It is certain that towards the year 1000 A.D. the trade with the West from the Indian Ocean ceased to flow mainly through the Persian Gulf, being diverted to the Red Sea (see B. Lewis, The Fatimids and the Route to India, in Revue de la Fac. de Sc. Econ. d'Istanbul, 1953). The persistent troubles of Lower 'Irāk and the presence in Bahrayn of the Carmathians, whom the Buwayhids were powerless to command, must have had something to do with this, as had also the complete segregation of Syria from Mesopotamia brought about by the Fātimid and Byzantine conquests. Probably an even more significant influence, however, was the economic imperialism of the Fātimids and the favourable conditions which attracted the attention of the merchant ships of Italy. When a natural catastrophe (in about the year 1000) ruined Sirāf, which up to that time had been the great Persian port of the Gulf, the town was not rebuilt, and the mastery of the Gulf belonged henceforth to the Lord of the Island of Kīsh, who seems to have been more or less a Corsair chief. Although we cannot accurately assess the consequences of these facts, it is scarcely likely that they were not serious both for the merchant classes of society, who were doubtless henceforth less well able to resist the growing power of the military aristocracy, and for the internal economics of the Buwayhid régime and consequently its general stability. Even before the year 1000, the Buwayhids were unable to avoid the devaluation of their silver coinage, and doubtless it was for this reason that in the 11th century, gold was used more and more, though one wonders how it came there. The Buwayhids were increasingly forced, in order to raise taxes, to have recourse to tax-farming, selling offices, etc.

A more domestic and congenital weakness in the Buwayhid régime as in most of the Near-Eastern régimes of this period, lay in that very army which had brought about the ruin of the Caliphate. The Buwayhid army, in spite of the pay being supplemented by ḥāṣd, was no more easily satisfied than its forerunner, the army of the Caliph. Like its predecessor, it knew itself to be the cornerstone of the system, and took advantage of its position. It was not, however, united. The original Daylamite nucleus was not adequate for long and, even before the conquest of Baghdad, the Buwayhids, like Mardawīdī, had added to it the corps of Turkish slaves indispensable to every Muslim army in the East. These, on the one hand, could be used against the Daylamites in the event of a breach of discipline (and vice versa), and on the other hand, and even more important, they were mainly horsemen, while the Daylamites, who came from the mountains and forests, were infantrymen. Occasionally, Kurds, Kufs etc., were also recruited. To the rivalry between this diversity of ethnic groups, must be added the fact that, at the beginning at least, the Turks taken over by the Buwayhids from the Caliphate were Sunnīs. Finally, for reasons which are still unexplained, the recruitment of Daylamite troops dried up progressively. The last descendants of the princes who owed their power to them were surrounded almost entirely by Turkish soldiers.

The third cause of weakness, rather more peculiar to the Buwayhid dynasty, was the splitting-up of power. From the beginning, it has been noted, there was not one but three Buwayhid principalities. The circumstances of the conquest may have had something to do with this, but another factor must surely have been a patrimonial or familial conception of power. When strength and chance combined to permit 'Ādud al-Dawla to establish an almost complete unity to his own advantage, he did no more than his predecessors to perpetuate this unity, which was disrupted at his death. This splitting-up of power, which distinguishes the Buwayhid dynasty from all the other Muslim dynasties before the Kāshghānīd and Saljiqīd Turkish dynasties, is inevitably brought about by internal strife, once the three founder-brothers were dead. It goes without saying that the army and all the trouble-makers benefited, so much so that this flaw in the dynastic organisation in its turn aggravated the vices born of the military régime and the other internal weaknesses of the system. The disturbances among the urban population, a harsh warning to the early Buwayhids, started up again; a revolt of Ḥṣṭakhr caused the destruction of the old metropolis, and Baghdad was at times in the power of the ʿaysārān [q.v.]. If the late ʿināds of the futuwa were to be believed, Abū Kālidjār was one of them. The policy of religious equilibrium followed by the Buwayhids in practice did no more than foster in this same town and elsewhere the struggle between ᵠhī's and Sunnīs, and the Hanballi extremists went so far as to burn the masjīd of Husayn and the tombs of the Buwayhids. The later Buwayhids, especially in ʿIrāk, were virtually powerless to command obedience from anyone.

This powerlessness to some extent benefited the Caliphate. The Caliph, who sometimes arbitrated in dynastic disputes, regained some measure of influence, at least in the affairs of ʿIrāk. Finally, for ʿIrāk the Caliph al-Kāšīn was able to have once more in his service after the lapse of a century a wazīr in the
person of the intransigent Sunnī Ibn al-Muslima. Hope of a partial recovery of the Caliphate as an institution now became something more than a utopian dream, witness the treatise *al-Ḥādīm al-Suṭūmīyya* of the great kāfī al-Māwārdī, closely associated with the policies of the Caliph. It was even possible, in Sunni circles, to look forward to the removal of the heretical protector. True, the weakness of the Buwayhids was not sufficient to restore to the Caliphate the material power needed for the reconstitution of an autonomous government; but it was possible, at least, that an orthodox and more respectful guardian might be found.

There was no lack of candidates to succeed the Buwayhids, some having only local ambitions, others aspiring to the unification of the Muslim East to their own advantage. Barely twenty years after the fall of the Hamādānīs, faced by the Marwānī Kurds of Dīyar Bakr, it became necessary to recognise the power of the ʿUqaylid Arabs in Dījarra. Twenty years after the fall of the Hasanwayhid Kurds of Dībāl, the ascendency of the ʿAnāzīd Kurds had to be recognised in the same region; not to mention the various Bedouin tribes who held the ʿIrāk-Arab or ʿIrāk-Syrian borderlands, and the frontiers of the almost independent principality of the marshes of the Ḥablā at the gates of Baghdaḍ. In Iran, a family related to the Buwayhids and for this reason called Kākwayhids or Kākōyids (from Kākōy; in Daylamite: maternal uncle), had taken over first Iṣfahān and then Hamadān. But the gravest danger came from the east. Here, the Ghaznavids had become a power to be reckoned with, and Māmūd of Ghazna now openly aspired to liberate the Caliphate. Meanwhile, he took advantage of the quarrels and impurities of the Buwayhids to send his son Masʿud to occupy Ravy. His forces massacred the Shīʿīs and burnt the treasures of their library as well as those of the Muʿtazīlīs (420/1027).

The death of Māmūd, followed by the defeat of Masʿud by the Saljūqs, gave a brief respite to the rest of the Buwayhids. But the triumph of the Saljūqsids enabled them to take up on their own account and with greater effect the plans for a Sunni empire. They had supporters in the entourage of the Caliphate. Buwayhid acceptance of Saljūqids suzerainty was of no avail. In 1055, Ṭughrīl-Beg entered Baghdaḍ without striking a blow, and imprisoned al-Malik al-Raḥīm. Fārs, in spite of fortifications set up at Shīrāz, also fell, being attacked from the north and from Kirmān. The Buwayhid dynasty was at an end.

**Bibliography: Sources:** We are fortunate in possessing three collections of correspondence and official documents: that of Abū Iṣhāk al-Ṣāḥīb, secretary to the Caliph al-Muṣṭafī and al-Ṭāḥī, important for the study of diplomatic history (some extracts edited by Shāhīb Arslān, 1858, the greater part unpublished); that of the wāizar Shāhīb Ibn ʿAbdābd (the papers relating to the reign of Muʿayyid al-Dawla only have been preserved, ed. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb ʿAzzām and Shawkī Dāyf, Cairo 1947), of considerable interest for the study of home administration; finally that of ʿAbd al-ʿAẓīz b. Yūsuf, a high official under ʿAḏud al-Dawla (summary by Cl. Cahen in *Studi Orientalistici in onore . . . G. Levi della Vida*): all three from the third quarter of the 10th/11th century. See also Kālīkhazāndī, Sāḥīb, xii, 129 & 130.

Nevertheless, the principal sources are the chronicles. The fundamental chronicle is that of Thābit b. Șīnān, continued by Hīdāl al-Ṣāḥīb until 447 A.H. All that has been preserved pertaining to the Buwayhid period is an extract relating to the period from the end of 399 to the beginning of 403, but whose general substance seems to have been carried over into the later chronicles who made use of it, first the Ṭaḡārīb al-ʿUmān of Miskawayh and his successor Abū Shūdāk al-Rudhawarī, the single manuscript of which links up with the fragment of Hīdāl al-Ṣāḥīb (the whole ed. trans. Margoliouth, *The Eclipse of the Abbasid Caliphate*, 7 vols, 1920-21), but also, completing and often correcting the Ṭaḡārīb, the *Takmila of Muh. b. ʿAbd al-Malik al-Hamadhānī* (preserved only up to 367) (ed. Kanān in *Mahārī, 1955-58*), the Ṣāmīl of Ibn al-Ḥāṯir, the *Mīrād al-Zamān* of Sīḥt Ibn al-Djāwīzī (unpublished for this period, more complete than the *Munāsām* of his ancestor Ibn al-Djāwīzī from which it also derives): these last three sources only cover the years after 393 A.H.

An apologia for the early Buwayhids in the form of a chronicle was composed (in order to obtain his release from prison) by Abū Iṣhāk al-Ṣāḥīb, under the title of al-Kūtāb al-Taḍītī (for ʿAḏud al-Dawla Tādī, the beginning of which, recently rediscovered in the Yemen, is in the possession of Dr. Minovi (it was not accessible to me), the work seems to have been known by later historiographers. Among the many works of Arabic historiographical literature, the following deserve special mention: Masʿūdī, *Mūṣādjī, ix, 1-34* (origins); Yāḥyā of Antioch; Ibn Jaʿfar, *al-Dawal al-Muḥtāṯīt* (relations with the Fātimids, unpublished but used by Wüstenfeld, *Geschichte der Fatimidischen-Chalifen*); Ibn Khallikān (lives of Muʿizz, Rukn and ʿImād al-Dawla); Ibn ʿṬabīb (late, but Shīʿī traditions); al-ʿUthbī (relations with the Ghaznavids); and the unduly neglected *Nestorian History of Mārī b. Sulaymān*, ed. Gismondi, Rome 1903.

Persian historiography comes into the picture with the anonymous *Muṣjdīl al-Tawārīkh* (ed. Bahmanyār, 1940), linked as regards Buwayhid history to al-Hamadhānī, and with the chronicles of the border states, the Ghaznavids (Gardīzī, Bayhakī), Ziyārīds and other southern Caspian dynasties (Ibn Isfandiyār). Moreover, several important local histories have come down to us in Persian. Examples of these are the *Ṭawrīk al-Kumm* of Hasan b. Muḥ. Kumāl, ed. Djalāl al-Dīn Thirānī, 1934, and the anonymous *Ṭawrīk al-Sūṭīn*, ed. Bahār, 1937.

In parahistoric literature, some information is to be found in al-Tanakīlī b. Nīṣābūrī (41, 151, 157, 169 and also in the Damascus 1930 volume, 130), and in the autobiography, *Sīra*, by the Fātimid missionary al-Muʿayyad al-Ṣīrāzī, ed. Kāmil Husayn, Cairo 1949 (relating to propaganda in the time of Abū Kālīǧīr). The diwāns and anthologies of such poets as al-Ṭaḥālīfī (Yaṭima), al-Bākharzī (Dumya), al-Tawḥīdī (especially K. al-Imāmī) are also useful; there is also some original information in the *Irshād* of Yāḥyā, ii, 273 f., iii, 180 f., v, 347 f., vi, 250 f. To the three great classics of geography, Iṣṭakhī, Ibn Hawālī, and al-Muḥaddassī—all three contemporaries of the Buwayhids (the first-mentioned was their subject)—may be added Nāṣir-i Kháṣarvīs *Safar-nāma* and some information contained in Yāḥyāsī K. al-Balīdī (especially iii, 145, art. Sāmīrān), and, in Ibn Balikhīs *Forsmānā* (ed. Nicholson; historical passage, 117-119).
Among juridico-institutional works, al-Mawardi, al-Ahkâm al-Sultânîyya, on which see supra, and, recently discovered at al-Athâr, the Rusûm Dâr al-Shâhûda by Hilâl al-Shâhû and his son Muh., on the etiquette of the Caliphate and the rules of the chancellerly up to the Buwayhid period (which was made accessible to me by the courtesy of Prof. Duri, Baghda), the financial history of the era can be studied through the treatises on fiscal mathematics by Abu 'l-Wâfa' al-Buzdâni (unpublished) and the anonymous K. al-Hâdî (analysed by Cl. Cahen in AIEO, Algiers 1952). See also Nizâm al-Mulk's Siydsât-nâmâ (ed. Schefer), especially 183. For religious history, see the theological works cited above, especially those of Ibn Bâbawâa.

Epigraphical material is to be found in RCEA (v, 1831-32, 1877, 1956; vi, 2079, 2577; viii, 2577), to be supplemented by G. Wiet, Soteres Persanes (cited below). For numismatic material, incompletely published, see, in addition to the Catalogue of the British Museum by Lane Poole, G. C. Miles, A Numismatic History of Rayy, 1938.

Modern Studies. No detailed comprehensive study of the Buwayhids exists, and apart from the suggestive sketch of V. Minorsky, La domination des Daylamites, Paris 1932, reader should consult those sections of B. Spuler's Iran in frûk-Islâmischer Zeit, 1952, and of A. Méz's Die Renaissance des Islams, devoted to the Buwayhids. More specialised aspects are dealt with in Mohsen Azizi, La domination arabe et l'épanouissement du sentiment national en Iran, 1952; Specialised aspects are dealt with in Mohsen Azizi, La domination arabe et l'épanouissement du sentiment national en Iran, 1952; and Amedroz, art. Shurî, in inshâ
desm [q.v.], and in the records of its western suburb Bab al-Buza, today the small town and half village according to that writer, and dominated by a citadel from which its strength was derived, it managed to withstand after the establishment of an incoming petition or report, often ordering that a fermân (or berât, etc.) be issued to a certain effect (cf. Kânînâmât-i Âl-i 'Âlâm, TOEM, Suppl., 1330, 16); b) orders issued independently (re'sên, beyzâd izeserine). The form of many of the latter was modelled on the Sultans' fermân [q.v.].

Many Buwayhilds had a seal and (or) a tughra-like substitute of a signature, the so-called jende [q.v.], affixed. Sometimes the word sahâ, 'it is correct', was added for authentication. Buwayhilds deal with various administrative matters, especially appointments, grants of fiefs, economic regulations, safe passage, etc. Originals are preserved in many archives in Turkey and elsewhere. The Baspevdet Arşivi [q.v.] at Istanbul also possesses numerous volumes of Buwayhîl documents. Other texts are found in insâm works (e.g., library of Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara, MS no. 70; Bibl. Nat., Paris, suppl. ture, MS no. 90) and in the records (sidülî) of Şarîa courts.


BUWAYHIDS or BUZââ (or Bûzâa), a locality in northern Syria about forty kilometres east of Aleppo in the rich valley of the Nahâr al-Dâbah or Wâdi Buţân [q.v.], which has lost its former prosperity in favour of its western suburb Bâb al-Buza, today the small town of al-Bâb. The freshness of its gardens and its commercial activity attracted the attention of Ibn al-Bawârî who stopped there in 380/1194, on the caravan route from Manbij to Aleppo. Half town and half village according to that writer, and dominated by a citadel from which its strength was derived, it managed to withstand after the establish-
ment of the Crusaders in Syria numerous attacks resulting either in the plunder of its territory, or even, in 531/1138, its seizure by the Franks, followed in the same year by Zangi's reoccupation. An inscription there mentions in 567/1171 the name of Isma'îl, the son of Nūr al-Dīn, before the town fell in 571/1175 to Saḷāḥ al-Dīn, and passed after that into the hands of the Mongols in 657/1258. It is also known that in 570/1174-75 there was a massacre of the Ismā'îlīs there who seem to have dominated the country formerly, and that in the vicinity the minaret of 'Aqīl b. Abī Tābī was venerated. It was during the period of the Mamluks that the village of al-Bāb, whose name was not separated from that of Buza'a in the medieval texts, appears to have clearly taken the lead. The importance of this place, which was the principal town of the 24th district of the province of Aleppo, and which Yākūt formerly described as an exportation point of cotton stuffs, is attested by the construction at that time of its great mosque (connected with the erection of the minarets of Buza'a and Tadhif, dated by inscriptions of 756/1355 and 755/1354), and by the number of administrative measures which were engraved on the gates of this building between 775/1374 and 858/1454.

Several epigraphical fragments are preserved as well in the neighbouring village of Tadhif.


BUZ-ABEH, governor of Fārs under the Saljuqs. Būz-Abeh was one of the amīrs of Mengu-bars, the governor of Fārs, for whom he administered the province of Khūzestān. He was also in the army of his superior when the latter, accompanied by other amīrs, moved against the Saljuqs. Mas'ud and was made prisoner at the battle of Kurganba (other sources call the scene of the encounter Pandī Angushi), later being put to death, in 532/1137-38. Since, after their victory, the sultan's troops began to plunder the enemy camp, Būz-Abeh attacked and dispersed them. Several prominent amīrs of the sultan's retinue were captured, and the sultan himself escaped only with great difficulty, in the company of the aṭaēb Kara Sonḳor. Enraged at the death of his superior, Būz-Abeh had all of the prisoners executed, among whom was the son of Kara Sonḳor. In order to avenge his son, the aṭaēb undertook in the following year an expedition against Fārs, where he installed the Saljuq prince Saldjūkshāh. But scarcely had Kara Sonḳor retired with his troops when Būz-Abeh, who had in the interim withdrawn to the fortress of Saḷīdīdī (Ku'd al-bayyādī), reappeared and conquered the defenceless Saldjūkshāh (534/1141). Sultan Mas'ud then forced them to abandon to him the province of Fārs. Būz-Abeh found an opportunity to confirm his situation by allying himself with two other amīrs, 'Abbās, ruler of Rayy, and 'Abd al-Rahmān Tūghūnyarāk. The sultan tolerated some time the tutelage of these men, but succeeded in freeing himself by having assassinated the two latter amīrs. Būz-Abeh marched against the sultan, but was captured and killed at the battle of Mardjk Karatākīn, a day's march from Hamadhān, in 542/1147. Būz-Abeh appears to have left a good administrative record at Shīrāz. Conforming with the tendency of all of the generals educated in the Saljuq tradition, he had erected a madrasa, richly endowed and at first Hanafī, though it became later Ḥanbali.


AL-BUZADJĀNĪ [see Abu' l-Wafā'ī]

BUZAKHA, a well in Nāqid in the territory of Asad or their neighbours Tāyyūn (cf. Mosâdāta, 3, 361, n. 3). The forces of the Banū Asad, who, led by the false prophet Tulayha, had relaxed from Islam on Muhammad’s death, were defeated at Buzakha in 11/632 by Abu Bakr's general Kḥālid b. al-Walī. Kḥālid's army was reinforced for the battle by 1000 men of Ṭayyi', detached from Tulayha's side; Tulayha had the help of 'Uyyayna b. Ḥṣa and 700 men from Fazāra of Chotaḥān, old allies of Asad's. After fierce fighting, 'Uyyayna saw that Tulayha's alleged prophetic powers were in practice proving useless against the Muslims, and fled the field. Tulayha had to flee to Syria; Asad submitted to Kḥālid; and neighbouring tribes like 'Amīr, who had been awaiting the outcome, now rallied to Islam.

Bibliography: Yākūt, i, 601-2; Ibn Saḑ, III, ii, 36-7; Tabarī, i, 1879, 1886-91; Ibn al-Ahīr, ii, 259-64; al-Baladhūrī, 95-97; Wellhausen, Skitten, vi, 9-12; Caetani, Amānā, ii, 604 ff.; Muir, Caliphate, Edinburgh 1915, 19-23. (C. E. Bosworth)

BIZURGMIHIR, Persian ships'-captain (nākūhād) of Rām-Hurmuz of the first half of the 4th/10th century and author of the Kitāb 'Aqīdah al-Hind (Marvels of India). This is a collection of Arabic of 134 stories and anecdotes gathered by the author from ships'-captains, pilots, traders and other seafaring men who used to sail the Indian Ocean and likely to spin a yarn about their adventures in East Africa, the Indian Archipelago and China. Incidentally they also give some information about these countries and the customs of their inhabitants. Sometimes the year of the event referred to is given, the latest being 349/953. The language of the book shows some Middle-Arabic traits (see 'Arabiyya, above, 570b).

Bibliography: The Arabic text, extant only in the Istanbul MS. Aya Sofya 3306, was edited by P. A. van der Lith together with a French translation by M. Devic, Leiden 1883-6. A new translation in French by J. Sauvaget is given in his Mémoires, i, Damascus 1954, 188-300; Russian translation by R. I. Ehrlich, Moscow 1959. See also Brockelmann S I, 409. (J. W. Fock)

BUZURGMIHIR, Iranian personal name (arabicised form Buzurgmihir) which according to a tradition transmitted by Iranian and Arab writers, was given to a man endowed with every ability and virtue who was the minister of Khusrav I Anūgha-
rawân (6th century A.D.). The earliest authorities who were acquainted with the Pahlawi Kthádhrnrmégk ("Book of Sovereigns"), written towards the end of the Sásánid period (7th century), the oldest accounts of pre-Islamic Iranian history penned by Arab writers (al-Tabari, Ibn Kutayba), have no reference to Buzurgmihr. It is only in later works that he becomes the hero of anecdotes deriving from popular tradition (in Thaślalí's "History of the Persian Kings", a section of the Thchur al-Siyar — vide El, iv, 770 col. a, and, more freely than one would expect, in Firdawsl's "Book of Kings", the Shâdk-nmâ, and sometimes the originator of numerous wise precepts, survivals from the collections (andar) of the Sásánid period, preserved in some minor post-Sásánid Pahlawi works (notably the Pandnrmégk-e Vuzurgmâr-e Bokhtaghdn, "the Book of precepts of Buzurgmâr son of Bokhtâgh"). These precepts were translated into Arabic and Persian by several authors: al-Masâdl, Firdawsl (in whose poem Buzurgmihr presents the king with the book of wisdom, the fruit of their conversations, which in reality derived from the Pandnrmégk), Nîçmîn al-Mulk, and others. There are three anecdotes concerning Buzurgmihr which are significant because of their elements of popular origin: I—the King of Persia dreams that, as he is drinking, a pig puts his snout in the cup. No one can interpret this until the young Buzurgmihr informs the king that one of his wives is bestowing her favours on another and that, in order to be certain, the women must be summoned to appear naked: among them is discovered a youth of the same age as the woman just mentioned. II—Buzurgmihr discovers the secret of the game of chess, sent as a challenge by the King of India to the King of Persia; he then invents the game of tic-tac-toe, the secret of which the latter and his counsellors do not succeed in discovering (the source of this is a small Pahlawi work of a popular type, the "Story of the Game of Chess", Mâdhdhrn-e satrang). III—Buzurgmihr, in disgrace and in prison, is recalled when the Byzantine Emperor refuses to pay tribute to the Persian sovereign unless he guesses the contents of a sealed coffer which he has sent him; the king summons Buzurgmihr, who resolves the enigma and is reinstated in royal favour (to the preceding theme is joined that of the sage liberated and recompensed for his wisdom: Nôdeke recognised the similarity of this episode with another in the history of the sage Ahikar). These anecdotes put Buzurgmihr in direct contact with popular tradition, but is he a historical personage? A. Christensen, in a noteworthy article, has rightly pointed out, apart from a reference to Buzurgmihr, there are others relating to the sentence of death passed by Hormizd, the son and successor of Anôsharawan, one of three of the latter's counsellors, one of whom bore the name of Burzmâr (Thaślalî), Burzmâr, then Simâh Burzê—a hypocoristic of Burzmâr (in Firdawsl). In the name of Burzê, the famous physician, the supposed author of the Pahlawi adaptation of Kaîla va Dimâ, who was a contemporary of Anôsharawan. Justi (Iran Namenbuch, 74) and Christensen see the same root burz ("high") and a hypocoristic ending (as in Burzê, peculiar to the Sásánid period, are very rare, Burzmâr ("protected by the High Mithra") is semantically related to Burzmâr ("protected by the Great Mithra"): further it is enough to write both words in the Arabic script in order to see discursively they may be confused. Finally, certain passages in the preface to the Kaîla, traditionally attributed to Bûrzê and known through the Arabic translation of Ibn al-Mukaffa', give bibliographical details which the authors also attribute to Buzurgmihr or divide them between both personalities. To sum up, Iran in the reign of Anôsharawân was influenced by Indian civilisation, thanks to certain intellectuals, of whom Bûrzê was one, and who was made famous by his Pahlawi adaptation of the Pancatantra; the introduction of chess in Iran was attributed to him, a number of precepts and maxims, and later certain characteristics of sagacity and divination which already existed in popular tradition; then a false reading of his name as transcribed in Arabic led to the creation of a double personality.

Bibliography: A. Christensen, La légende du sage Buzurgmihr, in Acta Orientalia, 1930, iii/1, 81-128 (a basic and detailed study, with an analysis of and extracts from the sources); idem, Iran sous les Sassanides (particularity 57-8, and index, i.e. Vuzurgmihr, Bûrzê); on the Zafarnmâ, vide the text in Ch. Schefler, Christ. persan, i, 17 and Christensen's trans. in La légende..., 121; Grundriss der Iran. Philologie, ii, 346-7. (H. Masé)

BUZURG-UMMID, Kîva, second dâsî (1124-1138) at Alamût (q.v.) of the Nizârî Ismâ'îlîs. He was evidently related by marriage to the ruling families of Mâzandârân. From 495/1102-1124 he was Ismâ'îlî governor of Lumnasar, a stronghold in the Rûdhâr of Alamût. He with three other chiefs had captured it for Hasan-i Sâbbâh when its holders had broken their agreement with the Ismâ'îlîs and had planned to call in the Sâlîgûk amîr, Nâshâtân Shîrîr. Using local forced labour, he rebuilt it, equipping it with water and fine gardens. There he successfully resisted the last and gravest attack on the Ismâ'îlîs by Muhammad Tapar's troops under Shîrîr in 511/1117. In 518/1124 Hasan-i Sâbbâh on his deathbed appointed him his successor as head dâsî of the sect, with three associates. Under his rule the Ismâ'îlî state retained its independence against renewed attacks [see Alamût (II) The Dynasty] several new strongholds were established, including Maymûndiz in 520/1126. In 526/1131 he defeated and killed a Zayûl îmîm, Abû Hâshûm, who had arisen in Daylamân and had followers as far as Khurûsân. Buzurg-ummid died in 532/1138, leaving the position of dâsî to his son Muhammad. He was buried next to Hasan-i Sâbbâh, where his tomb was piously visited. His descendants formed the leading family in Alamût.


BYZANTINES [see RUM].

BZEDUKH [see ČERKES].